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Abstract

In recent years, using social networks, in particular Facebook, has spread a lot in developing countries; therefore, it is quite important to pay attention to the factors, influential on accepting these technologies by users from these countries. This research aims to investigate the factors effecting Facebook acceptance by Iranian users from TAM and user experience perspective. 406 Iranian Facebook users are surveyed thorough a questionnaire and SEM and PLS software are used to analyze the gathered data. The results show the perceived usefulness as well as users’ experience effect the users’ attitude toward Facebook and their intention to reuse Facebook; the perceived ease of use has a positive impact on perceived usefulness, while it has no effect on the intention to reuse. Users’ experience of Facebook has a positive effect on the perceived usefulness; moreover, there is a positive and meaningful relation between the users’ attitude and their intention to reuse Facebook.
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1. Introduction

In recent years, information technologies have expanded greatly into social communication fields. The influence of social networks into humans’ mundane life is an example for this. Social networks’ services to millions of people have spread throughout the globe [2, 76, 38]. For instance, millions of people have been in Friend star since 2003; Myspace had more than 300 million users in early 2008 and Facebook has more beyond 13 million users, including almost 85% of American students [39]. Thus it is quite important to know the influential factors on accepting such technologies and social networks.

Having spread its influence among different users of various countries, Facebook has managed to attract a good number of users. Factors for users’ accepting Facebook can be included in the ease of its use, its usefulness [22, 320] and fame [30]. Another set of factors are those, connected with the user, himself, including the user’s gender [18], education [30], self-esteem, and life satisfaction [72]. There are yet other factors that involve the user’s social environment; an essential feature of many social networks is their tendency towards transitivity [70]; therefore, the third set of influential factors on the acceptance of technology could be the pressure from friends, family, and reference groups [79]. One of the famous models in the perspective of Intelligence Systems (IS) is the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM), which can be utilized to understand the influential factors on Facebook acceptance.

Accepting and using Information Technology (IT) is an issue that has attracted the researchers’ and experts’ attention in recent years [37, 77] for which access to the intended level of IT use is a key criterion of successful performance [21]. There are many theoretical perspectives on accepting new technology in the field of intelligence systems, among which the technology acceptance model is the most influential and popular one to describe an individual’s acceptance of an intelligence system [40, 11, 26, 44].

TAM overlaps both the Theory of Reasoned Action (TRA) and the Theory of Planned Behavior (TPB), where the effects of mental attitude and norms in reasoned action along with mental attitude and norms and its perceived behavior control in planned behavior are substituted with the two variants of ease and perceived usefulness; having a better performance in many studies when explaining the variance of these two hypotheses [3]. TAM shows the causal relation among belief-attitude-behavior will to predict and accept the technology among potential users. Two beliefs have been utilized in this model in terms of new technology, namely perceived usefulness and perceived ease of use in order to shape the individual’s attitude towards using that assumed technology and this attitude, itself, determines the purpose of using that technology [28].

TAM is proven to be the most influential model to predict user’s acceptance and use behavior within intelligence systems’ literature [11], having attracted much attention in recent researches, particularly in the fields of management and intelligence systems, also being evaluated in various contexts of IT use, such as M-learning [29], E-learning [20, 64, 59], E-commerce [60, 53], E-banking [62], distant medical technology [28], etc. All the same, theoretical validity and scientific use of this model still needs to expand more among various technologies, users, and
organizational contexts [40]. Social networking sites are also another type of virtual society, the popularity of which has increased significantly during the past years. Web traffic data for Facebook, which is a social networking site with tendency towards students, show 15 million particular viewers in USA for each month. As a matter of fact Facebook is a social networking site that began with emphasis on the students, now to include high schools and other organizations as well [17]. Facebook is the most popular social networking site, having 500 million users in June, 2010, having attracted 100 million new users by February of the same year [5]. Hence due to the excessive mass of its viewers, surveying the influential factors of Facebook acceptance and continuity of its use becomes an important issue.

Experiential marketing of science and art is the interaction of the customers with deep experiences of the product, indicating the real experiences of the consumers with the trade name, product, and services that result in sale and increase in the image and awareness of the brand [58]. Experiential marketing focuses on customer’s experiences, including sense, feel, think, act, and relate experiences; therefore, the consumers are called the emotional decision makers [25]. Experiential marketing factors can affect the components of TAM, adjusting technology acceptance. Experiences are appropriate to shape the users’ attitude, emotional states, and behavior [8]. Pleasant or unpleasant experience of the website might have an influence on acceptance or rejection.

