DIGITALISATION SOCIAL CAPITAL AND POLITICAL PARTICIPATICIPATION

An Investigation of Technological Affordance and Intensity of Social Media Use

TECHNICAL APPENDIX

Alessandro Grillo

March 2021

TABLE OF CONTENTS

APPENDIX A - LITERATURE REVIEW KEY WORDS AND JOURNALS

1. **Literature review of Political Marketing:**
    a) **Key words**: political marketing evolution, political marketing history, perspectives on political marketing, political marketing and ethics, political marketing and media, political marketing and theories of democracy, political marketing and criticisms, political marketing and approaches, political marketing and mainstream marketing, political marketing and political science, political marketing and societal welfare, political marketing and relationship marketing, exchanges of value, political marketing and G-D/ S-D logic;
    b) **Key Journals**: *Political Studies*, *Journal of Marketing*, *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, *Journal of Marketing Management*, *Journal of Political Marketing*, *European Journal of Marketing*, *Marketing Theory*, *Campaigns & Elections*, *Media, Culture & Society*, *Party Politics*, *Journal of Non-profit & Public Sector Marketing*, *The Communication Review*, *Journal of Services Marketing*, *European Journal of Political Research.*
2. **Literature review of Political Participation (in ethics, democracy and media studies)**:
    a) **Key words**: political participation and ethics, deontological approach, consequentialist approach, civic virtue and participation, civic virtue and history, civic virtue and Aristotle, civic virtue and Plato, civic virtue and Romans, civic virtue and republic, civic virtue and citizenship, civic virtue and participation, civic virtue and social capital, political participation and democracy, participation and representative democracy, participation and direct democracy, participation and competitive elitism, participation and participatory and deliberative democracy, participation and social capital, interaction and media, SNS and political participation, media and mobilisation theory, media and reinforcement theory, media and displacement theory;
    b) **Key journals**: *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, *Journal of Communication*, *Social Science Computer Review*, *Journal of Marketing Communications, American Behavioral Scientist*, *Social Science Computer Review, Parliamentary Affairs*, *European Journal of Political Research*, *Political Communication, Political Research Quarterly*, *Journal of political philosophy*, *Campaigns & Elections*, *International Political Science Review*, *The Harvard Journal of*

Press/Politics, *Political Studies*, *Central European Journal of Communication*, *Political Communication*, *Political Science and Politics*, *European Journal of Communication*, *Media, Culture & Society*, *Party Politics*, *The Communication Review*, *New Media and Society*, Journal of Public Affairs. *British Journal of Politics and International Relations*, *Parliamentary Affairs*.

3. **Literature review of Social Capital**:
    a) **Key words**: offline and social capital, online and social capital, virtual and social capital, SNS and social capital, political participation and social capital, measures and social capital, bridging and bonding social capital, criticisms and social capital, debates and Social Capital, benefit and Social Capital, drawbacks and social capital.
    b) **Key Journals**: *American Journal of Sociology*, *Political Science and Politics*, *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, *Computers in Human Behavior*, *American Behavioral Scientist*, *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, *Journal of Social Science Computer Reviews*.

APPENDIX B - LIST OF ALL POSSIBLE ACTIVITIES TO INCLUDE IN THE DEFINITION OF POLITICAL PARTICIPATION

On the basis of the definition of political participation provided in Chapter 3, the possible items to include in the operationalisation of the construct have been identified following several overviews of the literature (Barrett & Brunton-Smith, 2014; Brady, 1998; Conge, 1988; Ekman & Amna, 2012; Fox, 2014; Van Deth, 2001, 2014). This list is not exhaustive, but it is meant to facilitate the operationalisation of Political Participation and the identification of suitable measures and scales to employ in this research.

1. *Conventional forms of political participation (online/offline)*
    - Voting.
    - Donating money to political groups.
    - Donating money for a political campaign.
    - Working for a political party and/or candidate in election campaigns.
    - Being a member of a political party.
    - Being a member of a union.
    - Attending meetings and/or rallies for a candidate.
    - Attending meetings of a political party.
    - Attending meetings of a union.
    - Try to persuade others to vote.
    - Running for political elections.

2. *Non-conventional forms of political participation (online/offline)*
    - Signing a petition.
    - Demonstrating, protesting, marching.
    - Boycotting.
    - Contacting politicians or public officials.
    - Writing letters/emails or contact through phone calls media with political content.
    - Writing articles with a political content for the media.
    - Distribute or share political content to friends and contacts.
    - Wearing or displaying a symbol or sign representing support for a political cause.
    - Participating in fundraising events for a political cause.
    - Painting slogan or symbols on walls which express support for a political cause.

- Distributing leaflet which express support for a political cause.
- Participating in illegal actions (e.g., burning a national flag, throwing stones, blocking streets or railways, attacks on property, violent confrontation with police or political opponents, rioting) in support of a political cause.
- Actively avoiding reading newspapers when it comes to political issues.
- Actively avoiding watching TV when it comes to political issues.
- Actively avoiding political posts, twits or shared links on social networking sites (specify which sites) when it comes to political issues.
- Actively avoiding talking about politics.
- Non-voting as a form of protesting or affecting the political outcome.

APPENDIX C - THE INCONSISTENT EVIDENCE OF THE EFFECTS OF THE INTERNET AND THE SNSS USE ON POLITICAL PARTICIPATION

The table below provides a list of studies obtained through a search on ProQuest, Google Scholar and Jstor databases for the effects of the Internet and the SNSs on Political Participation either online and offline. ProQuest and Google Scholar were employed because academic databases like Jstor, may overrepresent statistically significant findings (Boulianne, 2017; Ellis, 2010). Google Scholar and ProQuest help to address this bias by including conference papers, dissertations, master's and doctoral theses (Boulianne, 2017). The search terms employed were: "Internet", "Internet use", "SNSs", "SNSs use", "Social Media", "Social Media use", "social networking", "political engagement" or "political participation", "online political participation" or "political participation online", "offline political participation" or "political participation offline", "civic engagement" or "civic participation", online civic participation" or "civic participation online", "offline civic participation" or "civic participation offline"

The search was carried out initially in October 2015 and it was updated several times till June 2020. The entire process of research yielded over 500 studies. Yet, most of those studies simply included the words mentioned above either in the main body or in the references but did not examine all the variables of interest of this research in their analysis. After a screening procedure, the studies relevant to this research were selected and categorised according to the type of effect reported of the Internet and SNSs on Political and Civic Participation. Notably, the table comprises studies dealing with both Internet and SNSs use and that consider either Online or Offline Political Participation or both, even when combined in a unique construct.

THE EFFECT OF THE INTERNET AND SNSs ON POLITICAL PARTICIPATION			
Reinforcement	**Mobilisation**	**Negative**	**No effect**
Bekafigo and McBride, 2013 Bennett and Iyengar 2008 Bimber, 2001, 2003 Bimber et al., 2015* Bonfadelli, 2002 Boulianne, 2011 Brundidge and Rice, 2009 Calenda and Mijer, 2009 Calenda and Mosca 2007 Carlisle and Patton,2013 Conroy et al., 2012 Cantijoch 2012* Dutta-Bergman and Chung, 2005	Bachman et al., 2010 Bakker and De Vreese, 2011 Baumgartner and Morris, 2010* Bengtsson and Christensen, 2012 Best and Krueger 2005 Bimber et al., 2015* Bode, 2012 Brundidge et al., 2014 Campante et al., 2013* Cantijoch 2012*	Ancu and Cozna, 2009 Fenton and Barassi, 2011 Gibson et al., 2000 Kwak et al., 2004 Nisbet and Scheufele, 2004 Scheufele and Nisbet, 2002 Shah et al., 2001a Shah et al., 2001b Theocharis and Lowe, 2016	Baumgartner and Morris, 2010* Campante et al., 2013* Chakraborty, 2016 Chunly, 2019 Dimitrova and Bystrom, 2013 Effing et al., 2011 Jennings and Zeitner, 2003 Kruikemeier et al., 2014* Quintelier and Visser, 2008*

Gibson and Cantijoch, 2013* Gustaffson, 2012 Hargittai and Shaw, 2013* Kenski and Stroud, 2006 Kim, 2006 Krueger,2006 Lindner and Riehm, 2011 Mascheroni, 2012 Mossberger et al., 2008 Moy et al., 2005 Norris, 2001, 2002 Oser et al., 2013* Polat, 2005 Quintelier and Visser, 2008* Rainie and Smith, 2012 Schlozman et al., 2010 Strandberg and Carlson, 2017* Tai et al., 2019* Tang and Lee, 2013 Tedesco, 2004 Vaccari, 2012* Vesnic-Alujevic, 2012 Vitak et al., 2011 Wang, 2007 Weber et al., 2003	Chan et al., 2012 Chun, 2012 Coleman and Blumler, 2009 Christensen and Bengtsson, 2011 Gibson and Cantijoch, 2013* Gibson and McAllister, 2013 Gibson et al., 2005 Gil de Zuniga et al., 2010 Gil de Zuniga et al., 2012 Halpern and Lee, 2011 Hamilton and Tolbert, 2012 Hargittai and Shaw, 2013* Hirzalla et al., 2011 Holt et al., 2013 Jensen & Anduiza, 2012 Johnson and Kaye, 2003 Kavanaugh et al., 2008 Kim and Geidner, 2008 Kim and Kim, 2007 Kim et al., 2016 Koc-Michalska et al., 2014 Krueger, 2002 Kruikemeier et al., 2014* Lewis, 2010 Lutz et al., 2014 Morris and Morris, 2013 Norris, 2003 Oser et al., 2013* Quintelier and Visser, 2008* Rice et al., 2013 Rojas and Puig-i-Abril, 2009 Skoric and Kwan, 2011 Skoric and Poor, 2013 Skoric et al., 2016 Stranberg, 2013 Strandberg and Carlson, 2017*	Yang and DeHart, 2016 Zhang and Chia, 2006*	Tolbert and McNeal, 2003* Towner, 2013* Zhang and Chia, 2006* Zhang and Gearhart, 2015* Zhang et al., 2010

	Tai et al., 2019* Tang and Lee, 2013 Tolbert and McNeal, 2003* Towner, 2013* Vaccari, 2012* Valenzuela et al., 2009 Visser and Stolle, 2014 Vitak, 2012 Ward et al., 2003 Williams and Gulati, 2007 Xenos et al., 2014 Yung and Leung, 2014 Zhang and Gearhart, 2015*		
* Studies that found mixed evidence.			

APPENDIX D - LIST OF STUDIES OF THE EFFECT OF SNSS' AFFORDANCE ON POLITICAL PARTICIPATION.

The table below provides a list of studies yielded by a search on ProQuest, Google Scholar and Jstor databases concerning the effects of the affordances of different types of SNSs on Political Participation both online and offline. The search terms employed were: "political engagement" or "political participation", "online political participation" or "political participation online", "offline political participation" or "political participation offline", "technology affordance" or "SNS affordance" or "Internet affordance" or "Social Media affordance" or "Social Network Sites affordance" or "Social Network Affordance" or "digital media affordance", "comparison" or "difference" and "online" or "web" or "social media" or "social networking" or "digital media" or "Internet."

The search was carried out initially in October 2015 and it was updated several times till June 2020. The entire process yielded a total of 17 studies. Yet, most of those studies simply included the words mentioned above either in the main body or in the references but did not examine all the variables of interest of this research in their analysis (Online/Offline Political Participation, different Types of SNSs like Facebook and Twitter).

After a screening procedure, the studies comparing the effects of two or more SNSs on online and offline forms of political participation were Haplern et al., (2017) and Woo-Yoo and Gil de Zuniga, (2014).

Authors	Year	Context	Thematic Focus	SNSs Considered	Online/Offline Political Participation
Cao	2020	U.S.	explore the political consequences of political discussion disagreement on SNSs	Facebook	Both
Comunello et al.	2016	Italy	Explore affordances and constraints of different social media platforms in relation to protest activities	Facebook Twitter	Offline
Enjolras et al.	2012	Norway	Investigate the mobilising effect of SNSs for political engagement	Facebook Twitter. Only descriptive comparison. No analysis performed.	Offline
Gil de Zuinga et al.	2014	U.S.	Investigate how SNSs use for news and social interactions affect political participation	No comparisons	Both
Gil de Zuniga et al.	2015	U.S.	Exploring second screening for news on a second, web-connected screen (i.e., smart-phone, laptop) and its effect on political participation		Online
Gil de Zuniga et al.	2019	Cross-National Comparison (19 countries)	Investigate whether discussion (face-to-face or on the Internet) is a mediating predictor of political participation	Internet	Both
Halpern at al.	2017	Chile	Explore how political sharing on different SNSs may influence individuals to engage in political activities offline.	Facebook Twitter	Both. However, Online considered predictor of Offline.
Kalsnes et al.	2017	Norway	Investigate and compare the influence of a series of socio-demographical variables on the interaction levels between citizens and politicians.	Facebook Twitter	Online

Lane et al.	2017	U.S.	The possibility that online discussion involving political disagreement can encourage users to politically engage online, which in turn can increase their offline political engagement	Several SNSs used for political discussion. But no comparison of effects.	Both. However, Online was consider and antecedent of Offline
Pandey et al.	2019		How SNSs general use affects new forms of political participation online	Twitter	Online
Rossi and Orefice	2016	Italy	Understand the effect of SNSs use for voting behaviour	Facebook Twitter	Offline
Saldana et al.	2015	Cross-National Comparison U.S./UK	How the use of SNSs to get news affects political behaviour across different countries	Several SNSs used to get news but no comparison of effects.	Both
Valenzuela et al.	2014	Chile	Investigate the link between SNSs use and protest behaviour	Facebook Twitter	Offline
Valenzuela et al.	2017	Chile	Investigate the link between SNSs use and protest behaviour	Facebook Twitter	Offline
Visser and Stolle	2014	Canadian	Whether SNSs use and the extent of its political use evolve into other types of political participation	Facebook	Both
Xu et al.	2018	China	examines how various resources, including money, computer and Internet access, Internet skills, and civic skills predict political participation	Internet	Online
Yoo and Gil de Zuniga	2014	U.S.	How SNSs use is related to the political engagement divide between people with higher and lower socio-economic status	Blogs Facebook Twitter	Both

APPENDIX E - LIST OF STUDIES INVESTIGATING THE EFFECT OF THE INTENSITY OF TWITTER USE ON POLITICAL PARTICIPATION.

The table below provides a list of studies yielded by a search on ProQuest, Google Scholar and Jstor databases related to the effects of the use of Twitter on Political Participation both online and offline. The search terms employed were: “political engagement” or “political participation”, “online political participation” or “political participation online”, “offline political participation” or “political participation offline”, “Twitter use” or “use of Twitter”, “intensity of use of Twitter” or “Intensity of Twitter use” or “Twitter intensity of use” or “time spent on Twitter”.

The search was carried out initially in October 2015 and it was updated several times till June 2020. The entire process yielded a total of 513 studies including academics papers, conferences papers, master and PhD thesis. Yet, most of those studies simply included the words mentioned above either in the main body or in the references but did not examine all the variables of interest of this research in their analysis (e.g., McManimon, 2014; Pătruţ and Pătruţ, 2014; Valeriani et al., 2016; Vromen, 2017). Others, (e.g., Gil de Zuniga et al., 2015; Weeks et al., 2017; Woo-Yoo and Gil de Zuniga, 2014) measures the intensity of use of social media in general including Facebook, Twitter and many others SNSs in the same measure without differentiating between them. Hence, it is impossible to disentangle the effects of Twitter intensity of use on Political Participation. Many others compare Twitter users and non-users but do not take into consideration the intensity of use of Twitter (e.g., Morpeau et al., 2011). After a screening procedure, only 3 studies investigating the effects of Twitter and its intensity of use either on online or offline forms of political participation (or both) were identified.

Authors	Year	Context	Thematic Focus	SNSs Considered	Online/Offline Political Participation
Yang and DeHart	2016	U.S.	Investigate what social media–related psychological and behavioural factors predicted their online political participation	Facebook Twitter	Online
Hopke et al.	2016	Colombia	Investigate the relationships between Twitter and Facebook use on mobile phones and political conversation with offline and online political participation, as well as online expressive communication.	Facebook Twitter Frequency	Both
Varnali and Gorgulo	2015	Turky	Aims to contribute to the growing literature on online political participation by seeking a better understanding of the social determinants of action that drive expressive political participation on Twitter.	Twitter Twitter use frequency was measured on a five-point Likert scale ranging from once a month or less frequently (1) to several times a day (5)	Online

APPENDIX F - THE INCONSISTENT EVIDENCE OF THE EFFECTS OF THE INTERNET AND SNSS USE ON SOCIAL CAPITAL.

The table below provides a list of studies obtained through a search on ProQuest, Google Scholar and Jstor databases for the effects of the Internet and the SNSs on Social Capital either online or offline. The search terms employed were: "Internet", "Internet use", "SNSs", "SNSs use", "Social Media", "Social Media use", "Social Capital", "Social Capital Online" or "Online Social Capital" or "Social Media Social Capital or "Internet Social Capital", "Offline Social Capital" or "Social Capital Offline".

The search was carried out initially in October 2015 and it was updated several times till June 2020. The entire process of research yielded more than 50000 studies. Yet, most of those studies simply included the words mentioned above either in the main body or in the references but did not examine all the variables of interest of this research in their analysis. After a screening procedure, the studies relevant to this research have been selected and categorised according to the type of effect reported of the Internet and SNSs on Social Capital. The table comprises studies dealing with both, the Internet and the SNSs use and that consider either Online or Offline Social Capital or both, in its bridging and bonding dimensions even when combined in a unique construct.

THE EFFECT OF THE INTERNET AND SNSs ON SOCIAL CAPITAL			
Positive	**Negative**	**Transformative**	**No effect**
Alessandrini, 2006, Barkhuus & Tashiro 2010, Bauernschuster et al., 2011, Boase, 2006, Brandtzaeg, 2012, Brandtzaeg et al., 2010, Burke et al., 2010, Burke et al., 2011, Ellison et al., 2007 Ellison et al., 2011, Hampton et al, 2011 Hofer and Aubert, 2013*, Johnston et al.,2013, kaigo, 2012, Kavanaugh et al., 2005 Kraut et al., 2002 (follow up, Kraut et al., 1998). Lampe et al., 2013, Lee et al., 2014,	Bohn et al., 2014, Cole et al., 2001, Kraut et al., 1998, Li et al., 2015*, Li et al., 2018*, Nie and Erbring, 2000, Nie and Hillygus, 2002, Norris, 2001, Putnam, 2000	Helliwell and Putnam, 2004, Quan-Hase et al., 2005, Williams, 2001	Brooks et al., 2014, Franzen, 2003 Hofer and Aubert, 2013*, Papacharissi and Mendelson, 2011, Robinson and De Haan, 2006*, Robinson and Martin, 2010*, Vitak et al., 2011*, Uslaner, 2004 Wellman et al., 2001*

Li et al., 2015*, Li et al., 2018*, Miyata et al., 2008, Quan-Haase and Wellman, 2004, Robinson and De Haan, 2006*, Robinson and Martin, 2010*, Sajuria et al., 2015, Stutzman et al., 2012, Tillema et al., 2010 Toriumi and Kamiko, 2017, Vitak et al., 2011*, Wang and Wellman, 2010 Wellman et al., 2001*			
* Studies that found mixed evidence.			

APPENDIX G - LIST OF STUDIES INVESTIGATING THE EFFECT OF INTENSITY OF USE OF FACEBOOK AND TWITTER ON SOCIAL CAPITAL

Authors	Year	SNS	Social Capital Type	Main Results
Bohn, Buchta, Hornik and Mair	2014	Facebook	BONDSC BRIDSC	Intensity of use (posting online) decreases BONDSC but increase BRIDSC.
Brandtzaeg	2012	Facebook	BRIDSC	Positive effect of SNS usage on BRIDSC. SNS users report more BRIDSC than non-users.
Brooks, Hogan, Ellison, Lampe and Vitak	2014	Facebook	BONDSC BRIDSC	Intensity of use (Number of visits) is not related to BRIDSC and BONDSC.
Burke, Marlow and Lento	2010	Facebook	BONDSC BRIDSC	Intensity of use predicts BRIDSC and BONDSC.
Burke, Kraut and Malow	2011	Facebook	BONDSC BRIDSC	Intensity of use (time spent) positively affects only BRIDSC.
Ellison, Steinfield and Lampe	2007	Facebook	BONDSC BRIDSC	Intensity of use has a positive relation with BRIDSC and BONDSC.
Ellison, Steinfield, and Lampe	2011	Facebook	BONDSC BRIDSC	Info-seeking and connection strategy (positively) predicts BRIDSC and BONDSC. Number of actual friends positively predicts BRISC.
Ellison, Vitak, Gray, and Lampe	2014	Facebook	BRIDSC	Intensity of use (time spent) is positively related to BRIDSC.
Hofer & Aubert	2013	Twitter	BONDSC BRIDSC	BONDSC is associated with the number of followers whereas BRIDSC is influenced by the number of followees.
Johnston, Tanner Lalla, and Kawalski	2013	Facebook	BONDSC BRIDSC	Intensity of use is positively related to BRIDSC and BONDSC.
Kaigo	2012	Twitter	BONDSC BRIDSC	Intensity of use (Frequency of Twits) is associated with both BRIDSC and BONDSC.

Lampe, Vitak, and Ellison	2013	Facebook	BONDSC BRIDSC	Heavy users report higher BRIDSC compared to non-users or light users. Heavy users and non-users report higher BONDSC compared to light users.
Lee, Kim, and Ahn	2014	Facebook	BONDSC BRIDSC	Intensity of use is positively related to BRIDSC and BONDSC.
Li, Chen, Sang and Lee	2018	Internet and SNS in general	BONDSC BRIDSC	Intensity of SNSs use for informational activity increases BRIDSC but not BONDSC online. Participatory and several recreational activities in crease both BONDSC and BRIDSC online. Intensity of use is not related to offline BONDSC and BRIDSC.
Papacharissi and Mendelson	2011	Facebook	BONDSC BRIDSC	No relationship between Intensity of use and BRIDSC and BONDSC.
Petersen and Johnston	2015	Facebook Twitter	BONDSC BRIDSC	No relationship between the intensity of Facebook and Twitter usage and BRIDSC and BONDSC.
Sajuria , VanHeerde-Hudson, Hudson, Dasandi and Theocharis	2015	Twitter	BONDSC BRIDSC	Twitter use and Online ties predict BRIDSC and BONDSC. However, for BRIDSC the results are conditional. Indeed, the formation of BRIDSC seems possible by the presence of people whose aim is to produce online ties.
Steinfield, Ellison and Lampe	2008	Facebook	BRIDSC	FB intensity positively affects BRIDSC.
Stutzman, Vitak, Ellison, Gray and Lampe	2012	Facebook	BONDSC BRIDSC	Facebook use, Broadcasting on Facebook and communication through Facebook are positively related to BRIDSC and BONDSC.
Su and Chan	2017	Facebook	BONDSC BRIDSC	Intensity of use is positively related to BRIDSC and BONDSC.
Toriumi and Kamiko	2017	Twitter	BONDSC BRIDSC	Intensity of Use (Number of twits and re-twits) positively affect BONDSC and BRIDSC.
Vitak	2012	Facebook	BRIDSC	Intensity of broadcasting is positively related to BRIDSC.
Vitak, Ellison, and Steinfield	2011	Facebook	BONDSC BRIDSC	Intensity of Use is positively related to BRIDSC but not with BONDSC.
Yoder and Stutzman	2011	Facebook	BRIDSC	Facebook use and Public directed communication predict BRIDSC.

APPENDIX H - SURVEY

Information Sheet

Dear Participant,

My name is Alessandro and I am a PhD student under the supervision of Prof. Francesca Dall'Olmo Riley at Kingston University.

We are asking your help with an academic study which investigates which social media people use, why and which range of social and political activities they engage in the online and offline environments.

You have been chosen as a possible participant via Pureprofile, provided that you are part of their panel of respondents. If you choose to participate in this research study, there would be no known risks or disadvantages for you. Also, no specific knowledge is required to participate. Only your experience and your opinions matter. They really do! Not just for us but rather for society at large. Indeed, if you decide to participate you should know that your responses may significantly help to improve academic research practice and help to develop new theories in our research field concerning political participation. Your response may also help to improve the understanding of the democratic practices of political participation that may lead to a better democracy. A better democracy is a democracy of all the people for all the people. Not just for you. Hence, your participation matters for all of us!

Your participation to this research project is totally voluntary and you are not obliged in any way to take part in it. Indeed, if you choose not to participate there will be no negative consequences for you. However, if you agree to participate, we will ask you to answer some questions through an online survey. The survey should take approximately between 5 and 10 minutes to complete. Please, complete the survey according to the instructions provided.

Remember, that even if you choose to answer the survey you can leave it at any time by simply closing your browser and without giving any reason. If you do so, your responses will be discarded and not used.

All information we gain from you will be kept anonymous and strictly confidential and will be stored in a secure manner. In particular, any personal information that could identify you will be removed or coded. Also, all data files and back-up copies will be kept in digital format and anonymised. Data will be encrypted and stored in discrete folders on a password protected computer and/or on the Kingston University secure server. The only people who will have access to the information will be my supervisor Prof. Francesca Dall'Olmo Riley and myself Alessandro Grillo, meaning that it will not be shared with other people. Data will be kept for at least ten years. After that time it will be either destroyed or further de-identified, meaning that we will replace any of your identifying information with a code that does not directly identify you.

Note, that your answers will be aggregated for analysis and used for research purpose only. In the reporting of the project, no information will be released which will enable the reader to identify who the respondent was. If you wish to know what the findings of this project are, please contact either me or my supervisor at the email addresses provided below. Once the data have been processed and analysed, we should be able to communicate you any available results.

If you have any questions about your rights as a participant in this research, if you feel you have been placed at risk, or for any other type of complaint please email either me or my supervisor using the contact details provided below.

Thank you for your time and consideration in this matter.

Yours Sincerely

Alessandro Grillo

Contact details:

[Redacted]

Informed Consent

I confirm that I have read and understood the information sheet/letter of invitation for this study.

I have been informed of the purpose, risks, and benefits of taking part in the study.

I am 18 years of age or older.

I understand what my involvement will entail and any questions have been answered to my satisfaction.

I understand that my participation is entirely voluntary, and that I can withdraw at any time without prejudice.

I understand that all information obtained will be confidential.

I agree that research data gathered for the study may be published provided that I cannot be identified as a subject.

Contact information has been provided should I (a) wish to seek further information from the investigator at any time for purposes of clarification (b) wish to make a complaint.

Please select your choice below. Clicking on the "Agree" button indicates that:

You have read and understood the above information. ·

You are 18 years of age or older. ·

You voluntarily agree to participate.

o I agree to participate

o I do not agree to participate

Questionnaire

1. Please Indicate which of the following Social Network Sites you ever use:

    - Facebook
    - Twitter
    - Both Facebook and Twitter
    - Neither Facebook nor Twitter

2. *Thank you for your time so far! Now some questions about your interactions on Facebook!*

3. Please, slide the cursor to rate the following items on a scale from 1 to 7 where 1 = strongly disagree and 7 = strongly agree:

    a. There is someone on Facebook I can turn to for advice about making very important decisions.
    b. There is someone on Facebook that I feel comfortable talking to about intimate personal problems.
    c. When I feel lonely, there are several people on Facebook I can talk to.
    d. If I needed an emergency loan of £ 500, I know someone on Facebook I can turn to.
    e. The people I interact with on Facebook would put their reputation on the line for me.
    f. The people I interact with on Facebook would provide good job references for me.
    g. The people I interact with on Facebook would share their last pound (£) with me.
    h. I know people on Facebook well enough to get them to do something important.
    i. The people I interact with on Facebook would help me fight an injustice.
    j. There are several people on Facebook I trust to help solve my problems.
    k. Please, select "Strongly agree" for this statement (this is a system check).

4. Please, slide the cursor to rate the following items on a scale from 1 to 7 where 1 = strongly disagree and 7 = strongly agree:

    a. Interacting with people on Facebook makes me interested in things that happen outside of my town.
    b. Interacting with people on Facebook makes me want to try new things.
    c. Interacting with people on Facebook makes me interested in what people unlike me are thinking.

d. Talking with people on Facebook makes me curious about other places in the world.
e. Interacting with people on Facebook makes me feel like part of a larger community.
f. Interacting with people on Facebook makes me feel connected to the bigger picture.
g. Interacting with people on Facebook reminds me that everyone in the world is connected.
h. I am willing to spend time to support general Facebook community activities.
i. Interacting with people on Facebook gives me new people to talk to.
j. On Facebook, I come in contact with new people all the time.

5. Now, a few questions about your interests on political and community affairs.

6. Please, rate the following items on a scale from 1 to 7 where 1 = strongly disagree and 7 = strongly agree:

a. In regards to my local community, I am interested in local community politics and local community affairs.
b. I am interested in national politics and national affairs.
c. In general, I am interested in politics.

7. Please, rate the following items on a scale from 1 to 7 where 1 = strongly disagree and 7 = strongly agree:

a. I consider myself to be well qualified to participate in politics.
b. I feel I have a pretty good understanding of the important political issues facing my country.
c. I feel that I could do as good a job in public office as most other people.
d. Please, select "Strongly disagree" for this statement (this is a system check).
e. I think that I am better informed about politics and government than most people.

8. Thank you for your time so far! Now, here are a few questions about government in the UK. Many people don't know the answers to these questions, so if there are some you don't know just check the option “don’t know” and proceed with the next question:

a. Margaret Thatcher was a Conservative Prime Minister.
b. The number of members of parliament is about 100.
c. The longest time allowed between general elections is four years.

d. Britain's electoral system is based on proportional representation.
e. MPs from different parties are on parliamentary committees.
f. Britain had separate elections for the European Parliament and the British Parliament.
g. No one may stand for parliament unless they pay a deposit.

9. Very close! Now, a few questions on the extent to which you engage on a range of activities online and offline.

10. Please indicate on a scale from 0 to 10 [where 0=Never and 10=Every time I could have a chance] how often you have engaged in the following online activities, in the past 12 months:

a. Created an online petition.
b. Signed a petition online.
c. Participated in an online question-and-answer session with a politician or public official.
d. Signed up online to volunteer to help with a political cause.
e. Donated money online to a campaign or political cause.
f. Started a political or cause-related group online.

11. Please indicate on a scale from 0 to 10 [where 0=Never and 10=Every time I could have a chance] how often you have engaged in the following activities, in the past 12 months:

a. Attended a public hearing, town hall meeting, or city council meeting.
b. Called or sent a letter to an elected public official.
c. Spoken to a public official in person.
d. Posted a political sign, banner, button or bumper sticker.
e. Please, select "Never" for this statement (this is a system check).
f. Attended a political rally.
g. Participated in any demonstrations, protests, or marches.
h. Written a letter to a news organisation.
i. Participated in groups that took local actions for social or political reforms.
j. Been involved in public interest groups, political action groups, political clubs, or party committees.

