Unfriend Me Please: An Examination of Social Media Fatigue and Its Antecedents

Abstract

As social media use continues to climb, consumers are beginning to experience social media fatigue. This research provides a conceptual model for social media fatigue and its antecedents – self-efficacy, confidence, helpfulness, and privacy concerns. Our findings suggest that growing privacy concerns lead to social media fatigue. However, consumers’ conscious decision to remain involved in social media reflects their belief that continued use provides outcomes that are more positive than discontinuance of use. Implications for marketers are discussed.
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In the United States, social media has become mainstream media. Today 87% of American adults are online (Pew Research, 2014a) and 74% of them use social networking sites (Pew Research, 2014b). Facebook has become the world’s largest social networking site with 1.6 billion active daily users on average during 2015, a 14% year-over-year increase (Smith, 2016). Similarly, Twitter has 320 million active user accounts and 500 million tweets sent per day (Oreskovic, 2015). Advertisers were quick to follow consumers into the realm of social media. While social media spending currently represents approximately 14% of total 2016 U.S. marketing budgets, marketers indicate that social media advertising will account for about 24% of total marketing investment over the next five years (Maddox, 2015). Marketers’ plans to increase their investment suggests growing confidence in the efficacy of social media as an advertising tool.

There are indications, however, that social media may have reached its peak in terms of usage. In 2014, the number of people in the U.S. who indicated that they use Facebook, Pinterest, Instagram, LinkedIn, and Twitter grew at a much slower rate than it did during previous years (Pew Research Center, 2015). Reduced interest in social media has been coined “social media fatigue” (Goasduff & Pettey, 2011). One explanation for this phenomenon is that users are experiencing information overload. According to “Zuckerberg’s Law,” the amount of status updates, photos, and other online material each individual posts on Facebook doubles every year (Bradshaw, 2011). The sheer volume of unsolicited information that is showered upon individuals’ friends and followers may have generated a backlash and increased need for privacy. The Limited Capacity Model (LCM) (Lang, 2000) suggests that people have a limited amount of mental resources to process mediated information. Whether it is grappling with the latest Facebook changes or dealing with a backlog of tweets, social media users are flooded with
information. Thus, LCM can be used to help explain social media fatigue. In addition, several models rooted in technology acceptance can also be used to explain this phenomenon including the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) (Davis, 1989) and the Unified Theory of Acceptance and Use of Technology (UTAUT) (Venkatesh, et al., 2003). Finally, the Theory of Rational Choice (TRC) (Becker, 1978), borrowed from economics, has been employed to explain the decision-making process that leads individuals to change their behavior on the basis of “expected utility”. This study will seek to provide an integrated theoretical framework that will explain the antecedents to social media fatigue.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Social Media Fatigue

Social media fatigue is defined as “social media users’ tendency to back away from social media usage when they become overwhelmed with too many sites, too many pieces of content, too many friends and contacts and too much time spent keeping up with these connections” (Technopedia, 2011). Social media fatigue can also be linked to concerns about privacy and boredom amongst social media users. According to market research conducted by Gartner, the social media market is beginning to show signs of maturity as some users in certain segments show signs of social media fatigue. “The trend shows some social media fatigue among early adopters, and the fact that 31 percent of Aspirers [younger, more mobile, brand-conscious consumers] indicated that they were getting bored with their social network is a situation that social media providers should monitor, as they will need to innovate and diversify to keep consumer attention,” said Brian Blau, researcher at Gartner (Goasduff & Pettey, 2011, p. 1). When asked why, the respondents were most concerned about online privacy. However, teenagers and those in their twenties reported that they were significantly more likely to say that
they had increased their usage. In fact, 37% of those in younger age groups and more tech-savvy segments said they used their favorite social media site more (Goasduff & Pettey, 2011). These results illustrate the unique paradox that social media creates – just as users become bored with their feeds and begin to experience social media fatigue, a new feature or technology product is debuted that draws them back into the cycle of usage.

These results were supported by yet another study indicating social media fatigue. Research firm Trendstream reported that active behavior on Facebook has declined since July 2009, particularly in established markets like the United States (GlobalWebIndex, 2011). The study revealed this trend is more visible in U.S. college educated users in their twenties, Facebook’s original users (GlobalWebIndex, 2011). Indeed, technology leaders are beginning to recognize that users have reached a point where there is simply no more time. This trend is supported by the LCM, which dictates that information consumers must make compromises when it comes to their attention given its limited capacity to process information.

