# The Impact of using Facebook on family silence: case study for families of city of Ha'il 

Mohammed EL Nadir Abdallah Tani, Dept of Media. Ha'il university, Ha'il, Saudi Arabia, m.abdallahtani@uoh.edu.sa Jazaa Farhan AL Shammari, Dept of Media. Ha'il university, Ha'il , Saudi Arabia, Jaz.alshammari@uoh.edu.sa
Arif Juma Biro Trouk, Dept of Media. Ha'il university, Ha'il , Saudi Arabia, ar.trouk@uoh.edu.sa
Nassredine Cheikh Bouhenni, Dept of Arabe , Ha'il university , Ha'il, Saudi Arabia, n.bouhenni@uoh.edu.sa


#### Abstract

The goal of current research to identify the impact of new media and applications on the family Mutes in Hail, addressed the researcher Yen Effect of Using Facebook Facebook on the family silence, and the researcher in this axis will also be exposed to the effects of using Facebook on the family silence. This site was chosen based on its popularity and observation, as we find it one of the most important social networking sites, which is the most used site in the world, as it allows its users the opportunity to get acquainted and communicate, as well as allowing them to present themselves with great freedom, and in more than one way, and we find that it has become an indirect compensatory and only outlet. In social life, the Saudi society is considered one of the societies that is known to have a wide spread in contacting this social networking site.

Because every technological progress has advantages and disadvantages, to the extent that it has provided individuals with facilities and services, but in return, thanks to his dazzling temptations, he made the individual be dragged behind him and plunged into his own world and navigated through his desires and inclinations ,and this is what gradually led to the change of the concept of the family. The change in communication between its members was evident through the change in the methods of interaction between family members and with the tangible increase in the use of this site from various groups, so we find, for example, family members who also have a percentage of the increase in the use of Facebook, for this site has a wide and great position in the use of family members.
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## I LITERATURE REVIEW:

In fact, no a grandfather a lot of studies on YouTube .Most studies related to new media and applications revolve around social networking sites and Facebook.
I only got three studies:
1 - Daniel Y. Park, Elizabeth M. Goering, The Health-Related Uses and Gratifications of YouTube: Motive, Cognitive Involvement, Online Activity, and Sense of Empowerment, Journal of Consumer Health on the Internet, 20 (1-2), 52--70.
The results revealed specific drivers of use YouTube Health related and an important relationship between the variables.It also discusses the implications of how healthcare professionals use a site YouTube to communicate with users about health related topics and their empowerment in healthcare.
2 - Gary Hanson, Paul Haridakis, YouTube Users Watching and Sharing the News: A Uses and Gratifications Approach
Web sites represent YouTube Important changes in method Broadcast video content.
The results of this study concluded that there are different motivations predicted by watching and sharing different types of news-related content.
Viewers of news are in a more traditional format primarily for information reasons. The news viewers in the comedy and satirical versions of this in the first class for entertainment.
Motivation for interpersonal communication expected news videos to be shared on YouTube .Results indicate that viewers may be driven by a set of motivations to watch news clips on YouTube and a different set of motivations to share.
The previous studies are considered one of the most important methodological procedures used in any scientific research, and we will try to present some studies that shed light on the subject of the research:

## The problematic:

In this study :Transformations of saudian society, We have tried to draw the problem of the subject of the study as follows:

What is the impact of the use of Facebook on family silence in Ha'il family - the city of Ha'il - a model?

## Asking questions:

1 -How popular are family members on Facebook? Facebook -What?
2-Does it affect the use of Facebook ? Facebook On the behavior of individuals within the family?
3- Do you use Facebook? Facebook It adopts the adoption of new behaviors among family members, such as alienation, social isolation, the absence of dialogue, or rather family dumbness?

## Study hypotheses:

We have hypotheses as follows:
1- The more popular the family members use the website - Facebook Whenever the dialogue is absent or rather family dumb.
2- The more frequent family members use Facebook Facebook Whenever new behaviors are introduced to family members, such as alienation and social isolation.

## the importance of studying:

The importance of this study is reflected in the fact that it deals with one of the current topics in this era, providing the reader with a balance of good knowledge, especially as it addressed a modern means of communication, namely social networking sites that facilitate communication between the sender and the recipient, and which have received attention from the social community in particular and we find the impact of communication sites Social Facebook On family communication, and here lies the importance of the topic as it examines the impact of the use of social media on family silence .

## Defining procedural concepts:

## Impact:

Language :The effect of moving the rest of the drawing of the thing, and the effect is keeping the effect on the object(Ibn Manzur, 2000).
Idiomatically: I t is the result of communication. It is located on both the sender and the recipient. The impact may be psychological or social .The impact of the media is achieved through providing news, information, entertainment, persuasion and improving the mental image ., ( Makkawi, H. E \& Al-Sayed, HS, 2008).

As for the effect, it is a relative and varying issue between one person and another, the group and another, after receiving the communication message and understanding it, and the effect of the means of communication is often slow and not immediate, as some believe, and the impact of some messages may be temporary and not permanent, and from that the effect is the ultimate goal that the sender seeks., Which is the result that the caller aims to achieve and the process of influencing two steps is the first is thinking and the second step is behavior change (Al-Hakim, M, 2010) .

The researcher Abdel-Basset Mohamed Abdel- Wahab believes that the effect is: "What was caused by this media technology, whether negative or positive, such as using satellites, created several transmission channels, and also created specialized transmission and worked to break up the masses to isolated individuals after the transmission before the satellites was directed to all audiences"(Abdel- Baset M, A, 2005).

As for the effect, we find in the media glossary that it can be defined in general as some change in the future of the message as an individual, the message has received his attention and awareness of it, it may be classified into new information and may make it be new directions or modify its old directions and may make it behave in a new way or amend its previous behavior, There are many levels of influence, from concern to the occurrence of an internal reinforcement of trends to a change in those trends, and ultimately the individual has embarked on a practical behavior (Al-Fur, M, J, 2006).

