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This study proposes an integrated research model to validate the antecedents of Facebook users’ information seeking and sharing behaviors. It conducts an online survey to investigate the effects of affective-/cognitive-based trust on social capital, which subsequently influences information seeking and information sharing from the perspective of the uses and gratifications (U&G) theory. This study collects 665 valid samples and indicates that cognitive/affective-based trust significantly and positively influences social capital (e.g., structural, cognitive, and relational) which has a significant and positive effect on information seeking and sharing. This study contributes to the research on uses and gratifications (U&G) theory in three different ways. Firstly, it indicates that trust influences social capital (structural, cognitive and relational). Secondly, it confirms the effect of social capital on information seeking and sharing. Thirdly, it validates the mediating roles of social capital in the relationship between affective-/cognitive-based trust and information seeking and sharing.
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**Introduction**

In contemporary times, social networking sites (SNSs) (e.g., Facebook, Instagram, and Twitter) have been developed into multifunctional tools for their users. Facebook is a cheap, easy, and fast vehicle for frequent communications and conveys interaction, opinions, and social values among users in ways which create reciprocal relationships. It provides a digital support network (Udwan, Leurs, & Alencar, 2020). The current COVID-19 pandemic is having a global effect. People are forced to stay at home and conduct social interaction via SNSs in order to seek information regarding community-level policies or personal health strategies (Bento, Nguyen, Wing, Lozano-Rojas, Ahn, & Simon, 2020) and share information (Engelmann, Kloss, Neuberger, & Brockmet, 2019). Facebook is the most popular SNS worldwide (Basak & Calisir, 2015) and is the primary source of information for millennials (Bene, 2017; Rusmann & Hess, 2020) to build their social capital (Docherty, 2020; Kent, Rechavi, & Rafaeli, 2019). For example, Indonesia ranks 3rd in the world in terms of Facebook users with 130 million users (Statista, 2020), of whom most (49.52%) are young people (Detik, 2018). These facts provided the motivation to examine the relationships among trust, social capital and information seeking/sharing behaviors of Indonesian Facebook users from various socio-demographic backgrounds.

Previous studies have applied U&G theory to understand the dynamics of social activities (Ferris & Hollenbaugh, 2018) in relation to information seeking (Basak & Calisir, 2015; Yi & Gong, 2013), information sharing (Su & Chan, 2017), and the management of social capital (Docherty, 2020). Trust is a crucial variable of social capital (Fu, 2004; Rusmann & Hess, 2020) which means that they expect that other users will behave in a certain way. However, no study has examined the role of the U&G theory on the relationships among trust, social capital and information seeking and sharing.

There are two main classifications of social capital: the network perspective (e.g., bonding, bridging, and linking) and social structure (e.g., structural, cognitive, and relational) (Claridge, 2018). Bonding social capital does not provide useful network assets in some situations and bridging social capital does not involve many shared norms. However, structural, cognitive, and relational social capitals are commonly connected and they mutually reinforce each other. They **facilitate** collective action through making peoples’ behavior more beneficial and predictable, as well as encouraging collaboration, exchange, and interaction. The World Bank has recognized and adopts this concept (Krishna & Shrader, 2002) due to more visible in a digital era where social media accounts for a huge amount of communication and interaction in the virtual community context.

This interactive approach emphasizes the important roles played by exchange information. They mutually influence each other. SNSs users play dual roles as information providers and seekers in online discussion forums (Jackson, Stromer-Galley, & Hemsley, 2020). Therefore, it is necessary to simultaneously examine information seeking and sharing (Savolainen, 2019) as key issues of online community success (Kent et al., 2019; Li & Su, 2020). Information seeking and sharing can alter and enhance the nature of social media effects (Docherty, 2020; Engelmann et al., 2019).

Previous research has not investigated the relationships between cognitive-/affective-based trust and structural, cognitive and relational social capital, but not those relationships between information seeking and sharing behaviors (Lefebvre, Sorenson, Henchion, & Gellynck, 2016).Therefore, two research questions remain regarding these interactions. (1) What are the relationships between cognitive-/affective-based trust and social capital (e.g., structural, cognitive, and relational)? (2) What are the relationships between social capital and information seeking-/sharing among Indonesian Facebook users? To close this gap, this study addresses the different dimensions of trust and social capital to investigate these relationships. In doing so, it makes two fundamental contributions to the existing body of literature. First, it validates the different effects of cognitive-/affective-based trust and social capital (e.g., structural, cognitive, and relational). Second, it empirically examines the various effects of social capital and information seeking and sharing.

**Literature Review**

***Uses and gratifications theory***

The U&G theory refers to new information and communication technologies with different patterns of internet-based media adoption, and broadens individuals’ communication channels, especially in terms of their social, hedonic, and cognitive needs (Hossain, 2019; Papacharissi & Mendelson, 2011). The need to exchange of information has been applied in recent studies, particularly among Facebook users regarding accessing, building, and seeking/sharing information produced by other users (Ferris & Hollenbaugh, 2018). U&G theory can clarify social media users’ goals and can therefore help us understand their behaviors and perceptions toward two distinct needs: how needs are gratiﬁed and how gratiﬁcations reconstruct needs (Savolainen, 2019). Several researchers have examined the motivation for effectively accessing the Internet through the U&G theory, because it explains the behavioral and psychological dimensions of mediating communication (Ferris & Hollenbaugh, 2018; Papacharissi & Mendelson, 2011). It also explains the motives of Facebook users towards fulfilling their needs for information seeking/sharing, and developing or maintaining new friendships (Hossain, 2019). U&G theory can help us to understand Facebook users’ motives and relationships in order to predict the frequency of their visits through photographs, social interaction (e.g., seek or share information about speciﬁc issue and news), and status updates.

