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Abstract. In recent years the huge success of Social Network Sites (SNSs) has principally been determined by their ability to link people and their respective relationships. These relationships allow people to access different resources, information, emotional and social support, entertainment, as well as providing them with the opportunity to extend personal social ties. This paper investigates the way in which SNSs are used by emerging adults, defined as young people in the transition from adolescence to adulthood, and particularly those in their last year of high school or at university. The study focuses on different types of social capital and on the use of social network sites by emerging adults during this transitional phase in maintaining and developing relationships. Data collected from a questionnaire administered to 927 emerging adults show, first of all, the relevance of different types of social capital (bridging, bonding and maintaining) based on the student’s position (high school, university first-year student or university student). Secondly, the data analysis indicates that social network sites can be conceived as part of functional organs that support emerging adults in their ability to connect and to be connected to a social network, and to develop and maintain it over time.

Practitioner’s Notes
What is already known about this topic:
• The Use of SNSs in College Students of the North American Context (Ellison, Steinfield & Lampe, 2007; 2008).
• SNSs Conceived as Mediational Tools in Educational Contexts (Cotroneo, 2011; Diggins, Risquez, Murphy, 2011; Harrison, Thomas, 2009; Hung, Yuenb, 2010).

What this paper adds:
• An European country’s vision of the use of SNSs in high school and university students.
• A different structure of social capital, with particular reference to Bridging Social Capital.
• The connection between different types of social capital (bridging, bonding and maintained), emerging adults and the mediational role played by social network sites.
• A vision of SNSs as functional organs that allow students to go beyond the boundaries of their physical capacities in order to achieve results which would otherwise be impossible.

Implications for practice and/or policy:
• The use of SNSs in supporting socialization during the transitions of emerging adults.
• The use of SNSs by educational institutes in sharing information and communicating with students.
• The mediational role played by social network sites in emerging adults for creating, maintaining and managing their social capital during their transitions from schools to university.
Introduction
Young people from 18 to 25 years of age go through a particular developmental stage defined as ‘emerging adulthood’. It is characterized by their subjective perception of no longer being adolescents, but at the same time, not yet adults since, in many cases, they are not financially independent from their families (Arnett, 2000). This phase of life is also characterized by many changes and choices to be made, such as leaving high school, going to university, forming more stable relationships, tackling unemployment, looking for a new job, leaving home, planning to start a family, etc. Arnett (2000; 2001) identified three further factors that are peculiar to the developmental stage in question, differentiating it from those before and after – adolescence and adulthood respectively. These factors are:
- The number of moves and residential changes (Goldscheider, 1997);
- Identity exploration;
- A greater likelihood of engaging in ‘risky behavior’.

Arnett (2000; 2003) suggested that the concept of ‘emerging adulthood’ is culturally and socially determined. It is typical of western industrial society, in which education and training consist almost normatively of various steps involving, among the other things, the possibility of trying many training courses and postponing the responsibilities typical of adulthood.

Despite critical comments about the concept made by some scholars like Bynner (2005) and Hendry and Kloep (2010), and the consequent debate between experts in this field (Arnett, Kloep, Hendry and Tanner, 2010), the concept of emerging adults will be central to the present paper.

In view of the transitions and related challenges faced by emerging adults (Hendry, Kloep, 2002), it may be asked what types of resources they have available to them in order to achieve their objectives. They undoubtedly rely on people (Hendry, Kloep, 2002; Wenger, 1998), or rather, on the network of relationships (social capital) that individuals constantly establish, develop, and modify throughout their lives.
Before considering the different types of social capital, the following key of the abbreviations used throughout the article is provided to aid the reader:
- SNS: Social Network Site
- SNSs: Social Network Sites
- BrSC: Bridging Social Capital
- BoSC: Bonding Social Capital
- MSC: Maintained Social Capital
- RBrSC: Relational Bridging Social Capital
- CBrSC: Contextual Bridging Social Capital
- HSS: High School Students
- UFYS: University First-Year Students
- US: University Students