## Procedural definition:

Impact is the overall negative social consequences of using a social networking site Facebook Within the family to produce side effects represented by family.
Usage: Language: Whoever served, served and served, worked for him as he is a servant (c) servants by combining the servant and served it as a servant and used it he took him as a servant and asked him to serve and understand him.A servant and use it, ie I asked him to serve me by joining the signer (Ibn Manzur, 2000)
Idiomatically :With technological development in general and communication technology in particular, the majority of the term use or use is often employed in other times, and this is to embody the relationship between the human being, the machine or the technology, and what prints this relationship and the interaction and what may lead in the future to a merger between the machine and the human being, and
the use is defined that it is what the individual actually uses of the information, that is, the rational use of the information that he really needs, in addition to that the use may be aimed at the needs of the beneficiary or does not satisfy him, when he does not find the information that he really needs and the use in the Internet field takes two concepts:
General use :It is entering a network without pre-setting the use process.
Private use :It is the specialized use that is often in a framework such as electronic commerce, buying and selling (Abdel Hamid, B, 2005/2006).

## Procedurally :

By use in this study, we mean the verb that links family members to social media, that is, their interaction and interaction with them in the absence of dialogue and speech within the same family .

## Social Media :

Language :The site is a language that is the location of the incident (Ibrahim, A \& AbdelHalim, Mand others,2011) .
Idiomatically :The Web site connects between a group of interconnected pages through the texts of the complex is known as the site as a start page or welcome through which we can extract documents from the Internet and attachments Brother associated with it, and anyone can open a site or a company or organization.
Procedurally: It is the social media and the site under study is the most used site among the study community and is Facebook.

## Social media is a idiomatic concept:

It is a term given to a group of websites on the Internet that appeared with the third generation of the web or what is known as the Web 0.2. It allows communication between individuals (in a village, university ( a virtual community environment that brings them together according to their interest or affiliation networks (school, organization) all of this is done through direct communication services such as sending messages or viewing others' profiles and knowing their news and information that they make available for viewing. They are also services established and programmed by major companies to gather users and friends, share activities and interests, and search for friendships, interests and activities for other people.( Balle, F , 2006) .
Procedural concept :We mean by it all the sites that allow social communication through the Internet, as it is a platform for exchanging opinions, ideas, cultures and discussions on various issues.

## Mute :

Language :it is the words of a person or a persons, who is muted by moving the source and silenced him to get out of his roar (Ibn Manzur, 2000) .

## Idiom :

It is an absolute refusal to speak and answer the questions asked :
Mutes when children can be completely (after an Emotional shock or under the Hani ) and selective, with some people (and be a reaction or nervous or pre - Hani or mentally).
Adult dementia: This dementia is observed in schizophrenia, mental confusion, dangerous danger or also helps in the pure benefit.( Farid , M, 2010)

## Family dementia: procedural

It is silence or isolation, or in the sense of the absence of dialogue between members of the same family and in exchange for going to social media to express their opinions and ideas instead of expressing them within the family as a result of using the Internet and social media.

## Gratings :

Satisfaction is satisfying a desire or achieving a goal or reducing a push, and the word also indicates the situation in which it is done and that means saturation in the theory of psychological analysis reducing the alert and getting rid of tension ,because accumulation and alert generates a sense of pain and pushes the device to work in order to happen again a state of gratification in which the perceived reduction To alert as if it was pleasure, and thus the concept of gratification is related to other concepts: need, desire and motivation (Al-Far, M, J,2006).

## Need and desire :

It says in the Encyclopedia of Sociology that the need is a situation or a matter that puts one in a difficult situation or distress and in a time of hardships and troubles with what he feels of want and desire for something necessary( Hijab, M , M, 2004), . And it is defined in the field of psychology as a state of tension or lack of gratification that a particular individual feels and pushes him to act the goal that he believes will satisfy him, and it means towards merely lack, but it is necessary to have a binding sense of the need to achieve the need, since in addition to Understanding the deficiency or lack of the subject of the need for a driving force that stimulates action to satisfy (El-Batal, M. 2010).

There is a difference between need and desire, as desire is a feeling of inclination towards certain people or things, such as the desire of the child to kiss his mother, for example, it does not arise from a situation of deficiency or turmoil as is the need, but rather arises from the individual's thinking about it or mentioning it or his awareness of desirable things, the desire aims to seek pleasure while The need is aimed at avoiding pain (Hijab, M , M, 2004) .

## The default relationship :

By that we mean those relationships that arise between users of social networks through frequent connections that turn into social connections, which can even turn into a real relationship in reality.

## the new media :

The high-tech dictionary briefly defines the new media and describes it as the merger of computers, computer networks and multimedia, according to Lester". New media, in short, is the set of communication technologies that have been created from the intermarriage between computers and traditional media means printing, photography, audio and video .( Mizal, M, 1993)

## Facebook :

Facebook is considered One of the most important social networking sites, and it is not only a social forum, but it has become an easy technology base through which anyone can do whatever they want (Hijab, M , M, 2004)

## Facebook Procedurally:

It is a social networking website, freely accessible and managed by Facebook Limited Liability as its own property.

## Data collection tool: Questionnaire:

We relied on the questionnaire and survey form, which is a method of data collection that aims to consult the researched individuals in a systematic and codified way to present specific facts, opinions and ideas within the framework of data related to the subject of the study and its goals without interference from the researcher in a self-report of respondents in this data which is in this data and is a printed form that contains On a set of questions addressed to a sample of individuals, on a topic or topics related to the aims of the study (Saad El-Din, E, S, 1998)
The format of the form has been designed after several directions and guidance by the arbitrators ( Arbitration Professors, 2020).
To the design The final form of the experimental form comes in its form divided into six axes.

## Curriculum :

We relied in this research on the descriptive approach, so this study is descriptive studies, which depend on the survey method survey, Which is based on the description of the phenomenon to gain access to the causes of her and the factors that control the draw results for circulation. This is done according to a specific research plan, through the collection, organization, and analysis of data. The descriptive approach includes more than one method. We relied on the survey method because it includes collecting data and variables for a large number of individuals. This method is applied in many studies in order to describe the current status of the phenomenon in detail and accurately. And to compare the phenomenon described in the study with levels and criteria to be chosen to accurately identify the characteristics of the studied phenomenon (El- Sawy , M, Mubarak, M, 1998)

## Search tools :

These are the various methods that the researcher uses to collect targeted information and data within his use of one or more specific approaches.

