Consumers’ Willingness to Share Digital Footprints on Social Media: The Role of Affective Trust

Abstract

Purpose – Despite consumers’ widespread use of social media platforms, there is scant research on the underlying factors that influence their willingness to share digital footprints on social media. The purpose of this study is to address this research gap by examining consumers’ cognitive and affective attitudes simultaneously.

Design/methodology/approach – This research used quantitative method by using online survey administered to a sample of 692 social media consumers.

Findings – The findings indicate both cognitive and affective attitudes jointly influence consumers’ behavioural intentions with trust as a key construct mediating the relationship between attitudinal antecedents and consumers’ willingness to share digital footprints on social media.

Research limitations/implications – This study contributes to the information systems (IS) literature by offering a comprehensive framework constituting the joint attitudinal components as antecedents to consumers’ behavioural intention for sharing digital footprints while trust works as a mediator.

Practical implications – This paper has important managerial implications. It helps marketers and IS managers in profiling consumers, understanding consumption patterns, sharing of digital footprints, which are useful for effective market segmentation, product development and future design of social media platforms. It informs social media providers of the importance of not only focusing on functional aspects but also underscores the essence of paying attention to consumers’ affect towards social media platforms, especially trust.

Originality/value – The paper presents an original framework that explains the influence of joint attitudinal components on behavioural intention, with trust as a mediator.
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1. Introduction

Technological advances such as social media have transformed lives more than ever before in the history of mankind (Shadbolt and Hampson, 2018; Marakhimov and Joo, 2017). It is increasingly ever challenging for users to avoid interacting with social media platforms (Shadbolt and Hampson, 2018; Kuchler, 2017). The exponential growth in these platforms have created many touchpoints (Roberts, 2018; Sharma, 2017). Consumers share big data digital footprints on these platforms. Digital footprints are digital DNAs that consumers share on technological platforms including social media. It is estimated that users spend around 144 minutes on social media platforms and 463 Exabyte of data are created globally each day (Desjardins, 2019; Statista, 2020). Social media are considered to be one of the major sources of digital footprints (Karabatak and Karabatak, 2020; Azucar et al., 2018; Muhammad et al., 2018; Tuton and Solomon, 2015) and a rich source of insight for marketers (Winter et al., 2021; Henderson and Bowley, 2010). The number of social media users would exceed 3.77 billion in 2021 and expected to reach 4.41 billion by the end of 2025 (Statista, 2021). The significance of social media platforms and digital footprints are increasing every year (Aydın, 2019) with advertising revenue exceeding $51 billion in 2018 with 11% growth annually (Cooper, 2018). Social Networking Sites alone have generated $85.21 worth of orders in 2017, with the current overall e-retail sales of $2.8 trillion and a further growth of $4.8 trillion by 2021 (Statista, 2020). Furthermore, user-generated content on social media will be the main channel for the enrichment of information base for public administrative bodies and commercial firms (Baur, 2017).

Consumers share digital footprints on social media by sharing comments, photos, videos, review of products, bookmarks and microblogs and leave digital trails of their behaviour on social media (Malhotra et al., 2012). These digital footprints exhibit their interests, social and cultural identities, occupational and geographical attachments which are essentially required by marketers (Charlesworth, 2014; Golder and Macy, 2014; Michael et al., 2014; Michael et al., 2014). Although consumers use social media excessively, they may or may not be aware of their digital footprints that they share on social media platforms (Muhammad et al., 2018) (i.e. Facebook, Twitter, LinkedIn, and Instagram etc.), that use personal data to track consumers and their behaviour in an invasive and ubiquitous manner. They use algorithms to generate powerful insights through data connections, inferences, and data interpretations (DWork and Mulligan, 2013). The wide-spread storage of digital footprints creates data collection (e.g. preferences, habits, personal information and location) (Ding et al. 2017) which may lead to an unauthorized access to and use of personal data (Syed, 2019; Lowry, et al., 2018; Chatterjee et al., 2015). There is increasing awareness amongst consumers on these risks, as recent research highlights consumers’ privacy and security concerns while using social media (Shane-Simpson et al., 2018) and internet (Zhu et al., 2020). Simultaneously, consumers’ interaction with digital interfaces is often driven by their desire for individualistic freedom and empowerment (Dey et al., 2020). Consumers use of social media, therefore involves paradoxes and ambivalence. At one end, social media is inextricably interconnected with human lives, on the other hand social media use creates digital footprints and encroaches into individuals’ privacy and may cause security threats (Warkentin et al., 2017). More than 3800 data breaches, cyberattacks and data leakages occurred early 2019 across the globe (Hinds et al., 2020; Winder, 2019). Cambridge Analytica, the data analytics company, collected data from around 87 million Facebook users’ account without their explicit consent raising huge privacy concerns amongst social media users (Hinds et al., 2020). Hence, the managerial implications for digital footprints are immense.
As such, the widespread use of digital footprints has undermined consumers’ trust in social media platforms. This area is of particular interest to individual consumers, as they may feel vulnerable to exploit by social media platforms and web technologies (Shahzad et al., 2019; Shu et al., 2017). For instance, privacy advocates in the USA allege that large Internet service providers can potentially infringe on consumers’ privacy, as they have access to large volume of personal data (Waters and Bond, 2017). Even everyday objects, connected to the Internet, are collecting personal digital footprints (Kuchler, 2017). Social media and connected devices, creating many digital touchpoints, collect, store, transmit and share digital footprints, thereby engendering privacy and security risks. Such technologies create privacy and security challenges, namely ubiquitous data collection (e.g. likes, dislikes, habits, personal information and location), unexpected use of consumers’ data collected from smart devices and security (access to personal data, misuse and breach of data, unauthorised access to personal information etc.) which can potentially shatter consumers’ trust (Marakhimov and Joo, 2017).

This is evident in the case of the Facebook incident as despite the apology from Facebook, survey of opinions across major markets including United States and Germany suggested that users maintained low level of trust in social media, especially, Facebook over their privacy (Kahn & Ingram, 2018). The survey also suggested that some users were reconsidering their membership or the nature of engagement with social media platforms (Ayaburi and Treku, 2020). Given the rise of scepticism in users’ sharing content online, combined with the significance of social media in a number of businesses’ success, examining the antecedents of trust is crucial in comprehending consumer willingness to share their personal information on social media and the subsequent managerial benefits.

