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ABSTRACT: Malaysian women, constitutes around 51 per cent of Malaysia’s 14,968,304 registered voters, and have played a crucial role in the Malaysian political scene, including elections since independence in 1957. Although political communication has advanced the study of voter decision-making and information sharing of women voters, the discipline still understands very little about how women go about reaching those decisions. What strategies do women voters employ to reach their voting decisions? The study examined the decision making and information sharing pattern among woman voters in during General Election 2014 (GE14) of N25 (Kajang) and By-Election of N24 (Semenyih) about whom to choose as their political representative or “YB” using social media. Quantitative survey with decision-making and information sharing items were administered in to women in both constituencies. The research instruments consisted of 51 items and 5 factors namely; demography, social media usage, decision making, information sharing and behavioural change. The structured questionnaire was validated by a pilot test, using the Cronbach alpha reliability coefficient was (α = 0.07). The study found out that the social media is important in transferring information and attributes their audiences to make the decision. The study also found that GE14 to be a Facebook and WhatsApp election year of 2018 and 2019 following the popular use of the media platform to channel more information to women voters compared to other social media platforms such as Blog and Instagram.
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1. INTRODUCTION

For those born after 1995, it might seem as though social media platforms have been around forever. Whether it be Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, Snapchat, Tumblr, Reddit, Pinterest or any of the countless other sites, they have established themselves as an inherent necessity. These applications are where we receive news and information, communicate with others and keep ourselves entertained on a daily basis.

Social media is internet based and offers users easy electronic communication of personal information and other content, such as videos and photos. Social media is proving to be a critical channel through which we develop a perception of the wider world and its concerns. (En, 2018).

Social media use has grown rapidly over the last decade. New media have been playing an increasingly central role in American elections since they first appeared in 1992. While television remains the main source of election information for a majority of voters, digital communication platforms have become prominent. New media have triggered changes in the campaign strategies of political parties, candidates and political organizations, reshaped election media coverage and influenced voter engagement.

This was proven recently in Malaysia, where the opposition party, Pakatan Harapan (PH) pulled off a shocking victory in the 14th General Elections setting in motion the first-ever transfer of power in the country’s 60 year history and Barisan Nasional (BN) victory on 2019 during By-Election in N24 (Semenyih) after the formation of new government Pakatan Harapan (PH). Malaysia is no stranger to social media and the internet.
1.1. Decision Making

Decision making is the process of making choices by identifying a decision, gathering information and assessing alternative resolutions. (1). The problem is not going to take care of itself, but it is unlikely to turn into degenerative malignancy. The opportunity is only for improvement rather than for real change and innovation, but it is still quite considerable. If we do not act, we will in all probability survive. But if we do act, we may be better off. (2).

Decision making can be regarded as a problem solving activity terminated by a solution deemed to be optimal or at least satisfactory. It is therefore a process which can be more or less rational or irrational and can be based on explicit or tacit knowledge and beliefs. Human performance has been the subject of active research from several perspectives, firstly is the psychological, it’s examining individual decisions in the context of a set of needs, preferences and values the individual has or seeks. (3).

Secondly is cognitive, the decision making process regarded as a continuous process integrated in the interaction with the environment. Finally is the normative, the analysis of individual decisions concerned with the logic of decision making or communicative rationality and the invariant choice it leads to. (3).

The first rule of decision making is that one does not make a decision unless there is disagreement. Decisions are made well only if based on the clash of conflicting views, the dialogue between different points of view, the choice between different judgements. (4).

1.1.1. Elements of Decision Making

1.1.1.1. Planning: The more relevant information you have, the better decision you are likely to make. However, you have to weigh up the cost and time of obtaining information against the potential benefits all decisions involve some uncertainties. Also, you need to avoid having so much information that you cannot make a decision paralysis by analysis. (5).

1.1.1.2. Monitor and Evaluate: While having a range of alternatives provides a richer decision making environment, it also raises the problem of how to choose between them. All pros and cons of alternatives are not equal and it is desirable to have a method of weighting them so that alternatives can be compared objectively. (5).

1.1.1.3. Implement: Having gone through the process in a depth justified by the importance of the decision, a decision eventually needs to be made. While the choice may be to do nothing, a failure to make any decision is really leaving the outcome to fate. (5).

1.2. Information Sharing

Information sharing describes the exchange of data between various organizations, people and technologies. (Techopedia, 2018). It refers in sharing the information we have among members in our team. Apart from that, to allow an efficient decision making, an exchange of information or provide an access on the information among team either inside nor outside of an agency are needed. A complex issue can be solved through information sharing.

This has been proved during the 14th General Election and By-Election Semenyih in 2019 of Malaysia by the woman voters in N25 (Kajang) and 24 (Semenyih) about whom to choose as their political representative or “YB” using social media.

1.2.1. Elements of Information Sharing

1.2.1.1. Information sharing with partners: Information exchange can include both internal and external information that staff or management exchange with external stakeholders of the organisation. The general aim is to build and maintain external relationships in order to obtain direct access to all relevant information.