***Trust***

Trust is the expectation of a cooperative, honest, and regular behavior based on commonly shared norms within a community. These norms may be related to religion or the perception of justice, as well as the secular norms of behavioral codes or professional standards (Fukuyama, 1995).There are two types of trust: cognitive-based trust and affective-based trust (McAllister, 1995). Cognitive-based trust refers to individuals’ beliefs about dependability and reliability. It includes three elements: competency, integrity and goodwill trust (Yeh & Choi, 2011). However, affective-based trust refers to trustees’ emotional elements, reciprocity, and social skills regarding interpersonal care and concern. It has two elements: relational and intuitive trust. This study applies intuitive trust in order to avoid confusion with relational social capital. This study adopts both cognitive-based trust and affective-based trust due to both being commonly used in social interaction, and having been validated in prior studies (Newman, Kiazad, Miao, & Copper, 2014). On the other hand, cognitive-based trust includes calculative and rational characteristics such as benevolence, competence, integrity, reliability, and responsibility of trustees (Yeh & Choi, 2011). It also increases their willingness to use information from the perspectives of affective-/cognitive-based trust (McAllister, 1995).

Members of virtual communities increase their information exchange activities as a result of trust, which is a crucial factor in information seeking and sharing on social media (Lefebvre et al., 2016; Udwan et al., 2020). Hence, social media users must apply several types of trust in their activities. The transformation of trust can influence social capital in a virtual community. While prior studies have acknowledged the importance of trust, they have however rarely validated it. In addition, it has been identified that it is important to investigate the relationship between trust and social capital (Fu, 2004).

***Social capital***

From a theoretical perspective, there are three different conceptualizations of the relationship between trust and social capital. First, trust is a component of social capital and refers to “obligations and expectations, which depend on trustworthiness of the social environment and information-flow capacity of the social structure, and norms accompanied by sanctions” (Coleman, 1988, p. S119). Second, trust is synonymous with social capital and enables the engagement among people for social capital (Fukuyama, 1995). Third, trust is independent from social capital, which does not include trust. The three theoretical approaches advanced by Burt (2000), Granovetter (1973; 1985), and Lin (1999; 2001) form a perspective and propose a mutual independency between trust and social capital due to their weak ties as channels of information flow. This study proposes that trust and social capital are not mutually independent. Conversely, we suggest that there is a relationship between these two constructs because social media users rely on social capital to build up their relationships with others based on trust.

Culture is a critical issue greater than technology and encourages people to actively involve information exchange processes (Wasko & Faraj, 2000), especially for interpersonal collaboration among social media users under science and technology studies (STS). Prior studies focused more on complexity theory. However, interaction norms among users are essential engagement mechanisms in the “techno-cultural construct” on social media platform (Crawford & Gillespie, 2016; Gillespie, Boczkowski, & Foot, 2014; Van Dijck, 2013) and have become guidelines for users to express their concerns and exchange information. For example, some scholars confirmed that culture is not an obstacle to social capital, neither in China (Mou & Lin, 2017; Wang, McNally, & Lenihan, 2019) nor in the United States (Son & Feng, 2019). Thus, technology such as social media can reach the same level of information exchange across countries and cultures.

The rapid changes in the economic, organizations, social, and technological worlds make an understanding of social capital more essential specifically in social media field (Cohen & Prusak, 2001; Kent et al., 2019). The actual and potential resources of exchanging or sharing information for individuals within the virtual communities are intellectual capital or social capital, which includes structural, cognitive, and relational social capital (Ghahtarani, Sheikhmohammady, & Rostami, 2019; Li, Ye, & Sheu, 2014). This framework is mostly widely accepted and used (Claridge, 2018). People contribute with their resources for exchanging or sharing information and collectively resolve problems to maintain quality social relations for mutual beneﬁt.

Social media users share a language and vision with cognitive social capital, which is related to attitudes and beliefs that faciliate mutual understanding among people (Docherty, 2020; Nahapiet & Ghoshal, 1998). People build relationships, spend time interacting socially, and maintain their social ties through the shared language of cognitive social capital (Son, Lee, Cho, & Kim, 2016). They ask questions and exchange information using a common language to gain accurate, adequate, credible, and timely information (Engelmann et al., 2019; Jackson et al., 2020).

***Information Seeking and Sharing***

In general, information seeking and sharing on social media is defined as how the users need, seek, give, share and use information (Bento et al., 2020). Many studies investigated information seeking, while few focused on information sharing (Wilson, 2010). The concept of seeking information has changed dramatically with advancements in technology, especially in social media contexts. Information seeking refers to information acquisition, opinions, or suggestions from credible source such as news, SNSs communities, and websites, which provide users with relevant and timely information related to topics. It involves meaningful content of application, recognition, and retrieval. SNSs are useful platforms for users to seek and share information about their daily lives (Engelmann et al., 2019). Facebook users ask for information or support to maintain weak ties with others via sharing their interests, mutual friends, or relational goals (Jackson et al., 2020).

***Information Seeking***

Connections among users in different communities are weak ties on Facebook, and these are powerful ways to transfer information across social distances and segments of the population (De Meo, Ferrara, Fiumara, & Provetti, 2014). Larger networks tend to be more diverse and link people together for the purpose of information exchange. For instance, social media (e.g., Facebook) is used to circulate information on the COVID-19 pandemic outbreak in some countries (Bento et al., 2020). People seek and share information to rapidly diffuse messages through users who may not know each other personally but become connected through weaker ties by trust and social capital (Engelmann et al., 2019). The interaction among social media users encourages them to seek and share information in the communities (Russmann & Hess, 2020; Savolainen, 2019). Thus, social capital is an essential component for SNSs users’ information seeking and sharing under weak ties.

***Information Sharing***

Information sharing is a set of activities where SNSs users provide information either proactively or upon request (Engelmann et al., 2019). They provide others with appropriate and collaborative information (Choo, Bergeron, Detlor, & Heaton, 2008; Docherty, 2020). There are two major perspectives of information sharing. It can be a one-way communication process in which information is disseminated or transferred from a sender to recipients or a two-way communication process in terms of mutual information exchange within small groups or online communities (Savoleinen, 2019). However, the gratification of Indonesian social media users is relatively unexplored, particularly regarding its economic and social value.

