

SOCIAL MEDIA INFLUENCE ON MALAY FAMILY RESILIENCE TOWARDS CHALLENGES OF THE INTERNET

SAODAH WOK, JUNAIDAH HASHIM & KALTHOM ABDULLAH
INTERNATIONAL ISLAMIC UNIVERSITY MALAYSIA

Abstract

In this modern and technological era, the social media can become a threat to the family. This study applies the Dependency Theory for users who actively seeking information at the expense of their own family resilience towards challenges of the Internet. As such, this study tries to explore the differences between the social media influence on the rural and urban Malay families. The objectives of the study are (1) to compare the social media used for communicating with family members and friends between the rural and urban families; (2) to compare the influence of social media on the rural and urban families; and (3) to differentiate the influence of social media on the rural and urban families on family resilience towards challenges of the Internet. A total of 800 respondents, representing families were surveyed, using the questionnaire for data collection. The results indicate a marked digital divide between the rural and urban families where the rural families use it for e-commerce while the urban families use more of the Internet for chatting, reading online newspaper and other materials while. The rural families use fewer types of the social media than the urban families. The social media influence the rural families positively while the urban families are affected both positively and negatively. As a whole, the rural families are more resilient than the urban families. Nonetheless, the Dependency Theory holds true for the social media influence on individualistic and antagonistic urban families.

Keywords: Dependency Theory, digital divide, family resilience, Malay families, social media influence.

PENGARUH MEDIA SOSIAL KE ATAS DAYATAHAN KELUARGA MELAYU TERHADAP CABARAN INTERNET

Abstrak

Dalam era moden dan teknologi masakini, media sosial boleh menjadi satu ancaman kepada keluarga. Kajian ini mengaplikasikan Teori Kebergantungan untuk pengguna yang aktif mencari maklumat dengan mengorbankan daya tahan keluarga mereka terhadap cabaran Internet. Oleh itu, kajian ini cuba untuk analisis perbezaan pengaruh media sosial terhadap keluarga Melayu di luar bandar dan di bandar. Objektif kajian ini adalah (1) untuk membandingkan penggunaan media sosial untuk berkomunikasi dengan ahli-ahli keluarga dan rakan-rakan antara keluarga luar bandar dan bandar; (2) untuk membandingkan pengaruh media sosial terhadap keluarga luar bandar dan bandar; dan (3) untuk membezakan pengaruh media sosial terhadap daya tahan keluarga luar bandar dan bandar terhadap cabaran Internet. Seramai 800 responden, yang mewakili keluarga, dikaji dengan menggunakan kaedah tinjauan dengan menggunakan borang soal selidik untuk pengumpulan data. Keputusan menunjukkan bahawa terdapat jurang digital yang ketara antara keluarga luar bandar dan keluarga bandar yang mana keluarga luar bandar menggunakannya untuk e-dagang manakala

itu keluarga bandar menggunakan Internet untuk berbual, membaca akhbar serta bahan-bahan lain dalam talian. Keluarga luar bandar kurang menggunakan pelbagai jenis media sosial berbanding dengan keluarga bandar. Media sosial mempengaruhi keluarga luar bandar secara positif manakala itu keluarga bandar dipengaruhi olehnya secara positif dan juga negatif. Secara keseluruhannya, keluarga luar bandar mempunyai daya tahan yang lebih tinggi berbanding dengan keluarga bandar. Namun begitu, Teori Kebergantungan ternyata berlaku dengan adanya pengaruh media sosial ke atas keluarga bandar yang mengamalkan ciri-ciri individualistik and antagonistik.

Kata kunci: *Teori Pergantungan, jurang digital, daya tahan keluarga, keluarga Melayu, pengaruh media sosial.*

INTRODUCTION

Family resilience is a characteristic of the family well-being that needs to be looked at, especially in relation to the Malay families in Malaysia. Malay families, representing a Muslim community, should be able to remain intact and be supportive of one another. They have to be strong and cohesive to ensure that family members stay together in times of sadness, not just in times of joy. However, the social media may threaten the peace and harmony of any family if the media is not properly used. In this new technological era, the social media may be an added disaster to the family institution stability. Hence, a study should be conducted to gauge the influence of the social media on the resilience of the family towards challenges of the Internet, especially the Malay families at the rural and urban areas. Even though Malaysian Communication and Multimedia Commissions (MCMC) have reported on “Klik dengan Bijak” in 2014, but their studies are limited to the children and adolescents only. However, this study explores further on the effect of the social media on the family institution as a whole, both at the rural and urban areas. Therefore, it is important so that the whole family, as the smallest unit of the organization, is taken into consideration, not merely the individuals or the groups in isolation.

The objectives of the study are (1) to compare the social media used for communicating with family members and friends between the rural and urban families; (2) to compare the influence of social media on the rural and urban families; and (3)

to differentiate the influence of social media on the rural and urban families on family resilience towards challenges of the Internet.

