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Abstract

Social media are all around us, dominating the virtual landscape and infiltrating our daily lives. Usage of these primarily hedonic systems continues to expand. Past research on technology adoption and usage has prominently investigated utilitarian systems, though other findings have shown that different characteristics impact the usage of hedonic systems. Given the socio-technical nature of social media and its pervasiveness in our daily lives, this study investigates the impacts that information privacy sensitivity, presenteeism, and sociality have on a user’s attitude towards social media, and from that attitude, the impact on actual usage of the technology. The results from surveys of college student social media users finds that presenteeism and sociality significantly impact attitude, which in turn increases usage. These findings provide groundwork for expanding our understanding of hedonic technologies and the need to continue investigating technology-specific characteristics.
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Introduction

Social media are all around us, dominating the virtual landscape and infiltrating our daily lives. A recent survey found that 86% of online adults in the US, and 79% of online adults in Europe use social media (Sverdlov 2012). Given this enormous population of users, it comes as no surprise that social media usage has become the most common activity on the Web (Socialnomics.net 2012), with Facebook and YouTube as the two most-visited social media, and second- and third-most visited sites on the Internet (Alexa.com 2015). Gallaugher and Ransbotham (2010) state that social media usage accounts for almost a quarter of all user online time, greatly surpassing gaming (10%) and email (8%) (Nielsen Corp. 2010). Due to its familiarity, speed, and reach, social media is changing the public discourse in society and setting trends and agendas in topics that range from the environment and politics, to the entertainment industry (Asur and Huberman 2010).

Many forms of social media, such as social networks and content communities, are primarily hedonic-focused, unlike most systems studied in Information Systems (IS) research. Research investigating technology adoption and usage is a fundamental cornerstone of the IS discipline; many studies in the past decades have looked at the factors the influence and drive this adoption and the intention to use systems. However, most of these studies are focused on business-oriented technologies with a utilitarian spirit. Systems with a hedonic nature may have different antecedent characteristics than systems that are used in a business environment (van der Heijden 2004; Venkatesh et al. 2003).

We’ve known for years that technological characteristics will affect system usage, so it should be the same with social media. However, even the more recent technology acceptance models with many variables, such as UTAUT (Venkatesh et al. 2003) do not address the emotional, personal, and social components and responses that pertain to a hedonic, network-dependent, socio-technical system. Social media are socio-technical systems where the social structure, people, technology, and tasks all interact to provide a holistic view of the system (Bostrom and Heinen 1977). Socio-Technical systems arise when cognitive and social interaction is mediated by information technology rather than the natural world (Whitworth 2006).
For understanding social media, in addition to analyzing the technological characteristics, additional factors, including personal characteristics, social structure, and tasks with the system must be examined.

It is worthwhile to investigate acceptance and usage of hedonic systems since findings can provide insight into how the value of technology is situational. Insight into hedonic systems can tell us about how people relate to technology and accomplish different goals with it. For example, technologies that foster enjoyment and fun, such as video games, are an important tool for many individuals. Performing activities that are fun and enjoyable are recommended as a way to take care of oneself and reduce stress, among other potential benefits (American Psychological Association 2014). There are organizational motivations for understanding drivers of hedonic technologies as well. It is rare to find businesses that do not have a presence on social media platforms. For some, this presence is simply informational to customers. However, those that leverage the capabilities of social media can use the platforms as a multi-faceted tool to advertise, market, and interact with customers, as well as garner goodwill and improve satisfaction. For organizations looking to tap into the power of social media, it is relevant to understand characteristics that foster their customers’ personal usage of social media so that the organization can align their interaction strategies with the customer base. As a potential example, if perceived enjoyment was a strong predictor of social media usage, the organization should consider making their interactions as enjoyable as possible to encourage their customers to participate.

This desire to understand characteristics that influence social media usage leads to the research question:

**RQ:** What are socio-technical characteristics of social media and its users that influence usage?

Developing models and understandings of phenomena that is more focused and context-specific is considered an important frontier in IS research (Brown et al. 2010; Orlikowski and Iacono 2001; Venkatesh and Bala 2008). “A model focused on a specific class of technology will be more explanatory compared to a general model that attempts to address many classes of technologies” (Brown et al. 2010). Following the path started by van der Heijden (2004) and Lin and Bhattacherjee (2010), this study draws from previous technology acceptance models such as TAM and UTAUT, and van der Heijden’s (2004) Hedonic IS acceptance model, and customizes it for hedonic social media usage. This customization includes both technological and personal/social characteristics leading to usage as both have been found to have significant impacts of technology usage (Brown et al. 2010; Kugler and Smolnik 2013). In addition to the scientific value, this model will provide greater value to professionals who are attempting to foster successful use of social media.

