

# Production vs. Consumption on Social Media: A Uses and Gratifications Perspective

Completed Research

**Thomas O. Meservy**  
Brigham Young University  
tmeservy@byu.edu

**Kelly J. Fadel**  
Utah State University  
kelly.fadel@usu.edu

**Ben Nelson**  
Brigham Young University  
ben.nelson.john@byu.edu

**Michael Matthews**  
Brigham Young University  
michaeljmatthews@byu.edu

## Abstract

Virtual communities are supported by social media platforms that allow community members to both produce and consume information. Social media use has reached unprecedented levels in recent years, prompting researchers to investigate motivators that drive social media use. The Uses and Gratifications Theory, a general theory of media choice and consumption, has been applied to better understanding why social media is used in general; however, few studies differentiate between different types of social media use even though theory suggests likely differences in the gratifications associated with different types of use. In this study, we extend prior research by examining how previously studied social media gratifications are differentially associated with production- and consumption-oriented social media activities. We report our analysis of 217 online survey responses showing that users experience different gratifications both types of social media use. We discuss the implications of our findings for research and practice.

## Introduction

Use of social media has reached an all-time high. With an estimated 2.7 billion users by 2019 (Statista 2017), social media offers several highly popular platforms where virtual community members can create and share content and interact with others online. Research suggests that use of these platforms is rapidly increasing in both volume and frequency. For example, recent polls indicate that 69% of American adults used some type of social media in 2018, up from just 5% in 2005 (Pew Research Center 2018). Moreover, across the most popular social media platforms (including Facebook, Snapchat, Instagram, Twitter, and YouTube), an average of 80% and 58% of users report accessing one of these platforms on at least a weekly and daily basis, respectively (Pew Research Center 2018).

Virtual communities generate value by enabling community participants to interact with each other using social media platforms. Consequently, understanding the drivers behind social media use has emerged as research question of both practical and theoretical import. Over the past two decades, studies in both the academic and trade press have begun to explore how and why people use social media in general. For example, a 2017 survey of 77,814 Internet users aged 16-64 showed that leading motivators for social media use included keeping up with what friends are doing, staying up-to-date on news and current events, filling up spare time, and finding funny or entertaining content (Valentine 2018). However, considering the multi-faceted nature of most social media platforms, “use” is not a monolithic construct. Although countless specific uses of social media can be identified, these uses can be broadly classified as those directed at *consuming* information (e.g., reading news, watching videos, listening to music) and those focused on *producing* information (posting status updates, uploading images, writing messages to others). Prior research exploring motivators behind social media use has generally either explicitly focused on consumption uses (e.g., Krause et al. 2014) or implicitly grouped production and consumption uses together (e.g., Phua et al. 2017; Quan-Haase and Young 2010; Whiting and Williams 2013). However, although it has received only scant empirical attention in the literature to-date, theory suggests likely divergence in the motivators that drive production- and consumption-oriented social media use.

The purpose of this study is to refine our theoretical understanding of motivators of social media use by examining how these motivators differ as applied to both consumption- and production-oriented social media activities. Consistent with prior research (e.g., Phua et al. 2017; Quan-Haase and Young 2010; Whiting and Williams 2013), we posit that social media use fulfills certain needs or gratifications, and we draw from the uses and gratifications framework (Blumler and Katz 1974; Katz et al. 1973) to identify common motivators for social media use. Through analysis of survey data collected on social media production and consumption behaviors, we then show that differences exist between the gratifications behind production and consumption social media uses, and we discuss the implications of these differences for both practice and ongoing theoretical development surrounding social media use.

## Theoretical Background and Hypotheses

The pervasiveness of social media-enabled virtual communities has made social media and its associated usage behaviors at the forefront of an important stream of IS research (Orchard et al. 2014; Quan-Haase and Young 2010). Guiding this body of work is the overriding question of why people use social media. Psychology researchers have observed that “social media use can be highly gratifying as it provides a reliable source of pleasure, helps to manage one’s mood, fuels psychological well-being, and fulfills various other needs ranging from less (e.g., passing time) to more fundamental (e.g., the need to belong)” (van Koningsbruggen et al. 2017, p. 334). Accordingly, one theoretical perspective that has been profitably applied to this question is the Uses and Gratifications Theory (UGT) (Blumler and Katz 1974; Katz et al. 1973). UGT is a theoretical framework that seeks to explain why and how people actively seek out specific types of media. According to UGT, people are active agents who choose to engage with media that satisfies specific needs and desires such as, relaxation, diversion, knowledge, social interactions/companionship, or escape. UGT has been used to explain usage behavior associated with several types of media, such as television (Rubin 1983; Ruggiero 2000), mobile phones (Leung and Wei 2000), and internet use in general (LaRose and Eastin 2004; Stafford et al. 2004). More recently, UGT has been also been applied to understanding social media use (Krause et al. 2014; Liu, Cheung, and Lee 2010; Orchard et al. 2014; Phua et al. 2017; Quan-Haase and Young 2010; Whiting and Williams 2013). Studies in this stream, while employing a wide variety approaches and perspectives (Poon and Leung 2011; Stafford et al. 2004), have identified several common gratifications associated with social media use including the following:

- Entertainment: Accessing content that provides entertainment, pleasure, or enjoyment
- Social interaction: Communicating and interacting with others
- Information seeking: Seeking out information or self-educating
- Passing time/relaxing: Occupying time, unwinding, or relieving boredom
- Information sharing: Posting informational content for the consumption of others
- Convenience utility: Obtaining general convenience or usefulness
- Expression of opinions: Sharing personal viewpoints or beliefs
- Keeping up with others: Finding out what others are doing
- Social capital: Building resources based on relationships with others

While the above uses and gratifications have been associated with overall social media use, few studies have examined how they relate to specific *types* of use. At a basic level, a useful theoretical distinction can be drawn between behaviors oriented toward *consuming* information on social media and those oriented toward *producing* information (Heinonen 2011). Interestingly, little direct attention has been paid to differences in motivations and gratifications for production and consumption activities on social media, despite ample evidence suggesting the likelihood that such differences exist. For example, studies of posters and lurkers on virtual community platforms have surmised that, owing to their differing behaviors, posters may be more attracted to extroverted activities such as entertaining others, building professional relationships, telling stories, or sharing expertise, while lurkers participate due to higher expectations of information content (Morrison et al. 2013; Nonnecke et al. 2004). Moreover, insights from social exchange theory suggest that reasons for sharing information in a virtual community (e.g., altruism, expectations of reciprocity) may be different from those that motivate information consumption (e.g., ease of access, value of information) (Watson and Hewett 2006). Empirically establishing differences between factors that motivate production- and consumption-oriented uses of social media constitutes an important step toward a more theoretically refined account of social media use behavior. Consequently, the objective of this study is to take a deeper look at how and whether uses and gratifications associated with social media differ

between production- and consumption-oriented uses. In the following paragraphs, we hypothesize about how each of the above uses and gratifications is likely to differ across these different types of use.

Consumption on social media entails reading, watching, or listening to content posted by others. Many of the uses and gratifications listed above are intrinsically oriented toward consumption behaviors (Heinonen 2011). First, studies have shown social media platforms can be an important *source of information* for virtual community members, such as finding deals on products, seeking out information on events, or even choosing to educate oneself (Broersma and Graham 2012; Wodzicki et al. 2012). Second, social media provides easy access to content that is *entertaining*, including comedic content, interesting videos, or games (Palmgreen and Rayburn 1979; Papacharissi and Rubin 2000). Third, perusal of social media to relieve boredom or simply *pass time* has been identified throughout multiple studies as a major motivator to its use. For instance, Whiting and Williams (2013) identified that many of their subjects accessed (or felt motivated to access) social media in moments of boredom and waiting. Finally, social media provides a means for keeping up-to-date on *what is happening in the lives of others* by checking status updates, new photo/video content (Kaplan and Haenlein 2010). All of these uses and gratifications involve accessing social media to consume content generated by others. We therefore hypothesize that:

*H1: Consumption uses of social media are most highly associated with the uses and gratifications of (a) information seeking, (b) entertainment, (c) passing time, and (d) keeping up with others.*

Social media production entails posting content online, such as posting a new photo on Instagram, replying to a Tweet, or posting to a Facebook group. One major motivator of production behaviors is the ability to quickly *share information* with large numbers of people. Liu et al. noted that, “The motivation of information sharing stresses the satisfaction gained from providing information to others (...)” (Liu, Cheung, and Lee 2010, p. 936). In a closely related vein, social media enables people to *express their opinion* on both personal and public issues in an open, potentially anonymous, or sometimes critical way. Both of these uses and gratifications require that the user go beyond mere consumption behaviors to instead *generate or produce* information on social media. Thus, we hypothesize that:

*H2: Production uses of social media are most highly associated with the uses and gratifications of (a) information sharing and (b) expression of opinions.*

While certain uses and gratifications naturally align with production or consumption behaviors, others may exert influence on both types of social media use. One general gratification for using social media may be rooted in its *convenience utility*, which Liu et al. (2010) describes as a “technical gratification” arising from the ease with which social media can be used to accomplish a wide variety of tasks (p. 936). In addition, *social interaction* has been identified as a major contributor to media satisfaction and usage (Rayburn 1996). Social media platforms enable interaction within virtual communities by providing a place for individuals to interact, connect with friends, and maintain a social life. Finally, social media provides a means for generating and leveraging *social capital*, which refers to the sum of resources that individuals gain from their participation in the community. Social interaction and social capital entail both consumption and production uses of social media in that they require both knowing what is going on with others and being able to use this information to interact effectively within the virtual community. We therefore hypothesize the following:

*H3: Both consumption and production uses of social media are associated with the uses and gratifications of (a) convenience utility, (b) social interaction, and (c) generating social capital.*

## Methods

To test our hypotheses, we created two independent survey instruments that focused on production and consumption social media behaviors, respectively. Each survey first briefly defined social media, including examples of common social media platforms. The survey introduction also explained that individuals typically engage in one of two major activities on social media platforms: consuming/browsing content (such as scrolling through Instagram or browsing the latest updates from your friends on Facebook), or producing/posting content (such as posting a new photo on Instagram or making a status update post on Facebook). The participant was then given a condition-specific prompt asking them to focus exclusively

on production- or consumption-oriented social media use behaviors.<sup>1</sup> For example, the prompt in the consumption condition stated: “Think about your own personal use of social media. There are two major activities you can participate in during your time on social media: consuming/browsing content (such as scrolling through Instagram), or producing/posting content (such as making a status update post on Facebook). For the following questions, think about times when you use social media to consume/browse content. Please answer the following questions in the context of consuming/browsing.” Thus, participants in each condition were primed to focus on consumption or production as they answered the remainder of survey questions.

Survey items asked about the participant’s demographic information, levels of social media use (production or consumption), and each of the identified social media gratifications. Items were adapted from previous social media and gratifications literature (Liu, Cheung, and Lee 2010; Quan-Haase and Young 2010; Whiting and Williams 2013). The same items were measured across both conditions with minor modifications to some item stems as required by the condition. Items are shown in the appendix.

Participants were solicited from Mechanical Turk following the guidelines suggested by Peer et al. (2014). Participants were based in the United States and were required to have achieved master worker status on the Mechanical Turk platform to ensure participant reliability. Each participant was paid \$1.50 for completing the survey (~\$9/hour). Data was collected from 217 participants (51.6% female; 53% less than 35 years old) over a span of 7 days. 108 of the participants were assigned to the production condition and 109 to the consumption condition.

## Data Analysis

Our analysis consisted of two primary steps. First, we used confirmatory factor analysis to load individual items on latent constructs (one for each gratification) and derive construct factor scores for all survey responses. Secondly, we conducted multivariate analysis of covariance (MANCOVA) to identify significant differences in gratifications for production- vs. consumption-focused respondents in our dataset. The method and results of each of these steps is outlined below. All data analysis was conducted in R, version 3.5.2 (R Core Team 2018).

As stated previously, the first step was conducted with a confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) using lavaan version 0.6-3 (Rossee 2012) and semTools version 0.5-1.908 (Jorgensen et al. 2018) in R. Latent factors were standardized allowing free estimation of all factor loadings. Initially, a full model with all 54 items was created for the nine gratifications constructs. This model lacked adequate convergent validity as not all factors loaded cleanly on their intended latent constructs. Items with substandard loadings (less than .7) were iteratively and systematically removed until all items for all constructs loaded cleanly. The final model contained 35 items that loaded onto nine distinct constructs. The final model fit was acceptable with a comparative fit index (CFI) of .916, root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA) of .073, and a 90% CI (.068, .079). Multiple criteria indicated that the refined model (AIC: 21899; BIC: 22257) was a better fit than the original model (AIC: 36610; BIC: 37096).

Consistent with our hypotheses, all indicators showed significant positive factor loadings, with standardized coefficients ranging from .716 to .967 (see appendix). Reliability and validity measures are shown in Table 1. Composite reliability was strong, with Cronbach’s alpha (min: 0.884; max: 0.957) and McDonald’s omega (min: 0.887; max: 0.975) above .7 for all constructs. Discriminant validity was confirmed as none of the inter-construct correlations were greater than the square root of the average variance extracted (AVE) for each construct. The retained items were used in the confirmatory factor analysis to generate construct factor scores for each observation, which were used for the remainder of the data analysis.