Types of Social Capital
Social capital has been defined as ‘the aggregate of the actual or potential resources which are linked to the possession of a durable network of more or less institutionalized relationships of mutual acquaintance and recognition’ (Bourdieu, 1986; 248). It can be conceptualized as a form of capital that is rooted in the relationships between individuals, and can be quantified at both individual or group level. The concept of ‘social capital’ (Bourdieu, 1980, 1986; Coleman, 1990) was revisited by Putnam (1993) who made a distinction between two types: Bridging Social Capital and Bonding Social Capital. The former is represented by the ‘weak ties’ suggested by Granovetter (1982), and is characterized by infrequent and occasional bonds; these can provide helpful information and open up new perspectives, but do not typically foster emotional support. In contrast, Bonding Social Capital refers to more frequent and stable ties, typical of friendship or family and characterized by emotional support. From this point of view, Bonding Social Capital is closely related to the idea of ‘strong ties’ proposed by Granovetter (1982). Following the scholars...
mentioned above, Ellison, Steinfield and Lampe (2007) introduced a subtype of BrSC, named Maintained Social Capital. This subtype represents the potential for staying in touch with a network of weak relationships over a long period of time and through many transitions. The authors (ibid.) adapted questions about general bridging relationships to be specific to maintained relationships with high school acquaintances.

Some authors have highlighted the positive effect of social capital, not only in the workplace, but also in educational or learning contexts and in a person’s free time. For instance, maintaining previously constructed social capital seems to facilitate the transition from high school to university (Paul, Brier, 2001). Further studies show that different types of social capital are directly associated with certain determinants of psychological well-being, such as self-esteem or life satisfaction (Bargh, McKenna, 2004; Helliwell, Putnam, 2004; Klingensmith, 2010). Based on an analysis of Maslow’s hierarchy of needs, Balague and Fayon (2010) noted that being part of a social network may meet the need to belong to a group or community, but may also help to fulfill the need for self-esteem, deriving from the received acknowledgment by others of being an effective member of the network. The authors also focused their attention on online networks, such as those created by Social Network Sites, and noted that these networks respond to higher needs such as creativity, a typical element in the need for self-actualization (an aspect which is evident in the care put into the construction of online profiles and self-presentation). Thus, social networks, and in particular online networks, today represent a simple and fast way, accessible to all, to develop personal social capital and enhance personal and interpersonal resources (Balague, Fayon, 2010; Hendry, Kloep, 2002).

Social Networking Sites: Connecting People Online
We can briefly describe SNSs as those online services that allow:
- the creation of a public (or semi-public) profile;
- the usage of a list of contacts for communication;
- the analysis of the personal network of ties and visualization of the friends of friends (Boyd, Ellison, 2007).

Thanks to these features, SNSs enable users to maintain and strengthen their existing friendships, extend their network of contacts and express their social identity online. Boyd and Ellison (2007) suggest that these services are unique, not as much due to their ability to connect people, as to the demarcation and visibility they give to the personal networks of ties. SNSs are frequently used to stay in touch with people that are part of a person’s offline, or real, social capital. Indeed, some studies suggest that Facebook users are more interested in looking for people they already know in the real world than in connecting with people they do not know (Lampe, Ellison, Steinfield, 2006; Lenhart, Madden, 2007). Boyd (2008) suggested that MySpace and Facebook enhance American teens’ opportunities for socialization in the real world. She argues that SNSs are public networks which support sociality in ways that real public spaces cannot. Boyd and Ellison (2007) pointed out that prior to the diffusion of SNSs, online and offline communities were not completely connected with each other and did not overlap as much as they do today. Furthermore, SNSs allow connections which would otherwise be impossible, thanks to the network of latent ties (Haythornthwaite, 2005) represented by those ties which are technologically existent and already possible, but not yet socially activated.

