

# An Empirical Study to Measuring the Impact of Organizational Media Performance on the Relationship between Social Media Management and Public Perception in UAE

Ayoub Y. A. ALAli<sup>1,\*</sup>, Muslimin B. Wallang<sup>1</sup>, and Hussein M. E. Abu Al-Rejal<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>UUM College of Law, Government and International Studies, Universiti Utara Malaysia, Sintok 06010, Kedah, Malaysia

<sup>2</sup>School of Technology Management and Logistics, University Utara Malaysia, Sintok 06010, Malaysia

Received: 2 Jul. 2023, Revised: 27 Oct. 2023, Accepted: 1 Nov. 2023

Published online: 1 Dec. 2023

**Abstract:** This study's main contribution is to deepen our understanding of the connections between social media management strategies, social media goals, the use of multiple platforms, content quality, follower interaction, scheduled publications, metrics analysis, organizational media performance, and public perception. The study looks at how social media management elements in government media organizations (such as the usage of social media tools, goals, various platforms, content quality, follower interaction, planned publication, and metrics analysis) affect the level of public perception in Dubai. Analyze the impact of social media management factors on the organizational media performance in Dubai's government media organizations, as well as the impact of organizational media performance in Dubai's government media institutions on public perception levels. and to investigate how organizational media performance mediates links between social media management characteristics and public perception in the UAE.

**Keywords:** Organizational Media Performance, Social Media Management, Public Perception

## 1 Introduction

The distinction between fact-based absolute truth and hypothetical reality influenced by public perception, media coverage, and reputation can be seen as the social phenomena known as public perception. It can be exceedingly challenging to change the way the public perceives someone, whether they are a politician, a celebrity, or a corporation. The public's perception of the industry as a whole can make it more challenging to put the right things into practice, even when individual businesses may endeavor to do the right things for the right reasons [1].

Wherever there is a generally negative public perception of the tobacco industry, such as in published articles about the risks of cigarette smoke or on television in scenes of tobacco executives testifying before Congress, it is assumed that the owners of the industry value profits over public safety and will not be willing to stop making such hazardous products. This impression may be based on an entirely accurate analysis of the sector or it may be based on skewed media coverage and flawed scientific research. Individual tobacco firms may find it challenging to adjust their business practices or project a positive image due to a bad public view [2].

Profit margins can make or break an organisation depending on how the public views it. A corporation can easily gain consumers for life if it is recognized as a trustworthy manufacturer of high-quality goods or services. Customers may leave, nonetheless, if they have a bad opinion of the same business, regardless of the specific information's impact on the view as a whole. obtained from a survey of the general public by [3].

The term "person perception" in social psychology refers to the various mental processes that are employed to create impressions of others [4]. In addition to how impressions are created, public perception also refers to the various inferences we draw about other people from our impressions and the inquiries we pose. How do we accomplish these milestones so rapidly and (usually) without mistakes is a question that cognitive psychologists ask. The information gleaned from a survey of public opinion is known as public perception. To put it another way, "public opinion" is merely the sum of the opinions of a group of people (often a randomly chosen sample) who are directly asked what they think about particular matters or events [5]

Social networking websites are crucial for shaping how the general public views the realities of societal concerns. [6] Based

\*Corresponding author e-mail: [ayoub\\_yousif\\_ali@gsgsg.uum.edu.my](mailto:ayoub_yousif_ali@gsgsg.uum.edu.my)

on the characteristics and features of the site itself, there are numerous reasons why the general public uses social networking services. The most significant concerns and subjects discussed by the public on social networking sites are the focus of these sites. The relationship between the audience's perception of social reality issues and their denial of the most significant difficulties and problems in contemporary society affects both the audience's perception and the extent of their participation in social networking sites [7].