1.2.1.2. Outsource Problem Solving: An open exchange with customers and business partners can generate ideas that help to improve the organisation’s performance, to solve specific problems and to develop innovations. In recent years a growing number of organisations has started to offer outside individuals the possibility to participate in open innovation projects. (6).
1.2.1.3. Open Interfaces: This last concept of open information sharing is different to the others because it does not focus on the exchange between people but on the exchange between computers. Open interfaces allow external actors to build on standardized processes of the organization and enhance these processes by adding new components. They also allow the automatic exchange of information, which is often the basis for entirely new services. (6).

1.3. Behavioural Change

A behaviour change method is a based method for changing one or several psychological determinants of behaviour such as a person's attitude or self-efficacy. (7).

A behaviour change method is any process that has the potential to influence psychological determinants. Psychological determinants are theoretical variables in people's head, comparable to risk factors in epidemiology, but only including psychological variables. Examples of such determinants are attitude, risk perception which is in fact an element of the attitude determinant according to the reasoned action approach, self-efficacy, and habit. (8).

These determinants are included in factor of behaviour explanation such as the reasoned action and health belief model. Other factor explain how such determinants may be changed, such as the social cognitive which is in fact also a factor to explain behaviour, the elaboration likelihood model, and the extended parallel process model. (8).

1.4. Problem Statement

Social media has the power to reach large audience through sharing information. Public has prominently used the media as the battleground for the domination of public opinion in this election. Our government and politicians utilize social media to engage with the public (voters). There are many factors of this defeat and there are also many crisis faced by the nation before the general election 2018. Start from the finance, education system to people's living standard.

The crisis faced by the nation in the education is student struggling to get the scholarship to continue their higher studies abroad. Other than this, National Higher Education Fund (PTPTN) loan defaulters was listed as blacklist in Immigration. Students need some help by our government in paying their institutional fees.

Secondly, the researcher see on the GST implementation and the effects to the public. GST is levied on most transactions in the production process, but is refunded with exception of Blocked Input Tax, to all parties in the chain of production other than the final consumer.

Apart from GST issue, 1MDB issue is the top most among all. The 1Malaysia Development Berhad Scandal is an ongoing political scandal occurring in Malaysia. In 2015, former Malaysia's Prime Minister Najib Tun Razak was accused of channelling over RM 2.67 billion (nearly USD 700 million) from 1Malaysia Development Berhad (1MDB), a government-run strategic development company, to his personal bank accounts. (9).

Other than these problems, Malaysian also faced petrol fluctuations. The Organisation of the Petroleum Exporting Countries’ (Opec) commitment to cut crude oil production, Brent crude oil has been hovering between US$50 and US$55 per barrel since January 2017. The median price sits at US$45.13 per barrel in 2016. (10).

The back-to-back increase in fuel prices sparks concern that it will result in higher inflation rates, according to the Federation of Malaysian Consumers Association (Fomca). (11).

2. LITERATURE REVIEW AND MODEL DEVELOPMENT

Many researchers have comment on the Malaysian journalism and the changes on public influenced by social media. The 14th General Election (GE14) has result to rigorous public debate on many political issues, particularly often challenging the ruling parties between Barisan Nasional (BN) and Pakatan Harapan (PH). Moreover, it was no wonder that the 14th General Election (GE14) was the Malaysia's first record breaking and Pakatan Harapan party has form a new federal government. But this victory is not fulfilled when Pakatan Harapan (PH) defeated to Barisan Nasional (BN) by-election Semenyih 2019.
Social media are that facilitate the creation and sharing of information, ideas, career interests and other forms of expression via virtual communities and networks. (12). Social media is the biggest factor in this elections by increasing the tempo of political debate. The public has prominently used the media as the battleground for the domination of public opinion by the political parties, especially the opposition after the print and broadcasting media became mostly controlled by the ruling Barisan Nasional (BN).

According to George R. Terry, decision making is the selection based on some criteria from two or more possible alternatives. Philip Kotler has defined decision making as a conscious choice among alternative courses of action. (13).

2.1. Manifesto of Pakatan Harapan (GE14).

Manifesto of Pakatan Harapan (PH) for (GE14) with a themed of (Membina Negara dan Memenuhi Harapan) consists of 5 main essence, 60 promises and 5 special commitments. Pakatan Harapan (PH) manifesto promising 10 things especially alleviating the people's burden during the first 100 days of the government's administration PH. (14).

In the 100 days of this manifesto, Pakatan Harapan (PH) wants to set up commission and committees to investigate and address issues of controversy, including 1MDB and the 1963 Malaysia Agreement. (14).

2.2. Manifesto of Barisan Nasional (By-Election Semenyih 2019).

According to Tan Sri Noh Omar, the UMNO Supreme Council Member asserted that Barisan Nasional (BN) was not launched any special manifesto during the by-election Semenyih 2019. Noh said it was a desperate act of certain parties by spreading false news saying Barisan Nasional (BN) has a manifesto. (15).