There is scant empirical evidence on what underlying factors drive consumers or deter them from sharing digital footprints. Although consumers’ engagement with social media has received significant research attention (Ferreira et al., 2020; Syrdal and Briggs, 2018; Voorveld et al., 2018; Tsai and Men, 2017; Al-Jabri et al., 2015; Charlesworth, 2014; Hajli, 2014; Akar and Topçu 2011), there is paucity of research that analyses the factors influencing consumers’ intention to share digital footprints on social media. Prior technology use and acceptance models examined trust in users’ general use of technologies. Trust has been used in product evaluation (Sullivan and Kim, 2018) and studying the continuous use of technology (Yuan et al., 2019). The recent enactment of General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) also focuses to enhance individuals’ trust by giving them more control on their data (Van Ooijen and Vrabec, 2019). However, the element of trust in sharing digital footprints on social media still remains underexplored. Research with regards to consumers’ digital footprints on social media is found to be in its infancy (Muhammad et al., 2018).

This paper aims to investigate the underlying factors that influence consumers’ willingness to share digital footprints on social media. Specifically, the paper seeks to answer the following research questions:

1. What are the attitudes that lead to consumers’ willingness to share digital footprints on social media platforms?
2. What is the role of trust in driving consumers’ willingness to share digital footprints on social media?
3. How do cognitive and affective attitudes drive consumers’ trust en route to their willingness to share digital footprints on social media platforms?

The paper is structured as follows: The first section focuses on literature review. The next section highlights research methodology followed by research findings and results. The final section discusses the results and their theoretical and practical implications, along with limitations and future research direction.
2. Literature review

2.1 Theoretical background

The current literature provides theoretical insights into the factors that drive customers' use and adoption of social media (Venkatesh et al., 2012; Hsu and Wu, 2011; Lu et al., 2009; Wei et al., 2009; Lin and Anol, 2008). Technology Acceptance Model (TAM), Theory of Reasoned Action (TRA), Theory of Planned Behaviour (TPB), Uses and Gratifications (U&G) and the Unified Theory of Acceptance and Use of Technology (UTAUT1 and UTAUT2) are widely cited theories that serve as the basis of the conceptual model for the current study. These frameworks are helpful to explain consumers' use of social media. These theories, in broader terms, enable us to analyse technology adoption and diffusion by identifying some of the key antecedents such as usefulness, relative advantage, ease of use, innovation, social and compatibility issues (Venkatesh et al., 2012; Hsu and Wu, 2011; Lu et al., 2009; Lin and Anol, 2008; Venkatesh et al., 2003). However, they do not explain the antecedents to consumers' willingness to share digital footprints on social media, which is far more complex than just adopting and using technology due to the inherent challenges and risks pertaining to consumer privacy and security. Kahn and Ingram (2018) explicate that despite the apology from Facebook on the “Facebook incident”, consumers maintained lower levels of trust in social media, hence future research is encouraged to explore further into what conditions consumer are willing to engage with the social media platforms. Furthermore, these frameworks (e.g., TRA, TPB, UTAUT1 or 2) do not address how trust in social media platforms affect consumers' willingness to share digital footprints on social media. As explained by Punyatoya (2019), trust plays a major role in online consumer behaviour, however, its overall impact on consumer buying or response are still limited and they call for further research on trust and attitude within social media platforms.

Muhammad et al. (2018) identified four key determining factors of social media use and digital footprints generation such as personal behaviour, social influence, technological and privacy and security. Personal behaviour consists of personal intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. The use of social media is mostly influenced by intrinsic motivation such as intrinsic perceived functional and emotional benefits; self-enhancement, self-esteem, and ego (Diffley et al., 2011; Hau and Kim, 2011). Users are driven by their perceived intrinsic experiential benefits, sensory pleasure (hedonic and emotional: Park and Kim, 2014) and self-enhancement, which satisfy their hedonic needs and extrinsic benefits. Similar findings are noted by Whiting and Williams (2013), who report that users tend to engage with social media to fulfill their intrinsic psychological needs of entertainment, relaxation, and expression of opinions. The extant literature suggests that psychological intrinsic emotional factors of enjoyment, pleasure, and self-enhancement affect social media use (Lu and Yuan, 2021; Qin, 2020; Kim et al., 2019; Grace et al., 2015; Campbell et al., 2014). In addition to emotional benefits, functional benefits include performance expectancy (usefulness, utility), ease of use and relative advantage of social media. Performance expectancy is found to comprise of perceived usefulness and utility. Similarly, ease of use includes convenience and relative advantage in terms of innovative compatibility that social media has over other technologies (Al Mamun et al., 2020; Chatterjee and Kar, 2020; Hajli, 2014; Zhang et al., 2014).

The other factors of social media use are social factors which include social interaction, social ties, and social support (Grace et al., 2015). These factors drive social interaction, which is a desire to connect, collaborate and communicate with others on social media (Sirola et al., 2021; Yang and Che, 2020; Trivedi et al., 2018). Social media are perceived to enhance social interaction, connect people almost anywhere, give control over interaction and maintain social relations with others (family, friends etc.). It is a platform to release anxiety and depression,
and to increase companionship and interpersonal utility, as suggested by the existing literature (Sirola et al., 2021; Yang and Che, 2020; Whiting and Williams, 2013; Ellison et al., 2007). Moreover, it is found that consumers’ pleasurable experience and peer pressure enhance the social interaction on social media (Geusens et al., 2020; Grace et al., 2015).

The third type of factors of social media use are privacy and security. These include perceived risk, control, and trust. Privacy involves users’ willingness to share information online and the ability to control and choose to divulge personal information, whereas security relates to protection against the threat from any unauthorised access to personal information on social media (Han et al., 2021; Dinev et al., 2013). By joining and interacting with social media, users create their profiles, connect and share interests and personal information with others, which may potentially lead to privacy and trust issues (Wang and Lee, 2020; Cheung et al., 2015; Tan et al., 2012). Moreover, users’ trust has also emerged as one of the leading factors for privacy and security, and comprises users’ confidence in the ability of a service provider to protect and monitor their personal information. This shows providers’ (vendor and social media) integrity and benevolence (Kartal and Li 2020; Teubner and Flath 2019; Muhammad et al., 2018; Cheung et al, 2015; Krassova et al., 2010). Trust is also noted to have a key relevance to social media users’ privacy risks and it is developed through quality and source credibility (Kartal and Li 2020; Zhou et al., 2016; Gamboa and Gonçalves, 2014; Pentina et al., 2013).

Furthermore, the usefulness and relevance of prior technology use models in forthcoming IS models cannot be understated, as more recent scholars continue to extend and develop previous models in various contexts. For instance, Dwivedi et al. (2017) revised the UTAUT model and argued for the re-introduction of attitude into the model because attitudes are the key perceptions held by consumers regarding a technology. They argue that the key element that is missing is the individuals’ perceptions, which are their attitudes that explain behaviour (Dwivedi et al., 2017; Rana et al., 2017). It can be argued that prior models have made significant contributions to the literature on technology use, but they provided little attention to the underlying factors that lead consumers to share digital footprints on social media.