To see whether gratifications varied for production versus consumption, the second step was conducted with a MANCOVA with each of the nine gratifications as dependent variables, type of social media use (production vs. consumption) as the independent variable, and age and gender as control covariates. Pillai’s trace (0.295438;  $\text{Pr}( > F ) < 0.0001$ ) indicated differences among at least one of the gratifications for

---

<sup>1</sup> Respondents were asked to report on their own social media use as well as social media use of known others. The current study includes data from both groups.

production versus consumption. Post hoc analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) for each of the factors revealed several differences in gratifications between production/consumption social media uses while controlling for both age and gender. To protect against Type I error, we used a traditional Bonferroni procedure to test each ANCOVA at the .0055 level (.05 divided by 9—the number of ANCOVAs conducted). Means were calculated for each of the factors for production/consumption to identify which gratifications were significantly greater for production vs. consumption. Table 2 summarizes our findings. The analysis provides support for most of the hypothesized differences or similarities in relationships between production/consumption social media uses and each type of gratification. One exception was entertainment, which was not significantly different between the two types of use as hypothesized in H1-b.

With respect to the covariates, no significant effect was found for gender (Pillai's trace: 0.025049;  $Pr(>F) = 0.8084$ ); however, age was significant in the omnibus test (Pillai's trace: 0.189486;  $Pr(>F) < 0.0001$ ). Post hoc comparisons using the same criteria outlined above revealed that age had a significant effect on the gratifications of passing time ( $F(1,215): 17.1073$ ;  $Pr(>F) < 0.0001$ ) and social capital ( $F(1,215): 8.0048$ ;  $Pr(>F) < .0001$ ), with both gratifications more commonly associated with younger people.

Gratification	alpha	omega	AVE	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
A Social Interaction	0.92	0.92	0.71	<b>0.84</b>								
B Information Seeking	0.91	0.91	0.62	0.18	<b>0.79</b>							
C Pass Time	0.95	0.95	0.86	0.04	0.22	<b>0.93</b>						
D Entertainment	0.91	0.91	0.78	0.22	0.40	0.61	<b>0.88</b>					
E Expression of Opinion	0.91	0.91	0.77	0.55	0.07	0.20	0.43	<b>0.88</b>				
F Social Capital	0.88	0.89	0.72	0.32	0.58	0.51	0.64	0.48	<b>0.85</b>			
G Convenience Utility	0.93	0.93	0.78	0.03	0.11	0.24	0.45	0.25	0.37	<b>0.88</b>		
H Information Sharing	0.96	0.96	0.79	0.59	-0.07	0.29	0.28	0.83	0.36	0.24	<b>0.89</b>	
I Others	0.90	0.90	0.82	0.47	0.40	0.53	0.58	0.40	0.78	0.29	0.41	<b>0.91</b>

**Table 1. Factor extraction statistics and correlations**

Hypothesis	Gratification	F Score F(1,215)	Pr(>F)	Gratification significantly greater for	Hypothesis Supported?
H1-a	Information Seeking	8.438	0.004063	Consumption	Supported
H1-b	Entertainment	5.9277	0.01573	No difference	Not Supported
H1-c	Pass Time	14.1619	0.0002169	Consumption	Supported
H1-d	Keeping up with others	10.6330	0.001293	Consumption	Supported
H2-a	Expression of Opinion	25.8429	8.096e-07	Production	Supported
H2-b	Information Sharing	18.3898	2.729e-05	Production	Supported
H3-a	Convenience Utility	2.5285	0.1133	No difference	Supported*
H3-b	Social Interaction	6.0471	0.01472	No difference	Supported*
H3-c	Social Capital	4.6909	0.031434	No difference	Supported*

\*Non-significant differences hypothesized in H3.

**Table 2. Significant differences in gratifications for production versus consumption**

Prior research has established a relationship between various gratifications and social media use in general, and our analysis shows how these gratifications differ between production- and consumption-oriented uses. However, a related question concerns how/whether each gratification is associated with greater involvement in the community as measured by *quantity* of social media use. Thus, as a corollary to our primary analysis, we conducted a supplemental MANCOVA to learn whether there was an effect of each

gratification on use quantity. We collected data on social media use quantity using six questions that measured duration, frequency, and recency of social media use. Responses to these questions were normalized and averaged to create a single use quantity index for which values less than (greater than) zero indicated below-average (above-average) use quantity. The omnibus test indicated significant differences in one or more gratifications based on social media use quantity (Pillai's trace: 0.2014;  $\text{Pr}( > F ) < 0.001$ ). Individual ANCOVAs revealed that several gratifications, shown in Table 3, were significantly greater for those with greater use. Age was also a significant covariate in this analysis (Pillai's trace: 0.1628;  $\text{Pr}( > F ) < 0.0001$ ), with passing time ( $F(1,215): 10.8413$ ;  $\text{Pr}( > F ) = 0.0012$ ) associated with younger people.