The Social Capital of Italian Emerging Adults
We conducted a study built on previous research into the use of SNSs (in particular Facebook) by emerging adults (Ellison, Steinfield, Lampe, 2007; Steinfield, Ellison, Lampe, 2008; Subrahmanyan and colleagues, 2008). According to Ellison and colleagues (2007; 2008), Facebook seems to play an important role in creating and maintaining both bonding and bridging social capital in college students. Data from their study show that the students use Facebook mainly to keep in touch with old friends (e.g. those from school or from their hometown), and to maintain and strengthen ties constructed in the offline world (e.g. with neighbors in their dorm room or students on their
courses). Subrahmanyan and colleagues (2008) suggested that SNSs are also important in finding out information regarding one’s personal interests. Many participants in their study stated that they use SNSs for finding people met in previous phases of their life, who could today be helpful to them for various specific reasons. Finding these old friends and acquaintances is made possible thanks to the individual’s network of latent ties constructed using SNSs. Assuming that SNSs are important tools for sustaining and enhancing bridging social capital, Mazzoni and Gaffuri (2009) integrated this type of web artifact into the Cultural Historical Activity Theory - CHAT (Engeström, 1987; Nardi, 1996). From this perspective, the artifacts can be seen as mediators for the relations between a subject, the reference community, and the object of the activity, within specific learning and working contexts known as activity systems (Engeström, 1987; Kaptelinin, 1996). Considering, therefore, a learning context such as university, a web artifact such as a SNS becomes a potential mediator between a student (subject) and the other students (community) for exchanging information or constructing knowledge (object) toward a common outcome represented by a university degree. Mazzoni and Gaffuri (2009) thus depicted the role played by SNSs in crossing the boundaries of human knowledge which characterize different activity systems during the transitions of emerging adulthood (e.g. from high school to work, from high school to university, or from university to work). In the authors’ view, SNSs can help emerging adults to actively manage their networks of relationships and acquaintances, obtain information about new opportunities or events, and get involved in knowledge construction processes (Frozzi, Mazzoni, 2011; Mazzoni, Gaffuri, 2009).

In this paper we therefore suggest that SNSs are web artifacts which mediate and facilitate the relations (entry, socialization, collaboration, etc.) between emerging adults and the activity systems they encounter during their transitions by augmenting their capacity to be connected, stay in touch with their network of relations, maintain and develop social capital and co-construct knowledge. In this study we refer to Leont’ev’s concept of ‘functional organ’ (Leont’ev, 1981) and we shall see SNSs as tools that allow people to achieve results (or objectives) otherwise impossible or more difficult to achieve. In summary, the present study aims to explore the role of SNSs in forming, maintaining, and evolving social capital. It will specifically investigate the use of SNSs by Italian emerging adults facing challenges represented by the transition from high school to university. This study focuses on young people aged between 18 and 25 living in Italy, an industrialized country. Based on the analysis of previous literature, this study examines how a role change (being a high school student, a university first-year student or a university student) and a residential change made in order to attend university, may influence an individual’s social capital and the use of SNSs in its construction, preservation and development. In particular, we intend to answer two main research questions:

RQ1) Do transitions, such as a change in a student’s role (from high school to a bachelor’s degree or from the latter to a master’s degree) or a residential change in order to attend university, influence the perceived importance of different types of social capital (BoSC, BrSC, MSC)? Since emerging adults (such as college and university students) are faced to many transitions (and in many cases these transitions mean the need of maintaining previous social networks and creating new ones), we will analyse if the three types of social capital have different importance for students due to the specific transitions they are going through.

RQ2) What role do SNSs play in creating and maintaining social capital during these transitions? In this case we are interested in analyzing the role of functional organs played by SNSs in supporting emerging adults in maintaining and constructing social relations during their transitions and if there are differences in the use of these web artefacts in relation to the specific transition and type of social capital to build, maintain or increase.

