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The primary objective of this study is to examine the relationship between social media use and job performance, with a specific focus on exploring the mediating roles of technostress, social capital, and job satisfaction. The study focused on Fars Regional Electric Company employees in Iran. The study relied on a descriptive survey method and collected data through a questionnaire in which the items were measured according to a five-point Likert scale. PLS software has employed structural equation modeling, or SEM, to test the research hypotheses. Results revealed that social media usage led to technostress, although the effects of social media usage on job satisfaction and job performance were not confirmed. However, job satisfaction positively affected the employees’ job performance. Furthermore, social media usage increased the employees’ level of social capital, while social capital left a positive effect on the employees’ job satisfaction and performance. Meanwhile, the effects of technostress on job satisfaction and performance were rejected. Investigating the mediation effects revealed that job satisfaction did not mediate the relationship between social media and job performance and that technostress did not significantly mediate the relationship between social media and job performance. Nevertheless, job satisfaction had a mediation effect on the relationship between social capital and job performance, and social capital had a mediation effect on the relationship between social media usage and job performance. The mediation effect of technostress on the relationship between social media and job performance was rejected.
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1. Introduction

The rapid growth of media technologies in today’s world has made it possible for societies and organizations to enjoy multifarious facilities and capacities that were not previously available and enhance their national positive characteristics, such as innovation, which can be related to the development level (Shayan et al., 2015). Implementing innovation and creativity in some of the available facets (e.g. social media) has enhanced many organizational practices, such as firm’s overall performance (Vardarlier & Ozsahin, 2021), rapid adaptation, cost reduction, and innovation (Dodokh, Al-Maaitah, 2019) creating new business models and marketing methods, improving demand forecasting, generating new ways of management and training, increasing the rate of novelties and productivity, sharing knowledge, establishing collaborations, and building sustainable relationships (Shayan et al., 2017). Therefore, one could safely argue that social media has been a factor that has foundationally transformed human methods of communication, collaboration, consumption, and creativity (Ali-Hassan et al., 2015).

The emergence of online social media (e.g., Facebook, Twitter) has enabled people worldwide to communicate with each other through such platforms (Charoensukmongkol, 2015). However, this expansive range of usage has inspired many heated debates and discussions about the impact of such emerging technologies and their possible effects on organizations. Many researchers contend that social media usage has brought about numerous advantages for organizations, underscoring that such online platforms facilitate the process of sharing knowledge and employee learning (Ashraf & Javed, 2015), recruitment and employee branding processes (Vardarlier & Ozsahin, 2021) increase employees’ satisfaction (Moqbel et al., 2013), and improve organizational relationships (Kishokumar, 2016).

Despite these functions, growing evidence reveals the negative aspects of such technologies in organizations. At the same time, many studies have observed that social media usage could distract employees from their main tasks (Olalekan, 2017). Such a problem could affect an organization’s functioning and achievement of goals. Many researchers believe that the ability to connect to virtual networks from any location via internet-based applications and mobile technology dependence could influence various dimensions of an individual’s life (including work and personal relationships) and lead to the experience of technostress (Mak et al., 2018; Jena, 2015). As a modern disorder, technostress can disturb concentration, cause reactivity, and discontinue intentions. The disorder could also lead to disability in using or learning the operations of computer systems and information-based technologies (Mak et al., 2018; Brooks et al., 2017). With the spread of the COVID-19 pandemic and increased technology
dependence, techno-stress studies are trying to develop an understanding of technostress and its consequences in the new environment. The results of this research indicate that the amount of technostress has increased significantly before (Boyer-Davice, 2020; Nimrod, 2020) and negatively affected job performance and satisfaction (Abilleira et al., 2021).

In other words, technostress is primarily experienced with a sense of worry correlated with using communication devices and develops into stress and anxiety caused by a maladaptation of new technologies (Sabaghinezhad et al., 2014). Studies concerned with technostress have emphasized that this disorder is correlated with a negative effect on job performance, job satisfaction, memory problems, and sleep disorders (Al-Ansari & Al-share, 2019; Brooks et al., 2017). It could also have a detrimental effect on job satisfaction (Jena, 2015). Given the importance of job performance and job satisfaction from the perspective of organizations, it would be important for (non-)governmental institutions to consider the effective factors. Among these, given the lack of a comprehensive understanding of the specific mechanisms through which social media, directly and indirectly, affect various aspects of employees’ routine and innovative job performance, and considering the limited studies on the mediating effects of some variables that may play an important role in this relationship separately, this study attempts to bridge and cover part of this research gap. Therefore, the present research seeks to answer the following question:

How does the utilization of social media effect job performance, and what are the mediating roles of factors such as technostress, social capital, and job satisfaction in this relationship?

2. Theoretical foundations

2.1. Social media usage

Social media are internet-based applications through which users generate and/or share content (Brooks, 2015). Various modes of such media include weblogs, wikis, podcasts, forums, content communities, and microblogging (Shayan et al., 2017). Among these, social networks are more popular; based on the statistics provided on www.statista.com, the number of current social network users worldwide is 2.62 billion, which will rise to 3.02 billion in 2021. Social media usage has proved to be the most popular online activity, and according to research, people tend to use social media 27% of the time they spend on online activities (Brooks et al., 2017).