Use Type	Gratification	F Score F(1,215)	Pr(>F)	Gratification significantly greater for
Consumption	Pass Time	19.1024	1.936e-05	Greater Use
	Entertainment	18.2567	2.91e-05	Greater Use
Production	Expression of Opinion	25.4708	9.616e-07	Greater Use
	Information Sharing	27.1514	4.433e-07	Greater Use
Consumption and Production	Social Capital	10.2225	0.001599	Greater Use

**Table 3. Significant differences in gratifications based on use**

## Discussion

Our findings deepen those of previous work by providing unique insights into the nature of social media gratifications through the distinctive lens of a production and consumption uses paradigm. Specifically, we demonstrate that gratifications associated with social media use are not uniform, but instead vary depending upon the type of use (production vs. consumption) in question. Our findings offer several important implications for both theory and practice.

From a theoretical perspective, our results highlight the importance of differentiating use types to paint a more complete picture of how social media behavior is driven by various gratifications. First, we show that consumption uses seem to be more associated with gratifications of information seeking, passing time, and keeping up with others. Interestingly, these gratifications comprise both utilitarian and hedonic motivators for consumptive use of social media. For example, information seeking constitutes an intentional, committed activity “driven by people’s desire to increase awareness and knowledge of one’s self, others, and the world” (Shao 2009, p. 9). Seeking information on social media is a task-oriented activity entailing purposeful consumption with the intent to obtain useful information and internalize meaning. In contrast, passing time, another consumption-associated gratification, is largely hedonic in nature, and involves passive use of social media without a task-oriented purpose. Consumption uses of social media require less mental effort and concentration compared to production uses (Adamic et al. 2008); thus, a greater association with the gratification of passing time would be consistent with expectations. Keeping up with others, another consumption-oriented gratification, may entail both utilitarian and hedonic elements. For example, finding out what others are doing can enable planning or execution of a task; however, research also indicates that social media platforms are used to satisfy curiosity about others’ lives through myriad consumption-based mechanisms such as notifications, reminders, emails etc. (Hart et al. 2008). Our empirical evidence appears to confirm the notion that individuals are motivated to participate in the lives of other virtual community members, and that such behavior is positively correlated with the amount of time users spend consuming information (Poon and Leung 2011).

Noteworthy in our results was that the gratification of entertainment was not differentially related to consumption over production as hypothesized by H1-b. Several possible reasons could account for this result. In contrast to information seeking, entertainment may be perceived as involving any temporary distraction and not as a distinct activity of content consumption. Indeed, popular press has indicated that social media entertainment has become more like “snack food” or a “buffet of “snack” TV: light, bright and digestible” (Michael Idato 2016). Another possible reason might be that the production of content on social media can provide self- or group-entertainment. For example, a user may categorize the posting of a lighthearted video as neither “expression of opinion” nor as any of the other constructs, but rather simply

as a means of entertaining oneself or other community members. This result offers preliminary quantitative confirmation of conclusions drawn by prior qualitative research, which postulates that entertainment can encompass both consumption and production uses (Heinonen 2011).

With regard to production, our results showed that information sharing and expressing opinions were the gratifications most strongly associated with this type of social media use. Research has shown that on some virtual community platforms, sharing information can be more common than asking for information (Naaman et al. 2010). While consumption uses of social media can be anonymous, sharing of information on social media is typically attached to an avatar, an individual's name, or another identity, thus allowing for increased visibility in the community which often leads to increased levels of content production (Baker 1984). Additionally, personality or trait-based motivators for sharing information, such as narcissism (Poon and Leung 2011) or altruism (Ma and Chan 2014) are also associated with production uses of social media. Overall, sharing information on social media can fulfill psychological needs to be recognized as well as emotional needs to contribute to society, and these needs can act as a catalyst in the production and consumption of content.

Our third hypothesis contends that both consumption and production uses of social media are equally associated with the gratifications of convenience utility, social interaction, and generating social capital. Although caution must be exercised in interpreting non-significant results, our analysis seems to provide some evidence in support of this assertion. One of the predominant advantages of social media is its convenience utility (Young 2011); recent research has identified the overall convenience factor of a social media platform as a major contributor in motivating individuals to use the platform for both production and consumption uses (Ahad and Lim 2014). This is particularly true when using social media in collaborative contexts (Jang 2015), which requires reciprocal production and consumption of material with other members of the community. Similarly, our results indicate that the gratifications of social interaction and generating social capital were not significantly different for consumption or production uses. Because both social interaction and the building of social capital require bi-directional interactions with others in the community over a period of time, it seems likely that one's perceptions of these gratifications are equally entwined with both production and consumption uses of social media (Chen et al. 2018). Importantly, we emphasize that the pattern of results observed for H3 should not be construed as evidence that these gratifications do not influence social media use; rather, our results are consistent with the hypothesis that these gratifications are equally operative for both production and consumption uses.

