



UNF Digital Commons

UNF Graduate Theses and Dissertations

Student Scholarship

2012

A Tale of Self-Monitoring, Social Capital, and Social Media

David A. Beane
University of North Florida

Suggested Citation

Beane, David A., "A Tale of Self-Monitoring, Social Capital, and Social Media" (2012). *UNF Graduate Theses and Dissertations*. 343.
<https://digitalcommons.unf.edu/etd/343>

This Master's Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Scholarship at UNF Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in UNF Graduate Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of UNF Digital Commons. For more information, please contact [Digital Projects](#).

© 2012 All Rights Reserved



A Tale of Self-Monitoring, Social Capital, and Social Media

by

David A. Beane

A thesis submitted to the Department of Psychology
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts in General Psychology

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH FLORIDA

COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

August, 2012

unpublished work c David Beane

Certificate of Approval

The thesis of David Anthony Beane is approved:

(Date)

Signature Deleted

Dr. Christophér Leone

Signature Deleted

July 17, 2012

Dr. Ashley Allen

July 17, 2012

Accepted for the Psychology Department:

Signature Deleted

Dr. Michael Toggia
Chair

7/17/12

Accepted for the College of Arts and Sciences:

Signature Deleted

Dr. Barbara Hetrick
Dean

1 AUGUST 2012

Accepted for the University:

Signature Deleted

Dr. Len Roberson
Dean of The Graduate School

8/6/12

Dedication

This thesis is the culmination of three years of hard work. However by no means was this accomplishment a one man effort. First and foremost I want to dedicate this thesis to my father, David P. Beane, who through his actions taught me the meaning of perseverance and redefined the word “tough”. I thank my mother, Estelle Beane, for teaching me what it means to achieve, and my sister, Christina Beane, for the support she’s showed me. I would also like to thank Alecia Schrenk for her emotional support and encouragement.

Acknowledgement

It is with immense gratitude that I acknowledge the support and help of Dr. Christopher Leone, without whom I would never have come as far as I have over these past three years. This accomplishment is also due in no small part to Lou Anne Hawkins who guided and supported me throughout this process. I am also indebted to Dr. Ashley Allen, who though new to the University of North Florida, jumped on board this project with her enthusiasm and an academic perspective that made this thesis that much better. I would also like to thank Dr. Michael Toggia for his input and feedback on my writing. My thanks also to Lee Gainey, John Krause, and Dustin Thomas for the copious writing feedback and editing assistance they provided throughout this process. Last, I’d like to thank Sara Haynes who assisted me in data collection and Robert Moulder who provided his technological know-how to this project.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES.....	v
ABSTRACT.....	vi
INTRODUCTION.....	1
Self-Monitoring.....	1
Self-Monitoring and Friendships.....	5
Self-Monitoring and the Digital World.....	7
Social Capital.....	11
Bridging Social Capital.....	14
Bonding Social Capital.....	16
Bridging and Bonding Social Capital: Holding Hands and Greasing Palms.....	17
Hypotheses.....	18
METHOD.....	20
Participants.....	20
Procedure.....	20
Self-Monitoring.....	21
Online Bridging and Bonding Social Capital.....	24
Facebook Importance.....	26
RESULTS.....	28
Preliminary Analyses.....	28
Main Analyses.....	29
Ancillary Analyses.....	31
DISCUSSION.....	35
Limitations.....	36
Future Directions.....	39
Conclusion.....	42
REFERENCES.....	47
FOOTNOTES.....	65
TABLES.....	66
CURRICULUM VITA.....	69

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE 1. Correlation Matrix for Frequency of Facebook uses.....	66
TABLE 2. Correlation Matrix for Frequency of Facebook Uses (continued).....	67
TABLE 3. Correlation Matrix for Importance of Facebook Uses.....	68

Abstract

We examined whether individual self-monitoring differences predict what type of relationships people have on Facebook. In the offline world, high self-monitors have large heterogeneous social networks made up of weak emotional ties, whereas low self-monitors have small homogenous social networks made up of strong emotional ties. In our study, we defined online relationships in terms of bridging and bonding social capital. Bridging social capital refers to large heterogeneous social networks made up of weak emotional ties. People maintain these relationships for social benefits. Bonding social capital refers to small homogeneous social networks made up of strong emotional ties. People maintain these relationships for emotional benefits. We predicted high self-monitors will have more bridging than bonding social capital on Facebook; low self-monitors will have more bonding than bridging social capital on Facebook. We believed attitudes about using Facebook would moderate these relationships. We used Snyder's Self-Monitoring Scale, Williams' Online Social Capital Scales, and Facebook Intensity Scale to assess our variables of interest. We found support for our hypotheses. For high self-monitors, greater importance placed on Facebook usage predicted increases in bridging social capital on Facebook; for low self-monitors, greater importance placed on Facebook usage predicted increases in bonding social capital on Facebook.

Keywords: self-monitoring, social capital, social media, Facebook

A Tale of Self-Monitoring, Social Capital, and Social Media

Self-Monitoring

People differ in how they monitor their nonverbal behavior (i.e., facial expressions), displays of affect (i.e., thinking or feeling), and their self-presentation (Snyder, 1974). Snyder (1974) categorized the ways individuals differ in their presentation strategy in terms of high self-monitors and low self-monitors. Snyder (1974) classified these differences on five dimensions: motivation, attention, ability, use of ability, and behavioral stability (see also Fuglestad & Snyder, 2009). High and low self-monitors differ on each of these dimensions.

High and low self-monitors approach social situations with different motivations. High self-monitors are motivated by a need for social status (Flynn, Reagans, Amanatullah, & Ames, 2006; Gangestad & Snyder, 2000). Put differently, high self-monitors prefer to look good to those around them. To achieve higher social standing, high self-monitors strive to be socially appropriate across all social situations (Gangestad & Snyder, 2000; Snyder, 1974). For a high self-monitor, failure to be socially appropriate may result in distress or even shame (Snyder & Monson, 1975). For this reason, high-self-monitors may demonstrate behaviors that are inconsistent across situations.

In keeping with their need for social status, high self-monitors are instrumental in social exchange (Flynn et al., 2006). High self-monitors are more inclined than low self-monitors to help others and less inclined to take help from others (Flynn et al., 2006). High self-monitors compared to low self-monitors are also more likely to mediate social exchange between individuals who would otherwise be socially unconnected to one another (Oh & Killduff, 2008). Further, high self-monitors compared to low self-monitors are more adept at keeping track of who owes whom in a social exchange, be it their own relationship or someone else's (Flynn et

al., 2006). Low self-monitors differ from high self-monitors in that they are motivated to be self-congruent across social situations (Gangestad & Snyder, 2000; Snyder, 1974). In other words, low self-monitors prefer to be true to themselves. Low self-monitors experience distress and even shame if they act in a manner inconsistent with their self-image (Snyder & Monson, 1975). Rather than having an elevated social standing, low self-monitors prefer to be in relationships with others based on equity and honesty (Flynn et al., 2006). They do so by establishing relationships based on social equality (Flynn et al., 2006). Hence, low self-monitors have little concern with keeping track of who owes whom in a relationship (Flynn et al., 2006).

High and low self-monitors differ in where they focus their attention in social situations. High self-monitors want to look good to others and as a result they are outwardly focused. They attend to exterior qualities of themselves and others (Snyder & Cantor, 1980). When high self-monitors are faced with unfamiliar social situations, they look to others' behavior as a template for their own so as not embarrass themselves (Snyder & Smith, 1986). Through their focus, high self-monitors learn to adapt who they are to different situations. Conversely, low self-monitors want to be true to themselves and as a result are inwardly focused. They attend to interior qualities of themselves and those found within others (Snyder & Cantor, 1980). When faced with an unfamiliar social situation, low self-monitors look to themselves as a template for their own behavior. In this respect, low self-monitors learn to find situations suited for them.

High and low self-monitors also differ in their social ability. A high self-monitor's ability stems from social knowledge attained from a life time of externally focused attention (Snyder & Cantor, 1980). High self-monitors have a myriad number of self-presentation strategies at their disposal. This is a corollary of being exposed to a large number of social situations over their lifetime. High self-monitors are capable of being socially appropriate in a

wider variety of social situations as they accumulate more social knowledge throughout their lives. A low self-monitor's ability stems from self-knowledge attained over a life time of internally focused attention or introspection (Snyder & Cantor, 1980). Low self-monitors have a better grasp on how to accurately represent who they are in social situations. Low self-monitors are better at expressing who they are as they accumulate more self-knowledge throughout their lives.

High and low self-monitors differ in the use of their abilities in social situations. High self-monitors use their abilities for strategic self-presentation (Gangestad & Snyder, 2000; Oyamoto, Fuglestad, & Snyder, 2010). High self-monitors are capable of filling whatever role is necessary for a particular social climate. They are perfectly fine with moving from one social situation to the next regardless of how similar or different those social situations may be (Snyder & Gangestad, 1982). Low self-monitors use their ability for self-verification (Gangestad & Snyder, 2000; Oyamoto et al., 2010). They will actively choose to be in social situations where they can be themselves and actively avoid social situations where they cannot be themselves (Snyder & Gangestad, 1982).

High and low self-monitors differ in their behavioral stability across social situations (Gangestad & Snyder, 2000; Oyamoto et al., 2010). High self-monitors exhibit behavior that is situationally specific. High self-monitors are motivated to be socially appropriate, but what is socially appropriate in one situation may not be socially appropriate in another situation (Snyder & Monson, 1975). Were a high self-monitor to attend a poetry reading where quiet and reserved is the order of the day, then quiet and reserved a high self-monitor will be. However, if this same high self-monitor were to attend a party where being talkative and energetic were called for, then talkative and energetic a high self-monitor will be (Snyder & Cantor, 1982). Recall that low

self-monitors exhibit behavior that is cross-situationally consistent. Low self-monitors will be themselves whether a situation calls for it or not. If a low self-monitor is talkative and energetic by nature, then he or she will be talkative and energetic whether at a poetry reading, a party, or anywhere else (Snyder & Cantor, 1982).

Individual differences in self-monitoring have an impact on how people view themselves (Snyder, 1978, 1987; Snyder & Cantor, 1980). High self-monitors view themselves as pragmatic (Gangestad & Snyder, 2000). They take pride in their ability to fit into a variety of social situations and define who they are by whatever role is needed in a particular social situation. Low self-monitors view themselves as principled (Gangestad & Snyder, 2000). They take pride in their ability to be themselves across situations and define who they are by enduring traits and dispositions they display in most situations.

Self-Monitoring and Friendships

High and low self-monitors have different social worlds. High self-monitors have larger social networks than do low self-monitors (Oyamot et al., 2010). High self-monitors also tend to have heterogeneous, compartmentalized social worlds (Oyamot et al., 2010; Snyder, Gangestad, & Simpson, 1983). Consistent with a need for social status, high self-monitors inhabit more key positions in social networks than do low self-monitors (Mehra, Kilduff, & Brass, 2001; Oh & Kilduff, 2008). Low self-monitors have smaller social networks than do high self-monitors (Oyamot et al., 2010). A low self-monitor's social world also tends to be homogeneous and integrated (Snyder et al., 1983).

High and low self-monitors also differ in their friendships. High self-monitors choose friends based on interest in a common activity and will interact with those friends only during that activity (Snyder et al., 1983). For example, a high self-monitor will select a friend to play

tennis with based on that individual's tennis skills or a movie-going partner based on his or her knowledge of cinema. Low self-monitors select friends based on personal compatibility (Snyder et al., 1983). Low self-monitors will engage in multiple activities with the same friends. For example, a low self-monitor will play tennis and see a movie with the same friends regardless of their level of expertise in those areas (Snyder et al., 1983).

High and low self-monitors differ in how they initiate and maintain relationships. High self-monitors have an approach-avoidance style of friendship initiation which is ideal for crafting large compartmentalized social worlds (Snyder & Smith, 1986). In an approach-avoid style of initiation, a high self-monitoring individual is quick to initiate a relationship with someone but avoids relationship closeness once it has been established. A high self-monitor is more likely than a low self-monitor to initiate a new friendship (Snyder & Smith, 1986). During the process of relationship initiation, high self-monitors engage in greater intimacy and reciprocal self-disclosure earlier in a relationship than low self-monitors do (Ludwig, Franco, & Malloy, 1986; Shaffer, Tomarelli, & Smith, 1982; Snyder & Simpson, 1984). Canary and Stafford (1992) found greater self-disclosure is a key component of friendship initiation. Disclosure builds trust which in turn fosters relationship closeness. Once a friendship has been initiated, however, high self-monitors avoid further closeness with their new friend and in fact experience anxiety at the prospect of further closeness because getting too close to one person may preclude expansion of their social network (Snyder & Smith, 1986).

Low self-monitors are motivated to look for relationship closeness (Snyder & Smith, 1986). Low self-monitors take longer than high self-monitors to establish relational closeness because they seek others who are personally compatible with them (Ludwig et al., 1986; Shaffer et al., 1982; Snyder & Smith, 1986). Low self-monitors will experience anxiety when their

friends' attitudes and behaviors differ from their own attitudes and behaviors (Snyder & Smith, 1986). Snyder and Simpson (1984) found low self-monitors demonstrate greater intimacy in the later stages of their relationships than do high self-monitors. This strategy gives a low self-monitor time to determine a prospective friend's personal compatibility before becoming invested in that friendship.

Until recently, most research on self-monitoring has encompassed face-to-face interactions. Very little research has been conducted on behaviors of high and low self-monitors in the digital social arena which has exploded in the last decade. However, in this age of ever advancing technology, online social interaction has fast become an integral part of the social process (Boyd & Ellison, 2007; Jung, Lin, & Cheong, 2005; Kim, Kim, & Nam, 2010; Lenhart & Madden, 2007; Selwyn, Gorad & Furlong, 2005; Rohall, Cotton, & Morgen, 2002; Subrahmanyam, Reich, & Waechter, 2008; Williams & Merten, 2008; Zhao, 2006). It seems inevitable that personality differences will have an impact there as well.