Social media as entities enable people to create, share, and exchange ideas and other materials through computerized tools, networks, and virtual communities (Shayan et al., 2017). Meanwhile, as Babiker (2015) observes, social media and virtual networks are usually used
interchangeably. However, they do not refer to the same entities because virtual networks are one of the modes of social media. Social media usage does not exclusively include an individual’s personal (leisure) time, as social media is now being used in the workplace and has dramatically transformed employees’ work-related activities. A study dealing with about 1000 business experts confirmed that they would frequently check their accounts on Facebook, LinkedIn, and Twitter during the day. Another study on human resource managers of 122 firms in Turkey showed they prefer LinkedIn in most human resources management processes, such as recruitment and employee branding (Vardarlier & Ozsahin, 2021).

This routine of checking social media could engender negative effects (Brooks & Califf, 2017). For instance, Brooks’s (2015) research found that a higher rate of private social media usage could reduce efficiency at work while increasing technostress and reducing happiness. According to Ali-Hassan et al. (2015), social media usage may appear in three forms: hedonic use, cognitive use, and social use:

Hedonic use of social media: In this mode, social media is used for purposes such as leisure, entertainment, relaxation, and distraction from problems;

Cognitive use of social media: In this mode, users work with social media to generate and share content while having access to the content created by others; otherwise put, in such a case, individuals share their ideas, stories, personal images, and other items;

Social use of social media: In this type of use, social media is used to make contact with current friends and acquaintances, make new social relationships, or find new friends/individuals with interests compatible with those of the user.

2.2. Technostress

Organizational stress typically involves an individual’s perception of demands imposed on him/her by intense stimulators called stressors; the psychological reaction made to such demands is called pressure. Stressors represent accidents, demands, stimulators, or conditions that individuals face in the workplace. Pressures, however, refer to behavioral and psychological consequences seen in individuals (Brooks et al., 2017). Stressors include role conflicts, ambiguities, demanding jobs, and a lack of sufficient skills. In contrast, symptoms of pressure include memory loss, limited concentration, mental/physical fatigue, frustration, and aggression. (Zarei Matin, 2017). Recently, information technology (IT) has adopted a technology-oriented approach to research stress called technostress (Brooks et al., 2017).
Craig Brod, who first used the term “technostress”, finds this phenomenon to be a modern disorder arising from an individual’s ability to adapt healthily to globally used computer technologies (Sabbaghinejad, 2014). As this definition suggests, the first researchers dealing with technostress viewed it as a disorder, although later research considered it a maladaptation to changes introduced by IT (Jena, 2015). Technostress refers to the negative effect technology use will have in-directly on attitudes, thoughts, behaviors, and even biological systems (Carlotto et al., 2017). The symptoms of technostress are the inability to concentrate, reactivity, and a sense of losing control.

This type of stress prevents individuals from learning or even developing the ability to use computer and IT skills (Brooks et al., 2017). When individuals experience technostress and fail to adapt themselves to rapid changes in information and communications technology (ICT), they tend to process information insufficiently and ineffectively; they can hardly recognize useful information and have little time to explore creative/innovative ways of doing their activities (Carlotto et al., 2017). As a consequence of these experiences, they tend to make frequent mistakes, downgrading their productivity levels and their job satisfaction. Under such circumstances, they are likelier to evaluate their jobs as “negative.” Based on the studies conducted, the most important causes of technostress are as follows (Brooks et al., 2017; Carlotto et al., 2017; Ibrahim et al., 2014; Jena, 2015; Sabbaghinejad, 2014; Yasir et al., 2016):

1. Techno-uncertainty: This type of stress is caused by frequent changes and updates in ICT software and hardware; it refers to conditions in which recurrent ICT changes distress users who feel they need to master a new ICT-related change constantly;
2. Techno-insecurity: This mode refers to employees’ job security, which depends on the increasing development in ICT. It describes conditions under which users feel they may lose their jobs of competition with individuals who possess more ICT knowledge;
3. Techno-complexity: It explains conditions in which ICT complexities make users’ skills insufficient and make them spend more time or effort on learning and perceiving various dimensions of new technologies;
4. Techno-invasion: This item describes the invasive impact of ICT in creating contexts in which users are exposed and reached anywhere and anytime while fleeing the need to be constantly connected; this condition could disturb their work-life balance;
5. Techno-overload: This notion suggests that ICT makes employees work more and faster.

2.3. Job satisfaction

How people view the various aspects of the external world shapes their attitudes; job satisfaction is among the most important attitudes toward one’s job (Zarei Matin, 2017). That is to say, a positive attitude toward one’s job could bring about job satisfaction. In contrast, a negative or cynical attitude may lead to dissatisfaction (Kumar et al., 2013). Job satisfaction is
an employee’s emotional response to his/her work, which could be positive or negative (Jena, 2015).

Chung et al. (2017) regard job satisfaction as an emotional reaction that employees make to their jobs, and this factor is determined when their real work outcomes are compared to their expected outcomes. According to research, high job satisfaction leads to better performance, less delay, less turnover, and better psychological, mental, and physical well-being (Zarei Matin, 2017). In other words, job satisfaction could create positive outcomes in duties, roles, and workplace relations (Robertson & Kee, 2017), and it can ultimately guarantee the achievement of organizational goals.

2.4. Performance
Organizational performance has proven to be a significant notion due to its impact on productivity (Bakhshi et al., 2017); given this importance, researchers have tried to find different ways to realize organizational performance (Moqbel, 2012). Performance refers to an employee’s level of completing a task, demonstrating how an employee manages to perform the requirements of a task (Shayan et al., 2017). Put otherwise, job performance points to outcomes after completing a task and shows the level decided for every employee regarding job accomplishment, organizational regulations, and expectations/requirements (Bakhshi et al., 2017).