In addition to providing meaningful theoretical contribution, our results also have important implications for practice. Designers and purveyors of social media platforms should recognize that different gratifications may be associated with certain types of platform use. These insights can be practically used to both better understand user behavior and to design platforms with specific purposes in mind. Several applicative uses, which demonstrate the usability of our findings, can be extracted from our research. For example, platforms designed primarily for consumption purposes should emphasize features that serve as a pastime or enable users to easily find information, including information about the status of others. In contrast, sites primarily concerned with encouraging information production would be better served by developing and showcasing features that support sharing of information and opinions. Platforms that support both production and consumption should recognize that these activities together may promote greater social interactions and building social capital, which may present opportunities to create, support, and leverage more tight-knit virtual communities. Both of these illustrative examples establish the potential actionable steps which can be taken in order to apply our findings in practice.

Finally, while our results contribute to a deeper understanding production and consumption social gratifications, this study has some limitations that should be considered. First, although our survey questions were adapted from previous studies, the pruning of the measurement items necessitated by our confirmatory factor analysis could potentially limit the content validity of our scales, and suggests that further work is needed to refine and validate these scales. Second, use of a cross-sectional survey methodology limits our ability to measure the possible temporal nature of both gratifications as well as interleaved patterns of production and consumption uses, which may evolve over time. Additional work employing time-based research methods is needed to verify the results we observed here. Finally, although we included age and gender as covariates in our analysis, resource constraints prevented us from

collecting data on other potential covariates associated with gratifications and uses, such as personality (Hughes et al. 2012). We therefore encourage additional research that incorporates an expanded set of control variables.

## Conclusion

Today's burgeoning growth of social media-enabled virtual communities has spurred growing practical and theoretical interest in the motivators behind social media use. As virtual communities continue to expand, the need for better theory surrounding social media use becomes more acute. This study builds on the insights from prior literature by offering a more refined and nuanced theoretical perspective on how different types of social media use are associated with various gratifications. In addition to providing a theoretical perspective to previous research, our results also provide practical insights on how social media platforms should enable both consumption and production behaviors in its design. Our findings suggest that "social media use", though often treated as such, is not a monolithic construct, particularly as it relates to gratifications commonly identified with social media in the literature. Future theorization surrounding UGT and social media use should further explore how gratifications are differentially connected to various types of social media use, including production and consumption uses.

## REFERENCES

- Adamic, L. A., Zhang, J., Bakshy, E., and Ackerman, M. S. 2008. "Knowledge Sharing and Yahoo Answers," in *Proceeding of the 17th International Conference on World Wide Web - WWW '08*, New York, New York, USA: ACM Press, p. 665.
- Ahad, A. D., and Lim, S. M. A. 2014. "Convenience or Nuisance?: The 'WhatsApp' Dilemma," *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences* (155), Elsevier, pp. 189–196.
- Baker, P. M. 1984. "Seeing Is Behaving," *Environment and Behavior* (16:2), SAGE Publications, INC.275 South Beverly Drive, Beverly Hills, California 90212, pp. 159–184.
- Blumler, J. G., and Katz, E. 1974. *The Uses of Mass Communications: Current Perspectives on Gratifications Research*, Sage Publications.
- Broersma, M., and Graham, T. 2012. "SOCIAL MEDIA AS BEAT," *Journalism Practice* (6:3), Taylor & Francis Group, pp. 403–419.
- Chen, W., Wei, X., and Zhu, K. X. 2018. "Engaging Voluntary Contributions in Online Communities: A Hidden Markov Model," *MIS Quarterly* (42:1), pp. 83–100.
- Hart, J., Ridley, C., Taher, F., Sas, C., and Dix, A. 2008. "Exploring the Facebook Experience," in *Proceedings of the 5th Nordic Conference on Human-Computer Interaction Building Bridges - NordiCHI '08*, New York, New York, USA: ACM Press, p. 471.
- Heinonen, K. 2011. "Consumer Activity in Social Media: Managerial Approaches to Consumers' Social Media Behavior," *Journal of Consumer Behaviour* (10:6), John Wiley & Sons, Ltd, pp. 356–364.
- Hughes, D. J., Rowe, M., Batey, M., and Lee, A. 2012. "A Tale of Two Sites: Twitter vs. Facebook and the Personality Predictors of Social Media Usage," *Computers in Human Behavior* (28:2), Pergamon, pp. 561–569.
- Jang, Y. 2015. "Convenience Matters: A Qualitative Study on the Impact of Use of Social Media and Collaboration Technologies on Learning Experience and Performance in Higher Education," *Education for Information* (31:1,2), (K. Dalkir, ed.), IOS Press, pp. 73–98.
- Jorgensen, D., T., Pornprasertmanit, S., Schoemann, M., A., Rosseel, and Y. 2018. *{semTools}: Useful Tools for Structural Equation Modeling*.
- Kaplan, A. M., and Haenlein, M. 2010. "Users of the World, Unite! The Challenges and Opportunities of Social Media," *Business Horizons* (53:1), Elsevier, pp. 59–68.
- Katz, E., Blumler, J. G., and Gurevitch, M. 1973. "Uses and Gratifications Research," *The Public Opinion Quarterly* (37:4).
- van Koningsbruggen, G. M., Hartmann, T., Eden, A., and Veling, H. 2017. "Spontaneous Hedonic Reactions to Social Media Cues," *Cyberpsychology, Behavior, and Social Networking* (20:5), pp. 334–340.
- Krause, A. E., North, A. C., and Heritage, B. 2014. "The Uses and Gratifications of Using Facebook Music Listening Applications," *Computers in Human Behavior* (39), pp. 71–77.
- LaRose, R., and Eastin, M. S. 2004. "A Social Cognitive Theory of Internet Uses and Gratifications: Toward a New Model of Media Attendance," *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media* (48:3), pp. 358–