Social media comes in a variety of shapes and sizes, including blogs, microblogs, social networks, media sharing websites, social bookmarking, voting websites, rating websites, forums, and virtual worlds, according to [8] study from 2020. Additionally, user-generated material, which distinguishes social media, has been found to be more powerful than conventional marketing messages in influencing the attitudes and behaviors of other users [9].

### 1.1 Problem Statement

By supplying people with critical knowledge and information on all facets of a single topic or numerous national and international issues, the media serves as a crucial pillar of the state and a significant agent of society [10]. It gives the audience guidance for making their judgments and perceptions and includes news and updates on a variety of subjects and events. Additionally, social media helps create platforms for the general people to voice their ideas and perceptions. In the past, the media were unable to accurately reflect public opinion on certain topics. This is because of the harm that these methods cause to the general public, a question that the present study will attempt to address [11].

When there are no constraints on access to knowledge about many important concerns, people can access any type of information they wish, turning the world into a global village where they can learn about every element. [12] The media can plan to bring about the desired changes in a society or for the individuals who reside in that specific society. People's perspectives are shaped by the information that is offered to them by the media, according to [13].

For a variety of reasons, perception is crucial in determining which topics are deemed essential and which are not. Perceptions can occasionally be influenced by numerous other factors [14].

### 1.2 Research Objective

In keeping with the overall goal of the study, which is to investigate how social media management affects organizational media performance and the amount to which it influences the public in Dubai.

### 1.3 Significance of the study

This study's main contribution is to deepen our understanding of the connections between social media management strategies, social media goals, the use of multiple platforms, content quality, follower interaction, scheduled publications, metrics analysis, organizational media performance, and public perception. This study makes use of social media management tactics to enhance media organizations' functionality and the way the public perceives them in Dubai. Based on numerous research like [15] ; [16], these hypotheses have been tested, and essential characteristics of social media management methods have been identified to explain their impact on public perception.

## 2 Description of the Sample

This section outlines the characteristics of the sample concerning the citizen's age. This characteristic is presented in table (1):

**Table (1):** Description of the sample of citizens (N=384).

Demographic Characteristics		Frequency	Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Age	18Years old	1	0.26%	0.26%
	Under 18Years old	2	0.52%	0.78%
	Over 18Years old	381	99.22%	100%

According to Table (1), 0.26% (1) 18 years old, followed by 0.52% (2) Under 18 years old, finally 99.22% (381) over 18 years old. These results mean that the majority of my sample concentrated on the age of 18 years old.

2.1 Descriptive analysis:

**Table (2):** Descriptive statistics (N=384).

Diminsions	Measurement Item	Mean	Std. deviation	Skewness	Kurtosis
Social media management tools	Q1	4.333	0.544	-0.188	0.463
	Q2	4.464	0.649	-1.158	2.020
	Q3	4.224	0.640	-0.598	1.367
	Q4	4.349	0.665	-0.800	0.665
	Q5	4.130	0.807	-0.601	-0.291
Social media management tools		4.300	0.409	-0.908	2.484
Social communication goals	Q6	4.195	0.639	-0.558	0.955
	Q7	4.313	0.702	-0.885	1.109
	Q8	4.201	0.704	-0.619	0.317
	Q9	4.260	0.670	-0.621	0.402
	Q10	4.091	0.814	-0.723	0.446
Social communication goals		4.212	0.475	-0.707	0.663
use of multiple platforms	Q11	4.453	0.632	-0.788	-0.092
	Q12	4.221	0.626	-0.459	0.597
	Q13	4.245	0.695	-0.606	0.114
	Q14	4.229	0.670	-0.461	-0.110
	Q15	4.096	0.781	-0.733	0.740
use of multiple platforms		4.249	0.478	-0.781	0.933
Quality content	Q16	4.430	0.613	-0.924	1.958
	Q17	4.357	0.613	-0.599	0.496
	Q18	4.253	0.651	-0.649	1.224