These research questions are relevant first of all to understand the influence of different types of social capital for students' well-being during their transitions, and further to build university welcoming services to sustain these students transitions based on more informal (and popular) web
Materials and Methods

This study focuses on two types of transitions (leaving high school to go to university and a change in one’s residence, for example leaving one’s hometown to attend university) during emerging adulthood in an industrialized country (Italy). The questionnaire was completed by a total of 927 students from high school (329, i.e. 35.50%) and university (598, i.e. 64.50%), including 629 (67.90%) females and 298 (32.10%) males. As regards the high school students, 139 (42.25%) attend vocational institutes, 138 (41.95%) technical schools and 52 (15.80%) attend a ‘liceo’ (a high school specializing in various humanities or sciences). 395 (66.05%) of the university students surveyed belong to humanistic faculties, 137 (22.91%) to scientific faculties, 60 (10.04%) to socio-economic faculties and 6 (1.00%) to other faculties. The average age of the students surveyed is 20.70 (min. 18 and max. 29). The average time spent on the Internet is 2-3 hours per day, and the most utilized SNS is Facebook (94.37%).

Regarding the university students’ residential changes, 285 students (47.70%) stated that they had left their previous town to attend university. It is also important to distinguish between the 212 (35.50%) first-year students doing a Bachelor’s degree or a Master’s degree (i.e. those who have made one or two transitions) and the 386 (64.50%) university students enrolled in years after the first (i.e. those that have already experienced one or both transitions) in this group.

Table 1

A questionnaire derived from the tool used by Ellison, Steinfield, and Lampe (2007; 2008) was administered for data collection. These authors had inquired about demographic details, Facebook use, psychological well-being, and social capital (bridging, bonding, and maintained) by using 5-point Likert scales. After obtaining permission from the authors, an Italian version of their questionnaire was devised; the same scales of the original were maintained, but some questions were adjusted to suit the Italian language and context. In order to translate and adapt the questionnaire, the forward-backward-forward technique was used. Overall the questionnaire was composed by a total of 125 items: 18 for demographic details, 4 relational items (they refer to relationship status, number of friends, number of acquaintances and to belonging to students associations), 6 on Internet use, 23 on SNS use and SNS contacts/relations, 74 items of the Ellison, Steinfield and Lampe questionnaire. Within these 74 items, there are specific items for detecting the three different types of social capital previously described, i.e. Bridging Social Capital (BrSC), Bonding Social Capital (BoSC) and Maintained Social Capital (MSC).

An important difference between the original questionnaire and the Italian version is that in the former the authors only focused on Facebook, whereas in the latter, the students were asked to name the SNS they used primarily and to complete the questionnaire accordingly. This is due to the fact that we were not interested in a specific SNS, but rather in the mediating role played by this type of web artifact. The survey was administered on paper for the high school students and online for the university students. We chose to make this differentiation as Italian high schools do not have the good networks between each other and between their students which are typical of the university environment in which students have the opportunity to participate in many groups and associations connecting many faculties and universities.

Results

To identify the main responses to the questionnaire and compare them with those given in the original study, we computed a factor analysis that yielded the same factors (with the same items) extracted by Ellison, Steinfield, and Lampe (2007), with also similar results about the reliability analysis. In particular, as regard specifically the different types of social capital, we obtain a
reliability score of .75 and .73 for respectively BoSC and MSC, while in Ellison, Steinfield and Lampe’s study the same scores are of .75 and .81. The sole but very interesting and important difference lies in the structure of Bridging Social Capital. Ellison and colleagues found a one-factor solution representing BrSC (.87), while we found two different factors that describe two different aspects of this type of social capital:
- Relational BrSC (RBrSC; Cronbach’s alpha = .74), i.e. the construction of social capital (and the related perception of it) deriving from a direct activation in creating relations with the other students in the faculty;
- Contextual BrSC (CBrSC; Cronbach’s alpha = .84), i.e. the construction of social capital (and the related perception of it) deriving from belonging to the faculty (and the involvement in interactions that this belonging entails).
We can therefore say that the first type of BrSC is characterized by a more active role on the part of the individual, while the second is characterized more by the context and by the opportunities that it provides.