With the above objectives, the study hopes to contribute to the wellbeing of the rural and urban families in curbing families from being estranged. Suggestion and recommendation are put forth so that Malay families maintain the Eastern culture of being cohesive, with sense of collectivity, togetherness and with high level of spirituality because these values are needed and they become the hallmark of the Malay families.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Dependency Theory

The moderate effect theory acknowledges the importance of media effects occurring over longer periods of time as a direct consequence of audience intention of using them. This applies to the new media, currently known as the social media. The moderate effect theory also acknowledges that the audience is active, and not passive. Therefore, people can make use of the media to serve certain purposes such as to get information, to learn a new language, and to induce meaningful experiences. Hence, when people use the media to make meaning, there will be significant effects on them. Sometimes the effects are intended by the audience and sometimes the effects are not anticipated. An example of the moderate effect theory is the Dependency Theory (Ball-Rokeach & DeFleur, 1976). Although the theory was originally applied to the television, it can also be applied to the new media, especially the social media, that is, pervasive, accessible and sometimes free. The new social media could reinforce the influence of the other traditional media, specifically, television. However, the new social media is more impactful, keeping people engrossed in their own world because of the personal possession of the media at hand. Such behavior can easily make family be lost in its own world such that it becomes devoid of linkages and is cut off from contacting one another. Learning from the social media can be hazardous not only to the person concerned but also to the others surrounding such types of individuals. The

immediate individuals are the family members, friends and relatives. The urban families tend to practice individualism while the rural families practice collectivism. This culture might affect the family resilience of the respective family members.

Digital Divide in Malaysia

The Malaysian government initiated several plans for the betterment and development of information and communication technologies (ICTs) in the country, which, in turn, contributed to the development of the country at large. An early government-initiated project is the “One Home One Computer”, launched in July 2000 (Noor Ismawati & Ainin, 2005). The government’s noble intention is to narrow the gap between the urban and the rural families in terms of the information and communication technologies (ICTs). In addition, Mohd Nizam (2007) finds that the strategic plans, measures, implementation mechanisms of the Malaysian government call more for better coordination between agencies.

The government, in its development plans, launches several projects emphasizing ICT. The national information technology agenda (NITA) focuses on transforming the country from an agricultural- and industry-based society into an information- and knowledge-based society by 2020. The Eighth Malaysia Plan (2001) allocates more than five billion Ringgit Malaysia for the spread and adoption of ICTs in various activities; from business to education (Noor Ismawati, 2003).

Internet usage has dramatically increased during the last decade. As of June 2012, Internet users in the country have been reported to be 17,723,000 users with a penetration rate of 60.7% (Internet World Statistics, 2014). In 2015, the penetration rate has increased to 68.0% with 20,637,217 users and recently, the penetration rate is 68.6% with 21,090,777 in the first quarter of 2016 (Malaysia Internet Users, 2016). The prominent purposes for using the Internet are: for getting information, social networking, communication, education and learning, and the downloading of files and documents (Malaysian Communications and Multimedia Commission “MCMC”, 2011, 2012). The use of the Internet is not confined to PC users only but also to the

mobile phone users, with 84% of the nationwide sample reported to have used the Internet through their mobile phones (MCMC, 2009). Moreover, a report by the Malaysian Statistics Department (2013) indicates that 57.0% of the citizens use the Internet at least once a day.

A recent MCMC survey (2009) reveals that 50.0% of the respondents have personal computers (14.1 million users). Two-thirds of the PC users access it from the home, followed by at the workplace, internet cafe, and school/university. The two least important places to access the PC are public accessed places and the rural Internet centers.

A more recent study by the Malaysian Statistics Department (2015) finds an increase in the household access of computers by 59.4%, while the individual use of computers is 56.0%. The report reveals that Kuala Lumpur (72.1%), being urban, has the highest users while the state of Kelantan (43.7%) is at the bottom of the list in terms of computer usage by individual citizens. In fact other agricultural-based states are considered rural and they have low penetration of computer access.

The MCMC report (2012) indicates that there are differences between the urban and rural populations in terms of computer usage. Respondents from the cities show a higher level of computer usage compared to rural respondents in each state. In general, the urban population (60%) is using computers more than the rural population (40%). As for the Internet, the same trend applies where the urban population has more Internet usage than the rural population.

In Malaysia, scholars have long been studying the phenomenon of computer and the Internet adoption and usage among the different segments of the population in the country. Early studies on the subject focus on factors affecting adoption of computers among various populations (Noor Ismawati, 2003; Noor Ismawati & Ainin, 2005; Ramayah, Ignatius, & Bushra, 2005; Ramayah, Jantan, & Noraini Ismail, 2003). Among the factors affecting the Internet and computer adoption are demographic

characteristics, attitude and concerns, entertainment, work/job, surfing the Internet, email and communication, perceived usefulness, perceived ease of use, prior experience, and perceived enjoyment.

Most research has been done on youths and university students. Nonetheless, there exists research on the adults' usage of the ICTs. Mohd Yusof, Ali Salman, Norizan, Noor Fariza and Jalaluddin (2012) in their study on *Jendela Informasi Anda* (JENii) among the elderly to bridge the digital divide have revealed mixed findings where both positive and negative outcomes emerged. Initially, the elders were motivated to learn and after some motivation and interest decreased due the frustrations they encountered for remembering the steps of using it. However, Che Su and Nan Zakiah (2014) found that Malaysian parents used the social media to obtain current development, communicate with family, strengthen relationships and for work and academic purposes. The rural communities, on the other hand, mainly use the Internet services for web surfing, seeking the latest information (politics, crime, sports and current issues) and treating it as social media (Siti Zobidah, Jusang, D'Siva & Hayrol Azril, 2016). However, less research has been conducted on the effect of social media on the family institution, specifically on family resilience to challenges of the Internet.