**Research Model and Hypotheses**

***The Relationship between Cognitive-/Affective-based Trust and Social Capital***

Past studies revealed that an essential factor of building cooperation, relations, and positive outcome at interpersonal and team levels depends on trustworthiness. People are more willing to interact and contribute to others when mutual trust occurs (Kent et al., 2019; Udwan et al., 2020). Cognitive and affective trust is the foundation that triggers social interactions and improves efficiency among people (Jackson et al., 2020). With similar characteristics or common goals on SNSs, users’ endorsements of trust increase their potential social capitals toward share common viewpoints and positive views. Thus, social media communities’ members create communication and interaction frequency through endorsements of trust due to shared language and a vision. Moreover, trust strengthens social capital through facilitating access to resources and encouraging engagement in social exchanges and cooperative interaction. Higher trust levels often typify strong ties between individuals and communities in social capital. An alteration in trust and shared value triggers changes in the amount of social capital that exists in interactions. Trust strengthens norms of reciprocity (Fu, 2004). It also reduces the time spent in the expensive and slow process of defining, monitoring, and guaranteeing complying with the detailed process of enforcement (Nahapiet & Ghoshal, 1998; Rusmann & Hess, 2020).

Structural social capital refers to contact connectivity among people that occur through interaction ties (Nahapiet & Ghoshal, 1998). It portrays the nature and quality of relationships among users (Claridge, 2018). Reciprocity occurs when people trust each other in an interpersonal domain (Kent et al., 2019; Udwan et al., 2020). The norm of reciprocity, as a relational social capital (Nahapiet & Ghoshal, 1998), refers to a sense of mutual indebtedness that ensures community members reciprocate the benefits they receive from others (Wasko & Faraj, 2000). People build up their social relationships and enhance their sharing experiences or values to establish interpersonal relationships (cognitive social capital) based on interaction and trust. Shared language and vision are two dimensions of cognitive social capital, which also include the dimensions of attitudes, beliefs, and perceptions of support (Claridge, 2018; Lefebvre et al., 2016). In the SNSs context, trust is an important factor of motivating virtual community members to use social technologies (Li & Su, 2020; Rusmann & Hess, 2020).  SNSs’ members believe that they can obtain help from others if they help others to solve their problems. This relationship is based on trust. In addition, relational social capital exists when group members trust others in the group (Huang, Kim, & Kim, 2013). Hence, this study proposes the following hypotheses.

*H1: Cognitive-based trust has significant and positive effects on (a) structural social capital, (b) cognitive social capital, and (c) relational social capital.*

*H2: Affective-based trust has significant and positive effects on (a) structural social capital, (b) cognitive social capital, and (c) relational social capital.*

***The Relationship between Structural Social Capital and Cognitive Social Capital***

Social structure is the most important factor of social interaction. Social network ties facilitate social interaction, which in turn stimulates the cognitive social capital (Claridge, 2018). Structural social capital exists in the relationships among SNSs members. It becomes the antecedent of cognitive social capital and develops a shared language and vision (Lefebvre et al., 2016) among SNSs members. Thus, cognitive social capital relies on the premise that social interaction plays an important role in sharing a common set of goals and values among Facebook users to learn about values and visions of others (Lu & Yang, 2011). Moreover, social interaction enhances SNSs members’ feelings of belonging, social connections, and a sense of shared beliefs, codes, languages, and visions (Lefebvre et al., 2016). Thus, Facebook users share common goals and values with others through their social interaction. This study therefore proposes the following hypothesis.

*H3: Structural social capital has a significant and positive effect on cognitive social capital on Facebook users.*

***The Relationship between Structural Social Capital and Relational Social Capital***

Social structure is the most important element in the nature and quality of social relationships (Claridge, 2018). Interaction leads to positive affect, then to interpersonal affection, followed by shared norms of reciprocity, and finally the development of mutual relationships in the SNSs context (Lefebvre et al., 2016). Alternatively, it has been suggested that frequent social interaction strengthens users’ feelings of connectedness and therefore creates more relationships on Facebook. Moreover, it facilitates the exchange of resources among users (Nahaphiet & Ghoshal, 1998) within the group so that they are more willing to reciprocate favors or other social resources in the interaction process (Wasko & Faraj, 2000). Frequent communication and interaction among Facebook users allow them to easily access more information and to evaluate their abilities and behavior. Structural social capital influences SNSs members’ benefits and triggers sharing more information with others to create more reciprocal relationships. Thus, this study proposes the following hypothesis.

*H4: Structural social capital has a significant and positive effect on relational social capital on Facebook users.*

***The Relationship between Cognitive Social Capital and Relational Social Capital***

Shared vision and shared language, as the primary manifestation of cognitive social capital, lead to a harmony of interests and eliminates opportunistic behavior. Social media supports the development of trusting relationships and shared visions. People build trusting relationships toward a shared vision to create awareness of how others react in a given situation on social media. It benefits SNSs users through the production of intellectual capital including expectations, norms, obligations and trust (Engelmann et al., 2019; Kent et al., 2019). Moreover, shared language and a vision encourage the development of reciprocal relationships among social media members. Shared language facilitates people to ask questions and do business together, whereas a shared vision binds community members together and creates the opportunity of beneﬁting from others or returning benefits to others. Members tend to respect each other and have more mutual reciprocity when they share a language and a vision (Lu & Yang, 2011). A low level of cognitive social capital leads to low level of relational social capital (Tsai & Ghoshal, 1998). Hence, this study proposes the following hypothesis.

*H5: Cognitive social capital has a significant and positive effect on relational social capital on Facebook users.*

***The Relationship between Structural Social Capital and Information Seeking/Sharing***

Individuals search for and gather information from virtual learning communities in order to gain insights regarding information sharing, and to optimize the support of a social network with social capital (Huang et al., 2013; Li & Su, 2020). This is highly related to social exchange behavior such as information seeking and sharing where people interact with others (Jackson et al., 2019; Savolainen, 2019). People are willing to share information when structural social capital occurs (Nahapiet & Ghoshal, 1998). Structural social capital is the social interaction regarding the conﬁguration and pattern of connection among SNSs members and the process of building and forming social ties, which is the beneficial propensity of connections with others (Tsai & Ghoshal, 1998).