Self-Monitoring in the Digital World

At one time, psychologists viewed internet use as impairing to the goal of maintaining social ties and overall psychological well-being (Caplan, 2002; Donchi, & Moore, 2002; Young, 1996). More recently, researchers have found internet use positively correlates with larger social networks and greater psychological well-being (Dowling & Quirk, 2009; Lanigan, 2009; McKenna & Bargh, 2000; Rohall et al., 2002; Wellman, Quan-Haase, Witte, & Hampton, 2001; Zhao, 2006). Several researchers have suggested online social interaction be viewed as another component of our social existence that is on par with face-to-face interactions (Jung et al., 2005; Ross, Orr, Sissic, Arsenault, Simmering, & Orr, 2009; Selwyn et al., 2005; Subrahmanyam et al., 2008; Williams & Merten, 2008).

Use of social media has altered how we initiate and maintain relationships with others (Boyd & Ellison, 2007). Over 800 million people worldwide spend a collective 700 billion minutes logged onto Facebook each month (Facebook.com, 2012). By 2007, 50% of adolescents in the United States were a part of online social networks sites like Facebook (Lenhart & Madden, 2007). Further, 72% of adolescents on social network sites stated that they made plans for social activities with offline friends via online communication (Lenhart & Madden, 2007).

People use social media to enhance their “offline” social relationships (Lampe, Ellison & Steinfeld, 2006). Social sites like Facebook allow people to maintain contact with family and friends they may have lost touch with due to life changes such as going away to college, marriage, or a getting a new job (Coget, Yamauchi, & Suman, 2002; Ellison, Steinfeld, & Lampe, 2007; Kenski & Shroud, 2006; Park, Kee, & Velenzeula, 2009; Wellman, 2002; Resnick, 2001). In the past, a person’s social network could fluctuate due to such changes. Important connections could be lost or broken. A person who joined the military, for example, would be gone for many months and return to find the social landscape he or she left behind was completely different.

Social media sites afford individuals an ability to maintain large social networks with minimal effort (Ellison et al., 2007; Kenski & Shroud, 2006; Park et al., 2009; Resnick, 2001). Without an iota of conversation, an individual is instantly made aware of events and goings-on in the lives of his or her family and friends by logging onto sites like Facebook (Coget et al., 2002). On Facebook, facts about family and friends such as going away to college, marriage, or a getting a new job are instantly known with a glance. Instant knowledge provided by Facebook thus streamlines the process of staying socially connected.

Individual differences in personality, age, ethnicity, and gender play a role in how and why people use social media sites (Gangadharbatla, 2008; Gosling, Augustine, Vazire, Holtzman, & Gaddis, 2011; Kim et al., 2010). Motivations for using Facebook as a social tool are also tied to individual differences in global self-esteem, loneliness, extraversion, neuroticism, self-identity, and one's need to belong (Gangadharbatla, 2008, 2010; Joinson, 2008; Kim et al., 2010; Ong, Ang, Ho, Lim, Gho, Lee, & Chua, 2011; Pagani, Hofacker, & Goldsmith, 2011; Pelling & White, 2009; Ryan & Xenos, 2011; Steinfield, Ellison, & Lampe, 2008; Wang & Wellman, 2010). Researchers have found individual personality differences predict individual behaviors and social experiences on Facebook (Amichai-Hamburger & Vinitzky, 2010; DeWall, Buffardi, Bonser, & Campbell, 2008; Haferkamp & Krämer, 2011; Kim et al., 2010; Lampe et al., 2006; Pempek et al., 2009; Ross et al., 2009; Sheldon, Abad, & Hinsch 2011). Individual differences in personality are also related to levels of online self-disclosure and privacy measures people employ on social media sites (Christofides, Muise, & Desmarais, 2009; Debatin, Bernhard, Lovejoy, Horn, & Hughes, 2010; Hollenbaugh, 2010; Joinson, Reips, Buchanan, & Schofield, 2010; Ledbetter, Mazer, DeGroot, Meyer, Mao, & Swafford, 2011; Nosko, Wood & Molema, 2010; Park, Jin, & Jin, 2011).

Our personality differences also affect how we present ourselves online. Krämer and Winter (2008) found individual differences in efficacy of self-presentation (i.e., belief in one's ability to present oneself in a positive manner) are related to how expressive individuals are on their profile pages. Specifically differences in efficacy of self-presentation predict style of profile pictures posted, amount of personal information disclosed, and the manner in which profile information is written. Schouten, Valkenburg, and Peter (2007) found differences in age, sex and extraversion are related to how individuals present themselves online. They found 9-13

year-olds, females, and introverts tend to present themselves as older than their actual age when interacting with others online (Schouten et al., 2007). Schouten and colleagues (2007) also found boys and introverts tend to present themselves as being macho to others online. Other researchers have found people alter their self-presentation in different online social situations (i.e., interacting with another student versus interacting with a perceived authority figure) or in response to changes in perceived online social cues (Ellison, Heino, & Gibbs, 2006; Walther, 2007).

Researchers have also found evidence that self-monitoring propensities have an influence on individual online behaviors. High and low self-monitors differ in which type of websites are more persuasive in influencing their consumer preferences (Lin, 2008; Yates & Noyes, 2007). High self-monitors prefer image-oriented web sites. Low self-monitors prefer information-oriented web sites. High and low self-monitors differ in how they present themselves when engaging in online dating (Hall, Park, Song, & Cody, 2010). High self-monitors are more likely than low self-monitors to dishonestly represent themselves in order to seem more desirable to potential online dating partners (Hall et al., 2010).

Child and Agyeman-Bidu (2010) found individual differences in blogging behavior of high and low self-monitors. High self-monitors are more mindful of privacy settings on their blogging profile than are low self-monitors. High self-monitors are better able to tailor their blogs for specific audiences than are low self-monitors. High self-monitors spend more time than low self-monitors crafting their blogs and managing their level of online self-disclosure. High self-monitors are more concerned than low self-monitors are about revealing sensitive personal information via their blog. When asked about their blogging habits, high self-monitors indicated taking extra pains to make sure their words are not misunderstood by their potential

audience. In short, high self-monitors demonstrate as much of a propensity for managing their online self-presentation as their offline self-presentation (Child & Agyeman-Bidu, 2010).

Social Capital

Social capital refers to resources an individual gains from others within his or her social network (Putnam, 2000). A social network consists of lateral connections between individuals and can be something as simple as a two friends or as complex as a community (Coleman, 1988; Putnam, 2000). People accrue resources within their social networks based on a social dynamic of expectation and obligation between all members of that social network. Interpersonal trust between individuals in a social network facilitates this dynamic of expectation and obligation (Bourdieu, 1985; Coleman, 1988; Granovetter, 1983; Platteau, 1994; Nahapiet & Ghoshal, 1998; Williams, 2006, 2007). Social capital works thusly: If I do a favor for a friend, we both have an unspoken expectation that my friend will one day reciprocate this favor. If both my friend and I share this notion of reciprocity, then I now have an expectation whereas my friend has an obligation. I have accrued a social credit from my friend whereas my friend has accrued a social debt to me. Similar to financial capital, the more social credits an individual earns, the greater amount of social capital he or she accrues. With enough accrued social capital, an individual can attain a greater social status (Adler & Kwon, 2002; Bordieu, 1985; Coleman, 1988; Kobayashi, 2010; Putnam, 2000). There are five components in the social capital dynamic: a social network, social norms, interpersonal trust (based on social norms), reciprocity, and an individual's willingness to engage in social norms (Coleman, 1988; Putnam, 2000).

Social capital cannot be accrued unless there is a social network in which to accrue it. Examples of a social network are people's jobs, their family, or their friend list on Facebook (Coleman, 1998; Ellison et al., 2007; Inkpen & Tsang, 2005; Williams, 2006, 2007). An

individual can be part of multiple social networks as well as social networks within social networks (Coleman, 1988; Putnam, 2000). As an individual is a member of a family, he or she can also be an employee for an organization, a voter in a particular district, and a national citizen. Similarly, a family is its own social network while simultaneously being a part of a neighborhood, while that neighborhood is also part of a community.

Within any social network exists a series of social norms which are set scripts individuals have for how a situation plays out (Coleman, 1988; Fishbein & Ajzen, 1975; Inkpen & Tsang, 2005; Putnam, 2000). A social norm can be set by the community in which a social network resides (Coleman, 1988). For example, it is customary in most communities to verbally greet someone who has verbally greeted you. A social norm can also be specific to a particular social network. For example, fraternity members may have a secret handshake as part of their standard greeting which is not used outside of that group.

Reciprocity arises from social norms operating within a group (Cialdini, Reno, & Kalgren, 1990; Coleman, 1988; Putnam, 2000; Woolcock, 1998). For people, existence of social norms strengthens their expectations that if they engage in a certain behavior (i.e., saying “hello” to someone), this behavior will be reciprocated by others (i.e., someone will say “hello” back). If reciprocation is perceived as likely, greater trust is engendered between individuals. Strength of a social norm’s effect on reciprocity is moderated by what Coleman calls a social network’s “closure” (Coleman, 1988). Coleman refers to closure as the degree to which members of a social network are aware of one another. If a dishonest person engages in dishonest dealings with two individuals who are not aware of one another (e.g., not related or go to different schools), this dishonest person is more likely to engage in his or her dishonest activity with those individuals without fear of reprisal. On the other hand, if a dishonest person

deals with two other individuals who *are* aware of one another (e.g., related or go to the same school), this dishonest person is less likely to engage in his or her dishonest activity for fear of reprisal. If multiple individuals in a social network are aware of a member's wrongdoing, that member will have fewer chances to accrue resources within that social network. In short, this wrongdoer will have earned a bad reputation. Closure of a social network can affect reciprocity in another way. A potential wrongdoer is less likely to engage in said wrongdoing if his or her intended target has greater social resources than the wrongdoer. For example, in a high school setting, one would be less likely to slight the captain of the football team than a new kid by not returning a greeting.

Interpersonal trust arises from social norms and reciprocity. For example, at the most basic level, we do not fear for our survival when we leave our homes because we expect that, in general, those around us adhere to the same ideas of not harming others that we do. At a more social level, because we know it is fairly common to greet someone when you meet them, we don't fear our greeting not being returned by another person. However, reciprocity is not always a one to one proposition. In some cases, when we do something for another person, we may not expect that specific individual to reciprocate but rather that someone else may reciprocate that deed later on. For example, we often let someone who has only a few items skip ahead of us in line at a grocery store even though the likelihood of seeing that person again is small. However, because of our trust in this social norm, we expect that somewhere down the line someone may do the same for us (Putnam, 2000).

In order for reciprocity to exist, individuals in a social network must be willing to engage in activities that fall in line with social norms (Bourdieu, 1983; Coleman, 1988; Onyx & Bullen, 2000; Paxton, 2002). When entering a social network, there are social costs (Galston, 1999). An

individual determines whether or not potential benefits of entering into a social situation or network outweigh potential costs of entering into that social situation or network (Bourdieu, 1983; Coleman, 1988; Galston, 1999). In some cases, an individual will pay these social costs regardless of the situation out of personal necessity. For example, a recent PhD graduate who has just been hired at a university in a different state has to move to a new neighborhood to accommodate change in employment status. For this hypothetical PhD graduate, social costs such as moving to a new neighborhood or entering into a new social network (i.e., department faculty) are of less importance than being gainfully employed.

Different researchers focus on different aspects of social capital. Some authors distinguish social capital at specific levels of units (e.g., individual social capital versus community social capital) or within levels of units (e.g., individual bridging social capital versus individual bonding social capital) (Coleman, 1988; Putnam, 2000). Other authors focus on resources individuals attain from relationships within their social network (Andriessen & Gubbins, 2006; Nahapiet & Ghoshal 1998). The focus for this study will be individual two types of social capital: bridging social capital and bonding social capital (Ellison et al., 2007, Kobayashi, 2010, Pajak, 2006; Putnam, 2000; Williams, 2006, 2007).

Bridging social capital. Bridging social capital refers to informational or “weak” ties. (Granovetter, 1973; Kobayashi, 2010; Pajak, 2006; Putnam, 2000; Williams, 2006, 2007; Woolcock, 1998). Putnam (2000) refers to individuals in social networks based on bridging social capital as being outwardly focused (e.g., focused on relationships outside one’s immediate social circle). Relationships based on bridging social capital are functional rather than emotional. They are maintained not for emotional support but instead for accruing information or benefits

one could not have accrued within one's close social circle (Granovetter, 1973, Kobayashi, 2010; Putnam, 2000; Williams, 2006, 2007).

Social networks based on bridging capital are made up of a large number of individuals and characterized by heterogeneity or diversity of individuals within that social network (Choi, Kim, Sung, & Sohn, 2011; Pajak, 2006; Putnam, 2000; Williams, 2006). Greater diversity within a social network yields contact with a broader range of people and thus greater access to external resources for individuals within that network and consequently greater social status (Granovetter, 1973, 1983; Kobayashi, 2010; Pajak, 2006; Putnam, 2000). Diversity of a social network can mean individuals in a network have different social, religious or political views, come from different age groups, or live in different locations (Coleman, 1988).

An example of a relationship based on bridging capital may be a friendship based on expertise in a particular subject. An individual may have a friend that is his or her "go-to guy" for information on current politics with little else to their friendship aside from discussions of a political nature. An individual may also maintain social ties with specific others for employment opportunities or access to potential dating partners (Kobayashi, 2010; Pajak, 2006; Putnam, 2000; Williams, 2006, 2007). However, social networks based on bridging social capital can yield access to more than physical benefits for members of that network (Putnam, 2000). When a social network is based on bridging social capital, a sense of community can emerge among its members due to the large size and diversity of those relationships (Putnam, 2000). When individuals are part of something bigger (e.g., part of a community), diffuse reciprocity (e.g., individuals spending time to help other community members) can also take root among members of that social network (Putnam, 2000).

