# Leisure Time and Social Integration

*The difference between online and offline leisure time and their influence on social integration* 



University of Groningen The Faculty of Behavioural and Social Sciences

Bachelor's Thesis Sociology

Roma Lamain

R.C.Lamain@student.rug.nl

June 2022

Supervisor: Dr. F. Giardini

### Abstract

With the technological developments in the last years, the way people spend their free time has also changed drastically. Spending leisure time online has increased. Social media use seems to increase the feeling of social isolation. The shift from offline to online leisure time is interesting to investigate to see if it matters how someone spends their leisure time and how this influences how they socially integrate. In this research, we will look if there is a difference between offline and online leisure time and their effect on social integration. We will also research if age influences this relationship. There will be controlled for gender, health, and education. The data used for this research is collected from the Longitudinal Internet studies for the Social Sciences (LISS) panel. The total amount of respondents used in this research is 2746. Looking at the results, we can see that there is a difference between online and offline leisure time and how it affects social integration. Individuals who spend their free time online are less socially integrated than those who spend it offline. Age also has a role in this relationship. Those who spend their leisure time online are socially integrated more the older they are. Age did not affect the relationship between offline leisure time and social integration. There were no gender differences in social integration. Better health and higher education both are related to social integration Lastly, the implications of the findings and the limitations of the study will be discussed.

Table of contents
Introduction
<b>Theory</b>
<b>Method</b> 11
<b>Results</b>
Descriptive statistics
Model evaluation
Assumptions and multicollinearity17
Outliers
Hypothesis testing
Conclusion and discussion
References
Appendix 1 - operationalizations
Offline
Online
Social Integration
Age
Gender
Education
Health
Appendix 2 – syntax and output
Appendix 3 – assumptions, outliers, and multicollinearity

### Introduction

You come home after a long day of work and decide to watch your favorite television show on Netflix. Others might decide that they want to read their favorite book as a way of winding down. People spend their leisure time in different ways, some spend it offline, others spend it online.

Nowadays, technology has improved in many ways. It is easy to find others online and make new connections. In the past, contacting others was practically only possible physically. Spending time with others was the only way to make new connections and maintain them. With the rise of social media, keeping in touch with others has never been easier. Does this mean that spending leisure time online has a positive influence on how someone socially integrates?

Everybody has a preference on how they spend their leisure time. People need time to relax and do things that they enjoy. Leisure activities are vital in maintaining both physical health and social well-being (Marcum, 2021). With the new strong presence of technological devices in the Western world, people are more likely to spend their pastimes online. This shift raises new research opportunities. Research shows that those who used increased amounts of social media subsequently develop increased social isolation (Primack et al., 2017). Since the use of technology in the last years has increased, we can assume that individuals who feel socially isolated have increased as well. This can cause them to not be as socially integrated as others.

Age plays a key role when it comes to types of leisure time. The internet now encompasses almost all domains of life, think of education, work, or as a medium for interaction with others. The younger generation grew up with technology, while the older generation has to get used to this transition. It seems plausible that they, therefore, gravitate more towards spending leisure time on offline activities like reading a book rather than spending it online, for example on Twitter (Mohta & Halder, 2020). This means that younger individuals are more susceptible to feeling socially isolated than older individuals, simply because they use the internet more often.

It is interesting to look further into this. Social integration is an essential factor in life. When someone feels like they are not socially integrated, they can feel alone and isolated. Social isolation is known to be associated with negative health effects (Primack et al., 2017). Researching the relationship between leisure time and social integration gives us more insight if we need to worry about the way individuals spend their leisure time. Especially with the internet becoming a predominantly part of our everyday lives it is important to see if this affects social integration. This leads to the research question of this thesis: Is there any difference in social integration between people who spend a lot of their leisure time online and those who spend it offline? Since we expect age to influence the cause-and-effect relationship of the two main effects, a sub-question is created: to what extent does age affect the relationship between online and offline leisure time and their effect on social integration?

Social integration is a term that is used a lot in sociological research. It has a broad definition. In this thesis, we will define it as the degree to which an individual participates in a broad range of social relationships (Chin et al., 2018). Important in this definition is how the individual feels about their connections. If the individual feels poorly about these relationships, they might still feel alone which means that they are not socially integrated.

The other term that is used in this research is leisure time. We will define leisure time in two ways; offline and online. Offline leisure time being in "real life", like reading a book or visiting a concert. It is the leisure time that is not spent on any technology device. It also falls under the category of productive activities, since they are used for creative or expressive goals (van Ingen & van Eijck, 2009). Online leisure is the type of leisure spent on technology, for example, using social media like Twitter or TikTok or watching your favorite TV show. They fall under the category of consumptive activities because they can be defined by the use of certain goods, in this case, screen-use activity and the internet (van Ingen & van Eijck, 2009).

To answer the research question and the sub-question, the mechanisms will firstly be discussed based on the literature. This will be done for the type of leisure time, social integration, and age. Other factors that can influence the outcome of the relationship between leisure type and social integration are gender, health, and education which will shortly be discussed in the theory chapter as well. In the method chapter, we will present how the data for the research was collected, how the variables are operationalized, and an analysis plan is created. Thereafter, we will discuss the results of the linear regression. Finally, we draw conclusions and discuss the limitations and recommendations for future studies.

### Theory

Social integration is a broad concept. We will delineate the term to make clear what we are trying to research. In this thesis, it is defined as the degree to which an individual participates in social relationships. It is assessed as the number of social roles, for example, parent or friend, the individual actively participates in (Chin et al., 2018). What is crucial in this definition is that we make sure that we consider how the individual feels about the connections. If they feel poorly about these relationships, we can conclude that they are not socially integrated. This is relevant to our study because we do not research how many connections an individual has, but we want to know if they also feel like these connections have meaning. If they do not have a positive feeling about these relationships, they might still feel alone which means they are not socially integrated.

Social capital is a crucial factor to which social integration is linked. Social capital has been defined by many noticeable sociologists. Putnam's definition of social capital consists of three components: moral obligations and norms, social values where trust is most important, and social organization, such as networks (Putnam, 1994). Bourdieu defines social capital a little differently. He sees social capital as one of several recourses that individuals use to pursue their interests and position themselves. Lastly, we have Lin's definition of social capital (Ihlen, 2005). Lin defines it as the resources embedded in social networks accessed and used by actors for actions (Ihlen, 2005).

The definition that is most relevant to this research is Putnam's definition. His definition looks at social networks and important social values like trust. His definition can be linked to the definition we use for social integration. Social integration looks at connections and their meaning. Social capital generally refers to tangible and intangible property that arises from an individual's social relationships (Bano et al., 2019). Social relationships seem to increase social capital. This means that when someone has good social relationships, they are socially integrated and have a higher social capital. We therefore can use Putnam's definition of social capital because it encompasses our definition of social integration.

The connection between social integration and social capital is essential for our research. Van Ingen and van Eijck (2009) have researched the relationship between social capital and leisure time. They make a distinction between productive and consumptive leisure time. In this research, a distinction is made between offline and online leisure time. Offline activities fall under the category of productive activities, for example going to a concert or listening to music. These will be considered productive because while indulging in these activities, you are actively using your brain and using it for a creative or expressive goal, for example reading a book. These activities are also 'physical' which means it is something you do without the use of the internet, you often have to get out of the house to do these things or it takes place in situations where other people are physically able to join. Online activities will be defined as consumptive because it is characterized by the 'utilization' of

certain goods, in this case, screen-use activity like watching TV or using the internet, like scrolling on Instagram (van Ingen & van Eijck, 2009).

Leisure activities can create social networks, which can help someone create or expand their social capital (van Ingen & van Eijck, 2009). However, not all leisure activities have a positive effect on social capital. According to Putnam, the nature of activities has a significant impact on the relationship between social capital and how people spend their leisure time. Productive activities consist of *doing* things, often involving others. Individuals are active and creative, and it often involves cooperation. Consumptive activities are defined as *watching* things, sometimes involving others. The individuals are passive, and they are using material or cultural goods. Passive activities result in less opportunity to create social ties or consolidate them. Consumptive activities do not help to advance social capital (van Ingen & van Eijck, 2009).

Since online activities are defined as consumptive activities, our first hypothesis is that because there are fewer opportunities to create social ties or consolidate them, it makes individuals who spend their leisure time online less socially integrated than those who spend their leisure time on productive, or offline, activities.

Aging is an inevitable process. In the last decades, the population of individuals who are above 65 years old has increased. People live longer than they did before. Old age brings some challenges with it. Old age gives rise to the feeling of loneliness. This is because of an increase in the number of losses experienced. Aging also makes it more difficult to keep on living as an able and active person (Hacihasanoğlu et al., 2012). An aged person loses their previous active roles and is to assume a passive position because their body changes. They get weaker and are not able to participate in certain activities like they were used to. They lose their mobility and are not able to function like they were before. The elderly become dependent on others and need more supervision. They also lack trust in others and have decreasing financial support. All these factors contribute to their feeling of loneliness (Hacihasanoğlu et al., 2012).

The older you get, the less social interaction you have (Marcum, 2012). Older people are more likely to be widowed and live alone. Because they are less mobile, it is harder for them to leave the house and participate in activities. This makes them more likely to feel socially isolated (Marcum, 2021). Adolescents, unlike the elderly, have more opportunities to make new contacts. They can meet more people, for example at work or school. Adolescents are mobile and can participate in social activities. They are more likely to have more connections than older individuals (Chin et al., 2018). We have already established that loneliness and social isolation mean that someone is not socially integrated. The theory confirmed that older individuals overall feel alone and socially isolated. We can make the connection that older individuals are not socially integrated because they have less social interaction and feel more alone.

Not only do individuals of all ages socially integrate differently from each other, but they also spend their daily activities, or leisure time, differently. Older people tend to spend their time doing activities that are conducive to being alone, for example, doing housework. Research by Marcum (2012) shows that they spend less time with others, no matter what the activities are. Younger individuals tend to live in larger families and have more obligations from work and family in comparison to the elderly who are more likely to live alone and be retired. Therefore, older people seem to have more time for themselves, and younger people might find it more difficult to find a minute for themselves (Marcum, 2021). Even though younger people seem to have less free time, they spend their time on activities that are conducive to being with others, for example going out to dinner with friends, which is why they seem to spend more time with others. When an activity is inherently social, like going to a party, older individuals do tend to spend their time with others, while younger individuals tend to spend all activities with others, whether they are inherently social or not.

The internet has rapidly become a major vehicle for communication and information dissemination. The use of computers and the internet increased significantly. Research shows that there is a digital divide. Older individuals have a harder time adopting modern technology (Czaja et al., 2008). There seems to be an increase in older adults who feel more comfortable with using computers, but the age difference still exists (Lee & Coughlin, 2014). The younger generations are more familiar with technology and the internet because they grew up with it (Mohta & Halder, 2020). Older individuals most often reject using technology. There are 10 factors that are important for older adults to make decisions about adaptation and use of technology. The 10 factors are value, usability, affordability, accessibility, technical support, social support, emotion, independence, experience, and confidence (Lee & Coughlin, 2014).

Older adults are aware of technological benefits and are willing to try new technology, however, they only accept modern technologies under the influence of various factors, such as usefulness and cost. Developers often overlook what older adults need. The expectations and needs of older adults are often masked by stereotypes and not accurately assessed, for example, they value independence privacy and social interactions. Current products focus mostly on safety and physical assistance. Older adults are less likely to adopt new technologies because of the shortcomings in assessing their needs and expectations. Technology developers often forget relevance to everyday life, cultural norms, and personal values when designing (Lee & Coughlin, 2014).

What we can establish from all of this is that older individuals are less socially integrated than younger individuals because they are more susceptible to loneliness and social isolation. They also divide their time differently than younger individuals. Their free time is often spent alone. This differs from adolescents who often spend their pastimes with others. There is not only a difference with whom they spend their leisure time but also how they spend it. Because older people are less likely to

adopt technology, we assume that they are less likely to spend their free time online. The younger generations grew up with technology and the internet which makes it more likely for them to resort to technology in their free time.

Taking all of this into account, we expect that age has a moderating effect on the relationship between the type of leisure time and social integration. This means that it is likely that the effect that type of leisure time has on social integration differs for older and younger individuals. The first expectation that is made is that age has a positive effect on the relationship between offline leisure time and social integration. This expectation is made because older individuals are less likely to adopt technology. Because of this, we can assume that they are less likely to spend their leisure time online. Because offline activities are expected to promote social integration, we can assume that the older you are, the more likely you are to spend your leisure time offline which makes someone more socially integrated. The opposite expectation counts for younger individuals. They are more likely to spend their leisure time online which makes them less socially integrated.

This thesis also considers that there might be confounding variables. These are also called control variables and they are included because they can influence the outcomes of the research. By including them in this research, we can rule out if they have an impact. There are three control variables in this thesis: gender, health, and education and they will be discussed shortly.

Firstly, we will look at gender differences. Women are more socially active than men. This is why they not only receive more support from "primary" networks (spouse/close friends) but also "secondary" networks (social groups through community/volunteering). Because of this, women can participate in social groups of their choosing outside their immediate circle (Phongsavan et al., 2013). Women also report more close persons in their primary networks and are less likely to nominate their partner as their closest person. This means that women have a wider range of sources of emotional support than men (Fuhrer & Stansfeld, 2002). We can assume that since women are socially more active than men and have more close social relationships, they have more social roles and have more close relationships which makes them more socially integrated than men.

Secondly, we look at health. Health is taken as a general concept that can be divided into mental and physical health. Research shows that social integration has a positive effect on mental health. Reporting more contact with close friends is associated with a decline in depressive symptoms (Seeman, 1996). The effect of health on social integration has been researched less. If someone has bad mental health, it can impact someone's capacity for social interaction. It can hinder individuals from successfully integrating (Liamputtong & Kurban, 2018). People with bad physical health are more likely to fall victim to social isolation. Individuals who feel more isolated found it difficult to make meaningful connections with other people (Liamputtong & Kurban, 2018). The assumption that can be made here is that those with either physical or mental health problems, or both, have a harder

time with social interaction and making meaningful connections. This means they are more likely to be less socially integrated.

Lastly, we also look at the effect education has on social integration. Research shows that low levels of education heighten the risk of job loss. Job loss brings many negative effects with it. Employment performs an integrative role. It helps draw people into social life. Having a stable job and an orderly career are also associated with higher levels of social integration (Brand, 2015). Higher educated individuals are more likely to attain jobs where they will stay for a long time which helps maintain social contacts (Ginn & Fast, 2006). Lower educated individuals have a harder time attaining a stable job and are consequently at a higher risk of unemployment. Since unemployment does not perform an integrative role, we can assume that lower-educated individuals are less socially integrated because they are more likely to be unemployed.



### Method

The data that is used in this research is collected from the Longitudinal Internet studies for the Social Sciences (LISS) panel. This panel consists of 5000 households, compromising approximately 7500 individuals who are residents in the Netherlands. The 13th wave of the LISS Core Study module called 'Social Integration and Leisure` is used in particular for this research. The collection period was from 02-11-2020 to 24-11-2020. It was collected via an internet survey. All panel members are aged 16 years and older. In total there were 6680 household members selected. 710 were non-response which means that 5970 respondents did fill out the survey. However, 87 did not complete it, so the total of complete surveys is 5883 (*Social Integration and Leisure (LISS Core Study*), 2008). In this research, all respondents will be included but all missing data has been deleted leaving a total of 2746 respondents that are used in this research.