In summary, three cognitive factors and two affective factors have been identified that help to explain consumers’ willingness to leave digital footprints on a social media platform. The following paragraph discusses the development of the study’s conceptual model where hypotheses will be developed therein.

3. Research model and hypothesis development

In order to understand consumers’ digital footprint sharing behaviour, this study has developed a model examining the effects of consumers’ attitudes (cognitive and affective) on their willingness to share digital footprints on social media. The model is based on the Unified Theory of Acceptance and Use of Technology (UTAUT 2) and the baseline model of Multi-Level Framework of Technology Acceptance and Use. It is argued that in organisational contexts, UTAUT explains 77 percent of the variance in behavioral intention to use and 52 percent of the variance in actual technology use (Venkatesh et al. 2016). The model with additional emphasis on constructs such as hedonic motivation has also been applied for consumer use of technology (Palau-Saumell et al. 2019; Mikalef, et al., 2013; Venkatesh et al. 2012; Bagozzi, 2007; Benbasat and Barki, 2007) exhibiting up to 74 percent of the variance in consumers’ behavioural intention to use a technology and 52 percent of the variance in consumers’ technology use. As such, the model offers a robust framework to analyse consumers’ willingness to share big data digital footprint.
Two of the constructs (Perceived Related Advantage and Perceived Social Influence) of the original UTAUT model are used in this research. However, in the context of this research, careful consideration has been paid to the context of consumer adoption and use of social media. Extant literature (Hansen et al., 2018; Akman and Mishra, 2017) with similar research objectives and conceptual and theoretical underpinning have not used the likes of effort expectancy and facilitating conditions to assess consumers’ adoption and use of social media related technological applications. A plausible reason behind this counter intuitive findings could be attributed to users’ adequate level of expertise and acquaintance with the social media use which diminishes the role of effort expectancy on their adoption decision. Social media use is not a new technology adoption, while it also requires users’ continuous adoption of and adjustments with the enhanced features and new innovation. This is further reinforced by Herrero et al.’s (2017) work on the adoption of SNS (social networking site) for user generated content. Herrero et al. found no direct influence of effort expectancy and facilitating conditions on behavioural intention. Furthermore, when it relates to willingness to share big data digital footprints, it would be reasonable to assume that effort expectancy is less relevant compared to utilitarian and hedonic benefits. This research aims to bring in direct contrast between the two broader benefits and following relevant literature bring in enjoyment (Ameen et al. 2018), perceived control (Hansen et al. 2018) and trust (Hansen et al., 2018; Akman and Mishra, 2017) as additional constructs to build the conceptual model. An additional construct in the form of self-enhancement has been added as consumers take to social media to fulfil their emotions and self-status (Lu and Yuan, 2021; Qin, 2020; Chen et al., 2014). The incorporation of the additional constructs and exclusion of the some of the constructs from the original model, make the conceptual model contextually appropriate.

3.1 Hypotheses development

This study develops the following theoretical model (Figure 1) and hypotheses that Perceived Relative Advantage (PRA), Perceived Social Influence (PSI), Perceived Control (PC), Enjoyment, Self-enhancement (SE), and Trust are antecedents to behavioural intentional, with Trust mediating the positive effect of the aforementioned antecedents on behavioural intention.
Fig. 1. Theoretical Model and Hypotheses
3.1.1 Cognitive attitudes

In consumer behaviour studies and IS literature, attitude has been identified as a strong antecedent to behavioural intention, which also leads to a specific behaviour. It is also understood that attitude is an outcome of belief, indicating cognition of consumers. A cognitive attitude is an evaluative response to the attitude object (positive or negative evaluation of the object). Eagly and Chaiken (1993) argue that cognitive attitudes exist when individuals process information about an object, and form beliefs about that object.

Following previous calls to investigate attitudes in the context of social media sharing (Park and Kim, 2014; Nov et al., 2010), this paper proposes the following cognitive attitudes (PRA, PSI and PC) to positively impact on consumers’ behavioural intention to share digital footprints on social media platforms. Similarly

3.1.1.1 Perceived relative advantage (PRA)

PRA is a perceived cognitive belief of usefulness, ease of use, expected outcome and degree of innovation, as a predictor of intention to use technology (Kavota et al., 2020; Zolkepli and Kamarulzaman, 2015). PRA is the degree to which consumers believe that social media offers them utility, usefulness, innovation, technology with an improved performance better than its precursor (Huang, 2018; Zolkepli and Kamarulzaman, 2015; Zhang et al. 2014).

This study postulates that consumers develop their assessment of social media features and functional characteristics that they perceive as useful and novel (Dootson et al. 2016). Users may have the impression that social media features may be compatible with their needs and the tasks they want to accomplish. This study argues that PRA is a cognitive attitude relating to the performance of the social media platform; and proposes that when consumers perceive social media platforms to perform better than their precursor, then it is likely that consumers would share digital footprints on social media (Mikalef et al., 2013). Similarly, Muhammad et al., (2018) and Makanyeza (2017) highlights that PRA serves as a main driver of online consumer behaviour. Hence, the following hypothesis is suggested.

H1 – Perceived Relative Advantage (PRA) has a positive effect on behavioural intention to share digital footprints on social media.

3.1.1.2 Perceived social influence (PSI)

Social influence is consumers’ perceived social pressure, which denotes their cognitive psychological goals to develop and maintain social relations with others on social media platforms. This perceived social pressure drives social interaction (desire to connect, collaborate and communicate), and establishes social ties (with friends, colleagues, family etc, Sirola et al., 2021; Yang and Che, 2020; Hau and Kim, 2011) and social support (social exchange to help and share information with others, Lisitsa et al., 2020; Ali, 2011). PSI is the desire to communicate, interact with others and build relationships. Social media is perceived by consumers to enhance social interaction, connect them anywhere and complement their offline relationship.

Consumers are driven by psychological goals to develop social relations, and to gratify their socialisation needs that affect their technology use behaviour (Muhammad et al., 2018; Zhang and Benyoucef, 2016, Talukder and Quazi, 2011). Thus, this study suggests that PSI is a cognitive attitude indicating consumers’ perceived cognitive social pressure for social interaction, social ties, and social support. Consumers with this attitude are likely to share their digital footprints when engaging in social media.
H2 – Perceived Social Influence (PSI) has a positive effect on behavioural intention to share digital footprints on social media.

3.1.1.3 Perceived control (PC)

Perceived control builds consumers’ confidence in the integrity and reliability of the technology. Consumers are likely to evaluate social media platforms positively if they perceive to have control over these platforms (Cheung et al., 2015; Krasnova et al., 2010). Consumers evaluate sharing digital footprints on social media platforms in terms of personal relevance and importance. When consumers perceive to have control over what to share on these platforms, they are likely to be confident about sharing their digital footprints on social media platforms (Kroll and Stieglitz, 2021). This paper thus posits:

H3 – Perceived Control has a positive effect on behavioural intention to share digital footprints on social media.