12. Lastly, please provide some information about you:

13. In a typical day, how much time do you spend on Facebook?

- Less than 10 minutes.
- 10-30 minutes.
- 31-59 minutes.
- 1-2 hours.
- More than 2 hours.
- More than 3 hours.

14. In a typical day how many hours and minutes do you spend on Facebook? (if you spend less than 1 hour per day, please write 0 in the hours' box and indicate just the number of minutes in the appropriate box).

- Hours _____
- Minutes _____

15. Please indicate your gender:
    - Male
    - Female
    - Prefer not to say

16. What is your age (in years)?

_____

17. What is your level of education? Please indicate:
    - Less than high school
    - High School
    - Bachelor's degree
    - Master's degree
    - Doctoral degree

APPENDIX I - COMMON METHOD BIAS PRECAUTIONS

FACTOR CAUSING CMB	MECHANISM	SUGGESTED REMEDIES	CONSIDERED HANDLED
Lack of verbal ability, education, or cognitive Sophistication of respondents	May increase the difficulty of the task of comprehending the meaning of the questions, retrieving information, and making judgments.	Pretesting questions to ensure they are written at a level the respondents can comprehend.	(**Yes**) Based on the results of the pilot study no questions were consistently unanswered or skipped. Question wording was simple, and answers were provided in present tense.
Lack of experience thinking about the topic	**(a)** hinders comprehension by reducing the respondent's ability to link key terms to relevant concepts, **(b)** makes information retrieval more difficult **(c)** makes it harder to draw inferences needed to fill in gaps and to integrate material that is retrieved.	Select respondents who have the necessary experience thinking about the issues of interest. Exercise caution when asking respondents about the motives for their behaviour, or other things pertaining to cognitive processes that are unlikely to have been attended to or stored in short-term memory.	(**Yes**) Respondents are selected through screening question asking whether they use SNSs (Facebook and Twitter in particular – topic of this study) and whether they were 18+ years old (for political participation).
Complex or abstract questions	May increase the difficulty of comprehending the meaning of the questions, retrieving relevant information, and making judgments.	Avoid referring to vague concepts without providing clear examples; simplify complex or compound questions; use language, vocabulary, and syntax that match the reading capabilities of the respondents.	(**Yes**) Questions simplified based on results from the pilot study and examples were given when needed (For instance, in the question about age was shown how to report the exact age using only numbers and not words – See pilot study section).
Item ambiguity.	May increase the difficulty of comprehending the questions, retrieving relevant information and making judgments.	Use clear and concise language; avoid complicated syntax; define ambiguous or unfamiliar terms; and provide numbers/labels for all response options rather than just the end points.	(**Yes**) Clear and language was used and complex syntax like the use of negatives in items formulation was avoided (Bonding Scale items 3 and 9 reworded). Also, all the response options were numbered and labelled to the end points.

FACTOR CAUSING CMB	MECHANISM	SUGGESTED REMEDIES	CONSIDERED HANDLED
Questions that rely on retrospective recall.	May increase the difficulty of the retrieval process.	Refocus the questions to ask about current states because this reduces the effort required for retrieval. Take steps to increase the respondent's motivation to expand the effort required to retrieve the information necessary to answer the question accurately by explaining why the questions are important and how accurate responses will have useful consequences for the respondent and/or the study.	(**Partially Handled**) All the questions batteries but the Political Participation ones, were stated et the present tense. Political participation questions asked whether in the past 12 months respondents carried out specific political activities. Information not stored in short memory. Yet, formula of the Political Participation items was retained as it was already used in previous peer-reviewed studies and for reasons of reliability, comparability and replicability. Steps to increase the respondent's motivation to expand the effort required to retrieve the information necessary motivating sentences which were introduced in the information sheet about the their role to help improve research in the field and assist in making this study succeed.
Auditory only presentation of items (telephone) versus written presentation of items (print or web).	Increases the memory load because respondents must keep the meaning of the question and all response options in short-term memory before responding.	Simplify questions and/or response options. Present long, complex, questions with many response options in written form or with visual aids.	(**Yes**) Web-based survey was employed. Also, respondents could finish the survey at the pace they wanted. So, no memory load increase.

FACTOR CAUSING CMB	MECHANISM	SUGGESTED REMEDIES	CONSIDERED HANDLED
Low personal relevance of the issue.	May decrease a respondent's motivation to exert cognitive effort and result in poorer comprehension, less thorough retrieval and less careful judgment.	Explain to respondents why the questions are important and how their accurate responses will have useful consequences for them and society; promise feedback to respondents to motivate them to respond more accurately.	(**Yes**) Reasons why their response was important was introduced in the information sheet. Also, we informed respondents that analysis results could have been made available to them once processed.
Low self-efficacy to provide a correct Answer.	May decrease motivation to exert cognitive effort which decreases a person's willingness to assess the completeness and accuracy of information retrieved, fill in gaps in what is recalled, and trust his/her own inferences based on partial retrieval.	Emphasizing to respondents that it is their personal opinions that are important, and only their personal experience or knowledge is required to answer the questions.	(**Yes**) The information that only respondent's personal opinions, experience and knowledge was needed to answer the questions of the survey was introduced in the information sheet.
Low need for cognition.	May decrease motivation to exert cognitive effort and thereby diminish: **(a)** the thoroughness of information retrieval and integration processes, and **(b)** the filling in of gaps in what is recalled.	Enhance motivation to exert cognitive effort by emphasizing the importance of the issues; reminding respondents of how research can benefit them or help society at large; or increasing personal relevance of the task.	(**Yes**) Motivating sentences were introduced to respondents in the information sheet emphasizing their role as effective members to help improve academic research and practices related to the democratic process of participation in politics.
Low need for self-expression, self-disclosure,	May decrease motivation to exert cognitive effort and thereby decrease **(a)** the thoroughness of	Enhance the motivation for self-expression by explaining in the Information sheet that "we value your opinion", "we need your	(**Yes**) Was done in the information sheet. In particular, we highlighted the fact that only participants' experience and

FACTOR CAUSING CMB	MECHANISM	SUGGESTED REMEDIES	CONSIDERED HANDLED
or emotional catharsis.	information retrieval and **(b)** the filling in of gaps in what is recalled. People may respond carelessly, randomly, or non-purposefully.	feedback," or that we want respondents to "tell us what they think," and so forth. Similarly, enhance willingness to self-disclose by emphasizing the personal benefits of the research to them.	beliefs matter. We emphasised it with the statement "They really do (matter)!".
Low feelings of altruism.	May decrease intentions to exert cognitive effort decreasing the thoroughness of information retrieval and the filling in of gaps in what is recalled.	Explain how much the respondent's help is needed, indicating that others are depending upon the accuracy of the responses.	(**Yes**) Motivating sentences were included in the information sheet explaining respondents how their responses would improve the understanding of democratic practices of political participation and how a better democracy would benefit society.
Agreeableness.	Increases the tendency to uncritically endorse or acquiesce to statements, search for cues suggesting how to respond and edit responses for acceptability.	Stress the fact that the best way to help the researcher is to answer the questions as accurately as possible. Enhance motivation by emphasizing the importance of the issues; reminding respondents of how research can benefit them or increasing personal relevance of the task.	**(Yes)** Motivating sentences were introduced to the respondents in the information sheet on their role to be an effective member of the research project that can help improve what's provided and help make this study succeed.
Implicit Theories.	May motivate respondents to edit their responses in a manner that is consistent with their theory.	Introduce a temporal, proximal, or spatial separation.	(**Yes**) Was done in the design of the survey by mixing some questions of Political Participation, Political Interest and Social Capital.
Lengthy Scales.	May decrease motivation to maintain the cognitive effort required to provide optimal answers.	Increase motivation by minimizing the length of the survey, simplifying the questions, making the questions	(**Yes**) According to the pilot study respondents spent an average of 8 minutes and 37 seconds to complete the questionnaire

FACTOR CAUSING CMB	MECHANISM	SUGGESTED REMEDIES	CONSIDERED HANDLED
		seem less repetitive by reversing some items or changing the format.	which is below the rule of thumb of 15 minutes indicated by Rea and Parker (2014). Also, different scale had different points range and format options with respect to their response. The survey employed different type of questions, from factual to attitudinal questions to make the survey more dynamic and interesting for respondents. Moreover, irrelevant questions were skipped. Indeed, contingency questions were set so that respondents were only presented with relevant questions and were not forced to read and answer irrelevant questions (i.e., if a respondents replied that they used only Facebook they were redirected to the branch of questions related to Facebook rather than Twitter).
Forced Participation.	May increase psychological reactance and consequently decrease the motivation to exert cognitive effort to generate accurate answers or to faithfully report those answers.	Solicit participation by promising rewards rather than by threatening punishment. Treat participants in a respectful manner, show that you value their time, and express appreciation for their participation which should be voluntary.	**(Yes)** It was clearly mentioned in the information sheet that participation was anonymous and voluntary.
Measurement conditions that make the consequences of a response salient.	May increase desire to edit answers in order to provide a socially acceptable response or to avoid undesirable consequences.	Can be diminished by guaranteeing anonymity, telling respondents there are no right or wrong answers, and assuring them that people have different opinions about the issues addressed in the questionnaire.	(**Yes**) Anonymity was assured to respondents in the information sheet. Also, questions of Political Knowledge were introduced with the following formula "*Many people don't know the answers to these questions, so if there are some you don't know just check the option "don't know" and proceed with the next question*". This was meant to

FACTOR CAUSING CMB	MECHANISM	SUGGESTED REMEDIES	CONSIDERED HANDLED
			highlight the principle of honesty and to reassure respondents that no negative consequences could occur in case of wrong answers.
Presence of an interviewer.	May motivate respondents to edit their answers to make them more socially desirable.	If appropriate, use a self-administered method of data collection.	(**Yes**) A computer-based self-completion questionnaire was used.
Source of the survey is disliked.	May decrease: the desire to cooperate; willingness to exert the cognitive effort required to generate optimal answers, or motivation to faithfully report those answers.	Treat participants in a respectful manner, show that you value their time, and express appreciation for their participation.	(**Yes**) Expressions of gratitude for the time spent taking the survey were given in the information sheets.
Contexts that arouse suspicions	May motivate respondents to conceal their true opinion by editing their responses. They might do this by using the middle scale category regardless of their true feelings, or by responding to items carelessly, randomly, or non-purposefully.	Suspicions may be mitigated by explaining how the information will be used, why the information is being requested, who will see the responses, and how the information will be kept secure. In addition, one could assure participants that their responses will be used only for research purposes, will be aggregated with the responses of others, and that no one in their organization will see their individual responses. Measure midpoint response style and control for it.	(**Yes**) Everything was mentioned in the information sheet.

Source: adapted from MacKenzie and Podsakoff (2012).

APPENDIX J - PILOT STUDY RESULTS

Facebook Users Sample (n = 102)

Table J.1. Summary Measurement Model Assessment Metrics for Bonding and Bridging Social Capital of Facebook Users Sample.

LV	Indicators	Convergent Validity			Internal Reliability		Discriminant Validity			
		Loadings	Communality	AVE	CR	CA	Fornell Larcker Criterion	Cross Loadings	HTMT Ratio	HTMT CI
Bond_SC	Bond_1	0.890	0.792	0.759	0.969	0.964	Condition met	Condition met	<0.90	∌ 1
	Bond_2	0.924	0.854							
	Bond_3	0.776	0.602							
	Bond_4	0.773	0.598							
	Bond_5	0.878	0.771							
	Bond_6	0.839	0.704							
	Bond_7	0.939	0.882							
	Bond_8	0.906	0.821							
	Bond_9	0.823	0.677							
	Bond_10	0.944	0.891							
Brid_SC	Brid_1	0.910	0.828	0.742	0.966	0.961	Condition met	Condition met	<0.90	∌ 1
	Brid_2	0.868	0.753							
	Brid_3	0.910	0.828							
	Brid_4	0.867	0.752							
	Brid_5	0.848	0.719							
	Brid_6	0.814	0.663							
	Brid_7	0.842	0.709							
	Brid_8	0.840	0.706							
	Brid_9	0.895	0.801							
	Brid_10	0.812	0.659							

Table J.2. Summary Measurement Model Assessment Metrics for Online and Offline Political Participation, Internal Political Efficacy and Political Interest of Facebook Users Sample.

LV	Indicators	Convergent Validity			Internal Reliability		Discriminant Validity			
		Loadings	Communality	AVE	CR	CA	Fornell Larcker Criterion	Cross Loadings	HTMT Ratio	HTMT CI
Off_PP	Off_PP_1	0.843	0.711	0.643	0.941	0.928	Condition met	Condition met	<0.90	∌ 1
	Off_PP_2	0.672	0.452							
	Off_PP_3	0.883	0.780							
	Off_PP_4	0.853	0.728							
	Off_PP_5	0.944	0.891							
	Off_PP_6	0.669	0.448							
	Off_PP_7	0.836	0.699							
	Off_PP_8	0.758	0.575							
	Off_PP_9	0.709	0.503							
On_PP	On_PP_1	0.771	0.594	0.560	0.884	0.844	Condition met	Condition met	<0.90	∌ 1
	On_PP_2	0.673	0.453							
	On_PP_3	0.774	0.599							
	On_PP_4	0.805	0.648							
	On_PP_5	0.776	0.602							
	On_PP_6	0.681	0.464							
PEff	PEffic_1	0.917	0.841	0.715	0.908	0.865	Condition met	Condition met	<0.90	∌ 1
	PEffic_2	0.853	0.728							
	PEffic_3	0.704	0.496							
	PEffic_4	0.892	0.796							
PInt	PInt_1	0.943	0.889	0.915	0.970	0.954	Condition met	Condition met	<0.90	∌ 1
	PInt_2	0.955	0.912							
	PInt_3	0.972	0.945							

Table J.3. Fornell-Larcker Criterion Facebook Users Sample.

Fornell-Larcker Criterion						
	Bond_SC	**Brid_SC**	**Off_PP**	**On_PP**	**PEff**	**PInt**
Bond_SC	0.871					
Brid_SC	0.462	0.861				
Off_PP	0.105	-0.043	0.802			
On_PP	0.295	0.388	0.198	0.748		
PEff	0.045	-0.088	0.413	0.118	0.845	
PInt	0.128	0.239	0.271	0.218	-0.010	0.957

Table J.4. Cross-Loadings Facebook Users Sample.

Cross-loadings						
	Bond_SC	**Brid_SC**	**Off_PP**	**On_PP**	**PEff**	**PInt**
Bond_1	**0.890**	0.454	0.041	0.238	-0.016	0.096
Bond_10	**0.944**	0.469	0.108	0.219	0.034	0.094
Bond_2	**0.924**	0.347	0.079	0.225	0.021	0.095
Bond_3	**0.776**	0.463	0.058	0.269	-0.057	0.093
Bond_4	**0.773**	0.362	0.108	0.262	-0.016	0.220
Bond_5	**0.878**	0.353	0.124	0.278	0.054	0.098
Bond_6	**0.839**	0.365	0.059	0.242	0.116	0.024
Bond_7	**0.939**	0.320	0.052	0.279	0.044	0.118
Bond_8	**0.906**	0.459	0.119	0.255	0.078	0.150
Bond_9	**0.823**	0.424	0.145	0.274	0.121	0.104
Brid_1	0.445	**0.910**	-0.045	0.358	-0.094	0.252
Brid_10	0.378	**0.812**	-0.066	0.342	-0.197	0.180
Brid_2	0.379	**0.868**	0.028	0.232	-0.101	0.233
Brid_3	0.412	**0.910**	-0.012	0.344	-0.023	0.203
Brid_4	0.413	**0.867**	-0.010	0.297	-0.072	0.223
Brid_5	0.395	**0.848**	-0.051	0.351	0.019	0.155
Brid_6	0.447	**0.814**	-0.106	0.346	-0.128	0.186
Brid_7	0.345	**0.842**	0.015	0.422	0.009	0.274
Brid_8	0.352	**0.840**	-0.025	0.262	-0.131	0.172
Brid_9	0.402	**0.895**	-0.078	0.299	-0.081	0.158
Off_PP_1	0.084	-0.027	**0.843**	0.179	0.409	0.188
Off_PP_2	0.028	-0.011	**0.672**	0.178	0.290	0.199
Off_PP_3	0.078	-0.058	**0.883**	0.154	0.438	0.188
Off_PP_4	0.128	0.025	**0.853**	0.173	0.328	0.220
Off_PP_5	0.063	-0.045	**0.944**	0.185	0.321	0.281
Off_PP_6	0.023	-0.068	**0.669**	0.156	0.254	0.211
Off_PP_7	0.140	0.061	**0.836**	0.184	0.301	0.246
Off_PP_8	0.025	-0.141	**0.758**	0.156	0.282	0.187
Off_PP_9	0.175	-0.051	**0.709**	0.068	0.325	0.238
On_PP_1	0.163	0.363	0.094	**0.771**	0.072	0.135
On_PP_2	0.253	0.293	0.088	**0.673**	0.000	0.121
On_PP_3	0.222	0.316	0.136	**0.774**	0.120	0.077
On_PP_4	0.236	0.286	0.203	**0.805**	0.155	0.223
On_PP_5	0.253	0.276	0.165	**0.776**	0.101	0.245
On_PP_6	0.176	0.160	0.251	**0.681**	0.097	0.163
PEffic_1	0.036	-0.118	0.405	0.129	**0.917**	-0.021
PEffic_2	-0.004	0.043	0.291	0.115	**0.853**	0.056
PEffic_3	-0.053	-0.273	0.256	-0.042	**0.704**	-0.174
PEffic_4	0.123	-0.013	0.405	0.142	**0.892**	0.047
PInt_1	0.165	0.224	0.310	0.205	0.047	**0.943**
PInt_2	0.108	0.228	0.241	0.223	-0.002	**0.955**
PInt_3	0.083	0.234	0.214	0.195	-0.089	**0.972**

Table J.5. HTMT Ratio Values for Facebook Users Sample.

HTMT						
	Bond_SC	**Brid_SC**	**Off_PP**	**On_PP**	**PEff**	**PInt**
Bond_SC						
Brid_SC	0.478					
Off_PP	0.113	0.089				
On_PP	0.318	0.408	0.243			
PEff	0.092	0.173	0.446	0.186		
PInt	0.131	0.247	0.286	0.238	0.110	

Table J.6. HTMT BCa CI for Facebook Users Sample.

HTMT CONFIDENCE INTERVALS BIAS CORRECTED (Bootstrapping 5000 Samples)					
	Original Sample (O)	**Sample Mean (M)**	**Bias**	**2.50%**	**97.50%**
Brid_SC -> Bond_SC	0.478	0.481	0.002	0.272	0.650
Off_PP -> Bond_SC	0.113	0.166	0.053	0.058	0.157
Off_PP -> Brid_SC	0.089	0.151	0.063	0.063	0.088
On_PP -> Bond_SC	0.318	0.325	0.007	0.140	0.502
On_PP -> Brid_SC	0.408	0.412	0.005	0.215	0.591
On_PP -> Off_PP	0.243	0.279	0.036	0.117	0.432
PEff -> Bond_SC	0.092	0.160	0.068	0.047	0.099
PEff -> Brid_SC	0.173	0.214	0.041	0.077	0.228
PEff -> Off_PP	0.446	0.448	0.002	0.282	0.583
PEff -> On_PP	0.186	0.234	0.048	0.105	0.286
PInt -> Bond_SC	0.131	0.156	0.024	0.061	0.285
PInt -> Brid_SC	0.247	0.253	0.006	0.080	0.437
PInt -> Off_PP	0.286	0.289	0.003	0.138	0.434
PInt -> On_PP	0.238	0.254	0.015	0.099	0.416
PInt -> PEff	0.110	0.155	0.045	0.051	0.149

Table J.7. Bias-Corrected and Bonferroni-Adjusted Confidence Intervals of the CTA-PLS analysis for Bond_SC of Facebook Users Samples.

CTA – Bond_SC **Non-Redundant Tetrad**	**CI Low adj.**	**CI Up adj.**	**Tetrad Vanish**
1: Bond_1,Bond_10,Bond_2,Bond_3	-0.434	2.808	Yes
2: Bond_1,Bond_10,Bond_3,Bond_2	-1.470	2.985	Yes
4: Bond_1,Bond_10,Bond_2,Bond_4	-1.885	2.422	Yes
6: Bond_1,Bond_2,Bond_4,Bond_10	-0.942	2.733	Yes
7: Bond_1,Bond_10,Bond_2,Bond_5	-1.128	2.110	Yes
10: Bond_1,Bond_10,Bond_2,Bond_6	-2.682	1.772	Yes
13: Bond_1,Bond_10,Bond_2,Bond_7	-0.527	2.379	Yes
17: Bond_1,Bond_10,Bond_8,Bond_2	-0.988	2.694	Yes
20: Bond_1,Bond_10,Bond_9,Bond_2	-0.835	1.847	Yes
29: Bond_1,Bond_10,Bond_6,Bond_3	-2.555	2.579	Yes
31: Bond_1,Bond_10,Bond_3,Bond_7	-2.318	3.245	Yes
35: Bond_1,Bond_10,Bond_8,Bond_3	-1.850	2.482	Yes
41: Bond_1,Bond_10,Bond_5,Bond_4	-2.384	2.190	Yes
43: Bond_1,Bond_10,Bond_4,Bond_6	-2.346	3.188	Yes
47: Bond_1,Bond_10,Bond_7,Bond_4	-1.583	1.799	Yes
50: Bond_1,Bond_10,Bond_8,Bond_4	-2.485	1.767	Yes
60: Bond_1,Bond_5,Bond_7,Bond_10	-0.707	1.193	Yes

CTA – Bond_SC Non-Redundant Tetrad	CI Low adj.	CI Up adj.	Tetrad Vanish
64: Bond_1,Bond_10,Bond_5,Bond_9	-0.859	2.795	Yes
66: Bond_1,Bond_5,Bond_9,Bond_10	-0.360	1.947	Yes
71: Bond_1,Bond_10,Bond_8,Bond_6	-1.716	1.672	Yes
80: Bond_1,Bond_10,Bond_9,Bond_7	-0.474	1.992	Yes
91: Bond_1,Bond_2,Bond_3,Bond_6	-3.156	1.919	Yes
120: Bond_1,Bond_5,Bond_6,Bond_2	-1.453	1.513	Yes
169: Bond_1,Bond_3,Bond_5,Bond_8	-1.868	2.947	Yes
182: Bond_1,Bond_3,Bond_9,Bond_6	-1.535	5.311	Yes
205: Bond_1,Bond_4,Bond_6,Bond_7	-3.049	2.783	Yes
233: Bond_1,Bond_5,Bond_8,Bond_7	-1.583	1.148	Yes
236: Bond_1,Bond_5,Bond_9,Bond_7	-0.766	1.508	Yes
248: Bond_1,Bond_6,Bond_9,Bond_8	-0.900	3.597	Yes
281: Bond_10,Bond_2,Bond_8,Bond_4	-2.966	0.724	Yes
324: Bond_10,Bond_4,Bond_7,Bond_3	-0.997	5.110	Yes
358: Bond_10,Bond_3,Bond_8,Bond_9	-1.875	2.220	Yes
395: Bond_10,Bond_5,Bond_8,Bond_6	-2.416	0.942	Yes
434: Bond_2,Bond_3,Bond_9,Bond_4	-1.160	4.875	Yes
526: Bond_3,Bond_4,Bond_5,Bond_6	-3.548	2.619	Yes

Table J.8. Bias-Corrected and Bonferroni-Adjusted Confidence Intervals of the CTA-PLS analysis for Brid_SC of Facebook Users Sample.

CTA – Brid_SC Non-Redundant Tetrad	CI Low adj.	CI Up adj.	Tetrad Vanish
1: Brid_1,Brid_10,Brid_2,Brid_3	-0.294	0.665	Yes
2: Brid_1,Brid_10,Brid_3,Brid_2	-0.924	0.427	Yes
4: Brid_1,Brid_10,Brid_2,Brid_4	-0.387	0.460	Yes
6: Brid_1,Brid_2,Brid_4,Brid_10	-1.837	0.088	Yes
7: Brid_1,Brid_10,Brid_2,Brid_5	-0.576	0.550	Yes
10: Brid_1,Brid_10,Brid_2,Brid_6	-0.709	0.393	Yes
13: Brid_1,Brid_10,Brid_2,Brid_7	-0.945	0.681	Yes
17: Brid_1,Brid_10,Brid_8,Brid_2	-0.720	0.702	Yes
20: Brid_1,Brid_10,Brid_9,Brid_2	-0.401	0.563	Yes
29: Brid_1,Brid_10,Brid_6,Brid_3	-0.335	0.973	Yes
31: Brid_1,Brid_10,Brid_3,Brid_7	-1.228	0.758	Yes
35: Brid_1,Brid_10,Brid_8,Brid_3	-0.674	0.565	Yes
41: Brid_1,Brid_10,Brid_5,Brid_4	-0.458	0.543	Yes
43: Brid_1,Brid_10,Brid_4,Brid_6	-2.000	0.216	Yes
47: Brid_1,Brid_10,Brid_7,Brid_4	-0.675	0.657	Yes
50: Brid_1,Brid_10,Brid_8,Brid_4	-0.516	0.442	Yes
60: Brid_1,Brid_5,Brid_7,Brid_10	-0.610	0.543	Yes
64: Brid_1,Brid_10,Brid_5,Brid_9	-0.590	0.674	Yes
66: Brid_1,Brid_5,Brid_9,Brid_10	-0.219	0.941	Yes
71: Brid_1,Brid_10,Brid_8,Brid_6	-0.910	0.525	Yes
80: Brid_1,Brid_10,Brid_9,Brid_7	-0.523	0.769	Yes
91: Brid_1,Brid_2,Brid_3,Brid_6	-0.576	0.657	Yes
120: Brid_1,Brid_5,Brid_6,Brid_2	-0.326	0.500	Yes
169: Brid_1,Brid_3,Brid_5,Brid_8	-0.142	0.916	Yes
182: Brid_1,Brid_3,Brid_9,Brid_6	-0.441	1.427	Yes
205: Brid_1,Brid_4,Brid_6,Brid_7	-0.223	2.511	Yes
233: Brid_1,Brid_5,Brid_8,Brid_7	-1.705	0.190	Yes
236: Brid_1,Brid_5,Brid_9,Brid_7	-1.486	0.287	Yes
248: Brid_1,Brid_6,Brid_9,Brid_8	-0.443	0.589	Yes

CTA – Brid_SC Non-Redundant Tetrad	CI Low adj.	CI Up adj.	Tetrad Vanish
281: Brid_10,Brid_2,Brid_8,Brid_4	-0.409	0.981	Yes
324: Brid_10,Brid_4,Brid_7,Brid_3	-1.356	0.887	Yes
358: Brid_10,Brid_3,Brid_8,Brid_9	-0.328	0.671	Yes
395: Brid_10,Brid_5,Brid_8,Brid_6	-0.863	0.138	Yes
434: Brid_2,Brid_3,Brid_9,Brid_4	-0.959	0.458	Yes
526: Brid_3,Brid_4,Brid_5,Brid_6	-0.319	1.349	Yes

Table J.9. Bias-Corrected and Bonferroni-Adjusted Confidence Intervals of the CTA-PLS analysis for Off_PP of Facebook Users Sample.

CTA – Off_PP Non-Redundant Tetrad	CI Low adj.	CI Up adj.	Tetrad Vanish
1: Off_PP_1,Off_PP_2,Off_PP_3,Off_PP_4	-5.810	2.538	Yes
2: Off_PP_1,Off_PP_2,Off_PP_4,Off_PP_3	-1.573	2.496	Yes
4: Off_PP_1,Off_PP_2,Off_PP_3,Off_PP_5	-5.853	2.110	Yes
6: Off_PP_1,Off_PP_3,Off_PP_5,Off_PP_2	-2.114	6.118	Yes
9: Off_PP_1,Off_PP_3,Off_PP_6,Off_PP_2	-3.066	4.712	Yes
10: Off_PP_1,Off_PP_2,Off_PP_3,Off_PP_7	-4.556	2.646	Yes
13: Off_PP_1,Off_PP_2,Off_PP_3,Off_PP_8	-18.825	9.229	Yes
17: Off_PP_1,Off_PP_2,Off_PP_9,Off_PP_3	-2.700	8.054	Yes
20: Off_PP_1,Off_PP_2,Off_PP_5,Off_PP_4	-1.102	1.422	Yes
26: Off_PP_1,Off_PP_2,Off_PP_7,Off_PP_4	-1.714	1.632	Yes
29: Off_PP_1,Off_PP_2,Off_PP_8,Off_PP_4	-1.704	4.623	Yes
33: Off_PP_1,Off_PP_4,Off_PP_9,Off_PP_2	-3.145	2.865	Yes
41: Off_PP_1,Off_PP_2,Off_PP_8,Off_PP_5	-1.240	3.211	Yes
47: Off_PP_1,Off_PP_2,Off_PP_7,Off_PP_6	-0.952	1.383	Yes
49: Off_PP_1,Off_PP_2,Off_PP_6,Off_PP_8	-5.510	2.930	Yes
51: Off_PP_1,Off_PP_6,Off_PP_8,Off_PP_2	-2.935	5.661	Yes
57: Off_PP_1,Off_PP_7,Off_PP_8,Off_PP_2	-3.474	7.751	Yes
109: Off_PP_1,Off_PP_4,Off_PP_5,Off_PP_6	-0.686	0.320	Yes
113: Off_PP_1,Off_PP_4,Off_PP_7,Off_PP_5	-1.191	0.509	Yes
133: Off_PP_1,Off_PP_4,Off_PP_7,Off_PP_9	-2.823	1.584	Yes
137: Off_PP_1,Off_PP_4,Off_PP_9,Off_PP_8	-2.978	4.014	Yes
149: Off_PP_1,Off_PP_5,Off_PP_8,Off_PP_7	-1.159	1.136	Yes
151: Off_PP_1,Off_PP_5,Off_PP_7,Off_PP_9	-2.438	1.233	Yes
161: Off_PP_1,Off_PP_6,Off_PP_9,Off_PP_7	-1.492	1.184	Yes
165: Off_PP_1,Off_PP_8,Off_PP_9,Off_PP_6	-1.840	1.458	Yes
174: Off_PP_2,Off_PP_4,Off_PP_6,Off_PP_3	-1.814	2.382	Yes
231: Off_PP_2,Off_PP_6,Off_PP_8,Off_PP_4	-2.204	2.170	Yes

Table J.10. Bias-Corrected and Bonferroni-Adjusted Confidence Intervals of the CTA-PLS analysis for On_PP of Facebook Users Sample.