People who participate in the LISS panel surveys have to complete online questionnaires every month and it takes about 15 to 30 minutes. In exchange for filling out the surveys, they get compensated. It is a longitudinal study meaning that it is done over a longer period. The same respondents get examined to see if any changes have occurred. The LISS panel started in October 2007 and is still ongoing.

This research consists of 53 variables total. A lot of those variables are similar which makes it that they can be transformed into scales. This leaves a total of 7 variables. The operationalization of these 7 variables will be discussed shortly.

Firstly, Offline is the first of the two independent variables that consist of a scale. In total, the scale offline is made of 26 ordinal variables. The question that was asked was: average number of days per week that time is spent on: ....'. This question had 26 different variations, for example, photography or reading. They all had the same answer categories: 0 = less than 1 day a week, 1 = 1 day per week, 2 = 2 days per week, 3 = 3 days per week, 4 = 4 days per week, 5 = 5 days per week, 6 = 6 days per week, 7 = 7 days per week, 99 = never. The answer categories have been moved in the new scale. 0 now means never, and 1 = less than 1 day a week, 2 = 1 day per week, etc. Since offline is a continuous variable, it has been centered for the regression analysis. A new variable Offline\_C was made by subtracting the mean of 1,0238 off the scale variable offline.

Secondly, online is the other independent variable that consists of a scale. This scale has a total of 17 continuous variables. The question that was asked was: 'average number of hours per week spent on: ....'. Just like the variable offline, the question asked was followed with different variations, in this case, 17, for example: watching online films or TV. The respondents were able to fill out how much time they spent on online activities per week, from 0.0 hours up until 168.0 hours. Just like offline, online is a continuous variable used in the regression analysis, so it has been centered. The mean of 1,8289 was subtracted from the scale online to make the new centered variable Online\_C.

The dependent variable social integration also consists of a scale. There were 6 statements to which the respondents could answer if it applied to them. The answer options were: 1 = yes, 2 = more or less, 3 = no. The first statement is: 'I have a sense of emptiness around me'. The second one is: 'there are enough people I can count on in case of misfortune'. The third is 'I know a lot of people I can fully rely on'. The fourth one is 'there are enough people to whom I feel closely connected'. The fifth and sixth statements are: 'I miss having people around me' and 'I often feel deserted'. For three of the six ordinal variables of which the scale is made of, the answers categories were mirrored. This was done for statements 2, 3, and 4. This was done so that the answers would all mean the same thing, 3 means that the respondent feels socially integrated, and 1 means that they feel that they are not socially integrated.

The variable age is in this research known as the moderator. Age is a continuous variable that was measured in birth year. This is a difficult way of measuring age, so the variable was made into a new variable that consisted of just the age itself. This was done by subtracting the birth year from the year 2020, the year in which the survey was taken. This way a variable with age in years was left. Since this is a continuous variable and a moderator, age has also been centered. This was done the same way by subtracting the mean of 53,3591 off the new variable age to make Age\_C.

For the regression analysis, two interaction variables have been created. This was done to see if age had a moderating effect on the relationship between offline and social integration and/or on online and social integration. The first interaction variable consists of the product of the centered variable Age\_C and the centered variable offline\_C and was made into the variable IntOffxAge\_C. The second interaction does the same, but this time with the centered variable online. The product of Age\_C and Offline\_C was made into the interaction variable IntOnxAge\_C.

Next up, we have the control variables. The first one that will be discussed is gender. This is a nominal variable. The answer options were 1 = man and 2 = women. This has been changed to 0 = man and 1 = women. This makes interpretation of the variable easier in the statistical analysis later on.

Another control variable is the variable education. This is an ordinal variable. The question that was asked for this variable is: 'highest level of education with diploma'. The answer categories were 1 = primary school, 2 = vmbo, 3 = havo/vwo, 4 = mbo, 5 = hbo, 6 = wo, 7 = different, 8 = education not (yet) completed, 9 = not yet started education. The last three categories were removed because they are not relevant to the research and did not add anything significant.

Lastly, health is just like education an ordinal variable. The corresponding question to this variable is: 'How would you describe your health, generally speaking?' The answer categories were 1 = bad, 2 = average, 3 = good, 4 = very good, 5 = excellent.

The hypotheses that have been developed will be tested using linear regression. In the first model, the control variables will be added. In this research, the control variables are gender, age, and education. Then, in the second model, de independent variables will be added. These are online and offline leisure time. Lastly, in the third model, the moderator age will be added. For these models, there will be checked whether there is linearity, so if the relationship between the dependent and independent variables is linear. Next, there will be checked for homoscedasticity: the variance of residual is the same for any value of the independent variables. Both of these assumptions can be checked with a residual plot. Another requirement is that the observations have to be independent of each other. And lastly, the variables must be normally distributed. This can be checked with a histogram.

### Results

### **Descriptive statistics**

Firstly, we will look at the variable social integration. The mean is 2,64 and the standard deviation is ,43. This is an extremely high mean when we compare it to the scale of social integration which was 1-3. This means that the respondents feel like they are very socially integrated.

Offline has a mean of 1,02 and a standard deviation of ,047. This means that the respondents on average spend less than 1 day of their leisure time on online activities. The minimum is ,00 which means that some respondents never spend their leisure time online, and the maximum is 4,08 which means that the maximum amount that the respondents spend on online leisure activities is around 3 days per week.

What is very remarkable about the data shown in *table 1* is the low mean of online which is 1,83. The respondents were able to fill in from 0.0 hours up to 168.0 for how much time they spent on online activities per week. A mean of 1,83 is exceptionally low, it means that the respondents only spent around 2 hours per week on online activities.

Next, we will look at the moderating variable age. The mean is 53,35 and the standard deviation is 18,06, there was little dispersion. The minimum age the respondents had to be to participate is 16, and as we can see in *table 1* the minimum age is 16. The maximum age of the respondents is 97. The age that most respondents filled out was 56.

Looking at the variable gender, we can see that the ratio of men to women is almost equal. With 50,2% there are more men than women who were with 49,8%. This means that the data is quite representative of both genders since almost the same number of men and women participated.

For education, we can see that the majority followed either a mbo education; 26,5%, or an hbo education; 25,5%. However, what is also noteworthy is that 21,3% of the respondents got their diplomas at the level of vmbo. This is a high percentage in comparison to havo/vwo which only 9,5% graduated from.

Lastly, we look at the variable health. We can see that the majority of the respondents filled out that they feel good, namely 55,8%. This is over half. The category that follows with 21,6% is very good. Only a few people would describe their health below good, in total 17,7% filled out that they feel their health is moderate or even poor.

Variable	Mean	Std. Deviation	Minimum	Maximum	Median	Ν
Age	53,35	18,02	16	97	56	2746
Gender	Male: 50,2%	-	-	-	-	
(0=male;	Female: 49,8%					
l = female)						
Education	Primary school:	-	-	-	-	2746
	4,1%					
	Vmbo: 21,5%					
	Havo/vwo: 9,5%					
	Mbo: 26,5%					
	Hbo: 25,3%					
	Wo: 13,0%					
Health	Poor: 1.7%	_	_	-	-	2746
	Moderate: 16.0%					
	Good: 55.8%					
	Very good: 21.6%					
	Excellent: 4,9%					
Offline	1,02	0,47	.00	4,08	1.00	2746
(Scale of 26 items*)	,	,	,	,	,	
Online	1,83	1,92	,00	40,35	1,41	2746
(Scale of 17 items*)	,	,	,	,	,	
Social integration	2.64	0,43	1,00	3	2.83	2746
(Scale of 6 items*)	-,	- ,	,	-	,	

Table 1: Descriptive statistics of the variables

\*See appendix 1 for operationalizations

*Table 2* shows the correlation between all the variables of this research. What stands out most is that most of the correlations are close to 0, which means that there is hardly a correlation between the two. For example, the correlation between social integration and gender is -,02. There is no correlation between the two.

One of the higher correlations is -,27 and is between offline and gender. This means that there is a negative and weak correlation between the two. This would mean that there is a link between gender and how much time they spend on online activities in their leisure time. The highest correlation is between social integration and age. With ,98 the correlation between the two is positive and strong, it is almost 1. Age and social integration are strongly related to each other.

We will also discuss some of the correlations based on a one-way ANOVA analysis. The relation between social integration and health is interesting to analyse (F(4,2741,) = 39,243; p <,001). The means of all categories are very similar, for example, good 2,64 (SD = ,41) and moderate 2,49 (SD = ,51). However, the different scores on education significantly differ for social integration.

Another interesting finding is the correlation between health and age. The means of the answer categories significantly differ from each other (F(4,2741) = 62,029; p < 0,01), for example, people score 59,76 on moderate (SD = 16,51) and 41,10 on excellent (SD = 16,74). The average score on health differs significantly for every age group.

	1.	2.	З.	4.	5.	6.	7.
1. Age	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2. Gender	-,06 <sup>a</sup> **	-	-	-	-	-	-
3. Education	,28°**	,08 <sup>b</sup> *	-	-	-	-	-
4. Health	,29°**	,06 <sup>b</sup> **	,11 <sup>b</sup> *	-	-	-	-
5. Offline	-,02 <sup>a</sup> *	-,27 <sup>a</sup> **	,12 <sup>c**</sup>	,06°*	-	-	-
6. Online	-,28 <sup>a</sup> *	,01 <sup>a</sup> *	,01 <sup>c</sup> **	,06 <sup>c</sup> **	,14 <sup>a</sup> **	-	-
7. Social Integration	,98 <sup>a**</sup>	-,02 <sup>a</sup> *	,16 <sup>c**</sup>	,23 <sup>c</sup> **	,05ª*	-,09 <sup>a**</sup>	-

Table 2: the coherent measures of all variables in the research model

\*Significant with 0,05; \*\*significant with 0,01; <sup>a</sup> Pearson correlation; <sup>b</sup> Cramer's V; <sup>c</sup> Correlation based on ANOVA.

### Model evaluation

*Table 1 shows that the* first model has an  $R^2_a$  of ,053 meaning it can explain 5,3% of the variance of the dependent variable social integration. The f-change is 51,705 and is significant with p <,001. This means that the control variables cause a significant increase in variance.

The second model adds the two independent variables offline and online which both have been centered. *Table 1* shows that the  $R_a^2$  has increased to ,066. This means that model 2 can explain 6,6% of the variance which is more than model 1 can. The f-change is 20,179 and is also significant with *p* <,001.

The third model adds the moderator which is the centered variable of age. The  $R_a^2$  increases in comparison to model 2. This model can explain 8,9% of the variance. The f-change has increased as well to 70,022 and is significant with p <,001.

Lastly, the fourth model adds the two interaction variables. The  $R_a^2$  is slightly higher than model 3 with ,090. Model 4 can explain 9% of the variance, making it the model that can explain the most variance. However, the f-change of 2,724 is not significant with p = ,066. This means that the interaction variables do not significantly contribute to the model. The percentage of variance the model can explain only increases by ,1% in comparison to model 3 and because the f-change is not significant, the hypothesis will be tested with model 3. The interaction will be tested in model 4.

	Model 1		Model	2	Model 3 Model 4			VIF	
	b (SE)	р	b (SE)	р	b (SE)	р	b (SE)	р	
Constant	2,212 (,038)	< ,001	2,213(,038)	<,001	2,108(,039)	<,001	2,114(,039)	<,001	
Education	,021(,006)	,023	,022(,005)	,006	,029(,006)	<,001	,028(,006)	<,001	1,101
Health	,113(,010)	<,001	,114(,010)	<,001	,136(,010)	<,001	,137(,010)	<,001	1,085
Gender	,000331 (,016)	,984	-,011(,017)	,498	,003(,016)	,876	,003(,016)	,857	1,113
Offline			,050(,018)	,004	,042(,017)	,017	,042(,018)	,016	1,120
(Centered)									
Online			-,025(,004)	<,001	-,015(,004)	<,001	-,010(,005)	,032	1,401
(Centered)									
Age					,004(,000)	<,001	,004(,000)	<,001	1,214
(Centered)									
Offline*Age							,001(,001)	,461	1,031
Online*Age							,000449 (,000214)	,036	1,300
$R^2_{adjusted}$		,053		,066		,089		,090	
F change / p	51,705	<,001	20,179	<,001	70,022	<,001	2,724 ,066		
Ν	2746								

Table 3: parameters of the regression	n analysis with the social	integration as the depen	ıdent variable
---------------------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------	----------------

Ν

### Assumptions and multicollinearity

For linear regression, multiple assumptions must be checked. Firstly, the observations must be independent of each other. The data consists of a random sample, but the respondents can come from the same household. This means that the first assumption is violated since it is not guaranteed that the observations are independent of each other.

The second assumption is linearity. The relationship between the dependent and independent variables has to be linear. There seems to be no linearity because there is skewness to the data. The cases do not follow the line linearly. The assumption of linearity is violated.

This is also the case for the third assumption which looks at normality. The data is leftskewed. The data does not follow a bell-curve shape. The respondents scored high on the dependent variable social integration which means that the cases are mostly on the right, which makes the data left-skewed. This assumption is also violated.

Lastly, there should be homoscedasticity. There seems to be a pattern in the data, which makes it that the different samples do not have the same variance. This means that this assumption is also

violated. All four of the assumptions are violated. We must take this into account when making conclusions.

Finally, multicollinearity will be discussed. Multicollinearity is the coherency between the predictors. These are measured with the VIF values. All of the VIF values are below 2, meaning that there are no high correlations among the predictor variables.

### **Outliers**

In the data, multiple outliers can be found. Based on the standardized residuals, leverage, and Cook's Distance, no particular outliers seem to influence the data so heavily to the point where they should be removed. Two respondents score fairly high on both leverage and Cook's Distance but when removing these two, not much changes in the model, and the skewness in the distribution does not disappear.

### Hypothesis testing

The first hypothesis that is tested is that people who spend their leisure time offline score higher on social integration. Looking at the results, the regression coefficient is positive and quite low, but still significant (b = ,042; SE = ,017; p = ,017). When someone spends more of their leisure time offline, they are more socially integrated.

The second hypothesis is that someone who spends their leisure time online scores lower on social integration. *Table 3* shows that the slope of the variable online is negative and low, but still significant (b = -,015; SE = ,004; p <,001). This shows that those who spend their leisure time online score lower on social integration.

In this research, age is considered a moderator. When we look at age independently, it shows that the older someone is in years, the higher they score on social integration (b = ,004; SE = ,000; p < ,001). For the moderating effect, we expect that age influences the relationship between the independent and dependent variables. The first expectation is that age will positively affect the relationship between offline leisure time and social integration. The second expectation is that age will negatively affect the relationship between online leisure time and social integration. For this, we will look at model 4 in *table 3* since the interaction variables are added there. The slope of the centered variable age is ,004 and the slope of the centered variable offline is ,042. The slope for the interaction between the two is ,001. This means that when someone scores one entity higher on age, the influence of offline on social integration increases with ,045. The effect of offline leisure time on social integration gets positively stronger the older a person is.

For the centered variable online, the slope is -,010. The slope of the interaction variable for age and online is ,000449. This means that the effect of online leisure time on social integration slightly gets higher the older a person is.