3.1.2 Affective attitudes

In addition to the cognitive aspect of attitudes, psychologists widely argue that the affect or emotional part of attitude is also important. Affective components of attitudes such as enjoyment, self-enhancement, fear, and trust (Yarchi et al., 2021; Abdul Manan et al., 2020; Chen et al., 2014; Hau and Kim, 2011; Nov et al., 2010) have been identified and discussed as affective attitudes. Therefore, it is essential to consider these affective attitudes in addition to cognitive attitudes in this study.

Affective attitudes are emotional experiences or preferences composed of affective components such as enjoyment and delight (Abdul Manan et al., 2020; Kwon and Vogt, 2010). Positive emotions such as enjoyment, pleasure and self-enhancement arise from positive social media experiences, which make consumers’ attitudes towards sharing digital footprints on social media more favourable.

3.1.2.1 Enjoyment

Consumers are driven by their intrinsic sensory elements of pleasure, enjoyment, and flow, with emotional dimensions originating from self-interest driving their attitude (Hau and Kim, 2011). Enjoyment refers to pleasure, fun and an intrinsic acceptance of social media (Ameen et al. 2018; Zolkepli and Kamarulzaman, 2015). Consumers immerse in social media platforms that give them enjoyment with significant impact on their behaviour (Petit et al., 2019; Huang, 2012) In line with earlier discussion, this study suggests that enjoyment emanates from fun and playfulness in social activities which satisfies consumers’ hedonic needs for enjoyment, influencing their behavioural intention to share digital footprints on social media platforms.

H4 – Enjoyment has a positive effect on behavioural intention to share digital footprints on social media.

3.1.2.2 Self-enhancement (SE)

Self-enhancement refers to consumers’ positive feelings about themselves. Self-enhancement is a hedonic need manifested in consumers’ portrayal of a desired impression on social media platforms (Hepper et al., 2011; Sedikides and Gregg, 2008). In order to attract attention, consumers’ self-fulfilling emotions would enhance their self-status and image, and they would overwhelmingly engage with social media platforms (Muhammad et al., 2020; Ali and Lee, 2010; Krasnova et al., 2010). Emotional attachments are good predictors of social media acceptance. Positive words from users affect other users’ emotional state (Chen et al.,
High self-enhancement would augment consumers’ self-esteem, as they would tend to overwhelmingly present their status on social media platforms and share information (Gutierrez et al., 2019; King et al., 2014; Hennig-Thurau et al., 2004). This explains that consumers’ affective goal of self-enhancement is likely to lead consumers to share their digital footprints on social media (Muhammad et al. 2021). Therefore, the following hypothesis is suggested.

**H5 – Self-enhancement has a positive effect on behavioural intention to share digital footprints on social media.**

### 3.1.2.3 Trust

Trust refers to consumers’ feelings of assurance and protection on social media platforms. Consumers’ attitude towards social media acceptance and sharing of information depends on the integrity and reliability of these platforms (Szmigin, 2018). This refers to how consumers feel about the reliability, credibility, and integrity of social media platforms. The lack of these key characteristics may make consumers emotionally sensitive about their privacy and security (Cheung et al., 2015). As example, due to the Facebook’s incident as discussed earlier, privacy concern among social media users has increased lately (Kahn and Ingram, 2018). Trust is thus, considered to be an important determinant for sharing online information and it plays a crucial role in e-commerce transactions (Bansal et al., 2016; Bashir and Madhavaiah, 2015). However, trust has not been studied in the context of consumers’ willingness to share digital footprints on social media platforms (Ayaburi and Treku, 2020). The sharing of digital footprint may have paradoxical and ambivalent perceptions involving subtle risks. Users may or may not have clear knowledge and understanding of the risks. Even if they have, they may be bound to engage with the platforms due to unavoidable reasons and/or convinced by the security measures that the engagement is adequately safe and secured. The role of trusts, as such, is unique compared to other forms of online transactions and engagements. Accordingly, this study focuses on consumers’ trust as an affective attitude rather than a rational concept because consumers may not be fully aware of every aspect of social media platform. In this context, consumers’ trust does not undergo a careful and methodical thought process on social media platforms; rather, it is more affect-based, comprising their emotions, feelings, and instincts (Eagly and Chaiken, 1993).

Consumers rely on affective signals from other social media users, such that these emotional connections enhance their trust in social media platforms beyond extensive awareness of social media features. Drawing on the consumer behaviour literature alluding that trust is an important antecedent to behavioural intention (Shao et al., 2019; Kumar et al., 2018; Bansal et al., 2016), this study suggests that in the specific context of social media use, that involves privacy and security concerns (Bergström, 2015), trust plays a vital role in consumers’ intention to share their digital footprints. Therefore, this study postulates the following hypotheses:

**H6 – Trust has a positive effect on behavioural intention to share digital footprints on social media.**

The role of trust as a mediator between the benefits sought from a technology and behavioural intention has been examined in the information systems literature (e.g., Mukherjee and Nath, 2007). While the benefits and usefulness perceived from participating in a technology can directly impact on behavioural intentions (according to UTAUT and UTAUT2), this study suggests that the effect of these perceived benefits (PRA, PSI, perceived control, enjoyment, self-enhancement) is also funneled through trust, being a crucial driver in peoples’ sharing of their digital footprints on social media, especially as these digital footprints may be difficult to delete completely at times (Punyatoya, 2019).
Technological, functional and utility factors such as usefulness, performance expectancy and relative advantage are all determinants of behavioural intention (Al Mamun et al., 2020; Chatterjee and Kar, 2020; Lin and Anol, 2008; Al-Gahtani et al., 2007). Perceived relative advantage and perceived usefulness have been found to have significant influence on the intention to use social media. For instance, perceived relative advantage of social media transformed e-commerce into social commerce, facilitating consumer interaction to enhance trust which significantly influences consumers' behavioural intention (Kavota et al., 2020; Hajli, 2014; Zhang et al., 2014; Milewicz and Saxby, 2013; Lu et al., 2010). However, consumers who have low trust in technology, may perceive them less useful. (Singh and Sinha, 2020). Thus, this study focuses on the role of trust as a mediator. Consumers perceive the relative advantage of social media platforms influencing their willingness to share digital footprints on social media platforms. However, this study postulates that consumers who have low trust in social media platforms may tend to forego the relative advantage of social media. Hence, the study hypothesises the mediation effect of trust and suggest the following hypothesis.