The factors identified from the factor analysis are as follows:

Table 2

Examples of items of each scale are the following:
Scale 1 - “Interacting with people at my faculty makes me want to try new things”.
Scale 2 - “I attend parties or social gatherings where most attendees are students of my faculty”.
Scale 3 - “There is someone at my faculty I can turn to for advice about making very important decisions”.
Scale 4 - “I would be able to find information about a job or internship from persons met in the past”.
Scale 5 - “I am able to do things as well as most other people”
Scale 6 - “People I knew from high school want me to use my SNS”.
Scale 7 - “I feel I am part of the SNS community”
Scale 8 - “I think that most people that see my SNS profile would come away with a good impression of me”.
Scale 9 - “Many people I communicate with use the same SNS that I use”
Scale 10 - “My SNS use is out of control”.
Scale 11 - “In most ways my life at my faculty is close to my ideal”

For the purposes previously stated, this paper will focus principally on factors related to social capital, i.e. RBrSC, CBrSC, BoSC, MaSC (Scale 1, 2, 3, 4), and also on the social pressure to be part of a SNS (scale 6).

We shall firstly consider the students’ position, i.e. whether they are in the last year of high school, a university first-year student or a university student who is no longer a first-year student. The following tables show the results of a MANOVA, in which we compare the different students’ conditions as regards the factors previously outlined (tab. 3), measured on a 5-point Likert scale (1-strongly disagree → 5-strongly agree; e.g. I would be able to find information about a job or internship from a high school/faculty acquaintance; I’d be able to stay with a high school/faculty acquaintance if traveling to a different city; etc.), and the reasons for using the SNS (tab. 4), measured on a 5-point Likert scale (1-very unlikely → 5-very likely).

Table 3

Results show that there are significant differences between the three types of students’ in the following:
- RBrSC and CBrSC, in which UFYS affirm that they have more opportunities in terms of bridging social capital than those perceived by the other types of students;
- MaSC, in which the HSS perceive fewer possibilities for this type of social capital;
- Social pressure to be part of the SNS, in which the HSS seem to perceive greater pressure to subscribe to the SNS than that perceived by US.

There is, however, no difference regarding the BoSC. The following table (tab. 4) shows the significant differences in the purposes for using a SNS. The first three types of use are connected to the social capital construction, while the latter four are connected to the learning support and the knowledge construction.

Table 4

HSS seem to be more likely than the other students to use a SNS to get to know new people and to find people. However, both UFYS and US are more likely than HSS to use a SNS to keep in touch with old friends and take a break from studying. Furthermore, US are more likely to use a SNS to get help while studying, find useful information, and share music, films, videos, etc.

We will now focus on UFYS and US, particularly those students that went through a residential change in order to attend university. Our aim is to verify whether and how the residential change has an impact on the use of SNSs and on factors detected by the factor analysis. A MANOVA was carried out on both UFYS and US, including those with a residential change; the results indicated no significant differences regarding either the use of SNSs or the factors previously described. No differences were found when considering solely the UFYS and focusing on the residential change, whereas some significant differences were revealed in US based on whether they had made a residential change in order to attend university (tab. 5).

Table 5

Those university students who had experienced a residential change seem to perceive greater Bridging Social Capital (both relational and contextual) and also greater Maintained Social Capital than those who didn't go through that change. At the same time, it is more likely that they would use the SNS to keep in touch with old friends then to find out more about friends and acquaintances. In other words, the second use of the SNS is considerably more widespread in university students who have not experienced a residential change than in those who have, even though one may expect the opposite.

Discussion

Before beginning to analyze the results, it is first necessary to define two different types of BrSC which are relevant to this paper: relational (RBrSC) and contextual (CBrSC). In our view, these two types of BrSC are constructed by activating different types of behavior such as contacting or interacting actively with people in a given context (RBrSC), or participating in activities within the context which are perceived as sources of enrichment for the social capital (CBrSC).