Bonding Social Capital. Bonding social capital refers to emotional or “strong ties” and is characterized by a focus on internal relations (Granovetter, 1973; Kobayashi, 2010; Pajak, 2006; Putnam, 2000; Williams, 2006, 2007; Woolcock, 1998). Putnam (2000) refers to individuals in social networks based on bonding social capital as being inwardly focused (e.g., focused on relationships within one’s immediate social circle). Relationships based on bonding social capital are emotional rather than merely functional. Relationships based on bonding social capital are maintained not for accruing information or benefits but instead for emotional support gained from others within one’s close social circle (Granovetter, 1973; Putnam, 2000).

Social networks based on bonding capital are made up of a small number of individuals and are characterized by great homogeneity or sameness of individuals within that social network (Putnam, 2000). Sameness within a social network yields access to few external resources for individuals but greater interpersonal trust (Kobayashi, 2010; Pajak, 2006; Putnam, 2000). Sameness of a social network can mean individuals in a network have the same social, religious or political views, come from the same age group, or live in the same city (Putnam, 2000; Williams, 2006).

An example of a relationship based on bonding social capital may be an individual’s relationship with his or her immediate family or a close friend (Granovetter, 1973, 1983; Kobayashi, 2010; Pajak, 2006; Putnam, 2000). Whereas an individual’s emotionally based relationship with another individual may also provide access to physical resources (e.g., job opportunities or access to potential dating partners), the emotional resources are of primary importance to this kind of relationship (Granovetter 1973, 1983; Kobayashi, 2010; Pajak, 2006; Putnam, 2000; Williams, 2006, 2007). However, networks based on bonding social capital are also formed to ensure access to scarce or limited physical resources that are limited to only

members of that small network (Putnam, 2000). When a social network is based on bonding social capital, a sense of solidarity can emerge among its members due to small size and closeness of those relationships (Putnam, 2000). When individuals are a part of a small, intimate group (e.g., family, race, or religion), out group antagonism (e.g., strong dislike of individuals who are of a different family, race, or religion) can also take root among members of that social network (Putnam, 2000).

Bridging and Bonding Social Capital: Holding Hands and Greasing Palms

Although bridging and bonding social capital may appear to be conceptual opposites, we would be mistaken to think of one existing in absence of the other. In fact, both forms of social capital are necessary for a social network's survival. Putnam (2000) states social networks not only can but frequently do contain both forms of social capital, even if in differing amounts. Individuals maintain bonding social capital like that found in family or close friendships while simultaneously maintaining bridging social capital like that found in jobs, organizations, or being a member of a community. Bonding social capital serves as a network's "social glue" that helps to ensure interpersonal trust and reciprocity whereas bridging social capital serves as a network's social lubricant, helping to spread information and provide benefits to a broad range of people (Putnam, 2000). Put another way, bonding social capital keeps a social network together while bridging social capital keeps a social network moving.

Researchers speculate that online social interaction augments accumulation and maintenance of social capital in the offline world (Choi et al., 2011; Ellison et al., 2007; Hampton & Wellman, 2003; Lampe et al., 2006; Vergeer & Pelzer, 2009; Wellman et al., 2001; Williams, 2006, 2007). However, researchers disagree on whether online social interaction is more beneficial in accruing and maintaining bridging social capital or bonding social capital.

Some researchers argue online social interaction increases an individual's bridging social ties while weakening his or her bonding social ties (Putnam, 2000; Williams, 2006, 2007). Because online social interaction has little social cost for an individual, larger social networks can be created and maintained quickly and easily thus bypassing establishment of any emotional ties (Coget et al., 2002; Putnam, 2000; Williams, 2007).

Other researchers argue online social interaction strengthens both bridging and bonding social capital (Choi et al., 2011; Hlebec, Manfreda, & Vehovar, 2006; Lanigan, 2009; Quan, Hasse & Wellman, 2002a). Lanigan (2009) found people who used online social sites like Facebook to augment ties with family and close friends. Age may be a contributing factor to how we maintain our social capital through social media. Teenagers compared to individuals over age 60 tend to have more friends on their MySpace profiles (Pfeil, Arjan & Zaphiris, 2009). However, individuals age 60 and over when compared to teenagers tend to have a more diverse friend list on their MySpace profile (Pfeil et al., 2009). Sex differences can also be an influence on maintaining social capital through social media. Males compared to females more easily accumulate bridging and bonding capital through use of social media sites like Facebook (Choi et al., 2011). While there may be some socio demographic differences in how and why we use social media, individual personality differences impact on how and why we use social media. It is possible that our personality differences may also have an impact on what type of relationships we acquire and maintain through our social media use.

Hypotheses

High and low self-monitors have different social worlds. High self-monitors compared to low self-monitors maintain large social networks with friendships low in emotional closeness (Gangestad & Snyder, 2000; Oyamoto et al., 2010). The type of relationship high self-monitors

maintain closely matches the kind of relationships defined as bridging social capital. Recall bridging social capital is created by accruing relationships with social benefits and less emotional closeness (Granovetter, 1973; Putnam, 2000). Social networks based on bridging social capital tend to be larger than social networks based on bonding social capital (Putnam, 2000).

Low self-monitors compared to high self-monitors maintain small social networks with friendships high in emotional closeness. Low self-monitors are not concerned with social status but with establishing relationships based on social equality (Flynn et al., 2006). The type of relationship low self-monitors maintain closely matches the kind of relationships defined as bonding social capital. Bonding social capital is based more on accruing emotional closeness and less on social benefits (Granovetter, 1973; Putnam, 2000). Social networks based on bonding social capital tend to be smaller than social networks based on bridging social capital (Putnam, 2000).

Researchers have found use of social media sites like Facebook yields greater increases in bridging social capital than bonding social capital (Lampe et al., 2008). However, other researchers have found evidence that increases in bonding social capital do happen through use of social media sites like Facebook (Choi et al., 2011). We believe self-monitoring propensities may be a dividing line in this regard. Researchers have already established that high and low self-monitors differ in some of their online attitudes and behaviors (Child & Agyeman-Bidu, 2010; Hall et al, 2010; Lin, 2008; Yates & Noyes, 2007). Our first hypothesis is high self-monitors compared to low self-monitors will have more bridging social capital than bonding social capital on Facebook. Our second hypothesis is low self-monitors compared to high self-monitors will have more bonding social capital than bridging social capital on Facebook.

Method

Participants

Our sample was 179 students (79 men, 100 women) enrolled in psychology courses at the University of North Florida. Participants' ethnicity was 64.2% White/Caucasian, 14.5% Black/African-American, 8.9% Hispanic/Latino, and 6.7% Asian/Pacific Islander. In terms of age, 125 participants were 18-22 years old, 34 participants were 23-27 years old, 13 participants were 28-32 years old, 3 participants were 33-37 years old, and 4 participants were 38 years old or older. We recruited our participants using the SONA system with a listing for a study titled "Individual Differences in Behaviors on Facebook". Students participated in this study for extra course credit. Those students who did not wish to participate in this study had alternative options for extra course credit available to them. Individuals under age 18 or without a Facebook profile could not participate in our study. Participants signed an informed consent document before participating. Ethical Principles of Psychologists and Code of Conduct were used in ensuring ethical treatment of all participants (American Psychological Association, 2010). None of our participants failed to complete this study.

Procedure

Participants completed this study in groups no larger than four. Participants began the Media Lab survey after an experimenter opened up Media Lab v2010 and entered a participant number. Our Media Lab survey included questions meant to measure a person's Facebook behaviors (e.g. "How often do you log onto Facebook" or "How often do you use Facebook to look up old friends from high school"), self-monitoring propensities (i.e., Snyder's 25-item Self-Monitoring Scale), rated importance of Facebook (i.e., Facebook Intensity Scale), as well as type of social capital maintained on Facebook (i.e., Online Social Capital Scale).

Self-Monitoring

We measured individual self-monitoring differences with participant scores on Snyder's 25-item Self-Monitoring Scale (Snyder, 1974). As stated previously, Snyder (1974) defined self-monitoring in terms of five dimensions: attention, motivation, ability, use of ability, and behavior. Attention is measured by items such as "When I am uncertain of how to act in a social situation, I look to the behavior of others for cues." Motivation is measured by items such as "At parties and social gatherings, I do not attempt to do or say things that others will like." Ability is measured by items such as "When I am uncertain of how to act in a social situation, I look to the behavior of others for cues." Use of ability is measured by items such as "I can look anyone in the eye and tell a lie with a straight face (if for a right end)." Behavior is measured by items such as "In different situations and with different people, I often act like very different persons."

Snyder's (1974) 25-item Self-Monitoring Scale has 13 items written for high self-monitors (e.g., "I can make impromptu speeches even on topics about which I have almost no information.") and 12 items written for low self-monitors (e.g., "I would not change my opinions (or the way I do things) in order to please someone else or win their favor."). An answer of *true* to 13 statements that describe high self-monitors was scored as "1" while an answer of *false* was scored as "0". We reverse scored the twelve items describing low self-monitors, with an answer of false scored as "1" and an answer of *true* scored as "0". To assess whether participants were high or low self-monitors, we performed a median split on the full range of total scores. We categorized participants who scored at or above this median split as high self-monitors and participants who scored below this median split as low self-monitors. The median split in this study was 13, with 90 participants classified as high self-monitors and 89 participants classified as low self-monitors.

Snyder (1974) found scores on the 25-item Self-Monitoring Scale to have a Kuder-Richardson-20 reliability of .70 and a test-retest reliability of .83. Snyder found a Cronbach's α of .66 for scores on the 25-item Self-Monitoring Scale and .70 for scores on the 18-item Self-Monitoring Scale (Snyder, 1974, 1987). In a meta analysis Day, Shleicher, Unckless, and Hiller (2002) found a Cronbach's α of .71 and .73 for scores on the 25-item Self-Monitoring Scale and the 18-item Self-Monitoring Scale, respectively. In our study, we found a Cronbach's α of .76 and .77 for scores on the 25-item Self-Monitoring Scale and 18-item Self-Monitoring Scale respectively.

Snyder found convergent validity for scores on his 25-item Self-Monitoring Scale. Convergent validity occurs when two measures of the same concept correlate with one another (MacKenzie, Podsakoff, & Podsakoff, 2011; Shadish, Cook, & Campbell, 2002). Snyder (1974) had 16 fraternity members rate six of their fellow fraternity members on five dimensions of self-monitoring. Those fraternity members that were rated also filled out the 25-item Self-Monitoring Scale. Peer ratings of fraternity members positively correlated with that fraternity member's score on the 25-item Self-Monitoring Scale (Snyder, 1974). Snyder (1974) examined convergent validity of scores on the 25-item Self-Monitoring Scale by administering it to predetermined groups of individuals who should score as either high or low self-monitors. Theater actors, who should be able to moderate their outward emotional displays very well, had higher scores than did students on the 25-item Self-Monitoring Scale. Psychiatric patients, who should have little ability to moderate their outward emotional displays, had lower scores than did students on the 25-item Self-Monitoring Scale.

Researchers have found evidence of discriminant validity for scores on Snyder's 25-item Self-Monitoring Scale. Discriminant validity occurs when measures of theoretically unrelated

concepts yield different results (Bickman, 2009; MaKenzie, 2011; Shadish et al., 2002). Scores on the 25-item self-monitoring scale have little or no correlation with scores on measures of social desirability, need for approval, Machiavellianism, locus of control, inner-directed versus other-directed social character, social chameleon, field dependence, MMPI Pd (Psychotic Deviance), hypnotic susceptibility, neuroticism, repression-sensitization, achievement anxiety, intelligence, academic achievement, public self-consciousness, private self-consciousness, social anxiety, MMPI L (Lie Scale), MMPI Ma (Mania Scale), MMPI Si (Social Introversion Scale), vocational interests, and others (Snyder, 1979).

Various researchers have found evidence for construct validity for the 25-item Self-Monitoring Scale. Construct validity is the “degree to which inferences are warranted from the observed persons, settings, and cause-and-effect operations sampled within a study to the constructs these samples represent” (Shadish et al., 2002, p. 20). Put simply, construct validity refers to a construct’s explanatory power: how many things can a construct predict. Individual differences in scores on the 25-item Self-Monitoring Scale are related to how people choose their friends (Snyder et al., 1983) and social worlds (Snyder & Gangestad, 1982). Scores on the 25-item Self-Monitoring Scale predict individual differences in blogging behavior (Child & Agyeman-Bidu, 2010), how people interact with their romantic partners (Leone & Hall, 2003; Snyder & Simpson, 1984), and which coping strategies people will employ in stressful intimate relationships (Büyükşahin, 2009). Still other researchers have found differences in scores on the 25-item Self-Monitoring Scale predict differences in how and when people disclose personal information to others (Ludwig et al., 1986; Shaffer et al., 1982), behaviors in a retail shopping environment (Puccinelli, 2007), and differences in desire for social status (Flynn et al., 2006).

Online Bridging and Bonding Social Capital

We used Williams' (2006) Online Social Capital Scale to measure participants' social capital on Facebook. The Online Social Capital Scale is broken down into Online Bridging Social Capital and Online Bonding Social Capital. Online bridging social capital was measured using a modified version of Williams' (2006) Ten-item Online Bridging Social Capital Scale. We modified these items by changing the term "online" to "on Facebook". The online Bridging Social Capital Scale has four dimensions: 1) outward looking; 2) contact with a broader range of people; 3) a view of oneself as part of a broader group; and 4) diffuse reciprocity with a broader community (Putnam, 2000; Williams, 2006). Outward looking is measured by items such as "Interacting with people makes me interested in things that happen outside of my town." Contact with a broader range of people is measured by items such as "On Facebook, I come in contact with new people all the time." Viewing oneself as part of a broader group is measured by items such as "Interacting with people on Facebook makes me feel like part of a larger community." Diffuse reciprocity within a broader community is measured by items like "I am willing to spend time to support general Facebook community activities." Participants indicated on a Likert scale from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*) the extent to which they agree with each item. Two items in the Bridging Social Capital Scale are reverse scored. To assess bridging social capital, we reverse scored those two items and took a sum of responses to all ten items yielding a range of scores from a low of 10 to a high of 50.