	Q19	4.391	0.657	-0.839	0.579
	Q20	4.224	0.749	-0.879	0.978
Quality content		4.331	0.448	-0.719	1.349
Followers interaction	Q21	4.430	0.609	-0.704	0.266
	Q22	4.221	0.655	-0.488	0.267
	Q23	4.195	0.712	-0.739	0.967
	Q24	4.250	0.682	-0.509	-0.184
	Q25	4.081	0.779	-0.741	0.813
Followers interaction		4.235	0.478	-0.796	1.447
Scheduled posts	Q26	4.229	0.681	-0.621	0.440
	Q27	4.174	0.696	-0.531	0.174
	Q28	4.122	0.728	-0.518	0.028
	Q29	4.146	0.771	-0.772	0.645
	Q30	4.023	0.809	-0.637	0.380
Scheduled posts		4.139	0.544	-0.995	1.776
Metrics analysis	Q31	4.419	0.577	-0.378	-0.748
	QQ32	4.271	0.634	-0.666	1.551
	Q33	4.224	0.640	-0.538	1.092
	Q34	4.260	0.682	-0.678	0.797
	Q35	4.206	0.706	-0.538	-0.060
Metrics analysis		4.276	0.449	-0.393	0.551
social media management		4.249	0.377	-0.557	0.840
Public perception	Q36	4.302	0.749	-0.858	0.269
	Q37	4.289	0.585	-0.391	0.725
	Q38	4.208	0.633	-0.511	0.789

	Q39	4.297	0.670	-0.796	1.288
	Q40	4.219	0.715	-0.952	1.946
Public perception		4.263	0.454	-0.886	2.235
organizational media performance	Q41	4.323	0.591	-0.390	0.221
	Q42	4.237	0.661	-0.682	1.287
	Q43	4.224	0.664	-0.446	-0.062
	Q44	4.271	0.642	-0.495	0.170
	Q45	4.141	0.720	-1.019	2.785
organizational media performance		4.239	0.440	-0.555	1.312

2.2 Structural Equation Modeling

**Table (3):** KMO & Bartlett's Test for all variables.

Variables	Dimensions	Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin	Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	
			Chi Square	Sig.
Independent Variable: social media management	Social media management tools	0.700	166.668	0.000
	Social communication goals	0.773	279.350	0.000
	use of multiple platforms	0.795	365.932	0.000
	Quality content	0.788	294.590	0.000
	Followers interaction	0.789	336.616	0.000
	Scheduled posts	0.834	485.858	0.000
	Metrics analysis	0.784	336.831	0.000
Independent Variable: social media management		0.931	4668.519	0.000
Mediator Variable: organizational media performance		0.764	289.919	0.000
Dependent Variable: Public perception		0.754	279.736	0.000

### The Model Fit of the Measurement Model

**Table (4):** The indices of model fit for the measurement model.

Measure	social media management	organizational media performance	Public perception	Threshold	Interpretation
	Estimate	Estimate	Estimate		
GFI	0.881	0.945	0.979	Closer to 1	Accepted
RMR	0.037	0.041	0.045	Closer to 0	Accepted
CFI	0.782	0.966	0.976	Closer to 1	Accepted
TLI	0.858	0.932	0.951	Closer to 1	Accepted
RMSEA	0.051	0.069	0.060	Less Than 0.08	Accepted

### 2.3 The Construct Validity of the Measurement Model:

Table (5) summarizes all the factors used to assess model validity:

**Table (5):** The validity and reliability of the measurement model.

Dimensions	Factor Loading and Reliability			Convergent Validity	
	Questions	Factor Loading	Cronbach's Alpha	AVE	CR
Social media management tools	Q1	0.340	0.587	0.458	0.238
	Q2	0.499			
	Q3	0.336			
	Q4	0.507			
	Q5	0.607			
Social communication goals	Q6	0.506	0.695	0.559	0.419
	Q7	0.562			
	Q8	0.571			
	Q9	0.526			
	Q10	0.631			
use of multiple platforms	Q11	0.609	0.739	0.604	0.515

