

Table I. Measurement model and confirmatory factor analysis results

	Facebook sample		Soccer Teams sample	
<i>PARASOCIAL RELATIONSHIPS</i>	Loadings	AVE**/ CR**	Loadings	AVE**/ CR**
IDENTIFICATION WITH THE GROUP		0.47/0.78		0.59/0.85
The other members of this group remind me of myself	.73*		.85*	
I share the same qualities as the members of this group	.69*		.80*	
I have the same problems with the members of this group	.64*		.66*	
I can identify with the members of this group	.66*		.74*	
PROBLEM SOLVING OF THE GROUP		0.49/0.74		0.60/0.82
I wish I could handle problems as well as the members of this group	.76*		.78*	
I like the way the members of this group handle problems	.61*		.76*	
I would like to be more like the members of this group	.72*		.79*	
<i>SOCIAL RELATIONSHIPS</i>				
REFERENCE GROUP ACCEPTANCE		0.53/0.82		0.67/0.89
I follow this group because I am sure that my friends approve it	.79*		.84*	
I am very loyal to this group because my friends like it.	.81*		.86*	
My friends follow this group and I follow it too because I would like to be like them.	.65*		.78*	
I feel like I belong somewhere by following the groups that my friends follow.	.65*		.78*	
GROUP ENGAGEMENT		0.69/0.87		0.64/0.84
I am motivated to participate in the group's activities because I feel better afterward.	.87*		.86*	
I am motivated to participate in the group's activities because I am able to support other members	.88*		.82*	
I am motivated to participate in the group's activities because I am able to achieve personal goals	.73*		.72*	
<i>SERVICE BRAND TRUST</i>		0.49/0.74		0.79/0.92
I completely trust this brand	.66*		.86*	
This brand is honest	.72*		.89*	
This brand is reliable	.72*		.91*	
<i>SERVICE BRAND LOYALTY</i>		0.48/0.79		0.69/0.90
I always follow this brand	.76*		.85*	
I follow the brand in all of its activities	.66*		.82*	
I intent to be a fan of this brand forever	.67*		.78*	
I am loyal to this brand	.67*		.86*	
* significant at the 0.05 level				
** CR = Composite Reliabilities, AVE = Average Variance Extracted				

Table II: CFA and SEM Results: Offline (soccer teams) vs. online (Facebook) services

	Sport Team (N = 285)		Facebook (N = 298)	
	<i>CFA</i>	<i>SEM</i>	<i>CFA</i>	<i>SEM</i>
χ^2	529.71	555.21	370.64	563.03
<i>d.f.</i>	174	180	174	180
Ratio $\chi^2 / d.f.$	3	3	2	3
<i>P value</i>	.00	.00	.00	.00
<i>RMSEA</i>	.08	.08	.06	.08
<i>NNFI</i>	.90	.90	.90	.90
<i>CFI</i>	.92	.91	.92	.91
<i>IFI</i>	.92	.91	.92	.91
Comparing CFA models: $\Delta \chi^2=529.71-370.64=159.07$, $\Delta d.f.=174-174=0$				
Comparing SEM models: $\Delta \chi^2=563.03-555.21=7.82$, $\Delta d.f.=180-180=0$				

Table III: Results of the equality tests of factor structures between the soccer teams and the Facebook sample

	<i>Model A</i>	<i>Model B</i>	<i>Model A-B</i> $\Delta \chi^2$	<i>Model C</i>	<i>Model B-C</i> $\Delta \chi^2$	<i>Model D</i>	<i>Model A-D</i> $\Delta \chi^2$
χ^2	1083.7	1083.7	0	1083.7	0	1083.7	0
<i>d.f.</i>	405	384	21	366	18	366	39
Ratio $\chi^2 / d.f.$	2.7	2.8		3		3	
<i>RMSEA</i>	.05	.06		.06		.06	
<i>NNFI</i>	.92	.91		.90		.90	
<i>CFI</i>	.92	.92		.92		.92	
<i>IFI</i>	.92	.92		.92		.92	
Model A: Factor loadings, correlations and error variance invariant							
Model B: Factor correlations and error variance invariant							
Model C: Factor correlations invariant							
Model D: Factor loadings and factor correlations invariant							