Noh also confessed that winning this by-election will still remain Barisan Nasional (BN) as the opposition, therefore manifesto is not needed in this by-election Semenyih 2019. (15).

2.3. Research Objective

- To examine the behavioural change in decision making by women voters in N25 (Kajang) and N24 (Semenyih) about whom to choose as their political representative or “YB” using social media.
- To study on how the behavioural change occur through information sharing pattern through social media (Facebook and Whatsapp) among women voters in N25 (Kajang) and N24 (Semenyih) about whom to choose as their political representative or “YB” using social media.
- To examine the relationship between the decision making process and information sharing pattern towards the selection of their political representative or “YB” from Barisan Nasional (BN) or Pakatan Harapan (PH) affects the behaviour of women voters in N25 (Kajang) and N24 (Semenyih).

2.4. Research Question

What are the behavioural change in decision making by women voters in N25 (Kajang) and N24 (Semenyih) about whom to choose as their political representative or “YB” using social media?

Does the behavioural change occur through information sharing pattern through social media (Facebook and Whatsapp) among women voters in N25 (Kajang) and N24 (Semenyih) about whom to choose as their political representative or “YB” using social media?

How the relationship between the decision making process and information sharing pattern towards the selection of their political representative or “YB” from Barisan Nasional (BN) or Pakatan Harapan (PH) affects the behaviour of women voters in N25 (Kajang) and N24 (Semenyih)?

2.5. Hypothesis

- (H1): Planning is positively related to behavioural change in decision making process.
- (H2): Implement is positively related to behavioural change in decision making process.
• (H3): Monitor and Evaluate is positively related to behavioural change in decision making process.
• (H4): Behavioural change in decision making is related to information sharing with partners.
• (H5): Behavioural change in decision making is related to outsource problem solving.
• (H6): Open interfaces influence the behaviour change in decision making.

3. RESEARCH METHOD

This chapter also addresses the objectives of the study that were achieved through a pilot study followed by the main study, which comprises four (4) phases.

This research used hypothesis testing to collect data that signified a relationship between independent and dependent variable. Therefore, the researcher conducts a questionnaire survey analysis by using Simple Random Sampling to meet the decision changes.

Theoretical framework represent the work to be carried out in analysing the study and researcher have used the Likert Scale to measure. The researcher suggest on using correlational theory as the research framework in this research. The following framework will help in guiding the study and the development of the hypothesis. Quantitative method is used to analyse, examine and to answer the research question.

The rest of this chapter is organized as follows. First, researcher explain the method to gather decision making among woman voters by using social media as a platform to share information. Second, researcher present the method to statistically understand the correlation between the decision making and information sharing leads to behavioural change among the woman voters about whom to choose as their political leader during the election.

Finally, the researcher present to attempt to formally quantify these correlations using the reliability analysis and descriptive analysis method to measure the Likert Scale. Therefore, all the data collected and analysed been used to describe and explain, the elements in the variables. The researcher uses survey questionnaire to collect data and SPSS software to generate data from target group, women from N25 (Kajang) and N24 (Semenyih).

3.1. Data Collection

Data collection is the process of gathering and measuring information on targeted variables in an established system, which then enables one to answer relevant questions and evaluate outcomes. Data collection is a component of research in all fields of study including physical and social sciences, humanities and business. (16).

This chapter discuss on the data collection technique where this researcher have distributed survey questionnaires to collect data. Those questionnaires been distributed to 300 woman voters at random in N25 (Kajang) and N24 (Semenyih).

Decision making of the woman voters is defined as their implementation on about whom to choose as their political representative. Where else, the information sharing using the social media has been used as a tool to proof their cognitive power which lead to behavioural change.

3.2. Result

3.2.1. Reliability of the Pilot Test: In the process of developing a consistent and dependable research instrument, measurement of reliability must be tested. This was the first testing tool designed and to be completed. The measurement between the respondents may varied across time periods, therefore, the instruments should be tested to check the reliability of the score.

The pilot test data were analysed using the IBM SPSS Statistics. Fifty respondents answered all 63 questions on the The Decision Making and Information Sharing among Woman Voters: A Comparison between GE14 in N25 (Kajang) and By-Election N24 (Semenyih).

The highest Cronbach alpha reliability was on the theory Decision Making Factor 1 – Planning. The alpha coefficient for the six items in Factor 1 is $a = 0.906$, suggesting that the items have relatively high internal consistency, indicating that the measurement reflected high reliability. The items mean are 21.28 reflecting that a high number of respondents agree to the statements as in Table 1.
Below is the Table 1, it shows that the reliability of sample=50.