Up to 2006, Facebook was essentially limited to users with academic email addresses. But in September 2006, it allowed non-academic users to sign up, which resulted in fast growth in the number of users along with virus-like expansion in non-educational; organizations [32]. Statistics show that among undergraduate students in USA, 94% were Facebook members and were online in the website for 10 to 30 minutes daily [5]. Moreover, Yazdekhasti et al. (2013) have stated that despite existing prohibitions in Iran on not using the website, statistics show that considerable number of Iranian users is in virtual social networks; according to the statistics Facebook is one of the 10 best websites, used by the Iranians [83]. Hence the evidence raises this question: which factors motivate Iranian users accept Facebook? So this research aims to survey the influential factors of accepting this social network in the perspective of TAM and to study the relation between acceptance, artificial behavior, and the experience of the Facebook users of the website based on the theory of “experiential marketing” from the perspective “sense experience”, “feel experience”, “think experience”, “act experience”, and “relate experience”.

2. Theoretical Bases
2.1 Technology Acceptance Model

To understand the reason behind acceptance or rejection of computer systems by people is one of the challenging issues in researches, related to intelligence systems [54]. Accepting or adjusting to IT has attracted considerable attention in the recent decade with many theoretical models proposed to explain the final users’ acceptance behavior [51]. Researchers and experts are very interested in understanding people’s resistance to use computers, thus they developed better methods to design technology, evaluate the systems, and predict the way users will respond to new technologies [56]. Meanwhile it is believed that TAM is the strongest, most economical, and
most influential model to explain the adjusting behavior of IT/IS [49]. First proposed by Davis et al. (1989) as a tool to predict the possibility of accepting a new technology in a group or organization [74, 75], it was developed in accordance with an agreement with IBM, Canada in mid-1980 in order to evaluate the market’s potentiality for various types of appearing personal computers, based on useful programs in multimedia, picture processing, and calculations based on pen as a guideline for investment in new product investment [11].

TAM is adapted from Theory of Reasoned Action by Ajzen and Fishbein (1980) [44, 74], which is a model that is widely used in social psychology in terms of surveying the aware behavior purposes. Fig. 1 shows its function. Based on this model, the attitude to a behavior is determined by behavioral beliefs on the consequences of the behavior (based on the existing information or the presented one to the individual), as well as the effective evaluation of these consequences in individual level. Beliefs are defined as the possibility of individual estimation of the fact that having a specific behavior will lead into a specific result [74]. To put it more simply, individual’s action in a specific behavior is determined by his individual purpose for having that behavior; and behavioral purpose is also mutually determined by specific attitude and mental norms [52, 37].

Davies (1989) used Reasoned Action Model, which particularly meant the explanation of the behavior of using the computer, to develop TAM. The latter substituted attitude factors of reasoned action with two significant variants of perceived ease and usefulness [3]. Like reasoned action, TAM is theorized based on the fact that real use of computer is determined by behavioral intention; yet it differs in believing that intention is mutually determined by attitude to use and perceived usefulness. Furthermore, attitude to computer is mutually determined by perceived usefulness and ease [38]. Fig. 2 demonstrates TAM.

Therefore, TAM differs from TRA in two key methods: 1) It regards perceived usefulness and ease as two variants or external beliefs that determine the attitude to IT, intention to use, and real use; therefore, it is not needed to fit TAM with any behavior as long as that behavior is related to IT use. 2) TAM does not include mental norms structure in reasoned action. Mental norms are considered to measure the intention to have a specific behavior in TRA, whereas they are of no account to TAM [15].

Fig. 1 (TRA) Reasoned action model [37]
TAM hypothesizes that the two specific behavioral beliefs, perceived usefulness and perceived ease of use, are the two essential factors to predict the user’s acceptance [36], in which external factors are adjusted in user’s intention via these two key beliefs [33, 29]. Davies defines the perceived ease of use as “the amount to which an individual believes that using a specific system will be without endeavor” [11]. Also perceived usefulness is termed as “the degree an individual believes that using a particular system can improve his work performance” [65]. This model assumes that both the perceived ease of use and perceived usefulness are related to using the system, a relation that somehow explains why people accept or reject an information technology [26]. Perceived ease of use affects perceived usefulness both directly and indirectly [9].