Impact of the wireless technology among Malaysian society was conducted by Norizan, Zaini, Mahmud, and Norhayati (2010). They found that there were differences in usage between the urban and the rural areas in terms of education, social business and health. This is because the urbanites have access to the wireless technology almost everywhere.

Social Media Influence on Family Resilience

Today, almost every house is equipped with an Internet-connected computer and most people have smartphones with the Internet application system. This system and its application can be called the social media because the telephone is a device used to help users' communication among family members and friends for social and

interaction purposes. In this case, the social media can integrate family members and keep them interacting with one another, especially in times of need. But, there are cases when every family member is so engrossed in his/her own world, so much so that the family integration and closely-knitted entity have deteriorated and family members have become isolated and disintegrated. They become estranged to one another. Therefore, it is crucial to find out the influence of such social media on the family resilience to challenges of the Internet.

There are two types of social media influence on family resilience towards the Internet challenges: First, the positive influence and the other is the negative influence. The positive influence is better than the negative influence on the family institution. The positive influence can be in terms of information sharing, communication and social interaction, adding to the sense of connectedness, forging linkages, and maintaining friendships. But in some cases, negative influences supersede the positive influences, whereby family relationships become sour, there is distrust and disruption of family stability (because damage has been done whether intentional or unintentionally), tendency to quarrel over petty things, and an increase in communication breakdown leading to the breaking up of the family institution. Nonetheless, social media can help reconciling family breakdowns as coping strategies, the third party can be used as a mediator to resolve disputes. There are pros and cons to the social media influences on the family resilience.

Family resilience is a “family’s capacity to adapt to stressor and ‘bounce back’ following a trauma; respond positively to adverse situation or to exhibit strength by changing the family dynamic to solve the problems encountered” (Gauvin-Lepage, Lefebvre & Malo, 2014, p. 29). National Network for Family Resilience summarizes that family resilience as helping family members to be resistant to disruption in the face of change and adaptive in the face of crisis (1996, p. 5). However, the wrong uses of the social media threaten the stability of the family institution. The social media usage may reduce the crisis and defend any attack from the environment to the family, provided the family members collaborate and protect the integrity of the family.

METHODOLOGY

This paper takes into consideration the quantitative aspect of the research design. A survey method was used for the quantitative research design. Data were collected using a questionnaire, developed based on the previous studies.

The population of the study encompasses rural and urban household heads. Specifically, the villages are assumed to be the traditional Malay community, reflecting a segment of the Malay farming community, the fishing community, typical Malay rubber smallholders, and small cash crop growers. As for the urban Malay community, Kampung Baru, the most controversial community located in the center of Kuala Lumpur, is taken to represent the other urban Malay families. The selection of Kampong Baru is merely based on proximity and the sponsor of the study is very much interested in knowing the culture and heritage of the present-day Malay dwellers in the vicinity.

In order to have a representative sample in representing the population of the study, a stratified random sample based on urban and rural communities, is employed. For comparison, the stratum is area (locality), represented by the rural and urban families. There are equal numbers of the rural to urban families.

Each variable with more than three items was tested for its reliability. Results show that all items for the respective variables are reliable, Cronbach's Alpha ranging from .900 to .948 (Table 1).

Table 1: Reliability test for social media variables

Variable	No. of Items	Cronbach's Alpha
Reasons of using Internet	14	.948
Social media usage	12	.900
Social media influence	10	.906
Family resilience	10	.948

The variables used in the study are measured based on the previous research conducted (Saodah, Syed Arabi & Norealyana, 2012; Saodah & Norealyana, 2014). Reasons for using the Internet are measured using 14 items, such as for finding

information, sharing information and for reading blog. Social media uses for communicating with friends/relatives are measured by the degree of usage, for example, telephone, WhatsApp and Facebook. All the items are measured using a 5-point Likert-like scale, where 1=never (0 day), 2=rarely (1-2 days), 3=sometimes (3-4 days), often (5-6 days), 5=always (7 days) in a week. The social media influence, on the other hand, is measured using 10 items, such as affecting the family positively, reduce communication between us (reversed), and improving the quality of life; and a 5-point Likert-like scale is used in each, where 1=never, very little, sometimes, much and very much. The family resilience is measured using 10 items, such as no matter how difficult the situation, we remain united; we are always willing to help each other; and even though we are busy, we still allocate time for each other; and the items are measured using a 5-point Likert-like scale, where 1=never, 2=very little, 3= moderate, 4=much, and 5=very much.

Data were collected from November 8-24, 2014. The method of data collection is through face-to-face interviews with the identified respondents based on the stratified random sample. Qualified and trained enumerators conducted the survey for 20-30 minutes per respondent. A total of 800 respondents were gathered with 400 respondents from the rural families (n_1) and another 400 respondents representing the urban families (n_2). Specifically, 100 respondents each from Pontian, Johor; Kampung Besut, Terengganu; Kampung Singkir, Kedah; and Manjoi, Perak while the rest (400 respondents) come from Kampung Baru. This is because Kampung Baru is an urban village, yet the traditional Malay identity is preserved, having similar Malay culture, traditions and values to the rural villages selected.