### Table 1. Reliability of Sample = 50

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Reliability Statistics</th>
<th>Scale Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cronbach’s Alpha Based on Standardized Items</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM Factor 1 – Planning</td>
<td>.906</td>
<td>21.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM Factor 2 - Implement</td>
<td>.870</td>
<td>20.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM Factor 3 - Monitor and Evaluate</td>
<td>.819</td>
<td>20.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS Factor 4 - Information Sharing with Partners</td>
<td>.850</td>
<td>20.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS Factor 5 - Outsource Problem Solving</td>
<td>.844</td>
<td>19.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS Factor 6 - Open Interfaces</td>
<td>.797</td>
<td>19.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2.2 Normal Distribution Assumption: The measurement results of variables in this research are decision making and information sharing leads to behavioural change. The research would be conducted on a test in the form of data distribution to find out whether it is normally distributed or not. Graphic distribution testing would be shown by using histogram, meanwhile the measurement would be conducted by using Shapiro-Wilk test. Below Table 4.1.1, shows the data distribution and result of Shapiro-Wilk test on decision making leads to behavioural change (a) and information sharing leads to behavioural change (b).

![Histogram](image)

Table 4.1.1 Data Distribution on Decision Making leads to Behavioural Change (a) and Information Sharing leads to Behavioural Change (b).

The shape of histogram of both independent variable vs dependant variable is similar to the form of bell/normal curve, so that as shown by the histogram graph Table 4.1.1 above, it is strongly assumed that it would be normally distributed. It also could be seen from the results of Shapiro-Wilk test as described in Table 4.1.2, both of the distributions have similar data distribution compared to normal distribution (p>0.05).

The description of both data explains that the rate of decision making and information sharing leads to behavioural change is quite high.

3.2.3 Demographic Characteristic: The research was conducted towards two different district, namely Kajang (N25) and Semenyih (N24). Survey was done on sample of N=300 respondents. Following Table 2 below is the list of respondent’s characteristic of this research.
Table 2. Characteristic of Respondent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Woman</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>21-69</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>39.13</td>
<td>11.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place of Living</td>
<td>Commercial Bungalow</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Terrace</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Apartment/Condo</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Flats</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PPR</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly Income</td>
<td>&lt;RM1K</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;RM3K</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working At</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non – Government</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self-Employ</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Homemaker</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Duration</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>13.38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>Malay</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Others</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrangement of Meet</td>
<td>Weekends</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>After Working</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place of Meet</td>
<td>Coffee Shop</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>House</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mosque</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gym</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How Often Meet</td>
<td>Everyday</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Once a Week</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Once a Month</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How Often Call</td>
<td>Everyday</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Once awhile</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Once a Month</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication Technology</td>
<td>IPad</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Smartphone</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Laptop</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GSM Mobile</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Media Usage</td>
<td>FB</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Instagram</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WhatsApp</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to the above table, the respondent of this research are all woman’s of sample N=300 (100%) from Kajang (N25) and Semenyih (N24), with the age characteristic between, 21-69 with an M=39.13 and SD=11.590. Respondents who lives in terrace house has the highest percentage with (40%) where else, the lowest percentage is (10%) who lives in PPR.

The number of the married woman is higher than the single with an M=1.70 and SD=.459 who earning more than 3K a month (59%) with the M=2.08 and SD=.881 for the Ethnicity. Respondents prefer to meet during the weekends (74%) than after working (26%) in Coffee Shop as the place of meeting with M=1.91 and SD=.993 because they don’t prefer to call (64%).
It’s about (92%) of them accessing social media to retrieve nor share information’s with smartphones. None of them used laptop as their communication tool (0%). Mostly, respondents uses WhatsApp application as a platform to share and received information (76%).

3.3. Hypothesis Testing

This study design to examine the relationship between the two independent variable, decision making and information sharing. Overall result of which item determine to be most significance factor for the decision making and information sharing lead to behavioural change. The result of the hypothesis testing are discussed in the succeeding paragraphs.

3.4. Pearson Correlation

3.4.1. Behavioural Change in Decision Making

3.4.1.1. Decision Making – Factor 1 Planning vs Behavioural Change – Social Cognitive: According to the Pearson Correlation test, the significance value between Decision Making Factor 1 – Planning and Behavioural Change – Social Cognitive is between .000 - .05, which is less than .05. Then there is a significant correlation between the variables. So in this case, the correlation between Decision Making Factor 1 – Planning and Behavioural Change – Social Cognitive is significant.

The highest Pearson Correlation between Planning and Social Cognitive is .339. The direction is positive. It means, if, Planning pattern increases Social Cognitive also increases. The strength of .339 is consider a good strength.

RQ1: What are the behavioural change in decision making by women voters in N25 (Kajang) and N24 (Semenyih) about whom to choose as their political representative or “YB” using social media?

Hypothesis 1 (H1): Planning is positively related to behavioural change in decision making process.