One stream of research is dealing with the ways that this new media environment may be compromising learning and attention. Research shows individuals pay less attention to messages when faced with distractions (Lang, 2000) and retain less information overall. Other studies have shown that recall of information can be inhibited by information overload (Nasco & Bruner, 2009; Drolet & Luce, 2004). Biocca et al. (2007) have found that overwhelming amounts of information makes it harder to comprehend complex messages and Palfrey and Gasser (2008) found that information overload can cause people to use sensory filters to cope with the sheer amount of information, making it impossible to pay attention to most messages (Hill & Moran, 2011). Furthermore, psychologists have linked text messaging and instant messaging with self-reported symptoms of depression and social anxiety amongst college undergraduates (Becker,
Alzahabi & Hopwood, 2013). Yet, none of this research has dealt specifically with social media as a context, but rather considered it as part of the entire media landscape.

**A Theoretical Framework to Examine Social Media Fatigue**

Several models provide appropriate constructs to better understand the underlying components that could lead to increased social media fatigue. Among them, the most applicable are TAM (Davis, 1989), UTAUT (Venkatesh, et al., 2003), LCM (Lang, 2000), and TRC (Becker, 1978). Each of these models provides a framework for examining social media fatigue from a variety of angles including perceived usefulness, perceived ease of use, self-efficacy, information processing, and overall technology acceptance.

In his research to better understand technology acceptance through the lens of predicting use, Davis (1989) established two constructs relevant to social media fatigue: 1) perceived ease of use (PEU) and 2) perceived usefulness (PU). PEU is conceptualized as “the degree to which a person believes that using a particular system would be free of effort” (p.320). In the case of social media fatigue, PEU could be high for a given social media website if a person’s friends and family are all on the website; however, PEU could decrease if the consumer feels overwhelmed by privacy settings, friend requests, frequency of postings, etc. Davis (1989) defines PU as “the degree to which a person believes that using a particular system would enhance his or her job performance” (p.320). As it relates to social media fatigue, PU might be conceptualized in terms of a person maintaining his or her own appearance or personal brand through social media. PEU and PU could both potentially impact the level of fatigue one may experience on social media websites and, as such, will be components of the proposed model.

The Unified Theory of Acceptance and Use of Technology model (UTAUT) (Venkatesh, et al., 2003) is another foundational theory for social media fatigue. The UTAUT has four key
constructs – performance expectancy, effort expectancy, social influence and facilitating conditions – that have been shown to influence technology use, particularly in organizational settings. There have been several extensions and replications of this theory to address new contexts, user populations and constructs (Venkatesh, Thong and Xu 2012). Facilitating conditions are defined as “consumers’ perceptions of the resources and support available to perform a behavior,” and effort expectancy is defined as “the degree of ease associated with consumers’ use of technology” (Venkatesh, Thong and Xu 2012, 159). Both concepts are related to social media self-efficacy which can drive social media fatigue.

The Limited Capacity Model (LCM) explains the psychological trigger of information overload. The LCM assumes that individuals have a limited capacity to process information. Primarily, the LCM was developed to examine how people process television messages (Lang, 1992, 1995; Lang & Basil, 1998). However, it has since been applied to studies on online forms of advertising (Macias, 2003; Lee & Faber, 2007). The model makes two major assumptions: (1) people are information processors and (2) a person’s ability to process information is limited (Lang, 2000). Many things affect how well a message is processed and then ultimately retrievable. One primary factor is whether the recipient has sufficient processing resources to process the message at the time of exposure. In a social media context, the recipient (or user) may feel overwhelmed by the sheer number of messages and therefore not allocate enough cognitive resources to process the message. Or, depending on the type of message, it may just require too many resources from the user to adequately process the message.

When conceptualizing social media fatigue, it is also possible to perceive the state – fatigue – as a conclusion on the part of the individual. In this case, identifying with a state of social media fatigue affects the decision regarding continuance of social media use. The Theory
of Rational Choice (TRC) (Becker, 1978) suggests that such choices are the outcome of considered alternative, preferences, and reasons. Specifically, a rational choice reflects not only an individual’s preferences but also the weighted value attached to those preferences in terms of the anticipated outcomes. Preferences reflect beliefs. In the parlance of economics, TRC results from the evaluation of costs and benefits associated with each preference. While the alternatives facing the individual are mutually exclusive and jointly exhaustive, motivating reasons may change according to better information or altered circumstances. Thus, each choice is made within a specific context. Changes in beliefs are reflected in changed preferences. In the case of social media continuance, the antecedents to social media fatigue must be regarded as beliefs and preferences regarding social media use.