The first interaction variable is not significant, but the interaction for online and age is significant. This means that age can be considered a moderator for the relationship between online leisure time and social integration because it significantly influences the effect between the two.

Lastly, the control variables education, health, and gender will be discussed. These are variables that could influence the outcomes of this research and therefore will be tested. Firstly, the slope for education is positive, low, and significant (b = ,029; SE =,006 ; p <,001). The scale of social integration ranges from 1 to 3 which makes this effect of education with ,029 small. It positively affects how someone socially integrates, so someone who graduated from higher education is more socially integrated than someone who graduated from lower education.

Out of the control variables, health has the strongest effect (b = ,136; SE =,010; p <,001). Someone who indicates that they feel generally good scores higher on social integration. This effect is strong given the scale of social integration which ranges from 1 to 3

Finally, the control variable gender will be discussed. Looking at the positive but small regression coefficient, women score only slightly higher on social integration than men do. This effect however is exceedingly small and not significant (b = ,003; SE = ,016; p = ,876).

### **Conclusion and discussion**

This research aimed to look at the impact the two different types of leisure time have on social integration. The research question that we constructed was: Is there any difference in social integration between people who spend a lot of their leisure time online and those who spend it offline?

We also expected age to influence the relationship between the type of leisure time and social integration. This is why we created the sub-question: to what extent does age affect the relationship between online and offline leisure time and their effect on social integration?

In the last few years, the internet and technology have become a predominant part of our everyday lives. Because of this, we can assume that people spend their leisure time differently than they did before. Since technology is so accessible and widely used, it makes sense that people now spend their pastimes online, for example, watching Netflix. In the past, people were only able to spend their leisure time offline, like reading a book. Age is a crucial factor when looking at technology adoption. The younger generations all grew up with the new technology and are more likely to adopt it. The older generations have a harder time adjusting to these changes and might reject them (Mohta & Halder, 2020). This shift in how people spend their free time brings new opportunities for research into the different influences the different types of leisure time have.

Research shows that those who spent most of their time on social media have an increased chance to feel socially isolated. Social isolation can have a serious negative impact on someone's health (Primack et al., 2017). When someone feels socially isolated, they do not feel like they have any meaningful relationships. This fits the definition of social integration that is used in this thesis. Social integration is defined as the degree to which an individual participates in a broad range of social relationships, in other words, how many connections a person has. The most important part of this definition is that the individual has to feel that their relationships are good or meaningful relationships and therefore are less socially integrated. It is relevant to see if the type of leisure time indeed influences how someone socially integrates since this can influence someone's health negatively. Using linear regression, we look if there is a difference between the types of leisure time and their influence on social integration. If that is the case, we can further research this relationship and come up with solutions.

Social capital is an important term in sociology and is also used in this research. We use Putnam's definition of social capital because it encompasses our definition of social integration. It looks at social networks and important social values like trust (Putnam, 1994). Social integration looks at social relationships and the value they hold to this individual. Social relationships seem to increase social capital, so we assume that when someone has a high social capital, they have higher levels of social integration. Van Ingen and van Eijck (2009) have linked leisure time to social capital. They made a distinction between consumptive and productive activities. Our definition of offline activities falls under productive activities because they are used for creative goals, they are 'physical' in the sense that they are activities that happen in real life, not on the internet, and you often have to get out of the house for them. Online activities are consumptive because they are defined by the usage of goods, in this case, screen-use or the internet. Consumptive, or online, activities create fewer opportunities to create social ties or consolidate them (van Ingen & van Eijck, 2009). Based on these findings, the two hypotheses that were made are that online leisure time has a negative influence on social integration and offline leisure time has a positive influence on social integration. Evidence has been found for both hypotheses in our dataset. Individuals who spent their leisure time on online activities overall were less socially integrated than those who spent it offline. Both results were significant which means we can generalize them to the population.

We expected age to be a moderator in this research. Research shows that there is a digital divide. Older people have a harder time adopting the new technology (Czaja et al., 2008). They are aware of the benefits and are willing to try, however, most technology is not accommodated to their standards. They only accept new technologies under the influence of several factors which are often overlooked by developers due to stereotypes (Lee & Coughlin, 2014). This is why older individuals are less likely to adopt new technologies. The first hypothesis that was made based on the literature is that age negatively influences the relationship between online leisure time and social integration, because the older the person is, the less likely they are to spend their leisure time online. The second hypothesis is that age has a positive influence on the relationship between offline leisure time and social integration because the older someone is, the more likely they are to spend their free time offline.

Looking at the results, we can see that age does not influence the relationship between offline leisure time and social integration. The results do not support the theory found on this and it does not support our hypothesis. However, the results do show that age has a small effect on the relationship between online leisure time and social integration. This means that when an individual spends their leisure time online, they will be more socially integrated the older they are. This goes against the theory we found on this, and it does not support our second hypothesis.

One of the reasons for this could be that older individuals spend most of their time alone in real life and younger individuals are more surrounded by family and friends when going to work or school. They might spend more leisure time online, but they might already feel more socially integrated because of the connections they made outside their free time. Older individuals might feel more alone and isolated in general which makes it easier to feel like their online connections are more important and meaningful in comparison to the younger individuals. Another reason could be that

younger individuals spend their online free time with those they know from offline activities like work. This might be a reason it does not influence the relationship between online and social integration because they already established these connections outside their free time. This is interesting for follow-up research

We also controlled for three different variables to see if they influenced social integration. The first control variable was gender. Based on the literature, we expected that women were more socially integrated because they were socially more active and reported having more close social relationships than men (Fuhrer & Stansfeld, 2002). From the results of our analysis, we can see that women score higher on social integration than men. However, this result was not significant. The findings in the literature are not empirically proven in this thesis.

The second control variable which we looked at was health. The expectation was that good health made someone more socially integrated. Research by Liamputtong & Kurban (2018) shows that someone who has poor mental health has trouble forming connections because they have more difficulty functioning properly. People with poor physical health fall victim to social isolation more often because they are less mobile. The results show that individuals are more socially integrated when they report that they generally feel good which is in line with our found literature. This result is significant so it is important to take into account that health is related to social integration.

The last control variable is education. Research shows that people who followed a lower education are often at risk of being unemployed. A stable job and career are all foundations for higher levels of social integration. Looking at our results, we can see that higher education significantly causes an increase in social integration. This is in line with the theory found on this subject. As for health, education should be considered a confounding variable when researching social integration.

Some limitations should be considered. Firstly, we used data from an existing panel. This means that the questions used in the questionnaire might not fully research what we want to research. The data were collected within households, so we cannot assure that the cases are independent of each other. This means that the members of a household could have influenced each other's answers. The data also violates the assumptions of linear regression. The conclusions that were made based on these results should be taken with a grain of salt since the data was not sufficient enough to draw conclusions. The information that was gathered can be used as a basis for follow-up research.

This research gives rise to follow-up research. It is interesting to look further into the influence of age on the relationship between online leisure time and social integration because the findings go against the found theory and are counterintuitive. It is interesting to see why the older a person gets, the influence of online leisure time increases social integration. Our intuition would say that older individuals make less meaningful relationships online because they use it differently than the youth does. Younger generations use technology daily and especially for interacting with others, while older generations generally use the internet less and for other means. It is interesting to look further into this when doing future research.

Another interesting subject for future research is to look further into the influence the Corona pandemic might have had on the relationship between leisure time and social integration. Social media use saw a staggering surge from January to March 2020 (Chaudhury et al., 2020). The younger generation massively downloaded TikTok, a social media app where people can share short videos of themselves where the target audience is young adults. The inability to go outside, thus making spending leisure time offline almost impossible, resulted in the usage of other distracting online activities. Next to this, adolescents have indicated that they experienced an increase in the feeling of loneliness since the pandemic (Phillips et al., 2022). It is interesting to research if the increase in online usage caused this increase in loneliness and if it made them less socially integrated.

In conclusion, it can be said that spending leisure time on offline activities causes someone to be more socially integrated than those who spend their leisure time on online activities. Age seems to influence the relationship between online leisure time and social integration. The older the individual that spends their pastime online, the more socially integrated they are. This is not the case for offline leisure time as there does not seem to be an influence of age. Gender does not significantly influence how someone socially integrates, but health and education do. However, the results found are not sufficient enough for us to draw these conclusions with certainty.

### References

- About the Panel / LISS Panel Data. (z.d.). LISS Panel Centerdata Research Institute. Geraadpleegd op 5 april 2022, van https://www.lissdata.nl/about-panel
- Bano, S., Cisheng, W., Khan, A. N., & Khan, N. A. (2019). WhatsApp use and student's psychological well-being: Role of social capital and social integration. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 103, 200–208. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2019.06.002
- Brand, J. E. (2015). The Far-Reaching Impact of Job Loss and Unemployment. *Annual Review of Sociology*, *41*(1), 359–375. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-soc-071913-043237
- Chaudhury, S., Dhamija, S., & Saldanha, D. (2020). Social media during corona pandemic. *Industrial Psychiatry Journal*, 29(2), 357. https://doi.org/10.4103/ipj.ipj\_123\_20
- Chin, B., Murphy, M. L., & Cohen, S. (2018). Age moderates the association between social integration and diurnal cortisol measures. *Psychoneuroendocrinology*, 90, 102–109. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psyneuen.2018.02.008
- Czaja, S. J., Lee, C. C., Nair, S. N., & Sharit, J. (2008). Older Adults and Technology Adoption. Proceedings of the Human Factors and Ergonomics Society Annual Meeting, 52(2), 139–143. https://doi.org/10.1177/154193120805200201
- Fuhrer, R., & Stansfeld, S. (2002). How gender affects patterns of social relations and their impact on health: a comparison of one or multiple sources of support from "close persons". *Social Science* & *Medicine*, 54(5), 811–825. https://doi.org/10.1016/s0277-9536(01)00111-3
- Ginn, J., & Fast, J. (2006). Employment and Social Integration in Midlife. *Research on Aging*, 28(6), 669–690. https://doi.org/10.1177/0164027506291748
- Hacihasanoğlu, R., Yildirim, A., & Karakurt, P. (2012). Loneliness in elderly individuals, level of dependence in activities of daily living (ADL) and influential factors. *Archives of Gerontology* and Geriatrics, 54(1), 61–66. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.archger.2011.03.011
- Ihlen, Y. (2005). The power of social capital: Adapting Bourdieu to the study of public relations. *Public Relations Review*, *31*(4), 492–496. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pubrev.2005.08.007

- Lee, C., & Coughlin, J. F. (2014). PERSPECTIVE: Older Adults' Adoption of Technology: An Integrated Approach to Identifying Determinants and Barriers. *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, 32(5), 747–759. https://doi.org/10.1111/jpim.12176
- Liamputtong, P., & Kurban, H. (2018). Health, social integration, and social support: The lived experiences of young Middle-Eastern refugees living in Melbourne, Australia. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 85, 99–106. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2017.12.020
- Marcum, C. S. (2012). Age Differences in Daily Social Activities. *Research on Aging*, 35(5), 612–640. https://doi.org/10.1177/0164027512453468
- Mohta, R., & Halder, S. (2020). Elderly Population and New Age Technology. *Journal of Psychosocial Research*, *15*(1), 151–158. https://doi.org/10.32381/jpr.2020.15.01.12
- Phillips, R., Seaborne, K., Goldsmith, A., Curtis, N., Davies, A., Haynes, W., McEnroe, R., Murphy, N., O'Neill, L., Pacey, C., Walker, E., & Wordley, E. (2022). Student loneliness through the pandemic: How, why and where? *The Geographical Journal*, 188(2), 277–293. https://doi.org/10.1111/geoj.12438
- Phongsavan, P., Grunseit, A. C., Bauman, A., Broom, D., Byles, J., Clarke, J., Redman, S., & Nutbeam, D. (2013). Age, Gender, Social Contacts, and Psychological Distress. *Journal of Aging and Health*, 25(6), 921–943. https://doi.org/10.1177/0898264313497510
- Primack, B. A., Shensa, A., Sidani, J. E., Whaite, E. O., Lin, L. Y., Rosen, D., Colditz, J. B., Radovic, A., & Miller, E. (2017). Social Media Use and Perceived Social Isolation Among Young
  Adults in the U.S. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 53(1), 1–8.
  https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amepre.2017.01.010
- Putnam, R. D. (1994). Social Capital and Public Affairs. Bulletin of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, 47(8), 5. https://doi.org/10.2307/3824796
- Seeman, T. E. (1996). Social ties and health: The benefits of social integration. *Annals of Epidemiology*, 6(5), 442–451. https://doi.org/10.1016/s1047-2797(96)00095-6
- Social Integration and Leisure (LISS Core Study). (2008). [Dataset]. LISS panel. https://doi.org/10.17026/dans-zaf-casa

Van Ingen, E., & Van Eijck, K. (2009). Leisure and Social Capital: An Analysis of Types of Company and Activities. *Leisure Sciences*, *31*(2), 192–206. https://doi.org/10.1080/01490400802686078

# **Appendix 1 - operationalizations**

Offline

	Statistics														
		average number of days per week that time is spent on: playing a musical instrum	average number of days per week that time is spent on: singing/choir/ singing gro	average number of days per week that time is spent on: small jobs in and around	average number of days per week that time is spent on: handicrafts	average number of days per week that time is spent on: photography	average number of days per week that time is spent on: caring for animals	average number of days per week that time is spent on: handwork	average number of days per week that time is spent on: watching films and series	average number of days per week that time is spent on: reading	average number of days per week that time is spent on: a collection	average number of days per week that time is spent on: following a course, works	average number of days per week that time is spent on: acting	average number of days per week that time is spent on: equestrian sport	average number of days per week that time is spent on: car/motor sport
N	Valid	5940	5940	5940	5940	5940	5940	5940	5940	5940	5940	5940	5940	5852	5939
	Missing	855	855	855	855	855	855	855	855	855	855	855	855	943	856
Mean		87,02	91,02	14,33	77,37	73,60	63,10	85,27	29,95	25,86	89,61	80,85	97,65	97,07	91,58
Media	ı	99,00	99,00	2,00	99,00	99,00	99,00	99,00	5,00	5,00	99,00	99,00	99,00	99,00	99,00
Std. D	eviation	31,953	26,727	32,678	40,613	43,005	45,714	33,814	43,093	40,820	28,816	38,134	11,406	13,535	25,940
Minim	um	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Maxim	um	99	99	99	99	99	99	99	99	99	99	99	99	99	99

average number of days per week that time is spent on: mechanical work on car/mo	average number of days per week that time is spent on: card games	average number of days per week that time is spent on: billiards, pool, snooker,	average number of days per week that time is spent on: pigeon keeping	average number of days per week that time is spent on: going out, cinema, theatr	average number of days per week that time is spent on: cooking	average number of days per week that time is spent on: listening to music and/or	average number of days per week that time is spent on: fishing	average number of days per week that time is spent on: shopping	average number of days per week that time is spent on: travelling	average number of days per week that time is spent on: boating	average number of days per week that time is spent on: dancing
5939	5939	5939	5939	5939	5939	5939	5939	5939	5939	5939	5939
856	856	856	856	856	856	856	856	856	856	856	856
92,44	76,69	92,16	98,41	35,99	19,11	19,24	94,70	20,41	57,69	88,52	88,67
99,00	99,00	99,00	99,00	1,00	5,00	6,00	99,00	1,00	99,00	99,00	99,00
24,557	41,150	25,042	7,515	47,230	34,360	34,161	20,089	39,136	48,534	30,370	30,098
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
99	99	99	99	99	99	99	99	99	99	99	99