During an interaction process, social structure plays an important role in the users’ willingness to engage in seeking and sharing information. It erases users’ concerns whether or not others are allies or are merely act opportunistically. Social interaction is a channel for information flow and sharing behavior. Information seeking and sharing behaviours often occur in collaborative setting, which is supported by connectivity and contact among users to exchange information and is highly dependent on social relationships in online environments. Close and frequent interaction among them creates common goals and enables the reciprocal exchange of information (Lefebvre et al., 2016).

Structural social capital plays a significant role in facilitating collaboration and information sharing in SNSs, which allows users to share information, participate in community activities, and form relationships with others (Ghahtarani et al., 2019). As part of information seeking and sharing behavior, users exchange their resources and create reciprocal relationships through frequent social interaction. This plays a crucial role in the shaping of a set of common goals and values in virtual communities. Individuals’ social interaction influences information exchange in a virtual community (Huang et al., 2013). The exchange of information is a type of social interaction which enhances the relationships between social capital and information seeking (Bento et al., 2020; Docherty, 2020)/information sharing (Engelmann et al., 2019; Li et al., 2014). Thus, this study proposes the following hypothesis.

*H6: Structural social capital has significant and positive effects on (a) information seeking and (b) information sharing.*

***The Relationship between Cognitive Social Capital and Information Seeking/Sharing***

Social capital provides a framework to explain information seeking and sharing mechanisms through the dimensions of structures, contents, and relations (Docherty, 2020; Savolainen, 2019). Some degree of mutual understanding regarding shared language and vision among members affect their engagement in a community (Engelmann et al., 2019; Lu & Yang, 2011). Furthermore, it provides collaboration and information exchanges among SNSs members through their shared values or visions for interpersonal relationships (Ghahtarani et al., 2019; Jackson et al., 2020). Individuals understand others and build common jargon through similar goals and the use of a shared vocabulary in their domains. Therefore, the use of a shared language motivates participants to become more proactive in information seeking and sharing, which subsequently enhances the quality and quantity of the information exchange. Shared values encourage members to get together, make cooperative actions possible, and eventually beneﬁt communities (Cohen & Prusak, 2001).

Users who have a common vision become partners to exchange information, which plays an important role in social media communities (Li et al., 2014; Rusman & Hess, 2020). Social network users browse the internet to seek information (Bento et al., 2020; Son et al., 2016) and to share information (Engelmann et al., 2019; Li et al., 2014), both of which are influenced by social capital (Ghahtarani et al., 2019). It facilitates the establishment of common goals and appropriate ways of communicating within a social system on social media (Lu & Yang, 2011). The presence of a shared language and vision for information exchange enhances Facebook users’ communications, since cognitive social capital emphasizes the availability of common beliefs, experiences, and information. Thus, this study proposes the following hypothesis.

*H7: Cognitive social capital has significant and positive effects on (a) information seeking and (b) information sharing.*

***The Relationship between Relational Social Capital and Information Seeking/Sharing***

The normative conditions of expectation, identification, obligation, and trust are reasons for exchanging information among social media members. Relational social capital influences the willingness of users to share information with others and to reduce their communication barriers (Ghahtarani et al., 2019). It is an essential mechanism for reciprocal exchange (Fukuyama, 1995). Thus, relational social capital has an effect on information seeking and sharing (Bento et al., 2020) as a beneﬁt for individuals to engage in social exchange (Engelmann et al., 2019; Rusmann & Hess, 2020). They participate in SNSs’ communities to keep abreast of the most up-to-date ideas and innovations. The success of a virtual community depends on available information and knowledge that is helpful, useful, and timely (Wasko & Faraj, 2000; Son et al., 2016).

In the SNSs context, relational social capital motivates members searching for information to gain insights of knowledge in virtual communities (Huang et al., 2013). People gather information for community interest, moral obligation, and self-interest when they interact with families, friends, and others for information exchange. Social media interaction fosters the exchange of information and prosperous interaction among users (Jackson et al., 2020). Information sharing refers to behavior including downloading, following, and liking information, news, and problem-solving within the social interaction of a computer-mediated community. Relational social capital influences information sharing behavior (Ghahtarani et al., 2019; Li et al., 2014). Thus, this study proposes the following hypothesis.

*H8: Relational social capital has significant and positive effects on (a) information seeking and (b) information sharing.*
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**Figure 1. *Proposed research model.***

**Methodology**

***Questionnaire Design, Pretest, and Pilot Study***

We adopted the high reliability and validity of the scales for all multi-items of the constructs from prior studies. We used the technique of back-translation and invited a professional translator to translate the English questionnaire into Indonesian language to make sure the meaning of the measurement items remained the same for each construct. We then tried a pretest and these wording were revised during the face-to-face interaction to ensure they were fully embedded within the Indonesian context. Subsequently, we conducted a pilot test of the measurement items and constructs to examine the reliability analysis, convergent validity, and discriminant validity with the suggested criteria before conducting the formal survey.

***Sample and Data Collection***

This study invited Indonesian Facebook users to fill out the online survey by offering a random prize draw of 50,000 Indonesia rupiahs (IDR) from a convenience store as an incentive to increase their response rate. This online survey was conducted through Google Forms from February 1 to March 31, 2020. There were 665 valid responses from a total of 697 collected samples, indicating a completion rate of 95.41 %. Table 1 shows the respondent demographics.