We measured bonding social capital using a modified version of Williams' (2006) 10-item Online Bonding Social Capital Scale. We modified these items by changing the term "online" with "on Facebook". The Bonding Social Capital subscale has three dimensions: 1) emotional support, 2) access to scarce or limited resources, and 3) ability to mobilize solidarity

(Putnam, 2000; Williams, 2006). Emotional support is measured by items such as “There are several people on Facebook whom I trust to help solve my problems.” Access to scarce or limited resources is measured by items such as “If I needed an emergency loan of \$500, I know someone on Facebook I can turn to.” Ability to mobilize solidarity is measured by items like “The people I interact with on Facebook would help me fight an injustice.” Participants indicated on a Likert scale from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*) the extent to which they agree with each item. None of the items in the Bonding Social Capital Scale are reverse scored. To assess bonding social capital, we took a sum of responses to all ten items yielding a range of scores from a low of 10 to a high of 50.

The Online Bridging and Bonding Social Capital Scales are reliable measures (Choi, 2011; Williams, 2006, 2007). Williams (2006) found a Cronbach’s α of .90 for scores on the Online Social Capital Scale with Cronbach’s α of .84 and .90 for Online Bridging Social Capital and Online Bonding Social Capital respectively. Other researchers have found a Cronbach’s α of .90 and .86 for scores on the Online Bridging Social Capital Scale and a Cronbach’s α of .89 and .86 for scores on the Online Bonding Social Capital Scale (Choi, 2011; Williams, 2007). In our study, we found a Cronbach’s α of .87 for scores on the Online Bridging Social Capital Scale and a Cronbach’s α of .89 for the Online Bonding Social Capital Scale.

Researchers have found evidence of convergent validity for scores on Williams’s Online Bridging and Bonding Social Capital Scales. Scores on the Online Bonding Social Capital Scale positively correlates with scores on survey items that measure online closeness, trust, support, and community, such as “using the internet to keep in touch with someone far away” and “receiving help for a personal problem from friends online” (Williams, 2006). Scores on the Online Bonding Social Capital Scale also positively correlates with scores on survey items like

“People online give me a strong sense of community”, and "Generally speaking, people online can be trusted" (Williams, 2006). Scores on the Online Bridging Social Capital Scale positively correlates with scores on other measures of outward thinking and behaviors including contact with a broad range of people in online environments, links to external information and assets, and behaviors such as meeting someone new online, or visiting chat rooms (Williams, 2006).

Researchers have found evidence of discriminant validity for scores on Williams’s Online Bridging and Bonding Social Capital Scales. Williams (2006) performed a confirmatory factor analysis on the Internet Social Capital Scale as a whole. Items believed to measure Online Bridging Social Capital loaded onto one factor while items believed to measure Online Bonding Social Capital loaded onto a separate factor. Other researchers who used a variation of the Internet Social Capital Scale also performed a factor analysis of this scale (Ellison et al., 2007). In their study, Ellison and colleagues (2007) also found items thought to measure Online Bridging Social Capital loaded onto one factor.

The Online Bridging and Bonding social capital scales are relatively new. However, there is some evidence of construct validity for these measures. Differences in scores on the Online Bridging and Bonding Social Capital Scales predict differences in psychological well-being and life satisfaction (Choi, 2011; Ellison et al., 2007). In our study, we hope to find further evidence of construct validity for these measures.

Facebook Importance

We believe how much a person values being on Facebook may be a moderating variable in our study. We measured importance of Facebook use with the 6-item Facebook Intensity Scale (Ellison et al., 2007). Researchers have used this scale to measure a person’s attitudes about Facebook as well as the extent to which Facebook is integrated into his or her daily life

(e.g., “Facebook is part of my everyday activity.” and “I am proud to tell people I’m on Facebook.”). Participants indicate on a Likert scale from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*) the extent to which they agree with each item. We created an index of Facebook Intensity scores by summing the six items.

Researchers have found scores on the Facebook Intensity Scale to be a reliable measure of individual attitudes about how important it is to use Facebook. The Facebook Intensity Scale had a Cronbach’s α of .83 in its initial use (Ellison et al., 2007). In our study, we found a Cronbach’s α of .87. Researchers have found convergent validity for scores on the Facebook Intensity Scale. Ellison and colleagues (2007) found scores on the Facebook Intensity Scale positively correlated with the number of friends individuals reported having on Facebook as well as amount of time participants reported spending on Facebook.

Researchers have found discriminant validity for scores on the Facebook Intensity Scale (Ellison et al., 2007; Ross et al., 2009). In multiple factor analyses of the Facebook Intensity Scale, all six items load on one factor (Ellison et al., 2007; Ross et al., 2009). Additionally, in an initial regression analysis, researchers found scores on the Facebook Intensity Scale to be an independent predictor of Facebook use for obtaining bonding and bridging social capital (Ellison et al., 2007).

Scores on the Facebook Intensity Scale also have construct validity (Ellison et al., 2007). Differences in scores on the Facebook Intensity Scale predicted differences in Facebook use for obtaining as well as maintaining online bridging and bonding social capital (Ellison et al., 2007). Differences in scores the Facebook Intensity Scale also predicted differences in overall satisfaction with Facebook (Ross et al., 2009).

Results

Preliminary Analyses

Self-monitoring is a variable that we measured rather than manipulated and, as a consequence, a possibility exists (however slight) that another variable could account for any of the relationships we found between self-monitoring and other variables in our study.

Researchers have found sex of participant is a variable sometimes confounded with self-monitoring (Day et al., 2002). Males compared to females tend to be high self-monitors; conversely, females compared to males tend to be low self-monitors.

We initially classified participants in our sample as either high or low self-monitors based on a median split of the full range of scores on Snyder's 25-item Self-Monitoring scale. The total range of self-monitoring scores in our study was 2 to 23, with high self-monitors having a score of 13 or higher and low self-monitors having a score of 12 or lower. After classifying our participants as high or low self-monitors, we performed a χ^2 analysis to determine if males in our sample were more likely to be high self-monitors than low self-monitors, and if females in our sample were more likely to be low self-monitors than high self-monitors. In fact, males were more likely to be high self-monitors (59%) than low self-monitors (41%); females were more likely to be low self-monitors (58%) than high self-monitors (44%), $\chi^2(1, N = 179) = 5.40, p = .020$.

To control for sex as a confounding variable, we performed separate median splits of self-monitoring scores for males and females. For males in our sample, low self-monitors had a score of 13 or lower, and high self-monitors had a score of 14 or higher. For females in our sample, low self-monitors had a score of 11 or lower, and high self-monitors had a score of 12 or higher. We performed another χ^2 analysis and found no significant relationship between self-

monitoring scores and sex of participant in our study, $\chi^2(1, N = 179) = 1.25, p = .262$. Males were not more likely to be high self-monitors (54%) than low self-monitors (46%); females remained just as likely to be high self-monitors (46%) or low self-monitors (54%). Through these preliminary analyses, we dealt with participant sex as a confounding variable in terms of self-monitoring.

In other studies, Facebook importance has been a moderator of the connection between other individual differences (i.e., self-esteem) and social capital maintained on Facebook (Ellison et al., 2007; Steinfeld et al., 2008). For this reason, we also believed participant scores on the Facebook Intensity Scale might help explain any relationship we found between self-monitoring scores and social capital. As stated previously, the Facebook Intensity Scale is a measure of how important Facebook use is to someone (Ellison et al., 2007).

Other researchers have found Facebook Intensity scores to be a predictor of social capital that is independent from other possible predictor variables (i.e., sex of participant) (Ellison et al., 2007; Ross et al., 2009). However, this construct has never been examined in conjunction with self-monitoring. We performed independent samples *t*-tests to find out if high and low self-monitors in our sample significantly differ in their rated importance of Facebook. High self-monitors ($M = 20.78, SD = 5.89$) and low self-monitors ($M = 20.63, SD = 4.83$) in our sample did not significantly differ in their rated importance of Facebook ($t(177) = -.186, p = .116$). Establishing that these predictors are indeed independent of one another, we moved on to the next phase of our analyses.¹

Main Analyses

We hypothesized high self-monitors would drive more bridging social capital than bonding social capital on Facebook. We also hypothesized low self-monitors would derive more

bonding social capital than bridging social capital on Facebook. This research design has three predictor variables: self-monitoring, Facebook importance, and type of social capital. Self-monitoring and type of capital are categorical variables each with two levels (high and low self-monitors; bridging and bonding capital). Facebook importance is a continuous variable. Self-monitoring and Facebook importance are between-subjects variables whereas type of social capital is a within-subjects variable. We also had two criterion variables: the amount of bridging capital and the amount of bonding capital (as measured by scores on Williams' Online Social Capital Scales).

We computed four Pearson Product-Moment Correlation coefficients to examine the relationship between Facebook importance and each type of social capital (bridging and bonding) for high and low self-monitors. For high self-monitors, we found a significant positive correlation between Facebook importance and (a) bridging social capital, $r(90) = .42, p < .001$, and (b) bonding social capital, $r(90) = .27, p < .009$. That is, as the importance of Facebook as a social tool increased, the amount of social capital high self-monitors obtained increased more for bridging capital than for bonding capital. For low self-monitors, we found a marginally significant positive correlation between Facebook importance and bridging social capital, $r(89) = .19, p = .070$, and a significant positive correlation between Facebook importance and bonding social capital, $r(89) = .55, p < .001$. That is, as the importance of Facebook as a social tool increased, the amount of social capital low self-monitors obtained increased more for bonding capital than for bridging capital.

Having identified these relationships, we wanted to determine whether these relationships were significantly different from one another. We conducted a z -test comparison of the correlations between Facebook importance and amount *bridging social capital* for high and low

self-monitors. We first converted the raw correlations into z -scores using Fischer's r to z -transformation. For the correlation between Facebook importance and bridging social capital for high self-monitors, $r(90) = .42$, the z -score was .448. For the correlation between Facebook importance and bridging social capital for low self-monitors, $r(89) = .19$, the z -score was .192. When we compared these z -values, we found these relationships significantly differed from one another, $z = 1.68$, p (two-tailed) = .047.

We also conducted a z -test comparison of the correlations between Facebook importance and amount *bonding social capital* for high and low self-monitors. We first converted the raw correlations into z -scores using Fischer's r to z -transformation. For the correlation between Facebook importance and bonding social capital for high self-monitors, $r(90) = .27$, the z -score was .277. For the correlation between Facebook importance and bonding social capital for low self-monitors, $r(89) = .55$, the z -score was .633. When we compared these z -values we found these relationships significantly differed from one another, $z = 2.34$, p (two-tailed) = .010.²

Ancillary Analyses

In our survey, we included several items that measure how often people use Facebook for a particular purpose (e.g., Get information about people in your classes) as well as how important it is to use Facebook for a particular purpose (e.g., Finding out what old friends are doing now). We adapted these items from surveys used in previous research (Joinson, 2008; Lampe, Ellison & Stienfeld, 2006). We explored a relationship between these items and participant scores on Snyder's 25-item self-monitoring scale to determine other possible self-monitoring differences in social media usage (See Tables 1-3).

We first examined items asking how often a participant used Facebook for particular purposes. We found increases in self-monitoring scores (from low to high) predicted greater

frequency viewing and sharing photos on Facebook. Increases in self-monitoring scores (from low to high) also predicted greater frequency of receiving friend requests, Facebook stalking others, looking at profiles of people you do not know, and looking at profiles of friends' friends.

We also explored relationships with items gauging how important people deem using Facebook is for a particular purpose. Increases in self-monitoring scores (from low to high) predicted greater importance placed on using Facebook for getting information about people from class, virtual people-watching, getting new friends, and tracking the actions, beliefs and interests of groups to which one belongs. We also found Increases in self-monitoring scores (from low to high) predicted increases in the rated importance of using Facebook to find people to date and finding casual sex partners. Here we see several parallels between high and low self-monitor's online behavior with their real world behavior. In the real world, high self-monitors value gathering information on people they may potentially interact with (Berscheid, Graziano, Monson, & Dermer, 1976). Online, we see high self-monitors value using Facebook for finding information on other potential friends (i.e., their friend's Facebook friends). In the real world, high self-monitors are more likely than low self-monitors to have casual sex partners in the real world (Snyder, Gangestad & Simpson, 1986). Online, we see high self-monitors value using Facebook for dating and finding casual sex partners.

In an attempt to establish convergent validity, we also examined a relationship between these items with scores on Williams' bridging and bonding social capital scales. We ran correlations between each type of social capital and items on this survey that should be a measure of social capital (See Tables 1-3). We examined the relationship of these items with bridging social capital. We first examined items asking how often one uses Facebook for particular purposes.

We found the more bridging social capital people had on Facebook, the more often they used Facebook for maintaining relationships with people they do not see very often as well as contacting friends who are away from home. Increases in bridging capital also predicted greater frequency of using Facebook to post one's status updates and looking at status updates of others. These relationships make sense when we think about bridging social capital. Each of these Facebook functions allows an individual to maintain a large social network while expending minimal social effort.