# average number of days per week that time is spent on: playing a musical instrument

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	less than 1 day a week	317	4,7	5,3	5,3
	1 day per week	111	1,6	1,9	7,2
	2 days per week	78	1,1	1,3	8,5
	3 days per week	58	,9	1,0	9,5
	4 days per week	37	,5	,6	10,1
	5 days per week	50	,7	8,	11,0
	6 days per week	29	,4	,5	11,4
	7 days per week	53	,8	,9	12,3
	never	5207	76,6	87,7	100,0
	Total	5940	87,4	100,0	
Missing	System	855	12,6		
Total		6795	100,0		

# Vali Mis Tota

# average number of days per week that time is spent on: small jobs in and around

Va

Mi

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	less than 1 day a week	1641	24,2	27,6	27,6
	1 day per week	1286	18,9	21,6	49,3
	2 days per week	875	12,9	14,7	64,0
	3 days per week	531	7,8	8,9	72,9
	4 days per week	281	4,1	4,7	77,7
	5 days per week	231	3,4	3,9	81,6
	6 days per week	119	1,8	2,0	83,6
	7 days per week	208	3,1	3,5	87,1
	never	768	11,3	12,9	100,0
	Total	5940	87,4	100,0	
Missing	System	855	12,6		
Total		6795	100,0		

# average number of days per week that time is spent on: singing/choir/singing group

	-	-			
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
d	less than 1 day a week	192	2,8	3,2	3,2
	1 day per week	139	2,0	2,3	5,6
	2 days per week	59	,9	1,0	6,6
	3 days per week	22	,3	.4	6,9
	4 days per week	14	,2	,2	7,2
	5 days per week	8	,1	,1	7,3
	6 days per week	4	,1	,1	7,4
	7 days per week	49	,7	,8	8,2
	never	5453	80,3	91,8	100,0
	Total	5940	87,4	100,0	
sing	System	855	12,6		
al		6795	100.0		

### average number of days per week that time is spent on: handicrafts

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
ılid	less than 1 day a week	681	10,0	11,5	11,5
	1 day per week	283	4,2	4,8	16,2
	2 days per week	132	1,9	2,2	18,5
	3 days per week	83	1,2	1,4	19,8
	4 days per week	44	,6	,7	20,6
	5 days per week	37	,5	,6	21,2
	6 days per week	13	,2	,2	21,4
	7 days per week	40	,6	,7	22,1
	never	4627	68,1	77,9	100,0
	Total	5940	87,4	100,0	
ssing	System	855	12,6		
ital		6795	100,0		

# average number of days per week that time is spent on: photography Cumulative Cumulative

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Percent
Valid	less than 1 day a week	980	14,4	16,5	16,5
	1 day per week	260	3,8	4,4	20,9
	2 days per week	123	1,8	2,1	22,9
	3 days per week	72	1,1	1,2	24,2
	4 days per week	30	,4	,5	24,7
	5 days per week	32	,5	,5	25,2
	6 days per week	10	,1	,2	25,4
	7 days per week	30	,4	,5	25,9
	never	4403	64,8	74,1	100,0
	Total	5940	87,4	100,0	
Missing	System	855	12,6		
Total		6795	100,0		

#### average number of days per week that time is spent on: handwork

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	less than 1 day a week	337	5,0	5,7	5,7
	1 day per week	135	2,0	2,3	7,9
	2 days per week	83	1,2	1,4	9,3
	3 days per week	81	1,2	1,4	10,7
	4 days per week	47	,7	,8	11,5
	5 days per week	40	,6	,7	12,2
	6 days per week	35	,5	,6	12,8
	7 days per week	83	1,2	1,4	14,2
	never	5099	75,0	85,8	100,0
	Total	5940	87,4	100,0	
Missing	System	855	12,6		
Total		6795	100,0		

#### average number of days per week that time is spent on: reading

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	less than 1 day a week	1160	17,1	19,5	19,5
	1 day per week	577	8,5	9,7	29,2
	2 days per week	485	7,1	8,2	37,4
	3 days per week	428	6,3	7,2	44,6
	4 days per week	261	3,8	4,4	49,0
	5 days per week	331	4,9	5,6	54,6
	6 days per week	235	3,5	4,0	58,5
	7 days per week	1056	15,5	17,8	76,3
	never	1407	20,7	23,7	100,0
	Total	5940	87,4	100,0	
Missing	System	855	12,6		
Total		6795	100,0		

# average number of days per week that time is spent on: following a course, works

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	less than 1 day a week	689	10,1	11,6	11,6
	1 day per week	229	3,4	3,9	15,5
	2 days per week	80	1,2	1,3	16,8
	3 days per week	46	.7	8,	17,6
	4 days per week	13	,2	,2	17,8
	5 days per week	19	,3	,3	18,1
	6 days per week	3	0,	,1	18,2
	7 days per week	18	,3	,3	18,5
	never	4843	71,3	81,5	100,0
	Total	5940	87,4	100,0	
Missing	System	855	12,6		
Total		6795	100,0		

# average number of days per week that time is spent on: caring for animals

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	less than 1 day a week	352	5,2	5,9	5,9
	1 day per week	150	2,2	2,5	8,5
	2 days per week	99	1,5	1,7	10,1
	3 days per week	91	1,3	1,5	11,6
	4 days per week	56	8,	,9	12,6
	5 days per week	72	1,1	1,2	13,8
	6 days per week	41	,6	,7	14,5
	7 days per week	1407	20,7	23,7	38,2
	never	3672	54,0	61,8	100,0
	Total	5940	87,4	100,0	
Missing	System	855	12,6		
Total		6795	100,0		

# average number of days per week that time is spent on: watching films and series

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	less than 1 day a week	797	11,7	13,4	13,4
	1 day per week	558	8,2	9,4	22,8
	2 days per week	628	9,2	10,6	33,4
	3 days per week	601	8,8	10,1	43,5
	4 days per week	354	5,2	6,0	49,5
	5 days per week	430	6,3	7,2	56,7
	6 days per week	203	3,0	3,4	60,1
	7 days per week	707	10,4	11,9	72,0
	never	1662	24,5	28,0	100,0
	Total	5940	87,4	100,0	
Missing	System	855	12,6		
Total		6795	100,0		

### average number of days per week that time is spent on: a collection

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	less than 1 day a week	320	4,7	5,4	5,4
	1 day per week	98	1,4	1,6	7,0
	2 days per week	49	,7	.8	7,9
	3 days per week	40	,6	,7	8,5
	4 days per week	14	,2	,2	8,8
	5 days per week	13	,2	,2	9,0
	6 days per week	8	,1	,1	9,1
	7 days per week	28	,4	,5	9,6
	never	5370	79,0	90,4	100,0
	Total	5940	87,4	100,0	
Missing	System	855	12,6		
Total		6795	100,0		

#### average number of days per week that time is spent on: acting

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
/alid	less than 1 day a week	42	,6	,7	,7
	1 day per week	13	,2	,2	,9
	2 days per week	8	,1	,1	1,1
	3 days per week	10	,1	,2	1,2
	4 days per week	4	,1	,1	1,3
	5 days per week	3	0,	,1	1,3
	7 days per week	2	0,	0,	1,4
	never	5858	86,2	98,6	100,0
	Total	5940	87,4	100,0	
lissing	System	855	12,6		
Total		6795	100,0		

average number of days per week that time is spent on: equestrian sport Cumulative

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Percent
Valid	less than 1 day a week	38	,6	,6	,6
	1 day per week	16	,2	,3	,9
	2 days per week	21	,3	,4	1,3
	3 days per week	6	,1	,1	1,4
	4 days per week	11	,2	,2	1,6
	5 days per week	9	,1	,2	1,7
	6 days per week	3	,0	,1	1,8
	7 days per week	13	,2	,2	2,0
	never	5735	84,4	98,0	100,0
	Total	5852	86,1	100,0	
Missing	System	943	13,9		
Total		6795	100,0		

# average number of days per week that time is spent on: mechanical work on car/motor

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	less than 1 day a week	273	4,0	4,6	4,6
	1 day per week	65	1,0	1,1	5,7
	2 days per week	34	,5	,6	6,3
	3 days per week	11	,2	,2	6,4
	4 days per week	6	,1	,1	6,5
	5 days per week	5	,1	,1	6,6
	6 days per week	1	0,	0,	6,7
	7 days per week	1	0,	0,	6,7
	never	5543	81,6	93,3	100,0
	Total	5939	87,4	100,0	
Missing	System	856	12,6		
Total		6795	100,0		

# average number of days per week that time is spent on: billiards, pool, snooker, darts

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	less than 1 day a week	306	4,5	5,2	5,2
	1 day per week	61	,9	1,0	6,2
	2 days per week	27	,4	,5	6,6
	3 days per week	8	,1	,1	6,8
	4 days per week	5	,1	,1	6,9
	5 days per week	3	0,	,1	6,9
	7 days per week	2	0,	,0	6,9
	never	5527	81,3	93,1	100,0
	Total	5939	87,4	100,0	
Missing	System	856	12,6		
Total		6795	100,0		

# average number of days per week that time is spent on: going out, cinema, theatre, dining out, lounging

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Percent
Valid	less than 1 day a week	2368	34,8	39,9	39,9
	1 day per week	864	12,7	14,5	54,4
	2 days per week	381	5,6	6,4	60,8
	3 days per week	125	1,8	2,1	62,9
	4 days per week	41	,6	,7	63,6
	5 days per week	15	,2	,3	63,9
	6 days per week	3	0,	,1	63,9
	7 days per week	6	,1	,1	64,0
	never	2136	31,4	36,0	100,0
	Total	5939	87,4	100,0	
Missing	System	856	12,6		
Total		6795	100,0		

### average number of days per week that time is spent on: car/motor sport

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	less than 1 day a week	263	3,9	4,4	4,4
	1 day per week	90	1,3	1,5	5,9
	2 days per week	46	,7	.8	6,7
	3 days per week	20	,3	,3	7,1
	4 days per week	10	,1	,2	7,2
	5 days per week	8	,1	,1	7,4
	6 days per week	4	,1	,1	7,4
	7 days per week	8	,1	,1	7,6
	never	5490	80,8	92,4	100,0
	Total	5939	87,4	100,0	
Missing	System	856	12,6		
Total		6795	100,0		

#### average number of days per week that time is spent on: card games

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	less than 1 day a week	813	12,0	13,7	13,7
	1 day per week	283	4,2	4,8	18,5
	2 days per week	128	1,9	2,2	20,6
	3 days per week	44	,6	,7	21,4
	4 days per week	22	,3	.4	21,7
	5 days per week	20	,3	,3	22,1
	6 days per week	11	,2	,2	22,2
	7 days per week	29	,4	,5	22,7
	never	4589	67,5	77,3	100,0
	Total	5939	87,4	100,0	
Missing	System	856	12,6		
Total		6795	100,0		

### average number of days per week that time is spent on: pigeon keeping

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	less than 1 day a week	10	,1	,2	,2
	1 day per week	5	.1	,1	,3
	2 days per week	1	0,	.0	,3
	3 days per week	3	0,	.1	,3
	4 days per week	2	0,	,0	.4
	5 days per week	2	0,	0,	,4
	6 days per week	1	0,	0,	,4
	7 days per week	13	,2	,2	,6
	never	5902	86,9	99,4	100,0
	Total	5939	87,4	100,0	
Missing	System	856	12,6		
Total		6795	100,0		

#### average number of days per week that time is spent on: cooking

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	less than 1 day a week	456	6,7	7,7	7,7
	1 day per week	323	4,8	5,4	13,1
	2 days per week	403	5,9	6,8	19,9
	3 days per week	499	7,3	8,4	28,3
	4 days per week	556	8,2	9,4	37,7
	5 days per week	800	11,8	13,5	51,1
	6 days per week	666	9,8	11,2	62,4
	7 days per week	1312	19,3	22,1	84,4
	never	924	13,6	15,6	100,0
	Total	5939	87,4	100,0	
Missing	System	856	12,6		
Total		6795	100,0		

#### average number of days per week that time is spent on: listening to music and/or radio

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Percent
Valid	less than 1 day a week	455	6,7	7,7	7,7
	1 day per week	320	4,7	5,4	13,0
	2 days per week	387	5,7	6,5	19,6
	3 days per week	461	6,8	7,8	27,3
	4 days per week	391	5,8	6,6	33,9
	5 days per week	635	9,3	10,7	44,6
	6 days per week	370	5,4	6,2	50,8
	7 days per week	2003	29,5	33,7	84,6
	never	917	13,5	15,4	100,0
	Total	5939	87,4	100,0	
Missing	System	856	12,6		
Total		6795	100,0		

#### average number of days per week that time is spent on: fishing

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	less than 1 day a week	172	2,5	2,9	2,9
	1 day per week	37	,5	,6	3,5
	2 days per week	16	,2	,3	3,8
	3 days per week	15	,2	,3	4,0
	4 days per week	11	,2	,2	4,2
	5 days per week	2	0,	0,	4,3
	7 days per week	7	,1	,1	4,4
	never	5679	83,6	95,6	100,0
	Total	5939	87,4	100,0	
Missing	System	856	12,6		
Total		6795	100,0		

### average number of days per week that time is spent on: shopping

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Percent
Valid	less than 1 day a week	2555	37,6	43,0	43,0
	1 day per week	971	14,3	16,3	59,4
	2 days per week	631	9,3	10,6	70,0
	3 days per week	364	5,4	6,1	76,1
	4 days per week	122	1,8	2,1	78,2
	5 days per week	67	1,0	1,1	79,3
	6 days per week	21	,3	,4	79,7
	7 days per week	29	,4	,5	80,1
	never	1179	17,4	19,9	100,0
	Total	5939	87,4	100,0	
Missing	System	856	12,6		
Total		6795	100,0		

#### average number of days per week that time is spent on: boating

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Percent
Valid	less than 1 day a week	500	7,4	8,4	8,4
	1 day per week	48	,7	,8	9,2
	2 days per week	39	,6	,7	9,9
	3 days per week	16	,2	,3	10,2
	4 days per week	10	,1	,2	10,3
	5 days per week	3	0,	,1	10,4
	6 days per week	5	,1	,1	10,5
	7 days per week	11	,2	,2	10,6
	never	5307	78,1	89,4	100,0
	Total	5939	87,4	100,0	
Missing	System	856	12,6		
Total		6795	100,0		

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Percent
Valid	less than 1 day a week	1794	26,4	30,2	30,2
	1 day per week	325	4,8	5,5	35,7
	2 days per week	132	1,9	2,2	37,9
	3 days per week	80	1,2	1,3	39,2
	4 days per week	37	,5	,6	39,9
	5 days per week	55	,8	,9	40,8
	6 days per week	10	,1	,2	41,0
	7 days per week	63	,9	1,1	42,0
	never	3443	50,7	58,0	100,0
	Total	5939	87,4	100,0	
Missing	System	856	12,6		
Total		6795	100,0		

average number of days per week that time is spent on: travelling

#### average number of days per week that time is spent on: dancing

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
alid	less than 1 day a week	355	5,2	6,0	6,0
	1 day per week	127	1,9	2,1	8,1
	2 days per week	64	,9	1,1	9,2
	3 days per week	27	,4	,5	9,6
	4 days per week	13	,2	,2	9,9
	5 days per week	17	,3	,3	10,2
	6 days per week	3	,0	,1	10,2
	7 days per week	20	,3	,3	10,5
	never	5313	78,2	89,5	100,0
	Total	5939	87,4	100,0	
lissing	System	856	12,6		
otal		6795	100,0		

FREQUENCIES VARIABLES=cs20m160 cs20m161 cs20m162 cs20m164 cs20m165 cs20m166 cs20m167 cs20m500 cs20m169 cs20m171 cs20m172 cs20m173 cs20m174 cs20m175 cs20m176 cs20m177 cs20m178 cs20m179 cs20m180 cs20m181 cs20m182 cs20m183 cs20m184 cs20m598 cs20m186 cs20m185 /STATISTICS=STDDEV MINIMUM MAXIMUM MEAN MEDIAN /ORDER=ANALYSIS.