***Table 1. Respondent Demographics.***

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Demographics | Frequency | Percentage | Accumulated  percentage |
| Gender |  |  |  |
| Male | 315 | 47.4 | 47.4 |
| Female | 350 | 52.6 | 100.0 |
| Age |  |  |  |
| Under 26 years old | 480 | 72.2 | 72.2 |
| 26~40 years old | 129 | 19.4 | 91.6 |
| 41~55 years old | 56 | 8.4 | 100.0 |
| Education |  |  |  |
| Bachelor | 428 | 64.4 | 64.4 |
| Master and PhD degree | 237 | 35.6 | 100.0 |
| Range time use FB |  |  |  |
| Below 5 years | 157 | 23.6 | 23.6 |
| 6~10 years | 367 | 55.2 | 78.8 |
| Over 10 years | 141 | 21.2 | 100.0 |

***Measures***

The items used to measure each of the constructs are presented in the Appendix. A 7-point Likert scale was used for all scale items. Cognitive-based trust refers to the calculative and rational characteristics such as competence, reliability, and responsibility of trustees. Affective-based trust refers to the emotional elements and social skills of the trustees. Both constructs were adapted from Yeh and Choi (2011). Structural social capital refers to communication, social interaction and relationship among Facebook users. Cognitive social capital refers to the extent which resources provide a common understanding among users. Relational social capital refers to property embedded in interpersonal relationships, such as reciprocity, and respect. These constructs were adapted from Lu and Yang (2011). Information seeking refers to browsing product information in a Facebook context and includes individual searching as well as interactive searching adapted from Basak and Calisir (2015) and Yi and Gong (2013). Information sharing refers to the Facebook users who visually share both form and content on Facebook. Measurement of information sharing was adapted from Choo et al. (2008) and Yi and Gong (2013).

***Common Method Variance (CMV)***

This study asked respondents to complete the questionnaire with anonymity, and it randomly arranged measurement items and hid the label of constructs to reduce respondents’ concerns when completing the questionnaire (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Lee, & Podsakoff, 2003). As for post-detection, this study applied the Harman’s single-factor test proposed by Eichhorn (2014) and the common latent factor (CLF) to conduct post-detection is the inherent weakness of the Harman’s single-factor test to detect the CMV. The explained variance of the first factor is 20.87%. Besides, the factor loading of CLF was 0.65 that indicated a 42.65% variance of CMV. The EFA result shows no significant problem of CMV in the data.

**Results**

Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) was used to test the proposed model and the research hypotheses. This study employed the two-stage approach suggested by Anderson and Gerbing (1988), namely CFA to test reliabilities and validities of the research constructs. Then, the structural model to test the strength and direction of the proposed relationships among research constructs including the hypothesized model.

***Measurement Model***

This study conducted the measurement model by adopting the AMOS software with maximum likelihood estimation. Table 2 showed the CFA model reproduces the covariance matrix of the observed variables with an adequate fit (Anderson & Gerbing, 1988; Gefen, Straub, & Boudreau, 2000): χ2/df = 4.676, goodness-of-fit index (GFI) = 0.801, nonnormed fit index (NFI) = 0.863, comparative fit index (CFI) = 0.889, incremental fit index (IFI) = 0.889 and root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA) = 0.074. Table 2 shows that the factor loadings and square multiple correlations for each item are larger than 0.6 and 0.2. Composite reliabilities (CR) and average of variance extracted (AVE) for each construct are above 0.836 and 0.618 which exceed the criteria of 0.6 and 0.5. In addition, the values of Cronbach’s α for all constructs were larger than 0.8. The results show a good convergent validity for all measurement items and constructs (Anderson & Gerbing, 1988; Gefen et al., 2000). Table 3 shows that the square root of the AVE for each construct is greater than the coefficient of correlation of between this construct and other constructs. As per Fornell and Lacker (1981), the results showed evidence of convergent validity and discriminant validity.

***Table 2. Analysis of Measurement Model.***

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Constructs | MLE Estimates Factor Loading/ Measurement Error | | Squared Multiple Correlation (SMC) | Composite Reliability (CR) | Average of Variance Extracted (AVE) | Cronbach’s α |
| CBT |  |  |  | 0.915 | 0.641 | 0.914 |
| CBT1 | 0.766 | 0.413 | 0.587 |  |  |  |
| CBT2 | 0.820 | 0.328 | 0.672 |  |  |  |
| CBT3 | 0.815 | 0.336 | 0.664 |  |  |  |
| CBT4 | 0.779 | 0.393 | 0.607 |  |  |  |
| CBT5 | 0.820 | 0.328 | 0.672 |  |  |  |
| CBT6 | 0.803 | 0.355 | 0.645 |  |  |  |
| ABT |  |  |  | 0.914 | 0.638 | 0.912 |
| ABT1 | 0.848 | 0.281 | 0.719 |  |  |  |
| ABT2 | 0.789 | 0.377 | 0.623 |  |  |  |
| ABT3 | 0.817 | 0.333 | 0.667 |  |  |  |
| ABT4 | 0.802 | 0.357 | 0.643 |  |  |  |
| ABT5 | 0.751 | 0.436 | 0.564 |  |  |  |
| ABT6 | 0.783 | 0.387 | 0.613 |  |  |  |
| SSC |  |  |  | 0.905 | 0.706 | 0.905 |
| SSC1 | 0.798 | 0.363 | 0.637 |  |  |  |
| SSC2 | 0.835 | 0.303 | 0.697 |  |  |  |
| SSC3 | 0.882 | 0.222 | 0.778 |  |  |  |
| SSC4 | 0.843 | 0.289 | 0.711 |  |  |  |
| CSC |  |  |  | 0.907 | 0.618 | 0.906 |
| CSC1 | 0.743 | 0.448 | 0.552 |  |  |  |
| CSC2 | 0.807 | 0.349 | 0.651 |  |  |  |
| CSC3 | 0.800 | 0.360 | 0.640 |  |  |  |
| CSC4 | 0.790 | 0.376 | 0.624 |  |  |  |
| CSC5 | 0.770 | 0.407 | 0.593 |  |  |  |
| CSC6 | 0.805 | 0.352 | 0.648 |  |  |  |
| RSC |  |  |  | 0.836 | 0.630 | 0.834 |
| RSC1 | 0.779 | 0.393 | 0.607 |  |  |  |
| RSC2 | 0.832 | 0.308 | 0.692 |  |  |  |
| RSC3 | 0.768 | 0.410 | 0.590 |  |  |  |
| ISE |  |  |  | 0.925 | 0.638 | 0.925 |
| ISE1 | 0.745 | 0.445 | 0.555 |  |  |  |
| ISE2 | 0.809 | 0.346 | 0.654 |  |  |  |
| ISE3 | 0.775 | 0.399 | 0.601 |  |  |  |
| ISE4 | 0.826 | 0.318 | 0.682 |  |  |  |
| ISE5 | 0.818 | 0.331 | 0.669 |  |  |  |
| ISE6 | 0.817 | 0.333 | 0.667 |  |  |  |
| ISE7 | 0.800 | 0.360 | 0.640 |  |  |  |
| ISH |  |  |  | 0.946 | 0.713 | 0.945 |
| ISH1 | 0.847 | 0.283 | 0.717 |  |  |  |
| ISH2 | 0.855 | 0.269 | 0.731 |  |  |  |
| ISH3 | 0.848 | 0.281 | 0.719 |  |  |  |
| ISH4 | 0.820 | 0.328 | 0.672 |  |  |  |
| ISH5 | 0.870 | 0.243 | 0.757 |  |  |  |
| ISH6 | 0.848 | 0.281 | 0.719 |  |  |  |
| ISH7 | 0.821 | 0.326 | 0.674 |  |  |  |
| Fit statistics (N = 665)  χ2/df = 4.676, Goodness-of-Fit Index (GFI) = 0.801, Nonnormed fit index (NFI) = 0.863, Comparative Fit Index (CFI) = 0.889, Incremental fit index (IFI) = 0.889, and Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA) = 0.074  CBT: Cognitive-based trust, ABT: Affective-based trust, SSC: Structural social capital, CSC: Cognitive social capital, RSC: Relational social capital, ISE: Information seeking, ISH: Information sharing. | | | | | | |