**A CONCEPTUAL MODEL FOR EXPLORING SOCIAL MEDIA FATIGUE**

Social media fatigue is rooted in the idea that too much information stemming from social media can lead to feelings of being overwhelmed. As such, LCM is being utilized in this research to determine whether information overload plays a conceptual role in social media fatigue. Research in psychology and organizational science have shown that humans have limited information processing capacity and that information that exceeds this capacity will result in reduced performance (Hunter, 2004). Evidence shows that large amounts of information can lead to information overload. Information overload is defined as a state induced by a level of information exceeding the ability of an individual to assimilate or process a given unit of time (Jacoby, Speller & Kohn, 1974). In the past, it has been reflected in two dimensions: increasing errors and negative affect (e.g. confusion or frustration). This research aims to examine the latter – the negative affect associated with social media fatigue. Due to the variety of motivations that
consumers may have for engaging with social media, there are several antecedents that we want
to examine for social media fatigue.

**Social Media Helpfulness**

Social media helpfulness refers to the extent to which users gain resources and helpful
information from their exploration of social media sites. Research has explored why people
participate in social media and social networks (Foster, Francescurri & West, 2010). Much of the
research centers on various theoretical platforms such as social capital (Ellison, Steinfield &
Lampe, 2007; Wasko & Faraj, 2005) or uses and gratifications theory (Raacke & Bonds-Raacke,
2008; Papacharissi & Rubin, 2000). Foster, Francescurri and West (2010) found that people used
social networks for its information value (among others). Therefore we explore antecedents that
contribute to the belief that social media is helpful in daily life.

**Social Media Confidence**

Social media confidence describes a person’s perception of their ability to use social
media in an effective manner. For the purposes of this research, confidence refers to the level of
certitude or assurance consumers have for dealing with content on social media websites. Based
on a study conducted by Pew Internet and American Life (2010), American consumers are
becoming more confident with social media websites as evidenced by an increase in the total
number of sites to which consumers belong. As a consequence of increased social media
confidence, consumers are more likely to engage in social media use and avail themselves of the
benefits of social media. Thus,

**H1:** Social media confidence positively affects individuals’ beliefs in the helpfulness of
social media.

**Social Media Self-Efficacy**
According to Bandura (1986), self-efficacy is belief in one’s ability to organize and execute a particular course of action - in this case, engagement and participation in social media. Self-efficacy is particularly relevant for novice users who have not yet mastered the skills needed to utilize social media sites like Facebook. Self-efficacy suggests that as social media users become more self-efficacious, their expectations of obtaining specific outcomes will also increase. As a result, their experience will encourage further usage. Related to this is the TAM construct PEU. Based upon person’s perception of the ease of use regarding the operation of a social media website, he or she will adjust their intentions to adopt the technology (Davis, 1989). Therefore, consumers who are confident in their social media self-efficacy are likely to find more reasons to use social media. Therefore,

**H2:** Social media self-efficacy positively affects individuals’ beliefs in the helpfulness of social media.

**Concerns with Privacy**

As social media grows, the issue of privacy becomes ever more important. It is likely, therefore, that increased belief in the usefulness of social media will correspond to a growing awareness of privacy issues. Facebook continues to have a liberal viewpoint on privacy and Google recently announced major changes to privacy for all of its properties. In general, the transparent interaction between user and site raises concerns about privacy online (Karahasanovic, Brandtzaeg & Heim et al., 2009). Indeed, research from Gartner (2010) shows that privacy is a major concern with users. Therefore,

**H3:** Respondents’ beliefs regarding the helpfulness of social media will positively affect their preferences for privacy protections.
Social Media Fatigue

We would expect those with higher privacy concerns to experience social media fatigue due to the “threshold beyond which social contact becomes irritating for all parties” (Schwartz, 1968, p.741) meaning that people might experience being too accessible or receiving too much information from too many people. Additionally, there are continued concerns about what social media sites do with the information collected. In terms of TRC, a rational person evaluates alternatives – in this case, whether or not they have tired of social media – on the basis of their preferences. Those preferences reflect their beliefs. Increased preference for privacy protection, based upon beliefs that indicate tremendous reliance upon social media, affects the decision to disengage, or reduce engagement, with social media.

**H4:** Respondents preferences for privacy protections will positively affect their identification with social media fatigue.