As a great model, TAM hypothesizes that real use of a system is under the influence of behavioral intentions; in accepting intelligence systems, behavioral intention is defined as “the amount to which an individual formulates a conscious program to have or not to have some specific behaviors in the future” [41]. Behavioral intentions are influenced by the attitude to using the system; Lancaster (1966) termed attitude as the initiator of appropriateness with consumer traits; Trindes (1979) defined attitude as an individual’s positive or negative behavior to getting adjusted to innovation [31]. And finally this model believes that system’s perceived usefulness and ease of use affect the attitude to system’s function [11, 18].

To put it in a nutshell, this theory says that an individual’s behavior as well as his behavioral intention is a function of the individual’s attitude towards behavior and his understanding of the behavior; therefore, behavior is a function of attitude and belief [43]. In fact Davies proposed TAM based on the relation among belief-attitude-intention-behavior in order to explain and predict user’s acceptance of an intelligence system [68]. Experiential evidence show successful prediction of this model in terms of using an IS in 40% of the cases [74].

### 2.2 User’s Experience

Recently companies have moved from traditional advantages and features of marketing towards experiences for their customers [66, 27]. Even though consumers' needs and requirements are different, getting some positive or negative experiences is an inevitable result of consuming
products and services they purchase. Experience or more particularly, consumption experience indicates "a set of customer consequences from the mixture of the environment as well as purchased products and services" [80]. More than focusing on performances and advantages of a product, people are influenced by experiences and the environment in which they spend time [7]. The concept of customer experience first appeared in mid-1980s, simultaneous with the literature of the consumer, hypothesizing the consumers as prudent decision makers; the new experiential approach is a primary offered a primary perspective to the literature of consumer behavior, reconsidering the importance of different variants, ignored so far. "The role of feeling in behavior in using a product is the fact that the consumers feel as well as they think and act, and their role when they choose a brand is beyond when they buy" [19].

Experiential marketing is a kind of marketing which is the result of emotional relation with a brand, a product, or an individual, and is a new concept in the age of marketing. Traditional marketing techniques, such as service to the customers, special events, product promotions, and public relation, are connected to the public in terms of feeling [67]. Experiential marketing is a new method in marketing that considers its focuses more on inductive experiences, eventually leading into the sale for which the marketers should be after stimulating five test areas of sense, feel, think, act, and relate [25]. Also experiential marketing is also called the experience-customer marketing which connects potential customers to the brand by means of various techniques of promotion [67].

Schmitt (1999) claims that one of the reasons of change towards experiential marketing is the thorough presence of IT in people’s lives. Nowadays businesses are increasingly directed by IT development. Information revolution does not merely mean speed improvement but mainly indicates “information superhighway”. Also Schmitt says that it is quite imaginable that after some years the consumers will significantly use smaller and cheaper computer devices that combine cell phones, TV, and audio equipment with their access to anything real or anywhere virtual around the world [66].

In experiential marketing, “sense” is given to the visual and aural experience, offered by a website for the consumer, mainly when he easily surfs the website. “Feel” is the consumers’ mental experience while “think” is the zeal and excitement that makes the experience, causing the consumers to think [47]. “Act” refers to physical experiences as well entire living way and “relate” is the experiences of social identity, related to a reference group or the culture, itself [27].

3. Research Hypotheses
   3.1 Perceived Usefulness, perceived Ease of Use and Attitude

Developing motivational factors in perceived usefulness and perceived ease of use, thus helping to improve users’ attitude toward use, so If that users understand the usefulness and ease of use they will have a positive attitude toward using (Ke et al, 2012). Hu et al. (1999) who studied the acceptance rate of remote medical technology by physicians by means of TAM, concluded that the ease of use cannot be an important determining factor to shape the attitude and have regarded
perceived usefulness as an important factor to determine the attitude [28]. In the research, carried out by Davies in 1993 on influential factors of users’ IT acceptance, results showed a positive and meaningful relation between perceived usefulness and attitude also Davies in his research reached the small but meaningful relation between perceived usefulness and attitude [13]. On the other hand, Moon and Kim (2001) in their study on TAM within World Wide Web (WWW), reached a positive and meaningful relation between perceived ease and attitude towards this network, Moreover they have emphasized the positive relation between perceived usefulness and attitude [55]. Read et al. (2011) surveyed TAM with emotional attachment and their findings showed positive relation between perceived usefulness and attitude also reached a positive relation between perceived ease of use and attitude in their research [63]. What is more, Legris et al. (2003) studied the reasons behind accepting information technology by individuals, with their results showing a weak relation between the perceived ease of use of these technologies and the attitude towards them [45]. Many former researches claimed the perceived ease of use and usefulness as an important factor, influential on user’s acceptance and using behavior of IT [77]. Therefore the hypothesis is mentioned as below:

**First Hypothesis:** There is a positive and meaningful relation between Facebook users’ perceived usefulness and their attitude to using the website.