Next, we examined items gauging how important people deem using Facebook is for a particular purpose. Increases in bridging social capital on Facebook were related to more importance placed on using Facebook for checking out the profile of someone met in the offline world, messaging friends outside of their social network, and maintaining relationships with people they may not get to see very often. Increases in bridging social capital were also related to higher importance placed on using Facebook for maintaining and reinforcing prior existing social networks, keeping up with high school friends, and contacting friends away from home. It is important to note that each of these items also had strong relationships with bonding social capital. In fact, in almost every instance, the relationships these items had with bonding social capital was stronger than that with bridging social capital. Bridging and bonding social capital had equally strong relationships with how often one uses Facebook to see what others have put in their status updates or to contact friends that are away from home.

We then turned our attention to how these items were related to bonding social capital. First, we examined items asking how often one uses Facebook for particular purposes. People with higher amounts of bonding social capital use Facebook more often to check status updates (either their own or someone else's). These relationships were twice as strong as those with

bridging social capital. Of particular interest was that bonding social capital scores had a strong positive correlation with how often one uses Facebook to keep in touch with like-minded people. This relationship was the strongest of all relationships we observed (See Table 1). Put simply, the more important someone thinks communicating with like-minded people on Facebook is, the more bonding social capital they have on Facebook. This relationship makes sense in light of what we know about bridging and bonding social capital. One of the characteristics of bonding social capital is relationships with similar others (Granovetter, 1973; Putnam, 2000). Importance of using Facebook to communicate with like minded people correlated with our measure of bonding social capital, but not bridging social capital. Here we see some evidence of convergent validity for the Online Bonding Social Capital Scale while we simultaneously see evidence of discriminant validity for the Bridging Social Capital Scale.

We also explored relationships with items gauging how important people deem using Facebook is for a particular purpose as we did with bridging social capital. Increases in bonding social capital predicted increases in importance of using Facebook for reconnecting with others. This includes finding people you have not seen in a while and reconnecting with people with whom you've lost contact. Higher amounts of bonding social capital also predicted higher ratings of importance for using Facebook to maintain friendships. This includes keeping in touch with old friends, getting new friends, contacting friends away from home, and chatting with people with whom you have lost contact. The relationship between bonding social capital and the importance of using Facebook to maintain and reinforce preexisting social networks was also twice as strong as was the relationship between these items and bridging social capital.

Discussion

In our study, we hypothesized high self-monitors would have more bridging than bonding social capital on Facebook; low self-monitors would have more bonding than bridging social capital on Facebook. We also hypothesized Facebook importance would moderate these relationships. We found support for our hypotheses. For high self-monitors, high Facebook importance predicts more bridging than bonding social capital on Facebook; for low self-monitors, high Facebook importance predicts more bonding than bridging social capital on Facebook.

These results are consistent with what we already know about high and low self-monitors in the offline world. High self-monitors are motivated by a need for social status (Flynn et al., 2006; Gangestad & Snyder, 2000). To this end, they establish large, heterogeneous social networks made up of loose social connections in their offline world (Snyder et al., 1983). Put another way, high self-monitors establish relationships based on bridging social capital. We saw in our study that high self-monitors who deem Facebook as an important social tool accrue more bridging than bonding social capital in their online world. Low self-monitors are motivated by a need for social equity and self-verification (Flynn et al., 2006; Gangestad & Snyder, 2000; Oyamoto et al., 2010). To this end, low self-monitors establish small, homogeneous social networks made up of close social connections in their offline world (Snyder et al., 1983). Put another way, they establish relationships based on bonding social capital. We see in our study that low self-monitors who deem Facebook as an important social tool accrue more bonding than bridging social capital in their online world.

We found other offline/online parallels of self-monitoring behavior. Offline, high self-monitors have more casual sex partners than do low self-monitors (Snyder & Simpson, 1984;

Snyder et al., 1986; Sakaguchi, Sakai, Keisuke, & Hasegawa, 2007). In our sample, we found high self-monitors are more likely than low self-monitors to use Facebook to find casual sex partners. Offline, high self-monitors are more likely than low self-monitors to gather information on people with whom they may potentially interact but do not know (Berscheid et al., 1976). Consistent with this offline behavior, we found high self-monitors are more likely than low self-monitors to use Facebook to look at profile information (i.e., photos and personal information) of people they do not know.

One finding that also bears discussion was the positive relationship between Facebook importance and bonding social capital for high self-monitors. True, the strength of this relationship was almost half what we saw for low self-monitors, but it was there nonetheless. So why do both high and low self-monitors accrue bonding social capital on Facebook? Researchers have established that maintaining preexisting social connections is a primary function of social media (Hlebec et al., 2006; Lampe et al., 2008; Lanigan, 2009). Facebook's membership of 850 million+ rivals the population of most countries (Facebook.com, 2012). With so many people as members of this same social media site, contact with close friends and family would seem inevitable. Excluding people in our immediate offline social circles from our online social circles may be taken offensively by those we exclude. It is therefore possible we all maintain some measure of online bonding social capital regardless of our self-monitoring propensities.

Limitations

As with most research, several factors may impact the veracity of our findings. One issue of concern is measurement error made by researchers. For this reason, we chose measures for our study based on criteria of reliability and validity. In prior studies, researchers have found scores on Snyder's 25-item Self-Monitoring Scale (Snyder, 1974), Williams' Online Social Capital

Scale (Choi, 2011; Williams, 2006, 2007), and the Facebook Intensity Scale (Burke, Marlow, & Lento, 2010; Ellison et al., 2007; Ross et al., 2009) to be reliable and valid. In our study, we found reliability levels for scores on these measures similar to what has been found by previous researchers. Moreover, we found further evidence of convergent and discriminant validity for Williams' scales in our study.

Another possible argument for measurement error is that Williams' 10-item online bridging and bonding social capital measures originally referred to general internet usage, whereas we adapted items in those measures to be specifically about Facebook usage. We modified Williams' online bridging and bonding social capital scales in a manner modeled after Ellison and colleagues (2007) who modified these scales in a similar fashion with no ill effects. The Cronbach's alpha we found for both modified measures in our study mirror what Williams found for his original version of those measures. Further, as our modifications merely consisted of exchanging the word "online" for the words "on Facebook," we believe any error that might arise as a result of this change to be minimal.

Another possible limitation is that we chose to measure rather than manipulate our variables of interest (i.e., self-monitoring, Facebook importance, and social capital) at one point in time, which makes our study correlational. Correlational studies are useful for finding a relationship between two variables, but there can be little or no evidence that one variable causes another (Aronson, Wilson, & Brewer, 1998; Reis, Capobianco & Tsai, 2002; Shadish et al., 2002). In our study, for instance, does self-monitoring affect using Facebook to accrue social capital or is it the other way around? From a developmental standpoint, people may be born high or low self-monitors. Those born as high self-monitors might be drawn to bridging social capital while those born as low self-monitors might be drawn to bonding social capital. However,

another possibility exists. As we go through life, we find some situations to be rewarding and others, not so much. Some people may have early rewarding experiences with relationships based on bridging social capital. Consequently, they desire more bridging capital based relationships and become high self-monitors. On the other hand, some people may have early rewarding experiences with bonding social capital. Consequently, they desire more bonding capital based relationships and become low self-monitors.

To answer the question of directionality, we could make use of a cross-lagged design (Campbell, Stanley, & Gage, 1963). We could measure self-monitoring and amount of social capital at one point in time, and then again at a second later point in time. If we found a correlation between self-monitoring at time one and the amount of social capital at time two, but little or no correlation between the amount of social capital at time one and self-monitoring at time two, we would have evidence that differences in self-monitoring lead to differences in the amount of bridging and bonding social capital.

Any number of possible third variables can explain the relationship we find between self-monitoring and social capital (Aronson et al., 1998; Johnson, 2001; Reis et al., 2002). In the body of social media research, we find several plausible third variables that may influence our findings. Researchers have found other individual differences are related to what kind of social capital we maintain through social media. When Facebook importance is high, people who are high in loneliness and/or low in self-esteem will maintain more bridging social capital than bonding social capital through social media (Ellison et al., 2007). However, researchers found self-monitoring to be a construct that is separate from self-esteem (Buri & Mueller, 1988; Gangestad & Snyder, 2000). Although self-esteem might explain a portion of social capital

maintenance, it would likely account for a different portion than that explained by self-monitoring.

Researchers have also found a connection between individual levels of extraversion and amount of bridging and bonding social capital via social media. Individuals who score high on extraversion have more bonding social capital than bridging social capital (Choi, 2011; Pajak, 2006). However, self-monitoring is a construct that is separate from extraversion (Furnham, 1989; Osborn, Field, & Veres, 1998; Snyder & Gangestad, 1983). Osborn and colleagues (1998) found self-monitoring moderated the connection between levels of extraversion and interview performance. If we were to examine extraversion as a predictor of social capital maintenance, it is possible we might find a similar moderating effect of self-monitoring.

Yet another possible limitation could be that our sample consists solely of college students. Long has been the debate concerning use of college students in psychology studies. Some argue that findings from a sample of college students have limited generalizability because college students do not represent the overall population (Cooper, McCord, & Socha 2011; Henry, 2008; Sears, 1986). However, in our case, a sample of college students is representative of the majority of Facebook users. The largest demographic of Facebook users is 18-34 (Facebook.com, 2012).

Future Directions

With the advent of social media, we are looking at the birth of a society within societies whose membership cuts across sex, culture, ethnicity, age, religious beliefs, etc. Facebook has over 10% of the world's population in its membership (Facebook.com, 2012). Studying this burgeoning community is important for a variety of reasons. As researchers of the human psyche, we seek to explain why we do the things we do at the times and places we do them.

Social media provides a whole new venue in which to study the human condition. One method of study psychologists use frequently is self-report which is particularly useful when a researcher is under practical and ethical constraints (i.e., we cannot assign people to be male or female). However, the results we get from self-report studies can be limited. On the other hand, studying actual behaviors can be rather difficult or even impossible (especially when budgets for research are nonexistent). Through social media, we see tangible evidence of human behavior on an almost up-to-the-minute basis.

Facebook.com now presents each individual member's user activity in a timeline format that extends from the present back to the moment they became a member. Information stored in such a format could provide staggering possibilities of study as each personal profile page could become an ad hoc longitudinal case study. Researchers have found people are inclined to reveal large amounts of accurate personal information in various online outlets including their Facebook profiles (Acquisiti & Gross, 2002, 2006; Barak & Gluck-Ofri, 2007; Markey & Wells, 2002; Suler, 2004; Tidwell & Walther, 2008). Indeed, we can learn more about people through their Facebook profiles than we do from face-to-face meetings (Gosling, Gaddis, & Vazire, 2007). Markey and Wells (2002) found people can accurately assess levels of extraversion, agreeableness, and openness in individuals they met only via chat room conversation.

Researching social media use is also important because as communication technologies become more precise and accessible, social media use will surely increase. Currently 350 million Facebook members log on through their mobile phone. Individuals who log onto Facebook via mobile phone spend 50% more time logged on Facebook compared to members who log on via lap top or home computer (Facebook.com, 2012). From 2009 to 2010, smart phone (i.e., mobile phones with internet accessibility) sales jumped 72.1% (Gartner.com, 2011).

In the U.S. alone, smart phone sales rose from 67 million in 2010 to an estimated 95 million in 2011 (Gartner.com, 2011). In comparison, Facebook membership jumped from 350 million in 2010 to 800 million in 2011 (Facebook.com, 2012). Twitter (a microblogging site) went from having 75 million members in 2010 to 175 million in 2011 members while LinkedIn (a social media site created for professionals and employers to connect with another) went from having 50 million users in 2010 to 100 million in 2011 (Facebook.com, 2012).

Social media is by no means a simple topic of study. Technology is an ever changing phenomenon. Indeed, Facebook's proprietors saw fit to make several changes to the general profile page layout over the course of our study (fortunately our variables of interest were not related to profile page layouts). If further social media research is to be conducted, online surveys would be a more efficient way of collecting large amounts of information in a short period of time. Further, online surveys would allow for a larger sample size as well as greater diversity within that sample.

For future studies, we might also consider other methodological changes. We measured participants' Facebook attitudes and self-reported behaviors at one point in time. It might be useful to collect this information at several different points in time. There are several advantages to a longitudinal study of social media use. On social media sites like Facebook, we're able to stay in touch with people we might not have otherwise been able to maintain contact with (Lampe et al., 2006). As we get older in the "real world", we accumulate more social connections. Normally, as we experience life changes such as going away to college, getting married, or a getting a new job, we lose contact with some of those connections (Coget, 2002). Social media is a means of potentially maintaining our accumulated relationships simultaneously despite such life changes (Coget, 2002; Ellison et al., 2007; Kenski & Shroud, 2006; Resnick,

2001; Velenzeula et al., 2009; Wellman, 2002). How might this affect our social lives in the long-run?

We can also explore choice of social media site. Facebook is only one type of social media site. Moreover, it is a very general social media site at that. In future studies, we might choose to expand our scope to other social media sites. For example, some sites like LinkedIn are designed specifically to maintain strictly professional connections whereas other sites like DeviantArt are designed to connect with people with artistic interests. Perhaps high and low self-monitors differ in the types of social media sites they join. As Snyder and Harkness (1984) found, choice itself can be a very revealing avenue of study.

Still another possibility is illuminated by Burke and Marlowe (2010). In their study, they found how an individual uses Facebook is related to how much online bridging and bonding capital they have. Participants who mainly used Facebook to look at their friends' photos, personal information, or status updates had more bridging social capital; participants who mainly used Facebook to communicate with friends (i.e., commenting on a friend's status update) had more bonding social capital (Burke et al., 2010). How and why people use Facebook may have a similar effect in our findings.

Conclusion

At this point, it should come as no coincidence that we chose to marry self monitoring with social capital theory. One of the primary components of self-monitoring theory is relationship maintenance. High self-monitors maintain large social networks consisting of diverse but detached social connections (Snyder et al., 1983). They maintain these kinds of social connections in order to further their social status (Flynn et al., 2006). But what does that really

mean? How does one increase his or her social status simply by knowing a lot of different people?