The data were analyzed for the descriptive and inferential statistics. The descriptive statistics include frequency, percentage, mean, and standard deviation, minimum and maximum values. For the inferential statistics, Chi-square test and the independent t-test are used for comparing the differences between the rural and urban families. In addition, simple multiple regression analysis is used to investigate factors affecting family resilience for both the rural and urban families

FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

Sample Profile

The profile of respondents presented in Table 2 is based on the locality (rural and urban). Results show that there are differences between males and females in terms of locality ($\chi^2=5.162$, $df=1$, $p=.023$), where there are more male respondents (54.5%) than female respondents (45.5%); and the males mainly reside in the urban areas (58.5%). In relation to age, there exists differences between the age-groups ($\chi^2=31.321$, $df=4$, $p=.000$), whereby the rural respondents tend to belong to the older groups of 41-50 years old (28.8%) and 61 years old and above (25.1%); while, for the urban area, younger age group (15.5%) is more represented than the rural area (4.8%). The findings are further tested using the independent t-test where the age of the rural respondents ($M=51.47$, $SD=13.05$) is higher than the urban respondents ($M=47.85$, $SD=14.43$) which is found to be significant ($t=3.718$, $p=.000$). The oldest respondent in the rural community is 90 years old compared to the urban families, when the oldest is 83 years old. With regards to marital status, there are more single respondents in the urban area (17.8%) than in the rural (6.0%). However, there are more married rural respondents (84.5%) compared to the urban respondents (73.0%). The results are further supported by the significant difference in the proportions of the respondents in terms of locality ($\chi^2=26.625$, $df=2$, $p=.000$). The respondents are also different in proportion in terms of educational achievement ($\chi^2=44.177$, $df=4$, $p=.000$). Majority of the rural respondents (82.8%) are having secondary education and below whereas the urban respondents (81.7%) are more educated, that is, with secondary and tertiary education. Overall, there are associations between rural and urban respondents for gender ($\phi=.080$, $p=.023$), age (Cramer's $V=.198$, $p=.000$), marital status (Cramer's $V=.182$, $p=.000$), and educational achievement (Cramer's $V=.235$, $p=.000$). Therefore, the respondents' demographic profile attributes have significant association with locality.

Table 2: Demographic characteristics of respondents

Demographic Characteristics	Category	Rural (%)	Urban (%)	Total (%)	Chi-sq.	p	Phi/Cramer's V
Gender	Male	202 (50.5)	234 (58.5)	436	5.162	.023	.080,

	Female	198 (49.5)	166 (41.5)	(54.5) 364 (45.5)			p=.023
	Total	400	400	800			
Age (years)	30 and below	19 (4.8)	62 (15.5)	81 (10.1)	31.321	.000	.198, p=.000
	31-40	66 (16.5)	76 (19.0)	142 (17.8)			
	41-50	115 (28.8)	84 (21.0)	199 (24.9)			
	51-60	99 (24.8)	100 (25.0)	199 (24.9)			
	61 and above	101 (25.1)	78 (19.5)	179 (22.3)			
	Overall:	Total	400	400	800	t=3.718	.000
		Mean=51.47, SD=13.05; Min=19, Max=90	Mean=47.85, SD=14.43; Min=19, Max=83				
Marital Status	Single	24 (6.0)	71 (17.8)	95 (11.9)	26.625	.000	.182, p=.000
	Married	338 (84.5)	292 (73.0)	630 (78.8)			
	Divorced/ widowed	38 (9.5)	37 (9.2)	75 (9.3)			
	Total	400	400	800			
Highest Educational Level	No formal education	12 (3.0)	8 (2.0)	20 (2.5)	44.177	.000	.235, p=.000
	Primary school	89 (22.3)	60 (15.0)	149 (18.6)			
	Secondary school	230 (57.5)	180 (45.0)	410 (51.3)			
	College/STPM/ Diploma	44 (11.0)	89 (22.3)	133 (16.6)			
	Degree/Master/ PhD	25 (13.2)	63 (15.7)	88 (11.0)			
	Total	400	400	800			

Social Media Use with Friends and Relatives

Table 3 reveals that most of the urban families use the social media more than the rural families, except for the telephone. The overall frequency of using the social media is significant between the urban and rural families ($t=-3.766$, $p=.000$). Other social media that show significant differences are WhatsApp ($t=-5.538$, $p=.000$), Twitter ($t=-6.239$, $p=.000$), Friendster ($t=-2.244$, $p=.025$), Blog ($t=-2.288$, $p=.022$),

Yahoo mail ($t=-2.410$, $p=.016$), Instagram ($t=-4.781$, $p=.000$), Telegram ($t=-3.238$, $p=.001$), and WeChat ($t=-1.976$, $p=.049$). This means that the urban families have more avenues to communicate with their friends and relatives through the use of the social media.