**Second Hypothesis:** There is a positive and meaningful relation between Facebook users’ perceived ease of use and their attitude towards using the website.

### 3.2 Perceived Ease of Use and Perceived Usefulness

In their research, Li and Huang (2009) studied the influence of perceived risk on TAM. They called perceived usefulness and ease as individual’s mental judgment in terms of a particular system’s usefulness and ease. Perceived usefulness and ease are two separate structures while they are simultaneously interrelated. Testing the hypotheses of this research shows positive and meaningful relation between perceived usefulness as well as ease of use [46]. Choanget al. (2010) in their research say that unlike online societies, formed by many functions and uses in the Internet like messages with posted photos or exchanging the information with others. In case of new technologies, requiring skills or at least some time to get familiar with, ease of use can affect the perceived usefulness. Therefore, about users who are currently familiar with many functions and tools of the Internet, perceived ease of use cannot be an important factor for perceived usefulness [10]. Results from the research by Yusefet al. (2010) show positive relation between perceived ease of use and usefulness [81]. Additionally, other researchers have proven the positive relation between perceived ease and usefulness such as Hijden (2000) [23] and Seepo (2004) [69]. Based on these assumptions:

**Third Hypothesis:** Facebook’s perceived ease of use has a positive and meaningful relation with perceived usefulness of its users.

### 3.3 Attitude and Behavioral Intention to Use

Taylor and Tud (1995) studied TAMs in order to compare the theories of planned behavior in terms of their role to perceive IT advantages. It was realized in this survey that attitude cannot be an important determining factor in behavioral intention [73]. Husslo and Lo (2004) carried out a research that studied the influential factors of people’s acceptance of online games on the positive
and strong relation between attitude and behavioral intention to use [26]. The research by Jahangir and Beigom (2008) asserted the positive and meaningful relation between attitude and behavioral intention to adjust to E-banking systems [31]. Furthermore, in a research by Park (2009), results showed positive and meaningful relation between attitude and behavioral intention to use [59] which was also confirmed in the research by Read et al. (2011) [63]. This can be indicated that when Facebook users perceive that website application services are drawing card, their evaluations and intentions to use will be improved (Chang et al, 2014).

Other researchers have also asserted the positive relation between attitude and behavioral intention to use, among whom one can mention the researches by Carhanam Strub, and Chervani [35], Lioran and Lin [50], and Chau and Ho [6]. Therefore the fourth hypothesis is as follows:

**Fourth Hypothesis:** There is a positive and meaningful relation between Facebook users’ attitude and their behavioral intention to use the website.

### 3.4 Perceived Usefulness and Intention to Use

Li and Huang (2009) have claimed that in TAM, perceived usefulness is the main belief factor and perceived ease of use is a second factor to determine behavioral intentions to use an information technology; also the results confirmed a positive relation between perceived usefulness and intention to use [46]. In their article, entitled “The Influence of E-Banking Acceptance” Sah and Han (2002) reached the positive relation between perceived usefulness and intention to use [71]. Moreover, Yusef et al. (2010) and Dang et al. (2005) affirmed positive relation between perceived usefulness and intention to use in their studies [81, 14]; nonetheless, the research by Brett Rend and Bochard (2008) did not show a significant relation between the two [4], therefore:

**Fifth Hypothesis:** There is a positive and meaningful relation between perceived usefulness of Facebook and the intention to use it by the users.