To answer this question, we look to social capital theory. Maintaining bridging social capital is ideal for a high self-monitor's goals. Having a large diverse social network grants access to information and opportunities we might not have if we simply "stick to what we know" (Granovetter, 1973; Putnam, 2000). High self-monitors tend to offer help to others more often than they accept help from others (Flynn et al., 2006). According to social capital theorists, the more favors we do for others, the more social credits (social capital) we accrue (Bourdieu, 1985; Coleman, 1988; Granovetter, 1983; Nahapiet & Ghoshal, 1998; Platteau, 1994). More social capital means increased social status (Bourdieu, 1985; Coleman, 1988; Granovetter, 1983; Nahapiet & Ghoshal, 1998; Platteau, 1994). High self-monitors could, in fact, be agents of bridging social capital which acts as that social lubricant that keeps societies moving. Oh and Kilduff (2008) found evidence that high self-monitors mediate social exchange between individuals who would otherwise be socially unconnected to one another. As Putnam (2000) points out, bridging social capital helps create a sense of community and fosters diffuse reciprocity between individuals. Knowing how this happens is very important.

Of course, Putnam (2000) makes it very clear that bridging social capital does not exist in conceptual opposition to bonding social capital. Bridging and bonding social capital exist in a complimentary fashion (Putnam, 2000). Both types of social capital are needed for a society to flourish. Bridging social capital keeps a social network moving while bonding social capital keeps a social network together.

When we examine the tenets of bonding social capital, we see a parallel with low self-monitoring. Low self-monitors maintain small social networks consisting of close relationships

with similar others (Snyder et al., 1983). One of the reasons low self-monitors maintain these kinds of relationships is to maintain social equity (Flynn et al., 2006). But how does one maintain social equity simply by knowing a small group of similar people?

Once again, we look to social capital theory to answer that question. Maintaining bonding social capital is ideal for a low self-monitor's goals. Bonding social capital networks tend to be small and close knit groups of likeminded people (Putnam, 2000). By "sticking to what they know", these individuals gain equal access to scarce resources and a social support structure (Putnam, 2000). Low self-monitors could, in fact, be agents of bonding social capital. Low self-monitors seek relationships with similar others based on social equity (Flynn et al., 2006). According to social capital theorists, people in such social networks experience a sense of stability which in turn fosters interpersonal trust (Granovetter, 1973; Putnam, 2000). Interpersonal trust facilitates a social dynamic of expectation and obligation between members in a social network (Coleman, 1988; Putnam, 2000). Without that social dynamic in place, social capital cannot be accrued.

For our study, social media was not just a novelty to be used as a fanciful lark. Social media has provided us with a means of studying the relationship between self-monitoring propensities and social capital in a very precise manner. This was but one study of many more to come. The information upon which we can base future studies is laid out in detail by the very individuals we intend study. We know that one of the ways people maintain their social capital is through social media (Choi, 2011; Ellison et al., 2007; Williams, 2006, 2007). We also know that self-monitoring propensities affect our online attitudes and behaviors (Child & Agyeman-Bidu 2010; Lin, 2008; Yates & Noyes, 2007). In our study, we found some evidence that self-monitoring differences do play a role in the kinds of online relationships we have online. Further

study is required to discover the depth and specifics of this relationship to see what ties self-monitoring differences have to social capital maintenance both online and offline. Through this work, we hope to attain a greater understanding of how communities form and function. Given these and the other implications we have laid out through this paper, the importance of furthering this work is clear.

References

- Adler, P. S., & Kwon, S. (2002). Social Capital: Prospects for a new concept. *Academy Of Management Review*, 27(1), 17-40. doi:10.5465/AMR.2002.5922314
- Amichai-Hamburger, Y., & Vinitzky, G. (n.d). Social network use and personality. *Computers In Human Behavior*, 26(6), 1289-1295. doi:10.1016/j.chb.2010.03.018
- Andriessen, D., & Gubbins, C. (2006). "Defining Social Capital: A Systematic Analysis of Metaphorical Conceptualizations", *Organizational Discourse: Identity, Ideology and Idiosyncrasy*. Proceedings of the 7th Biennial Conference at Veiije Universiteit Amsterdam 26-28 July 2006. Leicester: KMCP The Management Centre, Armin Beverungen/ Nick Ellis/ Tom Keenoy *et al.* (eds.) 7, pp.1-35.
- Acquisti, A., & Gross, R. (2006). Imagined Communities: Awareness, Information Sharing, and Privacy on the Facebook. In Golle, P. and Danezis, G. (Eds.), *Proceedings of 6th Workshop on Privacy Enhancing Technologies*. (pp. 36-58). Cambridge, U.K. Robinson College. June 28-30.
- Aronson, E., Wilson, T. D., & Brewer, M. B. (1998). Experimentation in social psychology. In D. T. Gilbert, S. T. Fiske, & G. Lindzey (Eds.), *The handbook of social psychology* (pp. 99-142). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Barak, A., & Gluck-Ofri, O. (2007). Degree and reciprocity of self-disclosure in online forums. *Cyberpsychology & Behavior*, 10(3), 407-417. doi:10.1089/cpb.2006.9938
- Baron, R. A. (1989). Personality and organizational conflict: Effects of the Type A behavior pattern and self-monitoring. *Organizational Behavior And Human Decision Processes*, 44(2), 281-296. doi:10.1016/0749-5978(89)90028-9

- Berscheid, E., Graziano, W., Monson, T., & Dermer, M. (1976). Outcome dependency: Attention, attribution, and attraction. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 34(5), 978-989. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.34.5.978
- Bickman, L. and Rog, D.J. (1997), *Handbook of Applied Social Research Methods*. Sage Publications: London.
- Bourdieu, Pierre: The forms of capital. In: John G. Richardson (ed.): *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education*. New York: Greenwood Press 1986, 241-258. Retrieved from http://scholar.google.com/scholar_url?hl=en&q=http://bbs.knue.ac.kr/~edupolicy/lib._brd/_1.116_/education.pdf&sa=X&scisig=AAGBfm2Y98awGb6Rasx906WuDQXyGSraxA&oi=scholar
- boyd, d. m., & Ellison, N. B. (2007). Social network sites: Definition, history, and scholarship. *Journal Of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 13(1), 210-230. doi:10.1111/j.1083-6101.2007.00393.x
- Bradburry, K. (2011). Facebook Demographics Revisited – 2011 Statistics. *Social Media Today* Retrieved from <http://socialmediatoday.com/kenburbary/276356/facebook-demographics-revisited-2011-statistics>
- Brownlow, M. (2011). Smartphone Statistics and Market Share. *Email Marketing Reports* Retrieved from <http://www.email-marketing-reports.com/wireless-mobile/smartphone-statistics.htm>
- Buri, J. R., Mueller, J. R. (1988). Self-Monitoring and the Looking Glass Self. Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, Atlanta, GA.
- Burke, M., Marlow, C., & Lento, T. (2010). Social network activity and social well-being. In *Proc. CHI 2010*: 1902-1912.

- Büyükşahin, A. (2009). Impact of self monitoring and gender on coping strategies in intimate relationships among Turkish university students. *Sex Roles, 60*(9-10), 708-720. doi:10.1007/s11199-008-9561-9
- Campbell, D., Stanley, J. C., & Gage, N. (1963). *Experimental and quasi-experimental designs for research*. Boston, MA US: Houghton, Mifflin and Company.
- Caplan, S. E. (2002). Problematic internet use and psychosocial well-being: Development of a theory-based cognitive-behavioral measurement instrument. *Computers in Human Behavior, 18*, 553–575. doi:10.1016/S0747-5632(02)00004-3
- Cialdini, R. B., Reno, R. R., & Kallgren, C. A. (1990). A focus theory of normative conduct: Recycling the concept of norms to reduce littering in public places. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 58*, 1015–1026. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.58.6.1015
- Child, J. T., and Agyeman-Bidu, E. A. (2010). Blogging privacy management rule development: The impact of self-monitoring skills, concern for appropriateness, and blogging frequency. *Computers in Human Behavior, 26*, 957-963. doi:10.1016/j.chb.2010.02.009
- Chinn, M. D., & Fairlie, R. W., (2006). The determinants of the global digital divide: A cross-country analysis of computer and internet penetration. *Oxford Economic Papers, 16-44*. doi: 10.1093/oep/gpl024
- Choi, S. M., Kim, Y., Sung, Y., and Sohn, D., (2011). Bridging or Bonding?: A cross-cultural study of social relationships in social networking sites. *Information, Communications & Society, 14*, 107-129. doi 10.1080/13691181003792624
- Christofides, E., Muise, A., & Desmarais, S. (2009). Information disclosure and control on Facebook: Are they two sides of the same coin or two different processes?. *Cyberpsychology & Behavior, 12*(3), 341-345. doi:10.1089/cpb.2008.0226

Coget, J.F., Yamauchi, Y., & Suman, M. (2002). The Internet, social networks and loneliness.

IT & Society, 1 (1), 180-201. doi:10.1.1.4.6323

Coleman, I. S. 1988. Social capital in the creation of human capital. *American Journal of*

Sociology, 94: S95-S 120. doi:10.2307/2780243

Cooper, C. A., McCord, D. M., & Socha, A. (2011). Evaluating the College Sophomore

Problem: The Case of Personality and Politics. *Journal Of Psychology*, 145(1), 23-37.

Davis, R. A. (2001). A cognitive-behavioral model of pathological internet use. *Computers in*

Human Behavior. 17 (2), 187-195. doi:10.1016/S0747-5632(00)00041-8

Day, D. V., Shleicher, D. J., Unckless, A. L., & Hiller, N. J. (2002). Self-monitoring personality

at work: A meta-analytic investigation of construct validity. *Journal Of Applied*

Psychology, 87(2), 390-401. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.87.2.390

Debatin, B., Lovejoy, J. P., Horn, A., & Hughes, B. N. (2009). Facebook and online privacy:

Attitudes, behaviors, and unintended consequences. *Journal Of Computer-Mediated*

Communication, 15(1), 83-108. doi:10.1111/j.1083-6101.2009.01494.x

DeWall, C., Buffardi, L. E., Bonser, I., & Campbell, W. (2011). Narcissism and implicit

attention seeking: Evidence from linguistic analyses of social networking and online presentation. *Personality And Individual Differences*, 51(1), 57-62.

doi:10.1016/j.paid.2011.03.011

Donchi, L., & Moore, S. (2004) It's a boy thing: The role of the internet in young people's

psychological well being. *Behavior Change*, 21(2), 76-89.

doi:10.1375/bech.21.2.76.55426

- Dowling, N. A., & Quirk, K. L. (2009). Screening for internet dependence: Do the proposed diagnostic criteria differentiate normal from dependent internet use?. *Cyberpsychology & Behavior, 12*(1), 21-27. doi:10.1089/cpb.2008.0162
- Ellison, N., Heino, R., & Gibbs, J. (2006). Managing Impressions Online: Self-Presentation Processes in the Online Dating Environment. *Journal Of Computer-Mediated Communication, 11*(2), 415-441. doi:10.1111/j.1083-6101.2006.00020.x
- 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, 12*(4), 1143-1168. doi:10.1111/j.1083-6101.2007.00367.x
- Facebook.com (2012). Facebook Statistics. Retrieved from <http://www.facebook.com/press/info.php?statistics>
- Facebook.com (2012). Social Media Statistics. Retrieved from http://www.facebook.com/note.php?note_id=10150140568281509
- Fishbein & Ajzen, (1975). *Belief, Attitude, Intention and Behavior: An introduction to theory and research*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Flynn, F. J., Reagans, R. E., Amanatullah, E. T., & Ames, D. R. (2006). Helping one's way to the top: Self-monitors achieve status by helping others and knowing who helps whom. *Journal Of Personality And Social Psychology, 91*(6), 1123-1137. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.91.6.1123
- Fuglestad, P. T., & Snyder, M. (2009). Self-monitoring. In M. R. Leary & R. H. Hoyle (Eds.), *Handbook of individual differences in social behavior* (pp. 574-591). New York: Guilford.