In this study, performance is investigated from two perspectives (Ali-Hassan et al., 2015; Shayan et al., 2017): (a) routine job performance denotes an individual’s performance of his/her required job-related tasks and rewards received for conducting them, and (b) innovative job performance involves generating and employing creative and useful ideas in the workplace.

2.5. Social capital
The notion of social capital, which emerged from the beliefs of classical sociologists (Noghani & Asgharpour, 2008), was first introduced by French sociologist Pierre Bourdieu (1930-2002) (Hosseinpour, 2018). Bourdieu views social capital as “the sum of the resources, actual or virtual, that accrue to an individual or a group by possessing a durable network of more or less institutionalized relationships of mutual acquaintance and recognition” (Gauntlett, 2011). In other words, social capital represents resources or assets rooted in individual or group networks of social relations. As these definitions clarify, the central issue in social capital is the network of relations that produce a valuable source through which associated members can access
The social capital theory has been addressed from various perspectives in the literature. It has brought about organization-related insights such as the psychological empowerment of employees (Hassanzadeh Pasikhani & Khodashahri, 2018), knowledge sharing (Mazbohi et al., 2018), and organizational performance (Shayan et al., 2017). A common approach to measuring social capital relies on three dimensions, namely structural, relational, and cognitive (Ali-Hassan et al., 2015; Hassanzadeh Pasikhani & Khodashahri, 2018; Mazbohi et al., 2018; Shayan et al., 2017; Sun & Shang, 2014):

Structural dimension: It represents the general pattern of relationships between users (Sun & Shang, 2014) and involves two networks: the expressive network and the instrumental network. The former makes it possible for the network members to enjoy friendship, emotions, and social support; in the instrumental network, however, ties are weaker and non-mutual and usually occur in a workplace (as in the ties between individuals with very different personalities; see Ali-Hassan et al., 2015). Network hierarchy, composition, and group homogeneity are the main characteristics of this dimension (Shayan et al., 2017);

Elational dimension: This dimension encompasses assets such as trust, norms, obligations, and identity, which are formed through social relations (Sun & Shang, 2014); among these factors, trust seems to be the most important one (Ali-Hassan et al., 2015);

Cognitive dimension: The cognitive aspect of social capital represents a shared ground and mutual understanding that facilitates interactions among parties. This notion emphasizes a common understanding that simplifies the performance among parties (Sun & Shang, 2014).

3. Hypotheses and the research model

3.1. Social media and technostress

Recent research on social media and technostress has found that social media usage in the workplace could be correlated with technostress and the factors contributing to it (Brooks and Califf, 2017). For instance, in the study by Brooks et al. (2017), a positive relationship between distraction caused by social media usage and its contributing factors (Brooks et al., 2017). Another study observed that social media usage could lead to a degree of technostress, stating that the factors affecting technostress were social pressure to use technology, remembering passwords and usernames, the anxiety of losing data, and professional life shaped by technology. It was also found that degrees of technostress differed in gender, profession, and age (Coklar & Sahin, 2011). Moreover, Brooks (2015), creating an artificial workplace in a
classroom, demonstrated that social media usage could lead to a higher degree of technostress and a lower degree of happiness. Given these observations, the first hypothesis of the study is stated as follows:

First hypothesis: Social media usage is positively associated with technostress.

3.2. Social media and job satisfaction

Various studies have explored the positive effect of social media usage on job satisfaction. For instance, Moqbel (2012) found that employees who used their social network in the workplace showed higher job satisfaction as they received social support from their families and friends. In another research, Gupta (2015) observed that employees’ use of Facebook during working hours could inspire a positive sentiment in them toward their jobs (Gupta, 2015) and lead to job satisfaction; of course, this use was limited to their leisure time for entertainment. Robertson and Robertson and Kee (2017) showed that employees’ satisfaction improved as they spent more time interacting with others via Facebook, which functioned as a strategic platform for improving employee satisfaction. As these investigations suggest, it could be argued that the three dimensions of social media usage (hedonistic, social, and cognitive) could have an impact on employees’ job satisfaction, as stated in the following hypothesis:

Second hypothesis: Social media usage could improve employees’ job satisfaction.

3.3. Social media and job performance

Although the term social media serves as an umbrella term for a wide spectrum of applied tools and programs, such elements share some features: first, such tools are inherently social and reinforce relations among people; second, as employees start to use them at various levels of the organization, such tools are recognized as “public technology.” Finally, most of the tools in social media can be used at home and in the workplace, giving rise to a condition in which the borders between the two contexts become blurred (Ali-Hassan et al., 2015). Given such features, one could question how social media affects employees’ performance.

Studies have reported different results regarding the effect of social media on job performance; most researchers have found social media usage an element of distraction that could undermine job performance (Bizzi, 2018). For instance, in Hwang and Jeong’s (2017) investigation, it was found that when social media usage was prioritized while the individual performed his/her tasks and was engaged in the media, poor performance could be followed. In a study conducted by Olalekan et al. (2013), it was observed that distraction caused by social
media usage could deteriorate job performance; the solution the authors suggested was restrictions on social media usage in the organization.