Hypothesis 2 (H2): Implement is positively related to behavioural change in decision making process.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B1</th>
<th>Do you plan before making decisions?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D2</td>
<td>Have your behaviour changed or been influenced by the Internet Election in the early stage?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Table 3 below shows that, there was a positive correlation between woman voters who plan before making decision (before voting) which leads to behavioural change – social cognitive (been influenced by the Internet Election in the early stage), $r = .339$, $p = .000$, $n = 300$.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlations</th>
<th>D2_Social_Cognitive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1_Planning_Factor1</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

3.4.1.2. Decision Making – Factor 1 Planning vs Behavioural Change – Reasoned Action: According to the Pearson Correlation test, the significance value between Decision Making Factor 1 – Planning and Behavioural Change – Reasoned Action is between .000 - .031, which is less than .05. Then there is a significant correlation between the variables. So in this case, the correlation between Decision Making Factor 1 – Planning and Behavioural Change – Reasoned Action is also significant.

The highest Pearson Correlation between Planning and Reasoned is .211. The direction is positive. It means, if Planning pattern increases Reasoned Action also increases. The strength of .211 is consider a good strength.

RQ1: What are the behavioural change in decision making by women voters in N25 (Kajang) and N24 (Semenyih) about whom to choose as their political representative or “YB” using social media?
Hypothesis 1 (H1): Planning is positively related to behavioural change in decision making process.

Hypothesis 2 (H2): Implement is positively related to behavioural change in decision making process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B3</th>
<th>Do you plan remain calm when you have to make decisions very quickly?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D11</td>
<td>Do you participate when the evaluation of results lead to attitude changes among woman during information sharing?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Table 4 below shows that, there was a positive correlation between woman voters who plan remain calm when making decision (before voting) which leads to behavioural change – reasoned action (attitude changes among woman during information sharing), \( r = .211, \ p = .000, \ n = 300 \).

**Table 4. Pearson Correlation on Decision Making Factor 1 – Planning vs Behavioural Change – Reasoned Action.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B3_Planning_Factor1</th>
<th>D11_Reasoned_Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.211**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

3.4.1.3. Decision Making – Factor 2 Implement vs Behavioural Change – Social Cognitive: According to the Pearson Correlation test, the significance value between Decision Making Factor 2 – Implement and Behavioural Change – Social Cognitive is between .000 - .05, which is less than .05. Then there is a significant correlation between the variables. So in this case, the correlation between Decision Making Factor 2 – Implement and Behavioural Change – Social Cognitive is significant.

The highest Pearson Correlation between Implement and Social Cognitive is .336. The direction is positive. It means, if, Implement pattern increases Social Cognitive also increases. The strength of .336 is consider a good strength.

RQ1: What are the behavioural change in decision making by women voters in N25 (Kajang) and N24 (Semenyih) about whom to choose as their political representative or “YB” using social media?

Hypothesis 1 (H1): Planning is positively related to behavioural change in decision making process.

Hypothesis 2 (H2): Implement is positively related to behavioural change in decision making process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B10</th>
<th>Before you implement will you change your mind about things?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D1</td>
<td>Do you begin to analyse that information sharing affect the behaviour among women?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Table 5 below shows that, there was a positive correlation between woman voters who implement their decisions (before voting) which affects to behavioural change – social cognitive (among woman voters by information sharing), \( r = .336, \ p = .000, \ n = 300 \)

**Table 5 Pearson Correlation on Decision Making Factor 2 – Implement vs Behavioural Change – Social Cognitive.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B10_Implement_Factor2</th>
<th>D1_Social_Cognitive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.336*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
3.4.1.4. Decision Making – Factor 2 Implement vs Behavioural Change – Reasoned Action:
According to the Pearson Correlation test, the significance value between Decision Making Factor 2 – Implement and Behavioural Change – Reasoned Action is between .001 - .03, which is less than .05. Then there is a significant correlation between the variables. So in this case, the correlation between Decision Making Factor 2 – Implement and Behavioural Change – Reasoned Action is significant.

The highest Pearson Correlation between Implement and Reasoned Action is .187. The direction is positive. It means, if, Implement pattern increases Reasoned Action also increases. The strength of .187 is consider a good strength.

RQ1: What are the behavioural change in decision making by women voters in N25 (Kajang) and N24 (Semenyih) about whom to choose as their political representative or “YB” using social media?

Hypothesis 1 (H1): Planning is positively related to behavioural change in decision making process.

Hypothesis 2 (H2): Implement is positively related to behavioural change in decision making process.

B12 Do you prefer to implement the decision making if you can?

D10 Will you participate when behaviour believes change the attitude among woman voter when sharing information?

The Table 6 below shows that, there was a positive correlation between woman voters who implement their decisions (before voting) which leads to behavioural change – social cognitive (behaviour believe change the attitude among woman voter when sharing information), r = .187, p = .001, n = 300.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlations</th>
<th>D10_Reasoned_Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B12_Implement_Factor2</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation: .187**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed): .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N: 300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Therefore, a Shapiro-Wilk’s test, (p > .05) and a visual inspection of their histograms, normal Q-Q plots and box plots showed that the study of Decision Making for Factor 1 – Planning and Factor 2 – Implement using Social Media leads to Behavioural Change among woman voters in Kajang (N25) and Semenyih (N24) about whom to choose as their political leader were approximately normally distributed and statistically significant, therefore the null hypothesis is rejected.