- Fuglestad and Snyder, (2010). Status and the Motivational Foundations of Self-Monitoring. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 4, 1031-1041. doi:10.1111/j.1751-9004.2010.00311.x
- Furnham, A. (1989). Personality correlates of self-monitoring: The relationship between extraversion, neuroticism, Type A behaviour and Snyder's self-monitoring construct. *Personality And Individual Differences*, 10(1), 35-42. doi:10.1016/0191-8869(89)90175-X
- Galston, W. (1999). Does the Internet Strengthen Community?. *National Critic Review*, 89(3), 193-202. doi: 10.1002/ncr.89302
- Gangadharbatla, H. (2008). Facebook Me: Collective Self-Esteem, Need To Belong, And Internet Self-Efficacy As Predictors Of The Igeneration's Attitudes Toward Social Networking Sites. *Journal of Interactive Advertising*, 8, 2 5-15. Retrieved from <http://jiad.org/article100>
- Gangadharbatla, M. (2010). Individual differences in social networking site adoption. *Social networking communities and e-dating services: Concepts and implications* (pp. 1-17). Hershey, PA US: Information Science Reference/IGI Global. doi: 10.4018/978-1-60566-984-7.ch101
- Gangestad, S. W., & Snyder, M. (2000). Self-monitoring: Appraisal and reappraisal. *Psychological Bulletin*, 126(4), 530-555. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.126.4.530
- Gogolinski, T. (2010) Effects Of Self-Monitoring and Public Self-Consciousness on Perceptions of Facebook Profiles. *Colonial Academic Alliance Undergraduate Research Journal*, 1, 9. Retrieved from <http://digitalarchive.gsu.edu/caaurj/vol1/iss1/9>

- Gosling, S. D., Gaddis, S. & Vazire, S. (2007). Personality Impressions Based on Facebook Profiles. *In Proceedings of ICWSM 2007*. Boulder, Colorado, 2007.
- Gosling, S. D., Augustine, A. A., Vazire, S., Holtzman, N., & Gaddis, S. (2011). Manifestations of personality in online social networks: Self-reported Facebook-related behaviors and observable profile information. *Cyberpsychology, Behavior, And Social Networking*, *14*(9), 483-488. doi:10.1089/cyber.2010.0087
- Granovetter, M. (1973). The strength of weak ties. *American journal of Sociology*, *78*: 1360-1380.
- Granovetter, (1983). The Strength of Weak Ties: A Network Theory Revisited. In P. V. Marsden & N. Lin (Eds.), *Social structure and network analysis*: 105-130. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Haferkamp, N., & Krämer, N. C. (2011). Social comparison 2.0: Examining the effects of online profiles on social-networking sites. *Cyberpsychology, Behavior, And Social Networking*, *14*(5), 309-314. doi:10.1089/cyber.2010.0120
- Hall, J. A., Park, N., Song, H., & Cody, M. J. (2010). Strategic misrepresentation in online dating: The effects of gender, self-monitoring, and personality traits. *Journal Of Social And Personal Relationships*, *27*(1), 117-135. doi:10.1177/0265407509349633
- Hampton, K., & Wellman, B. (2003). Neighboring in Netville: How the Internet Supports Community and Social Capital in a Wired Suburb. *City & Community*, *2*(4), 277-311. doi:10.1046/j.1535-6841.2003.00057.x
- Harvey, J. H., Hendrick, S. S., & Tucker, K. (1988). Self-report methods in studying personal relationships. In S. W. Duck, D. E. Hay, S. E. Hobfoll, W. Ickes, & B. M. Montgomery (Eds) *Handbook of personal relationships: Theory, research, and interventions* (pp. 3-18). Chichester:Wiley.

- Henry, P. J. (2008). College Sophomores in the Laboratory Redux: Influences of a Narrow Data Base on Social Psychology's View of the Nature of Prejudice. *Psychological Inquiry*, 19(2), 49-71.
- Hlebec, V., Manfreda, K. L., & Vehovar, V. (2006). The social support networks of internet users. *New Media and Society*, 8(1), 9-32. doi: 10.1177/1461444806058166
- Hollenbaugh, E. E. (2010). Personal journal bloggers: Profiles of disclosiveness. *Computers In Human Behavior*, 26(6), 1657-1666. doi:10.1016/j.chb.2010.06.014
- Ickes, W. (2000). Methods of studying close relationships. In W. Ickes & S. Duck (Eds) *The Social Psychology of Personal Relationships* (pp. 157-180). Chichester:Wiley
- Inkpen, A., & Tsang, E., (2005). Social Capital, Networks, and Knowledge Transfer. *Academy of Management Review*, 30(1), 146-165.
- International Data Corporation (2012). Worldwide Smartphone Market Expected to Grow 55% in 2011 and Approach Shipments of One Billion in 2015, According to IDC [Press Release] Retrieved from <http://www.idc.com/getdoc.jsp?containerId=prUS22871611>
- Johnson, B. (2001). Toward a New Classification of Nonexperimental Quantitative Research. *Educational Researcher*, 30(2), 3-13. DOI: 10.3102/0013189X030002003
- Joinson, A.N. (2008). Looking at, looking up or keeping up with people? Motives and use of facebook. In: Proceedings of CHI '08. ACM, New York, NY, pp. 1027-1036.
- Joinson, A. N., Reips, U., Buchanan, T., & Schofield, C. (2010). Privacy, trust, and self-disclosure online. *Human-Computer Interaction*, 25(1), 1-24.
doi:10.1080/07370020903586662

- Jung, J., Kim, Y., Lin, W., & Cheong, P. (2005). The influence of social environment on internet connectedness of adolescents in Seoul, Singapore, and Taipei. *New Media and Society*, 7, 64-88. doi:10.1177/1461444805049145
- Kenski, K., & Stroud, N. (2006). Connections Between Internet Use and Political Efficacy, Knowledge, and Participation. *Journal Of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, 50(2), 173-192. doi:10.1207/s15506878jobem5002_1
- Kim, J. H., Kim, M., & Nam, Y. (2010) An Analysis of Self-Consrtuals, Motivations, Facebook Use, and User Satisfaction. *Journal of Human-Computer Interaction*, 26(11-12), 1077-1099. doi: 10.1080/10447318.2010.516726
- Kobayashi, T., (2010). Bridging Social Capital in Online Communities: Heterogeneity and Social Tolerance of Online Game Players in Japan. *Human Communication Research*, 36, 546-569. doi:10.1111/j.1468-2958.2010.01388.x
- Krämer, N. C., & Winter, S. (2008). Impression management 2.0: The relationship of self-esteem, extraversion, self-efficacy, and self-presentation within social networking sites. *Journal Of Media Psychology: Theories, Methods, And Applications*, 20(3), 106-116. doi:10.1027/1864-1105.20.3.106
- Lampe, C., Ellison, M., & Steinfeld C., (2006). A face(book) in the crowd: Social searching vs social browsing. Proceedings of the 2006 20th Anniversary Conference on Computer Supported Cooperative Work (pp. 167–170). New York: ACM Press.
- Lanigan, J. D. (2009). A sociotechnological model for family research and intervention: How information and communication technologies affect family life. *Marriage & Family Review*, 45(6-8), 587-609. doi:10.1080/01494920903224194

Ledbetter, A. M., Mazer, J. P., DeGroot, J. M., Meyer, K. R., Mao, Y., & Swafford, B. (2011).

Attitudes toward online social connection and self-disclosure as predictors of Facebook communication and relational closeness. *Communication Research*, 38(1), 27-53.

doi:10.1177/0093650210365537

Lenhart, A., & Madden M (2007). Social networking websites and teens: An overview. *Pew*

Internet and American Life Project. Retrieved from www.pewInternet.org

Lin, C. S. (2008). Exploring the personality trait of self-monitoring on technology usage of Web portals. *Cyberpsychology & Behavior*, 11(2), 235-238. doi:10.1089/cpb.2007.0021

Ludwig, D., Franco, J. N., & Malloy, T. E. (1986). Effects of reciprocity and self-monitoring on self-disclosure with a new acquaintance. *Journal Of Personality And Social Psychology*, 50(6), 1077-1082. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.50.6.1077)

MacKenzie, S. B., Podsakoff, P. M., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2011). Construct measurement and validation procedures in mis and behavioral research: integrating new and existing techniques. *MIS Quarterly*, 35(2), 293-A5. Retrieved from <http://ehis.ebscohost.com/eds/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?sid=cc8d1bf0-9a25-46a8-bbe1-c5060cdb4574%40sessionmgr115&vid=1&hid=124>

Markey, P. M., & Wells, S. M. (2002). Interpersonal perception in Internet chat rooms. *Journal Of Research In Personality*, 36(2), 134-146. doi:10.1006/jrpe.2002.2340

McKenna, K. A., & Bargh, J. A. (2000). Plan 9 From Cyberspace: The Implications of the Internet for Personality and Social Psychology. *Personality & Social Psychology Review (Lawrence Erlbaum Associates)*, 4(1), 57-75.

- Mehra, A., Kilduff, M., and Brass, D.J. (2001). The social networks of high and low self-monitors: Implications for workplace performance. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 46(1), 121-146. doi:10.2307/2667127
- Morahan-Martin, J., & Schumacher, P. (2000). Incidence and correlates of pathological internet use among college students. *Computers in Human Behavior*. 16(1), 13-29. doi:10.1016/S0747-5632(99)00049-7
- Nahapiet, J., & Ghoshal, S. 1998. Social capital, intellectual capital, and the organizational advantage. *Academy of Management Review*, 23: 242-266. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/259373?seq=2>
- Nosko, A., Wood, E., & Molema, S., (2010). All about me: Disclosure in online social networking profiles: The caes of FACEBOOK. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 26, 408-418. doi:10.1016/j.chb.2009.11.012
- Oh, H., & Kilduff, M. (2008). The ripple effect of personality on social structure: Self-monitoring origins of network brokerage. *Journal Of Applied Psychology*, 93(5), 1155-1164. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.93.5.1155
- Ong, E. L., Ang, R. P., Ho, J. M., Lim, J. Y., Goh, D. H., Lee, C., & Chua, A. K. (2011). Narcissism, extraversion and adolescents' self-presentation on Facebook. *Personality And Individual Differences*, 50(2), 180-185. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2010.09.022
- Onyx & Bullen, (2000) Measuring Social Capital in Five Communities. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 36(1), 23-42. doi: 10.1177/0021886300361002
- Osborn, S. M., Feild, H. S., & Veres, J. G. (1998). Introversion-extraversion, self-monitoring and applicant performance in a situational panel interview: A field study. *Journal Of Business And Psychology*, 13(2), 143-156. doi:10.1023/A:1022965721229

- Oyamot, C. M., Fuglestad, P. T., & Snyder, M. (2010). Balance of power and influence in relationships: The role of self-monitoring. *Journal Of Social And Personal Relationships*, 27(1), 23-46. doi:10.1177/0265407509347302
- Pagani, M., Hofacker, C. F., & Goldsmith, R. E. (2011). The influence of personality on active and passive use of social networking sites. *Psychology & Marketing*, 28(5), 441-456. doi:10.1002/mar.20395
- Pajak, K. (2006). *A tool for measuring bridging social capital. Paper presented at the 2006 Conference of the ESA Research Network for the Sociology of Culture.*
- Park, N., Kee, K. F., & Valenzuela, S. (2009). Being Immersed in Social Networking Environment: Facebook Groups, Uses and Gratifications, and Social Outcomes. *Cyberpsychology & Behavior*, 12(6), 729-733. doi:10.1089/cpb.2009.0003
- Park, N., Jin, B., & Jin, S. (2011). Effects of self-disclosure on relational intimacy in Facebook. *Computers In Human Behavior*, 27(5), 1974-1983. doi:10.1016/j.chb.2011.05.004
- Pelling, E. L., & White, K. M. (2009). The Theory of Planned Behavior Applied to Young People's Use of Social Networking Web Sites. *Cyberpsychology & Behavior*, 12(6), 755-759. doi:10.1089/cpb.2009.0109
- Pempek, T. A., Yermolayeva, Y. A., & Calvert, S. L. (2009). College students' social networking experiences on Facebook. *Journal Of Applied Developmental Psychology*, 30(3), 227-238. doi:10.1016/j.appdev.2008.12.010
- Pfeil, U., Arjan, R., & Zaphiris, P. (2009). Age differences in online social networking: A study of user profiles and the social capital divide among teenagers and older users in MySpace. *Computers In Human Behavior*, 25(3), 643-654. doi:10.1016/j.chb.2008.08.015

- Platteau, (1994) Behind the market stage where real societies exist – Part I: The role of private order institutions. *The Journal of Development Studies*, 30(3), 533-577. Retrieved 2/14/2012 from <http://rdarc.itakura.toyo.ac.jp/webdav/hisamatsu/public/Platteau/JDSv30n3Platteau.pdf>
- Puccinelli, N. M., Deshpande, R., & Isen, A. M. (2007). Should I stay or should I go? Mood congruity, self-monitoring and retail context preference. *Journal Of Business Research*, 60(6), 640-648. doi:10.1016/j.jbusres.2006.06.014
- Putnam, R. D. (2000). *Bowling alone : the collapse and revival of American community / Robert D. Putnam*. New York : Simon & Schuster, c2000.
- Reis, H. T., Capobianco, A., & Tsai, F. (2002). Finding the person in personal relationships. *Journal of Personality*, 70(6), 813-850. Retrieved from <http://web.ebscohost.com/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?sid=171a5614-047e-4954-b307-948993552138%40sessionmgr15&vid=2&hid=14>
- Quan-Haase, A., & Wellman, B. (2004). How does the Internet affect social capital? In M. Huysman & V. Wulf (Eds.), *Social Capital and Information Technology* (pp. 113–135). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Resnick, P. (2001). Beyond bowling together: Sociotechnical capital. In J. Carroll (Ed.), *HCI in the New Millennium* (pp. 247–272). Boston, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Rohall, D., Cotton, S. & Morgen, C. (2002). Internet use and the self concept: Linking specific uses to global self esteem. *Current research in social psychology*, 8(1), 1-19.
- Ross, C., Orr., E., Sisic, M., Arseneault, J. M., Simmering, M. G., & Orr, R. R. (2009). Personality and motivations associated with Facebook use. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 25, 578-576. doi:10.1016/j.chb.2008.12.024

- Ryan, T., & Xenos, S. (2011). Who uses Facebook? An investigation into the relationship between the Big Five, shyness, narcissism, loneliness, and Facebook usage. *Computers In Human Behavior, 27*(5), 1658-1664. doi:10.1016/j.chb.2011.02.004
- Schouten, A. P., Valkenburg, P. M., & Peter, J. (2007). Precursors and Underlying Processes of Adolescents' Online Self-Disclosure: Developing and Testing an "Internet-Attribute-Perception" Model. *Media Psychology, 10*(2), 292-315.
doi:10.1080/15213260701375686
- Schmidt, F. L., & Hunter, J. E. (1996). Measurement error in psychological research: Lessons from 26 research scenarios. *Psychological Methods, 1*(2), 199-223. doi:10.1037/1082-989X.1.2.199
- Sears, D. O. (1986). College sophomores in the laboratory: Influences of a narrow data base on social psychology's view of human nature. *Journal Of Personality And Social Psychology, 51*(3), 515-530. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.51.3.515
- Selwyn, N., Gorad, S., & Furlong, J. (2005). Whose internet is it anyway?: Exploring adults' (non)use of the internet in everyday life. *European Journal of Communication. 20* (5), 5-26. doi:10.1177/0267323105049631
- Shadish, W., Cook, T., & Campbell, D. (2002). *Experimental and quasi-experimental designs for generalized causal inference*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Shaffer, D. R., Smith, J. E., & Tomarelli, M. (1982). Self-monitoring as a determinant of self-disclosure reciprocity during the acquaintance process. *Journal Of Personality And Social Psychology, 43*(1), 163-175. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.43.1.163