***Table 3. Correlation Matrix for Measurement Scales.***

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Constructs | Mean | SD | CBT | ABT | SSC | CSC | RSC | ISE | ISH | |
| CBT | 4.96 | 1.02 | 0.800 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ABT | 5.21 | 1.05 | 0.669\*\* | 0.799 |  |  |  |  |  |
| SSC | 5.43 | 1.04 | 0.516\*\* | 0.635\*\* | 0.840 |  |  |  |  |
| CSC | 5.20 | 1.06 | 0.615\*\* | 0.723\*\* | 0.624\*\* | 0.786 |  |  |  |
| RSC | 5.29 | 1.16 | 0.623\*\* | 0.673\*\* | 0.593\*\* | 0.668\*\* | 0.793 |  |  |
| ISE | 5.18 | 1.07 | 0.662\*\* | 0.758\*\* | 0.690\*\* | 0.818\*\* | 0.676\*\* | 0.799 |  |
| ISH | 5.07 | 1.16 | 0.545\*\* | 0.653\*\* | 0.729\*\* | 0.717\*\* | 0.633\*\* | 0.647\*\* | 0.844 |

**Notes**: SD: Standard Deviation

Diagonal elements are the square roots of the AVE for each construct

Pearson correlations are shown below the diagonal

\**p*<0.05, \*\**p*<0.01, \*\*\**p*<0.001

***Structural Model***

The model fit of data was adequate: χ2 = 2559.35, df =661, χ2/df = 3.872, GFI = 0.837, NFI = 0.890, CFI = 0.916, IFI = 0.916, and RMSEA= 0.066. The results support all research hypotheses as shown in Table 4. This study empirically validates that trust (cognitive/affective-based trust) has a significant and positive effect on Social capital (cognitive, relational and structural) then significant and positive effect on information seeking and sharing with significantly among 1%, 5% and 10%. Figure 2 shows the structural model of this research.

***Table 4. Proposed Model Results.***

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Symbol | Paths | | | Coefficients | Hypotheses | Test Results |
| γ11 | CBT | 🡪 | SSC | 0.116\*\* | H1a | Supported |
| γ21 | CBT | 🡪 | CSC | 0.206\*\*\* | H1b | Supported |
| γ31 | CBT | 🡪 | RSC | 0.262\*\*\* | H1c | Supported |
| γ12 | ABT | 🡪 | SSC | 0.608\*\*\* | H2a | Supported |
| γ22 | ABT | 🡪 | CSC | 0.541\*\*\* | H2b | Supported |
| γ 32 | ABT | 🡪 | RSC | 0.227\*\* | H2c | Supported |
| β21 | SSC | 🡪 | CSC | 0.192\*\*\* | H3 | Supported |
| β31 | SSC | 🡪 | RSC | 0.187\*\*\* | H4 | Supported |
| β32 | CSC | 🡪 | RSC | 0.291\*\*\* | H5 | Supported |
| β41 | SSC | 🡪 | ISE | 0.165\*\*\* | H6a | Supported |
| β51 | SSC | 🡪 | ISH | 0.417\*\*\* | H6b | Supported |
| β42 | CSC | 🡪 | ISE | 0.677\*\*\* | H7a | Supported |
| β52 | CSC | 🡪 | ISH | 0.414\*\*\* | H7b | Supported |
| β43 | RSC | 🡪 | ISE | 0.165\*\* | H8a | Supported |
| β53 | RSC | 🡪 | ISH | 0.102\* | H8b | Supported |

**Notes**: \**p*＜0.05; \*\**p*＜0.01; \*\*\**p*＜0.001

γ 32=0.227\*\*

β32=0.291\*\*\*

R2= 0.647

R2=0.768

R2= 0.857

R2= 0.809

γ 11=0.116\*\*

γ 31=0.262\*\*\*

β51=0.417\*\*\*

β31=0.187\*\*\*

β42=0.677\*\*\*

R2= 0.753

γ 21=0.206\*\*\*

β52=0.414\*\*\*

β53=0.102\*

γ 12=0.608\*\*\*

β21=0.192\*\*\*

β43=0.165\*\*

β41=0.165\*\*\*

γ 22=0.541\*\*\*

**Notes**: Model fit: χ2 = 2559.35, df =661, χ2/df = 3.872, GFI = 0.837, NFI = 0.890, CFI = 0.916, IFI = 0.916, and RMSEA= 0.066

***Figure 2. Structural model.***

***Mediating Effect***

This study tested a range of mediating effects for the Bootstrapping method with 5000 simulations. Bootstrapping is a nonparametric statistical procedure in which the dataset is repeatedly sampled and indirect effects are calculated using such a nonparametric statistical procedure (Hayes, 2018). Table 5 shows that all ranges of both percentile method CIs and bias-corrected CIs exclude zero, indicating all mediating effects significant. The regression results indicate that all mediating effects are partial mediators.