	Q12	0.610			
	Q13	0.642			
	Q14	0.516			
	Q15	0.641			
Quality content	Q16	0.547	0.710	0.573	0.447
	Q17	0.565			
	Q18	0.523			
	Q19	0.585			
	Q20	0.643			
Followers interaction	Q21	0.538	0.729	0.592	0.487
	Q22	0.616			
	Q23	0.586			
	Q24	0.590			
	Q25	0.629			
Scheduled posts	Q26	0.622	0.789	0.657	0.622
	Q27	0.689			
	Q28	0.636			
	Q29	0.686			
	Q30	0.652			
Metrics analysis	Q31	0.575	0.728	0.592	0.487
	QQ32	0.609			
	Q33	0.606			
	Q34	0.570			
	Q35	0.600			
Public perception	Q36	0.565	0.701	0.566	0.435

	Q37	0.499			
	Q38	0.539			
	Q39	0.592			
	Q40	0.636			
organizational media performance	Q41	0.587	0.692	0.560	0.419
	Q42	0.561			
	Q43	0.537			
	Q44	0.607			
	Q45	0.507			

**Table (6):** Construct Correlations and Square Root of Average Variance Extracted.

	Social media management tools	Social communication goals	use of multiple platforms	Quality content	Followers interaction	Scheduled posts	Metrics analysis	organizational media performance	Public perception
Social media management tools	0.677								
Social communication goals	0.638	0.748							
use of multiple platforms	0.558	0.725	0.777						
Quality content	0.664	0.684	0.708	0.757					
Followers interaction	0.642	0.707	0.728	0.679	0.769				
Scheduled posts	0.648	0.658	0.744	0.652	0.689	0.811			
Metrics analysis	0.609	0.671	0.661	0.711	0.731	0.748	0.769		
organizational media performance	0.596	0.677	0.656	0.744	0.741	0.711	0.692	0.752	
Public perception	0.583	0.744	0.730	0.715	0.738	0.667	0.737	0.701	0.748

**Assessing the correlation coefficients among variables' dimensions:**

The results included in this table ensure a positive significant relationship among all dimensions for each variable.



**Table (7):** Pearson correlation Matrix.

	Social media management tools	Social communication goals	use of multiple platforms	Quality content	Followers interaction	Scheduled posts	Metrics analysis	social media management	Public perception	organizational media performance
Social media management tools	1									
Social communication goals	.659**	1								
use of multiple platforms	.619**	.649**	1							
Quality content	.555**	.551**	.564**	1						
Followers interaction	.569**	.612**	.589**	.525*	1					
Scheduled posts	.511**	.631**	.625**	.463*	.649**	1				
Metrics analysis	.578**	.581**	.578**	.615*	.626**	.540**	1			
social media management	.788**	.834**	.825**	.753*	.817**	.801**	.799**	1		
Public perception	.520**	.577**	.592**	.483*	.600**	.540**	.583**	.694**	1	
organizational media performance	.583**	.583**	.567**	.589*	.527**	.568**	.584**	.711**	.607**	1

\*\* . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

**Assessing the structural model and hypotheses testing**

Table (8) involves the indices used to test the fit structural model as follow:

**Table (8):** The indices of model fit for the structural model.

Measure	Estimate	Threshold	Interpretation
GFI	0.978	Closer to 1	Accepted
RMR	0.044	Closer to 0	Accepted
CFI	0.976	Closer to 1	Accepted
TLI	0.951	Closer to 1	Accepted
RMSEA	0.048	Less Than 0.8	Accepted

## The Direct relationships

In this section, the results of testing research hypothesis among study constructs are presented. Such hypotheses were tested using SEM with AMOS 22. Table (9) illustrates the results of testing these direct research hypotheses as follow:

**Table (9):** The results of testing direct relationships.

Hypothesis		Hypothesis direction			Estimate	Sig.	Hypothesis result
Relationship between social media management and Public perception	H1	Social media management tools	→	Public perception	-0.009	0.871	rejected
	H2	Social communication goals	→	Public perception	0.107	0.055	rejected
	H3	use of multiple platforms	→	Public perception	0.178	***	accepted
	H4	Quality content	→	Public perception	-0.037	0.454	rejected
	H5	Followers interaction	→	Public perception	0.212	***	accepted
	H6	Scheduled posts	→	Public perception	0.014	0.791	rejected
	H7	Metrics analysis	→	Public perception	0.153	0.004	accepted
Relationship between social media management and organizational media performance	H8	Social media management tools	→	organizational media performance	0.170	0.001	accepted
	H9	Social communication goals	→	organizational media performance	0.097	0.083	rejected
	H10	use of multiple platforms	→	organizational media performance	0.065	0.290	rejected
	H11	Quality content	→	organizational media performance	0.224	***	accepted
	H12	Followers interaction	→	organizational media performance	-0.009	0.863	rejected

Hypothesis		Hypothesis direction			Estimate	Sig.	Hypothesis result
	H13	Scheduled posts	→	organizational media performance	0.200	***	
	H14	Metrics analysis	→	organizational media performance	0.152	0.004	
H15		organizational media performance	→	Public perception	0.262	***	

**The direct effect of social media management on Public perception:**

According to table (9), I can show the hypotheses results from H1 to H7 as follow:

**H1: There is positive significant direct effect of Social media management tools on Public perception.**

Based on the above results, the independent variable Social media management tools has no effect on the Public perception where ( $\beta = -0.009$  &  $\text{Sig.} = 0.871 > 0.05$ ). Consequently, I can reject this hypothesis as follow: there is no significant direct effect of Social media management tools on Public perception.

**H2: There is positive significant direct effect of Social communication goals on Public perception.**

The hypothesis result revealed that the independent variable Social communication goals has no effect on the Public perception where ( $\beta = 0.107$  &  $\text{Sig.} = 0.055 > 0.05$ ). Consequently, I can reject this hypothesis as follow: there is no significant direct effect of Social communication goals on Public perception.

**H3: There is positive significant direct effect of use of multiple platforms on Public perception.**

It is obvious based on the above result of this hypothesis that the independent variable use of multiple platforms has a significant positive effect on the Public perception where ( $\beta = 0.178$  &  $\text{Sig.} = 0.000 < 0.05$ ). Consequently, I can accept this hypothesis as follow: There is positive significant direct effect of use of multiple platforms on Public perception.

**H4: There is positive significant direct effect of Quality content on Public perception.**

The hypothesis result revealed that the independent variable Quality content has no effect on the Public perception where ( $\beta = -0.037$  &  $\text{Sig.} = 0.454 > 0.05$ ). Consequently, I can reject this hypothesis as follow: there is no significant direct effect of Quality content on Public perception.

**H5: There is positive significant direct effect of Followers interaction on Public perception.**

It is obvious based on the above result of this hypothesis that the independent variable use of Followers interaction has a significant positive effect on the Public perception where ( $\beta = 0.212$  &  $\text{Sig.} = 0.000 < 0.05$ ). Consequently, I can accept this hypothesis as follow: There is positive significant direct effect of Followers interaction on Public perception.

**H6: There is positive significant direct effect of Scheduled posts on Public perception.**

From the indexed results above, it is clear that the independent variable Scheduled posts has no effect on the Public perception where ( $\beta = 0.014$  &  $\text{Sig.} = 0.791 > 0.05$ ). Consequently, I can reject this hypothesis as follow: there is no significant direct effect of Scheduled posts on Public perception.

**H7: There is positive significant direct effect of Metrics analysis on Public perception.**

It is clear that the independent variable use of Metrics analysis has a significant positive effect on the Public perception where ( $\beta = 0.153$  &  $\text{Sig.} = 0.004 < 0.05$ ). Consequently, I can accept this hypothesis as follow: There is positive significant direct effect of Metrics analysis on Public perception.