### 3.5 User’s Experience and Perceived Usefulness

Increasing experience affects perceived usefulness of a technology in time [9]. Lin et al. (2009) mentioned that perceiving the user’s experience has a direct influence on perceived value [48] and Otto and Ritchi (1996) divided the consumers into sentimental or rational, claiming that in both groups the experiences of the consumer are affective to the user’s perceived usefulness [57]. Zho and Lai (2009) in their studies on the impact of marketing’s intelligence on customers’ experienced value, claimed that customers develop their perception of experiential value through sense, feel, act, think, and relate experiences; furthermore, results from this research show a positive and direct relation between customer’s experience and perceived value [82], thus based on the evidence, the following hypothesis can be given:

**Sixth Hypothesis:** Users’ experience of Facebook has a positive and meaningful relation with their perceived usefulness of the website.
3.6 User’s Experience and Attitude

Attitudes are the result of gained experiences and experience of using Facebook over time makes people more self-disclosing private information about themselves (Chen & Sharma, 2013). Dalbeck and Chibet (2013) regarded experiences as a piece of information that transfers symbolic and experiential advantages and can affect consumers’ attitude to the market name. Also their research’s results emphasized the positive relation between experience and attitude [16]. Faam (2004) points at the positive relation between sense and feel experiences as well as attitude [61], thus the research hypothesis is posed as follows:

**Seventh Hypothesis**: There is a positive and meaningful relation between users’ experience of Facebook and their attitude to using it.

3.7 User’s Experience and Intention to Use

Increasing the experience during the period of time affects users’ behavioral intentions in terms of using a technology [9]. Hontana and Anandia (2010) concluded in their research that experiential marketing has a very great effect on customers’ satisfaction and behavioral intentions [25]. Hesso and Tesso (2011) studied customer experience in weblog environment, saying that while the customers get experience in weblogs, their behavioral intention increases [27]. Josephine and Lio (2007) studied experiential marketing in cyberspace; in this research behavioral intention divided into two dimensions of intention to search online and intention to buy online. Results showed that the factors of experiential marketing in cyberspace have a positive effect on both online behavioral intentions [24]. Therefore the hypothesis is posed as below:

**Eighth Hypothesis**: Users’ experience from Facebook has a positive and meaningful relation with their intention to use the website.
4. Study Model of the Research

The model of the present research is as below:

![Study model of the research](image)

5. Methodology

In terms of functional purposes, the present research is descriptive in terms of its nature and methodology and library- and questionnaire-based in terms of its method of collecting the data. Based on the current research’s goals and methodology, the statistical population is Iranian Facebook users. The questionnaire for this study was prepared online on docs.google.com. In order to collect the needed data, the Internet address of the questionnaire was provided to the users through the personal pages of Farsi-speaking individuals, groups, universities, and various places, active in Facebook. At the end 406 questionnaires were collected, which is appropriate for conducting the research in an unlimited society, in accordance to Jersey and Morgan Table. The questionnaire used the 5-item Likert Scale, ranging from “Totally disagree” (1) to “Totally Agree” (5). Table 1 shows the demographic features of the research sample.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Man</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>45.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woman</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>54.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age(years)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20≥</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>51.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1- Demographic statistics
6. Research Findings

In general, all statistics are divided into the mixed set and the reflexive one. Their difference is important in that to correctly edit a measurement model plays an essential role in determining the meaningful relations among structural models. It is also necessary in the present research to conceptualize both of user’s experiences in a mixed way. User experience is a reflexive variant of the first level as well as the mixed one of the second, made from the mixture of five structuring dimensions, each of which have been measured reflexively by some questions. As a result due to the existence of mixed variants in the research’s structural model, Covariance-based Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) software programs, such as Liserl, have less efficiency to calculate these models [71, 9], whereas a software, based on Partial Least Squares (PLS), is more capable to measure such models [47]. Additionally when researchers intend to measure high relations, PLS becomes a very suitable method [26]. Thus this research uses SmartPLS.02 to analyze the data.