***Table 5. Mediation Effects.***

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| IV | M | DV | IV->DV  (c) | IV->M  (a) | IV+M->DV | | Bootstrapping 95% CI | |
| IV (c’) | M(b) | Percentile method | Bias-corrected |
| CBT | SSC | CSC | 0.528\*\*\* | 0.414\*\*\* | 0.422\*\*\* | 0.638\*\*\* | [0.036, 0.144] | [0.037, 0.146] |
| Standard Error (SE) | | | 0.034 | 0.033 | 0.032 | 0.032 |  |  |
| CBT | SSC | RSC | 0.528\*\*\* | 0.490\*\*\* | 0.409\*\*\* | 0.705\*\*\* | [0.334, 0.611] | [0.341, 0.623] |
| Standard Error (SE) | | | 0.034 | 0.037 | 0.036 | 0.034 |  |  |
| CBT | CSC | RSC | 0.637\*\*\* | 0.387\*\*\* | 0.501\*\*\* | 0.705\*\*\* | [0.334, 0.611] | [0.341, 0.623] |
| Standard Error (SE) | | | 0.032 | 0.039 | 0.038 | 0.034 |  |  |
| ABT | SSC | CSC | 0.633\*\*\* | 0.553\*\*\* | 0.279\*\*\* | 0.729\*\*\* | [0.487, 0.676] | [0.618, 0.782] |
| Standard Error (SE) | | | 0.030 | 0.033 | 0.033 | 0.027 |  |  |
| ABT | SSC | RSC | 0.633\*\*\* | 0.547\*\*\* | 0.307\*\*\* | 0.740\*\*\* | [0.473, 0.641] | [0.496, 0.673] |
| Standard Error (SE) | | | 0.030 | 0.039 | 0.039 | 0.032 |  |  |
| ABT | CSC | RSC | 0.729\*\*\* | 0.437\*\*\* | 0.416\*\*\* | 0.741\*\*\* | [0.379, 0.641] | [0.397, 0.673] |
| Standard Error (SE) | | | 0.027 | 0.043 | 0.043 | 0.032 |  |  |
| SSC | CSC | ISE | 0.631\*\*\* | 0.301\*\*\* | 0.645\*\*\* | 0.708\*\*\* | [0.281, 0.660] | [0.293, 0.690] |
| Standard Error (SE) | | | 0.031 | 0.027 | 0.027 | 0.029 |  |  |
| SSC | CSC | ISH | 0.631\*\*\* | 0.513\*\*\* | 0.472\*\*\* | 0.812\*\*\* | [0.442, 0.698] | [0.462, 0.729] |
| Standard Error (SE) | | | 0.031 | 0.033 | 0.033 | 0.030 |  |  |
| SSC | RSC | ISE | 0.655\*\*\* | 0.458\*\*\* | 0.382\*\*\* | 0.708\*\*\* | [0.427, 0.660] | [0.446, 0.690] |
| Standard Error (SE) | | | 0.035 | 0.032 | 0.030 | 0.029 |  |  |
| SSC | RSC | ISH | 0.655\*\*\* | 0.608\*\*\* | 0.311\*\*\* | 0.812\*\*\* | [0.522, 0.698] | [0.545, 0.729] |
| Standard Error (SE) | | | 0.035 | 0.034 | 0.031 | 0.029 |  |  |
| CSC | RSC | ISE | 0.730\*\*\* | 0.673\*\*\* | 0.216\*\*\* | 0.831\*\*\* | [0.628, 0.775] | [0.663, 0.819] |
| Standard Error (SE) | | | 0.031 | 0.029 | 0.027 | 0.022 |  |  |
| CSC | RSC | ISH | 0.730\*\*\* | 0.584\*\*\* | 0.280\*\*\* | 0.789\*\*\* | [0.502, 0.678] | [0.530, 0.717] |
| Standard Error (SE) | | | 0.031 | 0.038 | 0.035 | 0.030 |  |  |

**Notes**:\**p*＜0.05; \*\**p*＜0.01; \*\*\**p*＜0.001.

**Discussions**

***Key Findings***

The results of this study confirm that cognitive-/affective-based trust significantly and positively influences social capital (e.g., structural, cognitive, and relational), which has a significant and positive effect on information seeking and sharing. These are innovative findings that, to the authors’ knowledge, have not been revealed by prior studies. This study also confirms that structural social capital has significant and positive effects on both cognitive and relational social capital (Docherty, 2020; Kent et al., 2019). Both structural social capital and cognitive social capital are mediators between trust (e.g., cognitive-/affective-based trust) and relational social capital as well as information seeking/sharing in the social media context (e.g., Facebook). Specifically, the findings show that Indonesian Facebook users’ trust is high when they have higher levels of communication and interaction as well as shared language, reciprocity, respect, and vision over their activities. It also corroborates that Facebook provides an effective two-way communication platform.

Moreover,the findings confirm the research hypotheses that U&G theory can explain the motives of Facebook users toward fulfilling their needs for information seeking and sharing (Ferris & Hollenbaugh, 2018; Hossain, 2019). Both cognitive-based trust and affective-based trust are antecedents of social capital (Fu, 2004; Newman et al., 2014; Yeh & Choi, 2011), which subsequently influence information seeking (Basak & Calisir, 2015; Son et al., 2016) and information sharing (Choo et al., 2008; Engelmann et al., 2019).