**The direct effect of social media management on organizational media performance:**

According to table (4.9), I can show the hypotheses results from H8 to H14 as follow:

**H8: There is positive significant direct effect of Social media management tools on organizational media performance.**

Based on the above results, the independent variable Social media management tools has significant positive effect on the Social media management tools where ( $\beta = 0.170$  & Sig. =  $0.001 < 0.05$ ). Consequently, I can accept this hypothesis as follow: there is significant positive direct effect of Social media management tools on Social media management tools.

**H9: There is positive significant direct effect of Social communication goals on organizational media performance.**

The hypothesis result revealed that the independent variable Social communication goals has no effect on the organizational media performance where ( $\beta = 0.097$  & Sig. =  $0.083 > 0.05$ ). Consequently, I can reject this hypothesis as follow: there is no significant direct effect of Social communication goals on organizational media performance.

**H10: There is positive significant direct effect of use of multiple platforms on organizational media performance.**

It is obvious based on the above result of this hypothesis that the independent variable use of multiple platforms has no significant effect on the organizational media performance where ( $\beta = 0.065$  & Sig. =  $0.290 > 0.05$ ). Consequently, I can reject this hypothesis as follow: There is no significant direct effect of use of multiple platforms on organizational media performance.

**H11: There is positive significant direct effect of Quality content on organizational media performance.**

The hypothesis result revealed that the independent variable Quality content has significant positive effect on the organizational media performance where ( $\beta = 0.224$  & Sig. =  $0.000 < 0.05$ ). Consequently, I can accept this hypothesis as follow: there is positive significant direct effect of Quality content on organizational media performance.

**H12: There is positive significant direct effect of Followers interaction on organizational media performance.**

It is obvious based on the above result of this hypothesis that the independent variable use of Followers interaction has no significant effect on the organizational media performance where ( $\beta = -0.009$  & Sig. =  $0.863 > 0.05$ ). Consequently, I can reject this hypothesis as follow: There is no significant direct effect of Followers interaction on organizational media performance.

**H13: There is positive significant direct effect of Scheduled posts on organizational media performance.**

From the indexed results above, it is clear that the independent variable Scheduled posts has significant positive effect on the organizational media performance where ( $\beta = 0.200$  & Sig. =  $0.000 < 0.05$ ). Consequently, I can accept this hypothesis as follow: there is significant positive direct effect of Scheduled posts on organizational media performance.

**H14: There is positive significant direct effect of Metrics analysis on organizational media performance.**

It is clear that the independent variable use of Metrics analysis has a significant positive effect on the organizational media performance where ( $\beta = 0.152$  & Sig. =  $0.004 < 0.05$ ). Consequently, I can accept this hypothesis as follow: There is positive significant direct effect of Metrics analysis on organizational media performance.

**The direct effect of organizational media performance on Public perception:**

According to table (4.9), it is clear that organizational media performance has a significant direct positive impact on Public perception where ( $\beta = 0.262$  & Sig. =  $0.000 < 0.05$ ). Therefore, H15 which represents the effect of organizational media performance on Public perception was totally accepted.

**The indirect relationships:**

Table (10) shows the results of testing the mediating effect of organizational media performance in the relationship between social media management and Public perception.

**Table (10):** The results of testing the indirect relationships.

Hypothesis		Independent	Mediator	Dependent	Indirect Effects	Total Effect	Sig.	Hypothesis result	Mediation
Indirect Relations hip	H16	Social media management tools	organizational media performance	Public perception	0.045	0.036	***	accepted	Partial Mediation

between social media management and Public perception	H17	Social communication goals	organizational media performance	Public perception	0.025	0.132	NS	rejected
	H18	use of multiple platforms	organizational media performance	Public perception	0.017	0.195	NS	rejected
	H19	Quality content	organizational media performance	Public perception	0.059	0.022	***	accepted
	H20	Followers interaction	organizational media performance	Public perception	-0.002	0.210	NS	rejected
	H21	Scheduled posts	organizational media performance	Public perception	0.052	0.066	***	accepted
	H22	Metrics analysis	organizational media performance	Public perception	0.040	0.193	***	accepted