To measure the validity and reliability in PLS, both measuring and structural models were taken into consideration. In order to evaluate the measuring model’s fitting, index reliability, convergent validity, and divergent validity were used. Index reliability for measuring the internal reliability involved the three criteria of Cronbach’s alpha, mixed reliability, and coefficients of factor loadings. Since the appropriate rate for Cronbach’s alpha is 0.7 [10], or 0.6 [62] and for mixed reliability, 0.7 [63], the research’s findings, brought in Table 2, can affirm that its reliability is appropriate. Factor loadings can be calculated by the cohesion of a structure’s indices, the appropriate rate of which is above 0.5 [33]. All factor loadings in the current model are appropriate.
Table 2 – Reliability and Validity Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
<th>Mixed validity</th>
<th>Average Variance Extracted (AVE)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sense experience</td>
<td>3/51</td>
<td>0/62</td>
<td>0/61</td>
<td>0/79</td>
<td>0/55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feel experience</td>
<td>3/32</td>
<td>0/66</td>
<td>0/80</td>
<td>0/86</td>
<td>0/56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Think experience</td>
<td>3/44</td>
<td>0/63</td>
<td>0/65</td>
<td>0/79</td>
<td>0/49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act experience</td>
<td>3/08</td>
<td>0/72</td>
<td>0/60</td>
<td>0/77</td>
<td>0/46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relate experience</td>
<td>3/81</td>
<td>0/60</td>
<td>0/67</td>
<td>0/80</td>
<td>0/50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use ease</td>
<td>4/04</td>
<td>0/72</td>
<td>0/91</td>
<td>0/94</td>
<td>0/85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived usefulness</td>
<td>3/79</td>
<td>0/72</td>
<td>0/92</td>
<td>0/94</td>
<td>0/80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude</td>
<td>3/32</td>
<td>0/76</td>
<td>0/88</td>
<td>0/93</td>
<td>0/81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose of use</td>
<td>3/6</td>
<td>0/76</td>
<td>0/81</td>
<td>/89</td>
<td>0/73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fornell and Larcker (1981) introduced AVE to measure convergent validity for which an AVE rate of beyond 0.4 shows acceptable convergent validity [55]. Therefore, the current model’s convergent validity can be resulted from Table 2. In order to survey the model’s divergent validity both Mutual factor Loadings and Fornell-Larcher Criterion Methods were employed. In Mutual Factor Loadings, used for validity in the indicator level, the loading of each indicator for each hidden variant should be more than its loading for other hidden variants. Results in Table 3 show that the model’s divergent validity is acceptable in accordance to this criterion. As it is clear in Table 4, taken from Fornell-Larcker Method (1981), the average square root of the extracted variance of the hidden variants, which are positioned in main diameter entries, is more than their cohesion, positioned below the main diameter and on its right. Hence it can be said that in the present research, the hidden variants have more interaction with their own criteria than other structures; therefore, the model’s divergent validity is affirmed in structure level.
### Table 3 - discriminant validity of reflective constructs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ACT</th>
<th>ATTITUDE</th>
<th>FEEL</th>
<th>RELATE</th>
<th>SENSE</th>
<th>THINK</th>
<th>INTENTION</th>
<th>P.E.U</th>
<th>P.U</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Act1</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act2</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act3</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act4</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attit1</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attit2</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attit3</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feel1</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feel2</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feel3</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feel4</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feel5</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relate1</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relate2</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relate3</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relate4</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense1</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense2</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense3</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Think1</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Think2</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Think3</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Think4</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intent1</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intent2</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intent3</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p.e.u1</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p.e.u2</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p.e.u3</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p.u.f1</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p.u.f2</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p.u.f3</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p.u.f4</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 4 – Cohesion among hidden variants and square root of the average extracted variance (main diameter)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Act experience</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feel experience</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User’s intention</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

http://www.ijhcs.com/index.php/ijhcs/index
In order to measure the validity of mixed structures both weights’ meaningfulness and multicollinearity are employed. In order to measure the latter, variance inflation factor is used, for which a rate higher than 10 is harmful and less than 5, appropriate [89]. Results of these two criteria for mixed structure of user experience are given in Table 5.

Table 5 – Meaningfulness of indicator weights of mixed structure and VIF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>User Experience</th>
<th>Sense Experience</th>
<th>Feel Experience</th>
<th>Think Experience</th>
<th>Act Experience</th>
<th>Relate Experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VIF</td>
<td>1/34</td>
<td>1/63</td>
<td>1/62</td>
<td>1/52</td>
<td>1/50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator weights</td>
<td>0/16***</td>
<td>0/40***</td>
<td>0/20***</td>
<td>0/25***</td>
<td>0/30***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meaningfulness</td>
<td>9/3</td>
<td>21/9</td>
<td>12/5</td>
<td>14/9</td>
<td>16/6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Accepting the measurement model’s validity and reliability makes it possible to evaluate the research’s structural model.

When an endogenous structure is only affected by one or two exogenous structures, a determinant coefficient, more than 0.33, shows strong relation between those structures as well as the endogenous one. Based on the results, these coefficients for endogenous hidden variants of perceived usefulness, attitude, and users’ intention to use are 0.39, 0.36, and 0.46 respectively, showing appropriate prediction strength for the proposed model [26].