Table 3: Social media used to communicate with friends/relatives by locality

No.	Media for Communication	Locality	N	Mean	SD	t	p
1	Telephone	Rural	400	3.853	1.360	1.147	.252
		Urban	400	3.743	1.351		
2	Short message (SMS)	Rural	400	3.355	1.485	-1.835	.067
		Urban	400	3.540	1.365		
3	Skype	Rural	400	1.173	0.655	-1.779	.076
		Urban	400	1.260	0.734		
4	WhatsApp	Rural	400	2.130	1.538	-5.862	.000
		Urban	400	2.788	1.634		
5	Twitter	Rural	400	1.233	0.756	-6.239	.000
		Urban	400	1.723	1.373		
6	Facebook	Rural	400	1.698	1.357	-1.182	.856
		Urban	400	1.715	1.367		
7	Friendster	Rural	400	1.088	0.436	-2.244	.025
		Urban	400	1.188	0.777		
8	Blog	Rural	400	1.175	0.617	-2.288	.022
		Urban	400	1.295	0.848		
9	Yahoo mail	Rural	400	1.325	0.950	-2.410	.016
		Urban	400	1.503	1.126		
10	Instagram	Rural	400	1.243	0.816	-4.781	.000
		Urban	400	1.628	1.389		
11	Telegram	Rural	400	1.263	0.881	-3.238	.001
		Urban	400	1.520	1.324		
12	WeChat	Rural	400	1.393	1.078	-1.976	.049
		Urban	400	1.563	1.342		
Overall media for communication		Rural	399	1.742	0.683	-3.766	.000
		Urban	400	1.955	0.900		

*1=never (0), 2=rarely (1-2 days), 3=sometimes (3-4 days), 4=always (5-6 days), 5=every day (7 days)

Influence of the Social Media

Table 4 shows the results of the social media influence on the rural and urban families. On the whole, the social media do influence the urban families more than the rural families ($t=-2.280$, $p=.023$). Specifically, the urban families are being affected both positively and negatively. In terms of the positive effects, urban families indicate that

their families have been affected positively ($t=-9.064$, $p=.000$) and the social media have helped them improve their quality of life ($t=-3.201$, $p=.001$). In terms of the negative effects, urban families admit that their families have been spending less on interpersonal interaction during meals ($t=-2.802$, $p=.005$), spending less on leisure time together ($t=-3.099$, $p=.002$), less sleeping time ($t=-4.110$, $p=.000$), and family members are less interested in family activities ($t=-3.754$, $p=.000$). The rural families, on the other hand, are affected by the social media in terms of negative influences only, namely, in reducing communication between them ($t=2.779$, $p=.006$), experiencing strained relations among family members ($t=3.619$, $p=.000$), and family members spending less time in resolving problems face-to-face ($t=7.757$, $p=.000$).

The findings indicate that for individualistic influence, the urban families are more affected than the rural families except for reducing the communication between the family members. As for the antagonistic influence, the rural families are slightly more affected than the urban families except for families members spend less sleeping hours because of the social media. The culture of togetherness and solving problems together is reduced among the rural families. To a certain extent, it is an alarming finding as the rural Malay families are supposed to more obedient and avoid individual isolation. Such situation should be looked at seriously. Nonetheless, the optimistic effect of the social media is more pronounced among the urban families than the rural families. This could be due to the lesser usage of the social media at home among the urban families. Hence, such effect is not that observable among the rural families.

Table 4: Influence of the social media by locality

No.	Influence of Social Media	F*	Locality	N	Mean**	SD	t***	p
1	Affecting the family positively	3	Rural	400	3.088	1.340	-9.064	.000
			Urban	400	3.918	1.249		
2	Reducing communication between us (R)	1	Rural	400	3.643	1.185	2.779	.006
			Urban	400	3.420	1.078		
3	Improving the quality of life	3	Rural	400	2.845	1.302	-3.201	.001
			Urban	400	3.155	1.434		
4	Family members spend more time with their social media/phone (have own social world) (R)	1	Rural	400	3.660	1.174	-1.905	.057
			Urban	400	3.810	1.050		
5	Spend less time on interpersonal	1	Rural	400	3.773	1.193	-2.802	.005

interaction during meals (R)								
			Urban	400	3.985	0.936		
6	Spend less on leisure time together (R)	1	Rural	400	3.750	1.164	-3.099	.002
			Urban	400	3.980	0.920		
7	Family members spend less sleeping hours because of the social media(R)	2	Rural	400	3.740	1.177	-4.110	.000
			Urban	400	4.053	0.962		
8	Family members are less interested in family activities (R)	1	Rural	400	3.808	1.168	-3.754	.000
			Urban	400	4.088	0.928		
9	Strained relations among family members (R)	2	Rural	400	3.988	1.125	3.619	.000
			Urban	400	3.680	1.273		
10	Family members spending less time in resolving problem through face-to-face together (R)	2	Rural	400	3.908	1.135	7.757	.000
			Urban	400	3.203	1.420		
Overall influence of social media			Rural	400	3.620	0.750	-2.280	.023
			Urban	400	3.729	0.593		

*Factor: 1=individualistic, 2=antagonistic, 3=optimistic

**1=never (1-20%), 2=very little (21-40%), 3=sometimes (41-60%), 4=much (61-80%), 5=very much (81-100%).

*** test value of 3; (R)=reversed statement

When analyzed for the factors in the social media influence, three items emerged. They are labeled as F1: individualistic, F2: antagonistic, and F3: optimistic. The factors are subjected to a reliability test and found to be reliable, with F1=Cronbach's alpha of .943, F2=Cronbach's alpha of .761, and F3=Cronbach's alpha of .889.