On the other hand, most researchers have expressed that social media usage could improve job performance. For instance, Charoensukmongkol (2015) found that excessive social media usage, especially when employees have to deal with highly demanding work, could positively affect their job performance. Therefore, the organization should allow employees to use social media via computer systems instead of cell phones. Another study observed that social media considerably affected employees’ performance by affecting their skills, productivity, knowledge, and motivation, although organizations should limit this usage to educational purposes (Ashraf & Javed, 2014).

Kishokumar (2016) traced the positive effect of social media usage on employees’ performance and stated that social media had a positive function in distributing shared knowledge and strengthening networked relationships, and consequently increased individuals’ adaptability to environmental changes. According to the findings of these studies, social media could distract users from their main duties, although it could increase their learning ability. Given this premise, the three functions of social media usage for hedonistic, cognitive, and social purposes in job performance are investigated through the mediatory role of social capital.


3.4. Job satisfaction and job performance

As Moqbel points out, attitude could affect performance (Moqbel, 2012); Esmaeili and Seyedzadeh (2016), Shayan et al. (2017), and Bin (2015) have provided evidence demonstrating the positive effect of job satisfaction (an attitudinal variable) on employees’ job performance (a behavioral variable). However, any possible causal relationship between satisfaction and performance cannot be established with certainty; Berghe and Hyung (2011), for instance, observed a weak or fairly small relationship between job satisfaction and employees’ performance, while a causal relationship cannot be taken for granted. Thus, the following hypothesis is proposed in this study:

Fourth hypothesis: Higher rates of job satisfaction could lead to better job performance.

AGiven the second and fourth hypotheses, one could shape an idea about the effect of social media usage on job performance through the mediatory role of employee satisfaction. Therefore, the fifth hypothesis could be stated as follows:
The fifth hypothesis: Job satisfaction mediates the relationship between social media usage and employees’ job performance.

### 3.5. Social media and social capital

Studies in the literature have shown that social media usage can function as a force affecting various dimensions of social capital. For instance, in Kim and Kim’s (2017) study, the effect of college students’ uses of social media on network heterogeneity (interaction with different people with different backgrounds) was investigated, and the relationship between network heterogeneity and the structural dimension (development of both expressive and compositional relationships) and social capital was explored. They found that social media usage was positively related to network heterogeneity, which was positively associated with social capital.

Chen and Li (2017) conducted another study to probe whether mobile social media impacted social capital and psychological well-being. They observed that mobile social media positively affected the structural dimension of social capital. Sun and Shang (2014) investigated the effect of two dimensions of social media (cognitive and social) on three dimensions of social capital (cognitive, relational, and structural) in China. They showed that social media usage could improve social capital, thus positively affecting individuals’ job-related outcomes (Sun & Shang, 2014).

Furthermore, the results of Shane-Simpson et al. (2018) demonstrated that the relationship between privacy settings, self-disclosure, and social capital was different for differences in users’ motivation and affordances of specific social media; more specifically, the participants who preferred Twitter were more likely to have a public profile and tended to disclose their information more, showing more social capital. However, participants who preferred Facebook would disclose their information less, although they had more friendly relationships than Instagram users. Another study revealed that Facebook would involve users in political events, increasing their political awareness (Hosseinpour, 2018). As such, the following hypothesis is stated in this study:

The sixth hypothesis: Social media usage could positively affect users’ social capital.

### 3.6. Social capital, job satisfaction, and job performance

Chamanifard et al’s (2015) research found that social capital, as mediated by job satisfaction, had an indirect effect on job performance; this indirect effect was even more substantial than its direct effect on job performance. Another study clarified that social capital in the workplace
functioned as a mechanism that increased employees’ satisfaction concerning their wages and jobs, ultimately improving organizational commitment (Hauser, 2015). Femina (2016) showed that in advanced countries, social capital in the workplace was positively associated with job satisfaction and physical health in employees, even in the case of financial crises, and could enhance financial performance, too. Of course, these results did not hold in developing countries like Indonesia, where social capital would only increase the levels of job satisfaction and would not affect corporate performance.

Ahmadi and Feyzabadi (2011) revealed that after trust, social capital had a direct association with improved performance, whereas formal networks showed an indirect association with improved performance through trust. Meanwhile, norms of practice had no relationship with improved performance; finally, the results showed a direct relationship between social capital and individuals’ improved performance.

Similarly, Jahangiri et al. (2018) state that social capital sets the ground for teachers’ development and self-actualization, shaping a condition resulting in improved satisfaction with and attitudes toward their jobs. Therefore, the following hypotheses can be formulated:

Seventh hypothesis: Social capital positively affects performance.

Eighth hypothesis: Social capital positively affects employees’ satisfaction.

Given the fourth and eighth hypotheses, the ninth hypothesis could be stated as follows:

The Ninth hypothesis: Job satisfaction mediates the effect of social capital on employees’ performance.

Given the sixth and seventh hypotheses, the tenth hypothesis might be stated as follows:

The tenth hypothesis: Social capital mediates the effect of social media usage on employees’ job performance.

3.7. Technostress and job performance

Researchers have confirmed the negative effects of technostress on job performance (Tagurum et al., 2017; Tarafdar et al., 2015). In a survey conducted on 144 academic staff, Tagurum et al. (2017) concluded that technostress affected the performance of 39.6% of the respondents. In the study of Odoh et al. (2013), it was observed that technostress did not affect the job performance of bank managers in Nigeria. However, the percentage of individuals who showed poor performance under the influence of technostress was still high. This issue must be considered in organizations. Brooks et al. (2017) investigated the effects of five factors causing technostress in employee job performance, showing that all of the factors led to poor
performance; given these observations, the following hypothesis can be stated:

Eleventh hypothesis: High technostress could negatively affect employees’ job performance.