Given these missing pieces, this study examines constructs of direct applicability to social media not found in the previous models. The rest of this article is organized as follows. First, discussions of social media and the technology acceptance models are provided. Then, the hypotheses are presented along with the research model. Afterwards, an overview of the research methodology that includes the data collection, measures used, analysis, and the results are provided. Finally, the article is concluded with a discussion of the findings, the contribution and limitations, and directions for future research.

**Background**

**Social Media**

Social media are a group of Internet-based applications that allow the creation and exchange of user generated content (UGC). UGC can take many forms, including videos uploaded to YouTube, posts shared on Facebook, thoughts shared on Twitter, etc. UGC can be seen as the sum of all ways in which people make use of social media (Kaplan and Haenlein 2010). The most common uses of social media are as a hedonic system that individuals use for enjoyment. This can be watching entertaining videos on YouTube, interacting with social circles on Facebook, or other enjoyable activities. Hedonic systems aim to provide self-fulfilling value to the user, in contrast to utilitarian systems, which aim to provide instrumental value to the user (van der Heijden 2004). For users, interacting with social media is an end in itself; hedonic systems encourage prolonged, enjoyable usage (van der Heijden 2004).
Social media has been ubiquitous and researchers have paid attention. In the business disciplines, much research has been conducted on how businesses can leverage social media to increase exposure, increase profits, measure ROI, and other external business goals (Culnan et al. 2010; Fisher 2009; Hoffman and Fodor 2010; Nair 2011). Other studies have proposed guidelines on how a firm should create, manage, and maintain its online presence (Brogan 2010; Scott 2011). Much of the previous research on social media in the business disciplines has concentrated on institutional-level use of the phenomenon and focuses on improving overall business (Mangold and Faulds 2009), public relations (Aula 2010), and/or a profits (Hoffman and Fodor 2010). Marketers have rigorously examined how a firm can leverage social media, but little work has been produced on the antecedents of social media usage at the individual level.

**Technology Acceptance**

Technology usage and adoption is an important topic that has been widely researched since the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) was introduced (Davis 1989). This model has helped spawn a large number of competing and evolved models, including TAM2 (Venkatesh and Davis 2000), UTAUT (Venkatesh et al. 2003), and TAM3 (Venkatesh and Bala 2008), among others. These newer models have introduced more and varied variables that have been shown to impact the use of technology. However, one shortcoming of TAM and its incarnations is that is has been primarily used to study the adoption and usage of utilitarian technologies, and thus does not include characteristics that apply to more hedonic and social technologies (Rosen and Sherman 2006; Sledgianowski and Kulviwat 2008). Van der Heijden (2004) found that perceived enjoyment has a significant impact on Intention to Use when investigating a hedonic technology. Researchers have argued that TAM and related models’ emphasis on cognition might be appropriate when considering utilitarian information, but that cognition is insufficient when considering contexts in which technology users are free to adopt technology based on their feelings (van der Heijden 2004; Komiak and Benbasat 2006; Kulviwat et al. 2007). Depending on the context of the system use, whether utilitarian or hedonic, the predictive importance of the determinants changes (van der Heijden, 2004). Much of the established technology acceptance literature does not take influencing characteristics of interest to hedonic and social systems into account. This issue needs to be addressed, as non-utilitarian technologies continue to grow in prominence and pervasiveness.

**Hypothesis Development**

To begin investigation into antecedents of social media usage, characteristics of relevance to social media were selected. To this end, information privacy sensitivity, presenteeism, and sociality were selected for inclusion. With regards to socio-technical systems, information privacy sensitivity is a personal characteristic, and both presenteeism and sociality reference the social structure. Constructs for measuring the tasks within the system were not included as the purpose of study is to investigate potential antecedents of usage. It is noted that these three constructs are not the only relevant constructs to examine in this context; for example, Rosen and Sherman (2006) investigated perceived number of users, computer playfulness, and flow as antecedents of perceived enjoyment, which itself was posited to predict behavioral intentions to use social networking websites. However, to establish initial findings with a set of constructs unused in previous related research and to strive for parsimony, other characteristics are excluded.