## The questionnaire :

It is the primary tool for collecting information from the sample individuals, which includes a set of questions that enables to identify the opinions and ideas of the respondents on the subject of the research. This method is characterized by the fact that it helps to collect new information or is derived directly from the reality( Abu Sayyah,J,M,20022002)
It is also known as a tool for obtaining facts, collecting data and methods that already exist .It depends on preparing a set of questions to send to a large number of individuals (Abdel-Majid, M, 1993)

## research community :

The research population in this study is the group of static families in Ha'il as they represent the target group to answer the questionnaire.
And since the vocabulary of the research was characterized by a degree of homogeneity and similarity in a large number of features, the researcher was satisfied with selecting the families of Al-Salam neighborhood in Ha'i l.

## *Sample:

It is a percentage of the total number of cases where one or several properties are available and it consists of a limited number of cases chosen from the sectors of a particular society for study, after which the sample size is intentionally divided among the different families(Abdel-Fattah, M, 199 8)
As for the type of sample chosen, it is the intentional, non-probable sample, so that the choice of the vocabulary of the research was directed to the families of Ha'il city, and the sample was determined by 100 families represented in a A university student for each family in the exploratory study in order to determine the features of the field and choose the most effective application of the study, as for basic study was the basic study sample . social on the city of Ha'il .

## Theoretical framework for the study :

So that we do not start from a vacuum in our study, we believe that it is more appropriate for us to rely on a specific theory, which would provide a comparative characteristic of depth and comprehensiveness of our study, by making use of knowledge accumulation and then guiding our course in field work by data questions. The hypotheses are a clear definition based on the accumulated knowledge accumulated, and given that our topic is about the impact of Facebook on family dementia, we have seen it more appropriate to rely on the theory of uses and gratifications ,either to reach more comprehensive results and service to the topic.

## 1-The concept of the uses and gratifications theory and its hypotheses:

The theory of uses and gratifications is the theory that is concerned with the study of mass communication, an organized and functional study, and its vision for the masses is limited to being effective in selecting its members for messages and media content, unlike early theories such as the unified effects theory or the magic bullet that sees the masses as negative and separate beings and act constructively $O n$ the same pattern, the media is more powerful than social, demographic, and personal variables (Bin Yunus , M, M, 2007) .
And are uses theory died and the gratifications s study of mass communication study of functional organization Through the decade of the forties of the twentieth century led to recognize the consequences of Individual differences and social inequality on the perception associated with the behavior of the media to the beginning of a new perspective of the relationship between the masses and the media, and that was a shift from Seeing the masses as an passive, ineffective element, to seeing them as effective in their members' selection of messages and a preferred content from the media .(Abbas S, M, 2008) .
The question is no longer asked: What did the media do to the public?
Why do audiences use media products ?
What are the satisfactions achieved ?And these questions involve...
On the transfer of the subject of influence from the content of the media article only, to the entire communication context. The source of the gratifications that the recipient gets from the mass media may relate to the specific content of the message, or exposure to the media itself, or to the special communication situation associated with a media outlet where the theory of uses and gratifications is Based on the way Which consumers actively choose to meet their own needs, this theory does not see users as passive consumers. The media industry controls their behavior, but it believes that they are responsible for their choice of which media they use how they use it (Abbas S, M, 2008) .Katz and his colleagues summarize the basic assumptions of the theory as follows (Muhammad Munir Hijab).
A media audience is an active, positive and effective audience whose use of the media is linked to specific goals.

- The public chooses the media from which it its satisfies desires and needs.
- Other media compete To satisfy the needs of the public, such as personal contact with official or academic institutions, and other relationships between the public and the means of communication with many environmental factors.
The public is able to determine its interests, needs, and motives for exposure to the media, and thus chooses the means that satisfy its needs and desires .
- The public can use the media the consistency and cultural norms prevalent in society and is determined in light of
It is the audience that determines the nature of its use of the content that desires the elements of the theory of uses


## Gratings :

Active Audience Assumption :Hewitt claims that ancient theories viewed the audience as a passive recipient of the power of messages and their effective influence until the concept of a stubborn audience searching for what they wanted to be exposed to and controlling the choice of the means that provided this content( Makkawi , H, E \& Al-Sayed, L, H, 2008) .

Where he restored this assumption, the theory that viewed the audience as a passive, powerless, and easy-to-influence recipient, and he has come to be seen as an active audience that picks and chooses the messages that he cares about to satisfy his needs in the end( Feryal Mhanna , 2002)

## Social and psychological origins of media use :

The emergence of the concept of selective perception based on individual differences led to the assumption that different types of people choose activities themselves and explain the media in a variety of different ways, that is, psychological factors can lead to the presence of incentives and identify many assets from the use of the media( Mervat Al-Tarabishi Abdul Aziz Al-Sayed, 2006) . Several studies have provided evidence empirical on the role of demographic factors and social exposure to the media: such as a link of this type of Exposure age, profession and educational level, social and economic (Makkawi, H, E \& Al-Sayed, L, H, 2008) . Motives for public exposure to the media: There are different perspectives to study the motives of public exposure to the media, but in general, most studies divide the motives for exposure to two categories (Tarabishi, M \& Al-Sayed, Al , 2006).
Utilitarian motivations :It aims at learning oneself, information, experiences and all forms of learning in general, which are reflected in news, educational and cultural programs..
Ritual motives :It aims to spend time, relaxation, charity and familiarity with the means and escape from problems. This category is reflected in fictional programs such as serials, films, variety and others.
Expectations from the media :see " Katz" The yearning At the gratifications that are looking for (Hamdi H, 1991) Thus, expectations to the choice of means and contents. Individuals differ from the media according to individual differences, as well as according to different cultures .Schramm sees In this regard that a person chooses one of the available media that he thinks will achieve psychological satisfaction. Required( Makkawi , H, E \& Al-Sayed, L, H, 2008)
Exposure to the media :Numerous studies have indicated the existence of correlations between the search for gratifications and exposure to the media, and it lends to the increased public exposure in general to the media about the activity of this audience and its ability to choose information that meets its needs ( Makkawi , H, E \& Al-Sayed, L, H, 2008)
Satisfaction of the media : The saturation of the media is the outcome that results from the public's use of the media, and the saturation achieved by the public depends on the type of means, the type of content presented and the nature of the social circumstance in which the communication was made ( .Hamdi H, 1991)
E.Gratifications Content :include gratification resulting from exposure to the contents of the media and are of two types, gratifications guidance includes access to information and confirm the defender and gratifications social relations meant social network
E grtifications scientific : and are not related to the characteristics of the content of scientific communication, but about the nature of scientific communication by choosing intermediate quality that is exposure to him include gratifications semi - guidelines, such as the feeling of pleasure.