These are the original 26 variables. Since they all have the same answer categories, the variables have been made into a scale. For every variable that will be discussed, dummy variables have been made, subsequently, the missing values were removed from the dataset.

RECODE Geslacht2 LeeftijdJaar oplmet ch20m004 Offline Online Integratie2 (SYSMIS=1) (ELSE=0) INTO DumGes DumLef DumEdu DumHealth DumOff DumOn DumIn2. EXECUTE.

COMPUTE Miss=DumGes + DumLef + DumEdu + DumHealth + DumOff + DumOn + DumIn2. EXECUTE.

FILTER OFF. JSE ALL. SELECT IF (Miss < 1). EXECUTE.

```
COMPUTE Offline=(cs20m160 + cs20m161 + cs20m162 + cs20m164 + cs20m165 + cs20m166 + cs20m167 + cs20m500 + 
cs20m169 + cs20m171 + cs20m172 + cs20m173 + cs20m174 + cs20m175 + cs20m176 + cs20m177 + cs20m178 + 
cs20m179 + cs20m180 + cs20m181 + cs20m182 + cs20m183 + cs20m184 + cs20m598 + cs20m185 + cs20m186) / 26. 
EXECUTE.
```

The mean of the scale online is 1,02 and the standard deviation is ,47.		Statistic	s
The minimum is 1 and the maximum is $4.08$ A higher score means that	Offline		
	N	Valid	2746
the person spends more days in the week on offline activities. On		Missing	0
	Mean		1,0238
average, the respondent generally spends less than 1 day on offline	Mediar	ı	1,0000
activities and the most they mont on offline activities is about 5 days per	Std. De	eviation	,47348
activities and the most they spent on offline activities is about 5 days per	Minimu	ım	,00,
week. The standard deviation is not very remarkable when compared to	Maxim	um	4,08
week. The standard de thation is not very remarkable when compared to			

the scale from 1 to 7. The median is 1,00 which is almost the same as the mean. It can be concluded that most of the respondents spent less than 1 day of the week on offline activities.

Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items	N of Items
,691	,683	26

### **Reliability Statistics**

DE	
RE	
1	ARIABLES=cs20m160 cs20m161 cs20m162 cs20m164 cs20m165 cs20m167 cs20m500 cs20m169 cs20m171
	cs20m172 cs20m166 cs20m173 cs20m174 cs20m175 cs20m176 cs20m177 cs20m178 cs20m179 cs20m180 cs20m181
	cs20m182 cs20m183 cs20m184 cs20m598 cs20m185 cs20m186
15	SCALE(ALL VARIABLES) ALL
/1	NODEL=ALPHA
15	STATISTICS=SCALE
15	SUMMARY=CORR.

To see if it was possible to combine all variables into a scale, a reliability test was done. This gave a Cronbach's alpha of ,691. This makes the reliability questionable, but it is not concerning enough to say that the scale is unreliable.

# Online

					St	atistics												
		average number of hours per week spent on: reading and sending email	average number of hours per week spent on: searching for information on the inte	average number of hours per week spent on: searching for and comparing products/	average number of hours per week spent on: purchasing things via the internet (e	average number of hours per week spent on: watching online films or TV programs	average number of hours per week spent on: downloading software, music or films	average number of hours per week spent on: internet banking	average number of hours per week spent on: playing internet games/online gaming	average number of hours per week spent on: reading online news, papers and magaz	average number of hours per week spent on: newsgroups (e.g. reading or downloadi	average number of hours per week spent on: other activities on the internet	average number of hours per week spent on: reading and viewing social media (e.g	average number of hours per week spent on: reading and/or writing blogs	average number of hours per week spent on: posting messages, photos and short fi	average number of hours per week spent on: chatting, video calling or sending me	average number of hours per week spent on: visiting dating websites (e.g. Relati	average number of hours per week spent on: visiting (discussion) forums and inter
N	Valid	5123	5292	5092	4794	5747	5691	4109	5735	5444	5829	5715	5459	5760	5362	5370	5859	5810
	Missing	1672	1503	1703	2001	1048	1104	2686	1060	1351	966	1080	1336	1035	1433	1425	936	985
Mean		4,48	3,33	1,58	1,05	2,82	,33	1,12	2,02	2,26	,25	2,14	4,02	,35	,64	3,17	,14	,27
Mediar		2,00	2,00	1,00	1,00	,00,	,00,	1,00	,00,	1,00	.00	.00	2,00	.00	,00,	2,00	.00	,00
Std. De	viation	6,796	4,788	2,593	1,927	5,765	2,784	2,574	5,645	3,196	1,095	5,054	6,347	1,484	2,708	6,249	1,065	1,604
Minimu	im	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Maxim	ım	84	90	50	40	100	168	100	100	35	30	84	101	40	100	150	40	40

# average number of hours per week spent on: reading and sending email

# average number of hours per week spent on: searching for information on the internet

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Percent						Currentetine
Valid	0	406	6,0	7,9	7,9			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Percent
	1	1752	25,8	34,2	42,1	Valid	0	422	6.4	9.2	9.2
	2	948	14,0	18,5	60,6	vallu		433	0,4	0,2	0,2
	3	393	5,8	7,7	68,3		1	1668	24,5	31,5	39,7
	4	242	3,6	4,7	73,0		2	1197	17,6	22,6	62,3
	5	257	3,8	5,0	78,0		3	492	7,2	9,3	71,6
	6	97	1,4	1,9	79,9		4	374	5,5	7,1	78,7
		205	3,0	4,0	83,9		5	359	5.3	6.8	85.5
	-	109	1,0	2,1	96.2		6	96	1.4	1.8	87.3
	10	224	3.3	4.4	90.6			176	2.6	1,0	00,5
	11	6	.1	.,1	90,7			176	2,0	3,3	90,6
	12	37	.5	.7	91,4		8	101	1,5	1,9	92,5
	13	1	,0	,0	91,5		9	6	,1	,1	92,6
	14	32	,5	,6	92,1		10	191	2,8	3,6	96,2
	15	74	1,1	1,4	93,5		11	1	0,	.0	96,3
	16	17	,3	,3	93,9		12	20	.3	.4	96.6
	18	8	,1	,2	94,0		12	2	,-	0	96.7
	19	2	0,	0,	94,0		-13	2	,0	,0	50,7
	20	135	2,0	2,6	96,7		14	34	,5	ð,	97,3
	21	4	,1	,1	96,8		15	31	,5	,6	97,9
	- 22	2	U, 0	.U	96,8		16	7	,1	,1	98,0
	23	12	,0	,0	97.1		18	1	,0	0,	98,1
	25	32	.5	.6	97.7		20	44	.6	.8	98,9
	26	2	.0	.0	97,7		21	6	1	1	99.0
	27	2	,0	,0	97,8		- 22			,,	00.0
	28	7	,1	,1	97,9				,0	,0	99,0
	29	1	,0	0,	97,9		23	1	,0	0,	99,0
	30	46	,7	,9	98,8		24	2	0,	0,	99,1
	31	1	0,	0,	98,8		25	6	,1	,1	99,2
	32	6	,1	,1	99,0		28	3	0,	,1	99,2
	34	1	,0	,0	99,0		30	21	.3	.4	99.6
	35	6	,1	,1	99,1		31	1	,-	0	99.7
	30	2	,0	,0	99,1				,0	,0,	55,7
	40	28	.1	.1	99,2		40	11	,2	,2	99,9
	45	4	,4	,5	99.9		45	2	0,	0,	99,9
	50	3	.0	.1	99,9		50	1	0,	0,	99,9
	56	1	.0	.0	99,9		60	1	0,	0,	99,9
	58	1	.0	.0	100,0		80	2	.0	.0	100.0
	70	1	0,	.0	100,0		90	1	,- n	,- 	100.0
	84	1	0,	0,	100,0		Total	5302	,0	0,	100,0
	Total	5123	75,4	100,0			lotal	5292	//,9	100,0	
Missing	System	1672	24,6			Missing	System	1503	22,1		
Total		6795	100,0			Total		6795	100,0		

average number of hours	per week	spent on: se	arching for
and comparing products/p	roduct inf	ormation on	the internet
			Cumulative

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Percent
Valid	0	1394	20,5	27,4	27,4
	1	2085	30,7	40,9	68,3
	2	824	12,1	16,2	84,5
	3	287	4,2	5,6	90,1
	4	164	2,4	3,2	93,4
	5	148	2,2	2,9	96,3
	6	38	,6	,7	97,0
	7	52	8,	1,0	98,0
	8	16	,2	,3	98,4
	9	3	0,	,1	98,4
	10	36	,5	,7	99,1
	12	4	,1	,1	99,2
	13	1	0,	0,	99,2
	14	3	0,	,1	99,3
	15	9	,1	,2	99,5
	16	2	0,	0,	99,5
	20	8	,1	,2	99,6
	21	1	0,	0,	99,7
	23	1	0,	0,	99,7
	24	2	0,	0,	99,7
	25	1	0,	0,	99,7
	30	10	,1	,2	99,9
	32	1	0,	0,	100,0
	40	1	0,	0,	100,0
	50	1	,0	0,	100,0
	Total	5092	74,9	100,0	
Missing	System	1703	25,1		
Total		6795	100,0		

average number of hours per week spent on: purchasing things via the internet

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	1952	28,7	40,7	40,7
	1	1935	28,5	40,4	81,1
	2	503	7,4	10,5	91,6
	3	178	2,6	3,7	95,3
	4	81	1,2	1,7	97,0
	5	71	1,0	1,5	98,5
	6	11	,2	,2	98,7
	7	16	,2	,3	99,0
	8	5	,1	,1	99,1
	9	4	,1	,1	99,2
	10	14	,2	,3	99,5
	12	3	0,	,1	99,6
	15	3	0,	,1	99,6
	16	1	0,	0,	99,6
	17	1	0,	0,	99,7
	18	1	0,	0,	99,7
	20	8	,1	,2	99,9
	24	2	0,	0,	99,9
	25	1	0,	0,	99,9
	30	3	0,	,1	100,0
	40	1	0,	0,	100,0
	Total	4794	70,6	100,0	
Missing	System	2001	29,4		
Total		6795	100,0		

average number of hours per week spent on: watching online films or TV programs

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	3092	45,5	53,8	53,8
	1	492	7,2	8,6	62,4
	2	545	8,0	9,5	71,8
	3	281	4,1	4,9	76,7
	4	199	2,9	3,5	80,2
	5	204	3,0	3,5	83,7
	6	140	2,1	2,4	86,2
	7	102	1,5	1,8	88,0
	8	85	1,3	1,5	89,4
	9	10	,1	,2	89,6
	10	212	3,1	3,7	93,3
	11	4	.1	,1	93,4
	12	44	,6	8,	94,1
	13	2	0,	0,	94,2
	14	77	1,1	1,3	95,5
	15	60	.9	1,0	96,6
	16	8	.1	,1	96,7
	17	2	0,	0,	96,7
	18	12	,2	,2	96,9
	20	80	1,2	1,4	98,3
	21	25	,4	,4	98,8
	22	1	0,	0,	98,8
	24	12	,2	,2	99,0
	25	5	.1	,1	99,1
	28	14	,2	,2	99,3
	29	1	0,	0,	99,3
	30	14	,2	,2	99,6
	32	2	0,	0,	99,6
	35	6	,1	,1	99,7
	36	1	0,	0,	99,7
	40	3	0,	,1	99,8
	42	2	0,	0,	99,8
	45	1	0,	0,	99,8
	48	1	0,	0,	99,9
	49	1	0,	0,	99,9
	50	2	0,	0,	99,9
	70	3	,0	,1	100,0
	100	2	,0	0,	100,0
	Total	5747	84,6	100,0	
Missing	System	1048	15,4		
Total		6795	100,0		

### average number of hours per week spent on: downloading software, music or films

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent	
Valid	0	4927	72,5	86,6	86,6	
	1	506	7,4	8,9	95,5	
	2		1,9	2,2	97,7	
	3	33	,5	,6	98,3	
	4	25	,4	,4	98,7	
	5	28	,4	,5	99,2	
	6	7	,1	,1	99,3	
	7	4	,1	,1	99,4	
	8	3	0,	,1	99,5	
	9	1	0,	0,	99,5	
	10	12	,2	,2	99,7	
	11	2	0,	0,	99,7	
	12	1	0,	0,	99,7	
	14	1	0,	0,	99,8	
	15	4	,1	,1	99,8	
	20	2	0,	0,	99,9	
	21	1	0,	0,	99,9	
	24	2	0,	0,	99,9	
	30	2	0,	0,	99,9	
	40	1	0,	0,	100,0	
	70	1	0,	0,	100,0	
	168	1	0,	0,	100,0	
	Total	5691	83,8	100,0		
Missing	System	1104	16,2			
Total		6795	100,0			

# average number of hours per week spent on: playing internet games/online gaming

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	3874	57,0	67,6	67,6
	1	455	6,7	7,9	75,5
	2	331	4,9	5,8	81,3
	3	186	2,7	3,2	84,5
	4	128	1,9	2,2	86,7
	5	135	2,0	2,4	89,1
	6	59	9,	1,0	90,1
	7	129	1,9	2,2	92,4
	8	47	,7	8,	93,2
	9	10	,1	,2	93,4
	10	120	1,8	2,1	95,4
	11	3	0,	,1	95,5
	12	9	,1	,2	95,7
	13	1	0,	0,	95,7
	14	40	,6	,7	96,4
	15	48	,7	8,	97,2
	16	7	,1	,1	97,3
	17	1	0,	0,	97,3
	18	7	,1	,1	97,5
	19	1	0,	0,	97,5
	20	62	,9	1,1	98,6
	21	12	,2	,2	98,8
	22	1	0,	0,	98,8
	24	11	,2	,2	99,0
	25	9	,1	,2	99,1
	28	5	,1	,1	99,2
	30	19	,3	,3	99,6
	32	1	0,	0,	99,6
	33	1	0,	0,	99,6
	35	2	0,	0,	99,6
	40	8	,1	,1	99,8
	42	1	0,	0,	99,8
	50	3	0,	,1	99,8
	55	1	0,	0,	99,9
	60	1	0,	0,	99,9
	70	3	0,	,1	99,9
	90	2	0,	0,	100,0
	100	2	0,	0,	100,0
	Total	5735	84,4	100,0	
Missing	System	1060	15,6		
Total		6795	100,0		