Due to the results, research’s hypotheses were tested and their results are presented in Table 6.

Table 6 – Hypotheses and Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypotheses</th>
<th>Path coefficient (T-values)</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H1  There is a positive and meaningful relation between Facebook users’</td>
<td>0/39 (5.85)***</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perceived usefulness and their attitude to using the website.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2  There is a positive and meaningful relation between Facebook users’</td>
<td>0/2(0/35)**</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perceived ease of use and their attitude towards using the website.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3  Facebook’s perceived ease of use has a positive and meaningful</td>
<td>0/33(5.38) ***</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relation with perceived usefulness of its users.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4  There is a positive and meaningful relation between Facebook users’</td>
<td>0/41(7.21)***</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attitude and their behavioral intention to use the website.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
H5 There is a positive and meaningful relation between perceived usefulness of Facebook and the intention to use it by the users. 0/23(4.45) *** Supported

H6 Users’ experience of Facebook has a positive and meaningful relation with their perceived usefulness of the website. 0/45(9.37) *** Supported

H7 There is a positive and meaningful relation between users’ experience of Facebook and their attitude to using it. 0/28(4.88) *** Supported

H8 Users’ experience from Facebook has a positive and meaningful relation with their intention to use the website. 0/16(2.83) ** Supported

ns = nonsignificant.* p < .05.** p < .01.*** p < .001

7. Conclusion

In this study, effective factors on acceptance of using Facebook were tested from the perspective of Technology Acceptance Model along with the influence of user’s experience’s components, i.e. sense, feel, think, act, and relate experience, as factors, adjusting TAM’s parameters. After testing the hypotheses it was determined that perceived usefulness and user’s experience of Facebook can affect their attitude. Cyberspace users’ understanding of potential advantages of using the website as well as the increase in the experience, gained from the website’s space, will be influential on adjustment to the technology; consequently, the first and seventh hypotheses of the research were accepted, which is similar to the findings of Hu et al. (1999), Davies (1993), Moon and Kim (2001), and Read et al. (2011), concerning the relation between attitude and perceived usefulness as well as the results from the previous researches by Dalbeck and Chibett (2013) and Faam (2004) on the relation between experience and attitude. On the other hand, the influence of perceived ease of use for Facebook on the attitude to the use was not accepted, which can be basically due to the limitations in Iran to use the website; therefore, in this dimension results from the current research are opposite to the findings of Davies (1993), Moon and Kim (2001), and Read et al. (2011); while confirming the findings of Hu et al. (1999) and Legris et al. (2003).

The impact of perceived ease of use on perceived usefulness in Facebook was accepted, similar to the research by Hijden (2000) and Seepo (2004). Also the results show the impact of experience on perceived usefulness; continuing to use Facebook and gaining experience from it results in more familiarity with its user tools, which by in turn increases users’ understanding of the usefulness; thus the sixth hypothesis was also accepted.

Testing the hypotheses shows a positive relation between attitude, perceived usefulness, and experience on behavioral intention to use Facebook; hence the fourth, fifth, and eighth hypotheses were accepted as well. As a result, research findings on the relation between attitude and intention to use were similar to the findings by Hasso and Lo (2004), Park (2009), and Read et al. (2011), and in terms of the relation between perceived usefulness and intention to use are similar to Dang et al. (2005) and in opposition to the researches by Bert Rend and Butchard.
(2008). Concerning the relation between experience and intention to use it was similar to Hunanta and Anandia (2010), Hesso and Tesso (2011), and Josephine and Lio (2007). With regard to the objective of this study explaining why Iranian Facebook users continue to use it The results showed that user's experience promoted the continued intention to use Facebook through formation of desirable attitude. Desirable attitude depends on user experience and perceived usefulness whereas because of some rules, perceived ease of use cannot be effective on it.

Limitations of this study that influenced the results of the survey are: due to complete questionnaires via Google Docs and non-verbal form, respondents’ may not be actual Facebook users. Second, the process of collected the questionnaires had taken over one month so the findings may represent a cross sectional information. Third, data were collected from Iranian users Facebook, therefore, may not be generalizable to other social networks or users of other cultures. Researchers in the future more efforts to ensure accountability actual users of social networks respond to the questionnaire. They can consider a longer period of time to gather information. They can also obtain information from users around the world.
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