**H7 – Trust mediates the positive effect of perceived relative advantage on behavioural intention to share digital footprints on social media.**

Perceived social influence is consumers' perceived social pressure and reward, which denote their cognitive psychological goals to develop and maintain social relations with others on social media platforms. Such perceived social pressure drives social interaction, and establishes social ties (with friends, colleagues, family etc.: Sirola et al., 2021; Yang and Che, 2020; Hau & Kim, 2011) and social support (social exchange to help and share information with others: Lisitsa et al., 2020; Ali, 2011). However, this study endeavours to address the conundrum that consumers face in relation to social pressure and the use of social media (Muhammad et al., 2018; Zhang and Benyoucef, 2016). Consumers engage with social media to remain connected with their friends and family. But little is known to what extent their social influence can increase trust and in turn enables them to leave big data digital footprints. The engagement with social media can be fraught with risks and difficulties and the role of social influence can work either way- it can increase or decrease trust in the social media and consequently determine to what extent users will be willing to leave digital footprints. That said, they may associate greater psychological risks when social interaction is perceived as unsuitable (Hong and Cha, 2013), hence render sharing their digital footprints. Alternatively, a strong perceived social influence can indicate a collective trust in the social media platform. This will in turn influence the individual’s trust and drive the consumer to share digital footprints in social media. Thus, this study proposes the following hypothesis.

**H8 – Trust mediates the positive effect of perceived social influence on behavioural intention to share digital footprints on social media.**

Consumers evaluate social media platforms positively if they have control over these platforms. It builds their confidence, integrity, and reliability (Kroll, and Stieglitz, 2021; Cheung et al., 2015; Krasnova et al., 2010). This study suggests that perceived control relates to cognitive attitude and it enhances their positive attitude towards sharing digital footprints on social media platforms. Similarly, Putuyoya (2019) explains that trust plays a major role when deciding to engage within an online platform. Consumers’ sharing of digital footprints depends on the level of control that social media platforms provide. Consumers evaluate the outcomes of their digital footprints in terms of personal and professional relevance and importance. Social media providers that give control to consumers on their personal information, foster trust among consumers and restores perception of equity in the exchange. This is due to the fact that people are more likely to trust what they know and what they perceive they can control, and are less likely to trust the unknown/uncontrollable. Hence, trust is considered to play a central role in such exchanges (Mosteller and Poddar, 2017). Therefore, this research
tests the mediation effect of trust between consumers’ perceived control on social media platforms and their intention to share digital footprints and proposes the following hypothesis.

**H9 – Trust mediates the positive effect of perceived control on behavioural intention to share digital footprints on social media.**

Consumers are driven by their intrinsic sensory elements of pleasure, enjoyment, and flow, with hedonic and emotional self-focused dimensions originating from self-interest driving their attitude (Lu and Yuan, 2021; Kim et al., 2019). The entertaining features of social media are deemed to be a significant predictor of social media engagement (Qin, 2020; Hsiao et al., 2016; Giovannini et al., 2015). Enjoyment is consumers’ intrinsic emotional factor driving their intrinsic hedonic and emotional pleasure, which satisfies their hedonic needs for enjoyment. This study argues that when consumers trust the platform, they can enjoy participating in the platform without any guilt that may come from perceived risk or a lack of trust (Gutierrez et al., 2019). Therefore, trust mediates the relationship between enjoyment and behavioural intention. This study is aligned with existing scholarship that suggests trust in social media platforms lead to consumers’ trusting intention (Giovannini et al., 2015; Dimitriadis and Kyrezis, 2010) and proposes the following hypothesis that trust mediates consumers’ enjoyment and their intention to share digital footprints on social media platforms.

**H10 – Trust mediates the positive effect of enjoyment on behavioural intention to share digital footprints on social media.**

Self-enhancement is a good predictor of intention to engage with social media platforms. It enhances consumers’ self-esteem to present their status online and share information to attract attention from others (Zheng et al., 2020; Chen et al., 2014; Schroeder, 2014). However, this research, aligned with prior literature, suggests that consumers’ affective attitude of self-enhancement increases when their feeling of trust operate on social media (Zheng et al., 2020; Krasnova et al., 2010), which in turn drive their behavioural intention to share digital footprints on social media platforms. Trust is crucial for the need of self-enhancement to translate into intention to engage in social media as people will trust that the platform will enable them to present themselves in a positive light (Ayaburi and Treku, 2020). Thus, this research proposes that trust works as a mediator between consumers’ self-enhancement and their intention to reveal desirable information on social media platforms to formulate the impression they wish to convey to others.

**H11 – Trust mediates the positive effect of self-enhancement on behavioural intention to share digital footprints on social media.**

3.1.3 Behavioural intention

There is consensus among scholars and researchers in previous research within the area of marketing and information system that cognitive and/or affective drivers explain behavioural intention and subsequently lead to the actual behaviour (Consuegra, et al. 2018; Anderson et al., 2014). For example, an interactive social media platform driven by whether utilitarian or hedonic) enhances behavioural intentions such as loyalty, purchase intention or positive eWOM (Consuegra, et al. 2018; Zhang & Benyoucef, 2016; Mikalef et al., 2013). In this context, the actual behaviour is illustrated through willingness to share their digital footprint. Aligned with the underlying theory of UTAUT, Multi-Level Framework of Technology Acceptance and Use and other intention models, this study formulates the following hypothesis that behavioural intention will have a positive effect on consumers’ sharing of digital footprints behaviour.
H12 – Behavioural intention has a positive effect on consumers’ willingness to share digital footprints.

4. Research methodology

4.1 Instrument development

Instruments are developed from prior studies and most of the constructs are measured by adapting established scales from the literature. For a theoretically sound conceptualisation, scale development and a valid measurement scale, Anderson and Gerbing (1988) and DeVellis, (2016) were consulted. This study had eight constructs. The domain of constructs was defined and items were generated for the instruments. Scales and items were adapted from earlier studies so that items measuring the constructs are adapted appropriately for the reliability and validity purposes and they match the context of the research. Operationalisation derived construct’s meaning in measurement terms and each construct was operationalised with the type and scale items (Hair et al., 2014; Hinkin, 1995). Existing measurement scales were adopted; consistent with the scaling literature, multiple items were developed for each dimension of the constructs. All the constructs and items’ loadings are given in Table I. These items are reflective as they have a common core (Petter et al., 2007) representing theoretically the construct. Table I also provides details of the literature used to scale each dimension.
4.2 Data Collection

