

Does the Government Hear Us?

A Picture of Interaction between Netizen and Indonesian Local Government in Twitter

Anang Dwi Santoso

Graduate Student Department of
Public Policy and Management
Universitas Gadjah Mada
Yogyakarta, Indonesia
anang.d.santoso@gmail.com

Nurul Hidayah

Graduate Student Department of
Public Policy and Management
Universitas Gadjah Mada
Yogyakarta, Indonesia
nurul.tigasatu@gmail.com

Dhia K. Rinjany

Graduate Student, Department of
Public Policy and Management
Universitas Gadjah Mada
Yogyakarta, Indonesia
Dhyakhalilaaa@gmail.com

Abstract— Social media is a space that allows society and government to interact and exchange information. Unfortunately, there is little empirical research to prove the benefits. This paper aims to describe the interaction between society and government in twitter. We collected 591 tweets from the community to 51 local government official accounts. The results show that people use twitter to ask certain questions related to public services and share information with local governments. Researchers found that twitter has the potential to be used as a two-way communication medium, but most local governments use it for one-way communication. This paper is useful for practitioners to provide an evaluation of the implementation of two-way communication through social media. Meanwhile, for academics, researchers found the application of the theory of dialogic communication in twitter.

Keywords: social media; local government; twitter, dialogic communication; Indonesia

I. INTRODUCTION

Social media is believed to bridge the effective communication between local government and society. By using social media, the local government can increase community involvement in policy making [1], encourage collaboration and knowledge management [2] and improve efficiency and productivity [3]. As a consequence, the relationship between government and society will be better because of the presence of social media.

Social media became one of the media selected by politicians, administrators and societies at the local government level, ranks after e-mail and official websites. Among social networks platforms, social media is the most popular medium because it is user friendly and inexpensive [4]. This encouragement becomes one the reasons of social media adoption in local level. Finally, governments at various levels begin using social media to communicate with the public [5]

Social media offers a space to interact with the community [6]. This media allows people to participate in certain areas, which then encourages dialogic communication. Unfortunately, McAllister [7] found that many organizations

including local governments do not use social media for dialogic communication with their stakeholders.

Dialogic communication through social media allows the government to change its relationship with the community from one way communication to two way communication. Governments and communities can exchange information to share ideas, solutions and more. [8] argue that social media makes the relationship between government and society more dialogic and deliberative.

Unfortunately, there is little empirical research to prove the benefits. Scholar in content generation (those who analyze posts shared by users in social media) is divided into two streams: (1) local government posts [9], [10], [11] and (2) citizen comment and post [12], [13]. Both see the behavior of social media usage by government and society separately. Therefore, a study is needed to prove the workings of social media in connecting communities and governments.

Demands also came from [14] and [15] who recommended to see the relationship between government and society in social media. They emphasize that the analysis should be expanded by focusing on the use of social media by governments and communities. Thus, traces of empirical research on the real impact of social media use by local governments will be found.

This study aims to make empirical and theoretical contributions by providing an overview of the interaction between society and government in social media. In this study we present the interaction by collecting some tweets of twitter accounts that mentions a local government account. We then categorize the tweets into specific categories. After that, we collected the government's response to the tweet. Considering the quality of the reply and the speed of reply, we categorize the accounts we explore into four categories: (1) high quality and fast response; (2) high quality and slow response, (3) low quality and fast response (4) low quality and slow response. This research also contributes to the application of dialogic communication concept in the level of local government.