[Insert Figure 1 here]

**METHODOLOGY**

**Design**

A 210-item questionnaire was developed and pre-tested on a small group of academic professionals to ensure clarity. Once tested, the online survey was created and administered using Qualtrics, a web-based survey management system. The survey was administered to an opt-in subject pool recruited for web-based research (i.e. online panel). A representative sample of American social media users between the ages of 18 – 49 was recruited for the survey. Data was gathered from a total of 750 participants over a seven-day period to insure an even distribution of respondents on each day of the week (i.e., weekdays and weekend days).
Sample

The final sample consisted of 747 current social media users with a Facebook account who currently reside in the United States. Amongst this sample, 47.5% (N=355) were male and 52.5% (N=392) were female. Respondents ranged in age from 18 to 49 (M=32.52, SD=9.1). With regard to ethnicity, 69.5% (N=519) were Caucasian, 8% (N=60) were African-American, 7.6% (N=57) were Asian American, 6.2% (N=46) were Hispanic American, 2.4% (N=18) were American Indian, 2.4% (N=18) were Multiracial, 0.5% (N=4) were International, and 3.3% (N=25) preferred not to indicate their ethnicity. The majority of the sample had an annual household income level of $50,000 (USD) or above (38.4%, N=287) with the remaining sample being evenly distributed amongst an annual household income of $40,000 - $49,000 (11.5%, N=86), $30,000 - $39,000 (14.6%, N=109), $20,000 - $29,000 (12.3%, N=92), and below $20,000 (14.7%, N=110). A total of 63 respondents (8.4%) opted not to provide their annual household income information. In terms of education level, 26.1% (N=195) of the sample had undertaken some college, 23.7% (N=177) were high school graduates, 19.7% (N=147) received a bachelor’s degree, 11.6% (N=87) have a graduate degree, 10% (N=75) completed an associate’s degree, 5.1% (N=38) have completed some high school, and 3.7% (N=28) have completed some graduate school. Respondents belonged to a variety of social media websites including Facebook, Twitter, Google+, Pinterest, and LinkedIn. On average, respondents have active accounts on between one and two social media websites (M=1.5, SD=1.48).

Measures

The survey instrument included measures related to social media fatigue, self-efficacy related to social media use, social media helpfulness, self-confidence related to social media, and
privacy concerns experienced when using social media. Sub-items within each scale were averaged resulting in composite scales. Items are provided in the Appendix.

**Independent Variables**

Respondents’ levels of social media confidence and self-efficacy were measured by adapting existing scales to fit within the social media context (Bearden, Netemeyer and Hawes 2011). Participants were asked to respond to a variety of seven-point, Likert type scales (1 = Strongly Disagree, 7 = Strongly Agree) to assess their social media aptitude as it relates to confidence and self-efficacy. Social media confidence was measured with a three-item social media confidence scale. An eight-item scale was used to assess each participant’s level of social media self-efficacy.

**Dependent Variables**

Respondents’ levels of social media helpfulness was measured by adapting an existing scale to fit within the social media context (Bearden, Netemeyer and Hawes 2011). Social media helpfulness was measured with a four-item scale. Respondents’ level of concern regarding social media privacy was measured on a three-item scale. Respondents’ level of social media fatigue was measured using a five-item scale adapted from a Gartner 2010 study.

**RESULTS**

**Data Analysis**

Confirmatory factor analysis using AMOS 23 was used to establish construct reliability and validity. Chi-square ($\chi^2$), degrees of freedom (df), the ratio of chi-square to degrees of freedom ($\chi^2$/df), the p-value, comparative fit index (CFI), Tucker-Lewis index (TLI), and root mean squared error of approximation (RMSEA) are reported. SPSS statistical software was used
for all statistical analyses. Pearson correlations and variance inflation factor tests were analysed to assess multicollinearity issues.

**Measurement Validation**

A confirmatory factor analysis was conducted to evaluate the appropriateness of the measurement model for the latent constructs. The initial model fit was poor and exhibited discriminant and convergent validity issues. The standardized regression weights were examined for each latent variable indicator. Two indicators for the Self-Efficacy variable, one indicator for the Helpfulness variable, and two indicators for the Media Fatigue variable were eliminated from the model because they did not meet the recommended .70 threshold weight. Because the model still exhibited discriminant and convergent validity issues, three indicators were iteratively eliminated from the model. Specifically, two indicators were removed from the Self Efficacy variable and one indicator was removed from the Helpfulness variable. The final model achieved acceptable fit in accordance with the guidelines proposed by Hair et al. (2010). Specifically, fit indices for the model ($\chi^2 = 448.00, df = 92, \chi^2/df = 4.87, p < .001, CFI = .96, TLI = .95, RMSEA = .07$) suggested acceptable fit for the data. The significant $p$-value is most likely attributable to the large sample size, and therefore was not considered problematic.