3.4.1.5. Decision Making – Factor 3 Monitor and Evaluate vs Behavioural Change – Social Cognitive: According to the Pearson Correlation test, the significance value between Decision Making Factor 3 – Monitor and Evaluate and Behavioural Change – Social Cognitive is between .000 - .05, which is less than .05. Then there is a significant correlation between the variables. So in this case, the correlation between Decision Making Factor 3 – Monitor and Evaluate and Behavioural Change – Social Cognitive is significant.

The highest Pearson Correlation between Monitor and Evaluate and Social Cognitive is .314. The direction is positive. It means, if, Monitor and Evaluate pattern increases Social Cognitive also increases. The strength of .314 is consider a good strength.

RQ2: Does the behavioural change occur through information sharing pattern through social media (Facebook and Whatsapp) among women voters in N25 (Kajang) and N24 (Semenyih) about whom to choose as their political representative or “YB” using social media?

Hypothesis 3 (H3): Monitor and Evaluate is positively related to behavioural change in decision making process.

Hypothesis 4 (H4): Behavioural change in decision making is related to information sharing with partners.
The Table 7 below shows that, there was a positive correlation between woman voters who monitor and evaluate the improvement in decision making (before voting) which leads to behavioural change – social cognitive (Internet Election influenced the behaviour change in the early stage of election), $r = .314$, $p = .000$, $n = 300$.

**Table 7. Pearson Correlation on Decision Making Factor 3 – Monitor and Evaluate vs Behavioural Change – Social Cognitive.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlations</th>
<th>D2_Social_Cognitive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B18_Monitor_and_Evaluate_Factor3</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

3.4.1.6. Decision Making – Factor 3 Monitor and Evaluate vs Behavioural Change – Reasoned Action: According to the Pearson Correlation test, the significance value between Decision Making Factor 3 – Monitor and Evaluate and Behavioural Change – Reasoned Action is between .001 - .05, which is less than .05. Then there is a significant correlation between the variables. So in this case, the correlation between Decision Making Factor 3 – Monitor and Evaluate and Behavioural Change – Reasoned Action is significant.

The highest Pearson Correlation between Monitor and Evaluate and Reasoned Action is .187. The direction is positive. It means, if, Monitor and Evaluate pattern increases Reasoned Actioned also increases. The strength of .187 is consider a good strength.

RQ2: Does the behavioural change occur through information sharing pattern through social media (Facebook and Whatsapp) among women voters in N25 (Kajang) and N24 (Semenyih) about whom to choose as their political representative or “YB” using social media?

Hypothesis 3 (H3): Monitor and Evaluate is positively related to behavioural change in decision making process.

Hypothesis 4 (H4): Behavioural change in decision making is related to information sharing with partners.

The Table 8 below shows that, there was a positive correlation between woman voters who monitor and evaluate while consulting (before voting) which leads to behaviour change – reasoned action (evaluation of results to attitude changes among woman during information sharing), $r = .187$, $p = .001$, $n = 300$.

**Table 8. Pearson Correlation on Decision Making Factor 3 – Monitor and Evaluate vs Behavioural Change – Reasoned Action.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlations</th>
<th>D11_Reasoned_Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B15_Monitor_and_Evaluate_Factor3</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

3.4.1.7. Information Sharing – Factor 4 Information Sharing with Partners vs Behavioural Change – Social Cognitive: According to the Pearson Correlation test, the significance value between Information Sharing Factor 4 – Information Sharing with Partners and Behavioural Change – Social Cognitive is between .000 - .05, which is less than .05. Then there is a significant correlation between the variables. So in this case, the correlation between Information Sharing Factor 4 – Information Sharing with Partners and Behavioural Change – Social Cognitive is significant.

The highest Pearson Correlation between Information Sharing with Partners and Social Cognitive is .281. The direction is positive. It means, if, Information Sharing with Partners pattern increases Social Cognitive also increases. The strength of .281 is consider a good strength.

RQ2: Does the behavioural change occur through information sharing pattern through social media (Facebook and Whatsapp) among women voters in N25 (Kajang) and N24 (Semenyih) about whom to choose as their political representative or “YB” using social media?

Hypothesis 3 (H3): Monitor and Evaluate is positively related to behavioural change in decision making process.

Hypothesis 4 (H4): Behavioural change in decision making is related to information sharing with partners.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C2</th>
<th>Will you share the information that you get through social media with your partners?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D4</td>
<td>Do you personally begin to know that the information sharing on social media been a platform to women on making decision?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Table 9 below shows that, there was a positive correlation between woman voters who shares information through social media (before voting) which leads to behavioural change – social cognitive (social media been a platform to women on making decision), r = .281, p = .000, n = 300.