3.8. Technostress caused by social media and job satisfaction

Technostress experienced due to exposure to social media could spread technostress among employees in different ways. In other words, technostress could affect job satisfaction in five ways: techno-uncertainty, techno-insecurity, techno-complexity, techno-invasion, and techno-overload (Qiu, 2013). In Jena’s (2015) investigation, the effect of the five dimensions of technostress on teachers’ job satisfaction was confirmed in India. In another study, Karimi and Nazari (2018) probed into the relationship between technostress and job satisfaction in public librarians in Ahwaz, Iran; they found a negative relationship between the five dimensions of technostress and job satisfaction in the sample under study, while techno-complexity proved to be the best predictor of job satisfaction.

Kumar et al. (2013) explored the relationship between technostress, job satisfaction, and commitment among IT experts, concluding that technostress was negatively associated with job satisfaction and employee commitment. They also stated that technostress management depended on how the individual would interpret technology changes s/he received and that collaboration in work could minimize the problems. Furthermore, in empirical research, Khan et al. (2013) surveyed the relationship between technostress and job satisfaction in KPK university libraries in Pakistan. Results unveiled a negative relationship between three dimensions of technostress (techno-uncertainty, techno-invasion, and techno-overload) and job satisfaction. However, techno-uncertainty left a stronger effect than the other dimensions. Given these discussions, one could argue that technostress would leave a negative impact on job satisfaction, and on this basis, the following hypothesis could be formulated:

Twelfth hypothesis: The factors causing technostress negatively affect employees’ job satisfaction.

As such, the fourth and eleventh hypotheses could help to justify the thirteenth hypothesis:

Thirteenth hypothesis: Job satisfaction mediates the effect of technostress on job performance.

Based on the first and eleventh hypotheses, one could raise the fourth hypothesis:

Fourth hypothesis: Technostress mediates the effect of social media on job performance.
In summary, according to the studies cited, the research model includes five factors: social media usage, technostress, social capital, job satisfaction, and job performance. The premise is that social media usage directly affects employees' technostress, social capital, job satisfaction, and job performance. Additionally, technostress, social capital, and job satisfaction may indirectly mediate the relationship between social media usage and job performance, considering the different dimensions of routine and innovative job performance and potential specific relationships among these variables. Given the discussions and hypotheses proposed in the above sections, the conceptual model in this study is constructed as in Figure 1.

![Figure 1. The conceptual model of the study](image-url)

4. Methodology

This study was a descriptive, cross-sectional survey that followed applied purposes, as it sought to make organizational managers aware of the effects of social media on their employees' satisfaction and performance. The population included 227 employees of the stationary district of Fars Regional Electric Company, Shiraz, Iran. The data were gathered through questionnaires based on the random sampling method; given an estimated population variance, 107 individuals...
were selected as the respondents. The scales used to measure the constructs and variables were extracted from the literature. More specifically, in the first section of the questionnaire, researchers used the scale developed by Ali-Hassan et al. (2015) to measure the type of social media usage, as they have been interested in assessing cognitive, hedonic, and social uses, which included 12 items measured according to a five-point Likert scale. In the second part, to measure technostress, the scales constructed by Qiu (2013) and Brooks et al. (2014) were used, which involved 19 items measured according to a five-point Likert scale.

In the third section of the questionnaire, to measure job satisfaction, the scales proposed by Qiu (2013) were utilized in which 4 items were measured through a five-point Likert scale. The items in this scale included questions such as “How much are you satisfied with YYY?” This measurement approach was used because it was compatible with the goals of this. In the fourth section, the scales suggested by Ali-Hassan et al. (2015) were used to measure routine and innovative types of job performance; in this case, too, the respondents answered 9 questions based on a 5-point Likert scale (Ali-Hassan et al., 2015). This method was used in the study because, in modern economics, there are few jobs from which data could be collected through objective instruments. However, popular belief suggests that objective instruments are the best tools for measuring personnel performance, although they are tough to conceptualize and operationalize (Pransky et al., 2006).

In the final section of the questionnaire, to measure the three dimensions of social capital, Ali-Hassan et al. (2015) proposed construction was used, which included 15 items measured according to a 5-point Likert scale (ranging from “Totally Disagree” to “Totally Agree”). Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was used to assess the questionnaire's validity, and Cronbach's alpha was computed to gauge its reliability (refer to Table 1). Given the values observed for the variables and the dimensions (greater than 0.6), the questionnaire showed a good reliability rate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Cronbach’s alpha</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Cronbach’s alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>Social use</td>
<td>2.162</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>3.474</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>Cognitive use</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Routine Job Performance</td>
<td>3.555</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>Hedonistic use</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Innovative Job Performance</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>Techno-overload</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>Structural Social Capital</td>
<td>3.150</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.986</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Expressive Network)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>Techno-invasion</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>Structural Social Capital</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Instrumental Network)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>Techno-complexity</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Cognitive Capital</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>Techno-insecurity</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Relational Capital</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td>Techno-uncertainty</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Cronbach’s alpha coefficients of the model variables
5. Findings