377.

- Leung, L., and Wei, R. 2000. "More than Just Talk on the Move: Uses and Gratifications of the Cellular Phone," *Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly; Summer* (Vol. 77), ABI/INFORM Global.
- Liu, I. L. B., Cheung, C. M. K., and Lee, M. K. O. 2010. "Understanding Twitter Usage: What Drive People Continue to Tweet," *Proceedings of the Pacific Asia Conference on Information Systems*, pp. 927–939.
- Liu, I. L. B., Cheung, C. M. K., Lee, M. K. O., Liu, I. L. B. ;, and Cheung, C. M. K. ; 2010. "Understanding Twitter Usage: What Drive People Continue to Tweet."
- Ma, W. W. K., and Chan, A. 2014. "Knowledge Sharing and Social Media: Altruism, Perceived Online Attachment Motivation, and Perceived Online Relationship Commitment," *Computers in Human Behavior* (39), Pergamon, pp. 51–58.
- Michael Idato. 2016. "Snack Attack." (<https://www.smh.com.au/entertainment/snack-attack-20060731-gdo2hx.html>, accessed February 23, 2019).
- Morrison, M. A., Cheong, H. J., and McMillan, S. J. 2013. "Posting, Lurking, and Networking: Behaviors and Characteristics of Consumers in the Context of User-Generated Content," *Journal of Interactive Advertising* (13:2), Taylor & Francis Group , pp. 97–108.
- Naaman, M., Boase, J., and Lai, C.-H. 2010. "Is It Really about Me?," in *Proceedings of the 2010 ACM Conference on Computer Supported Cooperative Work - CSCW '10*, New York, New York, USA: ACM Press, p. 189.
- Nonnecke, B., Preece, J., and Andrews, D. 2004. "What Lurkers and Posters Think of Each Other [Online Community]," in *37th Annual Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences, 2004. Proceedings of The*, IEEE, 9 pp.
- Orchard, L. J., Fullwood, C., Galbraith, N., and Morris, N. 2014. "Individual Differences as Predictors of Social Networking," *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication* (19:3), pp. 388–402.
- Palmgreen, P., and Rayburn, J. D. 1979. "Uses and Gratifications and Exposure To Public Television," *Communication Research* (6:2), Sage PublicationsSage CA: Thousand Oaks, CA, pp. 155–179.
- Papacharissi, Z., and Rubin, A. M. 2000. "Predictors of Internet Use," *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media* (44:2), Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc. , pp. 175–196.
- Peer, E., Vosgerau, J., and Acquisti, A. 2014. "Reputation as a Sufficient Condition for Data Quality on Amazon Mechanical Turk," *Behavior Research Methods* (46:4), pp. 1023–1031.
- Pew Research Center. 2018. "Demographics of Social Media Users and Adoption in the United States." (<http://www.pewinternet.org/fact-sheet/social-media/>, accessed February 21, 2018).
- Phua, J., Jin, S. V., and Kim, J. (Jay). 2017. "Uses and Gratifications of Social Networking Sites for Bridging and Bonding Social Capital: A Comparison of Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, and Snapchat," *Computers in Human Behavior* (72), Pergamon, pp. 115–122.
- Poon, D. C. H., and Leung, L. 2011. "Effects of Narcissism, Leisure Boredom, and Gratifications Sought on User-Generated Content Among Net-Generation Users," *International Journal of Cyber Behavior, Psychology and Learning* (1:3), pp. 1–14.
- Quan-Haase, A., and Young, A. L. 2010. "Uses and Gratifications of Social Media: A Comparison of Facebook and Instant Messaging," *Bulletin of Science, Technology & Society* (30:5), pp. 350–361.
- R Core Team. 2018. *R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing*, Vienna, Austria.
- Rayburn, J. . 1996. *An Integrated Approach to Communication Theory and Research. Uses and Gratifications.*, (M. B. Salwen and D. W. Stacks, eds.), Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Mahwah, NJ.
- Rosseel, Y. 2012. "{lavaan}: An {R} Package for Structural Equation Modeling," *Journal of Statistical Software* (48:2), pp. 1–36.
- Rubin, A. M. 1983. "Television Uses and Gratifications: The Interactions of Viewing Patterns and Motivations," *Journal of Broadcasting* (Vol. 27).
- Ruggiero, T. 2000. *Uses and Gratifications Theory in the 21st Century*.
- Shao, G. 2009. "Understanding the Appeal of User-generated Media: A Uses and Gratification Perspective," *Internet Research* (19:1), Emerald Group Publishing Limited, pp. 7–25.
- Stafford, T. F., Stafford, M. R., and Schkade, L. L. 2004. "Determining Uses and Gratifications for the Internet," *Decision Sciences* (35:2), John Wiley & Sons, Ltd (10.1111), pp. 259–288.
- Statista. 2017. "Number of Social Media Users Worldwide 2010-2021," *Statista*.
- Valentine, O. 2018. "Top 10 Reasons for Using Social Media - GlobalWebIndex." (<https://blog.globalwebindex.net/chart-of-the-day/social-media/>, accessed February 21, 2018).
- Watson, S., and Hewett, K. 2006. "A Multi-Theoretical Model of Knowledge Transfer in Organizations: Determinants of Knowledge Contribution and Knowledge Reuse," *Journal of Management Studies*