Measures of latent variables achieved satisfactory reliability levels. Construct reliability was assessed using two measures of internal consistency: Cronbach’s alpha ($\alpha$) and composite reliability (CR). Values for both measures should be above 0.70 to indicate an acceptable reliability (Chin, 1998). Table 1 provides the descriptive statistics and reliability and validity measures for each construct. The constructs were also determined to meet the necessary criteria for validity according to Hair et al (2010). Convergent validity was achieved when the CR assumed values greater than the average variance extracted (AVE) and if the AVE was greater
than 0.5. Discriminant validity was achieved if the values of the maximum squared shared variance (MSV) and the average shared squared variance (ASV) were less than the AVE.

[Insert Table 1 here]

Pearson correlations (see Table 2) revealed significant correlations between all five observed composite variables, suggesting possible multicollinearity issues. Variance inflation factor (VIF) tests revealed that the multicollinearity issues were not a problem, however. Specifically, the VIFs did not exceed “3” in all cases (Hair et al., 2010).

[Insert Table 2 here]

**Hypothesis Testing**

A structural equation model was developed using Amos 23 statistical software to test the hypothesized relationships among the variables. The model demonstrated adequate fit ($\chi^2 = 410.19, df = 96, \chi^2/df = 4.87, p < .001, CFI = .97, TLI = .96, \text{RMSEA} = .07$). Table 3 provides the parameter estimates, standard errors, and $p$-values for each of the relationships. All four of the paths were significant, supporting the four hypotheses.

[Insert Table 3 here]

**DISCUSSION**

The findings support the proposed conceptual model for social media fatigue and its antecedents – self-efficacy, confidence, helpfulness, and privacy concerns. Specifically, social media fatigue was directly affected by privacy concerns. The greater the concerns; the more likely the user will experience social media fatigue. Privacy concerns are directly affected by
perceptions regarding the helpfulness of social media, suggesting that privacy concerns are greater when the user is familiar with the benefits of social media use. Indeed, familiarity with social media may have raised users’ awareness of personalized advertising and the inevitability that their personal information was used to provide those ads. The perceived helpfulness of social media is affected by the user’s perceived self-efficacy and confidence. A user is more likely to find social media helpful when the user is confident that he/she knows how to access and use it as well. Furthermore, the user’s comfort level with social media will also affect his/her perceptions regarding the helpfulness of social media.

The primary contribution of this research is to examine the construct of social media fatigue. While bloggers and pundits have alluded to it, there has been little academic research that explicitly examines social media fatigue and its antecedents. The research suggests that there does seem to be a relationship among several established constructs – social media confidence, social media self-efficacy, privacy concerns and social media helpfulness - and social media fatigue. Furthermore, the relationship among the variables is consistent with the theory of rational choice. The individual’s degree of involvement in social media not only reflects his/her capabilities to engage with social media, it reflects the conscious decision that continued social media use provides outcomes that are more positive than discontinuance of social media use. Our findings also suggest that increased reliance upon social media has resulted in greater concerns regarding privacy issues. As a consequence, some individuals indicate that they are experiencing social media fatigue. It is possible as well that the “Fear of Missing Out” (FOMO) on content continues to drive usage regardless of the privacy concerns that consumers may have. Future research should address FOMO as a possible antecedent to social media fatigue.
Even as exploratory research, this research has theoretical and managerial implications. First, this research extends the limited capacity theory further into a digital context where there is much more activity and the likelihood of becoming overwhelmed by content than in traditional media. We can start to understand the nuances of social media and how its “opt-in” nature differs from the more passive consumption of traditional media such as television and magazines. It also ties in other technology acceptance theories – namely the TAM and UTAUT as foundational theories. Most important, by considering the social media user as a rational agent engaged in conscious decision-making regarding the positive and negative outcomes related to social media use, this research explains the perceived hazards of social media use.