We can interpret the results of the first (table 3) and third (table 5) analyses as the fact that the insertion into a new activity system (such as university) increases the need to construct new social capital in an unknown context, independently from any residential change. In other words, the importance of constructing a new social network is determined by the encounter with a new social context rather than by leaving an old familiar context. Since this is an important prerequisite for good socialization and an effective assumption of the role of university student, in UFYS the context is perceived as an important source of social capital, both for actively creating new relations and for participating in the context’s activities. Only in US, after the initial phase of the transition to university which is typical of UFYS, the residential change (and the distance from the place of origin) causes both types of BrSC to become particularly relevant. A possible explanation is that US try to construct new social capital that could also integrate the relations with the place of origin which may, for a time, suffer because of the distance. Conversely, those US without a residential
change may be able to count on a local network of ties that support them outside the university context; therefore the BrSC deriving from the university context is of lesser importance.

As regards to MaSC, the results obtained are probably due to the students’ need to maintain ties created during previous experiences which could also be useful to them in the future. Indeed, this type of social capital reflects age and previous experience, so it is not unusual that UFYS and above all US have a greater amount of MaSC. While this aspect may seem obvious, it is not so according to a Lifelong Learning view in which the diversification of experiences is an important factor for enhancing the social capital on which emerging adults may count in the future (Frozzi, Mazzoni, 2011).

Interesting differences were found between US and HSS in the perception of the relationship between SNSs and a real social network. While the former state that their offline social network also makes use of the same SNS, the latter admit to perceiving greater social pressure by their offline social network to subscribe to and use the SNS. We may interpret these results by referring to Leont’ev (1978) and the concept of functional organs (Kaptelinin, 1996; Mazzoni, Gaffuri, 2009). In US, due to their condition and also their previous experiences and future needs, the perception of the SNS evolves as an artifact for maintaining contact with their social capital, rather than being a simple reflex that responds to a trend (everyone uses it) and not to a real need determined by the aim to achieve a specific objective.

A further interesting result is that US have a greater awareness of the potentialities offered by the SNSs, probably seen as a possible online transposition of their offline social network. In fact, they claim to use SNSs significantly more than both UFYS and HSS to get help when studying, find useful information and share music, films, videos, etc.. These results can be interpreted as an evolution of their needs. After the initial need for affiliation (typical of HSS) and belonging and social support (important for UFYS), they (US) may focus on the realization of themselves and of their objectives. From this point of view the SNS becomes an artifact for creating, maintaining and managing their social networks, i.e. a tool that allows them to do something previously possible only within the physical boundaries of the offline world. It reinforces the idea of SNSs as parts of a functional organs (Leont’ev, 1981) which allow emerging adults to go beyond the boundaries of their physical and mental abilities in order to achieve results which would otherwise be impossible or more difficult. We may therefore interpret SNSs as web artifacts which allow emerging adults to expand their skills to create and maintain social capital over time, particularly so for those having to deal with important transitions between different activity systems (Tuomi-Gröhn, Engeström, 2003).

Last but not least, the differences found between students with and without a residential change. To interpret this result we suggest that students without a residential change have nonetheless expanded their social networks thanks to attending university. They may therefore count on the old social networks (of the context in which they live) and on the new one determined by their attendance of university courses. The SNS becomes the tool that allows them to quickly acquire concise information about their whole network of friends. Conversely, the students who experience a residential change may count principally on the new ties created at university with whom they share experiences and everyday life. They consequently find the information they need within the context of university rather than through the SNS. Finally, students with a residential change attach greater significance to their maintained social capital and, in this case, the SNS seems to be the ideal artifact for maintaining contact with people from the student’s hometown or from the context to which they previously belonged.

Conclusions

In this study we have described how high school and university students use SNSs to create, maintain and develop their social capital in the online world. Depending on the specific transitions and challenges they have to face, the relevance of the different types of social capital (bridging, bonding and maintained) varies, as does the use of SNSs by students as regards obtaining social...
support, constructing relations and looking for and finding information. An important element in the transition from school to university seems to be bridging social capital, both relational (with an active role of students in interactions) and contextual (belonging to a specific context). From this point of view, the SNSs can be seen as part of functional organs that may expand the students’ connectivity skills and in a Lifelong Learning view this might be considered particularly relevant for those activity systems that deal with important transitions of emerging adults and the related need for socialization. Indeed, SNSs can be seen as interesting web artifacts for a sort of pre-socialization of university first-year students which may facilitate the subsequent insertion into the university context.