5.1. Statistical inference of the hypotheses

5.1.1. Model fitting: The measurement model

Before the model's structural equations were constructed, the validity of the measurement tool of the research was confirmed through CFA. Convergent and divergent validity were employed to confirm the validity of the model construct. All question factor load values (except question 23) were greater than 0.5 and significant. Question 23, considering its high AVE index value and the significance of its factor load, stayed in the process, and as such, the convergent validity of the measurement was confirmed, too. Divergent validity was calculated via the correlation matrix, which showed the correlation between the dimensions in the main model. As this matrix revealed, the correlation between all 14 dimensions in the model was less than 0.9, which showed no overlap between the dimensions; as such, divergent validity was confirmed too. Because both convergent and divergent validity were already confirmed, construct validity was also confirmed. Table 2 shows the results of CFA for the items, and Table 3 reports the correlation matrix of the model dimensions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Factor loading</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Result</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Factor loading</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>0.810</td>
<td>23.887</td>
<td>confirm</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0.843</td>
<td>21.849</td>
<td>Confirm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>0.803</td>
<td>19.235</td>
<td>confirm</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0.865</td>
<td>24.436</td>
<td>Confirm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>0.912</td>
<td>64.137</td>
<td>confirm</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0.920</td>
<td>63.632</td>
<td>Confirm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>0.870</td>
<td>32.925</td>
<td>confirm</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0.791</td>
<td>11.125</td>
<td>Confirm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>0.859</td>
<td>34.763</td>
<td>confirm</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0.867</td>
<td>31.003</td>
<td>Confirm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>0.874</td>
<td>35.038</td>
<td>confirm</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0.897</td>
<td>30.655</td>
<td>Confirm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>0.918</td>
<td>58.162</td>
<td>confirm</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0.916</td>
<td>45.001</td>
<td>confirm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td>0.854</td>
<td>27.133</td>
<td>confirm</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0.906</td>
<td>49.299</td>
<td>confirm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td>0.922</td>
<td>56.281</td>
<td>confirm</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0.845</td>
<td>25.334</td>
<td>confirm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.843</td>
<td>16.405</td>
<td>confirm</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0.805</td>
<td>11.599</td>
<td>confirm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.930</td>
<td>63.211</td>
<td>confirm</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0.824</td>
<td>32.560</td>
<td>confirm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.913</td>
<td>61.026</td>
<td>confirm</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0.813</td>
<td>15.642</td>
<td>confirm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.859</td>
<td>24.606</td>
<td>confirm</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>0.808</td>
<td>18.848</td>
<td>confirm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.867</td>
<td>27.402</td>
<td>confirm</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>0.851</td>
<td>14.428</td>
<td>confirm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.815</td>
<td>18.364</td>
<td>confirm</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0.860</td>
<td>34.122</td>
<td>confirm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.765</td>
<td>13.554</td>
<td>confirm</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>0.868</td>
<td>21.621</td>
<td>confirm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.825</td>
<td>19.563</td>
<td>confirm</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>0.858</td>
<td>20.824</td>
<td>confirm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.701</td>
<td>10.900</td>
<td>confirm</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>0.886</td>
<td>41.191</td>
<td>confirm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.810</td>
<td>18.629</td>
<td>confirm</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>0.869</td>
<td>37.378</td>
<td>confirm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.890</td>
<td>34.550</td>
<td>confirm</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.855</td>
<td>34.707</td>
<td>confirm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.770</td>
<td>11.370</td>
<td>confirm</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>0.785</td>
<td>14.096</td>
<td>confirm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.782</td>
<td>15.252</td>
<td>confirm</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>0.821</td>
<td>16.855</td>
<td>confirm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>0.479</td>
<td>3.526</td>
<td>confirm</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>0.902</td>
<td>32.020</td>
<td>confirm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.612</td>
<td>5.278</td>
<td>confirm</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>0.891</td>
<td>21.277</td>
<td>confirm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.523</td>
<td>5.117</td>
<td>confirm</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>0.853</td>
<td>31.688</td>
<td>confirm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.837</td>
<td>26.476</td>
<td>confirm</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>0.825</td>
<td>22.918</td>
<td>confirm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>0.831</td>
<td>23.229</td>
<td>confirm</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>0.722</td>
<td>8.378</td>
<td>confirm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>0.758</td>
<td>16.350</td>
<td>confirm</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>0.886</td>
<td>33.767</td>
<td>confirm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>0.844</td>
<td>23.871</td>
<td>confirm</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>0.847</td>
<td>19.532</td>
<td>confirm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.846</td>
<td>23.11</td>
<td>confirm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3. Correlation matrix of the major dimensions in the research model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>01</th>
<th>02</th>
<th>03</th>
<th>04</th>
<th>05</th>
<th>06</th>
<th>07</th>
<th>08</th>
<th>09</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>-0.34</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.1.2. Model fitting: The structural model

Figure 2 illustrates the estimated structural model of the study. Based on the coefficient of determination of the fitting model, approximately 50% of the employees’ performance was affected by social media usage, technostress, satisfaction, and social capital, and the rest of the effect was left by other factors not incorporated into the model. Furthermore, 34% of the variance in technostress was influenced by social media usage, whereas the remaining 66% was caused by other factors not included in the model. As Figure 2 depicts, 34% of the variance in job satisfaction could be accounted for through technostress, social capital, and social media usage. However, the remaining 66% was influenced by other factors considered in this study. Finally, only 3% of the employees’ social capital could be explained by social media usage, and other factors beyond the scope of this investigation caused the rest of the effect.
5.2. Exploring the hypotheses

The student's t-test distribution was used to confirm or reject the hypotheses; a hypothesis at the 0.05 error level would be confirmed if the t-value were more significant than 1.96. The effect of social media on technostress in the first hypothesis was confirmed because, as Figure 2 and Table 4 show, the t-value in this hypothesis was 7.16, which is more significant than 1.96. It showed that this hypothesis was confirmed at the 95% level of confidence; moreover, given the positive value of the regression coefficient (0.584), it could be concluded that the relationship was positive.

