

Separate Analysis for PKS and NU Members

1. PKS

Our mediation analysis revealed that RF and CN accounted for 34% of the variance in EB scores ($R^2 = .24$, $F(3,189)=32.12$). Additionally, the results confirmed that there was also a direct significant effect of RF on EB ($B = .19$, $SE = .06$, $t = 2.97$, $p = .003$, 95% CI [.06, .31]) and that this was partially mediated by CN (*indirect effect* = .14, $SE = .04$, 95% CI [.07, .24]). Moreover, the result also showed that CN has a direct significant effect on EB ($B = .59$, $SE = .08$, $t = 7.47$, $p < .001$, 95% CI [.44, .75]). Meanwhile, our moderation analysis showed that TL moderate the relationship of RF and EB ($B = .16$, $SE = .06$, $t = 2.57$, $p = .01$, 95% CI [.037, .278]). Both RF ($B = .30$, $SE = .07$, $t = 4.46$, $p < .001$, 95% CI [.168, .434]) and TL ($B = .42$, $SE = .08$, $t = 4.98$, $p < .001$, 95% CI [.0255, .589]) have significant direct effects on EB and accounted for 25.75% variance in EB scores ($R = .26$, $F(4,188) = 16.29$). Finally, our full model revealed that RF ($B = .19$, $SE = .06$, $t = 2.97$, 95% CI [.063, .312]), CN ($B = .52$, $SE = .08$, $t = 6.67$, 95% CI [.367, .676]), and TL ($B = .31$, $SE = .08$, $t = 3.94$, 95% CI [.154, .462]) had significant direct effects on EB. However, in contrast to findings in the combined data, we did not find a significant interaction effect of RF and TL on CN ($B = .05$, $SE = .05$, $t = .48$, 95% CI [-.078, .358]) and EB ($B = .13$, $SE = .55$, $t = 2.42$, 95% CI [-.025, .243]) and the overall index of moderated mediation was also not significant ($B = .02$, $BootSE = .04$, 95% CI [-.052, .092]).

2. NU

Among NU members, we found similar findings to the combined data. First, in mediation analysis model, we found RF could directly influenced EB ($B = .30$, $SE = .03$, $t = .92$, 95% CI [.238, .367]) and indirectly via CN (*indirect effect* = .07, $BootSE = .016$, 95% CI [.044, .108]). CN also had a significant direct effect on EB ($B = .52$, $SE = .05$, $t = 9.49$, 95% CI [.415, .632]). RF and CN accounted for 28.6% variance on EB ($R^2 = .28$, $F(3, 585) = 78.11$, $p < .001$).

Second, in moderation analysis we also found there was a significant interaction effect of RF and Tightness on EB ($B = .08$, $SE = .03$, $t = 2.53$, $p = .01$, 95%CI[.018, .143]). Both RF ($B = .32$, $SE = .03$, $t = 9.47$, 95%CI[.253, .385]) and Tightness ($B = .39$, $SE = .05$, $t = 7.28$, 95%CI [.291, .506]) had significant direct effects on EB. This model accounted for 24.8% variance on EB ($R^2 = .248$, $F(4,585) = 48.21$, $p < .001$). Finally, in our full model, we found that RF ($B = .27$, $SE = .03$, $t = .83$, 95%CI[.208, .335]), Tightness ($B = .28$, $SE = .05$, $t = 5.27$, 95%CI[.331, .552]), and CN ($B = .28$, $SE = .05$, $t = 7.87$, 95%CI[.331, .552]). We also found a significant interaction effect of RF and Tightness on CN ($B = .07$, $SE = .02$, $t = 3.23$, 95%CI[.028, .116]) but there was no such significant interaction effect on EB ($B = .05$, $SE = .03$, $t = 1.59$, 95%CI[-.011, .108]). The overall index of moderated mediation was also significant, indicating that CN mediated the effect of RF on EB particularly when Tightness is higher.