We argue that the interaction between society and government is a form of dialogic communication theory. Kent and Taylor (1998) proposed the theory of dialogic communication as a tool to instruct practitioners and academics in encouraging effective relationships between organizations and the public. This theory provides a framework for understanding how organizations maintain online social reaction. In more detail, this research focuses on

Corresponding author: Anang Dwi Santoso

one of the principles of dialogic communication that is dialogic loop that discusses the exchange of information between society and government as part of the theory of dialogic communication

Some studies that employ this theory to examine relationships between organizations and the public include: [16]tried to understand the application of this theory through the website [17] suspected that the theory of dialogic communication is found in blogs. In addition, [4]viewed the interaction of government and society in twitter using dialogic communication theory. Unfortunately, Martinez et al. (2015) examined this interaction from the government's point of view. In fact, the evolution of communication technology provides more opportunities to offer two way communication [18]. Social media allows users to create and consume content, connect with others and engage in a conversation [19]. As a consequence, a research is needed to see dialogic communication from the community.

We then proposed two main research questions:

RQ 1: What type of information does a local government receive through its twitter account?

RQ 2: How does the government respond to such information?

The research was conducted at the local government level. Local governments are elected because people can participate directly in local affairs [20]. In addition, [21]added that there is a close relationship between democracy and local government. Local governments can make decisions that directly affect local communities. The community can then demand the government to be more accountable to the decision. These traditions which then make social media interesting to be discussed at the local level.

This research takes one of the social media platforms that is twitter. Twitter became one of the most widely used social media by local government [14]. Moreover, Twitter has many benefits because users can disseminate information faster than other platforms [4]. In more detail, Twitter can be used to send instant messages to inform facts or events [14].

This paper is divided into four sections. The first part contains the introduction and brief overview of the research flow. The research methodology will then be described next. After that, the author will present the research findings and then discuss them. The last part of the study is the conclusion, suggestion, and limitation.

II. RESEARCH METHOD

This research consists of two stages. The first stage, the author will answer RQ1 by collecting tweets from twitter users that mention to a local government account. The second stage, the authors will group districts and cities that use twitter for two-way communication by considering the speed of reply and quality of reply.

This research is a descriptive quantitative study. We categorize tweets in certain categories then display data in tabular form containing numbers. In analyzing this, we are assisted by Microsoft Excel 2013.

Sample in this research is all districts and cities in Java Island with amount 119. This research take place in Java Island. Java Island was chosen because it has a higher ICT development index than the other islands seen from ICT Use, Skill and Infrastructure [22].

We look for twitter accounts for each city and district using two ways. The first way is by visiting the official website of each district. If it is not find, researchers use the second way by searching for certain keywords in the search menu twitter.

Table 1. Twitter adoption in java island

Province	The total number of districts and cities	Twitter Adoption
Banten	8	100%
Jakarta	6	67%
Jawa Barat	27	67%
Jawa Tengah	35	80%
Yogyakarta	5	20%
Jawa Timur	38	71%
Total	119	72%

As presented at the Table 1., from 119 districts and cities in Java Island, twitter is adopted in 86 cities/districts. The province with the highest adoption of twitter is in Banten Province and the lowest adoption is in Yogyakarta Province. From the 86 accounts we found, 51 accounts are active and then being sample in the study.

The next stage is data collection. By using advanced search twitter, we collected a post that mentions an official local government account from 1-31 August 2017. The maximum number of tweet tweets taken is 20. By using this method researchers get 591 Tweets. Tweet are then grouped into several categories in Table 2.

Table 2. Tweet Category

Category	Description
Suggestion	Suggestions for the government given by netizens to do certain things
Complaint and request	Complaints towards a public service delivery and suggestions how to solve it
Informing an event	Inform an event to the government
Expression (appreciation)	Expression of society to a thing such as thank-you note and condolences
Ask for something	Asking questions to the government such as asking about the procedure of ID card service
Report	Reporting an incident to the government

While collecting these tweets, we also collect the information on (1) the time and date of the tweet; (2) Government's response to a question, Information or suggestion. Since not all districts and cities in Java Island use twitter as a two-way communication media, only 16 districts and cities follow this stage. Time and date information is used to see the speed of government responding to the community. A government reply is used to categorize whether the reply answers the question or not.