CTA – On_PP Non-Redundant Tetrad	CI Low adj.	CI Up adj.	Tetrad Vanish
1: On_PP_1,On_PP_2,On_PP_3,On_PP_4	-0.061	0.003	Yes
2: On_PP_1,On_PP_2,On_PP_4,On_PP_3	-0.004	0.026	Yes
4: On_PP_1,On_PP_2,On_PP_3,On_PP_5	-0.072	0.004	Yes
6: On_PP_1,On_PP_3,On_PP_5,On_PP_2	-0.008	0.081	Yes
7: On_PP_1,On_PP_2,On_PP_3,On_PP_6	-0.003	0.017	Yes
10: On_PP_1,On_PP_2,On_PP_4,On_PP_5	-0.018	0.053	Yes
16: On_PP_1,On_PP_2,On_PP_5,On_PP_6	-0.004	0.017	Yes
22: On_PP_1,On_PP_3,On_PP_4,On_PP_6	-0.003	0.006	Yes
26: On_PP_1,On_PP_3,On_PP_6,On_PP_5	-0.006	0.003	Yes

Table J.11. Bias-Corrected and Bonferroni-Adjusted Confidence Intervals of the CTA-PLS analysis for PEff of Facebook Users Sample.

CTA – PEff Non-Redundant Tetrad	CI Low adj.	CI Up adj.	Tetrad Vanish
1: PEffic_1,PEffic_2,PEffic_3,PEffic_4	-3.528	0.218	Yes
2: PEffic_1,PEffic_2,PEffic_4,PEffic_3	-0.34	1.246	Yes

Table J.12. CMB Assessment Through Multicollinearity for Facebook Users Sample.

CMB Full VIF Assessment						
	Bond_SC	**Brid_SC**	**Off_PP**	**On_PP**	**PEff**	**PInt**
Bond_SC		1.116	1.398	1.347	1.340	1.367
Brid_SC	1.242		1.492	1.413	1.443	1.558
Off_PP	1.359	1.292		1.394	1.262	1.251
On_PP	1.271	1.213	1.248		1.241	1.282
PEff	1.652	1.425	1.792	1.924		1.213
PInt	1.189	1.189	1.096	1.176	1.110	

Twitter Users Sample (n = 103)

Table J.13. Summary Measurement Model Assessment Metrics for Bonding and Bridging Social Capital of Twitter Users Sample.

LV	Indicators	Convergent Validity			Internal Reliability		Discriminant Validity			
		Loadings	Communality	AVE	CR	CA	Fornell Larcker Criterion	Cross Loadings	HTMT Ratio	HTMT CI
Bond_SC	Bond_1	0.826	0.682	0.661	0.951	0.943	Condition met	Condition met	<0.90	∌ 1
	Bond_2	0.806	0.650							
	Bond_3	0.665	0.442							
	Bond_4	0.833	0.694							
	Bond_5	0.863	0.745							
	Bond_6	0.791	0.626							
	Bond_7	0.815	0.664							
	Bond_8	0.806	0.650							
	Bond_9	0.775	0.601							
	Bond_10	0.923	0.852							
Brid_SC	Brid_1	0.900	0.810	0.747	0.967	0.962	Condition met	Condition met	<0.90	∌ 1
	Brid_2	0.837	0.701							
	Brid_3	0.885	0.783							
	Brid_4	0.871	0.759							
	Brid_5	0.877	0.769							
	Brid_6	0.853	0.728							
	Brid_7	0.875	0.766							
	Brid_8	0.767	0.588							
	Brid_9	0.902	0.814							
	Brid_10	0.867	0.752							

Table J.14. Summary Measurement Model Assessment Metrics for Online and Offline Political Participation, Internal Political Efficacy and Political Interest of Twitter Users Sample.

LV	Indicators	Convergent Validity			Internal Reliability		Discriminant Validity			
		Loadings	Communality	AVE	CR	CA	Fornell Larcker Criterion	Cross Loadings	HTMT Ratio	HTMT CI
Off_PP	Off_PP_1	0.801	0.642	0.659	0.946	0.935	Condition met	Condition met	<0.90	∌ 1
	Off_PP_2	0.809	0.654							
	Off_PP_3	0.844	0.712							
	Off_PP_4	0.762	0.581							
	Off_PP_5	0.835	0.697							
	Off_PP_6	0.804	0.646							
	Off_PP_7	0.810	0.656							
	Off_PP_8	0.824	0.679							
	Off_PP_9	0.814	0.663							
On_PP	On_PP_1	0.840	0.706	0.687	0.929	0.908	Condition met	Condition met	<0.90	∌ 1
	On_PP_2	0.799	0.638							
	On_PP_3	0.852	0.726							
	On_PP_4	0.895	0.801							
	On_PP_5	0.839	0.704							
	On_PP_6	0.739	0.546							
PEff	PEffic_1	0.930	0.865	0.822	0.949	0.928	Condition met	Condition met	<0.90	∌ 1
	PEffic_2	0.909	0.826							
	PEffic_3	0.874	0.764							
	PEffic_4	0.914	0.835							
PInt	PInt_1	0.930	0.865	0.921	0.972	0.957	Condition met	Condition met	<0.90	∌ 1
	PInt_2	0.968	0.937							
	PInt_3	0.979	0.958							

Table J.15. Fornell-Larcker Criterion Twitter Users Sample.

Fornell-Larcker Criterion						
	Bond_SC	**Brid_SC**	**Off_PP**	**On_PP**	**PEff**	**PInt**
Bond_SC	0.813					
Brid_SC	0.363	0.864				
Off_PP	0.310	0.363	0.812			
On_PP	0.228	0.615	0.520	0.829		
PEff	0.160	0.240	0.537	0.302	0.907	
PInt	0.269	0.120	0.491	0.315	0.382	0.960

Table J.16. Cross-Loadings Twitter Users Sample.

Cross-loadings						
	Bond_SC	**Brid_SC**	**Off_PP**	**On_PP**	**PEff**	**PInt**
Bond_1	**0.826**	0.302	0.275	0.135	0.170	0.253
Bond_10	**0.923**	0.258	0.264	0.090	0.176	0.232
Bond_2	**0.806**	0.279	0.190	0.172	0.161	0.253
Bond_3	**0.665**	0.278	0.115	0.174	0.039	0.060
Bond_4	**0.833**	0.327	0.298	0.231	0.128	0.240
Bond_5	**0.863**	0.328	0.327	0.241	0.139	0.226
Bond_6	**0.791**	0.247	0.251	0.149	0.236	0.290
Bond_7	**0.815**	0.281	0.282	0.163	0.012	0.172
Bond_8	**0.806**	0.351	0.113	0.152	0.145	0.106
Bond_9	**0.775**	0.301	0.262	0.270	0.102	0.260
Brid_1	0.217	**0.900**	0.239	0.549	0.177	0.044
Brid_10	0.253	**0.867**	0.244	0.555	0.148	0.127
Brid_2	0.385	**0.837**	0.295	0.419	0.218	0.122
Brid_3	0.387	**0.885**	0.269	0.530	0.216	0.139
Brid_4	0.267	**0.871**	0.294	0.589	0.181	0.104
Brid_5	0.350	**0.877**	0.412	0.532	0.281	0.088
Brid_6	0.362	**0.853**	0.365	0.520	0.260	0.133
Brid_7	0.268	**0.875**	0.320	0.480	0.156	0.019
Brid_8	0.338	**0.767**	0.314	0.510	0.187	0.080
Brid_9	0.319	**0.902**	0.361	0.603	0.239	0.170
Off_PP_1	0.207	0.268	**0.801**	0.395	0.414	0.370
Off_PP_2	0.156	0.301	**0.809**	0.413	0.487	0.402
Off_PP_3	0.299	0.413	**0.844**	0.434	0.457	0.387
Off_PP_4	0.242	0.274	**0.762**	0.384	0.351	0.421
Off_PP_5	0.330	0.347	**0.835**	0.488	0.362	0.365
Off_PP_6	0.199	0.237	**0.804**	0.444	0.427	0.443
Off_PP_7	0.192	0.177	**0.810**	0.395	0.419	0.395
Off_PP_8	0.322	0.281	**0.824**	0.412	0.448	0.408
Off_PP_9	0.307	0.332	**0.814**	0.427	0.532	0.396
On_PP_1	0.145	0.450	0.374	**0.840**	0.186	0.271
On_PP_2	0.077	0.530	0.232	**0.799**	0.203	0.304
On_PP_3	0.260	0.548	0.531	**0.852**	0.328	0.236
On_PP_4	0.313	0.593	0.482	**0.895**	0.280	0.239
On_PP_5	0.222	0.493	0.403	**0.839**	0.205	0.264
On_PP_6	0.098	0.423	0.572	**0.739**	0.295	0.253
PEffic_1	0.124	0.209	0.460	0.284	**0.930**	0.368

Cross-loadings						
PEffic_2	0.130	0.242	0.488	0.250	**0.909**	0.308
PEffic_3	0.193	0.169	0.509	0.227	**0.874**	0.417
PEffic_4	0.133	0.249	0.490	0.333	**0.914**	0.296
PInt_1	0.242	0.113	0.441	0.263	0.340	**0.930**
PInt_2	0.250	0.108	0.489	0.323	0.395	**0.968**
PInt_3	0.282	0.126	0.481	0.317	0.362	**0.979**

Table J.17. HTMT Ratio Values for Twitter Users Sample.

HTMT						
	Bond_SC	**Brid_SC**	**Off_PP**	**On_PP**	**PEff**	**PInt**
Bond_SC						
Brid_SC	0.383					
Off_PP	0.311	0.377				
On_PP	0.238	0.651	0.567			
PEff	0.175	0.252	0.573	0.327		
PInt	0.271	0.124	0.518	0.337	0.406	

Table J.18. HTMT BCa CI for Twitter Users Sample.

HTMT CONFIDENCE INTERVALS BIAS CORRECTED (Bootstrapping 5000 Samples)					
	Original Sample (O)	**Sample Mean (M)**	**Bias**	**2.50%**	**97.50%**
Brid_SC -> Bond_SC	0.383	0.383	0.000	0.203	0.564
Off_PP -> Bond_SC	0.311	0.328	0.018	0.144	0.481
Off_PP -> Brid_SC	0.377	0.379	0.002	0.227	0.504
On_PP -> Bond_SC	0.238	0.267	0.029	0.127	0.406
On_PP -> Brid_SC	0.651	0.650	-0.001	0.522	0.755
On_PP -> Off_PP	0.567	0.563	-0.003	0.397	0.697
PEff -> Bond_SC	0.175	0.206	0.031	0.078	0.334
PEff -> Brid_SC	0.252	0.258	0.005	0.098	0.442
PEff -> Off_PP	0.573	0.570	-0.003	0.444	0.690
PEff -> On_PP	0.327	0.329	0.001	0.143	0.525
PInt -> Bond_SC	0.271	0.281	0.010	0.106	0.455
PInt -> Brid_SC	0.124	0.152	0.028	0.059	0.284
PInt -> Off_PP	0.518	0.518	-0.001	0.379	0.629
PInt -> On_PP	0.337	0.339	0.001	0.143	0.523
PInt -> PEff	0.406	0.405	-0.001	0.220	0.570

Table J.19. Bias-Corrected and Bonferroni-Adjusted Confidence Intervals of the CTA-PLS analysis for Bond_SC of Twitter Users Samples.

CTA – Bond_SC Non-Redundant Tetrad	CI Low adj.	CI Up adj.	Tetrad Vanish
1: Bond_1,Bond_10,Bond_2,Bond_3	-2.109	1.830	Yes
2: Bond_1,Bond_10,Bond_3,Bond_2	-0.855	2.266	Yes
4: Bond_1,Bond_10,Bond_2,Bond_4	-3.267	1.323	Yes
6: Bond_1,Bond_2,Bond_4,Bond_10	-1.163	3.433	Yes
7: Bond_1,Bond_10,Bond_2,Bond_5	-3.449	0.759	Yes

CTA – Bond_SC Non-Redundant Tetrad	CI Low adj.	CI Up adj.	Tetrad Vanish
10: Bond_1,Bond_10,Bond_2,Bond_6	-4.186	0.707	Yes
13: Bond_1,Bond_10,Bond_2,Bond_7	-3.534	0.606	Yes
17: Bond_1,Bond_10,Bond_8,Bond_2	-0.938	1.507	Yes
20: Bond_1,Bond_10,Bond_9,Bond_2	-1.782	0.658	Yes
29: Bond_1,Bond_10,Bond_6,Bond_3	-1.815	1.731	Yes
31: Bond_1,Bond_10,Bond_3,Bond_7	-2.146	1.869	Yes
35: Bond_1,Bond_10,Bond_8,Bond_3	-0.796	3.664	Yes
41: Bond_1,Bond_10,Bond_5,Bond_4	-0.580	2.962	Yes
43: Bond_1,Bond_10,Bond_4,Bond_6	-2.150	1.789	Yes
47: Bond_1,Bond_10,Bond_7,Bond_4	-0.214	3.964	Yes
50: Bond_1,Bond_10,Bond_8,Bond_4	-0.388	2.239	Yes
60: Bond_1,Bond_5,Bond_7,Bond_10	-1.094	1.017	Yes
64: Bond_1,Bond_10,Bond_5,Bond_9	-0.855	1.458	Yes
66: Bond_1,Bond_5,Bond_9,Bond_10	-1.777	0.452	Yes
71: Bond_1,Bond_10,Bond_8,Bond_6	-1.811	1.736	Yes
80: Bond_1,Bond_10,Bond_9,Bond_7	-2.040	1.902	Yes
91: Bond_1,Bond_2,Bond_3,Bond_6	-1.914	3.200	Yes
120: Bond_1,Bond_5,Bond_6,Bond_2	-0.820	1.527	Yes
169: Bond_1,Bond_3,Bond_5,Bond_8	-2.913	1.246	Yes
182: Bond_1,Bond_3,Bond_9,Bond_6	-1.827	2.193	Yes
205: Bond_1,Bond_4,Bond_6,Bond_7	-3.337	2.466	Yes
233: Bond_1,Bond_5,Bond_8,Bond_7	-2.543	0.854	Yes
236: Bond_1,Bond_5,Bond_9,Bond_7	-3.270	0.619	Yes
248: Bond_1,Bond_6,Bond_9,Bond_8	-2.484	0.926	Yes
281: Bond_10,Bond_2,Bond_8,Bond_4	-0.368	2.138	Yes
324: Bond_10,Bond_4,Bond_7,Bond_3	-2.186	0.893	Yes
358: Bond_10,Bond_3,Bond_8,Bond_9	-1.479	0.944	Yes
395: Bond_10,Bond_5,Bond_8,Bond_6	-2.176	1.144	Yes
434: Bond_2,Bond_3,Bond_9,Bond_4	-1.543	1.795	Yes
526: Bond_3,Bond_4,Bond_5,Bond_6	-0.601	3.140	Yes

Table J.20. Bias-Corrected and Bonferroni-Adjusted Confidence Intervals of the CTA-PLS analysis for Brid_SC of Twitter Users Sample.

CTA – Brid_SC Non-Redundant Tetrad	CI Low adj.	CI Up adj.	Tetrad Vanish
1: Brid_1,Brid_10,Brid_2,Brid_3	-0.351	0.928	Yes
2: Brid_1,Brid_10,Brid_3,Brid_2	-0.385	0.757	Yes
4: Brid_1,Brid_10,Brid_2,Brid_4	-0.341	0.505	Yes
6: Brid_1,Brid_2,Brid_4,Brid_10	-0.723	0.399	Yes
7: Brid_1,Brid_10,Brid_2,Brid_5	-0.306	0.740	Yes
10: Brid_1,Brid_10,Brid_2,Brid_6	-0.376	0.580	Yes
13: Brid_1,Brid_10,Brid_2,Brid_7	-0.298	0.457	Yes
17: Brid_1,Brid_10,Brid_8,Brid_2	-0.315	0.767	Yes
20: Brid_1,Brid_10,Brid_9,Brid_2	-0.256	0.682	Yes
29: Brid_1,Brid_10,Brid_6,Brid_3	-0.634	0.578	Yes
31: Brid_1,Brid_10,Brid_3,Brid_7	-0.375	0.530	Yes
35: Brid_1,Brid_10,Brid_8,Brid_3	-0.220	1.017	Yes
41: Brid_1,Brid_10,Brid_5,Brid_4	-0.367	0.469	Yes

43: Brid_1,Brid_10,Brid_4,Brid_6	-0.505	0.582	Yes
47: Brid_1,Brid_10,Brid_7,Brid_4	-0.891	0.454	Yes
50: Brid_1,Brid_10,Brid_8,Brid_4	-0.170	0.702	Yes
60: Brid_1,Brid_5,Brid_7,Brid_10	-0.796	0.288	Yes
64: Brid_1,Brid_10,Brid_5,Brid_9	-0.910	0.267	Yes
66: Brid_1,Brid_5,Brid_9,Brid_10	-0.136	1.132	Yes
71: Brid_1,Brid_10,Brid_8,Brid_6	-0.436	0.623	Yes
80: Brid_1,Brid_10,Brid_9,Brid_7	-0.345	0.298	Yes
91: Brid_1,Brid_2,Brid_3,Brid_6	-0.289	0.465	Yes
120: Brid_1,Brid_5,Brid_6,Brid_2	-0.676	0.111	Yes
169: Brid_1,Brid_3,Brid_5,Brid_8	-0.588	0.491	Yes
182: Brid_1,Brid_3,Brid_9,Brid_6	-0.482	0.319	Yes
205: Brid_1,Brid_4,Brid_6,Brid_7	-0.324	0.667	Yes
233: Brid_1,Brid_5,Brid_8,Brid_7	-0.299	0.564	Yes
236: Brid_1,Brid_5,Brid_9,Brid_7	-0.517	0.199	Yes
248: Brid_1,Brid_6,Brid_9,Brid_8	-0.230	1.287	Yes
281: Brid_10,Brid_2,Brid_8,Brid_4	-0.815	0.426	Yes
324: Brid_10,Brid_4,Brid_7,Brid_3	-0.415	0.495	Yes
358: Brid_10,Brid_3,Brid_8,Brid_9	-0.708	0.152	Yes
395: Brid_10,Brid_5,Brid_8,Brid_6	-1.106	0.295	Yes
434: Brid_2,Brid_3,Brid_9,Brid_4	-0.554	0.383	Yes
526: Brid_3,Brid_4,Brid_5,Brid_6	-0.120	0.859	Yes

Table J.21. Bias-Corrected and Bonferroni-Adjusted Confidence Intervals of the CTA-PLS analysis for Off_PP of Twitter Users Sample.

CTA – Off_PP Non-Redundant Tetrad	**CI Low adj.**	**CI Up adj.**	**Tetrad Vanish**
1: Off_PP_1,Off_PP_2,Off_PP_3,Off_PP_4	-18.922	5.372	Yes
2: Off_PP_1,Off_PP_2,Off_PP_4,Off_PP_3	-20.133	10.942	Yes
4: Off_PP_1,Off_PP_2,Off_PP_3,Off_PP_5	-8.703	8.690	Yes
6: Off_PP_1,Off_PP_3,Off_PP_5,Off_PP_2	-30.095	9.260	Yes
9: Off_PP_1,Off_PP_3,Off_PP_6,Off_PP_2	-22.666	15.733	Yes
10: Off_PP_1,Off_PP_2,Off_PP_3,Off_PP_7	-12.746	5.454	Yes
13: Off_PP_1,Off_PP_2,Off_PP_3,Off_PP_8	-19.066	4.777	Yes
17: Off_PP_1,Off_PP_2,Off_PP_9,Off_PP_3	-12.166	7.835	Yes
20: Off_PP_1,Off_PP_2,Off_PP_5,Off_PP_4	-19.555	11.338	Yes
26: Off_PP_1,Off_PP_2,Off_PP_7,Off_PP_4	-7.060	11.536	Yes
29: Off_PP_1,Off_PP_2,Off_PP_8,Off_PP_4	-12.053	10.799	Yes
33: Off_PP_1,Off_PP_4,Off_PP_9,Off_PP_2	-12.800	16.601	Yes
41: Off_PP_1,Off_PP_2,Off_PP_8,Off_PP_5	-7.816	10.965	Yes
47: Off_PP_1,Off_PP_2,Off_PP_7,Off_PP_6	-6.600	12.482	Yes
49: Off_PP_1,Off_PP_2,Off_PP_6,Off_PP_8	-21.845	10.177	Yes
51: Off_PP_1,Off_PP_6,Off_PP_8,Off_PP_2	-13.323	20.752	Yes
57: Off_PP_1,Off_PP_7,Off_PP_8,Off_PP_2	-12.765	14.337	Yes
109: Off_PP_1,Off_PP_4,Off_PP_5,Off_PP_6	-15.197	7.184	Yes

113: Off_PP_1,Off_PP_4,Off_PP_7,Off_PP_5	-6.346	6.023	Yes
133: Off_PP_1,Off_PP_4,Off_PP_7,Off_PP_9	-10.068	3.267	Yes
137: Off_PP_1,Off_PP_4,Off_PP_9,Off_PP_8	-12.083	13.985	Yes
149: Off_PP_1,Off_PP_5,Off_PP_8,Off_PP_7	-9.535	9.254	Yes
151: Off_PP_1,Off_PP_5,Off_PP_7,Off_PP_9	-7.982	12.640	Yes
161: Off_PP_1,Off_PP_6,Off_PP_9,Off_PP_7	-12.579	8.197	Yes
165: Off_PP_1,Off_PP_8,Off_PP_9,Off_PP_6	-6.909	5.318	Yes
174: Off_PP_2,Off_PP_4,Off_PP_6,Off_PP_3	-4.534	4.638	Yes
231: Off_PP_2,Off_PP_6,Off_PP_8,Off_PP_4	-23.152	13.589	Yes

Table J.22. Bias-Corrected and Bonferroni-Adjusted Confidence Intervals of the CTA-PLS analysis for On_PP of Twitter Users Sample.

CTA – On_PP Non-Redundant Tetrad	CI Low adj.	CI Up adj.	Tetrad Vanish
1: On_PP_1,On_PP_2,On_PP_3,On_PP_4	-5.354	19.749	Yes
2: On_PP_1,On_PP_2,On_PP_4,On_PP_3	-5.445	16.813	Yes
4: On_PP_1,On_PP_2,On_PP_3,On_PP_5	-16.831	17.822	Yes
6: On_PP_1,On_PP_3,On_PP_5,On_PP_2	-14.949	19.746	Yes
7: On_PP_1,On_PP_2,On_PP_3,On_PP_6	-6.709	16.856	Yes
10: On_PP_1,On_PP_2,On_PP_4,On_PP_5	-17.446	22.426	Yes
16: On_PP_1,On_PP_2,On_PP_5,On_PP_6	-3.708	24.952	Yes
22: On_PP_1,On_PP_3,On_PP_4,On_PP_6	-13.598	12.506	Yes
26: On_PP_1,On_PP_3,On_PP_6,On_PP_5	-15.563	14.956	Yes

Table J.23. Bias-Corrected and Bonferroni-Adjusted Confidence Intervals of the CTA-PLS analysis for PEff of Twitter Users Sample.

CTA – PEff Non-Redundant Tetrad	CI Low adj.	CI Up adj.	Tetrad Vanish
1: PEffic_1,PEffic_2,PEffic_3,PEffic_4	-2.436	-0.147	Yes
2: PEffic_1,PEffic_2,PEffic_4,PEffic_3	-1.083	0.731	Yes

Table J.24. CMB Assessment Through Multicollinearity for Twitter Users Sample.

CMB Full VIF Assessment						
	Bond_SC	**Brid_SC**	**Off_PP**	**On_PP**	**PEff**	**PInt**
Bond_SC		1.204	1.321	1.313	1.352	1.279
Brid_SC	1.667		1.833	1.345	1.854	1.794
Off_PP	2.006	1.981		1.808	1.759	1.852
On_PP	1.997	1.475	1.838		2.116	1.988
PEff	1.781	1.768	1.542	1.789		1.757
PInt	1.485	1.495	1.475	1.538	1.560	

Facebook and Twitter Combined Users Sample (n = 100)

Table J.25. Summary Measurement Model Assessment Metrics for Bonding and Bridging Social Capital of Facebook and Twitter Combined Users Sample.

LV	Indicators	Convergent Validity			Internal Reliability		Discriminant Validity			
		Loadings	Communality	AVE	CR	CA	Fornell Larcker Criterion	Cross Loadings	HTMT Ratio	HTMT CI
Bond_SC	Bond_1	0.801	0.642	0.569	0.929	0.918	Condition met	Condition met	<0.90	∌ 1
	Bond_2	0.720	0.518							
	Bond_3	0.768	0.590							
	Bond_4	0.791	0.626							
	Bond_5	0.768	0.590							
	Bond_6	0.602	0.362							
	Bond_7	0.624	0.389							
	Bond_8	0.867	0.752							
	Bond_9	0.711	0.506							
	Bond_10	0.845	0.714							
Brid_SC	Brid_1	0.950	0.903	0.820	0.979	0.975	Condition met	Condition met	<0.90	∌ 1
	Brid_2	0.887	0.787							
	Brid_3	0.922	0.850							
	Brid_4	0.942	0.887							
	Brid_5	0.926	0.857							
	Brid_6	0.886	0.785							
	Brid_7	0.925	0.856							
	Brid_8	0.813	0.661							
	Brid_9	0.918	0.843							

	Brid_10	0.881	0.776							

Table J.26. Summary Measurement Model Assessment Metrics for Online and Offline Political Participation, Internal Political Efficacy and Political Interest of Facebook and Twitter Combined Users Sample.

LV	Indicators	Convergent Validity			Internal Reliability		Discriminant Validity			
		Loadings	Communality	AVE	CR	CA	Fornell Larcker Criterion	Cross Loadings	HTMT Ratio	HTMT CI
Off_PP	Off_PP_1	0.674	0.454	0.508	0.902	0.878	Condition met	Condition met	<0.90	∌ 1
	Off_PP_2	0.765	0.585							
	Off_PP_3	0.753	0.567							
	Off_PP_4	0.763	0.582							
	Off_PP_5	0.639	0.408							
	Off_PP_6	0.588	0.346							
	Off_PP_7	0.686	0.471							
	Off_PP_8	0.773	0.598							
	Off_PP_9	0.750	0.563							
On_PP	On_PP_1	0.775	0.601	0.591	0.895	0.860	Condition met	Condition met	<0.90	∌ 1
	On_PP_2	0.829	0.687							
	On_PP_3	0.771	0.594							
	On_PP_4	0.905	0.819							
	On_PP_5	0.729	0.531							
	On_PP_6	0.561	0.315							
PEff	PEffic_1	0.929	0.863	0.869	0.964	0.950	Condition met	Condition met	<0.90	∌ 1
	PEffic_2	0.942	0.887							
	PEffic_3	0.943	0.889							
	PEffic_4	0.914	0.835							
PInt	PInt_1	0.917	0.841	0.883	0.958	0.934	Condition met	Condition met	<0.90	∌ 1
	PInt_2	0.937	0.878							
	PInt_3	0.965	0.931							

Table J.27. Fornell-Larcker Criterion Facebook and Twitter Combined Users Sample.

Fornell-Larcker Criterion						
	Bond_SC	**Brid_SC**	**Off_PP**	**On_PP**	**PEff**	**PInt**
Bond_SC	0.754					
Brid_SC	0.363	0.906				
Off_PP	0.306	0.386	0.713			
On_PP	0.179	0.669	0.396	0.769		
PEff	0.208	0.219	0.557	0.043	0.932	
PInt	0.000	-0.065	0.351	0.039	0.235	0.940

Table J.28. Cross-Loadings Facebook and Twitter Combined Users Sample.

Cross-loadings						
	Bond_SC	**Brid_SC**	**Off_PP**	**On_PP**	**PEff**	**PInt**
Bond_1	**0.801**	0.315	0.243	0.146	0.256	0.094
Bond_10	**0.845**	0.149	0.127	-0.081	0.304	0.034
Bond_2	**0.720**	0.238	0.067	0.010	0.189	0.058
Bond_3	**0.768**	0.373	0.218	0.260	0.139	-0.217
Bond_4	**0.791**	0.261	0.299	0.076	0.031	0.071
Bond_5	**0.768**	0.227	0.263	0.098	0.216	0.005
Bond_6	**0.602**	0.133	0.062	0.054	0.263	0.060
Bond_7	**0.624**	0.251	0.268	-0.024	0.003	-0.017
Bond_8	**0.867**	0.365	0.162	0.147	0.221	-0.197
Bond_9	**0.711**	0.225	0.258	0.267	0.154	0.152
Brid_1	0.286	**0.950**	0.291	0.654	0.166	0.015
Brid_10	0.221	**0.881**	0.269	0.612	0.162	-0.126
Brid_2	0.415	**0.887**	0.360	0.500	0.280	-0.099
Brid_3	0.418	**0.922**	0.422	0.608	0.209	-0.071
Brid_4	0.358	**0.942**	0.296	0.618	0.100	-0.059
Brid_5	0.388	**0.926**	0.418	0.646	0.237	-0.099
Brid_6	0.316	**0.886**	0.366	0.615	0.217	0.064
Brid_7	0.246	**0.925**	0.287	0.569	0.163	-0.086
Brid_8	0.206	**0.813**	0.325	0.525	0.212	-0.157
Brid_9	0.401	**0.918**	0.433	0.679	0.236	0.000
Off_PP_1	0.007	0.033	**0.674**	0.168	0.425	0.344
Off_PP_2	0.285	0.455	**0.765**	0.384	0.431	0.175
Off_PP_3	0.295	0.456	**0.753**	0.326	0.385	0.083
Off_PP_4	0.228	0.165	**0.763**	0.293	0.351	0.440
Off_PP_5	0.155	0.210	**0.639**	0.321	0.289	0.326
Off_PP_6	-0.038	0.267	**0.588**	0.358	0.381	0.427
Off_PP_7	0.217	0.247	**0.686**	0.199	0.230	0.363
Off_PP_8	0.305	0.158	**0.773**	0.203	0.497	0.125
Off_PP_9	0.455	0.385	**0.750**	0.267	0.513	0.094
On_PP_1	0.045	0.423	0.158	**0.775**	-0.009	0.125
On_PP_2	-0.030	0.619	0.257	**0.829**	-0.009	0.057
On_PP_3	0.336	0.552	0.527	**0.771**	0.245	-0.047
On_PP_4	0.348	0.693	0.367	**0.905**	0.060	-0.078

Cross-loadings						
On_PP_5	0.151	0.393	0.182	**0.729**	-0.099	0.058
On_PP_6	-0.136	0.242	0.361	**0.561**	-0.040	0.167
PEffic_1	0.167	0.198	0.501	0.052	**0.929**	0.222
PEffic_2	0.192	0.214	0.555	0.017	**0.942**	0.231
PEffic_3	0.197	0.241	0.512	0.033	**0.943**	0.234
PEffic_4	0.220	0.163	0.507	0.061	**0.914**	0.188
PInt_1	0.132	-0.034	0.281	0.013	0.212	**0.917**
PInt_2	-0.101	-0.108	0.372	0.024	0.258	**0.937**
PInt_3	0.001	-0.030	0.325	0.070	0.186	**0.965**

Table J.29. HTMT Ratio Values for Facebook and Twitter Combined Users Sample.