## Field study:

As for the field study, this section deals with the applied aspect of the study whose content revolves around: "The effect of Facebook on family silence," as we analyzed the field study data based on the questionnaires that were initially distributed on a research sample of 100 individuals divided between males and females.

## Analysis of respondents' responses

## 1- Distribution of sample individuals according to gender:

Table No. (1) Distribution of the sample members according to gender

| percentage | Repetition | Sex | M |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| $74.0 \%$ | 74 | Mention | $\mathbf{1}$ |
| $26.0 \%$ | 26 | female | $\mathbf{2}$ |
| $100.0 \%$ | 100 | Total |  |

It is clear from Table (1) that the ratio of (74.0) \%Of the sample members are males, while the percentage of) 26.0 ( $\%$ Of respondents are females.


## -2Distribution of the sample according to age:

Table No. (2) Distribution of the sample members according to age

| percentage | Repetition | Age | M |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $12.0 \%$ | 12 | Less than 20 years old | $\mathbf{1}$ |
| $53.0 \%$ | 53 | From 20 to less than 30 years old | $\mathbf{2}$ |
| $14.0 \%$ | 14 | From 30 to less than 40 years old | $\mathbf{3}$ |
| $21.0 \%$ | 21 | Over 40 years old | $\mathbf{4}$ |
| $100.0 \%$ | 100 | Total |  |

It is clear from Table (2) that the ratio of (12.0) \%Of respondents are less than 20 years old, while the percentage of)53.0) \%Of the sample members are from 20 to less than 30 years old, while the percentage off14.0) \%Of the sample members are from 30 to less than 40 years old, while the percentage of) 21.0 (\% Of respondents are over 40 years old.


## -3Distribution of the sample according to the educational level:

Table No. (3) Distribution of the sample according to the educational level

| percentage | Repetition | Educational level | $\mathbf{M}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $4.0 \%$ | 4 | primary | $\mathbf{1}$ |
| $3.0 \%$ | 3 | Average | $\mathbf{2}$ |
| $12.0 \%$ | 12 | secondary | $\mathbf{3}$ |
| $81.0 \%$ | 81 | Collectors | 4 |
| $100.0 \%$ | 100 | Total |  |

It is clear from Table (3) that the ratio of (4.0) \%Of the sample members have a primary qualification, while the percentage of 3.0 ) $\%$ Of the sample members have an intermediate qualification, while the percentage of) 12.0 ) \%Of the sample members have a secondary qualification, while the percentage of) 81.0 (\%Of respondents whose ages have a university degree.

-4Distribution of the sample members according to marital status:
Table No. (4) Distribution of the sample members according to marital status

| percentage | Repetition | Social status | $\mathbf{M}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| $58.0 \%$ | 58 | Unmarried | $\mathbf{1}$ |
| $34.0 \%$ | 34 | Married | $\mathbf{2}$ |
| $3.0 \%$ | 3 | absolute | $\mathbf{3}$ |
| $5.0 \%$ | 5 | Widower | $\mathbf{4}$ |
| $100.0 \%$ | 100 | Total |  |

It is clear from Table (4) that the ratio of (4.0) \%Of the sample members are single, while the percentage of)3.0) \%Of the sample members are married, while the percentage of)12.0) \%Of the sample members are divorced, while the proportion of 81.0 (\%Of respondents are widows.

-5Distribution of sample members according to Do you have a job:
Table No. (5) Distribution of the sample members according to whether you have a job

| percentage | Repetition | Do you have a job? | M |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| $56.0 \%$ | 56 | No | $\mathbf{1}$ |
| $44.0 \%$ | 44 | Yes | $\mathbf{2}$ |
| $100.0 \%$ | 100 | Total |  |

It is clear from Table (5) that the ratio of (56.0) \%Of the sample members are unemployed, while the percentage of) 3.0 (\%Of respondents are affiliated with different jobs.

-6Distribution of the sample members according to the size of the family:
Table No. (6) Distribution of the sample members according to the size of the family

| percentage | Repetition | Family size | M |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| $54.0 \%$ | 54 | big | $\mathbf{1}$ |
| $46.0 \%$ | 46 | Small | $\mathbf{2}$ |
| $100.0 \%$ | 100 | Total |  |

It is clear from Table No. (6) that the ratio of (54.0 (\%Of the sample members have large families, while the percentage of (46.0 (\%Of respondents whose families are small.

-7Distribute the sample members according to whether you have a private room:
Table No. (7) Distribution of the sample members according to whether you have a private room

| percentage | Repetition | Do you have a private room | M |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| $25.0 \%$ | 25 | No | $\mathbf{1}$ |
| $75.0 \%$ | 75 | Yes | $\mathbf{2}$ |
| $100.0 \%$ | 100 | Total |  |

It is clear from Table No. (7) that the ratio of (25.0 (\%Of the sample individuals do not have a private room, while the percentage of $\mathbf{~} 75.0$ (\%Of respondents have a private room.

-8Distribution of the sample members according to whether you are connected to the internet:
Table No. (8) Distribution of the sample members according to their internet connection

| percentage | Repetition | Are you connected to the internet? | $\mathbf{M}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| $12.0 \%$ | 12 | From the computer | $\mathbf{1}$ |
| $86.0 \%$ | 86 | Via mobile | 2 |
| $2.0 \%$ | 2 | Via the electronic board | $\mathbf{3}$ |
| $100.0 \%$ | 100 | Total |  |

It is clear from Table No. (8) that the ratio of (25.0 (\%Of the sample individuals are connected to the internet via a computer, while the percentage of ( 75.0 (\%Of the sample members are connected to the internet via mobile, while the percentage of ( 75.0 (\%Of respondents are connected to the internet via the electronic board.