Family Resilience to Challenges

Family resilience is how family reacts when faced with challenges within and without their family. Even though there is no difference in the overall family resilience attributes between the rural and the urban families, rural families tend to be more cohesive and resilient (Table 5). The rural families still allocate time for each other ($t=2.512$, $p=.032$); they try to resolve problems together ($t=3.484$, $p=.001$); they will find solutions when in trouble ($t=3.432$, $p=.001$); and they persevere when in adversity ($t=4.080$, $p=.000$). This means that the rural families are more united on many attributes than the urban families. The Malay culture, traditions and values prevails in them.

Table 5: Family resilience to challenges

No.	Family Resilience to Challenges	Locality	N	Mean	SD	t	p
1	No matter how difficult the situation, we remain united.	Rural	400	4.420	0.685	-1.701	.089
		Urban	400	4.498	0.601		
2	We are always willing to help each other.	Rural	400	4.435	0.646	0.472	.637
		Urban	400	4.413	0.703		
3	Even though we are busy, we still allocate time for each other.	Rural	400	4.410	0.688	2.152	.032
		Urban	400	4.315	0.554		
4	We can accept dissent from family members.	Rural	400	4.328	0.705	0.197	.844
		Urban	394	4.317	0.761		
5	We can adapt when experiencing a crisis in the family.	Rural	400	4.343	0.668	1.206	.228
		Urban	400	4.283	0.738		
6	We can tolerate when problems arise.	Rural	400	4.375	0.667	1.795	.073
		Urban	400	4.285	0.748		
7	We try to resolve problems together.	Rural	400	4.385	0.669	3.484	.001
		Urban	400	4.205	0.787		
8	We will find solutions when in trouble.	Rural	400	4.340	0.648	3.432	.001
		Urban	397	4.219	0.810		
9	We persevere when facing adversity.	Rural	400	4.400	0.653	4.080	.000
		Urban	397	4.186	0.817		
10	We ask for help from relatives if necessary.	Rural	400	4.003	1.050	-1.609	.108
		Urban	397	4.111	0.837		
Total		Rural	399	4.352	0.597	1.545	.123
		Urban	391	4.286	0.612		

*1=never (1-20%), 2=very little (21-40%), 3=somewhat moderate (41-60%), 4=much (61-80%), 5=very much (81-100%).

The Influence of the Social Media on Family Resilience by Locality

Table 6 shows that for the rural families, family resilience is negatively related with individualistic ($r=-.116$, $p=.010$) and with antagonistic ($r=-.108$, $p=.016$) but positively related with optimistic ($r=.178$, $p=.000$). Individualistic and antagonistic are very strongly correlated with each other ($r=.860$, $p=.000$). However, optimistic is negatively related with individualistic ($r=-.501$, $p=.000$) and with antagonistic ($r=-.346$, $p=.000$).

As for the urban families, results show that family resilience is negatively related with individualistic ($r=-.209$, $p=.000$) but positively related with antagonistic ($r=.275$, $p=.000$) and with optimistic ($r=.442$, $p=.000$). There is a positive relationship between individualistic and antagonistic ($r=.366$, $p=.000$) but the relationship for individualistic and optimistic is negative ($r=-.456$, $p=.000$). However, in the urban there is a negligible relationship between antagonistic and optimistic ($r=.045$, $p=.188$). This indicates that the more individualistic effect of the social media on the urban families, the less resilience is the urban families to challenges of the Internet. However, the more positive is the social influence effect on the urban families, the more resilient they become. This result is similar to the rural families. Nonetheless, experiencing antagonistic influence brings them closer to each other, that is, they become more resilient to the challenges of the Internet. This is because the urban families are more open to contradicting ideas as long as they are beneficial to the families.

Table 6: Correlation for family resilience to challenges and social media influence factors by locality

Locality	Variable	M	SD	Alpha	r (p)			
					Family Resilience	Individualistic	Antagonistic	Optimistic
Rural (N=399)	Family Resilience	4.35	0.60	.946	1			
	Individualistic	3.73	1.06	.955	-.116 (p=.010)	1		
	Antagonistic	3.95	1.10	.951	-.108 (p=.016)	.860 (p=.000)	1	
	Optimistic	2.97	1.22	.831	.178 (p=.000)	-.501 (p=.000)	-.346 (p=.000)	1
Urban (N391)	Family Resilience	4.29	0.61	.946	1			
	Individualistic	2.12	0.85	.928	-.209 (p=.000)	1		
	Antagonistic	2.54	1.24	.844	.275 (p=.000)	.366 (p=.000)	1	
	Optimistic	3.54	1.18	.682	.442 (p=.000)	-.456 (p=.000)	.045 (p=.188)	1

Results (Table 7) show that for the rural families, only optimistic effect of the social media on family resilience is significant (Beta=.170, $t=2.919$, $p=.000$). This means that the positive effect of the social media influence on the rural families is making them able to work toward helping one another through sharing of information, coupled with helping to improve the quality of their lives. This is materialized through doing business online, which is doing e-commerce by marketing their products. This is a good initiative of the rural families to upgrade the economic standing of their families. Hence, the government project of one kampung, one product (1K1P) is taken its stride positively.