HTMT						
	Bond_SC	**Brid_SC**	**Off_PP**	**On_PP**	**PEff**	**PInt**
Bond_SC						
Brid_SC	0.351					
Off_PP	0.335	0.399				
On_PP	0.305	0.689	0.468			
PEff	0.257	0.227	0.598	0.138		
PInt	0.162	0.102	0.405	0.130	0.247	

Table J.30. HTMT BCa CI for Facebook and Twitter Combined Users Sample.

HTMT CONFIDENCE INTERVALS BIAS CORRECTED (Bootstrapping 5000 Samples)					
	Original Sample (O)	**Sample Mean (M)**	**Bias**	**2.50%**	**97.50%**
Brid_SC -> Bond_SC	0.351	0.386	0.035	0.190	0.594
Off_PP -> Bond_SC	0.335	0.417	0.082	0.186	0.434
Off_PP -> Brid_SC	0.399	0.431	0.032	0.224	0.551
On_PP -> Bond_SC	0.305	0.387	0.082	0.135	0.383
On_PP -> Brid_SC	0.689	0.692	0.002	0.507	0.827
On_PP -> Off_PP	0.468	0.520	0.052	0.277	0.610
PEff -> Bond_SC	0.257	0.310	0.053	0.124	0.434
PEff -> Brid_SC	0.227	0.258	0.031	0.083	0.520
PEff -> Off_PP	0.598	0.600	0.002	0.414	0.761
PEff -> On_PP	0.138	0.246	0.108	0.070	0.153
PInt -> Bond_SC	0.162	0.255	0.094	0.118	0.162
PInt -> Brid_SC	0.102	0.178	0.076	0.051	0.126
PInt -> Off_PP	0.405	0.436	0.031	0.211	0.586
PInt -> On_PP	0.130	0.224	0.095	0.069	0.147
PInt -> PEff	0.247	0.262	0.015	0.068	0.524

Table J.31. Bias-Corrected and Bonferroni-Adjusted Confidence Intervals of the CTA-PLS analysis for Bond_SC of Facebook and Twitter Combined Users Samples.

CTA – Bond_SC Non-Redundant Tetrad	CI Low adj.	CI Up adj.	Tetrad Vanish
1: Bond_1,Bond_10,Bond_2,Bond_3	-2.857	1.824	Yes
2: Bond_1,Bond_10,Bond_3,Bond_2	-1.910	0.983	Yes
4: Bond_1,Bond_10,Bond_2,Bond_4	-5.952	2.962	Yes
6: Bond_1,Bond_2,Bond_4,Bond_10	-3.329	5.758	Yes
7: Bond_1,Bond_10,Bond_2,Bond_5	-6.736	1.110	Yes
10: Bond_1,Bond_10,Bond_2,Bond_6	-6.842	1.926	Yes
13: Bond_1,Bond_10,Bond_2,Bond_7	-5.504	1.210	Yes
17: Bond_1,Bond_10,Bond_8,Bond_2	-1.682	0.824	Yes
20: Bond_1,Bond_10,Bond_9,Bond_2	-2.230	0.827	Yes
29: Bond_1,Bond_10,Bond_6,Bond_3	-2.075	2.365	Yes
31: Bond_1,Bond_10,Bond_3,Bond_7	-3.795	1.712	Yes
35: Bond_1,Bond_10,Bond_8,Bond_3	-1.085	2.376	Yes
41: Bond_1,Bond_10,Bond_5,Bond_4	-0.588	2.591	Yes
43: Bond_1,Bond_10,Bond_4,Bond_6	-3.634	1.540	Yes
47: Bond_1,Bond_10,Bond_7,Bond_4	-0.177	6.018	Yes
50: Bond_1,Bond_10,Bond_8,Bond_4	-1.080	3.647	Yes
60: Bond_1,Bond_5,Bond_7,Bond_10	-0.858	1.753	Yes
64: Bond_1,Bond_10,Bond_5,Bond_9	-1.191	1.808	Yes
66: Bond_1,Bond_5,Bond_9,Bond_10	-2.320	0.628	Yes
71: Bond_1,Bond_10,Bond_8,Bond_6	-3.371	1.804	Yes
80: Bond_1,Bond_10,Bond_9,Bond_7	-3.074	2.674	Yes
91: Bond_1,Bond_2,Bond_3,Bond_6	-3.851	3.692	Yes
120: Bond_1,Bond_5,Bond_6,Bond_2	-1.329	2.121	Yes
169: Bond_1,Bond_3,Bond_5,Bond_8	-1.356	1.782	Yes
182: Bond_1,Bond_3,Bond_9,Bond_6	-2.323	3.911	Yes
205: Bond_1,Bond_4,Bond_6,Bond_7	-5.412	3.270	Yes
233: Bond_1,Bond_5,Bond_8,Bond_7	-3.064	1.747	Yes
236: Bond_1,Bond_5,Bond_9,Bond_7	-3.211	1.995	Yes
248: Bond_1,Bond_6,Bond_9,Bond_8	-2.489	1.184	Yes
281: Bond_10,Bond_2,Bond_8,Bond_4	-0.280	4.397	Yes
324: Bond_10,Bond_4,Bond_7,Bond_3	-2.952	0.790	Yes
358: Bond_10,Bond_3,Bond_8,Bond_9	-2.170	0.955	Yes
395: Bond_10,Bond_5,Bond_8,Bond_6	-2.002	2.674	Yes
434: Bond_2,Bond_3,Bond_9,Bond_4	-2.693	2.358	Yes
526: Bond_3,Bond_4,Bond_5,Bond_6	-1.105	3.837	Yes

Table J.32. Bias-Corrected and Bonferroni-Adjusted Confidence Intervals of the CTA-PLS analysis for Brid_SC of Facebook and Twitter Combined Users Sample.

CTA – Brid_SC Non-Redundant Tetrad	CI Low adj.	CI Up adj.	Tetrad Vanish
1: Brid_1,Brid_10,Brid_2,Brid_3	-0.028	1.191	Yes
2: Brid_1,Brid_10,Brid_3,Brid_2	-0.433	1.031	Yes
4: Brid_1,Brid_10,Brid_2,Brid_4	-0.375	0.740	Yes
6: Brid_1,Brid_2,Brid_4,Brid_10	-0.564	0.539	Yes
7: Brid_1,Brid_10,Brid_2,Brid_5	-0.281	0.635	Yes
10: Brid_1,Brid_10,Brid_2,Brid_6	-0.235	0.917	Yes
13: Brid_1,Brid_10,Brid_2,Brid_7	-0.319	0.492	Yes
17: Brid_1,Brid_10,Brid_8,Brid_2	-0.509	0.782	Yes
20: Brid_1,Brid_10,Brid_9,Brid_2	-0.428	1.165	Yes
29: Brid_1,Brid_10,Brid_6,Brid_3	-0.617	1.073	Yes
31: Brid_1,Brid_10,Brid_3,Brid_7	-0.800	0.548	Yes
35: Brid_1,Brid_10,Brid_8,Brid_3	-0.046	0.727	Yes
41: Brid_1,Brid_10,Brid_5,Brid_4	-0.342	0.711	Yes
43: Brid_1,Brid_10,Brid_4,Brid_6	-0.324	1.314	Yes
47: Brid_1,Brid_10,Brid_7,Brid_4	-0.444	0.789	Yes
50: Brid_1,Brid_10,Brid_8,Brid_4	-0.273	0.465	Yes
60: Brid_1,Brid_5,Brid_7,Brid_10	-0.565	0.560	Yes
64: Brid_1,Brid_10,Brid_5,Brid_9	-0.227	0.613	Yes
66: Brid_1,Brid_5,Brid_9,Brid_10	-0.476	0.333	Yes
71: Brid_1,Brid_10,Brid_8,Brid_6	-0.386	0.596	Yes
80: Brid_1,Brid_10,Brid_9,Brid_7	-0.833	0.294	Yes
91: Brid_1,Brid_2,Brid_3,Brid_6	-0.505	0.390	Yes
120: Brid_1,Brid_5,Brid_6,Brid_2	-0.616	0.091	Yes
169: Brid_1,Brid_3,Brid_5,Brid_8	-0.369	0.568	Yes
182: Brid_1,Brid_3,Brid_9,Brid_6	-0.551	0.451	Yes
205: Brid_1,Brid_4,Brid_6,Brid_7	-0.800	0.032	Yes
233: Brid_1,Brid_5,Brid_8,Brid_7	-0.407	0.626	Yes
236: Brid_1,Brid_5,Brid_9,Brid_7	-0.350	0.221	Yes
248: Brid_1,Brid_6,Brid_9,Brid_8	-0.355	0.772	Yes
281: Brid_10,Brid_2,Brid_8,Brid_4	-1.176	0.103	Yes
324: Brid_10,Brid_4,Brid_7,Brid_3	-0.934	0.284	Yes
358: Brid_10,Brid_3,Brid_8,Brid_9	-1.102	0.028	Yes
395: Brid_10,Brid_5,Brid_8,Brid_6	-1.696	0.135	Yes
434: Brid_2,Brid_3,Brid_9,Brid_4	-0.758	0.150	Yes
526: Brid_3,Brid_4,Brid_5,Brid_6	-0.200	0.729	Yes

Table J.33. Bias-Corrected and Bonferroni-Adjusted Confidence Intervals of the CTA-PLS analysis for Off_PP of Facebook and Twitter Combined Users Sample.

CTA – Off_PP Non-Redundant Tetrad	CI Low adj.	CI Up adj.	Tetrad Vanish
1: Off_PP_1,Off_PP_2,Off_PP_3,Off_PP_4	-20.311	5.573	Yes
2: Off_PP_1,Off_PP_2,Off_PP_4,Off_PP_3	-34.666	13.058	Yes
4: Off_PP_1,Off_PP_2,Off_PP_3,Off_PP_5	-8.484	3.346	Yes
6: Off_PP_1,Off_PP_3,Off_PP_5,Off_PP_2	-20.452	11.277	Yes
9: Off_PP_1,Off_PP_3,Off_PP_6,Off_PP_2	-39.223	21.742	Yes
10: Off_PP_1,Off_PP_2,Off_PP_3,Off_PP_7	-10.752	5.070	Yes
13: Off_PP_1,Off_PP_2,Off_PP_3,Off_PP_8	-20.398	3.194	Yes
17: Off_PP_1,Off_PP_2,Off_PP_9,Off_PP_3	-20.866	8.202	Yes
20: Off_PP_1,Off_PP_2,Off_PP_5,Off_PP_4	-12.051	6.272	Yes
26: Off_PP_1,Off_PP_2,Off_PP_7,Off_PP_4	-11.842	5.516	Yes
29: Off_PP_1,Off_PP_2,Off_PP_8,Off_PP_4	-25.041	9.533	Yes
33: Off_PP_1,Off_PP_4,Off_PP_9,Off_PP_2	-16.221	26.067	Yes
41: Off_PP_1,Off_PP_2,Off_PP_8,Off_PP_5	-9.248	3.500	Yes
47: Off_PP_1,Off_PP_2,Off_PP_7,Off_PP_6	-9.240	5.306	Yes
49: Off_PP_1,Off_PP_2,Off_PP_6,Off_PP_8	-34.631	12.717	Yes
51: Off_PP_1,Off_PP_6,Off_PP_8,Off_PP_2	-23.110	32.197	Yes
57: Off_PP_1,Off_PP_7,Off_PP_8,Off_PP_2	-19.399	22.642	Yes
109: Off_PP_1,Off_PP_4,Off_PP_5,Off_PP_6	-6.138	10.491	Yes
113: Off_PP_1,Off_PP_4,Off_PP_7,Off_PP_5	-6.471	7.278	Yes
133: Off_PP_1,Off_PP_4,Off_PP_7,Off_PP_9	-10.213	4.238	Yes
137: Off_PP_1,Off_PP_4,Off_PP_9,Off_PP_8	-13.430	26.716	Yes
149: Off_PP_1,Off_PP_5,Off_PP_8,Off_PP_7	-15.580	7.473	Yes
151: Off_PP_1,Off_PP_5,Off_PP_7,Off_PP_9	-8.469	7.092	Yes
161: Off_PP_1,Off_PP_6,Off_PP_9,Off_PP_7	-11.336	12.458	Yes
165: Off_PP_1,Off_PP_8,Off_PP_9,Off_PP_6	-5.932	5.922	Yes
174: Off_PP_2,Off_PP_4,Off_PP_6,Off_PP_3	-8.869	4.223	Yes
231: Off_PP_2,Off_PP_6,Off_PP_8,Off_PP_4	-30.552	23.605	Yes

Table J.34. Bias-Corrected and Bonferroni-Adjusted Confidence Intervals of the CTA-PLS analysis for On_PP of Facebook and Twitter Combined Users Sample.

CTA – On_PP Non-Redundant Tetrad	CI Low adj.	CI Up adj.	Tetrad Vanish
1: On_PP_1,On_PP_2,On_PP_3,On_PP_4	-6.112	30.297	Yes
2: On_PP_1,On_PP_2,On_PP_4,On_PP_3	-10.339	22.723	Yes
4: On_PP_1,On_PP_2,On_PP_3,On_PP_5	-20.501	21.117	Yes
6: On_PP_1,On_PP_3,On_PP_5,On_PP_2	-21.055	21.364	Yes
7: On_PP_1,On_PP_2,On_PP_3,On_PP_6	-15.564	7.024	Yes
10: On_PP_1,On_PP_2,On_PP_4,On_PP_5	-31.356	21.639	Yes
16: On_PP_1,On_PP_2,On_PP_5,On_PP_6	-5.237	16.53	Yes
22: On_PP_1,On_PP_3,On_PP_4,On_PP_6	-6.224	5.673	Yes
26: On_PP_1,On_PP_3,On_PP_6,On_PP_5	-18.98	15.353	Yes

Table J.35. Bias-Corrected and Bonferroni-Adjusted Confidence Intervals of the CTA-PLS analysis for PEff of Facebook and Twitter Combined Users Sample.

CTA – PEff Non-Redundant Tetrad	CI Low adj.	CI Up adj.	Tetrad Vanish
1: PEffic_1,PEffic_2,PEffic_3,PEffic_4	-3.619	0.373	Yes
2: PEffic_1,PEffic_2,PEffic_4,PEffic_3	-1.888	1.477	Yes

Table J.36. CMB Assessment Through Multicollinearity for Twitter Users Sample.

CMB Full VIF Assessment						
	Bond_SC	**Brid_SC**	**Off_PP**	**On_PP**	**PEff**	**PInt**
Bond_SC		1.393	1.339	1.399	1.482	1.464
Brid_SC	1.804		2.236	1.465	1.491	1.400
Off_PP	1.748	2.412		2.176	1.740	1.834
On_PP	1.682	1.323	1.858		1.782	1.347
PEff	2.388	2.588	1.841	2.455		2.903
PInt	1.485	1.495	1.475	1.538	1.560	

Table J.37. Preliminary Inspection Predictive Accuracy and Relevance of all Samples.

Summary Predictive Accuracy and Relevance						
	F_U		**T_U**		**F+T_U**	
Constructs	R^2	Q^2	R^2	Q^2	R^2	Q^2
Off_PP	0.309	0.175	0.452	0.257	0.555	0.217
On_PP	0.238	0.100	0.468	0.302	0.491	0.229

Table J.38. Preliminary Inspection Structural Paths of all Samples.

Preliminary Inspection of the Structural Paths of Interest						
	F_U		T_U		F+T_U	
Relationships	β	t-value	β	t-value	β	t-value
Bond_SC -> Off_PP	0.032	0.939	0.081	0.903	0.168	0.926
Bond_SC -> On_PP	0.105	2.935*	-0.093	0.946	-0.033	0.142
Brid_SC -> Off_PP	0.217	6.008**	0.201	2.644*	0.168	1.115
Brid_SC -> On_PP	0.270	7.109**	0.570	7.402**	0.726	5.136**

* $p<.05$

** $p< .001$

APPENDIX K - PLS-SEM ASSESMNET METRICS, PROCEDURES AND ALGORITHM SETTINGS

Table K.1. Assessment Criteria of Internal Consistency Reliability for Constructs.

Assessment	Criterion	Description	Thresholds	Literature
Internal Consistency Reliability	Cronbach's alpha (CA)	Yields an estimate of the reliability based on the intercorrelations of the indicator variables of a construct. Values vary between 0 (completely unreliable) and 1 (perfectly reliable).	CA > .700 .600 < CA < .700 acceptable in exploratory research	Hair et al., 2017: p. 112. Nunally and Bernstein (1994).
	Composite Reliability (CR)	Refers to the internal consistency of indicators measuring the underlying factors. Values vary between 0 (completely unreliable) and 1 (perfectly reliable).	CR > .700 .600 < CR < .700 acceptable in exploratory research	Hair et al., 2017: p. 112. Nunally and Bernstein (1994).

Source: adapted from several sources.

Table K.2. Assessment Criteria of Convergent Validity for Reflective Constructs.

Assessment	Criterion	Description	Thresholds	Literature
Convergent Validity	Outer Loadings	Refers to the correlation between an indicator variable and the theoretical construct it represents.	> .70 are commonly accepted. For exploratory research designs, lower thresholds till 0.40 are acceptable. Indicators below 0.40 should always be removed unless content validity is jeopardised and Theory does not support the deletion of the item.	Hair et al., 2017: p. 113.
	Communality	Calculated as the square of the standardised outer loadings of the indicators, refers to the amount of variation of an item that is explained by its construct. It is sometimes described as the variance extracted form an item.	> .50 usually considered acceptable. Lower values accepted when the deletion of the item jeopardise content validity and/or Theory does not support elimination.	Hair et al., 2017: p. 113.
	Average Variance Extracted (AVE)	Is the grand mean value of the squared loadings of the indicators associated with the construct (i.e., the sum of the squared loadings divided by the number of indicators). Is equivalent to the communality of a construct.	AVE > .50 AVE < .50 accepted if CR is good.	Hair et al., 2017: p. 113. Fornell and Larcker, 1981: p.42 Lam, 2012: p. 1332 Malhotra and Dash 201: p. 702

Source: adapted from several sources.

Table K.3. Assessment Criteria of Discriminant Validity for Reflective Constructs.

Assessment	Criterion	Description	Threshold	Literature
Discriminant Validity	Cross-loadings	Are the indicator's outer loading (i.e., its correlation) on constructs different from that to which it belongs.	An indicator's outer loading on the associated construct should be greater than any of its cross-loadings (i.e., its correlation) on other constructs.	Chin, 1998. Gotz et al., 2009. Hair et al., 2017: p. 115.
	Fornell-Larcker criterion	Refers to the comparison of the square root of the AVE values with the latent variable correlations. It assumes that a latent construct shares more variance with its assigned indicators than with another LV.	AVE of each LV should be greater than the LV's highest squared correlation with any other LV.	Fornell and Larcker, (1981)
	Heterotrait-monotrait ratio of correlations (HTMT)	Refers to the mean of all correlations of indicators across constructs measuring different constructs relative to the mean of the average correlations of indicators measuring the same construct. It estimates what the correlation between two constructs would be if they were perfectly measured.	HTMT < .90	Henseler et al., (2015): p.121. Hair et al., 2017: pp. 118-122.
	HTMT Confidence Intervals	HTMT Bootstrap Confidence Intervals assuming level of confidence at 95% to test whether the HTMT ratio is significantly different from 1.	Should not include 1.	Hair et al., 2017: pp. 118-122.

Source: adapted from several sources.

Table K.4. Assessment Criteria for Structural Models in PLS-SEM.

CRITERION	DESCRIPTION	THRESHOLDS	LITERATURE
Variance Inflation Factor (VIF)	Refers to the level of collinearity between exogenous and endogenous variable.	VIF < .50	Hair et al. (2011)
Path Coefficient Significance	Investigate Path Coeffients standard errors through bootstrapping procedure.	If CI* does not include 0 the path coefficient is significant.	Hair et al. (2017)
Post-Hoc Power analysis (1-β) for non-significant path coefficients	Conduct Power analysis of the single effects of the exogenous variables on the endogenous constructs.	If Power below 80% sample size is not adequate to detect path coefficients significance.	Faul et al. (2007, 2009)
Coefficient of determination R^2	The amount of variance explained in the endogenous construct by its predictor variables.	.10 weak .30 moderate .50 substantial	Sarstedt and Mooi (2019)
BCa* CI** for R^2 significance	Bootstrapped confidence intervals to assess if R^2 is significantly different form 0.	If p < 0.05 then the R^2 is significantly different from 0.	Ohtani (2000) Streukens and Leroi-Werelds (2016)
Adjusted Coefficient of Determination (R^2_{adj})	Calculate the R^2 accounting for the number of constructs and sample size.	Used for nested model comparison. Show increase or decrease of R^2.	Hair et al. (2017)
Effect Size f^2	Refers to changes in the R^2 value when an exogenous construct is omitted from the analysis.	.02 low .15 medium .35 large	Cohen (1988) Hair et al. (2017)
Predictive Relevance Stone-Geisser's (Q^2)	Refers to the model's out-of-sample predictive power and relevance.	> 0 predictive relevance < 0 no predictive relevance	Gaisser (1974) Stone (1974) Hair et al. (2017)
q^2 Effect Size	Measures the relative impact of predictive relevance of each endogenous construct over an endogenous variable.	.02 small .15 medium .35 large	Hair et al (2017)

* BCa= *Bias Corrected and Accelerated*

** CI= *Confidence Interval/s*

Source: adapted from several sources (see in-table references).

Table K.5. Model Selection Criteria.

Category Model Assessment	Criteria	Thresholds	Literature
In-Sample	R^2	Higher values better model	Hair et al. (2017)
	R^2adj	Higher values better model	
	AICu	Lower values better model	Sharma et al. (2019a,b)
	AICc	Lower values better model	
	BIC	Lower values better model	
Out-of-Sample	RMSE	Lower values better model	Shmueli et al. (2016)
	MAD	Lower values better model	Sharma et al. (2019a)
	Q^2	Higher values better model	Hair et al. (2017)
Model Fit	RMS_{Theta}	< 0.12	Hair et al. (2017)
	SRMR	< 0.10	Henseler et al. (2014)
Significance Test R^2	F test	F statistic obtained > F critical values of an F distribution with degrees of freedom equal to the two denominators in the equation of the F test.	Field (2013)

Source: adapted from several sources.

Table K.6. Criteria to Empirically Assess Correct Model Specification and CMB.

Category Model Assessment	Technique	Criteria	Thresholds	Literature
Measurement Model Specification	Confirmatory Tetrad Analysis (CTA-PLS)	Non Redundant Tetrads	0 ∉ BCBa CI* ---> Formative 0 ∈ BCBa CI ---> Reflective	Hair et al. (2018)
CMB	Full Collinearity Assessment (FCA)	VIF	< 3.3 3.3 <VIF< 5 acceptable for high correlated constructs	Cock (2015)

** Bias corrected and Bonferroni adjusted Conficence intervals.*

Source: adapted from several sources.

Table K.7. Algorithm Settings for Measurement, Structural and Model Selection Criteria in SmartPLS.

Category Model Assessment	Criteria	Algorithm setting SmartPLS*
Measurement Model	CA CR Outer Loadings Communality** AVE Cross-Loadings Fornell-Larcker Criterion HTMT	A Maximum of 300 iterations and a stop criterion of $1x10^{-7}$ with the path weighting*** scheme method and equal indicator weights for the initialisation.
	HTMT Confidence Intervals	Two-tailed Bias corrected and Accelerated (BCa) Complete Bootstrapping procedure with 5000 Sub-samples at a significance level of 5% and no sign changes.
Structural Model	VIF R^2 R^2adj f^2 Q^2 q^2***	A maximum of 300 iterations and a stop criterion of $1x10^{-7}$ with the path weighting scheme method and equal indicator weights for the initialisation.
	Path Coefficient Significance. R2 Significance.	Two-tailed Bias corrected and Accelerated (BCa) Complete Bootstrapping procedure with 5000 Sub-samples at a significance level of 5% and no sign changes.
In-Sample Predictive Accuracy	AICu AICc BIC	A maximum of 300 iterations and a stop criterion of $1x10^{-7}$ with the path weighting scheme method and equal indicator weights for the initialisation.
Out-of-Sample Predictive Accuracy	RMSE MAD	PLS Predict algorithm with 10-fold cross-validation subsets and 10 repetitions.
Model fit	RMS_{Theta} SRMR	A maximum of 300 iterations and a stop criterion of $1x10^{-7}$ with the path weighting scheme method and equal indicator weights for the initialisation.

** Unless otherwise specified those reported in this table are the algorithms employed in the PLS-SEM analysis.*

*** Calculated manually in Microsoft Excel through the values of the outer loadings obtained in SmartPLS has been included in this table for reasons of completeness.*

**** There are other two methods of determining structural relationships, namely centroid and factor. Hair et al. (2017) recommends the path weighting scheme for its flexibility, higher statistical power and because it accounts for the direction of the path between endogenous and exogenous variables.*

***** Calculated manually in Micorsoft Excel through the Q^2 values obtained in SmartPLS has been included in this table for reasons of completeness.*

Source: Adapted from Hair et al. (2017), Hair et al. (2018) and Shmueli et al. (2016).

Table K.8. Algorithm Settings for Moderation Analysis in SmartPLS.

Category Model Assessment	Technique	Algorithm setting SmartPLS*
Moderation	Interaction term two-stage approach	Standardised product term generation with automatic weighting mode. Then run SmartPLS algorithm with a maximum of 300 iterations and a stop criterion of $1x10^{-7}$ with the path weighting scheme method and equal indicator weights for the initialisation.
	MGA - Permutation	5000 permutations, $\alpha = 0.05$, two-tailed, 300 iterations and a stop criterion of $1x10^{-7}$ with path weighting scheme method and equal indicator weights for the initialisation.
Measurement Invariance	Compositional Invariance Equality of Composite Means and Variances	5000 permutations, $\alpha = 0.05$, two-tailed, 300 iterations and a stop criterion of $1x10^{-7}$ with path weighting scheme method and equal indicator weights for the initialisation.

** Unless otherwise specified those reported in this table are the algorithms employed in the PLS-SEM analysis carried out with the SmartPLS software*

Source: adapted from Hair et al. (2017) and Hair et al. (2018).

Table K.9. Algorithm Settings for CTA-PLS and FCA in SmartPLS.

Category Model Assessment	Technique	Algorithm setting SmartPLS*
Measurement Model Specification	Confirmatory Tetrad Analysis (CTA-PLS)	5000 subsamples, $\alpha = 0.10$ two-tailed bootstrapping routine with bias-corrected Bonferroni-adjusted CI.
CMB	Full Collinearity Assessment (FCA)	A Maximum of 300 iterations and a stop criterion of 1*10-7 with the path weighting scheme method and equal indicator weights for the initialisation.

** Unless otherwise specified those reported in this table are the algorithms employed in the PLS-SEM analysis carried out with the SmartPLS software*

Source: Hair et al. (2018) and Kock (2015).

APPENDIX L - DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS, UNIBVARIATE AND MULTIVARIATE OUTLIERS

Entire Sample (n = 1212)

Table L.1. Descriptive Statistics of the Items for the Entire Sample (n = 1212).

Items	*M*	*Mdn*	*Mode*	*Min*	*Max*	*SD*	*Kurt*	*Skew*
Totime_SNSs_ Minutes	53.666	30	10	0	630	70.637	13.234	3.047
Bond_1	3.411	3	1	1	7	1.999	-1.170	0.275
Bond_2	3.13	3	1	1	7	2.084	-1.107	0.521
Bond_3	3.582	4	1	1	7	2.047	-1.262	0.198
Bond_4	2.762	2	1	1	7	2.070	-0.688	0.844
Bond_5	2.961	3	1	1	7	1.776	-0.659	0.569
Bond_6	3.478	4	1	1	7	2.026	-1.238	0.204
Bond_7	2.839	2	1	1	7	1.816	-0.535	0.712
Bond_8	3.59	4	1	1	7	1.952	-1.208	0.113
Bond_9	3.814	4	4	1	7	1.846	-0.988	-0.022
Bond_10	3.486	4	1	1	7	1.955	-1.135	0.220
Brid_1	3.894	4	5	1	7	1.803	-0.997	-0.072
Brid_2	3.019	3	1	1	7	1.628	-0.676	0.417
Brid_3	3.446	3	4	1	7	1.719	-0.883	0.160
Brid_4	3.683	4	4	1	7	1.811	-1.009	0.082
Brid_5	3.248	3	1	1	7	1.790	-0.957	0.355
Brid_6	3.516	4	4	1	7	1.761	-0.984	0.134
Brid_7	3.953	4	4	1	7	1.806	-0.921	-0.105
Brid_8	2.781	3	1	1	7	1.580	-0.577	0.546
Brid_9	3.187	3	1	1	7	1.749	-0.768	0.422
Brid_10	3.078	3	1	1	7	1.731	-0.636	0.538
On_PP_1	0.702	0	0	0	10	1.881	8.211	3.004
On_PP_2	4.252	4	0	0	10	3.316	-1.219	0.204
On_PP_3	1.089	0	0	0	10	2.261	4.291	2.257
On_PP_4	1.225	0	0	0	10	2.310	2.993	2.006
On_PP_5	1.662	0	0	0	10	2.521	1.298	1.547
On_PP_6	0.61	0	0	0	10	1.640	10.59	3.226
Off_PP_1	1.166	0	0	0	10	2.171	3.432	2.045
Off_PP_2	1.488	0	0	0	10	2.627	2.351	1.837
Off_PP_3	1.506	0	0	0	10	2.617	1.859	1.728
Off_PP_4	0.708	0	0	0	10	1.811	10.264	3.151
Off_PP_5	0.71	0	0	0	10	1.819	8.041	2.897
Off_PP_6	0.884	0	0	0	10	2.051	6.335	2.615
Off_PP_7	0.635	0	0	0	10	1.707	11.307	3.320
Off_PP_8	1.188	0	0	0	10	2.294	3.800	2.123
Off_PP_9	1.218	0	0	0	10	2.355	3.431	2.064
PInt_1	3.999	4	4	1	7	1.774	-0.877	-0.051
PInt_2	4.389	5	5	1	7	1.912	-1.011	-0.334
PInt_3	4.258	5	5	1	7	1.922	-1.032	-0.271
PEffic_1	3.358	3	1	1	7	1.876	-1.037	0.276
PEffic_2	4.479	5	5	1	7	1.751	-0.732	-0.410
PEffic_3	3.728	4	1	1	7	1.989	-1.185	0.091
PEffic_4	3.63	4	4	1	7	1.824	-1.010	0.066

Age	42	43	48	18	80	13.794	-0.622	-0.289
Pknow_score	4.724	5	6	0	7	1.952	-0.679	-0.595

Table L.2. Descriptive Statistics of the Composite Constructs of Facebook Users.