We then categorize the 16 districts and cities into four categories. The first category is those who respond quickly and solutively while the second category is the city districts which reply information less than 24 hours but provide solutive answers. The third category is those who respond quickly but not solutively while the fourth category is filled by those who are slow to answer and not solutive.

III. RESULT

Table 3: Category of Tweet

No	Category of Tweet	Total Tweet
1	Asking For Something	168
2	Expression and Appreciation	92
3	Complain and Request	67
4	Report	54
5	Suggestion	35
6	Informing an event	175
Total		591

Table 3 shows that in August 2017, there were 591 tweets for local governments sent by communities from 6 different provinces, namely: Banten, West Java, DKI Jakarta, Central Java, Yogyakarta and East Java. The highest number of publicized tweet category was asking for something' category, which was 168 tweets. On the other hand, the lowest number of publicized tweet category was to inform an event' category, which was only 10 tweets out of a total of 591 tweets. Finally, complete content and organizational editing before formatting. Please take note of the following items when proofreading spelling and grammar:

Table 4. Category of Tweet in Banten Province

Category of Tweet	List of City					
	Pandeglang	Kab. Tangerang	Cilegon	Serang	Kota Tangerang	Tangerang Selatan
Asking For Something	4	5	1	0	10	11
Complain and Request	1	6	0	2	3	2
Suggestion	2	2	1	0	3	3
Informing an Event	0	0	0	0	0	0
Expression and Appreciation	1	0	0	0	0	0
Report	3	1	0	1	4	4
Giving an Information	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	11	14	2	3	20	20

Table 4 shows Tangerang City and South Tangerang City was being the most active area to send tweets to its government in August 2017, which was 20 tweets per city. While Cilegon was the area where the people most often interact with the government through twitter, which was only 2 tweets in August 2017. In addition, the category of Asking For Something was the most commonly published tweet category in the community in all areas in Banten province,

with a total of 31 tweets. Meanwhile the category of giving an Information was a tweet category that has never been published by the Banten' community.

Table 5. Category of Tweet in West Java Province

Category of Tweet	List of City										
	Bogor	Indramayu	Kerawang	Subang	Sukabumi	Kab. Tasikmalaya	Bekasi	Kota Bogor	Kota Depok	Kota Sukabumi	Kota Tasikmalaya
Asking For Something	6	7	2	4	1	1	12	8	11	1	4
Complain and Request	3	1	0	2	0	0	2	1	4	0	0
Suggestion	1	0	0	1	0	0	2	2	2	1	0
Informing an Event	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	3	1	1	1
Expression and Appreciation	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	4
Report	6	0	2	0	0	0	4	5	1	0	2
Giving an Information	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	18	8	4	7	1	4	20	20	20	3	11

Table V shows Tangerang City, Bekasi City, Bogor City and Depok City was being the most active areas to send tweets to their government in August 2017, which was 20 tweets per city. In contrast, Sukabumi was the areas where citizen rarely communicate with the government by twitter, which was only 1 tweet in August 2017. In addition, the category of Asking for Something was the most commonly published tweet category by people in all regions in West Java Province, with a total of 57 tweets in a month. Furthermore, the category of Giving an Information was also a tweet category which has never published by the people in West Java Province.

Table 6. Category of Tweet in Jakarta Province

Category of Tweet	List Of City			
	Jakarta Selatan	Jakarta Timur	Jakarta Utara	Jakarta Barat
Asking For Something	2	2	0	0
Complain and Request	3	1	0	0
Suggestion	2	0	0	0
Expression and Appreciation	2	0	1	0
Report	2	2	0	0
Informing an Event	16	0	6	2
Total	27	5	7	2

Table VI shows South Jakarta was being the most active area with the high level of interaction activity with the local government through twitter in August 2017, which was 27 tweets. In Contrast, The community in West Jakarta rarely did communication with the local government through twitter, which was only 2 tweets in August 2017. In addition, the highest number of category of tweet which published by

people in all regions in the Province of DKI Jakarta was Giving an Information' Category, with a total of 24 tweets in a month. Meanwhile the Category of Informing an Event was a tweet category that has never been published by the people of DKI Jakarta Province.