Optimistic influence of the social media is the only predictor to the rural families' resilience to challenges of the Internet. This can be explained by the positive outlook of the rural Malay families as they remain intact and cohesive for the sake of their respective families. However, such influence is able to contribute only 2.7% of the rural family resilience. This is considered small. Perhaps there are other untapped factors that make the rural families cohesive and supportive of one another.

All factors of the social media influence are able to predict family resilience in urban families, with optimistic (Beta=.384; $t=7.950$, $p=.000$), antagonistic (Beta=.352; $t=5.622$, $p=.000$) and individualistic (Beta=-.163; $t=-3.139$, $p=.002$) dimensions of the social media influence. The individualistic effect of the social media significantly reduces the family resilience and such situation exists because the urban family members tend to be more individualistic than collective in tackling any problem facing the families. The sense of togetherness and collectivism is slowly dwindling in the urban families because of work pressure. The good thing is that the optimistic effect of the social media does bring the urban family more resilient against the Internet. In addition, the more that they challenge each other, that is, antagonistic effect of the social media, the more resilience are the urban families. This is a good indicator to curb the threats of the social media on the families, respectively. The explanatory contribution of the social media influence in total is 29.5%. Therefore, all

three dimensions of the social media influence are able to predict the urban family resilience in their own way, either positively or negatively.

Table 7: Simple multiple regression analysis for family resilience to challenges and the social media influence factors by locality

Model	Variable	B	SE	Beta	t	p
Rural 1	Constant	4.199	.179		23.463	.000
	Individualistic	0.124	.060	.042	0.391	.696
	Antagonistic	-.046	.053	-.085	-0.860	.390
	Optimistic	.083	.028	.170	2.919	.004
F=4.715, df=3,395; p=.003; R=.186; R ² Adj=.027						
Urban 1	Constant	3.437	.193		17.845	.000
	Individualistic	-.117	.037	-.163	-3.139	.002
	Antagonistic	.173	.023	.352	5.622	.000
	Optimistic	.199	.025	.384	7.950	.000
F=55.484, df=3,387; p=.000; R=.548; R ² Adj=.295						

DISCUSSIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

A total of 800 respondents are equally represented by the rural and the urban families studied. Results show that the rural families are equally distributed between males and females, mainly made up of old adults, married, and with secondary education and lower. The urban families composed of mainly young adult, married males and with secondary and tertiary education.

Urban families have more home computers that are connected to the Internet compared to the rural families. This is in line with the penetration of the Internet of the nation (Malaysia Internet Users, 2016). Hence, the digital divide still exists between the urban and the rural families. To become a developed country by 2020, Malaysia government is trying hard to narrow the gaps between the urban and the rural areas. Many programs have been planned and implemented for the rural communities.

In addition, the urban families also use the Internet for various purposes: chatting, reading the newspapers and other materials online, and for entertainment, interaction, and emailing purposes, while the rural families use the Internet mainly for e-commerce (ordering and purchasing products and services). The significant use by the rural families for e-commerce is a new. The findings contradict most of the

previous findings (Mohd Yusof, et al., 2012; Che Su and Nan Zakiah, 2014; Siti Zobidah, et al., 2016). In addition, urban families use many more social media applications than rural families. Urban families use more of WhatsApp, Twitter, Friendster, Blog, Yahoo mail, Instagram, Telegram and WeChat to communicate with friends and relatives than the rural families. The results indicate marked digital divide between the urban and the rural families. The possible explanation is that the young and educated males representing the urban families are more adventurous in their usage of the social media compared to the rural families' representatives who are much older and with lower educational level. Their motivation to stay on the system reduces as they find the steps are difficult to follow. This result supports Mohd Yusof et al., 2012). Thus widen the gap between the urban and the rural in terms of the Internet usage.

The social media have different influences on the rural and the urban families. The rural families have been affected by the social media in terms of spending less on interpersonal interaction during meals, spending less on leisure time together, and family members are less interested in family activities while the urban families face different types of influences from the social media, both negatively and positively.

The rural families tend to be more resilient when their families are threatened with challenges of the Internet. However, urban families become more cohesive through positive and antagonistic effects because they are more open to differences and can resolve them amicably to restore family togetherness. In a way, the Dependency Theory holds true for the study but unfortunately, the social media has made urban families to become individualistic, challenging and threatening their family resilience. This finding is similar to that found by Norizan et al. (2010).

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The authors would like to acknowledge the financial support given, under the IIUM Presidential Research grant, for this research.

BIODATA OF AUTHORS

Saodah Wok is a Professor in Communication at the Department of Communication, International Islamic University Malaysia (IIUM). wsaodah@iium.edu.my

Junaidah Hashim is a Professor in Human Resource Development at the Department of Business Administration, IIUM.