**Attitude Towards Social Media**

Many prior studies have looked at the potential mediating role of attitude towards a technology in the “characteristics to behavioral intention to use or usage” relationship (see Kim et al. [2009] for a list of identified studies). With the exception of Taylor and Todd (1995), each studied identified that used subjects with prior experience with the technology reported partial or full mediation via the attitude construct. In one example, Hsu and Lu (2004) investigated usage of online games, a primarily hedonic technology. The authors found that attitude fully mediated this relationship. In line with these results, attitude should mediate the relationships in this study.
Information Privacy Sensitivity

Information privacy, "the ability of the individual to personally control information about one’s self" (Stone et al. 1983), has been called one of the most important "ethical issues of the information age" (Smith 1994; Smith et al. 1996). By their nature, social media sites can contain and disseminate an enormous amount of personal information. These sites will often give the users options to protect their personal information from being seen by unwanted individuals. However, despite news stories, warnings, and even legislation, most social network users do not seem to alter their risky behavior of disclosing personal information online (Marett et al. 2011; Rosenblum 2007). One of the main ways that social networking site users create or maintain their social relationships is through the act of sharing personal information, as it is in real life. The difference is that once something is posted on the Internet, it can potentially be seen by many unintended individuals. The nature of the Internet is such that even information kept “private” by users could be seen by means of hacking, cracking, or social engineering. Users who are more worried with these potential information risks will have a lower attitude towards the services due to the concern, anxiety, and other negative emotions and cognitions.

H1: Users that are more sensitive with information privacy will have a more negative attitude towards social media.

Presenteeism

Presenteeism is defined as the degree to which a technology enables an individual to be reachable for communication (Ayyagari et al. 2011). Communication-enabling technologies such as mobile devices rely on presenteeism. This reachability can either be in real-time, such as the use of chat features of social media, or in punctuated timeframes, such as watching a user’s video posted on a content community site.

Presenteeism has been discussed as a cause of technostress (Ragu-Nathan et al. 2008; Taraefdar et al. 2007; Tu et al. 2005) due to its invasiveness and perception as an intrusive feature (Ayyagari et al. 2011). These studies posit that the technologies used are intruding upon the primary tasks that a user is focused on (such as work), thus creating internal conflict. In those situations, viewing presenteeism as a negative, stress-inducing phenomenon makes sense. Concerning personal social media, presenteeism does not make sense as a negative feature. Personal social media usage is a voluntary act of a primarily hedonic technology, and the ability to be reachable is one main benefit. Facebook’s chat feature remains a popular tool within the social networking site. When the technology is used in the spirit of a benefit to personal activities, presenteeism should increase the use of the social media by increasing the attitude a user has towards it.

H2: Users that perceive social media to enable higher amounts of presenteeism will have a more positive attitude towards social media.

Sociality

One major aspect that sets social media apart from traditional forms of media is the social-ness of the technology. As such, this social aspect should be included in any study involving social media usage. To begin an analysis of this aspect, Sociality is included in the research model. Sociality is defined by Sarker et al. (2005) as “The degree to which the technology is capable of enabling members to build social relationships and knowledge networks.” Building and maintaining social relationships is a key feature of social networking services. The users of these services commonly state that the websites provide an easy and entertaining way for them to keep in contact with remote friends and family, as well as for meeting new people with common interests, both platonically and romantically (Gibbs et al. 2006; Marett et al. 2011; Valkenburg et al. 2006). Knowledge networks can be seen throughout content communities and collaborative project sites; as of 1/31/2015, Wikipedia contains over 4.7 million articles, largely written by anonymous users (“Wikipedia” 2015). It could be argued that, based on their usage, sites such as Facebook and Wikipedia enable sociality. Similar to presenteeism, social media technologies that contain sociality will foster usage by increasing the attitude a user has towards it. This is because of the ability the technologies could provide to put the “social” in social media.

H3: Users that perceive social media to enable sociality will have a more positive attitude towards social media.
**Social Media Usage**

Studies investigating individuals’ IS adoption decisions define and operationalize the dependent variable differently. While some researchers focus on the behavioral intention to use a system (e.g. Agarwal and Prasad 1997; Hsu et al. 2007), others base their research on actual usage by measuring it in subjective (e.g., frequency, duration, intensity) or objective (e.g., system logs) terms (e.g. Igbaria et al. 1989; Limayem et al. 2007). Although studies in IS research have established a strong relationship between behavioral intention to use and actual system usage (e.g. Davis 1989; Devaraj et al. 2008), other research suggests that using actual usage measures may provide greater explanatory power than measures based on usage intentions (Limayem et al. 2007; Venkatesh and Bala 2008). Therefore, actual usage is measured as the dependent variable instead of the behavioral intention.