Constructs		***M***	***Mdn***	***Mode***	***Min***	***Max***	***SD***	***Kurt***	***Skew***
Bond_SC	Statistic	3.305	3.2	1	1	7	1.60	-0.972	0.251
	Std. Error	0.046						0.140	0.070
Brid_SC	Statistic	3.381	3.4	1	1	7	1.46	-0.740	0.163
	Std. Error	0.042						0.140	0.070
Off_PP	Statistic	1.5899	1	0	0	10	1.83	2.516	1.682
	Std. Error	0.052						0.140	0.070
On_PP	Statistic	1.056	0.2	0	0	10	1.63	5.190	2.158
	Std. Error	0.047						0.140	0.070
PEff	Statistic	4.215	4.3	4.66	1	7	1.73	-0.879	-0.251
	Std. Error	0.050						0.140	0.070
PInt	Statistic	3.799	3.7	4.25	1	7	1.63	-0.944	-0.002
	Std. Error	0.046						0.140	0.070
Pknow	Statistic	4.720	5	6	0	7	1.95	-0.679	-0.595
	Std. Error	0.056						0.140	0.070

Facebook Users Sample (n = 432)

Table L.3. Descriptive Statistics of all the Items for Facebook Users (n=432).

Item	*M*	*Mdn*	*Mode*	*Min*	*Max*	*SD*	*Kurt*	*Skew*
Int_SNS_Use	44.16	20	10	0	630	71.81	27.12	4.56
Bond_1	3.58	4	1	1	7	2.10	-1.34	0.10
Bond_2	3.14	2	1	1	7	2.24	-1.19	0.56
Bond_3	3.63	4	1	1	7	2.09	-1.31	0.17
Bond_4	2.83	2	1	1	7	2.21	-0.90	0.81
Bond_5	3.05	3	1	1	7	1.83	-0.78	0.51
Bond_6	3.58	4	1	1	7	2.09	-1.31	0.12
Bond_7	2.95	3	1	1	7	1.92	-0.79	0.62
Bond_8	3.70	4	1	1	7	1.97	-1.21	0.04
Bond_9	3.87	4	4	1	7	1.87	-0.95	-0.03
Bond_10	3.57	4	1	1	7	2.01	-1.20	0.19
Brid_1	3.78	4	5	1	7	1.85	-1.06	-0.04
Brid_2	3.01	3	4	1	7	1.54	-0.80	0.25
Brid_3	3.34	3	1	1	7	1.71	-0.99	0.13
Brid_4	3.50	4	1	1	7	1.87	-1.08	0.17
Brid_5	3.41	4	1	1	7	1.82	-1.05	0.20
Brid_6	3.50	4	4	1	7	1.78	-0.99	0.15
Brid_7	4.00	4	5	1	7	1.85	-0.98	-0.20
Brid_8	2.63	2	1	1	7	1.49	-0.38	0.63
Brid_9	3.00	3	1	1	7	1.69	-0.81	0.45
Brid_10	2.67	2	1	1	7	1.59	-0.11	0.82
On_PP_1	0.27	0	0	0	10	1.09	30.47	5.19
On_PP_2	3.75	3	0	0	10	3.31	-1.20	0.36
On_PP_3	0.68	0	0	0	10	1.88	9.76	3.16
On_PP_4	0.63	0	0	0	10	1.75	10.59	3.25
On_PP_5	1.21	0	0	0	10	2.21	2.84	1.91
On_PP_6	0.30	0	0	0	10	1.25	27.13	4.98
Off_PP_1	0.84	0	0	0	10	1.87	6.89	2.70
Off_PP_2	1.24	0	0	0	10	2.43	3.84	2.16
Off_PP_3	1.25	0	0	0	10	2.53	3.31	2.10
Off_PP_4	0.38	0	0	0	9	1.33	18.85	4.24
Off_PP_5	0.29	0	0	0	10	1.18	26.10	4.93
Off_PP_6	0.43	0	0	0	10	1.45	18.06	4.14
Off_PP_7	0.49	0	0	0	10	1.48	14.12	3.70
Off_PP_8	0.85	0	0	0	10	1.99	6.82	2.70
Off_PP_9	0.87	0	0	0	10	2.07	6.36	2.65
PInt_1	3.92	4	4	1	7	1.74	-0.86	-0.05
PInt_2	4.19	4	5	1	7	1.90	-1.06	-0.23
PInt_3	3.93	4	5	1	7	1.91	-1.11	-0.09
PEffic_1	3.05	3	1	1	7	1.79	-0.80	0.50
PEffic_2	4.27	5	5	1	7	1.73	-0.81	-0.35
PEffic_3	3.44	4	1	1	7	1.92	-1.04	0.27
PEffic_4	3.26	3	1	1	7	1.74	-0.81	0.26
Age	47	49	45	20	75	10.70	-0.141	-0.563
Pknow_score	4.83	5	5	0	7	1.91	-0.50	-0.72

Table L.4. Descriptive Statistics of the Composite Constructs of Facebook Users.

Constructs		*M*	*Mdn*	*Mode*	*Min*	*Max*	*SD*	*Kurt*	*Skew*
Bond_SC	Statistic	3.389	3.4	1	1	7	1.643	-1.050	-0.203
	Std. Error	0.079						0.234	0.117
Brid_SC	Statistic	3.283	3.4	1	1	7	1.444	-0.734	0.107
	Std. Error	0.069						0.234	0.117
Off_PP	Statistic	0.737	0.1	0	0	8	1.288	6.660	2.466
	Std. Error	0.062						0.234	0.117
On_PP	Statistic	1.140	0.7	0	0	10	1.366	7.150	2.161
	Std. Error	0.066						0.234	0.117
PEff	Statistic	3.507	3.5	3.5	1	7	1.552	-0.822	0.151
	Std. Error	0.075						0.234	0.117
PInt	Statistic	4.015	4.3	4.6	1	7	1.679	-0.843	-0.159
	Std. Error	0.081						0.234	0.117
Pknow	Statistic	4.833	5	5	0	7	1.907	-0.496	-0.716
	Std. Error	0.092						0.234	0.117

Table L.5. Demographic Characteristics of Facebook Heavy, Mild and Light Users.

SNS_Used	Int_SNS_Use	Education	Gender	Avg. Age	Count	% of Total Count
Facebook	Heavy Users	High education	Female	39	15	14
			Male	42	15	14
			Total	41	30	28
		Low education	Female	41	55	51
			Male	48	23	21
			Total	43	78	72
		Whole Sample		42	108	100
	Mild Users	High education	Female	39	28	17
			Male	47	28	17
			Total	43	56	35
		Low education	Female	47	65	40
			Male	52	41	25
			Total	49	106	65
		Whole Sample		47	162	100
	Light Users	High education	Female	43	20	20
			Male	53	29	29
			Total	49	49	49
		Low education	Female	54	27	28
			Male	49	23	23
			Total	52	50	51
		Whole Sample		50	99	100

Twitter Users Sample (n = 383)

Table L.6. Descriptive Statistics of all the Items for Twitter Users (n = 383).

Item	M	Mdn	Mode	Min	Max	SD	Kurt	Skew
Int_SNS_Use	31.84	20	10	0	240	40.18	5.30	2.24
Bond_1	3.10	3	1	1	7	1.96	-0.95	0.53
Bond_2	2.92	2	1	1	7	1.92	-0.94	0.60
Bond_3	3.21	3	1	1	7	2.01	-1.09	0.43
Bond_4	2.56	2	1	1	7	1.90	-0.33	0.95
Bond_5	2.77	2	1	1	7	1.75	-0.55	0.69
Bond_6	3.08	3	1	1	7	1.95	-1.03	0.47
Bond_7	2.48	2	1	1	7	1.68	0.03	0.98
Bond_8	3.19	3	1	1	7	1.95	-1.15	0.38
Bond_9	3.50	4	4	1	7	1.85	-1.02	0.13
Bond_10	3.15	3	1	1	7	1.93	-1.02	0.44
Brid_1	3.78	4	5	1	7	1.82	-1.03	0.07
Brid_2	2.79	3	1	1	7	1.65	-0.36	0.70
Brid_3	3.38	3	1	1	7	1.78	-0.86	0.28
Brid_4	3.65	4	4	1	7	1.82	-0.99	0.17
Brid_5	2.86	2	1	1	7	1.76	-0.48	0.72
Brid_6	3.45	3	4	1	7	1.79	-1.00	0.22
Brid_7	3.81	4	5	1	7	1.83	-0.97	-0.01
Brid_8	2.51	2	1	1	7	1.55	-0.20	0.80
Brid_9	3.24	3	1	1	7	1.87	-0.80	0.48
Brid_10	3.43	3	1	1	7	1.90	-1.03	0.32
On_PP_1	0.94	0	0	0	9	2.16	4.74	2.43
On_PP_2	4.37	4	0	0	10	3.37	-1.26	0.17
On_PP_3	1.36	0	0	0	10	2.35	1.98	1.75
On_PP_4	1.59	0	0	0	10	2.49	1.04	1.51
On_PP_5	1.84	1	0	0	10	2.60	0.89	1.45
On_PP_6	0.76	0	0	0	9	1.75	6.42	2.64
Off_PP_1	1.50	0	0	0	10	2.33	1.73	1.61
Off_PP_2	1.44	0	0	0	10	2.52	2.63	1.88
Off_PP_3	1.75	0	0	0	10	2.59	0.89	1.41
Off_PP_4	0.90	0	0	0	10	1.92	7.54	2.70
Off_PP_5	1.19	0	0	0	10	2.21	2.90	1.94
Off_PP_6	1.48	0	0	0	10	2.57	1.97	1.74
Off_PP_7	0.67	0	0	0	10	1.73	11.12	3.27
Off_PP_8	1.34	0	0	0	10	2.31	2.76	1.86
Off_PP_9	1.45	0	0	0	10	2.40	2.19	1.74
PInt_1	4.03	4	4	1	7	1.80	-0.92	0.00
PInt_2	4.56	5	6	1	7	1.92	-0.98	-0.43
PInt_3	4.56	5	5	1	7	1.86	-0.79	-0.46
PEffic_1	3.58	4	1	1	7	1.96	-1.14	0.16
PEffic_2	4.61	5	6	1	7	1.77	-0.72	-0.44
PEffic_3	3.96	4	1	1	7	2.05	-1.27	-0.03
PEffic_4	3.94	4	5	1	7	1.87	-1.08	-0.06
Age	38	38	37	18	69	14.56	-0.91	-0.06
Pknow_score	4.64	5	7	0	7	2.04	-0.92	-0.48

Table L.7. Descriptive Statistics of the Composite Constructs of Twitter Users.

Constructs		*M*	*Mdn*	*Mode*	*Min*	*Max*	*SD*	*Kurt*	*Skew*
Bond_SC	Statistic	2.996	2.7	1	1	7	1.615	-0.895	0.459
	Std. Error	0.082						0.249	0.125
Brid_SC	Statistic	3.290	3.2	1	1	7	1.511	-0.723	0.341
	Std. Error	0.077						0.249	0.125
Off_PP	Statistic	1.300	0.6	0	0	10	1.755	3.724	1.847
	Std. Error	0.090						0.249	0.125
On_PP	Statistic	1.808	1	0	0	8.8	2.026	1.057	1.381
	Std. Error	0.104						0.249	0.125
PEff	Statistic	4.023	4.3	4.3	1	7	1.691	-1.014	-0.100
	Std. Error	0.086						0.249	0.125
PInt	Statistic	4.381	4.7	4.7	1	7	1.728	-0.832	-0.357
	Std. Error	0.088						0.249	0.125
Pknow	Statistic	4.640	5	7	0	7	2.044	-0.918	-0.476
	Std. Error	0.104						0.249	0.125

Table L.8. Demographic Characteristics of Twitter Heavy, Mild and Light Users.

SNS_Used	Int_SNS_Use	Education	Gender	Avg. Age	Count	% of Total Count
Twitter	Heavy Users	High education	Female	40	25	28
			Male	34	23	27
			Total	37	48	55
		Low education	Female	39	26	30
			Male	35	14	15
			Total	37	40	45
		Whole Sample		37	88	100
	Mild Users	High education	Female	36	47	25
			Male	42	47	25
			Total	39	94	51
		Low education	Female	39	46	25
			Male	43	46	25
			Total	41	92	49
		Whole Sample		40	186	100
	Light Users	High education	Female	42	21	22
			Male	38	23	24
			Total	40	44	46
		Low education	Female	35	26	27
			Male	33	25	26
			Total	34	51	54
		Whole Sample		37	95	100

Facebook and Twitter Combined Users Sample (n = 397)

Table L.9. Descriptive Statistics of all the Items for Facebook and Twitter users combined (n=397).

Item	*M*	*Mdn*	*Mode*	*Min*	*Max*	*SD*	*Kurt*	*Skew*
Int_SNS_Use	85.1	60	20	0	430	80.76	3.28	1.77
Bond_1	3.5	4	4	1	7	1.89	-1.03	0.25
Bond_2	3.3	3	1	1	7	2.04	-1.19	0.37
Bond_3	3.9	4	5	1	7	1.98	-1.25	0.03
Bond_4	2.9	2	1	1	7	2.06	-0.78	0.76
Bond_5	3.1	3	1	1	7	1.73	-0.57	0.54
Bond_6	3.8	4	1	1	7	1.97	-1.21	0.06
Bond_7	3.1	3	1	1	7	1.78	-0.58	0.59
Bond_8	3.9	4	5	1	7	1.87	-1.10	-0.03
Bond_9	4.1	4	5	1	7	1.77	-0.92	-0.14
Bond_10	3.7	4	4	1	7	1.87	-1.04	0.06
Brid_1	4.1	4	5	1	7	1.72	-0.81	-0.22
Brid_2	3.3	3	4	1	7	1.67	-0.76	0.31
Brid_3	3.6	4	4	1	7	1.65	-0.77	0.09
Brid_4	3.9	4	4	1	7	1.72	-0.86	-0.07
Brid_5	3.4	3	2	1	7	1.73	-1.01	0.22
Brid_6	3.6	4	5	1	7	1.70	-0.93	0.04
Brid_7	4.0	4	4	1	7	1.73	-0.77	-0.08
Brid_8	3.2	3	4	1	7	1.62	-0.79	0.24
Brid_9	3.4	3	4	1	7	1.67	-0.74	0.32
Brid_10	3.2	3	3	1	7	1.61	-0.54	0.42
On_PP_1	0.9	0	0	0	9	2.16	5.10	2.50
On_PP_2	4.7	5	0	0	10	3.20	-1.14	0.10
On_PP_3	1.3	0	0	0	10	2.47	3.56	2.12
On_PP_4	1.5	0	0	0	10	2.52	1.89	1.74
On_PP_5	2.0	1	0	0	10	2.68	0.60	1.33
On_PP_6	0.8	0	0	0	10	1.84	7.95	2.82
Off_PP_1	1.2	0	0	0	10	2.26	3.19	2.00
Off_PP_2	1.8	0	0	0	10	2.90	1.13	1.53
Off_PP_3	1.6	0	0	0	10	2.71	1.69	1.71
Off_PP_4	0.9	0	0	0	10	2.08	7.88	2.83
Off_PP_5	0.7	0	0	0	10	1.87	8.85	3.03
Off_PP_6	0.8	0	0	0	10	1.90	7.98	2.82
Off_PP_7	0.8	0	0	0	10	1.90	9.15	3.03
Off_PP_8	1.4	0	0	0	10	2.53	2.77	1.91
Off_PP_9	1.4	0	0	0	10	2.55	2.74	1.92
PInt_1	4.1	4	4	1	7	1.79	-0.86	-0.11
PInt_2	4.4	5	5	1	7	1.90	-0.94	-0.37
PInt_3	4.3	5	5	1	7	1.94	-1.03	-0.31
PEffic_1	3.5	4	1	1	7	1.84	-1.07	0.13
PEffic_2	4.6	5	5	1	7	1.74	-0.62	-0.47
PEffic_3	3.8	4	1	1	7	1.97	-1.17	0.00
PEffic_4	3.7	4	5	1	7	1.80	-1.02	-0.07
Age	40	42	43	18	72	12.61	-0.419	-0.21
Pknow_score	4.7	5	6	0	7	1.91	-0.57	-0.59

Table L.10. Descriptive Statistics of the Composite Constructs of Twitter Users.

Constructs		*M*	*Mdn*	*Mode*	*Min*	*Max*	*SD*	*Kurt*	*Skew*
Bond_SC	Statistic	3.512	3.5	1	1	7	1.485	-0.827	0.164
	Std. Error	0.075						0.244	0.122
Brid_SC	Statistic	3.575	3.6	4	1	7	1.399	-0.721	0.068
	Std. Error	0.070						0.244	0.122
Off_PP	Statistic	1.167	0.3	0	0	10	1.790	4.733	2.090
	Std. Error	0.090						0.244	0.122
On_PP	Statistic	1.868	1.2	0	0	8.8	1.971	1.513	1.489
	Std. Error	0.099						0.244	0.122
PEff	Statistic	3.900	4	3.7	1	7	1.613	-0.904	-0.124
	Std. Error	0.081						0.244	0.122
PInt	Statistic	4.274	4.7	4.7	1	7	1.761	-0.901	-0.276
	Std. Error	0.088						0.244	0.122
Pknow	Statistic	4.688	5	6	0	7	1.910	-0.570	-0.594
	Std. Error	0.096						0.244	0.122

Table L.11. Demographic Characteristics of Facebook and Twitter combined Heavy, Mild and Light Users.

SNS_Used	Int_SNS_Use	Education	Gender	Avg. Age	Count	% of Total Count
F+T	Heavy Users	High education	Female	27	13	32
			Male	31	5	12
			Total	28	18	44
		Low education	Female	35	13	32
			Male	33	10	24
			Total	34	23	56
		Whole Sample		31	41	100
	Mild Users	High education	Female	37	17	22
			Male	42	22	28
			Total	40	39	50
		Low education	Female	45	14	18
			Male	47	25	32
			Total	47	39	50
		Whole Sample		43	78	100
	Light Users	High education	Female	45	5	11
			Male	47	22	49
			Total	47	27	60
		Low education	Female	38	6	13
			Male	44	12	27
			Total	42	18	40
		Whole Sample		45	45	100

APPENDIX M - MEASUREMENT MODEL DISCRIMINANT VALIDITY ASSESSMENT FOR Q1 WITH NO CONTROL VARIABLES

Discriminant Validity Metrics for Facebook Users Sample with no Control Variables (n = 432)

Table M.1. Fornell-Larcker Criterion Facebook Users Sample with no Control Variables (n = 432).

Fornell-Larcker Criterion				
	Bond_SC	**Brid_SC**	**Off_PP**	**On_PP**
Bond_SC	0.809			
Brid_SC	0.554	0.839		
Off_PP	0.126	0.315	0.699	
On_PP	0.230	0.358	0.646	0.713

Table M.2. Cross-Loadings Facebook Users Sample with no Control Variables (n = 432).

Cross-Loadings				
	Bond_SC	**Brid_SC**	**Off_PP**	**On_PP**
Bond_1	0.817	0.464	0.027	0.163
Bond_10	0.892	0.512	0.148	0.202
Bond_2	0.781	0.487	0.085	0.168
Bond_3	**0.787**	0.643	0.148	0.211
Bond_4	**0.749**	0.331	0.05	0.143
Bond_5	**0.824**	0.395	0.102	0.217
Bond_6	**0.740**	0.336	0.048	0.141
Bond_7	**0.804**	0.370	0.099	0.182
Bond_8	**0.843**	0.421	0.086	0.182
Bond_9	**0.837**	0.441	0.152	0.208
Brid_1	0.480	**0.865**	0.251	0.282
Brid_10	0.347	**0.766**	0.268	0.308
Brid_2	0.526	**0.854**	0.290	0.339
Brid_3	0.466	**0.863**	0.267	0.291
Brid_4	0.480	**0.844**	0.283	0.270
Brid_5	0.489	**0.866**	0.242	0.284
Brid_6	0.495	**0.879**	0.232	0.272
Brid_7	0.473	**0.807**	0.185	0.239
Brid_8	0.506	**0.791**	0.286	0.357
Brid_9	0.383	**0.846**	0.299	0.320
Off_PP_1	0.039	0.177	**0.749**	0.432
Off_PP_2	0.077	0.163	**0.627**	0.508
Off_PP_3	0.068	0.077	**0.598**	0.379
Off_PP_4	0.101	0.258	**0.657**	0.398
Off_PP_5	0.064	0.193	**0.700**	0.344
Off_PP_6	0.063	0.165	**0.651**	0.393
Off_PP_7	0.009	0.137	**0.670**	0.422

Cross-Loadings				
Off_PP_8	0.152	0.328	**0.813**	0.539
Off_PP_9	0.133	0.285	**0.791**	0.591
On_PP_1	0.137	0.249	0.440	**0.748**
On_PP_2	0.195	0.287	0.406	**0.648**
On_PP_3	0.090	0.214	0.437	**0.703**
On_PP_4	0.151	0.255	0.597	**0.765**
On_PP_5	0.228	0.295	0.459	**0.725**
On_PP_6	0.146	0.199	0.413	**0.682**

Table M.3. HTMT Values for Facebook Users Sample with no Control Variables (n = 432).

HTMT				
	Bond_SC	**Brid_SC**	**Off_PP**	**On_PP**
Bond_SC				
Brid_SC	0.574			
Off_PP	0.120	0.304		
On_PP	0.248	0.393	0.752	

Table M.4. HTMT Confidence Intervals Bias Corrected for Facebook Users Sample with no Control Variables (n = 432).

HTMT CONFIDENCE INTERVALS BIAS CORRECTED (Bootstrapping 5000 Samples)					
	Original Sample (O)	**Sample Mean (M)**	**Bias**	**2.50%**	**97.50%**
Brid_SC -> Bond_SC	0.574	0.575	0.001	0.487	0.648
Off_PP -> Bond_SC	0.120	0.142	0.023	0.075	0.169
Off_PP -> Brid_SC	0.304	0.306	0.001	0.191	0.410
On_PP -> Bond_SC	0.248	0.251	0.003	0.151	0.343
On_PP -> Brid_SC	0.393	0.395	0.001	0.275	0.491
On_PP -> Off_PP	0.752	0.753	0.002	0.624	0.854

Discriminant Validity Metrics for Twitter Users Sample with no Control Variables (n = 383)

Table M.5. Fornell-Larcker Criterion Twitter Users Sample with no Control Variables (n = 383).

Fornell-Larcker Criterion				
	Bond_SC	**Brid_SC**	**Off_PP**	**On_PP**
Bond_SC	0.854			
Brid_SC	0.326	0.849		
Off_PP	0.311	0.344	0.763	
On_PP	0.349	0.394	0.615	0.826

Table M.6. Cross-Loadings Twitter Users Sample with no Control Variables (n = 383).

Cross-Loadings				
	Bond_SC	**Brid_SC**	**Off_PP**	**On_PP**
Bond_1	**0.898**	0.267	0.252	0.291
Bond_10	**0.935**	0.289	0.282	0.329
Bond_2	**0.890**	0.234	0.247	0.303
Bond_3	**0.837**	0.401	0.275	0.322
Bond_4	**0.826**	0.189	0.299	0.286
Bond_5	**0.874**	0.292	0.298	0.314
Bond_6	**0.811**	0.299	0.274	0.215
Bond_7	**0.831**	0.146	0.222	0.241
Bond_8	**0.817**	0.275	0.247	0.322
Bond_9	**0.812**	0.361	0.248	0.326
Brid_1	0.199	**0.848**	0.267	0.32
Brid_10	0.217	**0.857**	0.339	0.428
Brid_2	0.315	**0.847**	0.275	0.296
Brid_3	0.299	**0.821**	0.26	0.274
Brid_4	0.267	**0.866**	0.308	0.357
Brid_5	0.278	**0.831**	0.264	0.281
Brid_6	0.279	**0.85**	0.221	0.287
Brid_7	0.277	**0.852**	0.251	0.28
Brid_8	0.309	**0.813**	0.293	0.358
Brid_9	0.333	**0.897**	0.355	0.397
Off_PP_1	0.228	0.258	**0.836**	0.506
Off_PP_2	0.120	0.155	**0.559**	0.343
Off_PP_3	0.246	0.239	**0.815**	0.509
Off_PP_4	0.228	0.218	**0.765**	0.490
Off_PP_5	0.249	0.201	**0.824**	0.492
Off_PP_6	0.287	0.400	**0.763**	0.450
Off_PP_7	0.109	0.149	**0.646**	0.367
Off_PP_8	0.270	0.282	**0.832**	0.534
Off_PP_9	0.294	0.302	**0.816**	0.534
On_PP_1	0.270	0.257	0.489	**0.829**
On_PP_2	0.288	0.390	0.391	**0.763**
On_PP_3	0.261	0.356	0.546	**0.828**
On_PP_4	0.375	0.340	0.584	**0.896**
On_PP_5	0.269	0.289	0.503	**0.859**
On_PP_6	0.240	0.293	0.555	**0.771**

Table M.7. HTMT Values for Twitter Users Sample with no Control Variables (n = 383).

HTMT				
	Bond_SC	**Brid_SC**	**Off_PP**	**On_PP**
Bond_SC				
Brid_SC	0.338			
Off_PP	0.314	0.336		
On_PP	0.366	0.409	0.676	

Table M.8. HTMT Confidence Intervals Bias Corrected for Twitter Users Sample with no Control Variables (n = 383).

HTMT CONFIDENCE INTERVALS BIAS CORRECTED (Bootstrapping 5000 Samples)					
	Original Sample (O)	**Sample Mean (M)**	**Bias**	**2.50%**	**97.50%**
Brid_SC -> Bond_SC	0.338	0.338	0	0.238	0.434
Off_PP -> Bond_SC	0.314	0.315	0	0.215	0.406
Off_PP -> Brid_SC	0.336	0.335	-0.001	0.236	0.426
On_PP -> Bond_SC	0.366	0.365	-0.001	0.267	0.463
On_PP -> Brid_SC	0.409	0.409	0	0.315	0.494
On_PP -> Off_PP	0.676	0.675	-0.001	0.575	0.758

Discriminant Validity Metrics for Facebook Users Sample with no Control Variables (n = 432) and Off_PP_3 removed.

Table M.9. Fornell-Larcker Criterion Facebook Users Sample with no Control Variables and Off_PP_3 Removed (n = 432).

Fornell-Larcker Criterion				
	Bond_SC	**Brid_SC**	**Off_PP**	**On_PP**
Bond_SC	0.809			
Brid_SC	0.555	0.839		
Off_PP	0.127	0.321	0.710	
On_PP	0.230	0.358	0.645	0.713

Table M.10. Cross-Loadings Facebook Users Sample with no Control Variables and Off_PP_3 Removed (n = 432).

Cross-Loadings				
	Bond_SC	**Brid_SC**	**Off_PP**	**On_PP**
Bond_1	**0.817**	0.464	0.028	0.163
Bond_10	**0.892**	0.512	0.149	0.202
Bond_2	**0.781**	0.487	0.087	0.168
Bond_3	**0.787**	0.643	0.152	0.211
Bond_4	**0.749**	0.331	0.049	0.143
Bond_5	**0.824**	0.395	0.100	0.217
Bond_6	**0.739**	0.336	0.044	0.141
Bond_7	**0.804**	0.370	0.099	0.182
Bond_8	**0.843**	0.421	0.085	0.182
Bond_9	**0.837**	0.441	0.151	0.208
Brid_1	0.480	**0.865**	0.254	0.282
Brid_10	0.347	**0.766**	0.273	0.308
Brid_2	0.526	**0.853**	0.295	0.339
Brid_3	0.467	**0.863**	0.270	0.291
Brid_4	0.481	**0.844**	0.288	0.270
Brid_5	0.490	**0.866**	0.249	0.284
Brid_6	0.496	**0.879**	0.237	0.272
Brid_7	0.473	**0.807**	0.188	0.239
Brid_8	0.507	**0.791**	0.291	0.357
Brid_9	0.383	**0.846**	0.305	0.320
Off_PP_1	0.039	0.177	**0.742**	0.432
Off_PP_2	0.077	0.163	**0.622**	0.508
Off_PP_4	0.102	0.258	**0.661**	0.398
Off_PP_5	0.064	0.193	**0.703**	0.344
Off_PP_6	0.063	0.165	**0.651**	0.393
Off_PP_7	0.009	0.137	**0.668**	0.422
Off_PP_8	0.152	0.328	**0.817**	0.539
Off_PP_9	0.133	0.285	**0.792**	0.591
On_PP_1	0.137	0.249	0.439	**0.748**
On_PP_2	0.196	0.287	0.409	**0.648**
On_PP_3	0.090	0.214	0.434	**0.703**
On_PP_4	0.151	0.255	0.596	**0.765**
On_PP_5	0.228	0.295	0.460	**0.725**
On_PP_6	0.146	0.199	0.411	**0.682**

Table M.11. HTMT Values for Facebook Users Sample with no Control Variables and Off_PP_3 Removed (n = 432).

HTMT				
	Bond_SC	**Brid_SC**	**Off_PP**	**On_PP**
Bond_SC				
Brid_SC	0.574			
Off_PP	0.120	0.326		
On_PP	0.248	0.393	0.759	

Table M.12. HTMT Confidence Intervals Bias Corrected for Facebook Users Sample with no Control Variables and Off_PP_3 Removed (n = 432).

HTMT CONFIDENCE INTERVALS BIAS CORRECTED (Bootstrapping 5000 Samples)					
	Original Sample (O)	**Sample Mean (M)**	**Bias**	**2.50%**	**97.50%**
Brid_SC -> Bond_SC	0.574	0.574	0	0.492	0.650
Off_PP -> Bond_SC	0.120	0.142	0.022	0.076	0.170
Off_PP -> Brid_SC	0.326	0.324	-0.001	0.208	0.429
On_PP -> Bond_SC	0.248	0.251	0.003	0.153	0.343
On_PP -> Brid_SC	0.393	0.395	0.002	0.281	0.492
On_PP -> Off_PP	0.759	0.762	0.003	0.628	0.863

Discriminant Validity Metrics for Twitter Users Sample with no Control Variables and Off_PP_3 removed (n = 383).

Table M.13. Fornell-Larcker Criterion Twitter Users Sample with no Control Variables and Off_PP_3 Removed (n = 383).

Fornell-Larcker Criterion				
	Bond_SC	**Brid_SC**	**Off_PP**	**On_PP**
Bond_SC	0.854			
Brid_SC	0.326	0.849		
Off_PP	0.311	0.344	0.763	
On_PP	0.349	0.394	0.615	0.826

Table M.14. Cross-Loadings Twitter Users Sample with no Control Variables and Off_PP_3 Removed (n = 383).