As shown above from the table (10), there are several results can be illustrated below:

**H16: There is positive significant indirect effect of Social media management tools on Public perception through mediating organizational media performance.**

Based on the above results, the independent variable Social media management tools has a significant positive effect on the Public perception through mediating organizational media performance where ( $\beta = 0.045$  & Sig. =  $0.000 < 0.05$ ), which means that the direct effect increases by 4.5% as result of mediating organizational media performance. Consequently, I can accept this hypothesis as follow: there is positive significant indirect effect of Social media management tools on Public perception through mediating organizational media performance.

**H17: There is positive significant indirect effect of Social communication goals on Public perception through mediating organizational media performance.**

The hypothesis result revealed that the independent variable Social communication goals has no effect on the Public perception through mediating organizational media performance where ( $\beta = 0.025$  & Not Significant). Consequently, I can reject this hypothesis as follow: there is no significant indirect effect of Social communication goals on Public perception through mediating organizational media performance.

**H18: There is positive significant indirect effect of use of multiple platforms on Public perception through mediating organizational media performance.**

It is obvious based on the above result of this hypothesis that the independent variable use of multiple platforms has no effect on the Public perception through mediating organizational media performance where ( $\beta = 0.017$  & Not Significant). Consequently, I can reject this hypothesis as follow: there is no significant indirect effect of use of multiple platforms on Public perception through mediating organizational media performance.

**H19: There is positive significant indirect effect of Quality content on Public perception through mediating organizational media performance.**

The hypothesis result revealed that the independent variable Quality content has a significant positive effect on the Public perception through mediating organizational media performance where ( $\beta = 0.059$  & Sig. =  $0.000 < 0.05$ ), which means that the direct effect increases by 5.9% as result of mediating organizational media performance. Consequently, I can accept this hypothesis as follow: there is positive significant indirect effect of Quality content on Public perception through mediating organizational media performance.

**H20: There is positive significant indirect effect of Followers interaction on Public perception through mediating organizational media performance.**

It is obvious based on the above result of this hypothesis that the independent variable use of Followers interaction has no

effect on the Public perception through mediating organizational media performance where ( $\beta = -0.002$  & Not Significant). Consequently, I can reject this hypothesis as follow: there is no significant indirect effect of Followers interaction on Public perception through mediating organizational media performance.

**H21: There is positive significant indirect effect of Scheduled posts on Public perception through mediating organizational media performance.**

From the indexed results above, it is clear that the independent variable Scheduled posts has a significant positive effect on the Public perception through mediating organizational media performance where ( $\beta = 0.052$  & Sig. =  $0.000 < 0.05$ ), which means that the direct effect increases by 5.2% as result of mediating organizational media performance. Consequently, I can accept this hypothesis as follow: there is positive significant indirect effect of Scheduled posts on Public perception through mediating organizational media performance.

**H22: There is positive significant indirect effect of Metrics analysis on Public perception through mediating organizational media performance.**

It is clear that the independent variable use of Metrics analysis has a significant positive effect on the Public perception through mediating organizational media performance where ( $\beta = 0.040$  & Sig. =  $0.000 < 0.05$ ), which means that the direct effect increases by 4% as result of mediating organizational media performance. Consequently, I can accept this hypothesis as follow: there is positive significant indirect effect of Metrics analysis on Public perception through mediating organizational media performance.

Finally, I can conclude that organizational media performance partially mediating the relationship between social media management and Public perception, where all indirect effects are significant except Social communication goals, use of multiple platforms and Followers interaction.