- (43:2), John Wiley & Sons, Ltd (10.1111), pp. 141–173.
- Whiting, A., and Williams, D. 2013. “Why People Use Social Media: A Uses and Gratifications Approach,” *Qualitative Market Research: An International Journal* (16:4), Emerald Group Publishing Limited, pp. 362–369.
- Wodzicki, K., Schwämmlein, E., and Moskaliuk, J. 2012. “‘Actually, I Wanted to Learn’: Study-Related Knowledge Exchange on Social Networking Sites,” *The Internet and Higher Education* (15:1), JAI, pp. 9–14.
- Young, K. 2011. “Social Ties, Social Networks and the Facebook Experience - ProQuest,” *International Journal of Emerging Technologies and Society* (9:1), pp. 20–34.

## Appendix – Items and Loadings

Construct	Adapted from	Question	Standardized Loading
Convenience Utility	(Liu, Cheung, and Lee 2010)	Convenient to use	0.830
		Easily accessible	0.960
		Readily available	0.936
		Easy to use	0.786
Entertainment	(Liu, Cheung, and Lee 2010; Quan-Haase and Young 2010)	Be entertained	0.820
		Find enjoyment	0.954
		Have fun	0.857
Expression of Opinion	(Liu, Cheung, and Lee 2010; Whiting and Williams 2013)	Express their thoughts and opinions	0.867
		Show others what they are interested in	0.891
		Make their voice heard	0.878
Information Seeking	(Liu, Cheung, and Lee 2010; Quan-Haase and Young 2010; Whiting and Williams 2013)	Find information on products and services	0.728
		Get immediate knowledge of events	0.804
		Find a wealth of information	0.880
		Obtain information that they cannot find elsewhere	0.809
		Find solutions to a problem	0.751
Information Sharing	(Quan-Haase and Young 2010; Whiting and Williams 2013)	Find answers to a question	0.753
		Keep people updated with what they are doing	0.909
		Inform others what is going on in their life	0.937
		Share things they are proud of	0.905
		Share information about recent events	0.861
		Post photos/videos about recent happenings	0.888
Keeping up with others	(Quan-Haase and Young 2010; Whiting and Williams 2013)	Show themselves in a positive light	0.829
		Find out what is going on in the lives of others	0.888
		Watch what others are doing	0.921
Pass Time	(Liu, Cheung, and Lee 2010; Quan-Haase and Young 2010)	Kill time	0.893
		Relieve boredom	0.929
		Pass the time	0.967
Social Capital	(Quan-Haase and Young 2010; Whiting and Williams 2013)	Make themselves feel in the know	0.871
		Know what is going on	0.914
		Provide themselves with something to talk about with others	0.766
Social Interaction	(Liu et al. 2010; Quan-Haase and Young 2010; Whiting and Williams 2013)	Provide help to others	0.764
		Thank people	0.716
		Let people know they care about them	0.889
		Show others encouragement	0.915
		Show others that they are concerned about them	0.908