# average number of hours per week spent on: internet banking

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	1073	15,8	26,1	26,1
	1	2454	36,1	59,7	85,8
	2	376	5,5	9,2	95,0
	3	79	1,2	1,9	96,9
	4	33	,5	8,	97,7
	5	45	,7	1,1	98,8
	6	10	,1	,2	99,1
	7	8	,1	,2	99,2
	8	3	0,	,1	99,3
	10	6	,1	,1	99,5
	12	1	0,	0,	99,5
	15	5	,1	,1	99,6
	20	3	,0	,1	99,7
	24	1	0,	0,	99,7
	30	10	,1	,2	100,0
	50	1	0,	0,	100,0
	100	1	0,	0,	100,0
	Total	4109	60,5	100,0	
Missing	System	2686	39,5		
Total		6795	100,0		

# average number of hours per week spent on: reading online news, papers and magazines

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	1757	25,9	32,3	32,3
	1	1301	19,1	23,9	56,2
	2	830	12,2	15,2	71,4
	3	422	6,2	7,8	79,2
	4	261	3,8	4,8	84,0
	5	253	3,7	4,6	88,6
	6	70	1,0	1,3	89,9
	7	265	3,9	4,9	94,8
	8	64	,9	1,2	95,9
	9	9	,1	,2	96,1
	10	91	1,3	1,7	97,8
	11	3	0,	,1	97,8
	12	8	,1	,1	98,0
	13	1	0,	0,	98,0
	14	47	,7	,9	98,9
	15	29	,4	,5	99,4
	16	5	,1	,1	99,5
	17	1	0,	0,	99,5
	18	3	0,	,1	99,6
	19	1	0,	0,	99,6
	20	9	,1	,2	99,7
	21	1	0,	0,	99,8
	22	1	0,	0,	99,8
	24	1	0,	0,	99,8
	25	2	0,	0,	99,8
	28	1	0,	0,	99,9
	30	7	,1	,1	100,0
	35	1	0,	0,	100,0
	Total	5444	80,1	100,0	
Missing	System	1351	19,9		
Total		6795	100,0		

# average number of hours per week spent on: newsgroups (e. g. reading or downloading from Usenet)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	5169	76,1	88,7	88,7
	1	379	5,6	6,5	95,2
	2	142	2,1	2,4	97,6
	3	43	,6	,7	98,4
	4	24	,4	,4	98,8
	5	26	,4	,4	99,2
	6	9	,1	,2	99,4
	7	16	,2	,3	99,6
	8	8	,1	,1	99,8
	9	2	0,	0,	99,8
	10	5	,1	,1	99,9
	14	1	0,	0,	99,9
	15	1	0,	0,	99,9
	20	2	0,	0,	100,0
	24	1	0,	0,	100,0
	30	1	0,	0,	100,0
	Total	5829	85,8	100,0	
Missing	System	966	14,2		
Total		6795	100,0		

# average number of hours per week spent on: reading and viewing social media

# average number of hours per week spent on: other activities

average	e numpe	r of nours p on t	the intern	spent on: oth et	er activities			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent	Valid	0	1520	22,4	27,8	27,8
Valid	0	2972	43.7	52.0	52.0		1	902	13,3	16,5	44,4
	1	963	14.2	16,9	68.9		2	748	11,0	13,7	58,1
	2	606	8.9	10.6	79.5		3	368	5,4	6,7	64,8
	3	234	3.4	4,1	83.6		4	305	4,5	5,6	70,4
	4	161	2,4	2,8	86,4		5	310	4,6	5,7	76,1
	5	238	3,5	4,2	90,5		6	127	1,9	2,3	78,4
	6	61	,9	1,1	91,6		7	375	5,5	6,9	85,3
	7	84	1,2	1,5	93,1		8	107	1,6	2,0	87,2
	8	42	,6	,7	93,8		9	21	,3	,4	87,6
	9	15	,2	,3	94,1		10	249	3,7	4,6	92,2
	10	136	2,0	2,4	96,4		11	1	0,	0,	92,2
	12	13	,2	,2	96,7		12	38	,6	,7	92,9
	13	5	,1	,1	96,8		13	1	0,	0,	92,9
	14	20	,3	,3	97,1		14	95	1,4	1,7	94,7
	15	27	,4	,5	97,6		15	76	1,1	1,4	96,0
	16	2	0,	0,	97,6		16	13	,2	,2	96,3
	17	1	,0	0,	97,6		17	1	0,	0,	96,3
	18	5	,1	,1	97,7		18	4	,1	,1	96,4
	19	2	,0	0,	97,8		19	1	.0	.0	96,4
	20	49	,7	,9	98,6		20	78	1,1	1,4	97,8
	21	4	,1	,1	98,7		21	19	.3	.3	98.2
	22	3	,0	,1	98,7		22	3	.0	.1	98.2
	23	1	,0	0,	98,8		24	3	.0	.1	98.3
	24	5	,1	,1	98,8		25	10	.1	.2	98.5
	25	8	,1	,1	99,0		26	1	0	-,	98.5
	26	1	0,	0,	99,0		27	3	,0	,2	98.5
	27	3	0,	,1	99,1		28	8	,0	.,	98.7
	28	1	,0	0,	99,1		29	1	,,		98.7
	29	1	,0	0,	99,1		30	32	,5	6	99.3
	30	17	,3	,3	99,4		32	2	,5	,9 0	99.3
	34	1	,0	0,	99,4		24	- 1	,0	0,	99,5
	35	6	,1	,1	99,5		25	7	,0	,0	99,5
	36	1	,0	0,	99,5			15	י, ר	۱, د	99,5
	39	1	0,	0,	99,5		40	10	,2	,3	99,7
	40	14	,2	,2	99,8		42		,0	0,	99,0
	42	3	0,	,1	99,8		40	1	0,	U,	99,8
	43	1	0,	0,	99,9		49		0,	.U	99,8
	45	1	,0	0,	99,9		50	4	,1	,1	99,9
	47	1	,0	0,	99,9		60	1	U,	U,	99,9
	50	2	,0	0,	99,9		80	2	0,	0,	99,9
	55	1	,0	0,	99,9		84	1	0,	0,	100,0
	60	2	0,	0,	100,0		100	1	0,	0,	100,0
	84	1	0,	0,	100,0		101	1	0,	0,	100,0
	Total	5715	84,1	100,0			Total	5459	80,3	100,0	
Missing	System	1080	15,9			Missing	System	1336	19,7		
rotal		6795	100,0			Total		6795	100,0		

#### average number of hours per week spent on: reading and/or writing blogs

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	4920	72,4	85,4	85,4
	1	473	7,0	8,2	93,6
	2	188	2,8	3,3	96,9
	3	45	,7	,8,	97,7
	4	31	,5	,5	98,2
	5	40	,6	,7	98,9
	6	7	,1	,1	99,0
	7	16	,2	,3	99,3
	8	6	,1	,1	99,4
	9	3	0,	,1	99,5
	10	19	,3	,3	99,8
	12	3	,0	,1	99,8
	13	1	,0	0,	99,9
	20	3	,0	,1	99,9
	24	1	0,	0,	99,9
	30	3	,0	,1	100,0
	40	1	,0	0,	100,0
	Total	5760	84,8	100,0	
Missing	System	1035	15,2		
Total		6795	100,0		

### average number of hours per week spent on: posting messages, photos and short films on social media yourself

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	4066	59,8	75,8	75,8
	1	785	11,6	14,6	90,5
	2	226	3,3	4,2	94,7
	3	65	1,0	1,2	95,9
	4	49	,7	,9	96,8
	5	56	8,	1,0	97,9
	6	14	,2	,3	98,1
	7	26	,4	,5	98,6
	8	12	,2	,2	98,8
	9	5	,1	,1	98,9
	10	21	,3	,4	99,3
	12	2	0,	,0	99,3
	13	1	0,	,0	99,4
	14	7	,1	,1	99,5
	15	7	,1	,1	99,6
	20	5	,1	,1	99,7
	24	3	0,	,1	99,8
	25	2	0,	,0	99,8
	30	4	,1	,1	99,9
	33	1	0,	,0	99,9
	35	1	0,	,0	99,9
	40	1	,0	,0	99,9
	50	1	,0	,0	100,0
	60	1	,0	,0	100,0
	100	1	0,	,0	100,0
	Total	5362	78,9	100,0	
Missing	System	1433	21,1		
Total		6795	100,0		

average number of hours per week spent on: chatting	video
calling or sending messages	

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	1387	20,4	25,8	25,8
	1	1269	18,7	23,6	49,5
	2	873	12,8	16,3	65,7
	3	442	6,5	8,2	73,9
	4	313	4,6	5,8	79,8
	5	289	4,3	5,4	85,2
	6	100	1,5	1,9	87,0
	7	197	2,9	3,7	90,7
	8	99	1,5	1,8	92,5
	9	7	,1	,1	92,7
	10	160	2,4	3,0	95,6
	12	16	,2	,3	95,9
	14	46	,7	.9	96,8
	15	39	,6	,7	97,5
	16	6	,1	,1	97,6
	17	1	,0	0,	97,7
	18	1	,0	0,	97,7
	20	43	,6	8,	98,5
	21	9	,1	,2	98,6
	22	1	0,	0,	98,7
	24	4	,1	,1	98,7
	25	9	,1	,2	98,9
	26	2	,0	0,	98,9
	28	5	,1	,1	99,0
	29	1	,0	0,	99,1
	30	24	,4	,4	99,5
	31	1	,0	0,	99,5
	32	1	,0	0,	99,5
	34	1	,0	0,	99,6
	40	8	,1	,1	99,7
	45	2	,0	0,	99,7
	50	4	,1	,1	99,8
	60	2	,0	0,	99,9
	72	1	,0	0,	99,9
	77	1	,0	0,	99,9
	84	1	,0	0,	99,9
	100	2	0,	0,	99,9
	110	1	,0	0,	100,0
	130	1	,0	0,	100,0
	150	1	,0	0,	100,0
	Total	5370	79,0	100,0	
Missing	System	1425	21,0		
Total		6795	100.0		

		<b>F</b>	Descent	Valid Damant	Cumulative			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
		Frequency	Percent	valid Percent	Percent	Valid	0	5277	77,7	90,8	90,8
Valid	0	5571	82,0	95,1	95,1		1	253	3,7	4,4	95,2
	1	127	1.9	2.2	97.3		2	137	2,0	2,4	97,5
	2	71	1.0	1 2	09.5		3	35	,5	6,	98,1
		/1	1,0	1,2	30,3		4	28	,4	,5	98,6
	3	24	,4	,4	98,9		5	25	,4	,4	99,1
	4	21	,3	.4	99,2		6	7	,1	,1	99,2
	5	11	2	2	99.4		7	15	,2	,3	99,4
			,2	,2	33,4		8	4	,1	,1	99,5
	6	4	,1	,1	99,5		10	12	,2	,2	99,7
	7	7	.1	,1	99,6		14	2	,0	0,	99,7
	8	4	1	1	99.7		15	1	0,	0,	99,8
		-			35,7		16	1	,0	0,	99,8
	9	2	,0	0,	99,7		20	5	,1	,1	99,9
	10	11	,2	,2	99,9			1	,0	0,	99,9
	12	1	n	0	99.9		24	1	0,	0,	99,9
			,0					1	,0	0,	99,9
	20	3	,0	,1	100,0		29	1	,0	0,	99,9
	24	1	,0	0,	100,0		30	1	0,	0,	99,9
	40	1	n	0	100.0			1	.0	0,	100,0
			,0	,0	100,0		39	1	,0	0,	100,0
	Total	5859	86,2	100,0			40	1	,0	0,	100,0
Missing	System	936	13,8			Minning	lotal	5810	85,5	100,0	
Total		6795	100.0			Missing	System	985	14,5		
rotar		0735	100,0			Total		6795	100,0		

# average number of hours per week spent on: visiting dating websites

#### average number of hours per week spent on: visiting (discussion)forums and internet communities

FREQUENCIES VARIABLES=cs20m267 cs20m268 cs20m269 cs20m270 cs20m437 cs20m438 cs20m276 cs20m277 cs20m278 cs20m279 cs20m282 cs20m439 cs20m440 cs20m487 cs20m280 cs20m443 cs20m281 /STATISTICS=STDDEV MINIMUM MAXIMUM MEAN MEDIAN /ORDER=ANALYSIS.

Just like the variable offline, these 17 variables have been turned into the scale online. The missing values have been removed as well. This leaves us with the following tables:

The mean is 1,83 and the standard deviation is 1,88. The minimum is ,00 and the maximum is 40,35. This means that the respondents generally only spent 1,83 hours per week on online activities. The standard deviation is also low seeing as the scale is 0 - 168. This means that there is not much dispersion in the data. This is very remarkable because it seems as if none of the respondents really spent any time on online activities during their leisure time. The maximum is 40,5 which is more expected for an individual to spend on online activities nowadays.

### Statistics

Online					
N	Valid	2746			
	Missing	0			
Mean		1,8289			
Median		1,4118			
Std. De	viation	1,92079			
Minimu	m	,00			
Maximu	ım	40,35			

# **Reliability Statistics**

	Cronbach's Alpha Based	
Cronbach's	on Standardized	
Alpha	Items	N of Items
,737	,776	17

RELIABILITY

/VARIABLES=cs20m267 cs20m268 cs20m269 cs20m270 cs20m437 cs20m438 cs20m276 cs20m277 cs20m278 cs20m279 cs20m282 cs20m439 cs20m440 cs20m487 cs20m280 cs20m443 cs20m281 /SCALE(ALL VARIABLES') ALL /MODEL=ALPHA /STATISTICS=SCALE /SUMMARY=CORR.

For the scale online there was also a reliability test done to see if the scale would be reliable. The Cronbach's alpha is ,737. This means that the reliability of the scales and their variables is acceptable.