One argument made is that usage should be modeled as an antecedent of attitude towards the technology. After all, a user needs to experience the system before they can generate flow and generate an attitude towards that system. However, since this study is interested in current users, this initial experience has already occurred; the users’ current attitudes towards the system will impact their continued usage. In this manuscript, attitude is modeled as affecting social media usage and not vice versa due to the users’ previous experience with the system.

Hedonic information systems aim to provide self-fulfilling value, are strongly connected to home and leisure activities, and encourage prolonged rather than productive use (van der Heijden 2004). When a user has a strong attitude or affect towards a technology, these strong cognitions and emotions, under some circumstances, can exert a strong influence on a user’s actions (Compeau and Higgins 1995). Given the theoretical support for such a link found in Social Cognitive Theory (Bandura 1982, 1986) and previous empirical tests (e.g. Compeau et al. 1999; Compeau and Higgins 1995), it follows that users who have a more positive attitude towards a technology should use the technology for greater amounts of time.

**H4:** Users with a more positive attitude towards social media will have greater amounts of time using social media.

**Methodology**

**Design**

Student subjects responded to a set of two surveys used to empirically test the proposed model. The instruments were spread out between two separate surveys to reduce attrition and to gain multiple data points about social media usage. The surveys were administered at a span of one month of separation.
Subjects were informed of the study through their IS classes and asked for voluntary participation. The data used in this study satisfied the main condition that the respondents were users of social media.

**Subjects**

The full sample (N = 238) consists of college students enrolled in either face-to-face or online information systems courses at a US university. College students were chosen for the sample due to their commonplace usage and familiarity with social media.

In order to increase generalizability to non-traditional students, online IS classes were offered these surveys; many students who enroll for online courses are considered non-traditional students due to age differences, familial responsibilities, and/or work responsibilities. An ANOVA was conducted to determine if there were any significant differences between the face-to-face and online students’ social media usage. The ANOVA showed no significant difference (p = .473).

Twenty participants did not complete both surveys and were dropped from the data. Of these twenty, fifteen stated that they forgot about the second survey. The remaining data was screened for incomplete responses and responses that did not answer a filtering question correctly. This resulted in a final data set of 191. Details of the sample’s demographics are in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender Distribution</th>
<th>Age Distribution</th>
<th>Prior Social Media Experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>106 Males</td>
<td>&lt;= 21 Years: 153 Respondents</td>
<td>Average: 6 Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85 Females</td>
<td>&gt; 22 Years: 38 Respondents</td>
<td>11 with &lt; 2 Years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 1: Demographic Details**

**Measures**

With the exception of the dependent variable, existing scales were adapted for the context of this study. For items in the scales that reference a “technology”, “social media” was used in place of the technological term to make the items appropriate in this context. Table A1 in Appendix A provides the scales used in this study. As all measures were captured using surveys, common method variance (CMV) is a concern. However, as noted by Sharma et al. (2009), the temporal separation between the two measures can reduce the effect of CMV.

*Information Privacy Sensitivity* was measured using items from Smith, Milberg, and Burke’s (1996) Information Privacy instrument. Prior to selection of constructs, a pilot test was conducted (N = 250) to determine which of the seven specific attributes of information privacy in Smith et al.’s (1996) paper are most important to users. The pilot study revealed that the three most important facets to this sample (in order of importance) are Collection, Unauthorized Secondary Use, and Improper Access. The items for these three constructs were measured.

*Presenteeism* was measured using the four-item scale developed by Ayyagari, Grover, and Purvis (2011). This scale has been validated and used in a number of studies. Though the creators of this scale were showing that presenteeism can be a negative characteristic, the instrument is neutral, allowing for positive responses as well.

*Sociality* was measured using three selected items from Sarker et al.’s (2005) Group Supportability construct. This construct was selected based on its description: “items capturing the parallelism, transparency, and sociality of the technology.” Of the five items for the construct, three were selected for their ease of conversion to the individual level and relevance to the sociality aspect of the construct.

*Attitude Towards Social Media* was measured using the five-item Attitude scale from Social Cognitive Theory (Compeau and Higgins 1995; Compeau et al. 1999) identified and partially used in Venkatesh et al. (2003).