- Sheldon, K. M., Abad, N., & Hinsch, C. (2011). A two-process view of Facebook use and relatedness need-satisfaction: Disconnection drives use, and connection rewards it. *Psychology Of Popular Media Culture, 1*(S), 2-15. doi:10.1037/2160-4134.1.S.2
- Siisiäinen, M. (2000) Two concepts of social capital: Bourdieu vs. Putnam. Paper presented at *ISTR 4th International Conference 'The Third Sector: For What and For Whom?'*, Dublin, Ireland.
- Snyder, M. (1974). Self-monitoring of expressive behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 30*(4), 526-537. doi:10.1037/h0037039
- Snyder, M. (1979a). Cognitive, behavioral, and interpersonal consequences of self-monitoring. In P. Pliner, K.R. Blankstein, & I.M. Spiegel (Eds.), *Advances in the study of communication and affect: Perception of emotion in self and others* (vol. 5, pp. 181-201). New York: Plenum Press
- Snyder, M. (1979b). Self-monitoring processes. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, 12*, 85-128. doi: 10.1177/026327692009002006
- Snyder, M. (1987). *Public appearances/private realities: The psychology of self-monitoring*. New York: W. H. Freeman.
- Snyder, M., Berscheid, E., & Glick, P. (1985). Focusing on the exterior and the interior: Two investigations of the initiation of personal relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 48*(6), 1427-1439. Retrieved from <http://web.ebscohost.com/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?sid=4ba9fef2-f90f-4a88-a737-473b81c1504c%40sessionmgr13&vid=2&hid=14>

- Snyder, M., & Cantor, N. (1980). Thinking about ourselves and others: Self-monitoring and social knowledge. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 39(2), 222-234. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.39.2.222
- Snyder, M. & Gangestad, S. (1986). On the nature of self-monitoring: Matters of assessment, matters of validity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 51(1), 125-139. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.51.1.125
- Snyder, M., Gangestad, S., & Simpson, J.A. (1983). Choosing friends as activity partners: The role of self-monitoring. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 45(5), 1061-1072. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.45.5.1061
- Snyder, M., & Harkness, A. R. (1984). *E = f(p): The impact of personality on choice of situation*. Paper presented at the annual meetings of the Midwestern Psychological Association, Chicago.
- Snyder, M., & Monson, T. C. (1975). Persons, situations, and the control of social behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 32, 637-644. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.32.4.637
- Snyder, M., & Simpson, J.A. (1984). Self-monitoring and dating relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 47(6), 1281-1291. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.47.6.1281
- Snyder, M., Simpson, J. A., & Gangestad, S. (1986). Personality and sexual relations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 51, 181-190. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.51.1.181
- Snyder, M. & Tanke, E. D. (1976). Behavior and attitude: Some people are more consistent than others. *Journal of Personality*, 44, 501-517. doi:10.1111/j.1467-6494.1976.tb00135.x

Steinfeld, C., Ellison, N. B., & Lampe, C. (2008). Social capital, self-esteem, and use of online social network sites: A longitudinal analysis. *Journal Of Applied Developmental Psychology, 29*(6), 434-445. doi:10.1016/j.appdev.2008.07.002

Steinfeld, C., DiMicco, J., Lampe, C., & Ellison, N. B. (2009). Bowling Online: Social Networking and Social Capital within the Organization. Paper presented at the fourth international conference on Communities and Technologies of the ACM in University Park, PA.

Subrahmanyam, K., Reich, S. M., Waechter, N., & Espinoza, G. (2008). Online and offline social networks: Use of social networking sites by emerging adults. *Journal Of Applied Developmental Psychology, 29*(6), 420-433. doi:10.1016/j.appdev.2008.07.003

Suler, J. (2004). The Online Disinhibition Effect. *Cyberpsychology & Behavior, 7*(3), 321-326. doi:10.1089/1094931041291295

Tabak, A. J. (2004, February 9) Hundreds register for new Facebook website. *The Harvard Crimson*. Retrieved from <http://web.archive.org/web/20050403215543/www.thecrimson.com/article.aspx?ref=357292>.

Tidwell, L., & Walther, J. B. (2002). Computer-mediated communication effects on disclosure, impressions, and interpersonal evaluations: Getting to know one another a bit at a time. *Human Communication Research, 28*(3), 317-348. doi:10.1111/j.1468-2958.2002.tb00811.x

van Manen, M. (2010). The pedagogy of Momus technologies: Facebook, privacy, and online intimacy. *Qualitative Health Research, 20*(8), 1023-1032.

doi:10.1177/1049732310364990

- Vergeer, M., & Pelzer, B. (2009). Consequences of media and Internet use for offline and online network capital and well-being. A causal model approach. *Journal Of Computer-Mediated Communication, 15*(1), 189-210. doi:10.1111/j.1083-6101.2009.01499.x
- Wadyanto, L., Griffiths, M. (2006). „Internet Addiction“: A critical view. *International Journal of Mental Health, 4*, 31-51. doi 10.1007/s11469-006-9009-9
- Wang, H., & Wellman, B. (2010). Social connectivity in America: Changes in adult friendship network size from 2002 to 2007. *American Behavioral Scientist, 53*(8), 1148-1169. doi:10.1177/0002764209356247
- Wellman, B., Quan Haase, A., Witte, J., & Hampton, K. (2001). Does the Internet increase, decrease, or supplement social capital? Social networks, participation, and community commitment. *American Behavioral Scientist, 45*(3), 436-455. doi:10.1177/00027640121957286
- Wellman, B. (2002a). Designing the Internet for a networked society. *Communications of the ACM, 45*(5), 91-96. Retrieved from http://www.itu.dk/~khhp/speciale/artikler/Wellman_2001%20Designing%20the%20internet%20for%20a%20networked%20society.pdf
- Williams, D. (2006). On and Off the “Net: Scales for Social Capital in an Online Era. *Journal Of Computer-Mediated Communication, 11*(2), 593-628. doi:10.1111/j.1083-6101.2006.00029.x
- Williams, D. (2007). The impact of time online: Social capital and cyberbalkanization. *Cyberpsychology & Behavior, 10*(3), 398-406. doi:10.1089/cpb.2006.9939

- Williams, A., & Merten M. (2008). A review of online social networking profiles by adolescents: Implications for future research and intervention. *Adolescence* 43, 253-274. Retrieved from <http://web.ebscohost.com/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?sid=825f50a2-c335-4245-9a9d-397c226123d2%40sessionmgr12&vid=2&hid=14>
- Woolcock, M. (1998). Social capital and economic development: Toward a theoretical synthesis and policy framework. *Theory & Society*, 27(2), 151-208. doi:10.1234/12345678
- Yates, R., & Noyes, J., (2007). Web site design, self-monitoring style, and consumer preference. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 37, 6, 1341-1362.
doi: 10.1111/j.1559-1816.2007.00215.x
- Young, K. (1996). Internet addiction: The emergence of a new clinical disorder. *Cyber Psychology and Behavior*, 3, 237–244. doi: 10.1089/cpb.1998.1.237
- Young, K. (1999). The research and controversy surrounding internet addiction. *Cyberpsychology and Behavior*, 2, 381-383. doi:10.1089/cpb.1999.2.381
- Zhao, S. (2006). Do Internet Users Have More Social Ties? A Call for Differentiated Analyses of Internet Use. *Journal Of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 11(3), 844-862.
doi:10.1111/j.1083-6101.2006.00038.x

Footnotes

¹We also performed independent samples *t*-tests to find out if males and females in our sample significantly differed in their online bridging and bonding social capital scores. Males ($M = 35.85$, $SD = 7.51$) and females ($M = 34.39$, $SD = 8.60$) in our sample did not significantly differ in their online *bridging* social capital scores ($t(177) = 1.91$, $p = .294$). Males ($M = 33.61$, $SD = 8.16$) and females ($M = 33.70$, $SD = 6.59$) in our sample did not significantly differ in their online *bonding* social capital scores ($t(177) = -.75$, $p = .941$).

²For the statistically inclined, we also examined our data using ANOVAs. For these analyses, our design had three independent variables each with two levels: self-monitoring (high or low), Facebook importance (high or low), and type of social capital (bridging or bonding). Self-monitoring and Facebook importance were between-subjects variables whereas type of social capital was a within-subjects factor. Our dependent variable was participants' amount of social capital on Facebook (which was a continuous variable). We conducted a 2 (high and low self-monitoring) x 2 (high and low Facebook importance) x 2 (bridging and bonding social capital) ANOVA and found a significant three-way interaction between self-monitoring, Facebook importance, and type of social capital, $F(1,175) = 6.10$, $p = .015$. To isolate the relationships in this three-way interaction, we next performed analyses of simple (two-way) interaction effects. In a 2 (high vs. low self-monitoring) x 2 (high vs. low Facebook importance) ANOVA for *bridging* social capital, we found a main effect for Facebook importance, $F(1,175) = 10.49$, $p = .001$. In a 2 (high and low self-monitoring) x 2 (high and low Facebook importance) ANOVA for *bonding* social capital, we found a marginally reliable interaction between self-monitoring and Facebook importance, $F(1,175) = 2.81$, $p = .096$. The means of social capital scores for high and low self-monitors at each level of Facebook importance were consistent with our hypotheses.

Table 1

Correlation Matrix for Frequency of Facebook Uses

	Self-Monitoring	Bridging Capital	Bonding Capital
Finding out what old friends are doing now	-.050	.052	.261**
Reconnecting with people you've lost contact with	.026	.099	.333**
Connecting with people you otherwise would have lost contact with	.040	.131	.342**
Receiving a friend request	.167*	.085	.314**
Finding people you haven't seen for a while	.037	.106	.369**
Maintaining relationships with people you may not get to see very often	.045	.278**	.327**
Contacting friends who are away from home	.082	.264**	.332**
Organizing or joining events	.092	.161*	.319**
Joining groups	.017	.188*	.315**
Communication with likeminded people	.076	.137	.498**
Viewing photos	.203**	.119	.242**
Being tagged in photos	.164*	.123	.292**
Tagging photos	.134	.145	.309**
Sharing/ posting photographs	.159*	.166*	.275**

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$

Table 2

Correlation Matrix for Frequency of Facebook Uses (continued)

	Self-Monitoring	Bridging Capital	Bonding Capital
Applications within Facebook	-.132	.022	.172*
Playing games	-.100	.034	.017
Discovering apps because you see friends have added them	-.117	.062	.094
Taking Quizzes	.088	.004	.057
Virtual people watching	.101	.156*	.227**
Using advanced search to look for specific types of people	.056	.035	.157*
Meeting new people	.094	-.017	.378**
Facebook stalking other people	.247**	.198**	.201**
Looking at the profiles of people you don't know	.197**	.147	.331**
Viewing other people's friends	.202**	.145	.326**
Browsing your friends' friends	.119	.123	.287**
Updating your own status	.113	.293**	.445**
The news feed	.025	.274**	.417**
Seeing what people have put as their status	.024	.351**	.392**

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$

Table 3

Correlation Matrix for Importance of Facebook Uses

	Self-Monitoring	Bridging Capital	Bonding Capital
Keep in touch with an old friend or someone you knew from high school	.015	.202**	.415**
Check out a Facebook profile of someone you met socially	.128	.164*	.411**
Get information about people that live in your dorm, fraternity or sorority	.095	.106	.333**
Get information about people in your classes	.144	.079	.331**
Find out information about people in your classes	.121	.058	.387**
Have a face-to-face encounter with someone that you learned about through Facebook	.093	.005	.354**
Find people to date	.195**	-.019	.292**
Find casual sex partners	.186*	.029	.240**
Maintain and reinforce pre-existing social networks on Facebook	.077	.192**	.402**
Message friends outside of your local network	.098	.228**	.399**
Track the actions, beliefs and interests of the larger groups to which you belong	.164*	.224**	.375**
Contacting friends who are away from home	-.005	.226**	.463**
Chatting to people you otherwise would have lost contact with	-.060	.102	.401**
Using the site to virtually people-watch	.153*	.037	.173*
Reconnecting with people you've lost contact with	-.034	.131	.458**
Finding people you haven't seen in awhile	-.026	.133	.482**
Talking to singles	.105	.068	.309**
Getting new friends	.184*	.099	.459**
Joining groups	.124	.130	.394**
Maintaining relationships with people you may not get to see very often	.019	.276**	.350**

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$

Curriculum Vita

David Anthony Beane was born in _____ to David and Estelle Beane. During his early college career, he was an actor and stage performer while also working part time. In 2002 he began a career in retail management that encompassed both store operations and human resources. Over the course of his management career he received several accolades and awards for his store.

In summer, 2008 David returned to school part time and earned his Associates of Arts Degree from Santa Fe College in Gainesville, Florida. The following year, he ended his management career of 11 years to attend the University of North Florida (UNF). There he learned the finer points of research design while working with the Person by Situation research team. In 2010, he graduated summa cum laude with a Bachelor of Science in Psychology and began his Master's Degree in General Psychology at UNF. As a graduate student David began multiple lines of research with Dr. Christopher Leone and Dr. Dan Richard while also teaching several lessons in upper level undergraduate psychology courses. Additionally he worked with LouAnne Hawkins in the office of undergraduate research as a teaching assistant and mentor for undergraduate students from various disciplines writing honors theses. He also assisted in the planning and execution of the Showcase of Osprey Advancements in Research & Scholarship (SOARS) Conference. In fall, 2012, David will begin his Doctoral Degree in Industrial Psychology at Florida International University.