To empirically test the research model, following the guidelines provided by Krejcie & Morgan (1970) and Saunders et al., (2015), a quantitative research approach and a random survey questionnaire using quantitative data was chosen. Figure 2 highlights the research design. The survey questionnaire is considered to be an appropriate confirmatory means to measure consumers’ attitude (Brace, 2018). It is a widely used strategy in business and management discipline; as it enables the researchers to collect quantitative data that can be used to interpret the relationships between constructs, then developing models of those relationships (Saunders et al., 2015). The target population was social media consumers. Social media consumers are described to be in multi-millions and it is difficult to determine the exact total...
number and difficult to reach all social media consumers (Saunders et al., 2015; Henderson and Bowley, 2010; Singleton and Straits, 2005). Around 2.5 million British consumers, driven by social connection, alone are noted to buy on social media (Criteo, 2016; Statista, 2019). Looking to the research aim, simple random sampling technique was chosen and an online questionnaire was administered to a random sample of social media consumers in the UK by sharing URL of the survey on social media platforms (Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, WhatsApp, LinkedIn etc.). The survey questionnaire is considered to be suitable to confirm established measurement scales of consumers’ attitudes and behaviour. Similarly, simple random sampling is considered appropriate, as it enables the results to be generalised when the population is large and covers large area, and statistics analysis performed where necessary (Brace, 2018; Saunders et al., 2015). The survey in this research was carried out in three steps: pre-pilot test, pilot test and a main survey to ensure complete validity of the survey questionnaires and outcomes. Face validity was established by asking an expert panel (academics and PhD students having expertise in the area) how far each item represented the domain of the constructs using a three-point Likert scale (1 = clearly representative, 2 = somewhat representative, and 3 = not at all representative) (Zaichkowsky, 1985). Pre-tests followed to develop the final survey. Finally, to identify any remaining inconsistencies, a pilot study among 40 social media consumers was conducted. These respondents suggested no further improvements. As a result of the final survey, a total of 733 responses were achieved, which was sufficient for the purpose of this study.

5. Data analysis and results

The respondents’ profiles revealed that around 99.05% respondents were social media users and fewer than 1% were non-social media users. The main social media platforms used by consumers were Facebook, Instagram, WhatsApp, YouTube, Twitter, and LinkedIn and their main engagements with social media were shopping related.

Standard deviation and measured Skewness and Kurtosis were carried out to check for outliers in assessing the normality of the data (Wilcox, 2011). No normality issues were found. Skewness and Kurtosis fell within the normal range of ±2.0. All constructs were tested for reliability using Cronbach’s Alpha. Reliability values of all the constructs are in the acceptable range >0.7. In addition, item-item correlation values are also in the acceptable range for internal consistency measurement. All constructs have scores above the reference value and thus achieve acceptable internal item consistency. The Cronbach’s alphas for each construct ranged from 0.74 to 0.96, all exceeding the recommended 0.70 cut off value (Nunnally, 1994). At this early stage, all items fell within the acceptable cut off value, no items were removed, leaving all 32 items considered suitable for Confirmatory Factor Analysis (Hair et al., 2018).

5.1 Step 1: Measurement model (CFA)

Data analysis was carried out in two steps by using SEM as suggested by Anderson and Gerbing (1988). In the first step, factor loading was carried out followed by reliability and validity measurement through Confirmatory Factor Analysis of the latent constructs for the measurement model. In the second stage, Structural Equation Modelling was undertaken to test for the hypotheses. Structural equation modelling (SEM) was conducted using AMOS 26 and the default method-maximum likelihood. A Two-Step approach tested the measurement model’s validity and reliability, and nomological validity (the full structural model in Step 2).

All items of the scale were subjected to CFA, the measurement model and results were purified to establish the construct validity and reliability of the items generated earlier. The measurement model showed a good fit (Hair et al., 2018); for example ($\chi^2 = 915.925; p < .000; \chi^2/df = 2.120; GFI = .92; IFI = .97; TLI = .97; CFI = .97; and RMSEA = .040$). Table I shows the structural relationships (or factor loadings) covaried from one dimension to another when they were tested in CFA.
Table I
Constructs, items, source and confirmatory factor analysis loadings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PRA</td>
<td>I believe it is easy to share my memories, likes, dislikes, interests and information etc. with others on social media.</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I believe social media have made my life more convenient to share my memories, likes, dislikes, interests and information etc. with others.</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I believe social media is very useful for sharing my memories, likes, dislikes, interests and information etc. with others.</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I believe social media fit well with the way I like to share my memories, interests and information etc. with others.</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSI</td>
<td>I think I interact well with others on social media for sharing my memories, likes, dislikes, interests and information etc.</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I believe I fit well with others on social media that share the same interests as me.</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I believe social media help me establish relationship with others to share information and interests etc.</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I think I maintain close relationships with others on social media for sharing information and interests etc.</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSI</td>
<td>I think I interact well with others on social media for sharing my memories, likes, dislikes, interests and information etc.</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I believe I fit well with others on social media that share the same interests as me.</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I believe social media help me establish relationship with others to share information and interests etc.</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I think I maintain close relationships with others on social media for sharing information and interests etc.</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The construct reliability tests using both composite reliability and Cronbach’s alpha all scored above the recommended level. The correlation among the constructs is also acceptable, ranging from .002 to .55 and AVE = > .50 (Fornell and Larcker, 1981, see Table II).

Table II
Correlations and reliability estimates.
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Discriminant validity was confirmed for all latent constructs since the square root of each construct’s AVE was greater than the bivariate correlation (Hair et al., 2018) (see Table II). At this stage, cross-loadings between both measured and error terms also did not suffer from any significant cross-loadings; standardized residuals were all < 2.58 (Byrne, 2016). Convergent validity was supported, with all parameter estimates > .5 (Kline, 1998). Table I shows details of each CFA individual item’s convergent validity and all items statistically significant at p < .000 (Anderson and Gerbing, 1988). Thus, the assessment results supported the adequacy of the discriminant validity of the measurement model.

5.2 Step 2: The Structural model – direct effects

Step 2 tests the theoretical model (Figure 1) and hypotheses of the study. The summary of the full structural model results with all direct and indirect effects is given in Table III and Table IV respectively. The model yielded a good fit: (χ²= 903.197, p < .000; χ²/df = 2.062; GFI = 0.92; IFI = 0.97; TLI = 0.97; CFI = 0.97; RMSEA = 0.03). Table III summarizes the detailed results of the direct effects. All direct effects were tested and provide significant positive effects (H2, H4, H5 and H6) except two parameters H1 (the effect of PRA on behavioural intention) and H3 (the effect of PC on behavioural intention). Both PRA and PC, however, interestingly do not have a direct effect on behavioural intention but are mediated through trust (β=.110, p = .001; β=.112, p = .000).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct/hypothesis (Testing Direct effects)</th>
<th>Direct path estimates</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Hypothesis result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H1 perceived relative advantage → behavioural intention</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2 perceived social influence → behavioural intention</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3 perceived control → behavioural intention</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.527</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4 enjoyment → behavioural intention</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5 self-enhancement → behavioural intention</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H6 trust → behavioural intention</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H12 behavioural intention → behaviour</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2.1 Mediation results
To test for mediation effects (H7, H8, H9, H10 and H11), the authors used the guidelines of Zhao et al. (2010) and Preacher and Hayes, (2008). Mediation was established using their guidelines as set out below.