### Social Integration

				Statistics			
		I have a sense of emptiness around me	There are enough people I can count on in case of a misfortune	l know a lot of people that l can fully rely on	There are enough people to whom I feel closely connected	l miss having people around me	l often feel deserted
Ν	Valid	5912	5912	5912	5912	5912	5912
	Missing	883	883	883	883	883	883
Mean		2,70	1,30	1,46	1,37	2,54	2,82
Mediar	ı	3,00	1,00	1,00	1,00	3,00	3,00
Std. De	eviation	,563	,552	,649	,594	,689	,473
Minimu	um	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maxim	um	3	3	3	3	3	3

#### There are enough people I can count on in case of a misfortune

#### I have a sense of emptiness around me

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Percent
Valid	Yes	311	4,6	5,3	5,3
	More or less	1174	17,3	19,9	25,1
	No	4427	65,2	74,9	100,0
	Total	5912	87,0	100,0	
Missing	System	883	13,0		
Total		6795	100,0		

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	4400	64,8	74,4	74,4
	More or less	1234	18,2	20,9	95,3
	No	278	4,1	4,7	100,0
	Total	5912	87,0	100,0	
Missing	System	883	13,0		
Total		6795	100,0		

#### I know a lot of people that I can fully rely on

#### There are enough people to whom I feel closely connected

Percent

60.5

21.3

5,2

87,0

13.0

100,0

Valid Percent

69.5

24.5

6,0

100,0

Cumulative Percent

69.5

94.0

100,0

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Percent			Frequency
Valid	Yes	3682	54,2	62,3	62,3	Valid	Yes	4110
	More or less	1719	25,3	29,1	91,4		More or less	1446
	No	511	7,5	8,6	100,0		No	356
	Total	5912	87,0	100,0			Total	5912
Missing	System	883	13,0			Missing	System	883
Total		6795	100,0			Total		6795

	I miss having people around me           Frequency         Percent         Valid Percent         Cumulative Percent           Yes         670         9,9         11,3         11,           More or less         1388         20,4         23,5         34,           No         3854         56,7         65,2         100,						l often fe	eel desert	ed		
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	670	9,9	11,3	11,3	Valid	Yes	220	3,2	3,7	3,7
	More or less	1388	20,4	23,5	34,8		More or less	638	9,4	10,8	14,5
	No	3854	56,7	65,2	100,0		No	5054	74,4	85,5	100,0
	Total	5912	87,0	100,0			Total	5912	87,0	100,0	
Missing	System	883	13,0			Missing	System	883	13,0		
Total		6795	100,0			Total		6795	100,0		

### FREQUENCIES VARIABLES=cs20m284 cs20m285 cs20m286 cs20m287 cs20m288 cs20m289 /STATISTICS=STDDEV MINIMUM MAXIMUM MEAN MEDIAN /ORDER=ANALYSIS.

These 6 variables have been turned into a scale to measure someone's social integration. Because 'yes' was coded as 1, some of the variables have been mirrored so that a high answer means high social integration. The variables that were mirrored are 'there are enough people I can count on in a case of misfortune', 'I know a lot of people I can rely on' and, 'there are enough people whom I feel closely connected to'. Just like the other variables, the missing values were removed as well.

RECODE cs20m285 cs20m286 cs20m287 (1=3) (2=2) (3=1) INTO intergratie1 Integratie5 integratie6. EXECUTE.

COMPUTE Integratie2=(intergratie1 + Integratie5 + integratie6 + cs20m284 + cs20m288 + cs20m289) / 6. EXECUTE.

The mean for social integration is 2,6446 and the standard deviation is ,43. The minimum was 1 and the maximum was 3. The mean is remarkably high which means that the respondents are very socially integrated. The standard deviation is normal in comparison to the scale of 1 - 3. The majority of the respondents filled out a 3 which was 'no'. Since the questions were mirrored, a higher score means higher social integration.

#### Statistics

Integratie2					
Ν	Valid	2746			
	Missing	0			
Mean		2,6475			
Median		2,8333			
Std. Deviation		,43016			
Minimum		1,00			
Maximum		3,00			

# **Reliability Statistics**

Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items	N of Items	RELIABILITY /VARIABLES=intergratie1 Integratie5 integratie6 cs20m284 cs20m288 cs20m289 /SCALE(ALL VARIABLES') ALL
,818	,824	6	/MODEL=ALPHA /STATISTICS=SCALE /SIIMMARV=CORR

For the scale of social integration, a reliability test was done to see if the variables were good to put in a scale together. The Cronbach's alpha is ,818. This is a high Cronbach's alpha which means that the reliability of this scale is good.

### FREQUENCIES VARIABLES=gebjaar /STATISTICS=STDDEV MINIMUM MAXIMUM MEAN MEDIAN

/ORDER=ANALYSIS.

Since age is measured in birth year, there is not a lot to say about the numbers shown in this table of the original variable. Therefore, a new variable was made to measure age in years. This was done by computing a new variable and deducting birth year off from 2020, the year in which the surveys were made. This leaves us with age in years.

COMPUTE LeeftijdJaar=2020 - gebjaar. EXECUTE.

Looking at these new numbers after the missing values were removed and the new variable was made, the mean is 53,14 which means that most respondents were middle-aged. The minimum is 16 which makes sense since that was the minimum age to participate in. What is remarkable is that the maximum age is 97, which is a very old age, especially since the surveys were taken online which makes it less accessible for older people. The standard deviation is 18,46 which is not very remarkable since age is something that ranges a lot.

### Statistics

Year of birth				
N Valid		6795		
	Missing	0		
Mean		1969,44		
Median		1968,00		
Std. Deviation		18,852		
Minimum		1917		
Maximum		2005		

### Statistics

Leeftij	dJaar		
Ν	Valid	2746	
	Missing	0	
Mean		53,3591	
Median		56,0000	
Std. Deviation		18,02649	
Minimum		16,00	
Maximum		97,00	

# Gender Statistics

Gend		
Ν	Valid	6795
	Missing	0
Mean		1,54
Median		2,00
Std. Deviation		,498
Minimum		1
Maximum		2

			Gender		
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Male	3107	45,7	45,7	45,7
	Female	3688	54,3	54,3	100,0
	Total	6795	100,0	100,0	

FREQUENCIES VARIABLES=geslacht /STATISTICS=STDDEV MINIMUM MAXIMUM MEAN MEDIAN /ORDER=ANALYSIS.

54,3% of the respondents identify themselves as female and the other 45,7% identify as male. Since the answer categories for this variable were 1 = male and 2 = female, the variable has been recoded to change to 0 = male and 1 = female. The syntax looks like this:

```
RECODE geslacht (1=0) (2=1) INTO Geslacht2.
EXECUTE.
```

This made a new variable called Geslacht2. Just like all the other variables, the missing values have been deleted. This leaves us with a new total and changes to the distribution.

Statistics				
Gesla	acht2			
Ν	Valid	2746		
	Missing	0		
Mean		,4982		
Media	an	,0000,		
Std. Deviation		,50009		
Minimum		,00,		
Maxin	num	1,00		

Geslacht2							
Frequency Percent Valid Percent Cumulative							
Valid	,00,	1378	50,2	50,2	50,2		
	1,00	1368	49,8	49,8	100,0		
	Total	2746	100,0	100,0			

### FREQUENCIES VARIABLES=Geslacht2 /STATISTICS=STDDEV MINIMUM MAXIMUM MEAN MEDIAN /ORDER=ANALYSIS.

0 = male and 1 = female. As seen in the table, the majority of the respondents are now male instead of female, namely 50,2%. This is just more than half of the respondents. The distribution between male and female respondents is almost equal. For research purposes, this is a good thing since you want to have a good representation of all genders.

### **Education**

Statistics

Highest level of education with d

N	Valid	6795
	Missing	0
Mean		4,10
Median	l .	4,00
Std. Deviation		1,596
Minimum		1
Maximu	um	9

#### Highest level of education with diploma

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	primary school	277	4,1	4,1	4,1
	vmbo (intermediate secondary education, US: junior high school)	1195	17,6	17,6	21,7
	havo/wo (higher secondary education/preparatory university education, US: senio	722	10,6	10,6	32,3
	mbo (intermediate vocational education, US: junior college)	1627	23,9	23,9	56,2
	hbo (higher vocational education, US: college)	1764	26,0	26,0	82,2
	wo (university)	926	13,6	13,6	95,8
	other	127	1,9	1,9	97,7
	Not (yet) completed any education	127	1,9	1,9	99,6
	Not yet started any education*	30	,4	,4	100,0
	Total	6795	100,0	100,0	

### FREQUENCIES VARIABLES=opImet /STATISTICS=STDDEV MINIMUM MAXIMUM MEAN MEDIAN /ORDER=ANALYSIS.

The variable education also has not been changed. Most of the respondents have finished hbo (26%) or mbo (23,9%). Just like all the other variables, the variable was made into a dummy and then the

### Statistics

Highest level of education with diploma

Ν	Valid	2746	_
	Missing	0	
Mean		3,86	
Median		4,00	
Std. Deviation		1,443	
Minimum		1	
Maxim	um	6	

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	primary school	113	4,1	4,1	4,1
	vmbo (intermediate secondary education, US: junior high school)	590	21,5	21,5	25,6
	havo/vwo (higher secondary education/preparatory university education, US: senio	262	9,5	9,5	35,1
	mbo (intermediate vocational education, US: junior college)	728	26,5	26,5	61,7
	hbo (higher vocational education, US: college)	696	25,3	25,3	87,0
	wo (university)	357	13,0	13,0	100,0
	Total	2746	100,0	100,0	

### Highest level of education with diploma

Most of the respondents have now finished mbo (26,5%) and the following is hbo (25,3%). This is similar to the original variable, not much has changed. Fewer people finished anything beyond primary school and high school. The majority of the respondents are of middle age, which is why it makes sense that the majority have finished a higher education like (junior) college or university.

### Health

### Statistics

How would you describe your he

Ν	Valid	5730
	Missing	1065
Mean		3,14
Mediar	ı	3,00
Std. De	eviation	,793
Minimu	ım	1
Maxim	um	5

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	poor	89	1,3	1,6	1,6
	moderate	892	13,1	15,6	17,1
	good	3169	46,6	55,3	72,4
	very good	1283	18,9	22,4	94,8
	excellent	297	4,4	5,2	100,0
	Total	5730	84,3	100,0	
Missing	System	1065	15,7		
Total		6795	100,0		

### How would you describe your health, generally speaking?

FREQUENCIES VARIABLES=ch20m004

/STATISTICS=STDDEV MINIMUM MAXIMUM MEAN MEDIAN /ORDER=ANALYSIS.

No changes have been made to this variable. Just like for every other variable the missing values have been removed. The question that was asked with this variable was: 'how would you describe your health, generally speaking?'. Since this is an ordinal variable category, it is not interesting to look at the mean, it is more interesting to look at the percentages. The table shows that the majority of the respondents would generally describe their health as good, namely 46,6%. This is almost half of the respondents. Since the missing variables have been removed from the dataset, the final variable has different results than this one.

#### Statistics

How would you describe your health, generally speaking?

Ν	Valid	2727
	Missing	0
Mean		3,12
Mediar	ı	3,00
Std. De	eviation	,798
Minimu	ım	1
Maxim	um	5

#### How would you describe your health, generally speaking?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	poor	48	1,8	1,8	1,8
	moderate	439	16,1	16,1	17,9
	good	1512	55,4	55,4	73,3
	very good	589	21,6	21,6	94,9
	excellent	139	5,1	5,1	100,0
	Total	2727	100,0	100,0	

The biggest category is still 'good'. 55,4% would generally describe their health as good. This is more than half of the respondents. When looking at the distribution, 17,9% fall under the lower half of how they would describe their half, so they describe it as 'bad' in comparison to the remaining 82,1% who describe their general health as good or even better than that. Overall, it seems that the respondents are in good health.

# Appendix 2 – syntax and output

# <u>Analysis 1</u>

# Coefficients<sup>a</sup>

		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients			Collinearity	Statistics
Model		В	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.	Tolerance	VIF
1	(Constant)	2,212	,038		58,553	,000		
	Geslacht2	,000	,016	,000	,021	,984	,995	1,005
	Highest level of education with diploma	,021	,006	,070	3,720	,000,	,966	1,035
	How would you describe your health, generally speaking?	,113	,010	,208	11,038	,000	,968	1,034
2	(Constant)	2,213	,038		58,439	,000		
	Geslacht2	-,011	,017	-,013	-,677	,498	,918	1,090
	Highest level of education with diploma	,022	,006	,075	3,949	,000,	,951	1,051
	How would you describe your health, generally speaking?	,114	,010	,209	11,133	,000	,967	1,034
	Offline_C	,050	,018	,055	2,849	,004	,900	1,111
	Online_C	-,025	,004	-,112	-6,008	,000	,974	1,026
3	(Constant)	2,108	,039		53,474	,000		
	Geslacht2	,003	,016	,003	,156	,876	,908	1,101
	Highest level of education with diploma	,029	,006	,098	5,171	,000	,931	1,074
	How would you describe your health, generally speaking?	,136	,010	,251	13,066	,000	,902	1,109
	Offline_C	,042	,017	,046	2,392	,017	,897	1,115
	Online_C	-,015	,004	-,068	-3,537	,000	,900	1,111
	Leeftijd_C	,004	,000,	,168	8,368	,000	,827	1,209
4	(Constant)	2,114	,039		53,536	,000		
	Geslacht2	,003	,016	,003	,181	,857	,908,	1,101
	Highest level of education with diploma	,028	,006	,093	4,910	,000,	,922	1,085
	How would you describe your health, generally speaking?	,137	,010	,253	13,153	,000	,898	1,113
	Offline_C	,042	,018	,047	2,420	,016	,893	1,120
	Online_C	-,010	,005	-,046	-2,147	,032	,714	1,401
	Leeftijd_C	,004	,000,	,171	8,511	,000	,824	1,214
	IntOffXLft_C	,001	,001	,014	,738	,461	,970	1,031
	IntOnXLft_C	,000,	,000,	,044	2,098	,036	,769	1,300

a. Dependent Variable: Integratie2

#### Model Summary

					Change Statistics				
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	,231 <sup>a</sup>	,054	,053	,41872	,054	51,705	3	2742	,000,
2	,259 <sup>b</sup>	,067	,066	,41582	,014	20,179	2	2740	,000
3	,301°	,091	,089	,41068	,023	70,022	1	2739	,000,
4	,304 <sup>d</sup>	,092	,090	,41042	,002	2,724	2	2737	,066

a. Predictors: (Constant), How would you describe your health, generally speaking?, Geslacht2, Highest level of education with diploma

b. Predictors: (Constant), How would you describe your health, generally speaking?, Geslacht2, Highest level of education with diploma. Online C. Offline C

c. Predictors: (Constant), How would you describe your health, generally speaking?, Geslacht2, Highest level of education with diploma, Online\_C, Offline\_C, Age\_C

d. Predictors: (Constant), How would you describe your health, generally speaking?, Geslacht2, Highest level of education with diploma, Online\_C, Offline\_C, Age\_C, IntOffXAge\_C, IntOnXAge\_C

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	27,196	3	9,065	51,705	,000 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	480,739	2742	,175		
	Total	507,934	2745			
2	Regression	34,174	5	6,835	39,529	,000°
	Residual	473,761	2740	,173		
	Total	507,934	2745			
3	Regression	45,983	6	7,664	45,441	,000 <sup>d</sup>
	Residual	461,951	2739	,169		
	Total	507,934	2745			
4	Regression	46,901	8	5,863	34,804	,000°
	Residual	461,033	2737	,168		
	Total	507,934	2745			

### ANOVA<sup>a</sup>

a. Dependent Variable: Integratie2

b. Predictors: (Constant), How would you describe your health, generally speaking?, Geslacht2, Highest level of education with diploma

c. Predictors: (Constant), How would you describe your health, generally speaking?,

Geslacht2, Highest level of education with diploma, Online\_C, Offline\_C

d. Predictors: (Constant), How would you describe your health, generally speaking?, Geslacht2, Highest level of education with diploma, Online\_C, Offline\_C, Age\_C

e. Predictors: (Constant). How would you describe your health, generally speaking?

eslacht2, Highest level of education with diploma, Online\_C, Offline\_C, Age\_C

IntOffXAge\_C, IntOnXAge\_C

In model 1, only the control variables have been added. This shows if the control variables have any effect on the dependent variable social integration. Control variables are added because they are not necessarily of interest in this research, but they might influence the results. Education and health seem to have a significant impact on social integration. It seems that when someone graduated with higher education, they score higher on social integration. This is also the case for health. When someone indicates that they generally feel good, they score higher on social integration. Gender does not have a significant effect on social integration. Women score higher on social integration than men do, but since it is not a significant result, they cannot be generalized. This model can explain 5,4% of the variance. This means that by adding the control variables to the model, they can explain 5,4% of social integration. The f-change shows that this addition is significant.