*Social Media Usage* was measured by asking subjects about their current usage (e.g. How many hours per day do you use social media?). The two current usage questions (hours per day, and days per week) were multiplied together to get the number of hours per week they use social media. These questions were
asked on both of the surveys sued in this study. The two measures were averaged to provide a more accurate measurement of usage.

**Analysis**

The marker variable approach to examining common method variance was analyzed (Richardson et al. 2009). The theoretically-unrelated marker variable, consumer spending self-control (Haws et al. 2012), was analyzed in the model to uncover potential CMV. All paths from the marker were non-significant, giving support for a lack of common method bias in this data. In addition, Harman’s single-factor test was conducted. The results of the test show that the items do not load on a single factor, given the percent of variance explained by a single factor of 35.8% and the number of factors identified by eigenvalues greater than 1 is 5.

**Measurement model**

SmartPLS 2.0 was used to analyze the data (Ringle et al. 2005). The PLS analysis technique has been viewed as superior for small to medium sample sizes, and when the research goal is identifying key “driver” constructs and an exploratory analysis of existing structural theory, as is this study (Chin et al. 2003; Hair et al. 2011). To analyze the model, the bootstrapping technique with 5000 samples and the PLS algorithm were used. Before the relationships in the structural model could be analyzed, bootstrapping and the PLS algorithm were run to identify poor items, non-significant constructs, and convergent and discriminant validity issues.

In the bootstrapping analysis, any indicators that loaded < .7 on their constructs were dropped from the model (Chin 1998), except those that loaded > .5 on their constructs that had other questions with high loadings (Chin 1998; Duarte and Raposo 2010) and/or when removal of the offending item lowered the content validity of the construct (Hair et al. 2011). Following these guidelines, a single item was removed from the Attitude construct, and Information Privacy Sensitivity was reduced to three items. To identify potential discriminant validity issues, the PLS algorithm was used to compare the constructs. Discriminant validity issues were not identified between constructs. Table 2 presents the measurement model results, including the reliability, square root of AVE, and correlations. The composite reliability of the multi-item scales are each greater than .7, providing satisfactory reliability (Nunnally and Bernstein 1994). The average variance extracted (AVE) for each construct is greater than .5 and the Fornell-Larcker criterion, where the square root of the AVE is larger than the correlation of the constructs, is supported, suggesting discriminant validity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CR</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Attitude Towards Social Media</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Information Privacy Sensitivity</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Presenteeism</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Sociality</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Usage</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2: Composite Reliability, Square Root of AVE (in diagonal), and Correlations**

**Results and Discussion**

Information privacy sensitivity was not found to have a significant relationship with attitude (p = .12), providing no support for H1. In this sample, individuals with higher levels of the sensitivity were no more likely to experience decreased levels of attitude than their peers. Presenteeism has a significant positive relationship with attitude (p < .01). Subjects who reported a higher level of presenteeism were more likely to report greater attitude, supporting H2. Sociality has a significant positive relationship with attitude as well (p < .001). Subjects who reported a greater level of sociality in their social media were more likely to have a greater attitude towards that social media, supporting H3. Finally, attitude has a significant
positive relationship with social media usage (p < .01). Subjects who have a greater attitude used social media more, supporting H4.

As social media is a primarily hedonic technology, the traditional models of utilitarian technology adoption and usage may not fit appropriately. Overall, the findings provide insight into the nomological net concerned with the usage of hedonic-focused technologies. While many studies focus on utilitarian-focused technological characteristics like ease of use, this study extends prior research by demonstrating how technology-specific characteristics are important for understanding usage. With the exception of information privacy sensitivity, the analysis supports the proposed hypotheses. With a social technology, the ability to be reachable can be a benefit that increases a user’s attitude towards the technology. This finding, in contrast with Ayyagari et al. (2011), shows that presenteeism can be a negative or a positive characteristic, depending on the technological context. Finally, as hypothesized, sociality has a positive relationship with attitude. that users of a social-focused technology would have a greater attitude from higher sociality. This finding shows that it is important to keep the “social” in social media.