(1) If the introduction of a mediator variable (M) into the X → Y relationship (known as the c path) reduces the effect sizes (β) of the original direct effect, it indicates mediation;

(2) A confidence interval (CI) that excludes zero indicates that mediation has occurred (Preacher and Hayes, 2008);

(3) An X → Y direct effect with a nonsignificant result (p > .05) after M is introduced (the c path), indicates full mediation, while a significant result demonstrates a partial case (Preacher and Kelley, 2011; Zhao et al., 2010);

(4) In the event of a partial case, effect sizes are examined as they could strengthen the justification for full or partial mediation (Preacher and Kelley, 2011). Effect sizes must fulfill all three general criteria: (1) interpretable scaling, (2) confidence interval available, and (3) independence of sample size, as in the case of ab123.

Thus, the results of the analyses indicate a support for stronger or full mediation with respect to four hypotheses. Table IV summarizes the detailed results of the indirect effects. First, trust was found to fully mediate the relationship between PRA and behavioural intention as the only indirect path was significant (Zhao et al., 2010) (PRA → trust → behavioural intention (β = .12, p = .000 and β = .29, p = .000)). Second, trust was found to fully mediate the relationship between PSI and behavioural intention as the only indirect path was significant (Zhao et al., 2010) (PSI → trust → behavioural intention (β = .21, p = .000 and β = .29, p = .000)). Third, trust was found to fully mediate the relationship between PC and behavioural intention as the only indirect path was significant (Zhao et al., 2010) (PC → trust → behavioural intention (β = .13, p = .000 and β = .29, p = .000)). Fourth, trust was found to fully mediate the relationship between enjoyment and behavioural intention as the only indirect path was significant (Zhao et al., 2010) (enjoyment → trust → behavioural intention (β = .12, p = .000 and β = .29, p = .000).

Finally, trust was found to partially mediate the relationship between SE and behavioural intention as both the direct and indirect paths were significant (Zhao et al., 2010) (SE → behavioural intention (β = .12, p = .000) and SE → trust → behavioural intention (β = .34, p = .000 and β = .29, p = .000)). Although the results shown in Tables IV and V indicate both direct and indirect effect, both paths are significant H11 (a partial mediation case), indicate that the mediator accounts for more than half of the total effect as shown in Table IV, thus supporting stronger mediation via trust.

Thus, full mediation occurred on four parameters namely PRA, PSI, PC and Enjoyment. That is, (1) perceived relative advantage, (2) perceived social influence, (3) perceived control and (4) enjoyment will affect behavioral intention only via trust. On the other hand, self-enhancement could have both direct and indirect (via trust) effects on behavioural intention. Zhao et al., (2010) argue that to determine the mediation whether via regression or SEM, only the indirect effects need to be significant (i.e., a × b is significant and c being nonsignificant) and a full mediation occurs when the beta coefficient is nearing zero or nonsignificant concerning the direct effect between X and Y when m (mediation) is introduced. Second, the magnitude of the indirect effect is given by the product of the standardized coefficients of the paths linking the two variables (Bentler, 1995). Tables IV and V summarize the hypotheses results, the direct and indirect parameter estimates.

Table IV
Hypothesis results and summary for mediation effect.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct/hypothesis (Testing Direct and Indirect effects)</th>
<th>Direct path estimates</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Indirect path estimates</th>
<th>Hypothesis result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H7 perceived relative advantage → trust → behavioural intention</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.214</td>
<td>Path 1: β=.12, p=.000 and Path 2: β=.29, p=.000</td>
<td>Supported H7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note: Full mediation as only indirect path is significant (Zhao et al., 2010)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H1 Not Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H8 perceived social influence → trust → behavioural intention</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>Path 1: β=.21, p=.000 and Path 2: β=.29, p=.000</td>
<td>Supported H8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note: Full mediation as only indirect path is significant (Zhao et al., 2010)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H2 Not Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H9 perceived control → trust → behavioural intention</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.210</td>
<td>Path 1: β=.13, p=.000 and Path 2: β=.29, p=.000</td>
<td>Supported H9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note: Full mediation as only indirect path is significant (Zhao et al., 2010)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H3 Not Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H10 enjoyment → trust → behavioural intention</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.590</td>
<td>Path 1: β=.12, p=.000 and Path 2: β=.29, p=.000</td>
<td>Supported H10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note: Full mediation as only indirect path is significant (Zhao et al., 2010)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H4 Not Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H11 self-enhancement → trust → behavioural intention</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>Path 1: β=.34, p=.000 and Path 2: β=.29, p=.000</td>
<td>Supported H11 and H5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note: Complimentary (or partially) mediated occurs as both direct and indirect paths are significant (Zhao et al., 2010)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Discussion

The results of this research demonstrate that social media users’ joint cognitive and affective attitudes are important antecedents to their behavioural intention. However, the results of this study show that trust plays a much vital role as it fully mediates the relationship between the joint attitudinal attributes (cognitive and affective) and consumers’ behavioural intention to share digital footprints on social media platforms. Unlike prior technology acceptance, use and adoption models, trust in this study, was found to be a mediator in explaining consumers’ behavioural intention. The direct effects of overall attitudinal components, (both cognitive and affective) on behavioural intention have been found to be insignificant in the presence of the mediator suggesting that consumers’ trust is an important part of consumers’ interaction with social media platforms and plays a significant role in explaining consumers’ willingness to share digital footprints on social media platforms. This is consistent with Punyatoya’s (2019) findings of trust mediating the relationship between antecedents to trust and relevant pertinent dependent variables such as satisfaction/behavioural intention.

In addition, this study offers empirical evidence for the impact of trust on the cognitive and affective attitudinal attributes and consumers’ behavioural intention to share digital footprints on social media platforms. In particular, this study examines the role of trust as a mediator. Although, there is a stream of research proposing differentiation through attitude (Agarwal et al., 2017; Dwivedi et al., 2017; Rana et al., 2017; Park and Kim, 2014; Diffley et al., 2011), they focus primarily on cognitive attitude or affective attitude and with little focus on the joint attitudinal attributes. Their antecedents as the joint attitudinal components on consumers’ behavioural intention are still unclear. The results of this study show an integrated conceptual understanding, whereby trust is the mediator variable in relation to its antecedents (cognitive and affective attitude) and its behavioural intention (willingness to share digital footprints). Thus, based on the empirical evidence from this study, social media consumers in the presence of both cognitive and affective attributes are likely to share their digital footprints on social media platforms if they feel that social media platforms are trustworthy.