<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D4_Social_Cognitive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2_Information_Sharing_with_Partners_Factor4</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.281**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

3.4.1.8. Information Sharing – Factor 4 Information Sharing with Partners vs Behavioural Change – Reasoned Action: According to the Pearson Correlation test, the significance value between Information Sharing Factor 4 – Information Sharing with Partners and Behavioural Change – Reasoned Action is between .000 - .02, which is less than .05. Then there is a significant correlation between the variables. So in this case, the correlation between Information Sharing Factor 4 – Information Sharing with Partners and Behavioural Change – Reasoned Action is significant.

The highest Pearson Correlation between Information Sharing with Partners and Reasoned Action is .236. The direction is positive. It means, if, Information Sharing with Partners pattern increases Reasoned Action also increases. The strength of .236 is consider a good strength.

RQ2: Does the behavioural change occur through information sharing pattern through social media (Facebook and Whatsapp) among women voters in N25 (Kajang) and N24 (Semenyih) about whom to choose as their political representative or “YB” using social media?
Hypothesis 3 (H3): Monitor and Evaluate is positively related to behavioural change in decision making process.

Hypothesis 4 (H4): Behavioural change in decision making is related to information sharing with partners.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C4</th>
<th>Are you willing to share political information with your partners if you are a government employee?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D10</td>
<td>Will you participate when behaviour believes change the attitude among woman voter when sharing information?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Table 10 below shows that, there was a positive correlation between woman voters who willing to share political information if they were a government employee (before voting) which leads to behavioural change – reasoned action (behaviour believes change the attitude among woman voter when sharing information), \( r = .236, p = .000, n = 300 \).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlations</th>
<th>D10_Reasoned_Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C4_Information_Sharing_with_Partners_Factor4</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation: .236**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed): .000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N: 300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Therefore, a Shapiro-Wilk’s test, (p > .05) and a visual inspection of their histograms, normal Q-Q plots and box plots showed that the study of Decision Making Factor 3 – Monitor and Evaluate and Information Sharing Factor 4 – Information Sharing with Partners using Social Media leads to Behavioural Change among woman voters in Kajang (N25) and Semenyih (N24) about whom to choose as their political leader were approximately normally distributed and statistically significant, therefore the null hypothesis is rejected.

### 3.4.1.9. Information Sharing – Factor 5 Outsource Problem Solving vs Behavioural Change – Social Cognitive:

According to the Pearson Correlation test, the significance value between Information Sharing Factor 5 – Outsource Problem Solving and Behavioural Change – Social Cognitive is between .000 - .05, which is less than .05. Then there is a significant correlation between the variables. So in this case, the correlation between Information Sharing Factor 5 – Outsource Problem Solving and Behavioural Change – Social Cognitive is significant.

The highest Pearson Correlation between Outsource Problem Solving and Social Cognitive is .322. The direction is positive. It means, if, Outsource Problem Solving pattern increases Social Cognitive also increases. The strength of .322 is consider a good strength.

RQ3: How the relationship between the decision making process and information sharing pattern towards the selection of their political representative or “YB” from Barisan Nasional (BN) or Pakatan Harapan (PH) affects the behaviour of women voters in N25 (Kajang) and N24 (Semenyih)?

Hypothesis 5 (H5): Behavioural change in decision making is related to outsource problem solving.

Hypothesis 6 (H6): Open interfaces influence the behaviour change in decision making.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C10</th>
<th>Do you think that an outsource problem solving will be the solution when disclosure affect the safety of the sender?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D1</td>
<td>Do you begin to analyse that information sharing affect the behaviour among women?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Table 11 below shows that, there was a positive correlation between woman voters who think that an outsource problem solving will be the solution affect the safety to the sender (before voting)
which leads to behavioural change – social cognitive (information sharing affect the behaviour among women), \( r = .322, p = .000, n = 300. 


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlations</th>
<th>D1_Social_Cognitive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C10_Outsource_Problem_Solving_Factor5</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation ( .322^{**} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)      ( .000 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N                   ( 300 )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

3.4.1.10. Information Sharing – Factor 5 Outsource Problem Solving vs Behavioural Change – Reasoned Action: According to the Pearson Correlation test, the significance value between Information Sharing Factor 5 – Outsource Problem Solving and Behavioural Change – Reasoned Action is between .000 -.05, which is less than .05. Then there is a significant correlation between the variables. So in this case, the correlation between Information Sharing Factor 5 – Outsource Problem Solving and Behavioural Change – Reasoned Action is significant.

The highest Pearson Correlation between Outsource Problem Solving and Reasoned Action is .260. The direction is positive. It means, if, Outsource Problem Solving pattern increases Reasoned Action also increases. The strength of .260 is consider a good strength.

RQ3: How the relationship between the decision making process and information sharing pattern towards the selection of their political representative or “YB” from Barisan Nasional (BN) or Pakatan Harapan (PH) affects the behaviour of women voters in N25 (Kajang) and N24 (Semenyih)?

Hypothesis 5 (H5): Behavioural change in decision making is related to outsource problem solving.

Hypothesis 6 (H6): Open interfaces influence the behaviour change in decision making.