Information privacy sensitivity was not found to have a significant relationship in these models. This is an interesting finding given the amount of personal information that is freely shared and distributed on many social media sites. Data breaches and information leaks seem to be frequently reported. While the extent of awareness surrounding information privacy raised from these events is unknown, the fallout from this type of breach can be enormous. Concerning the lack of a significant finding, it is possible that this result was found due to the sample characteristics. As the majority of subjects were between the ages of 18-21 (80%), it is possible that they haven’t experienced the negative repercussions of information privacy breaches. Other possible reasons for this include a lack of understanding of the risks of information security in the subjects and a lack of desire to keep private information private.

**Conclusion**

Like all research, this study has limitations to be acknowledged. One limitation is the potential significant characteristics not identified and tested in this study. Given that Falk and Miller (1992) recommend that $R^2$ values be at least .10 in order for the variance explained of a particular endogenous construct to be deemed adequate, the low $R^2$ value of Usage (.05) is not adequate. This low value is likely due to the complexity of explaining actual hedonic usage. It is possible (and would be of great interest to examine in future research) that utilitarian usage is simpler to explain. As utilitarian systems are those that provide practical purposes, such as enabling a user to perform job tasks, the drivers and motivations could be more direct. However, since hedonic systems are about fun and enjoyment, there is little if any requirement to use them. Users consciously make a decision to engage with a particular system. It is feasible that this decision making process involves many more components regarding the voluntary nature of usage.
Looking back through the evolution of the traditional technology acceptance models that started with relatively few constructs (e.g. TAM), many characteristics can potentially be determined as theoretically relevant and statistically significant as more research is conducted. Since the purpose of this study was an analysis of a small subset of potential characteristics, future research should continue to investigate and determine additional explanatory factors that influence social media usage.

Additionally, social media usage was collected through a self-reported measure instead of actual usage measurement. Though an actual measurement would be preferred for increased accuracy, it is not without limitations as well. To collect the actual usage, subjects would need to be informed that their usage is being logged. Due to this, there is great potential for social desirability to play a large factor due to the perception of being watched and the desire to be on best behavior during that time. The self-reported measure was collected during both surveys and averaged to be more robust than a single self-reported value.

**Future Research**

These findings are especially important in today’s always-connected atmosphere. Many organizations are realizing the potential benefits of social media technologies and are implementing internal systems for knowledge sharing, collaboration, virtual teams, and more (Koch et al. 2012) to boost worker productivity and improve performance. One issue that needs to be understood and addressed when implementing these types of systems is the hedonic nature of the common usage of the technology. The new graduates entering the workforce have been surrounded by the hedonic nature of the technologies and are familiar with the uses and benefits of productivity increasing tools like knowledge sharing (posting a video on YouTube) and collaboration (editing an article on Wikipedia). When these employees encounter an internal social media system without a familiar hedonic aspect, it is possible that usage of the system will decline. As van der Heijden (2004) states, “...if people reject a utilitarian system, system developers may want to add hedonic features to invoke the other configuration to achieve user acceptance. This is much like a parent persuading a child to swallow a bitter pill by administering it with a sweetener to make it go down...” Future research should investigate the role of this hedonic aspect in professional social media systems on usage, benefits, and productivity. In addition, future studies should investigate and compare the characteristics of both the technology and the people that lead to social media usage for hedonic and utilitarian reasons. Finally, future research should consider other potential characteristics in addition to the three investigated here. Having a more complete understanding of the characteristics that influence usage should lead to prescriptive advice for organizations implementing social media.

This study acts as a foray into understanding socio-technical characteristics that are associated with greater social media usage. Two of the three characteristics examined were found to significantly affect attitude towards social media. This positive attitude directly increased the amount of time users spend with the technology. Though the amount of variance in Usage explained was low, these results give support for investigating additional constructs relevant to usage of hedonic systems and extends the body of knowledge on technology usage.

**References**


An Examination of Personal Social Media Usage


An Examination of Personal Social Media Usage


An Examination of Personal Social Media Usage


## Appendix A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attitude Towards Social Media</td>
<td>I like using Social Media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I look forward to those aspects of life that require me to use Social Media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Using social media is frustrating for me (-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I get bored quickly when using Social Media (-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Privacy Sensitivity</td>
<td>It bothers me to give personal information to so many companies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>When companies ask me for personal information, I sometimes think twice before providing it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It usually bothers me when companies ask me for personal information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presenteeism</td>
<td>The use of social media enables others to have access to me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social media makes me accessible to others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The use of social media enables me to be in touch with others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social media enables me to access others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociality</td>
<td>To what extent does social media enable the development of social relationships?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To what extent does Social Media enable the sharing of knowledge?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table A1: Constructs and Items**