-8Distribution of sample members according to Do you have an e-mail account:

Table No. (9) Distribution of the sample members according to whether you have an e-mail account

| percentage | Repetition | Do you have an email account? | M |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| $3.0 \%$ | 3 | No | $\mathbf{1}$ |
| $97.0 \%$ | 97 | Yes | $\mathbf{2}$ |
| $100.0 \%$ | 100 | Total |  |

It is clear from Table No. (9) that the ratio of (3.0 (\%Of respondents do not have an e-mail account, while the percentage of $\mathbf{~} 97.0$ (\%Of respondents have an email account.

-9Distribution of the sample members according to whether you see the e-mails:
Table No. (10) Distribution of the sample members according to whether they look at the electronic messages

| percentage | Repetition | Are you looking at the emails? | M |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $9.0 \%$ | 9 | No | $\mathbf{1}$ |
| $91.0 \%$ | 91 | Yes | $\mathbf{2}$ |
| $100.0 \%$ | 100 | Total |  |

It is clear from Table No. (10) that the ratio of (9.0 (\%Of the sample individuals do not see e-mails, while the percentage of 91.0 (\%Of respondents see e-mails.

-10Distribution of sample members according to Do you have an account on social media:
Table No. (11) Distribution of the sample members according to whether an account on social media

| percentage | Repetition | An account on social media | M |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $4.0 \%$ | 4 | No | $\mathbf{1}$ |
| $96.0 \%$ | 96 | Yes | $\mathbf{2}$ |
| $100.0 \%$ | 100 | Total |  |

It is clear from Table No. (11) that the ratio of (9.0 (\%Of the sample individuals do not see e-mails, while the percentage of (91.0 (\%Of respondents see e-mails.

-11Distribution of the sample members according to if the answer is yes, what is it:
Table No. (12) Distribution of the sample members according to owning an account on social media

| percentage | Repetition | If yes then what is it | M |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $16.0 \%$ | 16 | Facebook | $\mathbf{1}$ |
| $42.0 \%$ | 42 | Twitter | $\mathbf{2}$ |
| $27.0 \%$ | 27 | snap chat | $\mathbf{3}$ |
| $9.0 \%$ | 9 | Instagram | $\mathbf{4}$ |
| $2.0 \%$ | 2 | LinkedIn | $\mathbf{5}$ |
| $4.0 \%$ | 4 | There is no | $\mathbf{6}$ |
| $100.0 \%$ | 100 | Total |  |

It is clear from Table No. (12) that the ratio of (4.0 (\%Of respondents have an account on Facebook, while the percentage of (3.0 (\%Of respondents have an account on Twitter, while the percentage of (12.0 (\%Of the sample have an account on Snapchat, while the percentage of (81.0) \%Of respondents have an Instagram account, while the percentage of) 81.0 (\%Of respondents have an account on LinkedIn , while the percentage of ( 81.0 (\%Of respondents do not have an account.

-12The distribution of the sample members according to the use of other social media sites. Determine:

Table No. (13): The distribution of the sample members according to the use of other social media sites

| percentage | Repetition | Select other social media sites | M |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| $22.0 \%$ | 22 | What's Up | $\mathbf{1}$ |
| $59.0 \%$ | 59 | Two of the above | $\mathbf{2}$ |
| $19.0 \%$ | 19 | All of the above | $\mathbf{3}$ |
| $100.0 \%$ | 100 | Total |  |

It is clear from Table No. (13) that the ratio of (4.0) \%Of the sample members have a WhatsApp account, while the percentage of) 3.0 (\%Of the sample members have an account on two of the above, while the percentage of (12.0 (\%Of respondents have an account on all of the above.


13- Distribution of the sample members according to how long you spend on your physio
Table No. (14): The distribution of the sample members according to how long you spend on the physioc

| percentage | Repetition | How long do you spend on Physioc | M |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $56.0 \%$ | 56 | Less than an hour | $\mathbf{1}$ |
| $15.0 \%$ | 15 th | hour | $\mathbf{2}$ |
| $29.0 \%$ | 29 | more than an hour | $\mathbf{3}$ |
| $100.0 \%$ | 100 | Total |  |

It is clear from Table No. (14) that the ratio of (56.0 (\%Of respondents spend less than an hour per day on Facebook, while the percentage of (15.0 (\%Of respondents spend an hour a day on Facebook, while the percentage of (29.0 (\%Of respondents spend more than an hour a day on Facebook.


14- Distribution of the sample members according to where they use Facebook
Table No. (15): The distribution of the sample members according to where they use Facebook

| percentage | Repetition | Where to use Facebook | M |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| $87.0 \%$ | 87 | The house | $\mathbf{1}$ |
| $10.0 \%$ | 10 | Workplace | $\mathbf{2}$ |
| $3.0 \%$ | 3 | Internet cafe | $\mathbf{3}$ |
| $100.0 \%$ | 100 | Total |  |

It is clear from Table No. (15) that the ratio of (87.0 (\%Of respondents use Facebook at home, while the percentage of (10.0 (\%Of respondents use Facebook in the workplace, while the percentage of (3.0 (\%Of respondents use Facebook in an internet café.


15th- Distribution of the sample members according to another place to use Facebook
Table No. (16): The distribution of the sample members according to another place to use Facebook

| percentage | Repetition | Another place to use Facebook | $\mathbf{M}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $7.0 \%$ | 7 | parks | $\mathbf{1}$ |
| $31.0 \%$ | 31 | rest | $\mathbf{2}$ |
| $29.0 \%$ | 29 | Everywhere | $\mathbf{3}$ |
| $33.0 \%$ | 33 | nowhere else | $\mathbf{4}$ |


| $100.0 \%$ | 100 | Total |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |

It is clear from Table No. (16) that the ratio of (7.0) \%Of respondents use Facebook at home in parks, while the percentage of (31.0 (\%Of respondents use Facebook for rest, while the percentage of (29.0 (\%Of respondents use Facebook everywhere, while the percentage of (33.0 (\%Of respondents do not use Facebook anywhere else.

-16Distribution of respondents according to whether you use Facebook to communicate with others:

Table No. (17): The distribution of the sample members according to whether Facebook is used to communicate with others

| percentage | Repetition | Do you use Facebook <br> communicate with others? | to |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | M

It is clear from Table No. (17) that the ratio of 9.0 (\%Of respondents do not use Facebook to communicate with others, while the percentage of ( 91.0 (\%Of respondents use Facebook to communicate with others.