Kalthom Abdullah is an Associate Professor in Marketing at the Department of Business Administration, IIUM. junaidah@iium.edu.my

REFERENCES

- Ball-Rokeach, S. J., & DeFleur, M. L. (1976). A dependency model of mass communication effects. *Communication Research*, 3(1), 3-21.
- Che Su Mustaffa & Nan Zakiah Megat Ibrahim. (2014). Persepsi dan penggunaan media social dari perspektif ibu bapa: Satu analisis kualitatif. *Jurnal Komunikasi*, 30(Special Issue), 43-74.
- Department of Statistics, Malaysia (2013). ICT use and access by individuals and households. Retrieved January 6, 2015 from http://www.statistics.gov.my/portal/download_ict/files/ict_use/2013/Laporan_PPC_ICT_2013.pdf
- Gauvin-Lepage, J., Lefebvre, H., & Malo, D. (2014). Family resilience: Defining the concept from a humanistic perspective. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Family Studies*, 19(2), 22-36.
- Malaysia Internet Users (2016). Retrieved September 21, 2016 from <http://www.internetlivestats.com/internet-users/malaysia/>
- Malaysian Statistics Department. (2013). ICT Use and Access by Individuals and Households Survey Report, Malaysia, 2015. Retrieved October 15, 2016 from https://www.statistics.gov.my/index.php?r=column/cthem&menu_id=amVoWU54UTl0a21NWmdhMjFMMWcyZz09&bul_id=Q313WXJFbG1PNjRwCHZQTVISR1UrQT09
- MCMC. (2009). Statistical brief number nine: Hand phone users Survey. Retrieved January 6, 2015 from <http://www.skmm.gov.my/skmmgovmy/files/attachments/HPUS-2009.pdf>

- MCMC. (2011). Statistical brief number thirteen: household use of the internet survey. Retrieved January 6, 2015 from http://www.skmm.gov.my/skmmgovmy/media/General/pdf/Household-Use-of-The-Internet-Survey-2011_051212.pdf
- MCMC. (2012). Communications and multimedia: Pocket book of statistics. Retrieved January 6, 2015 from http://www.skmm.gov.my/skmmgovmy/media/General/pdf/C-MQ1_Eng2012.pdf
- MCMC. (2014). Exploring the digital landscape in Malaysia access and use of digital technologies by children and adolescents. Retrieved on 16 October 2016 from http://www.unicef.org/malaysia/UNICEF_Digital_Landscape_in_Malaysia-FINAL-lowres.pdf
- Mohd Nizam Osman. (2007). The digital divide issues: Is the gap getting bigger? *Jurnal Komunikasi*, 23(1), 1-13.
- Mohd Yusof Abdullah, Ali Salman, Norizan Abdul Razak, Noor Fariza Mohd Noor, & Jalaluddin. (2012). Issues affecting the use of information and communication technology among the elderly: A case study of JENii. *Jurnal Komunikasi*, 28(1), 89-96.
- National Network for Family Resilience. (1996). Family resilience: Building strategies to meet life's challenges. Children, Youth and Families Network. CSREES-USDA. Retrieved October 15, 2016 from <http://www.mtroyal.ca/cs/groups/public/documents/pdf/familyresiliencyrb.pdf>
- Noor Ismawati Jaafar. (2003). Computer usage and perceptions among accounting students: A survey in a public university. *Jurnal Pendidikan*, 23, 57-69. Retrieved January 6, 2015 from <http://eprints.um.edu.my/2009/1/2.pdf>
- Noor Ismawati Jaafar & Ainin Sulaiman. (2005). Domestic computer usage and activities in West Coast Malaysia: Age and income differences. *Information Development*, 21(2), 128-137. DOI: 10.1177/0266666905054507
- Norizan Abdul Razak, Zaini Amir, Mahamod Ismail & Norhayati Shuja. (2010). The impact of wireless technology among Malaysian society. *Proceedings of the WSEAS International Conference (EHAC'10)*, University of Cambridge, UK, February 20-22, 2009, 54-59.
- Ramayah, T., Jantan, M., & Noraini Ismail. (2003). Impact of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation on Internet usage in Malaysia. *Proceedings of the Third International Conference on Electronic Commerce Engineering*. Retrieved January 6, 2015 from <http://ramayah.com/journalarticlespdf/impactofintrinsic.pdf>

- Ramayah, T., Ignatius, T., & Bushra Aafaqi. (2005). PC usage among students in a private institution of higher learning: The moderating role of prior experience. *Jurnal Pendidik dan Penyelidikan*, 20, 13-152. Retrieved January 6, 2015 from [http://web.usm.my/education/publication/jppramayah\(131-152\)b.pdf](http://web.usm.my/education/publication/jppramayah(131-152)b.pdf)
- Saodah Wok, Syed Arabi Idid & Norealyana Misman. (2012). Social media use for information-sharing activities among youth in Malaysia. *Journalism and Mass Communication*, 2(11), 1029-1047.
- Saodah Wok, & Norealyana Misman. (2014). Matching types of social media sites (SNS) to motives and profile of youth in Malaysia. Paper presented at the International Conference on Language, Communication, and Education, on 3-4 December 2014 (LANCOMME 2014) at Sunway Resort Hotel and Spa, Malaysia.
- Siti Zobidah Omar, Jusang Bolong, D'Silva, J. L., & Hayrol Azril Mohamed Shaffril (2016). Mapping the pattern of wireless village Internet service usage among rural communities. *The Social Sciences*, 11(3), 174-178.
- World Statistics Report. (2014). Malaysia: Internet Usage Stats and Marketing Report. Retrieved January 6, 2015 from <http://www.internetworldstats.com/asia/my.htm>