One limit of this study is that it refers to the specific cultural context of Italy, which is similar to that of many industrialized countries, particularly the European ones, but with its particularities concerning high school and university education, but also regarding the relationship between emerging adults, the family and the hometown. Based on these results, future researchers may choose to focus on a wider range of emerging adults around the world as well as on the transition from school or university to the workplace. What role do SNSs play during these transitions? And is the significance of the different types of social capital the same?
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residential change</th>
<th>UFYS</th>
<th>US</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Did you leave your previous city to attend university?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>90 (31.60%)</td>
<td>195 (68.40%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>122 (39.00%)</td>
<td>191 (61.00%)</td>
<td>313 (52.30%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>212 (35.50%)</td>
<td>386 (64.50%)</td>
<td>598 (100.00%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 1: University First-Year Students (UFYS) and University Students (US) who experienced a residential change to attend university.*
Table 2: Factors identified by the factor analysis and the corresponding reliability
The total number of items (54) is obtained by deleting from the factorial analysis those items having a factor score lower than 0.30.
Table 3: Significant results of the Sheffé post hoc test carried out on the identified factors. *p<0.05 **p<0.01

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Mean difference</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>df</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HSS</td>
<td>UFYS</td>
<td>US</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relational Bridging Social Capital (RBBrSC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSS</td>
<td>-.46**</td>
<td>-.16*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UFYS</td>
<td>.46**</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>-.30**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contextual Bridging Social Capital (CBrSC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSS</td>
<td>-.85**</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UFYS</td>
<td>.85**</td>
<td>.78**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.78**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintained Social Capital (MaSC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSS</td>
<td>-.51**</td>
<td>-.58**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UFYS</td>
<td>.51**</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US</td>
<td>.58**</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of use of SNS by their offline social network</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSS</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.15**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UFYS</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.14*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US</td>
<td>.15**</td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social pressure to be part of the SNS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSS</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UFYS</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US</td>
<td>-.29**</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HSS: High School Students
UFYS: University First-Year Students
US: University Students
F: F-distribution (mean square among group/mean square within group)
df: degrees of freedom
The probability of using a social network to … | Mean difference | F  | df |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HSS</td>
<td>UFYS</td>
<td>US</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get to know new people</td>
<td>.71**</td>
<td>.92**</td>
<td>43.02 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.71**</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.92**</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Find people to add to a list of friends</td>
<td>.91**</td>
<td>.91**</td>
<td>47.34 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.91**</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.91**</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keep in touch with old friends</td>
<td>-.21*</td>
<td>-.30**</td>
<td>10.02 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.21*</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take a break from studying</td>
<td>-.29*</td>
<td>-.49**</td>
<td>17.51 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.29*</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.49**</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get help while studying</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.46**</td>
<td>18.32 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.59**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.46**</td>
<td>.59**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Find useful information</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.43**</td>
<td>13.02 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.29*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.43**</td>
<td>.29*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share music, films, videos, etc.</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.44**</td>
<td>12.88 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.36**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.44**</td>
<td>.36*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Significant results of the Sheffé post hoc test carried out on the use of the SNS. *p<0.05 **p<0.01

HSS: High School Students
UFYS: University First-Year Students
US: University Students

F: F-distribution (mean square among group/mean square within group)
df: degrees of freedom
### University Students (US): Factors and reasons to use SNS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Residential change</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>df</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RBrSC</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>4.19*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBrSC</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>5.61*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MaSC</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>4.76*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... find out more about your friends and acquaintances</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>6.54*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.. keep in touch with old friends</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>4.20*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Significant results based on the residential change. *p<0.05

RBrSC: Relational Bridging Social Capital
CBrSC: Contextual Bridging Social Capital
MaSC: Maintained Social Capital

F: F-distribution (mean square among group/mean square within group)
df: degrees of freedom