Cross-Loadings				
	Bond_SC	**Brid_SC**	**Off_PP**	**On_PP**
Bond_1	**0.898**	0.267	0.251	0.291
Bond_10	**0.935**	0.289	0.282	0.329
Bond_2	**0.890**	0.234	0.251	0.303
Bond_3	**0.837**	0.401	0.278	0.322
Bond_4	**0.826**	0.189	0.296	0.286
Bond_5	**0.874**	0.292	0.299	0.314
Bond_6	**0.810**	0.299	0.268	0.215
Bond_7	**0.831**	0.146	0.222	0.241
Bond_8	**0.817**	0.275	0.245	0.322
Bond_9	**0.812**	0.361	0.251	0.326
Brid_1	0.199	**0.849**	0.273	0.320
Brid_10	0.217	**0.857**	0.341	0.428
Brid_2	0.315	**0.847**	0.277	0.296
Brid_3	0.299	**0.821**	0.265	0.274
Brid_4	0.267	**0.866**	0.310	0.357
Brid_5	0.278	**0.831**	0.269	0.281
Brid_6	0.279	**0.850**	0.225	0.287
Brid_7	0.277	**0.852**	0.256	0.280
Brid_8	0.309	**0.813**	0.296	0.358
Brid_9	0.333	**0.897**	0.362	0.397
Off_PP_1	0.228	0.258	**0.820**	0.506
Off_PP_2	0.120	0.155	**0.553**	0.343
Off_PP_4	0.228	0.217	**0.780**	0.490
Off_PP_5	0.249	0.201	**0.833**	0.492
Off_PP_6	0.287	0.400	**0.782**	0.450
Off_PP_7	0.109	0.149	**0.644**	0.367
Off_PP_8	0.270	0.282	**0.831**	0.534
Off_PP_9	0.294	0.302	**0.815**	0.534
On_PP_1	0.270	0.257	0.491	**0.829**
On_PP_2	0.288	0.390	0.384	**0.763**
On_PP_3	0.261	0.356	0.539	**0.828**
On_PP_4	0.375	0.340	0.579	**0.896**
On_PP_5	0.269	0.289	0.502	**0.859**
On_PP_6	0.240	0.293	0.557	**0.771**

Table M.15. HTMT Values for Twitter Users Sample with no Control Variables and Off_PP_3 Removed (n = 383).

HTMT				
	Bond_SC	**Brid_SC**	**Off_PP**	**On_PP**
Bond_SC				
Brid_SC	0.574			
Off_PP	0.120	0.326		
On_PP	0.248	0.393	0.759	

Table M.16. HTMT Confidence Intervals Bias Corrected for Twitter Users Sample with no Control Variables and Off_PP_3 Removed (n = 383).

HTMT CONFIDENCE INTERVALS BIAS CORRECTED (Bootstrapping 5000 Samples)					
	Original Sample (O)	**Sample Mean (M)**	**Bias**	**2.50%**	**97.50%**
Brid_SC -> Bond_SC	0.574	0.574	0	0.492	0.65
Off_PP -> Bond_SC	0.120	0.142	0.022	0.076	0.17
Off_PP -> Brid_SC	0.326	0.324	-0.001	0.208	0.429
On_PP -> Bond_SC	0.248	0.251	0.003	0.153	0.343
On_PP -> Brid_SC	0.393	0.395	0.002	0.281	0.492
On_PP -> Off_PP	0.759	0.762	0.003	0.628	0.863

APPENDIX N - CTA-PLS ANALYSIS OF THE SAMPLES TO ANSWER RESEARCH QUESTION Q1

Table N.1. Non-Redundant Tetrads of CTA that did not Vanish.

Group	Latent Variable	Non-Redundant Tetrad Number	CI Low adj.	CI Up adj.	Tetrad Vanish
HF_U	Brid_SC	64: Brid_1,Brid_10,Brid_5,Brid_9	-3.416	-0.155	**No**
LF_U	Bond_SC	80: Bond_1,Bond_10,Bond_9,Bond_7	0.497	5.617	**No**
MT_U	PEff	1: PEffic_1,PEffic_2,PEffic_3,PEffic_4	-2.262	-0.345	**No**
LT_U	PEff	2: PEffic_1,PEffic_2,PEffic_4,PEffic_3	0.143	2.035	**No**

However, it is important to note that if the CTA-PLS does not support a reflective measurement model, adjustments of the constructs must be consistent with theoretical and conceptual considerations and not just with the empirical results provided by the CTA (Hair et al., 2017). Indeed, Hair et al. (2018) argue that CTA results should not be mechanically applied. Rather, any change of measurement perspective must be substantiated by theoretical considerations, therefore confirming measurement theory. Indeed, in their analysis they rejected the reflective measurement model specification of two constructs in their model which was supported by the empirical results of the CTA in favour of the formative specification on theoretical and conceptual grounds. Hence, following Hair et al. (2018) suggestions, also the constructs reported in **Error! Reference source not found.** will not be changed to formative. This choice is supported by theoretical and conceptual considerations discussed in Section 6.5.1.2.

FACEBOOK USERS CTA-PLS ANALYSIS BEFORE REMOVING ITEM OFF_PP_3 (n = 432).

Table N.2. Bias-Corrected and Bonferroni-Adjusted Confidence Intervals of the CTA-PLS analysis for Bond_SC of Facebook Users (n = 432).

CTA – Bond_SC Non-Redundant Tetrad	CI Low adj.	CI Up adj.	Tetrad Vanish
1: Bond_1,Bond_10,Bond_2,Bond_3	-2.671	0.744	Yes
2: Bond_1,Bond_10,Bond_3,Bond_2	-1.506	1.643	Yes
4: Bond_1,Bond_10,Bond_2,Bond_4	-2.476	0.695	Yes
6: Bond_1,Bond_2,Bond_4,Bond_10	-1.922	1.698	Yes
7: Bond_1,Bond_10,Bond_2,Bond_5	-2.044	0.111	Yes
10: Bond_1,Bond_10,Bond_2,Bond_6	-2.280	0.244	Yes
13: Bond_1,Bond_10,Bond_2,Bond_7	-2.460	0.370	Yes
17: Bond_1,Bond_10,Bond_8,Bond_2	-2.290	0.937	Yes
20: Bond_1,Bond_10,Bond_9,Bond_2	-1.514	0.581	Yes
29: Bond_1,Bond_10,Bond_6,Bond_3	-1.678	1.447	Yes
31: Bond_1,Bond_10,Bond_3,Bond_7	-1.533	1.238	Yes
35: Bond_1,Bond_10,Bond_8,Bond_3	-2.459	1.310	Yes
41: Bond_1,Bond_10,Bond_5,Bond_4	-1.146	1.323	Yes
43: Bond_1,Bond_10,Bond_4,Bond_6	-1.253	2.086	Yes
47: Bond_1,Bond_10,Bond_7,Bond_4	-0.754	2.367	Yes
50: Bond_1,Bond_10,Bond_8,Bond_4	-0.953	1.941	Yes
60: Bond_1,Bond_5,Bond_7,Bond_10	-1.394	1.207	Yes
64: Bond_1,Bond_10,Bond_5,Bond_9	-1.208	1.594	Yes
66: Bond_1,Bond_5,Bond_9,Bond_10	-0.404	1.781	Yes
71: Bond_1,Bond_10,Bond_8,Bond_6	-1.086	2.373	Yes
80: Bond_1,Bond_10,Bond_9,Bond_7	-0.136	2.324	Yes
91: Bond_1,Bond_2,Bond_3,Bond_6	-0.504	3.044	Yes
120: Bond_1,Bond_5,Bond_6,Bond_2	-0.652	1.187	Yes
169: Bond_1,Bond_3,Bond_5,Bond_8	-0.896	1.826	Yes
182: Bond_1,Bond_3,Bond_9,Bond_6	-0.407	2.368	Yes
205: Bond_1,Bond_4,Bond_6,Bond_7	-0.995	2.139	Yes
233: Bond_1,Bond_5,Bond_8,Bond_7	-1.737	0.671	Yes
236: Bond_1,Bond_5,Bond_9,Bond_7	-0.833	1.573	Yes
248: Bond_1,Bond_6,Bond_9,Bond_8	-1.133	1.544	Yes
281: Bond_10,Bond_2,Bond_8,Bond_4	-0.866	2.823	Yes
324: Bond_10,Bond_4,Bond_7,Bond_3	-1.570	1.147	Yes
358: Bond_10,Bond_3,Bond_8,Bond_9	-0.502	2.192	Yes
395: Bond_10,Bond_5,Bond_8,Bond_6	-1.123	1.631	Yes
434: Bond_2,Bond_3,Bond_9,Bond_4	-0.941	2.012	Yes
526: Bond_3,Bond_4,Bond_5,Bond_6	-1.589	1.497	Yes

Table N.3. Bias-Corrected and Bonferroni-Adjusted Confidence Intervals of the CTA-PLS analysis for Brid_SC of Facebook Users (n = 432).

CTA – Brid_SC Non-Redundant Tetrad	CI Low adj.	CI Up adj.	Tetrad Vanish
1: Brid_1,Brid_10,Brid_2,Brid_3	-0.828	0.241	Yes
2: Brid_1,Brid_10,Brid_3,Brid_2	-1.068	0.110	Yes
4: Brid_1,Brid_10,Brid_2,Brid_4	-0.491	0.511	Yes
6: Brid_1,Brid_2,Brid_4,Brid_10	-0.778	0.348	Yes
7: Brid_1,Brid_10,Brid_2,Brid_5	-0.986	0.168	Yes
10: Brid_1,Brid_10,Brid_2,Brid_6	-0.718	0.260	Yes
13: Brid_1,Brid_10,Brid_2,Brid_7	-1.142	0.079	Yes
17: Brid_1,Brid_10,Brid_8,Brid_2	-0.572	0.331	Yes
20: Brid_1,Brid_10,Brid_9,Brid_2	-0.688	0.262	Yes
29: Brid_1,Brid_10,Brid_6,Brid_3	-1.066	0.331	Yes
31: Brid_1,Brid_10,Brid_3,Brid_7	-1.162	0.330	Yes
35: Brid_1,Brid_10,Brid_8,Brid_3	-0.710	0.148	Yes
41: Brid_1,Brid_10,Brid_5,Brid_4	-1.165	0.083	Yes
43: Brid_1,Brid_10,Brid_4,Brid_6	-0.735	0.535	Yes
47: Brid_1,Brid_10,Brid_7,Brid_4	-0.894	0.433	Yes
50: Brid_1,Brid_10,Brid_8,Brid_4	-0.781	0.105	Yes
60: Brid_1,Brid_5,Brid_7,Brid_10	-0.705	0.791	Yes
64: Brid_1,Brid_10,Brid_5,Brid_9	-1.736	0.115	Yes
66: Brid_1,Brid_5,Brid_9,Brid_10	-0.228	1.714	Yes
71: Brid_1,Brid_10,Brid_8,Brid_6	-0.552	0.393	Yes
80: Brid_1,Brid_10,Brid_9,Brid_7	-0.564	0.582	Yes
91: Brid_1,Brid_2,Brid_3,Brid_6	-0.419	0.766	Yes
120: Brid_1,Brid_5,Brid_6,Brid_2	-0.406	0.507	Yes
169: Brid_1,Brid_3,Brid_5,Brid_8	-0.250	1.078	Yes
182: Brid_1,Brid_3,Brid_9,Brid_6	-0.314	0.870	Yes
205: Brid_1,Brid_4,Brid_6,Brid_7	-0.431	1.324	Yes
233: Brid_1,Brid_5,Brid_8,Brid_7	-0.962	0.206	Yes
236: Brid_1,Brid_5,Brid_9,Brid_7	-0.608	0.857	Yes
248: Brid_1,Brid_6,Brid_9,Brid_8	-0.223	1.067	Yes
281: Brid_10,Brid_2,Brid_8,Brid_4	-1.019	0.143	Yes
324: Brid_10,Brid_4,Brid_7,Brid_3	-0.855	0.542	Yes
358: Brid_10,Brid_3,Brid_8,Brid_9	-0.917	0.290	Yes
395: Brid_10,Brid_5,Brid_8,Brid_6	-1.431	0.058	Yes
434: Brid_2,Brid_3,Brid_9,Brid_4	-0.406	0.546	Yes
526: Brid_3,Brid_4,Brid_5,Brid_6	-0.149	1.751	Yes

Table N.4. Bias-Corrected and Bonferroni-Adjusted Confidence Intervals of the CTA-PLS analysis for On_PP of Facebook Users (n = 432).

CTA – On_PP Non-Redundant Tetrad	CI Low adj.	CI Up adj.	Tetrad Vanish
1: On_PP_1,On_PP_2,On_PP_3,On_PP_4	-1.758	0.447	Yes
2: On_PP_1,On_PP_2,On_PP_4,On_PP_3	-1.406	0.511	Yes
4: On_PP_1,On_PP_2,On_PP_3,On_PP_5	-3.910	0.668	Yes
6: On_PP_1,On_PP_3,On_PP_5,On_PP_2	-0.659	3.422	Yes
7: On_PP_1,On_PP_2,On_PP_3,On_PP_6	-0.640	0.586	Yes
10: On_PP_1,On_PP_2,On_PP_4,On_PP_5	-3.985	0.015	Yes
16: On_PP_1,On_PP_2,On_PP_5,On_PP_6	-0.439	0.415	Yes
22: On_PP_1,On_PP_3,On_PP_4,On_PP_6	-0.471	0.788	Yes
26: On_PP_1,On_PP_3,On_PP_6,On_PP_5	-1.081	0.489	Yes

Table N.5. Bias-Corrected and Bonferroni-Adjusted Confidence Intervals of the CTA-PLS analysis for PEff of Facebook Users (n = 432).

CTA – PEff Non-Redundant Tetrad	CI Low adj.	CI Up adj.	Tetrad Vanish
1: PEffic_1,PEffic_2,PEffic_3,PEffic_4	-1.993	0.074	Yes
2: PEffic_1,PEffic_2,PEffic_4,PEffic_3	-0.495	0.462	Yes

TWITTER USERS CTA-PLS ANALYSIS BEFORE REMOVING OFF_PP_3 (n = 383).

Table N.6. Bias-Corrected and Bonferroni-Adjusted Confidence Intervals of the CTA-PLS analysis for Bond_SC of Twitter Users (n = 383).

CTA – Bond_SC Non-Redundant Tetrad	CI Low adj.	CI Up adj.	Tetrad Vanish
1: Bond_1,Bond_10,Bond_2,Bond_3	-1.165	1.457	Yes
2: Bond_1,Bond_10,Bond_3,Bond_2	-1.422	1.334	Yes
4: Bond_1,Bond_10,Bond_2,Bond_4	-1.176	0.648	Yes
6: Bond_1,Bond_2,Bond_4,Bond_10	-0.320	1.406	Yes
7: Bond_1,Bond_10,Bond_2,Bond_5	-0.474	0.857	Yes
10: Bond_1,Bond_10,Bond_2,Bond_6	-1.203	0.524	Yes
13: Bond_1,Bond_10,Bond_2,Bond_7	-0.292	1.011	Yes
17: Bond_1,Bond_10,Bond_8,Bond_2	-1.332	1.291	Yes
20: Bond_1,Bond_10,Bond_9,Bond_2	-0.818	0.774	Yes
29: Bond_1,Bond_10,Bond_6,Bond_3	-1.002	1.633	Yes
31: Bond_1,Bond_10,Bond_3,Bond_7	-1.464	0.503	Yes
35: Bond_1,Bond_10,Bond_8,Bond_3	-0.866	2.313	Yes
41: Bond_1,Bond_10,Bond_5,Bond_4	-0.776	1.366	Yes
43: Bond_1,Bond_10,Bond_4,Bond_6	-0.217	1.944	Yes
47: Bond_1,Bond_10,Bond_7,Bond_4	-0.847	1.444	Yes
50: Bond_1,Bond_10,Bond_8,Bond_4	-2.014	0.446	Yes
60: Bond_1,Bond_5,Bond_7,Bond_10	-0.821	0.270	Yes
64: Bond_1,Bond_10,Bond_5,Bond_9	-1.128	0.691	Yes
66: Bond_1,Bond_5,Bond_9,Bond_10	-0.760	0.892	Yes
71: Bond_1,Bond_10,Bond_8,Bond_6	-0.855	1.643	Yes
80: Bond_1,Bond_10,Bond_9,Bond_7	-0.806	0.744	Yes
91: Bond_1,Bond_2,Bond_3,Bond_6	-1.296	1.908	Yes
120: Bond_1,Bond_5,Bond_6,Bond_2	-0.997	0.642	Yes
169: Bond_1,Bond_3,Bond_5,Bond_8	-1.931	0.661	Yes
182: Bond_1,Bond_3,Bond_9,Bond_6	-1.071	1.429	Yes
205: Bond_1,Bond_4,Bond_6,Bond_7	-1.512	0.524	Yes
233: Bond_1,Bond_5,Bond_8,Bond_7	-1.429	0.331	Yes
236: Bond_1,Bond_5,Bond_9,Bond_7	-1.740	0.072	Yes
248: Bond_1,Bond_6,Bond_9,Bond_8	-1.551	0.843	Yes
281: Bond_10,Bond_2,Bond_8,Bond_4	-1.221	0.615	Yes
324: Bond_10,Bond_4,Bond_7,Bond_3	-1.108	0.502	Yes
358: Bond_10,Bond_3,Bond_8,Bond_9	-0.962	1.057	Yes
395: Bond_10,Bond_5,Bond_8,Bond_6	-1.153	1.036	Yes
434: Bond_2,Bond_3,Bond_9,Bond_4	-1.948	0.649	Yes
526: Bond_3,Bond_4,Bond_5,Bond_6	-0.939	1.410	Yes

Table N.7. Bias-Corrected and Bonferroni-Adjusted Confidence Intervals of the CTA-PLS analysis for Brid_SC of Twitter Users (n = 383).

CTA – Brid_SC Non-Redundant Tetrad	CI Low adj.	CI Up adj.	Tetrad Vanish
1: Brid_1,Brid_10,Brid_2,Brid_3	-0.136	1.452	Yes
2: Brid_1,Brid_10,Brid_3,Brid_2	-0.011	1.721	Yes
4: Brid_1,Brid_10,Brid_2,Brid_4	-0.431	1.061	Yes
6: Brid_1,Brid_2,Brid_4,Brid_10	-0.625	0.831	Yes
7: Brid_1,Brid_10,Brid_2,Brid_5	-0.311	1.817	Yes
10: Brid_1,Brid_10,Brid_2,Brid_6	-0.452	0.974	Yes
13: Brid_1,Brid_10,Brid_2,Brid_7	-1.027	0.533	Yes
17: Brid_1,Brid_10,Brid_8,Brid_2	-0.036	1.615	Yes
20: Brid_1,Brid_10,Brid_9,Brid_2	-0.257	0.971	Yes
29: Brid_1,Brid_10,Brid_6,Brid_3	-0.379	0.723	Yes
31: Brid_1,Brid_10,Brid_3,Brid_7	-0.908	1.269	Yes
35: Brid_1,Brid_10,Brid_8,Brid_3	-0.302	1.005	Yes
41: Brid_1,Brid_10,Brid_5,Brid_4	-0.685	1.256	Yes
43: Brid_1,Brid_10,Brid_4,Brid_6	-0.665	0.876	Yes
47: Brid_1,Brid_10,Brid_7,Brid_4	-0.690	1.276	Yes
50: Brid_1,Brid_10,Brid_8,Brid_4	-0.204	0.888	Yes
60: Brid_1,Brid_5,Brid_7,Brid_10	-0.246	1.371	Yes
64: Brid_1,Brid_10,Brid_5,Brid_9	-1.342	0.920	Yes
66: Brid_1,Brid_5,Brid_9,Brid_10	-0.390	2.019	Yes
71: Brid_1,Brid_10,Brid_8,Brid_6	-0.068	1.221	Yes
80: Brid_1,Brid_10,Brid_9,Brid_7	-0.139	0.932	Yes
91: Brid_1,Brid_2,Brid_3,Brid_6	-0.642	0.381	Yes
120: Brid_1,Brid_5,Brid_6,Brid_2	-1.190	0.281	Yes
169: Brid_1,Brid_3,Brid_5,Brid_8	-0.557	1.161	Yes
182: Brid_1,Brid_3,Brid_9,Brid_6	-0.335	1.059	Yes
205: Brid_1,Brid_4,Brid_6,Brid_7	-0.608	1.590	Yes
233: Brid_1,Brid_5,Brid_8,Brid_7	-0.330	0.939	Yes
236: Brid_1,Brid_5,Brid_9,Brid_7	-0.395	0.976	Yes
248: Brid_1,Brid_6,Brid_9,Brid_8	-0.296	1.287	Yes
281: Brid_10,Brid_2,Brid_8,Brid_4	-1.120	0.162	Yes
324: Brid_10,Brid_4,Brid_7,Brid_3	-1.340	0.500	Yes
358: Brid_10,Brid_3,Brid_8,Brid_9	-0.955	0.446	Yes
395: Brid_10,Brid_5,Brid_8,Brid_6	-1.649	0.063	Yes
434: Brid_2,Brid_3,Brid_9,Brid_4	-0.593	1.177	Yes
526: Brid_3,Brid_4,Brid_5,Brid_6	-0.426	1.435	Yes

Table N.8. Bias-Corrected and Bonferroni-Adjusted Confidence Intervals of the CTA-PLS analysis for On_PP of Twitter Users (n = 383).

CTA – On_PP Non-Redundant Tetrad	CI Low adj.	CI Up adj.	Tetrad Vanish
1: On_PP_1,On_PP_2,On_PP_3,On_PP_4	-2.804	2.325	Yes
2: On_PP_1,On_PP_2,On_PP_4,On_PP_3	-5.166	0.975	Yes
4: On_PP_1,On_PP_2,On_PP_3,On_PP_5	-5.145	2.025	Yes
6: On_PP_1,On_PP_3,On_PP_5,On_PP_2	-3.794	3.780	Yes
7: On_PP_1,On_PP_2,On_PP_3,On_PP_6	-1.128	2.989	Yes
10: On_PP_1,On_PP_2,On_PP_4,On_PP_5	-7.249	1.189	Yes
16: On_PP_1,On_PP_2,On_PP_5,On_PP_6	-1.228	3.973	Yes
22: On_PP_1,On_PP_3,On_PP_4,On_PP_6	-2.340	1.598	Yes
26: On_PP_1,On_PP_3,On_PP_6,On_PP_5	-4.675	1.004	Yes

Table N.9. Bias-Corrected and Bonferroni-Adjusted Confidence Intervals of the CTA-PLS analysis for PEff of Twitter Users (n = 383).

CTA – PEff Non-Redundant Tetrad	CI Low adj.	CI Up adj.	Tetrad Vanish
1: PEffic_1,PEffic_2,PEffic_3,PEffic_4	-1.886	0.024	Yes
2: PEffic_1,PEffic_2,PEffic_4,PEffic_3	-0.107	0.968	Yes

Facebook and Twitter Combined Users CTA-PLS Analysis Before Removing OFF_PP_3 (n = 397).

Table N.10. Bias-Corrected and Bonferroni-Adjusted Confidence Intervals of the CTA-PLS analysis for Bond_SC of Facebook and Twitter Users Combined Before Removing Off_PP_3 (n = 397).

CTA – Bond_SC Non-Redundant Tetrad	CI Low adj.	CI Up adj.	Tetrad Vanish
1: Bond_1,Bond_10,Bond_2,Bond_3	-0.830	1.685	Yes
2: Bond_1,Bond_10,Bond_3,Bond_2	-0.182	2.120	Yes
4: Bond_1,Bond_10,Bond_2,Bond_4	-1.020	1.947	Yes
6: Bond_1,Bond_2,Bond_4,Bond_10	-0.281	2.126	Yes
7: Bond_1,Bond_10,Bond_2,Bond_5	-1.728	0.756	Yes
10: Bond_1,Bond_10,Bond_2,Bond_6	-1.829	0.760	Yes
13: Bond_1,Bond_10,Bond_2,Bond_7	-1.364	1.265	Yes
17: Bond_1,Bond_10,Bond_8,Bond_2	-0.178	1.971	Yes
20: Bond_1,Bond_10,Bond_9,Bond_2	-1.364	0.527	Yes
29: Bond_1,Bond_10,Bond_6,Bond_3	-0.851	1.572	Yes
31: Bond_1,Bond_10,Bond_3,Bond_7	-1.120	1.530	Yes
35: Bond_1,Bond_10,Bond_8,Bond_3	-0.488	2.005	Yes
41: Bond_1,Bond_10,Bond_5,Bond_4	-0.517	1.582	Yes
43: Bond_1,Bond_10,Bond_4,Bond_6	-0.727	1.912	Yes
47: Bond_1,Bond_10,Bond_7,Bond_4	-0.259	2.131	Yes
50: Bond_1,Bond_10,Bond_8,Bond_4	-1.426	1.257	Yes
60: Bond_1,Bond_5,Bond_7,Bond_10	-0.653	0.780	Yes
64: Bond_1,Bond_10,Bond_5,Bond_9	-0.562	1.099	Yes
66: Bond_1,Bond_5,Bond_9,Bond_10	-1.365	0.447	Yes
71: Bond_1,Bond_10,Bond_8,Bond_6	-0.892	1.718	Yes
80: Bond_1,Bond_10,Bond_9,Bond_7	-0.961	1.112	Yes
91: Bond_1,Bond_2,Bond_3,Bond_6	-0.987	1.773	Yes
120: Bond_1,Bond_5,Bond_6,Bond_2	-1.037	0.671	Yes
169: Bond_1,Bond_3,Bond_5,Bond_8	-0.987	0.923	Yes
182: Bond_1,Bond_3,Bond_9,Bond_6	-0.916	1.639	Yes
205: Bond_1,Bond_4,Bond_6,Bond_7	-1.164	1.619	Yes
233: Bond_1,Bond_5,Bond_8,Bond_7	-2.428	0.098	Yes
236: Bond_1,Bond_5,Bond_9,Bond_7	-2.486	-0.007	Yes
248: Bond_1,Bond_6,Bond_9,Bond_8	-1.089	0.855	Yes
281: Bond_10,Bond_2,Bond_8,Bond_4	-2.258	0.019	Yes
324: Bond_10,Bond_4,Bond_7,Bond_3	-1.004	1.227	Yes
358: Bond_10,Bond_3,Bond_8,Bond_9	-0.599	1.423	Yes
395: Bond_10,Bond_5,Bond_8,Bond_6	-0.985	1.169	Yes
434: Bond_2,Bond_3,Bond_9,Bond_4	-0.278	2.053	Yes
526: Bond_3,Bond_4,Bond_5,Bond_6	-1.175	1.464	Yes

Table N.11. Bias-Corrected and Bonferroni-Adjusted Confidence Intervals of the CTA-PLS analysis for Brid_SC of Facebook and Twitter Users Combined Before Removing Off_PP_3 (n = 397).

CTA – Brid_SC Non-Redundant Tetrad	CI Low adj.	CI Up adj.	Tetrad Vanish
1: Brid_1,Brid_10,Brid_2,Brid_3	-0.280	0.837	Yes
2: Brid_1,Brid_10,Brid_3,Brid_2	-0.920	0.468	Yes
4: Brid_1,Brid_10,Brid_2,Brid_4	-0.034	1.015	Yes
6: Brid_1,Brid_2,Brid_4,Brid_10	-1.179	0.001	Yes
7: Brid_1,Brid_10,Brid_2,Brid_5	-0.329	0.842	Yes
10: Brid_1,Brid_10,Brid_2,Brid_6	-0.648	0.489	Yes
13: Brid_1,Brid_10,Brid_2,Brid_7	-0.646	0.450	Yes
17: Brid_1,Brid_10,Brid_8,Brid_2	-0.610	0.684	Yes
20: Brid_1,Brid_10,Brid_9,Brid_2	-0.249	0.635	Yes
29: Brid_1,Brid_10,Brid_6,Brid_3	-0.471	0.717	Yes
31: Brid_1,Brid_10,Brid_3,Brid_7	-0.512	0.795	Yes
35: Brid_1,Brid_10,Brid_8,Brid_3	-0.451	0.623	Yes
41: Brid_1,Brid_10,Brid_5,Brid_4	-0.440	0.682	Yes
43: Brid_1,Brid_10,Brid_4,Brid_6	-1.270	0.201	Yes
47: Brid_1,Brid_10,Brid_7,Brid_4	-0.638	0.404	Yes
50: Brid_1,Brid_10,Brid_8,Brid_4	-0.321	0.765	Yes
60: Brid_1,Brid_5,Brid_7,Brid_10	-0.837	0.213	Yes
64: Brid_1,Brid_10,Brid_5,Brid_9	-1.644	0.035	Yes
66: Brid_1,Brid_5,Brid_9,Brid_10	0.068	1.659	Yes
71: Brid_1,Brid_10,Brid_8,Brid_6	-0.545	0.746	Yes
80: Brid_1,Brid_10,Brid_9,Brid_7	-0.389	0.448	Yes
91: Brid_1,Brid_2,Brid_3,Brid_6	-0.756	0.768	Yes
120: Brid_1,Brid_5,Brid_6,Brid_2	-0.811	0.133	Yes
169: Brid_1,Brid_3,Brid_5,Brid_8	-0.098	1.119	Yes
182: Brid_1,Brid_3,Brid_9,Brid_6	-0.366	1.076	Yes
205: Brid_1,Brid_4,Brid_6,Brid_7	-0.156	1.500	Yes
233: Brid_1,Brid_5,Brid_8,Brid_7	-1.097	0.086	Yes
236: Brid_1,Brid_5,Brid_9,Brid_7	-1.205	0.035	Yes
248: Brid_1,Brid_6,Brid_9,Brid_8	-0.466	0.797	Yes
281: Brid_10,Brid_2,Brid_8,Brid_4	-0.733	0.601	Yes
324: Brid_10,Brid_4,Brid_7,Brid_3	-0.928	0.765	Yes
358: Brid_10,Brid_3,Brid_8,Brid_9	-0.697	0.309	Yes
395: Brid_10,Brid_5,Brid_8,Brid_6	-1.069	0.183	Yes
434: Brid_2,Brid_3,Brid_9,Brid_4	-1.021	0.179	Yes
526: Brid_3,Brid_4,Brid_5,Brid_6	-0.011	1.724	Yes

Table N.12. Bias-Corrected and Bonferroni-Adjusted Confidence Intervals of the CTA-PLS analysis for Off_PP of Facebook and Twitter Users Combined Before Removing Off_PP_3 (n = 397).