17- The distribution of the sample members according to what constitutes your communication circle on Facebook

Table No. (18): The distribution of the sample members according to what constitutes your communication circle on Facebook

| percentage | Repetition | What is the circle of your <br> communication on Facebook | M |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| $49.0 \%$ | 49 | friends | $\mathbf{1}$ |
| $10.0 \%$ | 10 | family members | $\mathbf{2}$ |
| $18.0 \%$ | 18 | colleagues | 3 |
| $23.0 \%$ | 23 | Other categories | 4 |
| $100.0 \%$ | 100 | Total |  |

It is clear from Table No. (18) that the ratio of (49.0 (\%Of respondents use Facebook to communicate with friends, while the percentage of ( 10.0 (\%Of respondents use Facebook to communicate with family members, while the percentage of 18.0 (\%Of respondents use Facebook to communicate with work colleagues, while the percentage of (23.0 (\%Of respondents do not use Facebook to communicate with other groups.

-18Distribution of the sample members according to whether you use a pseudonym with a pseudonym:
Table No. (19) Distribution of the sample members according to whether a pseudonym is used with a pseudonym

| percentage | Repetition | Are you using an alias with an <br> alias? | M |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| $67.0 \%$ | 67 | No | $\mathbf{1}$ |
| $33.0 \%$ | 33 | Yes | 2 |
| $100.0 \%$ | 100 | Total |  |

It is clear from Table No. (19) that the ratio of (67.0 (\%Of the sample respondents do not use a pseudonym with a pseudonym, while the percentage of ( 33.0 (\%Of respondents use a pseudonym with a pseudonym.


## -19Distribution of the sample members according to whether you use your real name with your personal picture:

Table No. (20) Distribution of the sample members according to whether you use your real name with your personal photo

| percentage | Repetition | Do you use your real name with <br> your profile picture? | M |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $54.0 \%$ | 54 | No | $\mathbf{1}$ |
| $46.0 \%$ | 46 | Yes | $\mathbf{2}$ |
| $100.0 \%$ | 100 | Total |  |

It is clear from Table No. (20) that the ratio of (54.0 (\%Of the respondents do not use their real name with their personal picture, while the percentage of (46.0 (\%Of respondents use their real name with their personal picture.

-20Distribution of the sample members according to whether you use your real name with a pseudonym:

Table No. (21) Distribution of the sample members according to whether you use your real name with a borrowed photo

| percentage $\quad$ Repetition | Are you using your real name with <br> a borrowed photo? | $M$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |


| $53.0 \%$ | 53 | No | $\mathbf{1}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| $47.0 \%$ | 47 | Yes | $\mathbf{2}$ |
| $100.0 \%$ | 100 | Total |  |

It is clear from Table No. (21) that the ratio of (53.0 (\%Of the respondents do not use their real name with a pseudonym, while the percentage of (47.0 (\%Of respondents using their real name with a borrowed photo.


## -21Distribution of the sample members according to the information provided in the profile Is it correct:

Table No. (22): the distribution of the sample members according to the information provided in the profile, are they correct?

| percentage | Repetition | The information provided in the <br> profile is correct | $\mathbf{M}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $9.0 \%$ | 9 | No | $\mathbf{1}$ |
| $91.0 \%$ | 91 | Yes | $\mathbf{2}$ |
| $100.0 \%$ | 100 | Total |  |

It is clear from Table No. (22) that the ratio of 9.0 (\%Of the sample individuals do not use the real information in their profile, while the percentage of ( 91.0 (\%Of respondents use the real information in their profile.

-22Distribute the sample according to Do you have criteria on which to base the selection of friends:
Table No. (23): The distribution of the sample members according to whether you have criteria on which to select friends

| percentage | Repetition | Do you have criteria for picking <br> friends? | M |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $16.0 \%$ | 16 | No | $\mathbf{1}$ |
| $84.0 \%$ | 84 | Yes | 2 |
| $100.0 \%$ | 100 | Total |  |

It is clear from Table No. (23) that the ratio of (16.0 (\%Of the sample individuals do not rely on criteria for selecting friends, while the percentage of ( 84.0 (\%Of respondents rely on criteria in selecting friends.

-23Distribution of the sample members according to whether the network helped you to find friends with the specifications you want:

Table No. (24): Distribution of the sample members according to whether the network helped you to find friends with the specifications you want

| percentage | Repetition | Did the network help you to find <br> friends with the specifications you |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |


|  |  | want? |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $38.0 \%$ | 38 | No | $\mathbf{1}$ |
| $62.0 \%$ | 62 | Yes | $\mathbf{2}$ |
| $100.0 \%$ | 100 | Total |  |

It is clear from Table No. (24) that the ratio of (38.0) \%Of the sample individuals were not helped by the network to find friends with the specifications they want, while the percentage of (62.0 (\%Of respondents who were helped by the network to find friends with the specifications they want.


## -24Distribution of respondents according to whether you use chatting with your friends:

Table No. (25): The distribution of the sample members according to whether to use chat with your friends

| percentage | Repetition | Do you use chatting with your <br> friends | M |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| $22.0 \%$ | 22 | No | $\mathbf{1}$ |
| $78.0 \%$ | 78 | Yes | $\mathbf{2}$ |
| $100.0 \%$ | 100 | Total |  |

It is clear from Table No. (25) that the ratio of (22.0 (\%Of respondents do not use chatting with their friends, while the percentage of ( 78.0 (\%Of respondents using chatting with their friends.

-24 Distribution of the sample members according to your family members and for how long:

Table No. (26) Distribution of the sample members according to the members of your family and how long it has been

| percentage | Repetition | With your family members and for <br> how long | $\mathbf{M}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $11.0 \%$ | 11 | hour | $\mathbf{1}$ |
| $58.0 \%$ | 58 | Two hours | $\mathbf{2}$ |
| $31.0 \%$ | 31 | More than two hours | $\mathbf{3}$ |
| $100.0 \%$ | 100 | Total |  |

It is clear from Table No. (26) that the ratio of (11.0 (\%Of respondents use chatting with their families for an hour a day, while the percentage of ( 58.0 ( $\%$ Of respondents use chatting with their families for a period of two hours per day, while the percentage of (31.0 (\%Of respondents use chatting with their families for more than two hours a day.