In the second hypothesis, the effect of social media usage on job performance was rejected because, as Table 4 shows, the t-statistic in the hypothesis at the 0.05 significance level was 0.498, which was less than 1.96. This calculation showed that, at the 95% confidence level, social media did not affect performance in the sample under investigation. The third hypothesis addressed the effect of social media on job satisfaction; as Figure 2 and Table 4 show, the regression coefficient was 0.035, and the t-statistic was 0.292, a figure less than 1.96 at the 0.05 level. It suggested that, at the 95% level of confidence, in the sample under investigation, social media usage was effectless on employees’ job satisfaction. The fourth hypothesis concerned job satisfaction's impact on employees’ performance. As Figure 2 and Table 4 reveal, the path coefficient was 0.444, and the statistic was 4.375, which was significant at the 0.05 level. As a result, it could be stated that job satisfaction positively affected the employees’ performance (given the positive value of the regression coefficient).
The fifth hypothesis addressed the mediation effect of job satisfaction on the relationship between social media and job performance; the indirect effect value was 0.0155 (see Figure 2 and Table 4) at the 0.05 significance level, which was an insignificant value. As a result, this hypothesis was rejected at the 95% confidence level. The sixth hypothesis dealt with the effect of social media on social capital; the path coefficient was 0.176, and the t-statistic was 2.545, which was more significant than 1.96 at the 0.05 significance level. Thus, it could be concluded that this path coefficient was significant at the 0.05 error level. Social media then affected the social capital of the employees at the 95% confidence level, and given the regression coefficient, the effect was positive.

Effect of social capital on job performance; as the values in Figure 2 and Table 4 show, the regression coefficient was 0.340, and the t-statistic was 3.625. As such, the t-statistic value was more significant than 1.96 at the 0.05 significance level. The seventh hypothesis was then confirmed at the 95% confidence level. Moreover, considering the positive value of the path coefficient, social capital positively affected performance. The eighth hypothesis explored the effect of social capital on job satisfaction; given the data in Figure 2 and Table 4, the t-statistic value was 8.030, more significant than 1.96 at the 0.05 significance level. It could then be concluded that the path coefficient of this hypothesis was significant at the 0.05 significance level. That is, the effect of social capital on the employees’ job satisfaction in the eighth hypothesis was significant at the 95% confidence level, and the relationship was positive given the regression coefficient (0.579). The effect of job satisfaction as the mediator variable in the relationship between social capital and job performance showed an indirect effect value of 0.257.

Considering the significant coefficients of the variables in the direct relationship (at the 0.05 level), one could conclude that the ninth hypothesis could be confirmed due to the mediation of job satisfaction in the relationship between social capital and job performance. The tenth hypothesis addressed the effect of the mediator variable social capital on the relationship between social media and job performance. At the 0.05 level of significance, there was an indirect effect of 0.0598, and considering the significant values of the variables’ coefficients in the direct relationship (at the 0.05 level), it could be concluded that the eighth hypothesis was confirmed, too. The eleventh hypothesis was concerned with the effect of technostress on job performance, with a path coefficient of 0.022. This hypothesis was rejected because the coefficient of significance value was less than 1.96 at the 0.05 significance level; therefore, technostress did not affect the employees’ job performance at the 95% confidence level.
Effect of technostress on job satisfaction; the path coefficient was 0.034. Table 4 shows that the t-statistic value was 0.048, less than 1.96 at the 0.05 significance level. Thus, this hypothesis was rejected at the 95% confidence level, and that technostress did not affect job satisfaction. In investigating the mediatory effect of job satisfaction on the relationship between technostress and job performance (as reported in Table 4 and Figure 2), the indirect effect was 0.015 at the 0.05 level, and the t-statistic was less than 1.96. As a result, this hypothesis was rejected, meaning that job satisfaction, as a mediator variable, did not affect the relationship between technostress and job performance. Finally, the mediating role of technostress in the relationship between social media and job performance was rejected with an indirect effect of 0.0286 at the 0.05 level. Given Table 4, the t-statistic was less than 1.96. Therefore, the fourteenth hypothesis dealing with the mediator effect of technostress on the relationship between social media and job performance was rejected at the 95% confidence level.