The Table 12 below shows that, there was a positive correlation between woman voters who think that an outsource problem solving will be the solution affect the safety to the sender (before voting) which leads to behavioural change – reasoned action (evaluation of results lead to attitude changes among woman during information sharing), \( r = .260, p = .000, n = 300. 

Table 12 Pearson Correlation on Information Sharing Factor 5 – Outsource Problem Solving vs Behavioural Change – Reasoned Action.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlations</th>
<th>D11_Reasoned_Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C10_Outsource_Problem_Solving_Factor5</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation ( .260^{**} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed) ( .000 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N              ( 300 )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

3.4.1.11. Information Sharing – Factor 6 Open Interfaces vs Behavioural Change – Social Cognitive: According to the Pearson Correlation test, the significance value between Information Sharing Factor 6 – Open Interfaces and Behavioural Change – Social Cognitive is between .000 -.05, which is less than .05. Then there is a significant correlation between the variables. So in this case, the
The correlation between Information Sharing Factor 6 – Open Interfaces and Behavioural Change – Social Cognitive is significant.

The highest Pearson Correlation between Open Interfaces and Social Cognitive is .403. The direction is positive. It means, if, Open Interfaces pattern increases Social Cognitive also increases. The strength of .403 is consider a good strength.

RQ3: How the relationship between the decision making process and information sharing pattern towards the selection of their political representative or “YB” from Barisan Nasional (BN) or Pakatan Harapan (PH) affects the behaviour of women voters in N25 (Kajang) and N24 (Semenyih)?

Hypothesis 5 (H5): Behavioural change in decision making is related to outsource problem solving.

Hypothesis 6 (H6): Open interfaces influence the behaviour change in decision making.

The Table 13 below shows that, there was a positive correlation between woman voters who think that an open interfaces help voters to compete when sharing information which leads to behavioural change – social cognitive (personally understand deeper that GE14 found to be a Facebook and WhatsApp election), r = .403, p = .000, n = 300.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C18_Open_Interfaces_Factor6</th>
<th>D5_Social_Cognitive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.403 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

3.4.1.12. Information Sharing – Factor 6 Open Interfaces vs Behavioural Change – Reasoned Action: According to the Pearson Correlation test, the significance value between Information Sharing Factor 6 – Open Interfaces and Behavioural Change – Reasoned Action is between .000 - .03, which is less than .05. Then there is a significant correlation between the variables. So in this case, the correlation between Information Sharing Factor 6 – Open Interfaces and Behavioural Change – Reasoned Action is significant.

The highest Pearson Correlation between Open Interfaces and Reasoned Action is .237. The direction is positive. It means, if, Open Interfaces pattern increases Reasoned Action also increases. The strength of .237 is consider a good strength.

RQ3: How the relationship between the decision making process and information sharing pattern towards the selection of their political representative or “YB” from Barisan Nasional (BN) or Pakatan Harapan (PH) affects the behaviour of women voters in N25 (Kajang) and N24 (Semenyih)?

Hypothesis 5 (H5): Behavioural change in decision making is related to outsource problem solving.

Hypothesis 6 (H6): Open interfaces influence the behaviour change in decision making.

The Table 14 below shows that, there was a positive correlation between woman voters who worried an open interfaces may harm you on the election information shared which leads to be behavioural change – social reasoned action (behaviour believes change the attitude among woman voter when sharing information), r = .237, p = .000, n = 300.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D10_Reasoned_Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C15_Open_Interfaces_Factor6</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation: .237**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed): .000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N: 300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Therefore, a Shapiro–Wilk’s test, (p > .05) and a visual inspection of their histograms, normal Q-Q plots and box plots showed that the study of Information Sharing – Outsource Problem Solving and Factor 6 – Open Interfaces using Social Media leads to Behavioural Change among woman voters in Kajang (N25) and Semenyih (N24) about whom to choose as their political leader were approximately normally distributed and statistically significant, therefore the null hypothesis is rejected.

4. CONCLUSION

The primary purposes of this study were twofold. First, we hoped to find something on not only ways to assist decision making and information sharing relationship but also the hierarchical process in explaining how decision making and information sharing lead to a behavioural change. To do this, the relationships among elements influencing the variables, including usage of social media, were examined. Results confirmed that three determinants—decision making and information sharing — positively influenced behavioural change. Differently stated, information sharing using social media was found to be a key antecedent to make a decision during the election. This finding is supported by the argument drawn by Marlene Greenfield (2019) that Malaysian population, are actively using social media as a platform during the election by sharing and gathering information and make decision. Second, this study examined a high effect of Facebook and WhatsApp on the decision making process of information sharing. Furthermore, it investigated if and how behavioural change occur with the use of both Facebook and WhatsApp. The findings revealed that the use of Facebook and WhatsApp for information sharing, both in the person’s daily life and to share with other people, enhanced the positive effects of perceived decision making and behavioural change. In addition to the high effects, the analysis represented direct effects of social media usage. That is, the information sharing using social media as a platform during the general election was positively related. The present study provides significant contributions from the theoretical framework.
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