CTA – Off_PP Non-Redundant Tetrad	CI Low adj.	CI Up adj.	Tetrad Vanish
1: Off_PP_1,Off_PP_2,Off_PP_3,Off_PP_4	-10.263	0.728	Yes
2: Off_PP_1,Off_PP_2,Off_PP_4,Off_PP_3	-5.18	2.421	Yes
4: Off_PP_1,Off_PP_2,Off_PP_3,Off_PP_5	-3.95	3.467	Yes
6: Off_PP_1,Off_PP_3,Off_PP_5,Off_PP_2	-8.585	3.253	Yes
9: Off_PP_1,Off_PP_3,Off_PP_6,Off_PP_2	-6.668	4.441	Yes
10: Off_PP_1,Off_PP_2,Off_PP_3,Off_PP_7	-7.954	1.071	Yes
13: Off_PP_1,Off_PP_2,Off_PP_3,Off_PP_8	-11.772	0.801	Yes
17: Off_PP_1,Off_PP_2,Off_PP_9,Off_PP_3	-6.02	3.443	Yes
20: Off_PP_1,Off_PP_2,Off_PP_5,Off_PP_4	-4.702	4.367	Yes
26: Off_PP_1,Off_PP_2,Off_PP_7,Off_PP_4	-2.703	4.509	Yes
29: Off_PP_1,Off_PP_2,Off_PP_8,Off_PP_4	-3.271	4.787	Yes
33: Off_PP_1,Off_PP_4,Off_PP_9,Off_PP_2	-6.336	2.739	Yes
41: Off_PP_1,Off_PP_2,Off_PP_8,Off_PP_5	-1.408	4.383	Yes
47: Off_PP_1,Off_PP_2,Off_PP_7,Off_PP_6	-2.188	4.076	Yes
49: Off_PP_1,Off_PP_2,Off_PP_6,Off_PP_8	-6.433	2.579	Yes
51: Off_PP_1,Off_PP_6,Off_PP_8,Off_PP_2	-2.131	6.986	Yes
57: Off_PP_1,Off_PP_7,Off_PP_8,Off_PP_2	-5.055	4.223	Yes
109: Off_PP_1,Off_PP_4,Off_PP_5,Off_PP_6	-3.165	1.663	Yes
113: Off_PP_1,Off_PP_4,Off_PP_7,Off_PP_5	-3.759	0.959	Yes
133: Off_PP_1,Off_PP_4,Off_PP_7,Off_PP_9	-5.628	0.673	Yes
137: Off_PP_1,Off_PP_4,Off_PP_9,Off_PP_8	-5.819	3.193	Yes
149: Off_PP_1,Off_PP_5,Off_PP_8,Off_PP_7	-3.081	3.681	Yes
151: Off_PP_1,Off_PP_5,Off_PP_7,Off_PP_9	-2.66	2.809	Yes
161: Off_PP_1,Off_PP_6,Off_PP_9,Off_PP_7	-3.607	2.367	Yes
165: Off_PP_1,Off_PP_8,Off_PP_9,Off_PP_6	-2.837	1.967	Yes
174: Off_PP_2,Off_PP_4,Off_PP_6,Off_PP_3	-1.621	5.164	Yes
231: Off_PP_2,Off_PP_6,Off_PP_8,Off_PP_4	-7.245	2.282	Yes

Table N.13. Bias-Corrected and Bonferroni-Adjusted Confidence Intervals of the CTA-PLS analysis for On_PP of Facebook and Twitter Users Combined Before Removing Off_PP_3 (n = 397).

CTA – On_PP Non-Redundant Tetrad	CI Low adj.	CI Up adj.	Tetrad Vanish
1: On_PP_1,On_PP_2,On_PP_3,On_PP_4	-2.685	3.837	Yes
2: On_PP_1,On_PP_2,On_PP_4,On_PP_3	-3.719	2.575	Yes
4: On_PP_1,On_PP_2,On_PP_3,On_PP_5	-6.183	2.133	Yes
6: On_PP_1,On_PP_3,On_PP_5,On_PP_2	-2.648	5.955	Yes
7: On_PP_1,On_PP_2,On_PP_3,On_PP_6	-1.378	2.949	Yes
10: On_PP_1,On_PP_2,On_PP_4,On_PP_5	-6.572	2.4	Yes
16: On_PP_1,On_PP_2,On_PP_5,On_PP_6	-1.972	3.859	Yes
22: On_PP_1,On_PP_3,On_PP_4,On_PP_6	-4.298	1.695	Yes
26: On_PP_1,On_PP_3,On_PP_6,On_PP_5	-4.409	2.756	Yes

Table N.14. Bias-Corrected and Bonferroni-Adjusted Confidence Intervals of the CTA-PLS analysis for PEff of Facebook and Twitter Users Combined Before Removing Off_PP_3 (n = 397).

CTA – PEff Non-Redundant Tetrad	CI Low adj.	CI Up adj.	Tetrad Vanish
1: PEffic_1,PEffic_2,PEffic_3,PEffic_4	-1.769	0.032	Yes
2: PEffic_1,PEffic_2,PEffic_4,PEffic_3	-0.538	0.315	Yes

APPENDIX O - RESULTS STEP II MICOM ANALYSIS FOR FACEBOOK, TWITTER AND FACEBOOK AND TWITTER USERS COMBINED SAMPLES WITH CONTROL VARIABLES DVIDED IN HEAVY, MILD AND LIGHT.

Table O.1. Compositional Invariance Constructs of Facebook and Twitter Combined Users (n = 397) Against Facebook Users (n = 432).

Compositional Invariance between F+T Users and F Users				
	Original Correlation	Correlation Permutation Mean	1.7%	Permutation *p*-Values
Bond_SC	0.997	0.998	0.994	0.286
Brid_SC	0.998	0.999	0.998	0.059
Off_PP	0.999	0.999	0.997	0.477
On_PP	0.999	0.998	0.994	0.634
PEff	0.998	0.998	0.997	0.441
PInt	1.000	1.000	0.999	0.598

Table O.2. Compositional Invariance Constructs of Facebook and Twitter Combined Users (n = 397) Against Twitter Users (n = 383).

Compositional Invariance Between F+T and T Users				
	Original Correlation	Correlation Permutation Mean	1.7%	Permutation *p*-Values
Bond_SC	0.998	0.999	0.998	0.087
Brid_SC	1.000	0.999	0.998	0.531
Off_PP	0.997	0.998	0.997	0.089
On_PP	0.999	0.999	0.997	0.559
PEff	0.999	1.000	0.998	0.143
PInt	1.000	1.000	0.999	0.310

Table O.3. Compositional Invariance of Constructs of Facebook Heavy Users (n = 108) Against Twitter Heavy Users (n = 88) with Control Variables and Item Off_PP_3 Removed.

Compositional Invariance between HF_U and HT_U Samples				
	Original Correlation	Correlation Permutation Mean	1.7%	Permutation *p*-Values
Bond_SC	0.999	0.984	0.894	0.993
Brid_SC	0.999	0.997	0.991	0.892
Off_PP	0.998	0.999	0.997	0.653
On_PP	0.999	0.997	0.990	0.992
PEff	0.999	0.999	0.996	0.233
PInt	1.000	1.000	0.997	0.879

Table O.4. Compositional Invariance of Constructs of Facebook Mild Users (n = 162) Against Twitter Mild (n = 186) Users with Control Variables and Item Off_PP_3 Removed.

Compositional Invariance between MF_U and MT_U Samples				
	Original Correlation	**Correlation Permutation Mean**	**1.7%**	**Permutation *p*-Values**
Bond_SC	0.967	0.993	0.964	0.119
Brid_SC	0.998	0.999	0.997	0.127
Off_PP	0.987	0.991	0.985	0.167
On_PP	0.999	0.997	0.988	0.887
PEff	1.000	0.999	0.998	0.609
PInt	0.999	1.000	0.997	0.125

Table O.5. Compositional Invariance of Constructs of Facebook Light Users (n= 99) Against Twitter Light Users (n = 95) with Control Variables and Item Off_PP_3 Removed.

Compositional Invariance between LF_U and LT_ U Samples				
	Original Correlation	**Correlation Permutation Mean**	**1.7%**	**Permutation *p*-Values**
Bond_SC	0.986	0.974	0.850	0.428
Brid_SC	0.996	0.978	0.875	0.904
Off_PP	0.984	0.991	0.976	0.119
On_PP	0.995	0.969	0.855	0.834
PEff	0.997	0.998	0.992	0.248
PInt	1.000	0.998	0.991	0.742

Table O.6. Compositional Invariance of Constructs of Facebook and Twitter Combined Heavy Users (n = 41) Against Facebook Heavy Users (108) with Control Variables and Item Off_PP_3 Removed.

Compositional Invariance between HF+T_U and HF_U Samples				
	Original Correlation	**Correlation Permutation Mean**	**1.7%**	**Permutation *p*-Values**
Bond_SC	0.997	0.992	0.967	0.712
Brid_SC	0.999	0.989	0.908	0.867
Off_PP	0.999	0.998	0.992	0.511
On_PP	0.999	0.995	0.979	0.917
PEff	0.996	0.998	0.991	0.110
PInt	1.000	0.999	0.993	0.640

Table O.7. Compositional Invariance of Constructs of Facebook and Twitter Combined Heavy Users (n = 41) Against Twitter Heavy Users (n = 88) with Control Variables and Item Off_PP_3 Removed.

Compositional Invariance between HF+T_U and HT_U Samples				
	Original Correlation	Correlation Permutation Mean	1.7%	Permutation *p*-Values
Bond_SC	0.999	0.987	0.934	0.997
Brid_SC	0.999	0.998	0.991	0.892
Off_PP	0.999	0.999	0.997	0.648
On_PP	1.000	0.997	0.990	0.993
PEff	0.999	0.999	0.996	0.251
PInt	1.000	1.000	0.997	0.865

Table O.8. Compositional Invariance of Constructs of Facebook and Twitter Combined Mild Users (n = 78) Against Facebook Mild Users (n = 162) with Control Variables and Item Off_PP_3 Removed.

Compositional Invariance between MF+T_U and MF_U Samples				
	Original Correlation	Correlation Permutation Mean	1.7%	Permutation *p*-Values
Bond_SC	0.985	0.962	0.924	0.866
Brid_SC	0.996	0.994	0.981	0.560
Off_PP	0.998	0.991	0.970	0.924
On_PP	0.999	0.969	0.836	0.998
PEff	0.999	0.997	0.987	0.712
PInt	1.000	0.999	0.991	0.578

Table O.9. Compositional Invariance of Constructs of Facebook and Twitter Combined Mild Users (n = 78) Against Twitter Mild Users (186) with Control Variables and Item Off_PP_3 Removed.

Compositional Invariance between MF+T_U and MT_U Samples				
	Original Correlation	Correlation Permutation Mean	1.7%	Permutation *p*-Values
Bond_SC	0.994	0.993	0.964	0.140
Brid_SC	0.999	0.999	0.998	0.508
Off_PP	0.997	0.995	0.983	0.746
On_PP	0.999	0.992	0.970	0.942
PEff	0.998	0.999	0.996	0.078
PInt	0.997	0.999	0.996	0.057

Table O.10. Compositional Invariance of Constructs of Facebook and Twitter Combined Light Users (n = 45) Against Facebook Light Users (n = 99) with Control Variables and Item Off_PP_3 Removed.

Compositional Invariance between LF+T_U and LF_U Samples				
	Original Correlation	**Correlation Permutation Mean**	**1.7%**	**Permutation *p*-Values**
Bond_SC	0.978	0.981	0.963	0.273
Brid_SC	0.990	0.968	0.908	0.387
Off_PP	0.986	0.989	0.981	0.134
On_PP	0.999	0.972	0.888	0.878
PEff	0.999	0.998	0.990	0.432
PInt	0.991	0.995	0.980	0.221

Table O.11. Compositional Invariance Constructs of Facebook and Twitter Combined Light Users (n = 45) Against Twitter Light Users (n= 95) with Control Variables and Item Off_PP_3 Removed.

Compositional Invariance between LF+T_U and LT_U Samples				
	Original Correlation	**Correlation Permutation Mean**	**1.7%**	**Permutation *p*-Values**
Bond_SC	0.991	0.978	0.895	0.378
Brid_SC	0.976	0.905	0.901	0.632
Off_PP	0.992	0.990	0.971	0.482
On_PP	0.943	0.962	0.875	0.188
PEff	0.997	0.997	0.989	0.376
PInt	0.998	0.998	0.990	0.288

APPENDIX P - MODEL COMPARISONS WITH AND WITHOUT CONTROL VARIABLES FOR FACEBOOK AND TWITTER USERS COMBINED SAMPLE

Table P.1. Model Comparison With and Without Controls Variables for Facebook and Twitter Combined Users Samples and Item Off_PP_3 Removed (n = 397).

Model Comparison of the Sample of Facebook and Twitter Combined Users with and without the Moderator Int_SNS_Use											
LV	**Model**	**In-Sample Measures**					**Out-of-Sample Measures**			**Model fit measures**	
		R^2	**R^2adj**	**AICu**	**AICc**	**BIC**	**RMSE**	**MAD**	**Q^2**	**RMS_{Theta}**	**SRMR**
Off_PP	No Moderation	0.055	0.050	-14.516	381.574	-5.576	0.994	0.702	0.030	0.109	0.102
	Moderation	0.262	0.247	-94.586	295.881	-67.834	0.893	0.639	0.146	0.106	0.072
On_PP	No Moderation	0.095	0.090	-31.469	364.622	-22.528	0.966	0.717	0.053	0.109	0.102
	Moderation	0.215	0.199	-69.916	320.550	-43.165	0.916	0.676	0.126	0.106	0.072

Table P.2. F test for Significance of the Change in R2 Between the Models Without and With Control Variables of Facebook and Twitter Combined Users Samples with Item Off_PP_3 Removed (n = 397).

Significance Test R^2				
LV	**Model**	**F test**	**F critical**	**Sig.**
Off_PP	No Controls	18.138	2.122	Yes
	Controls			
On_PP	No Controls	9.885	2.122	Yes
	Controls			

APPENDIX Q - MEASUREMENT MODEL ASSESSMENT FOR FACEBOOK AND TWITTER COMBINED USERS.

Facebook and Twitter Combined Users Entire Sample Measurement Model Assessment with Control Variables and Off_PP_3 Removed (n = 397)

Table Q.1. Summary Measurement Model Assessment Metrics for Facebook and Twitter Users Sample with No Control Variables and Item Off_PP_3 Removed (n = 397).

LV	Indicators	Convergent Validity			Internal Reliability	
		Loadings	Communality	AVE	Composite reliability	Cronbach's Alpha
Bond_SC	Bond_1	0.813	0.661	0.612	0.940	0.930
	Bond_2	0.788	0.621			
	Bond_3	0.749	0.561			
	Bond_4	0.736	0.542			
	Bond_5	0.761	0.579			
	Bond_6	0.732	0.536			
	Bond_7	0.764	0.584			
	Bond_8	0.806	0.650			
	Bond_9	0.793	0.629			
	Bond_10	0.874	0.764			
Brid_SC	Brid_1	0.863	0.745	0.687	0.956	0.950
	Brid_2	0.865	0.748			
	Brid_3	0.832	0.692			
	Brid_4	0.822	0.676			
	Brid_5	0.857	0.734			
	Brid_6	0.807	0.651			
	Brid_7	0.762	0.581			
	Brid_8	0.808	0.653			
	Brid_9	0.866	0.750			
	Brid_10	0.802	0.643			
Off_PP	Off_PP_1	0.758	0.575	0.602	0.924	0.906
	Off_PP_2	0.737	0.543			
	Off_PP_4	0.779	0.607			
	Off_PP_5	0.806	0.650			
	Off_PP_6	0.767	0.588			
	Off_PP_7	0.734	0.539			

LV	Indicators	Convergent Validity			Internal Reliability	
		Loadings	Communality	AVE	Composite reliability	Cronbach's Alpha
	Off_PP_8	0.814	0.663			
	Off_PP_9	0.807	0.651			
On_PP	On_PP_1	0.804	0.646	0.629	0.910	0.882
	On_PP_2	0.750	0.563			
	On_PP_3	0.840	0.706			
	On_PP_4	0.873	0.762			
	On_PP_5	0.796	0.634			
	On_PP_6	0.678	0.460			

Table Q.2. Fornell-Larcker Criterion Facebook and Twitter Combined Users Sample with no Control Variables and Item Off_PP_3 Removed (n = 397).

Fornell-Larcker Criterion				
	Bond_SC	**Brid_SC**	**Off_PP**	**On_PP**
Bond_SC	0.783			
Brid_SC	0.403	0.829		
Off_PP	0.193	0.200	0.776	
On_PP	0.284	0.223	0.544	0.793

Table Q.3. Cross-Loadings Facebook and Twitter Combined Users Sample with no Control Variables and Item Off_PP_3 Removed (n = 397).

Cross-Loadings				
	Bond_SC	**Brid_SC**	**Off_PP**	**On_PP**
Bond_1	**0.813**	0.367	0.179	0.229
Bond_10	**0.874**	0.381	0.132	0.185
Bond_2	**0.788**	0.272	0.119	0.197
Bond_3	**0.749**	0.342	0.056	0.188
Bond_4	**0.736**	0.200	0.144	0.229
Bond_5	**0.761**	0.241	0.159	0.187
Bond_6	**0.732**	0.288	0.089	0.160
Bond_7	**0.764**	0.216	0.135	0.205
Bond_8	**0.806**	0.367	0.137	0.220
Bond_9	**0.793**	0.418	0.253	0.326
Brid_1	0.310	**0.863**	0.125	0.143
Brid_10	0.286	**0.802**	0.198	0.293
Brid_2	0.345	**0.865**	0.167	0.161
Brid_3	0.384	**0.832**	0.160	0.138
Brid_4	0.323	**0.822**	0.162	0.189
Brid_5	0.348	**0.857**	0.148	0.119
Brid_6	0.414	**0.807**	0.135	0.136
Brid_7	0.324	**0.762**	0.165	0.131
Brid_8	0.298	**0.808**	0.157	0.153
Brid_9	0.343	**0.866**	0.194	0.257
Off_PP_1	0.106	0.131	**0.758**	0.390
Off_PP_2	0.109	0.204	**0.737**	0.376
Off_PP_4	0.201	0.156	**0.779**	0.413

Cross-Loadings				
Off_PP_5	0.180	0.118	**0.806**	0.478
Off_PP_6	0.126	0.126	**0.767**	0.440
Off_PP_7	0.116	0.133	**0.734**	0.409
Off_PP_8	0.149	0.187	**0.814**	0.422
Off_PP_9	0.186	0.167	**0.807**	0.449
On_PP_1	0.219	0.115	0.369	**0.804**
On_PP_2	0.228	0.260	0.362	**0.750**
On_PP_3	0.256	0.201	0.490	**0.840**
On_PP_4	0.264	0.161	0.494	**0.873**
On_PP_5	0.232	0.151	0.426	**0.796**
On_PP_6	0.099	0.145	0.479	**0.678**

Table Q.4. HTMT Values for Facebook and Twitter Combined Users Sample with no Control Variables and Item Off_PP_3 Removed (n = 397).

HTMT				
	Bond_SC	**Brid_SC**	**Off_PP**	**On_PP**
Bond_SC				
Brid_SC	0.424			
Off_PP	0.192	0.205		
On_PP	0.287	0.219	0.617	

Table Q.5. HTMT Confidence Intervals Bias Corrected for Facebook and Twitter Combined Users Sample with no Control Variables and Item Off_PP_3 Removed (n = 397).

HTMT CONFIDENCE INTERVALS BIAS CORRECTED (Bootstrapping 5000 Samples)					
	Original Sample (O)	**Sample Mean (M)**	**Bias**	**2.50%**	**97.50%**
Brid_SC -> Bond_SC	0.424	0.423	-0.001	0.327	0.515
Off_PP -> Bond_SC	0.192	0.201	0.008	0.101	0.292
Off_PP -> Brid_SC	0.205	0.206	0.001	0.118	0.298
On_PP -> Bond_SC	0.287	0.29	0.003	0.176	0.391
On_PP -> Brid_SC	0.219	0.221	0.002	0.134	0.315
On_PP -> Off_PP	0.617	0.615	-0.001	0.499	0.719

Table Q.6. Fornell-Larcker Criterion Facebook and Twitter Combined Users Sample with Control Variables and Item Off_PP_3 Removed (n = 397).

Fornell-Larcker Criterion						
	Bond_SC	**Brid_SC**	**Off_PP**	**On_PP**	**PEff**	**PInt**
Bond_SC	0.783					
Brid_SC	0.403	0.829				
Off_PP	0.189	0.200	0.776			
On_PP	0.280	0.221	0.549	0.794		
PEff	0.090	0.146	0.412	0.213	0.878	
PInt	0.151	0.223	0.421	0.304	0.459	0.936

Table Q.7. Cross-Loadings Facebook and Twitter Combined Users Sample with Control Variables and Item Off_PP_3 Removed (n = 397).

Cross-loadings						
	Bond_SC	**Brid_SC**	**Off_PP**	**On_PP**	**PEff**	**PInt**
Bond_1	**0.813**	0.367	0.178	0.225	0.055	0.087
Bond_10	**0.874**	0.381	0.129	0.181	0.091	0.092
Bond_2	**0.788**	0.272	0.117	0.191	0.023	0.158
Bond_3	**0.747**	0.342	0.050	0.182	0.012	0.049
Bond_4	**0.736**	0.200	0.140	0.227	-0.011	0.102
Bond_5	**0.761**	0.241	0.156	0.185	0.086	0.060
Bond_6	**0.732**	0.288	0.084	0.159	0.079	0.153
Bond_7	**0.764**	0.216	0.131	0.203	0.071	0.074
Bond_8	**0.806**	0.367	0.134	0.217	0.092	0.134
Bond_9	**0.793**	0.417	0.247	0.323	0.151	0.209
Brid_1	0.310	**0.862**	0.124	0.139	0.100	0.188
Brid_10	0.286	**0.803**	0.199	0.295	0.105	0.160
Brid_2	0.345	**0.865**	0.170	0.161	0.111	0.190
Brid_3	0.384	**0.832**	0.161	0.136	0.207	0.238
Brid_4	0.323	**0.821**	0.162	0.187	0.103	0.164
Brid_5	0.348	**0.856**	0.147	0.116	0.108	0.166
Brid_6	0.414	**0.807**	0.134	0.132	0.059	0.207
Brid_7	0.323	**0.762**	0.164	0.128	0.142	0.200
Brid_8	0.298	**0.807**	0.156	0.150	0.094	0.186
Brid_9	0.343	**0.866**	0.195	0.257	0.166	0.177
Off_PP_1	0.106	0.132	**0.770**	0.399	0.297	0.294
Off_PP_2	0.109	0.204	**0.750**	0.377	0.383	0.357
Off_PP_4	0.201	0.156	**0.761**	0.415	0.276	0.336
Off_PP_5	0.180	0.118	**0.798**	0.486	0.261	0.283
Off_PP_6	0.126	0.126	**0.763**	0.448	0.273	0.280
Off_PP_7	0.116	0.133	**0.751**	0.414	0.343	0.339
Off_PP_8	0.149	0.187	**0.810**	0.425	0.316	0.350
Off_PP_9	0.186	0.167	**0.802**	0.454	0.370	0.351
On_PP_1	0.219	0.115	0.367	**0.801**	0.094	0.189
On_PP_2	0.228	0.260	0.362	**0.735**	0.163	0.292
On_PP_3	0.256	0.202	0.493	**0.841**	0.231	0.262
On_PP_4	0.264	0.161	0.489	**0.870**	0.193	0.240
On_PP_5	0.232	0.151	0.422	**0.803**	0.121	0.225
On_PP_6	0.100	0.146	0.482	**0.702**	0.204	0.228
PEffic_1	0.072	0.112	0.376	0.227	**0.919**	0.419
PEffic_2	0.094	0.162	0.362	0.173	**0.875**	0.434
PEffic_3	0.071	0.074	0.311	0.121	**0.807**	0.310
PEffic_4	0.080	0.157	0.390	0.213	**0.905**	0.432
PInt_1	0.166	0.227	0.410	0.299	0.364	**0.899**
PInt_2	0.120	0.210	0.393	0.263	0.467	**0.952**
PInt_3	0.135	0.188	0.376	0.289	0.460	**0.956**

Table Q.8. HTMT Values for Facebook and Twitter Combined Users Sample with Control Variables and Item Off_PP_3 Removed (n = 397).

HTMT						
	Bond_SC	**Brid_SC**	**Off_PP**	**On_PP**	**PEff**	**PInt**
Bond_SC						
Brid_SC	0.424					
Off_PP	0.192	0.205				
On_PP	0.287	0.219	0.617			
PEff	0.095	0.153	0.447	0.233		
PInt	0.153	0.24	0.454	0.333	0.499	

Table Q.9. HTMT Confidence Intervals Bias Corrected for Facebook and Twitter Combined Users Sample with Control Variables and Item Off_PP_3 Removed (n = 397).

HTMT CONFIDENCE INTERVALS BIAS CORRECTED (Bootstrapping 5000 Samples)					
	Original Sample (O)	**Sample Mean (M)**	**Bias**	**2.50%**	**97.50%**
Bond_SC -> Age	0.090	0.103	0.013	0.045	0.168
Brid_SC -> Age	0.046	0.068	0.022	0.025	0.054
Brid_SC -> Bond_SC	0.424	0.424	0.000	0.325	0.512
Education -> Age	0.114	0.113	0.000	0.021	0.209
Education -> Bond_SC	0.048	0.070	0.023	0.023	0.056
Education -> Brid_SC	0.039	0.063	0.024	0.017	0.045
Gender -> Age	0.183	0.181	-0.001	0.086	0.280
Gender -> Bond_SC	0.117	0.122	0.005	0.051	0.209
Gender -> Brid_SC	0.056	0.072	0.016	0.026	0.117
Gender -> Education	0.015	0.042	0.027	0.000	0.052
Off_PP -> Age	0.097	0.114	0.018	0.054	0.143
Off_PP -> Bond_SC	0.192	0.200	0.008	0.101	0.297
Off_PP -> Brid_SC	0.205	0.207	0.001	0.118	0.297
Off_PP -> Education	0.084	0.100	0.015	0.036	0.160
Off_PP -> Gender	0.047	0.076	0.029	0.018	0.060
On_PP -> Age	0.167	0.176	0.008	0.080	0.256
On_PP -> Bond_SC	0.287	0.290	0.002	0.176	0.394
On_PP -> Brid_SC	0.219	0.220	0.001	0.136	0.319
On_PP -> Education	0.060	0.077	0.017	0.022	0.119
On_PP -> Gender	0.148	0.158	0.010	0.078	0.229
On_PP -> Off_PP	0.617	0.615	-0.002	0.498	0.720
PEff -> Age	0.152	0.152	0.001	0.056	0.257
PEff -> Bond_SC	0.095	0.115	0.020	0.055	0.167
PEff -> Brid_SC	0.153	0.160	0.007	0.075	0.251
PEff -> Education	0.164	0.164	0.000	0.074	0.264
PEff -> Gender	0.341	0.341	0.000	0.246	0.432
PEff -> Off_PP	0.447	0.447	0.000	0.365	0.515
PEff -> On_PP	0.233	0.235	0.002	0.129	0.342
PInt -> Age	0.123	0.124	0.001	0.034	0.226
PInt -> Bond_SC	0.153	0.158	0.005	0.075	0.252
PInt -> Brid_SC	0.240	0.239	-0.001	0.130	0.344

HTMT CONFIDENCE INTERVALS BIAS CORRECTED (Bootstrapping 5000 Samples)					
	Original Sample (O)	**Sample Mean (M)**	**Bias**	**2.50%**	**97.50%**
PInt -> Education	0.040	0.056	0.017	0.007	0.068
PInt -> Gender	0.081	0.091	0.011	0.023	0.172
PInt -> Off_PP	0.454	0.453	0.000	0.377	0.518
PInt -> On_PP	0.333	0.332	-0.001	0.230	0.434
PInt -> PEff	0.499	0.499	0.000	0.405	0.589
Pknow -> Age	0.432	0.432	0.000	0.348	0.507
Pknow -> Bond_SC	0.104	0.111	0.008	0.053	0.196
Pknow -> Brid_SC	0.045	0.068	0.022	0.024	0.052
Pknow -> Education	0.166	0.167	0.001	0.068	0.259
Pknow -> Gender	0.461	0.460	-0.001	0.378	0.538
Pknow -> Off_PP	0.158	0.161	0.003	0.068	0.260
Pknow -> On_PP	0.055	0.075	0.021	0.019	0.111
Pknow -> PEff	0.506	0.505	-0.001	0.418	0.586
Pknow -> PInt	0.249	0.249	0.000	0.153	0.342

Facebook and Twitter Combined Heavy Users Sample Measurement Model Assessment with Control Variables and Off_PP_3 Removed (n = 41)

Table Q.10. Summary Measurement Model Assessment Metrics for Facebook and Twitter Combined Heavy Users Sample with Control Variables and Item Off_PP_3 Removed (n = 41).

LV	Indicators	Convergent Validity			Internal Reliability		Discriminant Validity			
		Loadings	Communality	AVE	CR	CA	Fornell Larcker Criterion	Cross Loadings	HTMT	HTMT CI
Bond_SC	Bond_1	0.839	0.704	0.558	0.925	0.911	OK	OK	OK	OK
	Bond_2	0.752	0.566							
	Bond_3	0.537	0.288							
	Bond_4	0.764	0.584							
	Bond_5	0.833	0.694							
	Bond_6	0.746	0.557							
	Bond_7	0.724	0.524							
	Bond_8	0.692	0.479							
	Bond_9	0.636	0.404							
	Bond_10	0.882	0.778							
Brid_SC	Brid_1	0.869	0.755	0.667	0.952	0.944	OK	OK	OK	OK
	Brid_2	0.818	0.669							
	Brid_3	0.851	0.724							
	Brid_4	0.867	0.752							
	Brid_5	0.829	0.687							
	Brid_6	0.824	0.679							
	Brid_7	0.758	0.575							
	Brid_8	0.662	0.438							
	Brid_9	0.867	0.752							

LV	Indicators	Convergent Validity			Internal Reliability		Discriminant Validity			
		Loadings	Communality	AVE	CR	CA	Fornell Larcker Criterion	Cross Loadings	HTMT	HTMT CI
	Brid_10	0.800	0.640							
Off_PP	Off_PP_1	0.719	0.517	0.682	0.945	0.933	OK	OK	OK	OK
	Off_PP_2	0.774	0.599							
	Off_PP_4	0.800	0.640							
	Off_PP_5	0.877	0.769							
	Off_PP_6	0.902	0.814							
	Off_PP_7	0.872	0.760							
	Off_PP_8	0.835	0.697							
	Off_PP_9	0.810	0.656							
On_PP	On_PP_1	0.834	0.696	0.646	0.916	0.889	OK	OK	OK	OK
	On_PP_2	0.742	0.551							
	On_PP_3	0.858	0.736							
	On_PP_4	0.887	0.787							
	On_PP_5	0.790	0.624							
	On_PP_6	0.696	0.484							
PEff	PEffic_1	0.912	0.832	0.785	0.936	0.908	OK	OK	OK	OK
	PEffic_2	0.87	0.757							
	PEffic_3	0.842	0.709							
	PEffic_4	0.917	0.841							
PInt	PInt_1	0.947	0.897	0.928	0.975	0.961	OK	OK	OK	OK
	PInt_2	0.967	0.935							
	PInt_3	0.977	0.955							

Table Q.11. Fornell-Larcker Criterion Facebook and Twitter Combined Heavy Users Sample with Control Variables and Item Off_PP_3 Removed (n = 41).

Fornell-Larcker Criterion						
	Bond_SC	**Brid_SC**	**Off_PP**	**On_PP**	**PEff**	**PInt**
Bond_SC	0.747					
Brid_SC	0.404	0.817				
Off_PP	0.530	0.232	0.826			
On_PP	0.413	0.553	0.463	0.804		
PEff	0.374	0.559	0.595	0.451	0.886	
PInt	0.427	0.055	0.477	0.366	0.360	0.963

Table Q.12. Cross-Loadings Facebook and Twitter Combined Heavy Users Sample with Control Variables and Item Off_PP_3 Removed (n = 41).