-25Distribute the sample members according to your colleagues' members and how long it lasts:

Table No. (27): The distribution of the sample members according to the number of your colleagues and their duration

| percentage | Repetition | With your fellow members and for <br> how long | M |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| $54.0 \%$ | 54 | hour | $\mathbf{1}$ |
| $25.0 \%$ | 25 | Two hours | $\mathbf{2}$ |
| $21.0 \%$ | 21 | More than two hours | $\mathbf{3}$ |
| $100.0 \%$ | 100 | Total |  |

It is clear from Table No. (27) that the ratio of (54.0 (\%Of respondents use chatting with their colleagues for an hour a day, while the percentage of ( 25.0 (\%Of respondents use chatting with their colleagues for a period of two hours per day, while the percentage of (21.0 (\%Of respondents use chatting with their colleagues for more than two hours daily.


26- Distribution of the sample members according to how the relationship between family members was before using Facebook

Table No. (45): The distribution of the sample members according to how the relationship between family members was before using Facebook

| percentage | Repetition | How was the relationship between <br> family members <br> using Facebore | M |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $7.0 \%$ | 7 | very bad | $\mathbf{1}$ |
| $13.0 \%$ | 13 | Bad | $\mathbf{2}$ |
| $22.0 \%$ | 22 | Normal | $\mathbf{3}$ |
| $18.0 \%$ | 18 | Good | $\mathbf{4}$ |
| $40.0 \%$ | 40 | Very good | $\mathbf{5}$ |
| $100.0 \%$ | 100 | Total |  |

It is clear from Table No. (45) that the ratio of (7.0 (\%Of the respondents, the relationship between their family members before using Facebook was very bad, while the percentage of (13.0 (\%Of the sample individuals had a bad relationship between their family members before using Facebook, while the percentage of ( 22.0 (\%Of the sample individuals the relationship between their family members before using Facebook was normal, while the percentage of (18.0 (\%Of the sample, the relationship between their family members before using Facebook was good, while the percentage of (40.0 (\%Of respondents, the relationship between their family members before using Facebook was very good.


27- Distribution of the sample members according to how the relationship was between family members while using Facebook

Table No. (46): The distribution of the sample members according to how the relationship was between family members while using Facebook

| percentage | Repetition | How was the relationship between <br> family members <br> using Facebook | M |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $5.0 \%$ | very bad | $\mathbf{1}$ |  |
| $2.0 \%$ | 5 | Bad | $\mathbf{2}$ |
| $30.0 \%$ | 2 | Normal | $\mathbf{3}$ |
| $26.0 \%$ | 30 | Good | $\mathbf{4}$ |
| $37.0 \%$ | 36 | Very good | $\mathbf{5}$ |
| $100.0 \%$ | 100 | Total |  |

It is clear from Table No. (46) that the ratio of (5.0 (\%Of the sample individuals the relationship between their family members while using Facebook was very bad, while the percentage of ( 2.0 ( $\%$ Of the sample individuals had a bad relationship between their family members while using Facebook, while the percentage of ( 30.0 (\%Of the sample individuals the relationship between their family members while using Facebook was normal, while the percentage of (26.0 (\%Of the sample individuals the relationship between their family members while using Facebook was good, while the percentage of (37.0 (\%Of the respondents, the relationship between their family members while using Facebook was very good.

-28Distribution of the sample members according to if they are bad. Does the use of Facebook have a role in that:

Table No. (47) Distribution of the sample members according to the role of the use of Facebook in the deterioration of the relationship between family members

| percentage | Repetition | If it's bad, does Facebook use have <br> a role | M |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $63.0 \%$ | 63 | No | $\mathbf{1}$ |
| $37.0 \%$ | 37 | Yes | $\mathbf{2}$ |
| $100.0 \%$ | 100 | Total |  |

It is clear from Table No. (47) that the ratio of (63.0 (\%Of the sample individuals do not see Facebook as a role in the bad relationship between family members, while the percentage of (37.0 (\%Of respondents see Facebook as a role in the bad relationship between family members.


29- Distribution of the sample members according to what are your observations on the family relationship with family members when using Facebook

Table No. (48) Distribution of the sample members according to the observations used in the familial relationship with family members when using Facebook

| percentage | Repetition | What are your notes on the family <br> relationship with family members <br> when using Facebook | M |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $3.0 \%$ | 3 | very bad | $\mathbf{1}$ |
| $16.0 \%$ | 16 | Bad | $\mathbf{2}$ |
| $46.0 \%$ | 46 | Normal | $\mathbf{3}$ |
| $11.0 \%$ | 11 | Good | 4 |
| $24.0 \%$ | 24 | Very good | $\mathbf{5}$ |
| $100.0 \%$ | 100 | Total |  |

It is clear from Table No. (48) that the ratio of (3.0 (\%Of the sample individuals their observations of the family relationship with family members when using Facebook were very bad, while the percentage of (16.0 (\%Of the sample members had bad observations about the family relationship with family members
when using Facebook, while the percentage of (46.0 (\%Of the sample individuals their observations of the family relationship with family members when using Facebook were normal, while the percentage of (11.0 (\%Of the sample members had good observations about the family relationship with family members when using Facebook, while the percentage of ( 24.0 (\%Of the sample respondents had very good observations about the family relationship with family members when using Facebook and yours.


## -30Distribution of sample members according to the impact of lack of contact with family members on your daily life as a result of using Facebook

Table No. (49): Distribution of sample members according to the impact of lack of contact with family members on your daily life as a result of using Facebook

| percentage | Repetition | The impact of lack of contact with <br> family members on your daily life <br> as a result of using Facebook | $\mathbf{M}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $13.0 \%$ | 13 | Insomnia | $\mathbf{1}$ |
| $24.0 \%$ | 24 | Lack of verbal communication | $\mathbf{2}$ |
| $12.0 \%$ | 12 | Neglecting homework | 3 |
| $23.0 \%$ | 23 | Lack of attention to family needs | 4 |
| $28.0 \%$ | 28 | Feeling bored | 5 |
| $100.0 \%$ | 100 | Total |  |

It is clear from Table No. (49) that the ratio of (13.0 (\%Of the sample members as a result of lack of contact with family members due to the use of Facebook are exposed to insomnia, while the proportion of (24.0 (\% Of the sample members as a result of not communicating with family members due to their use of Facebook, they are exposed to a lack of verbal communication, while the percentage of (12.0) \%Of respondents as a result of not communicating with family members on account of using Facebook are exposed to neglect of household duties, while the percentage of 23.0 (\%Of the sample members as a result of lack of contact with family members due to the use of Facebook are exposed to a lack of attention to the needs of the family, while the percentage of ( 28.0 (\%Of respondents as a result of lack of contact with family members on Facebook because of using Facebook, they experience a feeling of boredom.