**IMPLICATIONS FOR MARKETERS**

Managers (particularly those who advertise online and through social media) will find these results compelling. Many companies still struggle with the move from a top down communication structure of traditional advertising to a more bottom up, grassroots foundation of social media whereby other users create conversations around brands and thus do much of the promotion. Many companies are still approaching social media as a collection of tactics, such as developing a Facebook presence, doing a few promotions, tweeting a few links and posting videos to YouTube, without considering the larger strategic imperative. As such, brands are guilty of creating much of that useless content that clutters social media. The privacy concerns of social media users pose a genuine threat to their perceived security as well as their continued use of social media sites. The research suggests that social media sites that offer clear privacy protections may, in the long run, reap the rewards of loyal, continued use.
AREAS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

This research is exploratory in nature and as such there are several avenues for further development. Future research should continue to develop the concept of social media fatigue and determine how it affects the decision to engage in social media. Areas of particular interest include investigating the relative importance of various beliefs as antecedents to preferences concerning privacy. By regarding social media involvement as an informed, rational choice, it is necessary to understand individuals’ perceptions regarding the positive and negative outcomes of social media use. In addition, the moderating effects of gender, age, and amount of social media use should be examined. Finally, future research should explore other preferences that correspond to social media fatigue, relating to gratifications sought from social encounters, both real and virtual.
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Table 1

Descriptive Statistics and Measures of Construct Reliability and Validity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>α</th>
<th>CR</th>
<th>AVE</th>
<th>MSV</th>
<th>ASV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Privacy</td>
<td>4.99</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helpfulness</td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence</td>
<td>5.60</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>5.28</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatigue</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* α = Cronbach’s alpha, CR = Composite Reliability, AVE = average variance extracted, MSV = maximum squared shared variance, ASV = average shared squared variance
Table 2

Correlations among Constructs (N = 746)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Helpfulness</th>
<th>Confidence</th>
<th>Privacy</th>
<th>Self-Efficacy</th>
<th>Fatigue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Helpfulness</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence</td>
<td>.70**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Privacy</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>.66**</td>
<td>.78**</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatigue</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.50**</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paths</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>Std. Est.</th>
<th>Sig (p)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy → Helpfulness</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence → Helpfulness</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helpfulness → Privacy</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Privacy → Fatigue</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* *p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001
Figure 1.

Conceptual Model

[Diagram showing the relationships between Beliefs, Preference, Conclusion, Self-Efficacy, Helpfulness, Privacy Concerns, and Social Media Fatigue.]
**APPENDIX**

**Scale Items**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale Items</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Media Self-Efficacy (Bearden, Netemeyer and Hawes, 2011)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMATT 01</td>
<td>My interaction with social media is clear and understandable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMATT 02</td>
<td>Interacting with social media does not require a lot of mental effort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMATT 03</td>
<td>I find social media websites easy to use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMATT 04</td>
<td>I find it easy to get social media websites to do what I want to do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMATT 05*</td>
<td>I enjoy the technical improvements that social media bring me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMATT 06*</td>
<td>Social media websites make life easier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMATT 07*</td>
<td>I feel that social media websites are superior to older technologies such as websites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMATT 08*</td>
<td>I think social media websites give me more control over my life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Media Self Confidence (Bearden, Netemeyer and Hawes, 2011)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMCONF 01</td>
<td>I feel comfortable using social media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMCONF 02</td>
<td>I understand how to use social media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMCONF 03</td>
<td>I am confident in my ability to use social media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Media Helpfulness (Bearden, Netemeyer and Hawes, 2011)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMHELP 01</td>
<td>Social media helps me keep in touch with family and friends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMHELP 02</td>
<td>Social media helps me learn new things</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMHELP 03*</td>
<td>Social media helps me do my job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMHELP 04</td>
<td>Social media helps me share ideas and creations with others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Media Privacy Concerns (Gartner Inc., 2010)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMPRIV 01</td>
<td>I am concerned about my privacy on social networks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMPRIV 02</td>
<td>I believe that my personal information can easily be used by marketers on social networks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMPRIV 03</td>
<td>I feel that I have to give too much information to social networks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMPRIV 04*</td>
<td>I am confident that setting my privacy settings keep my information on social networks private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Media Fatigue (Gartner Inc., 2010)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMINFO 01</td>
<td>I am likely to receive too much information when I am searching for something on social media sites.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMINFO 02</td>
<td>I am frequently overwhelmed by the amount of information available on social media sites.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMINFO 03</td>
<td>I find that social media sites do not have enough detail to quickly find the information I am looking for.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMINFO 04*</td>
<td>The amount of information available on social media sites makes me feel tense and overwhelmed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMINFO 05*</td>
<td>When searching for information on social media sites, I frequently just give up because there is too much to deal with.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMINFO 06*</td>
<td>I am confident in my ability to deal with large amounts of information on social media sites, such as following many different users and processing their Facebook updates or Twitter posts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: *not included in final scale