***Conclusion***

The obtained results based on U&G theory, suggest that Facebook users, specifically Indonesian young people, exchange information through their social interaction in order to meet their social needs. This study strengthens the work of Hossain (2019) and Savolainen (2019). Furthermore, these results indicate that trust influences SNSs users’ social capital based on their social needs. These factors contribute to the formation and maintenance of virtual communities’ relationships through trust, shared interests, language and vision, reciprocity, sense of community, and sociability, all of which subsequently influence information seeking and sharing. The social motivation of SNSs can be used as a predictor of general use of Facebook as a media to seek and share information. This study investigated social media usage using U&G theory in the SNSs context (e.g., Facebook). The results indicate that the primary motivators of U&G theory in this context are the seeking and sharing of information. Information seekers and sharers speciﬁcally engage in virtual communities to communicate and interact with others. Consequently, this behavior paves the way for the ultimate success of virtual communities in the maintenance of close relationships among SNSs users.

***Academic Implications***

The findings contribute to the literature of Facebook subscribers, U&G theory, and social connection. First, this study proposes and tests a model that illustrates the formation of information seeking and sharing for Indonesian Facebook users. It provides an appropriate theoretical background. The study of information exchange on social media is a trendy issue (Bento et al., 2020; Engelmann et al., 2019). Past studies have seldom established a model that simultaneously explains the antecedents of Facebook users’ information seeking and sharing behaviors. On the other hand, this study extends U&G theory to explain Facebook users’ behaviors of communication and interaction and provides theoretical contributions to the literature on the virtual community in two ways. Firstly, the findings of this research demonstrate the effects of cognitive-based trust and affective-based on three dimensions of social capital, which subsequently influence information seeking and sharing on Facebook. Secondly, this research demonstrates that U&G theory can explains the mediating effects of structural, cognitive, and relational social capital to information seeking and sharing for SNSs users’ social media usages. It provides a theoretical ground for future research.

***Practical Implications***

Facebook is an effective platform by which users can exchange information and express their opinions in order to develop social interaction through trust and social capital. Facebook must aware and endeavor to identify objective and rational characteristics to increase users to discuss topics regarding trust, social capital, and exchange information, as well as addressing members’ concerns for their welfare to improve their affective and cognitive based trust, as well as inviting everyone to participate in the interaction activities include a great deal of users’ control with and among users, and timely response to their questions. In addition, users’ interaction contents and processes to foster long-term relationships, create value propositions, and use innovative online platforms to maintain communication and interaction. This will provide cognitive- and affective-based trust among users as well as enhance members’ connections.

Our research provided practical implications for virtual community management. Furthermore, SNSs replace the role of conventional media such as TV and newspaper and provide appropriate platforms for users to seek and share information. SNSs managers or practitioners should focus on the major dimensions of U&G theory to maximize their users’ interaction on social media. They should investigate what prompts users to create interesting posts or to discuss social issues in order that reliable information is provided to users. In addition, Facebook managers should pay particular attention to their reference groups, most especially the active virtual communities’ members in order to broaden their users’ bases.

***Limitations and Future Research***

There are some limitations in this research. Firstly, this study conducted to examine Indonesian Facebook users’ behaviors. A longitudinal study could help researchers observe Facebook users’ interaction under dynamic conditions in order to elaborate the content and impact of users’ interaction based on social context and economic perspective. Secondly, it only considered the social capital factors on information exchange. Thirdly, this study looked at the relationships between cognitive-/affective-based trust and three dimensions of social capital from beneficial perspective on Facebook. Lastly, the majority of participants were Indonesian young people with bachelor’s degrees, so they cannot be considered representative of Indonesian Facebook users as a whole. Future research should also investigate internal factors (i.e., institution authority, economic cost, and information security), external factors (i.e., operation ability, inter-organization relationship, and organizational comparability) and individual factors (i.e., age, education and income) from an information seeking and sharing perspective.
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**Appendix**.

Scale Items

Cognitive-based Trust (Yeh & Choi, 2011)

1. Facebook users have relevant skills when discussing particular topics.

2. Facebook users have relevant knowledge when discussing particular topics.

3. Facebook users provide professional knowledge when discussing major topics.

4. Facebook users have the expertise to advance the community discussions.

5. Facebook users provide feedback after discussions.

6. Facebook users possess the capability to accomplish tasks (e.g., suggestions).

Affective-based Trust (Yeh & Choi, 2011)

1. Facebook users increase the interaction among users.

2. Facebook users do not intentionally interfere in discussions with malevolence.

3. Facebook users promote understanding among users.

4. Facebook users help other members within their capabilities.

5. Facebook users treat other members fairly (honestly).

6. Facebook users do not behave in a consistent manner.

Structural Social Capital (Lu & Yang, 2011)

1. Facebook users and I maintain close social relationships.

2. Facebook users and I spend a lot of time interacting with each other.

3. Facebook users and I have frequent communication with each other.

4. Facebook users know me at a personal level.

Cognitive Social Capital (Lu & Yang, 2011)

1. When interacting, Facebook users and I use common terms or jargon.

2. During the discussion, Facebook users and I use mutually-understandable communication patterns.

3. When communicating, Facebook users and I use mutually-understandable narrative forms.

4. Facebook users care about the same issues.

5. Facebook users have common goals towards the social media.

6. Facebook users understand each other.

Relational Social Capital (Lu & Yang, 2011)

1. The relationship among Facebook users and I is characterized by mutual respect.

2. The relationship among Facebook users and I is characterized by high reciprocity.

3. The relationship among Facebook users and I is characterized by personal friendship.

Information Seeking (Basak & Calisir, 2015; Yi & Gong, 2013)

1. I use Facebook because it gives quick and easy access to large amount of information.

2. I use Facebook because I learn a lot from using it.

3. I use Facebook to find out useful knowledge and new information.

4. I use Facebook to obtain useful knowledge and new information.

5. I use Facebook so I can learn about things happening in the world.

6. I use Facebook because it makes acquiring information inexpensive.

7. Facebook makes me easy to retrieve information and knowledge when I need.

Information Sharing (Choo, Bergeron, Detlor, & Heaton, 2008; Yi & Gong, 2013)

1. I clearly explain what the information I need on Facebook.

2. I give Facebook users proper information.

3. I provide necessary information so that Facebook users can perform her/his duty.

4. I answer related questions to Facebook users.

5. I expect to share information review contributed by other Facebook users.

6. I intend to share information on Facebook in the future.

7. I plan to share information on Facebook regularly.