## -31Distribution of the sample according to whether addiction to Facebook use resulted in unusual behaviors

Table No. (50): Distribution of sample individuals according to whether addiction to Facebook use resulted in uncommon behaviors

| percentage | Repetition | Did to Facebook use result in uncommon behaviors? | addiction | M |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 31.0\% | 31 | Silence |  | 1 |
| 14.0\% | 14 | Emotion |  | 2 |
| 40.0\% | 40 | isolation |  | 3 |
| 15.0\% | 15th | Alienation |  | 4 |
| 100.0\% | 100 | Total |  |  |

It is clear from Table No. (50) that the ratio of (31.0 (\%Of respondents believe that Facebook addiction causes silence, while the percentage of (14.0 (\%Of the sample respondents believe that Facebook addiction causes emotion, while the percentage of (40.0 (\%Of respondents believe that Facebook addiction causes isolation, while the percentage of (15.0 (\%Of respondents believe that Facebook addiction causes alienation.

-32Distribution of the sample members according to whether you agree that the popularity of Facebook has increased the dedication of family isolation

Table No. (51) Distribution of the sample according to whether you agree that the popularity of Facebook has increased the perpetuation of family isolation

| percentage | Repetition | Do you agree that the popularity <br> of Facebook has increased family <br> isolation? | M |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $20.0 \%$ | 20 | Not completely OK | $\mathbf{1}$ |
| $5.0 \%$ | 5 | not agree | $\mathbf{2}$ |
| $31.0 \%$ | 31 | I do not know | $\mathbf{3}$ |
| $33.0 \%$ | 33 | OK | $\mathbf{4}$ |
| $11.0 \%$ | 11 | Completely ok | $\mathbf{5}$ |
| $100.0 \%$ | 100 | Total |  |

It is clear from Table No. (51) that the ratio of (13.0 (\%Of respondents do not fully agree that the use of Facebook increased family isolation, while the percentage of (24.0 (\%Of respondents do not agree that the use of Facebook increased family isolation, while the percentage of (12.0 (\%Of the sample respondents do not know if the use of Facebook increased family isolation or not, while the percentage of (23.0 (\%Of respondents agree that the use of Facebook increased family isolation, while the percentage of ( 28.0 (\%Of respondents fully agree that the use of Facebook increased family isolation.

-33 The response of the sample members to why the popularity of Facebook increased the dedication of family isolation?

By reviewing the answers of the sample members, the researcher clarifies the following to the answer to the question in several points, namely:

1. Because everyone has found someone with whom they share interests.
2. Because it has become at the expense of physical physical communication, which conveys feelings in a more present and intimate manner and more effective in provoking the reaction of the other party.
3. Being preoccupied with communicating with family members.
4. Because it has become a means of distraction and entertainment for some.
5. I think that the use of Facebook in the Arab countries is very much compared to other means of communication such as Snapchat, Instagram and others.
-34Response of respondents to what do you think of the effect of excessive use of Facebook on your family obligations?

By reviewing the answers of the sample members, the researcher clarifies the following to the answer to the question in several points, namely:

1. Of course it is something wrong, so the family is more important than the excessive use of communication programs.
2. It ruins family relationships.
3. Any excessive use of social media or any other materials that has a negative impact on the person and society around him
4. It leads to wasting time and shortcomings in worship.
5. Bad, and it will affect interpersonal communication resulting in socially unsound practices.
6. A significant and negative impact on the relationship of family members with each other
-35Distribution of the sample members according to whether the addiction to Facebook is the most recent of your families:

Table No. (54): Distribution of the sample members according to whether the addiction to Facebook brought about how many families there are

| percentage | Repetition | Is the addiction to Facebook <br> the latest in your family? | M |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $54.0 \%$ | 54 | No | $\mathbf{1}$ |
| $46.0 \%$ | 46 | Yes | $\mathbf{2}$ |
| $100.0 \%$ | 100 | Total |  |

It is clear from Table No. (54) that the ratio of (54.0 (\%Of the sample respondents do not believe that Facebook addiction has resulted in many family members, while the percentage of (46.0 (\%Of respondents believe that the addiction to Facebook caused you to have families.

-36The response of the sample members to why is the addiction to Facebook more recent than many of your families?

By reviewing the answers of the sample members, the researcher clarifies in the following the answer to the question, which revolves around the answers about this belief, it may have affected the individual in somewhat isolating behavior, but not to an exaggerated extent. .

## Verification of hypotheses:

-1The first hypothesis: the more family members are willing to use the site Facebook Facebook Whenever dialogue is absent or rather family dumb.

It is clear from Table No. (51) that the ratio of (13.0 (\%Of respondents do not fully agree that the use of Facebook increased family isolation, while the percentage of (24.0 (\%Of respondents do not agree that the use of Facebook increased family isolation, while the percentage of (12.0 (\%Of the sample
respondents do not know if the use of Facebook increased family isolation or not, while the percentage of (33.0 (\%Of respondents agree that the use of Facebook increased family isolation, while the percentage of ( 28.0 (\%Of respondents fully agree that the use of Facebook increased family isolation. And make sure by reviewing the answers of the sample members, and this confirms the proposed hypothesis
-2The second hypothesis: the more family members are willing to use Facebook Facebook Whenever new behaviors are produced among family members, such as alienation and social isolation

It is clear from Table No. (50) that the ratio of (31.0 (\%Of respondents believe that Facebook addiction causes silence, while the percentage of (14.0 (\%Of the sample respondents believe that Facebook addiction causes emotion, while the percentage of (40.0 (\%Of respondents believe that Facebook addiction causes isolation, while the percentage of (15.0 (\%Of respondents believe that Facebook addiction causes alienation. This confirms the proposed hypothesis
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