Model 2 adds both the centered independent variables offline and online. It makes clear that when someone spends their leisure time offline, they will score higher on social integration. This regression coefficient is small but positive and significant with p = 0.004. Furthermore, model 2 shows

REGRESSION /MISSING LISTWISE /STATISTICS COEFF OUTS R ANOVA CHANGE COLLIN TOL /CRITERIA=PIN(.05) POUT(.10) /NOORIGIN /DEPENDENT Integratie2 /METHOD=ENTER Geslacht2 oplmet ch20m004 /METHOD=ENTER Offline\_C Online\_C /METHOD=ENTER Age C /METHOD=ENTER IntOffXAge\_C IntOnXAge\_C.

that when someone spends their leisure time online, they score lower on social integration. Again, this regression coefficient is small, but this time it is negative. This effect is again significant with p < ,001. The R<sup>2</sup><sub>a</sub> shows that adding the two independent variables causes the model to become better. It can now explain 6,7% of the variance in social integration. Again, the f-change shows that this addition is significant.

In model 3, the centered moderator age is added. The regression coefficient is very small and positive. It is also significant with p < ,001. This shows that the older someone is in years, the higher they score on social integration. The  $R^2_a$  increased to ,089, the addition of the variable age can explain 8,9% of the variance in social integration. The f-change is also significant with p < ,001. This model is the best and will be used to test the hypotheses.

Model 4 is the model in which the interaction variables have been added. The interactions are both between age and online or offline. The regression coefficient of the interaction of age and offline is ,001. When age increases by one entity, the score on social integration increases by,045. The effect of offline on social integration positively gets stronger the older someone is. This effect is not significant. The slope of the second integration is ,000449. This also means that the effect of online on social integration gets stronger the older someone is. This effect is significant. The R<sup>2</sup><sub>a</sub> has slightly increased to ,090 in comparison to model 3. This means that the addition of the two interactions causes them to explain 9% of the variance in social integration. The f-change, however, shows that this addition is not significant with p = ,066.

### Analysis 2

```
USE ALL.

COMPUTE filter_$=(ZRE_1 > -2).

VARIABLE LABELS filter_$ 'ZRE_1 > -2 (FILTER)'.

VALUE LABELS filter_$ 0 'Not Selected' 1 'Selected'.

FORMATS filter_$ (f1.0).

FILTER BY filter_$.

EXECUTE.

REGRESSION

/MISSING LISTWISE

/STATISTICS COEFF OUTS R ANOVA CHANGE COLLIN TOL

/CRITERIA=PIN(.05) POUT(.10)

/NOORIGIN

/DEPENDENT Integratie2

/METHOD=ENTER Geslacht2 oplmet ch20m004
```

/METHOD=ENTER Offline\_C Online\_C /METHOD=ENTER Age\_C

/METHOD=ENTER IntOffXAge C IntOnXAge C.

#### Model Summary

					Change Statistics				
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	,234 <sup>a</sup>	,055	,054	,32383	,055	50,079	3	2592	,000,
2	,273 <sup>b</sup>	,075	,073	,32054	,020	27,720	2	2590	,000,
3	,301°	,091	,089	,31777	,016	46,432	1	2589	,000,
4	,308 <sup>d</sup>	,095	,092	,31723	,004	5,394	2	2587	,005

 a. Predictors: (Constant), How would you describe your health, generally speaking?, Geslacht2, Highest level of education with diploma

b. Predictors: (Constant), How would you describe your health, generally speaking?, Geslacht2, Highest level of education with diploma, Online\_C, Offline\_C

c. Predictors: (Constant), How would you describe your health, generally speaking?, Geslacht2, Highest level of education with diploma, Online\_C, Offline\_C, Age\_C

d. Predictors: (Constant), How would you describe your health, generally speaking?, Geslacht2, Highest level of education with diploma, Online\_C, Offline\_C, Age\_C, IntOffXAge\_C, IntOnXAge\_C

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	15,755	3	5,252	50,079	,000 <sup>6</sup>
	Residual	271,814	2592	,105		
	Total	287,569	2595			
2	Regression	21,451	5	4,290	41,755	,000°
	Residual	266,117	2590	,103		
	Total	287,569	2595			
3	Regression	26,140	6	4,357	43,145	,000 <sup>d</sup>
	Residual	261,429	2589	,101		
	Total	287,569	2595			
4	Regression	27,225	8	3,403	33,817	,000°
	Residual	260,343	2587	,101		
	Total	287,569	2595			

## ANOVA<sup>a</sup>

a. Dependent Variable: Integratie2

 b. Predictors: (Constant), How would you describe your health, generally speaking?, Geslacht2, Highest level of education with diploma

- c. Predictors: (Constant), How would you describe your health, generally speaking?, Geslacht2, Highest level of education with diploma, Online\_C, Offline\_C
- d. Predictors: (Constant), How would you describe your health, generally speaking?, Geslacht2, Highest level of education with diploma, Online\_C, Offline\_C, Age\_C
- e. Predictors: (Constant), How would you describe your health, generally speaking?, Geslacht2, Highest level of education with diploma, Online\_C, Offline\_C, Age\_C, IntOffXAge\_C, IntOnXAge\_C

Coefficients <sup>®</sup>	
---------------------------	--

		Unstandardize	d Coefficients	Standardized Coefficients			Collinearity	Statistics
Model		В	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.	Tolerance	VIF
1	(Constant)	2,358	,031		77,134	,000		
	Geslacht2	,011	,013	,016	,855	,393	,993	1,007
	Highest level of education with diploma	,019	,004	,083	4,276	,000,	,968	1,033
	How would you describe your health, generally speaking?	,088	,008	,206	10,618	,000	,969	1,032
2	(Constant)	2,359	,031		77,095	,000,		
	Geslacht2	,002	,013	,003	,134	,893	,915	1,093
	Highest level of education with diploma	,020	,004	,088	4,560	,000,	,952	1,050
	How would you describe your health, generally speaking?	,088	,008	,205	10,694	,000	,969	1,032
	Offline_C	,041	,014	,057	2,859	,004	,896	1,116
	Online_C	-,024	,003	-,138	-7,200	,000,	,975	1,026
3	(Constant)	2,284	,032		70,785	,000		
	Geslacht2	,012	,013	,017	,882	,378	,904	1,107
	Highest level of education with diploma	,025	,004	,108	5,574	,000,	,931	1,074
	How would you describe your health, generally speaking?	,104	,008	,244	12,282	,000	,890	1,123
	Offline_C	,034	,014	,048	2,412	,016	,892	1,121
	Online_C	-,017	,003	-,100	-5,060	,000,	,898,	1,114
	Leeftijd_C	,003	,000,	,142	6,814	,000,	,813	1,229
4	(Constant)	2,289	,032		70,977	,000		
	Geslacht2	,012	,013	,018	,927	,354	,903	1,107
	Highest level of education with diploma	,024	,004	,102	5,230	,000,	,921	1,085
	How would you describe your health, generally speaking?	,106	,009	,247	12,451	,000	,886	1,128
	Offline_C	,034	,014	,048	2,442	,015	,890	1,123
	Online_C	-,012	,004	-,069	-3,132	,002	,716	1,396
	Leeftijd_C	,003	,000	,146	7,035	,000	,810	1,235
	IntOffXLft_C	,001	,001	,021	1,084	,279	,973	1,028
	IntOnXLft_C	,000	,000,	,062	2,929	,003	,773	1,293
2.0	enendent Variable: Integratie	,						

a. Dependent Variable: Integratie:

In this analysis, the standardized residuals that were below -2 were removed from the dataset. This was done to try and get rid of the left-skewed distribution. Looking at the  $R_a^2$  we can see it slightly increased to ,092. The f-change also shows that model 4 is now significant with p = ,005. However, when looking at the newly made histogram in *figure 2.1*, we can still see that there is a left-skewed distribution. It seems that the problem lies within the distribution of social integration itself. The respondents are generally very socially integrated.



Figure 2.1: histogram standardized residuals

### Appendix 3 – assumptions, outliers, and multicollinearity

In a regression analysis, there are four assumptions there can be controlled for. Below we will discuss them and see what happens if they are violated.

Firstly, the cases have to be independent of each other. For this to be the case, the sample has to be drawn randomly. On the website of the LISS panel, it is described that this is the case. However,

the respondents can come from the same household which means that they can influence each other when filling out the survey. The first assumption is therefore violated since it cannot be guaranteed that the observations are independent of each other.

Secondly, there has to be linearity. This can be controlled by looking at the residual plot. All items need to have a mean of 0. The standardized residuals can be found on the y-as and the predicted standardized values on the x-as. This is shown in *figure 3.1*. We can also look at a P-P Plot, which is shown in *figure 3.2*. Both figures show that the assumption of linearity is violated. Looking at the P-P plot, we can see that the cases do not follow the line in a nice straight line. The scatterplot shows that not all items have a mean of 0.









Another assumption that can be controlled for with a residual plot is homoscedasticity. The distribution in y-scores has to be the constant for every x. *Figure 1* shows a pattern in the data. It also shows that there are several outliers. The assumption of homoscedasticity seems to be violated as well.

Lastly, the conditional distribution of the dependent variable social integration has to be normally distributed. We will look at the standardized residuals for this. *Figure 3.3* shows that there is a left-skewed distribution. This can result in the test results not being reliable.



Figure 3.3: histogram standardized residuals

Below is the syntax that was used to create the graphs and to show the outliers.

REGRESSION /MISSING LISTWISE /STATISTICS COEFF OUTS R ANOVA COLLIN TOL /CRITERIA=PIN(.05) POUT(.10) /NOORIGIN /DEPENDENT Integratie2 /METHOD=ENTER opImet ch20m004 Geslacht2 Offline\_C Online\_C Age\_C IntOffXAge\_C IntOnXAge\_C /SCATTERPLOT=(\*SRESID ,\*ZPRED) /RESIDUALS HISTOGRAM(ZRESID) NORMPROB(ZRESID) /SAVE PRED ZPRED COOK LEVER RESID ZRESID DFBETA DFFIT.

Furthermore, there will be analyzed if there are outliers. This is done in four diverse ways. Firstly, we will look at the standardized residuals, then we look at the leverage and Cook's Distance, and lastly, we will look at the DFFIT.

First, the standardized residuals will be discussed. All absolute values below -3 and above 3 are considered outliers when we sort ZRE\_1 from descending, we can see that 42 items fall below -3. When sorted ascending, it shows there are no items that are above 3. There is one remarkable value which is -4,16992

Next, we will look at the leverage. This indicates the extent to which a value pulls on the regression line and thus how much influence it exerts. The further away from the mean on the independent variables, the more influence this point has on the slopes. To see if the leverage is too high, the cut-off value is calculated:  $\frac{3p}{n} = \frac{3*9}{2746} = ,009832$ . Looking at the data, we can see that 53 cases score above ,009832 on leverage. One leverage score is particularly high, namely ,36370.

Thirdly, we will look at the Cook's Distance (CD). This is also calculated with a cutoff value by doing  $\frac{4}{n} = \frac{4}{2746} = ,001456$ . Looking at the data, we can see that 116 cases can be considered an outlier when looking at the CD.

Lastly, we can look at the DFFIT. These values are compared to the scale of the dependent variable social integration. The scale ranges from 1 to 3. The highest DFFIT value is ,04828. Compared to the scale, this is not an exceedingly high value. Based on the DFFIT there is no outlier.

Looking at *figure 3.2* we can see that on the left, a case scores extremely low on the predicted standardized residuals. This is ID number 853962. This respondent scores high on the scale of offline, namely 40,35. We concluded earlier that this score was remarkably high seeing that the mean is 1,83. This case can be seen as a real outlier, it also scores high on the

Cook's Distance (,122728) and on leverage (,36370). However, removing this respondent does not have a big enough influence to ensure that the assumptions of linear regression are not violated.

Given these results, there seem to be several outliers. However, when removed from the dataset they do not seem to impact the regression analysis in a significant way. They also do not change the left-skewness in the distribution which seems to be salvaged in the variable social integration itself. Removing individual cases that score low on social integration is something we do not want to do because a low score has as much meaning as a high score. The respondents are just generally well socially integrated.

### Coefficients<sup>a</sup>

		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients			Collinearity Statistics	
Model		В	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.	Tolerance	VIF
1	(Constant)	2,358	,031		77,134	,000		
	Geslacht2	,011	,013	,016	,855	,393	,993	1,007
	Highest level of education with diploma	,019	,004	,083	4,276	,000,	,968	1,033
	How would you describe your health, generally speaking?	,088	,008	,206	10,618	,000	,969	1,032
2	(Constant)	2,359	,031		77,095	,000		
	Geslacht2	,002	,013	,003	,134	,893	,915	1,093
	Highest level of education with diploma	,020	,004	,088	4,560	,000,	,952	1,050
	How would you describe your health, generally speaking?	,088	,008	,205	10,694	,000	,969	1,032
	Offline_C	,041	,014	,057	2,859	,004	,896	1,116
	Online_C	-,024	,003	-,138	-7,200	,000	,975	1,026
3	(Constant)	2,284	,032		70,785	,000		
	Geslacht2	,012	,013	,017	,882	,378	,904	1,107
	Highest level of education with diploma	,025	,004	,108	5,574	,000,	,931	1,074
	How would you describe your health, generally speaking?	,104	,008	,244	12,282	,000	,890	1,123
	Offline_C	,034	,014	,048	2,412	,016	,892	1,121
	Online_C	-,017	,003	-,100	-5,060	,000	,898,	1,114
	Age_C	,003	,000,	,142	6,814	,000	,813	1,229
4	(Constant)	2,289	,032		70,977	,000		
	Geslacht2	,012	,013	,018	,927	,354	,903	1,107
	Highest level of education with diploma	,024	,004	,102	5,230	,000,	,921	1,085
	How would you describe your health, generally speaking?	,106	,009	,247	12,451	,000	,886	1,128
	Offline_C	,034	,014	,048	2,442	,015	,890	1,123
	Online_C	-,012	,004	-,069	-3,132	,002	,716	1,396
	Age_C	,003	,000,	,146	7,035	,000	,810	1,235
	IntOffXAge_C	,001	,001	,021	1,084	,279	,973	1,028
	IntOnXAge_C	,000	,000,	,062	2,929	,003	,773	1,293

a. Dependent Variable: Integratie2

Next to outliers and assumptions, there can also be controlled for multicollinearity. Multicollinearity indicates the extent to which the predictors are correlated. If this coherence is too strong, the standard errors become too large, which causes the t-values to be extremely high. These high t-values will cause high p-values. The regression coefficients are less likely to deviate significantly from 0. This will make it hard to generalize the results. We can check multicollinearity by looking at the VIF-scores. When a VIF-score is above 4, this indicates a correlation that is too strong. The column on the right shows these scores. As we can see, all the VIF-scores are below 2. There is no multicollinearity.