Unlike previous technology acceptance models with scant attention to the joint effects of attitudes (cognitive and affective) on behaviour, the results of this study show that attitudes involve not only cognitive but also more affective attributes (Yarchi et al., 2021; Abdul Manan et al., 2020; Park and Kim, 2014; Diffley et al., 2011). Combining both types of attitudes provides a comprehensive understanding of consumers’ attitudes in a particular context (Alwi and Kitchen, 2014). The other key finding of this study is that both cognitive and affective attitudes are important in shaping consumers’ behavioural intention in sharing digital footprints on social media. However, it is interesting to note that affective attitudes, which are more emotionally and hedonic driven, appear to have a stronger influence on the behavioural
intention. Affective attitudes were found to have a stronger effect (β= .34, p = .000 and β= .29, p = .000) on behavioural intention compared to cognitive attitudes (β= .12, p = .000 and β= .13, p = .000). This is consistent with Hau and Kim (2011) maintaining that affective attitudes represent consumers’ intrinsic senses and emotions and drive behaviour. However, this runs counter to Puntayona (2019) study that found the cognitive component to have a greater impact on behavioural intention in comparison to affective components.

In addition, this study hypothesised to examine the effects of joint attitudes on consumers’ intention to share digital footprints on social media platforms. Hence, the empirical evidence of this research confirms that not only cognitive (perceived relative advantage, perceived social influence and perceived control) but also affective (enjoyment, self-enhancement, and trust) attitudes drive behavioural intention. Perceived relative advantage shapes consumers’ perceptions of social media’s compatibility with their needs and provides them with convenience and improved performance (Bala and Venkatesh, 2016; Venkatesh et al., 2012). Perceived social influence represents cognitive social pressure on consumers for social interaction, social ties, and social support in social media (Sirola et al., 2021; Yang and Che, 2020; Trivedi et al., 2018; Grace et al., 2015). Similarly, more control (Cheung et al., 2015; Tucker, 2014), enjoyment (Lu and Yuan, 2021; Chiang, 2013) and self-fulfilment status on social media platforms (Qin, 2020; Hepper et al., 2011; Ali and Lee, 2010; Sas et al., 2009) lead consumers to share digital footprints on social media (Muhammad et al., 2020; Gutierrez et al., 2019). In addition, this study also found that certain antecedents (affective attitudinal attributes) showed stronger impact on consumers’ behavioural intention. However, the findings of this study confirm that despite these cognitive and affective antecedents, consumers may not be willing to share their digital footprints unless they feel that social media platforms are trustworthy.

6.1 Theoretical implications

This study makes a range of theoretical contributions. First, the study extends the technology and acceptance framework by examining the role of both cognitive and affective attitudes on consumers’ willingness to share digital footprints on social media platforms. This study offers insights into the joint (cognitive and affective attitudes) attitudinal attributes on consumers’ willingness to share digital footprints on social media platforms. In so doing, this paper offers and validates a conceptual framework to assess and contrast between utilitarian and hedonistic factors that influence consumers’ intention and willingness to share digital footprints on social media.

Second, to the best knowledge of the authors, this paper pioneers the study of the effect of attitudes on consumers’ intention to share digital footprints on social media platforms. The findings of this study show that not only cognitive but also affective attitudes drive behavioural intention. This study also confirms that affective attitudinal attributes show stronger impact on consumers’ behavioural intention for social media use and consumers are not likely to share their digital footprints unless they feel that social media platforms are trustworthy. This study adds to the trust literature (Punyatoya, 2019) in highlighting the importance of affective attitudes in the online consumer behaviour.

Finally, this study identifies the key role of trust in driving consumers’ willingness to share digital footprints on social media. This is consistent with Szmigin (2018) who argues that consumers’ sharing of information depends on their feeling of integrity and reliability of social media platforms. This study highlights trust as a mediator in explaining consumers’ behavioural intention and plays a significant role in explaining consumers’ willingness to share digital footprints on social media platforms. Whilst some of the existing empirical works (eg. Baabdullah, 2018; Hansen et al. 2018; Akman and Mishra, 2017) consider perceived trust as an independent variable, this paper identifies its mediation role in determining the influence of
perceived relative advantage, perceived social influence, perceived control, enjoyment, and self-enhancement on behaviour intention. This is important to notice that cognitive and affective attitudinal components lead to positive trust. Hence, trust can be enhanced through increased utilitarian and hedonic benefits which in turn also enhances consumers’ intention to share big data digital footprints. The originality of this study lies in the exploration and validation of the mediator role of trust and its relationships with the antecedents of the joint attitudinal components and consumers’ behavioural intention of their willingness to share digital footprints on social media platforms. This study is important for academics and practitioners who may appreciate the aspects of the joint attitudinal attributes, which are more significant in consumers’ evaluation of the cutting-edge social media platforms.

6.2 Managerial implications

Social media providers should not only focus on the functional aspects of social media platforms, but also pay attention to the emotions that the platforms may evoke in consumers (i.e., enjoyment, self-fulfilment, trust). In relation to trust, social media providers and brands operating on social media platforms need to incorporate trustworthiness in their marketing strategy. In addition, it helps social media providers and brands to focus on consumers’ cognitive and affective attitudes so as to enhance their willingness to share their digital footprints on social media platforms. Similarly, social media providers need to optimise social media value propositions around consumers’ trust by using the integrated response model developed in the study. In addition, they need to develop strong recognition and understanding of consumers’ trust related activities so that consumers’ feeling of trust enhance especially in times where data breaches, cyberattacks and data leakages are getting more rampant. Thus, this study provides significant practical implications for not only social media providers and practitioners but other technology providers and policy makers.

As this paper identifies trust’s mediating role, social media designers and marketers should assess how trust can be enhanced by increasing utilitarian and hedonic benefits of their products and services. For instance, by providing opportunities for control and self-enhancement social media platforms can be made much trustworthy. It has been noticed that Facebook has increased users’ control by enabling them to decide on how they can post, who can view their posts, who can engage with the posts and how these posts can be monitored. By looking at the number of ‘Likes’, ‘Share’, ‘Retweet’ etc users can assess the impact of their posts on various social media. This research finds efficacy of these measures in increasing users’ engagement and willingness to share digital footprints.

7. Limitations and further research

This study has some limitations that should be acknowledged. First, this study was carried out using social media platforms in general. It was difficult to confine this research to a single social media platform. Therefore, identifying the impact of both types of attitudes for a single social media platform is an avenue for future research. Second, this study tested the model on social media consumers, future studies can focus on social media users in general. Third, this study focused on social media platforms. Future research could extend the model to other technologies. In addition, this study calls for further research exploring further the reasons behind the differential effect between affective and cognitive attitudes in online trust behaviour. Finally, this study used both cognitive and affective attitudes simultaneously in the model. Future research could extend the model by considering the hierarchical and causal nature of cognitive attitudes preceding affect or vice a versa, thereby giving a deeper insight to the causal nature of attitudes.
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