Supplementary Materials

Table 1.

Pearson Correlations among All Study Variables.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| The Singaporean Sample (*n* = 232) | | | | | |  | | The Hong Kong Sample (*n* = 998) | | | | | |
|  | ATSG | INSG | DNSG | SESG |  | |  | | ATHK | INHK | DNHK | SEHK |
| ATSG | - |  |  |  |  | | ATHK | | - |  |  |  |
| INSG | .290\* | - |  |  |  | | INHK | | .322\* | - |  |  |
| DNSG | .279\* | .257\* | - |  |  | | DNHK | | .240\* | .265\* | - |  |
| SESG | .480\* | .285\* | .357\* | - |  | | SEHK | | .481\* | .330\* | .361\* | - |
| BISG | .574\* | .239\* | .333\* | .443\* |  | | BIHK | | .453\* | .249\* | .380\* | .468\* |

*Note.* \**p* < .001. AT = attitudes, IN = injunctive norms, DN = descriptive norms, SE = self-efficacy.

Table 2.

Multiple Group SEM and Path Coefficient Comparison Results for the Singaporean Sample.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Model | χ2 | *df* | RMSEA | | 90% CI of RMSEA | CFI | TLI | SRMR | Compare with the  baseline model |
| M1a: Baseline model | 75.29 | 64 | | 0.039 | 0.000-0.071 | 0.98 | 0.97 | 0.033 |  |
| M2a: Constrained path: attitudes to intention | 76.25 | 65 | | 0.039 | 0.000-0.070 | 0.98 | 0.97 | 0.034 | Δχ2 = 0.78, Δ*df* = 1, *p* = .38 |
| M3a: Constrained path: descriptive norms to intention | 80.36 | 65 | | 0.045 | 0.000-0.075 | 0.98 | 0.96 | 0.034 | Δχ2 = 7.63, Δ*df* = 1, *p* = .01 |
| M4a: Constrained path: injunctive norms to intention | 75.29 | 65 | | 0.037 | 0.000-0.069 | 0.99 | 0.98 | 0.033 | Δχ2 = 0.00, Δ*df* = 1, *p* = 1.0 |
| M5a: Constrained path: self-efficacy to intention | 74.79 | 65 | | 0.036 | 0.000-0.069 | 0.99 | 0.98 | 0.033 | Δχ2 = 0.37, Δ*df* = 1, *p* = .55 |

*Note*. The scaling correction was applied in calculating the chi-square differences.

Table 3.

Multiple Group SEM and Path Coefficient Comparison Results for the Hong Kong Sample.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Model | χ2 | *df* | | RMSEA | | 90% CI of RMSEA | CFI | TLI | SRMR | Compare with the  baseline model |
| M1b: Baseline model | 257.05 | | 160 | | 0.035 | 0.027-0.043 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.032 |  |
| M2b: Constrained path: attitudes to intention | 258.13 | | 161 | | 0.035 | 0.027-0.042 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.032 | Δχ2 = 0.95, Δ*df* = 1, *p* = .33 |
| M3b: Constrained path: descriptive norms to intention | 262.67 | | 161 | | 0.036 | 0.028-0.043 | 0.98 | 0.97 | 0.032 | Δχ2 = 5.04, Δ*df* = 1, *p* = .02 |
| M4b: Constrained path: injunctive norms to intention | 257.49 | | 161 | | 0.035 | 0.027-0.042 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.032 | Δχ2 = 0.40, Δ*df* = 1, *p* = .52 |
| M5b: Constrained path: self-efficacy to intention | 256.99 | | 161 | | 0.035 | 0.026-0.042 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.032 | Δχ2 = 0.05, Δ*df* = 1, *p* = .82 |

*Note*. The scaling correction was applied in calculating the chi-square differences.