### 3. Results and Recommendations for Future Research

Because (HRM) may benefit from organizational resilience—defined as an organization's capacity to effectively absorb, design situation-specific responses to, and eventually engage in transformative activities to benefit from unexpected disruptions that might endanger organizational survival—the study should be repeated in other countries in order to generalize the hypothesized relationships. The behavioral and contextual elements of strategic HRM in the human resource system specify the organizational flexibility, HRM practices, and employee contributions required to support the company's resilience and survival in the face of crises.

One of the HR system components that is being focused on is establishing the strategic components of organizational resilience as well as coping with its elements, such as robustness, redundancy, resource fulness, and speed.

### Reference

- [1] Appel, G., Grewal, L., Hadi, R., & Stephen, A. T. (2020). The future of social media in marketing. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science.*, **48(1)**, 79-95(2020).
- [2] DePierre, J. A., Puhl, R. M., & Luedicke, J. (2014). Public perceptions of food addiction: A comparison with alcohol and tobacco. *Journal of Substance Use.*, **19(1-2)**, 1-6(2014).
- [3] Khaled Fayad (2019), Political Participation for the Arab Woman between the Democratic Development and Culture Privacy, *World Research of Political Science Journal*, Vol.2, No.2, Pp 55-61
- [4] Broomell, S. B., & Kane, P. B. (2017). Public perception and communication of scientific uncertainty. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General.*, **146(2)**, 286(2017).
- [5] Khodair, A.A., AboElsoud, M.E., Khalifa, M., (2019) The Role of Regional Media in shaping political awareness of Youth, Vol.47, No.6, Pp 1095-1124
- [6] Gao, C., cheh, Y., Lai, W. S., Liang, C. K., & Huang, J. B. (2020). Portrait neural radiance fields from a single image. arXiv preprint arXiv:2012.05903.
- [7] Stella, M. (2020). Text-mining forma mentis networks reconstruct public perception of the STEM gender gap in social media. *PeerJ Computer Science.*, **6**, e295(2020).
- [8] Koukaras, P., Tjortjis, C., & Rousidis, D. (2020). Social Media Types: introducing a data-driven taxonomy. *Computing.*, **102(1)**, 295-340(2020).
- [9] Kitarattarkarn, G. P., Araujo, T., & Neijens, P. (2019). Challenging traditional culture? How personal and national collectivism-individualism moderates the effects of content characteristics and social relationships on consumer engagement with brand-related user-generated content. *Journal of Advertising.*, **48(2)**, 197-214(2019).
- [10] M Khalifa, A Khodair (2014), Social Media and the Public Policy Process in Egypt, *Journalism and Mass Communication* 4 (6), 367-378

- [11] Khan, A., & Krishnan, S. (2021). Citizen engagement in co-creation of e-government services: a process theory view from a meta-synthesis approach. *Internet Research*.
- [12] Cai, W., McKenna, B., & Waizenegger, L. (2020). Turning it off: Emotions in digital-free travel. *Journal of Travel Research.*, **59(5)**, 909-927(2020).
- [13] Wang, Y., Graziotin, D., Kriso, S., & Wagner, S. (2019). Communication channels in safety analysis: An industrial exploratory case study. *Journal of systems and software.*, **153**, 135-151(2019).
- [14] Meghana Trivedi (2018), Racial Construction as an Avenue for Better Life: A Study of Nepali Migrants and Their Employers in New Delhi, *World Research of Political Science Journal*, Vol.1, No.2, pp 1-5
- [15] Bai, L., & Yan, X. (2020). Impact of Firm-Generated Content on Firm Performance and Consumer Engagement: Evidence from Social Media in China. *Journal of Electronic Commerce Research.*, **21(1)**, 56-74(2020).
- [16] Cuevas, L. M., Chong, S. M., & Lim, H. (2020). Influencer marketing: Social media influencers as human brands attaching to followers and yielding positive marketing results by fulfilling needs. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services.*, **55**, 102133(2020).