Table 4. Regression coefficients and the significance of the hypotheses tested

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Path</th>
<th>Regression</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Social media → technostress</td>
<td>0.584</td>
<td>7.160</td>
<td>Confirm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Social media → job performance</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>0.498</td>
<td>Reject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Social media → job satisfaction</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>0.292</td>
<td>Reject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Job satisfaction → job performance</td>
<td>0.444</td>
<td>4.375</td>
<td>Confirm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Social media → job satisfaction → job performance</td>
<td>0.0155</td>
<td>t&lt;1.96</td>
<td>Reject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Social media → social capital</td>
<td>0.176</td>
<td>2.545</td>
<td>Confirm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Social capital → job performance</td>
<td>0.340</td>
<td>3.625</td>
<td>Confirm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Social capital → job satisfaction</td>
<td>0.579</td>
<td>8.030</td>
<td>Confirm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Social capital → job satisfaction → job performance</td>
<td>0.257</td>
<td>1.96&gt;t</td>
<td>Confirm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Social media → social capital → job performance</td>
<td>0.0598</td>
<td>1.96&gt;t</td>
<td>Confirm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Technostress → job performance</td>
<td>-0.049</td>
<td>0.474</td>
<td>Reject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Technostress → job satisfaction</td>
<td>0.034</td>
<td>0.250</td>
<td>Reject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Technostress → job satisfaction → job performance</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>1.96&gt;t</td>
<td>Reject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Social media → technostress → job performance</td>
<td>-0.0286</td>
<td>t&gt;1.96</td>
<td>Reject</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Conclusion

The development of social media has affected all dimensions of peoples’ lives, including their personal lifestyle and work environment. Social media has facilitated knowledge sharing and the functioning of jobs while providing a source of entertainment and developing social relationships for individuals. Given such effects, many researchers believe that social media usage could harm the workplace. Technostress has been recognized as a negative dimension of social media usage. Although many studies have shown its damaging effects on employees’ performance and satisfaction, investigations into this phenomenon have remained underdeveloped.
Furthermore, research still needs to consider simultaneously the positive effects of social media usage (e.g., its effects on social capital) and its negative effects (e.g., technostress). This study sought to investigate the effect of social media usage on a sample of employees’ technostress, satisfaction, performance, and social capital. The findings showed that social media could lead to technostress (according to the first hypothesis), although the effects of social media on job performance (based on the second hypothesis) and job satisfaction (refer to the third hypothesis) were rejected; such observations, of course, clashed with the findings in the literature (Al-Ansari & Al-share, 2019; Abilleira et al., 2021; Mak et al., 2018). The reason these hypotheses were rejected, as Table 4 shows, might be the low means of social media usage of Fars Regional Electric Company employees. Due to security infrastructure reasons, access to social media is highly restricted within the company, and employees mostly use internal networks. The fourth hypothesis was confirmed, addressing the relationship between job satisfaction and the employees’ performance. This finding was compatible with the observations of Moqbel (2012), Esmaeili and Seyedzadeh (2016), Shayan et al. (2017), and Bin (2015).

Furthermore, according to hypothesis no. 6, social media usage increased the employees’ level of social capital. This variable left a positive effect on the employees’ performance (based on hypothesis no. 7) and satisfaction (according to hypothesis no. 8). These observations, too, confirmed the findings of Hauser (2015), Femina (2015), Ahmadi and Feyzabadi (2011), and Jahangiri et al. (2018). Moreover, the effect of technostress on the employees’ performance (based on hypothesis no. 11) and satisfaction (according to hypothesis no. 12) was rejected, which was an observation that clashes with the findings of most researchers, such as Tagurum et al. (2017) and Jena (2015); The reason for this difference might be the mediation level of technostress in the sample under investigation. It means that the company's techno-stress level is not so high as to cause problems for their job performance or employee job satisfaction. Finally, the mediatory effect of job satisfaction on the relationship between social media and job performance (according to hypothesis no. 5) and the mediation effect of technostress on the relationship between social media and job performance (based on hypothesis no. 14) were insignificant. Given the lack of a significant relationship, it is normal statistically.

Meanwhile, the mediation effect of job satisfaction on the relationship between social capital and job performance (refer to hypothesis no. 9) and the mediation effect of social capital on the relationship between social media and job performance (according to hypothesis no. 10) were confirmed. It means that, on the one hand, using social media enhances organizational social
capital. On the other hand, "social capital" increases employee job satisfaction, positively affecting employee job performance.

Based on the findings, recommendations for practitioners may include implementing targeted training and support programs to assist employees in managing technostress associated with social media usage. Managers could provide training and education on the effective use of social media for professional networking and relationship building, thereby enabling employees to utilize social media to enhance their social capital rather than causing stress. Additionally, consideration of job characteristics and their potential effect on employees' experiences with social media usage and its effects is advised. Managers are encouraged to foster a work culture that values face-to-face interactions and relationship-building activities, promoting organizational social through team-building exercises and mentorship programs. Furthermore, it is recommended that resources and support be provided to help employees balance the positive and negative aspects of social media usage in the workplace. It may involve offering mindfulness training, stress management workshops, and access to mental health support services to assist employees in coping with technostress related to social media usage.

This research helps the literature on the effects of social media use and opens up some attractive possibilities for more study. Specifically, this study empirically shows the mediating effects of job satisfaction on social media-induced technostress, social capital, and job performance. Future research should explore more variables, such as job characteristics mediating or moderating social media-induced technostress and social media-induced social capital. Also, multi-job characteristics studies can be done with personnel of different characteristics. Moreover, an overall assumption of this study is that social media usage is sometimes negative and sometimes positive. Future research should explore the positive aspects of social media usage induced by social capital and the negative aspects of social media usage induced by technostress. Finally, the personnel’s social media usage-related technostress level can be investigated with those who do not. This study also has several limitations. One of the primary limitations arises from the sampling strategy. While much care was taken on the survey description, the survey design, and cleaning the data, it is possible that employees were able to respond who did not use social media usage. As of the time of the data collection, researchers needed a way to filter respondents by job characteristics. Targeted sampling can be used in future studies to overcome this problem. Second, this research provides subjective measures of job performance and another critical variable.
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