Cross-loadings						
	Bond_SC	**Brid_SC**	**Off_PP**	**On_PP**	**PEff**	**PInt**
Bond_1	**0.839**	0.295	0.422	0.221	0.286	0.340
Bond_10	**0.882**	0.343	0.480	0.278	0.331	0.399
Bond_2	**0.752**	0.210	0.270	0.247	0.232	0.401
Bond_3	**0.537**	0.158	0.171	0.173	0.263	0.219
Bond_4	**0.764**	0.513	0.466	0.477	0.348	0.264
Bond_5	**0.833**	0.408	0.492	0.411	0.265	0.235
Bond_6	**0.746**	0.204	0.445	0.215	0.308	0.446
Bond_7	**0.724**	0.214	0.427	0.253	0.182	0.215
Bond_8	**0.692**	0.361	0.202	0.272	0.379	0.193
Bond_9	**0.636**	0.170	0.367	0.385	0.226	0.472
Brid_1	0.146	**0.869**	0.123	0.483	0.407	-0.058
Brid_10	0.258	**0.800**	-0.004	0.464	0.324	-0.072
Brid_2	0.319	**0.818**	0.198	0.284	0.462	0.079
Brid_3	0.367	**0.851**	0.138	0.425	0.595	0.059
Brid_4	0.343	**0.867**	0.185	0.464	0.453	0.132
Brid_5	0.371	**0.829**	0.284	0.409	0.495	0.059
Brid_6	0.440	**0.824**	0.326	0.504	0.526	0.157
Brid_7	0.150	**0.758**	0.205	0.294	0.376	-0.118
Brid_8	0.422	**0.662**	0.211	0.441	0.358	0.018
Brid_9	0.388	**0.867**	0.183	0.603	0.517	0.105
Off_PP_1	0.306	0.103	**0.719**	0.207	0.368	0.218
Off_PP_2	0.486	0.343	**0.774**	0.414	0.489	0.281
Off_PP_4	0.277	0.162	**0.800**	0.410	0.500	0.534
Off_PP_5	0.548	0.161	**0.877**	0.385	0.457	0.370
Off_PP_6	0.483	0.145	**0.902**	0.435	0.458	0.464
Off_PP_7	0.427	0.235	**0.872**	0.404	0.473	0.464
Off_PP_8	0.412	0.129	**0.835**	0.366	0.550	0.428
Off_PP_9	0.501	0.250	**0.810**	0.403	0.604	0.373
On_PP_1	0.232	0.367	0.378	**0.834**	0.283	0.413
On_PP_2	0.149	0.451	0.043	**0.742**	0.299	0.328
On_PP_3	0.441	0.473	0.502	**0.858**	0.472	0.263
On_PP_4	0.512	0.538	0.420	**0.887**	0.412	0.282
On_PP_5	0.333	0.403	0.403	**0.790**	0.301	0.310
On_PP_6	0.280	0.411	0.501	**0.696**	0.380	0.177

Cross-loadings						
PEffic_1	0.243	0.450	0.464	0.422	**0.912**	0.233
PEffic_2	0.176	0.469	0.493	0.298	**0.870**	0.232
PEffic_3	0.573	0.494	0.607	0.449	**0.842**	0.441
PEffic_4	0.271	0.557	0.519	0.408	**0.917**	0.332
PInt_1	0.346	0.040	0.443	0.333	0.352	**0.947**
PInt_2	0.460	0.065	0.485	0.376	0.349	**0.967**
PInt_3	0.422	0.053	0.449	0.347	0.339	**0.977**

Table Q.13. HTMT Values for Facebook and Twitter Combined Heavy Users Sample with Control Variables and Item Off_PP_3 Removed (n = 41).

HTMT						
	Bond_SC	**Brid_SC**	**Off_PP**	**On_PP**	**PEff**	**PInt**
Bond_SC						
Brid_SC	0.411					
Off_PP	0.535	0.257				
On_PP	0.445	0.581	0.531			
PEff	0.397	0.595	0.635	0.489		
PInt	0.455	0.116	0.501	0.398	0.374	

Table Q.14. HTMT Confidence Intervals Bias Corrected for Facebook and Twitter Combined Heavy Users Sample with Control Variables and Item Off_PP_3 Removed (n = 41).

HTMT CONFIDENCE INTERVALS BIAS CORRECTED (Bootstrapping 5000 Samples)					
	Original Sample (O)	**Sample Mean (M)**	**Bias**	**2.50%**	**97.50%**
Bond_SC -> Age	0.103	0.203	0.100	0.062	0.103
Brid_SC -> Age	0.092	0.190	0.098	0.041	0.105
Brid_SC -> Bond_SC	0.411	0.455	0.044	0.249	0.588
Education -> Age	0.235	0.244	0.009	0.014	0.494
Education -> Bond_SC	0.115	0.214	0.099	0.055	0.123
Education -> Brid_SC	0.133	0.203	0.070	0.049	0.172
Gender -> Age	0.061	0.142	0.081	0.000	0.196
Gender -> Bond_SC	0.183	0.242	0.059	0.067	0.331
Gender -> Brid_SC	0.114	0.190	0.076	0.054	0.157
Gender -> Education	0.162	0.186	0.024	0.009	0.434
Off_PP -> Age	0.083	0.199	0.117	0.040	0.087
Off_PP -> Bond_SC	0.535	0.569	0.035	0.322	0.690
Off_PP -> Brid_SC	0.257	0.313	0.056	0.152	0.363
Off_PP -> Education	0.126	0.208	0.082	0.044	0.189
Off_PP -> Gender	0.239	0.279	0.039	0.111	0.355
On_PP -> Age	0.174	0.229	0.056	0.057	0.281
On_PP -> Bond_SC	0.445	0.482	0.038	0.294	0.590
On_PP -> Brid_SC	0.581	0.583	0.003	0.392	0.739
On_PP -> Education	0.218	0.266	0.048	0.082	0.442
On_PP -> Gender	0.210	0.258	0.048	0.089	0.407
On_PP -> Off_PP	0.531	0.546	0.015	0.301	0.708

HTMT CONFIDENCE INTERVALS BIAS CORRECTED (Bootstrapping 5000 Samples)					
PEff -> Age	0.046	0.158	0.111	0.013	0.052
PEff -> Bond_SC	0.397	0.438	0.041	0.245	0.623
PEff -> Brid_SC	0.595	0.603	0.008	0.287	0.818
PEff -> Education	0.030	0.152	0.122	0.007	0.019
PEff -> Gender	0.097	0.174	0.078	0.019	0.159
PEff -> Off_PP	0.635	0.638	0.003	0.451	0.785
PEff -> On_PP	0.489	0.494	0.004	0.222	0.754
PInt -> Age	0.072	0.148	0.077	0.007	0.225
PInt -> Bond_SC	0.455	0.468	0.013	0.229	0.690
PInt -> Brid_SC	0.116	0.206	0.090	0.081	0.125
PInt -> Education	0.082	0.155	0.073	0.007	0.196
PInt -> Gender	0.097	0.167	0.070	0.008	0.251
PInt -> Off_PP	0.501	0.501	0.000	0.264	0.684
PInt -> On_PP	0.398	0.410	0.012	0.155	0.679
PInt -> PEff	0.374	0.381	0.007	0.117	0.636
Pknow -> Age	0.180	0.198	0.018	0.008	0.446
Pknow -> Bond_SC	0.090	0.197	0.107	0.057	0.086
Pknow -> Brid_SC	0.187	0.246	0.059	0.075	0.322
Pknow -> Education	0.084	0.141	0.057	0.001	0.277
Pknow -> Gender	0.167	0.189	0.022	0.008	0.447
Pknow -> Off_PP	0.145	0.246	0.102	0.050	0.270
Pknow -> On_PP	0.146	0.218	0.073	0.035	0.350
Pknow -> PEff	0.448	0.454	0.007	0.152	0.708
Pknow -> PInt	0.227	0.247	0.020	0.035	0.502

Facebook and Twitter Combined Mild Users Sample Measurement Model Assessment with Control Variables and Off_PP_3 Removed (n = 78)

Table Q.15. Summary Measurement Model Assessment Metrics for Facebook and Twitter Combined Mild Users Sample with Control Variables and Item Off_PP_3 Removed (n = 78).

LV	Indicators	Convergent Validity			Internal Reliability		Discriminant Validity			
		Loadings	Communality	AVE	CR	CA	Fornell Larcker Criterion	Cross Loadings	HTMT	HTMT CI
Bond_SC	Bond_1	0.825	0.681	0.577	0.931	0.920	OK	OK	OK	OK
	Bond_2	0.808	0.653							
	Bond_3	0.792	0.627							
	Bond_4	0.615	0.378							
	Bond_5	0.737	0.543							
	Bond_6	0.668	0.446							
	Bond_7	0.651	0.424							
	Bond_8	0.79	0.624							
	Bond_9	0.763	0.582							
	Bond_10	0.902	0.814							
Brid_SC	Brid_1	0.781	0.610	0.620	0.942	0.932	OK	OK	OK	OK
	Brid_2	0.86	0.740							
	Brid_3	0.801	0.642							
	Brid_4	0.689	0.475							
	Brid_5	0.839	0.704							
	Brid_6	0.843	0.711							
	Brid_7	0.729	0.531							
	Brid_8	0.757	0.573							

LV	Indicators	Convergent Validity			Internal Reliability		Discriminant Validity			
		Loadings	Communality	AVE	CR	CA	Fornell Larcker Criterion	Cross Loadings	HTMT	HTMT CI
	Brid_9	0.834	0.696							
	Brid_10	0.725	0.526							
Off_PP	Off_PP_1	0.727	0.529	0.471	0.875	0.840	OK	OK	OK	OK
	Off_PP_2	0.763	0.582							
	Off_PP_4	0.652	0.425							
	Off_PP_5	0.627	0.393							
	Off_PP_6	0.623	0.388							
	Off_PP_7	0.518	0.268							
	Off_PP_8	0.747	0.558							
	Off_PP_9	0.789	0.623							
On_PP	On_PP_1	0.722	0.521	0.414	0.804	0.706	OK	OK	OK	OK
	On_PP_2	0.699	0.489							
	On_PP_3	0.491	0.241							
	On_PP_4	0.796	0.634							
	On_PP_5	0.551	0.304							
	On_PP_6	0.544	0.296							
PEff	PEffic_1	0.926	0.857	0.779	0.934	0.905	OK	OK	OK	OK
	PEffic_2	0.883	0.780							
	PEffic_3	0.816	0.666							
	PEffic_4	0.902	0.814							
PInt	PInt_1	0.861	0.741	0.849	0.944	0.910	OK	OK	OK	OK
	PInt_2	0.962	0.925							
	PInt_3	0.939	0.882							

Table Q.16. Fornell-Larcker Criterion Facebook and Twitter Combined Mild Users Sample with Control Variables and Item Off_PP_3 Removed (n = 78).

Fornell-Larcker Criterion						
	Bond_SC	**Brid_SC**	**Off_PP**	**On_PP**	**PEff**	**PInt**
Bond_SC	0.760					
Brid_SC	0.617	0.788				
Off_PP	0.261	0.291	0.686			
On_PP	0.011	0.145	0.050	0.643		
PEff	-0.019	0.168	0.413	-0.026	0.882	
PInt	0.021	0.251	0.516	-0.026	0.771	0.922

Table Q.17. Cross-Loadings Facebook and Twitter Combined Mild Users Sample with Control Variables and Item Off_PP_3 Removed (n = 78).

Cross-loadings						
	Bond_SC	**Brid_SC**	**Off_PP**	**On_PP**	**PEff**	**PInt**
Bond_1	**0.825**	0.549	0.167	-0.021	-0.104	-0.067
Bond_10	**0.902**	0.550	0.180	-0.047	0.020	0.092
Bond_2	**0.808**	0.505	0.296	-0.046	0.005	0.111
Bond_3	**0.792**	0.518	0.123	0.052	-0.111	-0.037
Bond_4	**0.615**	0.424	0.123	-0.039	-0.113	0.036
Bond_5	**0.737**	0.313	0.230	-0.030	0.077	-0.044
Bond_6	**0.668**	0.374	0.029	-0.025	-0.037	0.048
Bond_7	**0.651**	0.311	0.037	-0.088	-0.077	-0.111
Bond_8	**0.790**	0.404	0.142	0.068	-0.084	-0.070
Bond_9	**0.763**	0.591	0.264	0.139	0.052	0.042
Brid_1	0.472	**0.781**	0.153	0.092	0.082	0.166
Brid_10	0.326	**0.725**	0.257	0.092	0.146	0.144
Brid_2	0.497	**0.860**	0.158	0.108	0.163	0.219
Brid_3	0.449	**0.801**	0.244	0.208	0.247	0.308
Brid_4	0.433	**0.689**	0.167	0.110	0.204	0.214
Brid_5	0.508	**0.839**	0.244	0.146	0.063	0.184
Brid_6	0.624	**0.843**	0.233	0.145	-0.024	0.128
Brid_7	0.493	**0.729**	0.230	-0.002	0.158	0.223
Brid_8	0.577	**0.757**	0.285	0.064	0.060	0.132
Brid_9	0.474	**0.834**	0.254	0.124	0.229	0.251
Off_PP_1	0.119	0.148	**0.727**	0.131	0.148	0.328
Off_PP_2	0.209	0.262	**0.763**	0.036	0.400	0.477
Off_PP_4	0.195	0.163	**0.652**	-0.062	0.288	0.328
Off_PP_5	0.055	0.037	**0.627**	0.013	0.099	0.143
Off_PP_6	0.128	0.085	**0.623**	-0.046	0.197	0.129
Off_PP_7	0.165	0.133	**0.518**	0.027	0.335	0.287
Off_PP_8	0.231	0.372	**0.747**	0.016	0.307	0.470
Off_PP_9	0.255	0.247	**0.789**	0.097	0.364	0.458
On_PP_1	0.020	0.137	-0.083	**0.722**	0.014	-0.076
On_PP_2	0.059	0.128	0.042	**0.699**	-0.041	-0.029
On_PP_3	-0.018	0.082	0.113	**0.491**	0.133	0.111
On_PP_4	0.076	0.143	0.083	**0.796**	-0.056	-0.038

Cross-loadings						
On_PP_5	-0.132	0.051	0.147	**0.551**	-0.011	0.076
On_PP_6	-0.012	-0.024	-0.087	**0.544**	-0.120	-0.107
PEffic_1	-0.033	0.116	0.370	0.074	**0.926**	0.673
PEffic_2	-0.103	0.114	0.365	-0.078	**0.883**	0.734
PEffic_3	0.132	0.220	0.332	-0.071	**0.816**	0.526
PEffic_4	-0.049	0.149	0.387	-0.018	**0.902**	0.773
PInt_1	0.125	0.382	0.477	0.112	0.589	**0.861**
PInt_2	-0.026	0.148	0.483	-0.053	0.753	**0.962**
PInt_3	-0.038	0.165	0.467	-0.129	0.787	**0.939**

Table Q.18. HTMT Values for Facebook and Twitter Combined Mild Users Sample with Control Variables and Item Off_PP_3 Removed (n = 78).

HTMT						
	Bond_SC	**Brid_SC**	**Off_PP**	**On_PP**	**PEff**	**PInt**
Bond_SC						
Brid_SC	0.644					
Off_PP	0.248	0.300				
On_PP	0.179	0.199	0.231			
PEff	0.132	0.198	0.446	0.159		
PInt	0.123	0.273	0.546	0.180	0.845	

Table Q.19. HTMT Confidence Intervals Bias Corrected for Facebook and Twitter Combined Mild Users Sample with Control Variables and Item Off_PP_3 Removed (n = 78).

HTMT CONFIDENCE INTERVALS BIAS CORRECTED (Bootstrapping 5000 Samples)					
	Original Sample (O)	**Sample Mean (M)**	**Bias**	**2.50%**	**97.50%**
Bond_SC -> Age	0.112	0.169	0.057	0.049	0.136
Brid_SC -> Age	0.130	0.166	0.036	0.051	0.237
Brid_SC -> Bond_SC	0.644	0.646	0.002	0.450	0.781
Education -> Age	0.268	0.271	0.003	0.049	0.466
Education -> Bond_SC	0.087	0.152	0.065	0.049	0.097
Education -> Brid_SC	0.057	0.130	0.073	0.028	0.056
Gender -> Age	0.168	0.176	0.008	0.009	0.389
Gender -> Bond_SC	0.237	0.259	0.022	0.110	0.426
Gender -> Brid_SC	0.194	0.227	0.033	0.089	0.363
Gender -> Education	0.069	0.106	0.037	0.001	0.229
Off_PP -> Age	0.400	0.411	0.010	0.219	0.560
Off_PP -> Bond_SC	0.248	0.308	0.060	0.139	0.346
Off_PP -> Brid_SC	0.300	0.339	0.039	0.170	0.416
Off_PP -> Education	0.134	0.192	0.058	0.034	0.192
Off_PP -> Gender	0.171	0.221	0.050	0.065	0.224
On_PP -> Age	0.110	0.173	0.063	0.031	0.158
On_PP -> Bond_SC	0.179	0.273	0.094	0.136	0.172
On_PP -> Brid_SC	0.199	0.305	0.105	0.126	0.212

HTMT CONFIDENCE INTERVALS BIAS CORRECTED (Bootstrapping 5000 Samples)					
On_PP -> Education	0.179	0.231	0.052	0.047	0.287
On_PP -> Gender	0.186	0.258	0.072	0.057	0.302
On_PP -> Off_PP	0.231	0.313	0.082	0.124	0.301
PEff -> Age	0.070	0.140	0.070	0.017	0.084
PEff -> Bond_SC	0.132	0.200	0.068	0.086	0.137
PEff -> Brid_SC	0.198	0.239	0.040	0.109	0.319
PEff -> Education	0.094	0.149	0.056	0.019	0.160
PEff -> Gender	0.313	0.313	0.000	0.096	0.521
PEff -> Off_PP	0.446	0.457	0.011	0.266	0.604
PEff -> On_PP	0.159	0.238	0.080	0.073	0.191
PInt -> Age	0.098	0.142	0.044	0.019	0.200
PInt -> Bond_SC	0.123	0.190	0.067	0.080	0.130
PInt -> Brid_SC	0.273	0.299	0.027	0.145	0.460
PInt -> Education	0.143	0.168	0.024	0.040	0.278
PInt -> Gender	0.202	0.215	0.013	0.102	0.340
PInt -> Off_PP	0.546	0.555	0.009	0.391	0.685
PInt -> On_PP	0.180	0.242	0.062	0.091	0.222
PInt -> PEff	0.845	0.844	-0.001	0.739	0.915
Pknow -> Age	0.327	0.326	-0.001	0.129	0.499
Pknow -> Bond_SC	0.174	0.218	0.043	0.075	0.268
Pknow -> Brid_SC	0.200	0.225	0.025	0.085	0.421
Pknow -> Education	0.112	0.132	0.020	0.004	0.319
Pknow -> Gender	0.557	0.557	0.000	0.370	0.709
Pknow -> Off_PP	0.227	0.253	0.027	0.099	0.378
Pknow -> On_PP	0.118	0.199	0.082	0.043	0.145
Pknow -> PEff	0.576	0.574	-0.002	0.387	0.720
Pknow -> PInt	0.470	0.470	0.001	0.268	0.648

Facebook and Twitter Combined Light Users Sample Measurement Model Assessment with Control Variables and Off_PP_3 Removed (n = 45)

Table Q.20. Summary Measurement Model Assessment Metrics for Facebook and Twitter Combined Light Users Sample with Control Variables and Item Off_PP_3 Removed (n = 45).

LV	Indicators	Convergent Validity			Internal Reliability		Discriminant Validity			
		Loadings	Communality	AVE	CR	CA	Fornell Larcker Criterion	Cross Loadings	HTMT	HTMT CI
Bond_SC	Bond_1	0.579	0.335	0.553	0.924	0.910	OK	OK	OK	OK
	Bond_2	0.746	0.557							
	Bond_3	0.752	0.566							
	Bond_4	0.7	0.490							
	Bond_5	0.849	0.721							
	Bond_6	0.682	0.465							
	Bond_7	0.831	0.691							
	Bond_8	0.702	0.493							
	Bond_9	0.74	0.548							
	Bond_10	0.814	0.663							
Brid_SC	Brid_1	0.842	0.709	0.496	0.905	0.884	OK	OK	OK	OK
	Brid_2	0.804	0.646							
	Brid_3	0.631	0.398							
	Brid_4	0.838	0.702							
	Brid_5	0.620	0.384							
	Brid_6	0.447	0.200							
	Brid_7	0.666	0.444							
	Brid_8	0.778	0.605							

LV	Indicators	Convergent Validity			Internal Reliability		Discriminant Validity			
		Loadings	Communality	AVE	CR	CA	Fornell Larcker Criterion	Cross Loadings	HTMT	HTMT CI
	Brid_9	0.692	0.479							
	Brid_10	0.626	0.392							
Off_PP	Off_PP_1	0.870	0.757	0.637	0.929	0.904	OK	OK	OK	OK
	Off_PP_2	0.472	0.223							
	Off_PP_4	0.895	0.801							
	Off_PP_5	0.928	0.861							
	Off_PP_6	0.369	0.136							
	Off_PP_7	0.966	0.933							
	Off_PP_8	0.818	0.669							
	Off_PP_9	0.849	0.721							
On_PP	On_PP_1	0.791	0.626	0.574	0.890	0.851	OK	OK	OK	OK
	On_PP_2	0.771	0.594							
	On_PP_3	0.792	0.627							
	On_PP_4	0.689	0.475							
	On_PP_5	0.776	0.602							
	On_PP_6	0.720	0.518							
PEff	PEffic_1	0.905	0.819	0.683	0.895	0.844	OK	OK	OK	OK
	PEffic_2	0.782	0.612							
	PEffic_3	0.744	0.554							
	PEffic_4	0.864	0.746							
PInt	PInt_1	0.82	0.672	0.852	0.945	0.914	OK	OK	OK	OK
	PInt_2	0.96	0.922							
	PInt_3	0.982	0.964							

Table Q.21. Fornell-Larcker Criterion Facebook and Twitter Combined Light Users Sample with Control Variables and Item Off_PP_3 Removed (n = 45).

Fornell-Larcker Criterion						
	Bond_SC	**Brid_SC**	**Off_PP**	**On_PP**	**PEff**	**PInt**
Bond_SC	0.743					
Brid_SC	0.231	0.704				
Off_PP	-0.166	-0.146	0.798			
On_PP	0.445	0.364	-0.109	0.758		
PEff	-0.076	-0.250	0.530	-0.131	0.826	
PInt	0.096	0.151	0.186	0.285	-0.159	0.923

Table Q.22. Cross-Loadings Facebook and Twitter Combined Light Users Sample with Control Variables and Item Off_PP_3 Removed (n = 45).

Cross-loadings						
	Bond_SC	**Brid_SC**	**Off_PP**	**On_PP**	**PEff**	**PInt**
Bond_1	**0.579**	-0.088	0.177	0.208	0.196	-0.044
Bond_10	**0.814**	0.005	-0.091	0.345	0.172	0.059
Bond_2	**0.746**	0.191	-0.158	0.267	-0.320	0.127
Bond_3	**0.752**	0.194	-0.076	0.400	0.009	-0.023
Bond_4	**0.700**	0.323	-0.282	0.356	-0.204	0.126
Bond_5	**0.849**	0.228	-0.179	0.407	-0.048	0.045
Bond_6	**0.682**	0.255	-0.176	0.335	-0.129	0.124
Bond_7	**0.831**	0.067	-0.127	0.348	0.025	0.021
Bond_8	**0.702**	0.236	-0.037	0.293	-0.189	0.177
Bond_9	**0.740**	0.089	0.005	0.202	0.112	0.075
Brid_1	0.081	**0.842**	-0.038	0.205	-0.146	0.226
Brid_10	-0.063	**0.626**	0.000	0.174	-0.038	-0.004
Brid_2	0.113	**0.804**	0.013	0.178	-0.040	-0.056
Brid_3	0.414	**0.631**	0.147	0.276	0.069	0.098
Brid_4	0.200	**0.838**	-0.042	0.267	-0.136	0.208
Brid_5	-0.009	**0.620**	-0.182	0.191	-0.191	-0.045
Brid_6	0.295	**0.447**	-0.334	0.214	-0.456	0.369
Brid_7	0.285	**0.666**	-0.162	0.335	-0.178	0.161
Brid_8	0.059	**0.778**	-0.101	0.341	-0.297	0.085
Brid_9	0.066	**0.692**	-0.070	0.180	0.024	-0.271
Off_PP_1	-0.212	-0.066	**0.870**	-0.138	0.524	0.129
Off_PP_2	-0.254	0.095	**0.472**	-0.155	0.178	0.123
Off_PP_4	0.023	-0.127	**0.895**	-0.103	0.486	0.153
Off_PP_5	-0.125	-0.171	**0.928**	-0.125	0.426	0.272
Off_PP_6	-0.395	-0.092	**0.369**	-0.048	0.271	-0.014
Off_PP_7	-0.195	-0.148	**0.966**	-0.150	0.563	0.187
Off_PP_8	-0.125	-0.211	**0.818**	0.046	0.286	0.160
Off_PP_9	0.067	-0.168	**0.849**	0.010	0.512	0.099
On_PP_1	0.345	0.338	-0.065	**0.791**	-0.166	0.135
On_PP_2	0.414	0.212	-0.126	**0.771**	-0.084	0.343
On_PP_3	0.320	0.331	-0.035	**0.792**	-0.056	0.078
On_PP_4	0.267	0.294	-0.111	**0.689**	-0.121	0.341
On_PP_5	0.388	0.212	-0.113	**0.776**	-0.094	0.292
On_PP_6	0.280	0.270	-0.048	**0.720**	-0.077	0.122

Cross-loadings						
PEffic_1	-0.162	-0.186	0.579	-0.075	**0.905**	-0.127
PEffic_2	0.281	-0.166	0.401	-0.005	**0.782**	0.056
PEffic_3	-0.348	-0.385	0.299	-0.365	**0.744**	-0.456
PEffic_4	0.010	-0.116	0.418	-0.023	**0.864**	-0.023
PInt_1	0.163	0.137	0.180	0.132	-0.057	**0.820**
PInt_2	0.048	0.130	0.204	0.317	-0.151	**0.960**
PInt_3	0.092	0.157	0.136	0.296	-0.205	**0.982**

Table Q.23. HTMT Values for Facebook and Twitter Combined Light Users Sample with Control Variables and Item Off_PP_3 Removed (n = 45).

HTMT						
	Bond_SC	**Brid_SC**	**Off_PP**	**On_PP**	**PEff**	**PInt**
Bond_SC						
Brid_SC	0.305					
Off_PP	0.284	0.260				
On_PP	0.481	0.414	0.181			
PEff	0.352	0.308	0.583	0.237		
PInt	0.143	0.254	0.223	0.309	0.246	

Table Q.24. HTMT Confidence Intervals Bias Corrected for Facebook and Twitter Combined Light Users Sample with Control Variables and Item Off_PP_3 Removed (n = 45).

HTMT CONFIDENCE INTERVALS BIAS CORRECTED (Bootstrapping 5000 Samples)					
	Original Sample (O)	**Sample Mean (M)**	**Bias**	**2.50%**	**97.50%**
Bond_SC -> Age	0.267	0.305	0.038	0.116	0.489
Brid_SC -> Age	0.169	0.260	0.091	0.083	0.202
Brid_SC -> Bond_SC	0.305	0.399	0.094	0.226	0.325
Education -> Age	0.221	0.234	0.012	0.010	0.480
Education -> Bond_SC	0.087	0.188	0.101	0.050	0.086
Education -> Brid_SC	0.136	0.224	0.088	0.075	0.147
Gender -> Age	0.212	0.226	0.014	0.009	0.490
Gender -> Bond_SC	0.106	0.196	0.089	0.049	0.129
Gender -> Brid_SC	0.106	0.211	0.106	0.061	0.119
Gender -> Education	0.151	0.176	0.026	0.006	0.415
Off_PP -> Age	0.190	0.220	0.030	0.072	0.322
Off_PP -> Bond_SC	0.284	0.367	0.083	0.168	0.344
Off_PP -> Brid_SC	0.260	0.351	0.091	0.175	0.300
Off_PP -> Education	0.313	0.321	0.008	0.187	0.445
Off_PP -> Gender	0.125	0.192	0.067	0.065	0.139
On_PP -> Age	0.152	0.246	0.093	0.043	0.225
On_PP -> Bond_SC	0.481	0.496	0.014	0.292	0.688
On_PP -> Brid_SC	0.414	0.480	0.065	0.240	0.646
On_PP -> Education	0.128	0.220	0.092	0.027	0.204
On_PP -> Gender	0.309	0.332	0.023	0.089	0.590
On_PP -> Off_PP	0.181	0.263	0.082	0.100	0.205
PEff -> Age	0.291	0.333	0.041	0.100	0.408
PEff -> Bond_SC	0.352	0.423	0.071	0.231	0.424
PEff -> Brid_SC	0.308	0.402	0.093	0.196	0.366
PEff -> Education	0.203	0.235	0.032	0.056	0.427
PEff -> Gender	0.176	0.227	0.051	0.044	0.405

HTMT CONFIDENCE INTERVALS BIAS CORRECTED (Bootstrapping 5000 Samples)					
PEff -> Off_PP	0.583	0.598	0.015	0.359	0.773
PEff -> On_PP	0.237	0.322	0.085	0.124	0.279
PInt -> Age	0.033	0.139	0.107	0.011	0.032
PInt -> Bond_SC	0.143	0.234	0.091	0.078	0.178
PInt -> Brid_SC	0.254	0.320	0.066	0.146	0.324
PInt -> Education	0.125	0.169	0.044	0.020	0.352
PInt -> Gender	0.015	0.128	0.113	0.005	0.010
PInt -> Off_PP	0.223	0.276	0.052	0.100	0.429
PInt -> On_PP	0.309	0.363	0.054	0.118	0.511
PInt -> PEff	0.246	0.322	0.076	0.098	0.343
Pknow -> Age	0.406	0.403	-0.003	0.130	0.650
Pknow -> Bond_SC	0.164	0.238	0.074	0.072	0.217
Pknow -> Brid_SC	0.160	0.231	0.070	0.059	0.243
Pknow -> Education	0.299	0.299	0.000	0.030	0.550
Pknow -> Gender	0.444	0.441	-0.003	0.113	0.699
Pknow -> Off_PP	0.208	0.241	0.034	0.090	0.305
Pknow -> On_PP	0.251	0.292	0.041	0.063	0.542
Pknow -> PEff	0.416	0.418	0.002	0.209	0.601
Pknow -> PInt	0.066	0.143	0.077	0.007	0.108