Table 7. Category of Tweet in Central Java Province

Category of Tweet	List of City															
	Kab. Blora	Kab. Batang	Kab. Brebes	Kab. Cilacap	Kab. Demak	Jepara	Kab. Karanganyar	Kab. Pati	Kab. Pekalongan	Kab. Pemalang	Kab. Purbalinggo	Kab. Rembang	Kab. Salatiga	Kota Semarang	Kota Solo	Kab. Tegal
Asking For Something	8	3	4	5	1	4	5	0	3	2	5	0	1	2	1	4
Complain and Request																
Suggestion	1	1	3	2	0	0	2	2	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	1
Expression and Appreciation	4	4	7	4	0	6	3	0	3	6	5	0	1	3	3	7
Report	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	0
Informing an event	1	9	6	7	1	9	1	2	1	1	9	8	4	1	1	5
Total	16	19	20	20	3	20	25	5	20	20	20	9	7	20	20	20

Table 7 shows Kab. Brebes, Kab. Cilacap, Jepara, Kab. Karanganyar, Kab. Pekalongan, Kab. Pemalang, Kab. Purbalinggo, Semarang City, Solo City, and Kab. Tegal were the district with the highest number of tweets undertaken by community to the local government through twitter in August 2017, which was 20 tweets. Whilst Demak was the district with the lowest number of tweets sent by citizen to the government, which was only 3 tweets in August 2017. Furthermore, The highest number of category of tweet which published by people in all regions in Cetntral Java Province was informing an event Category, with a total of 121 tweets in a month. In Yogyakarta Province, there was only people living in Kulon Progo who actively interacted with the government through twitter in August 2017, with a total tweet of 1 tweet. The Tweet categorized by this community is Asking for Something' Category.

Table 8 shows that Banyuwangi and Malang City were the district with the highest number of tweets sent by community to the local government through twitter in August 2017, which was 20 tweets. While Blitar, Bojonegoro, Kab. Probolinggo, Tuban, Pasuruan, and Probolinggo City was district with the

lowest number of tweets sent by citizen to the government, which was only 1 tweet in August 2017. In addition, the highest number of category of tweet which published by people in all regions in East Java Province was Asking For Something' Category, with a total of 23 tweets. In Contrast, the category of Suggestion was the most rare tweet category published by the people of East Java Province, which was only 1 tweet.

Table 8. Category of Tweet in East Java Province

Category of Tweet	List of City													
	Banyuwangi	Blitar	Bojonegoro	Jember	Lamongan	Lumajang	Malang	Kab. Probolinggo	Situbondo	Tuban	Malang	Pasuruan	Probolinggo	Surabaya
Asking For Something	3	0	0	4	1	2	2	0	3	0	8	0	0	4
Complain and Request	1	1	0	3	0	1	4	0	0	0	4	1	1	5
Suggestion	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Expression and Appreciation	6	0	0	7	1	0	0	1	0	0	5	0	0	3
Report	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	7
Informing an event	9	0	1	5	1	0	2	0	2	0	2	0	0	0
Total	20	1	1	9	3	3	8	1	5	1	20	1	1	20

Based on data that has been searched from all official twitter account of city / regency government in Java Island, there are 51 cities / districts that actively use twitter as one of communication channel with society. Actually there are many local governments that have an official twitter account, but it has not been used in a relatively long time so that authors do not note the interaction. In this study, the authors recorded all the tweets / posts and online interactions that occurred during the month of August 2017. The number of tweets recorded from each regions is no more than 20 tweets. After the online search, only 18 local government twitter accounts are mentioned by public/ netizen with the number reaching 20 tweets or more. The rest is less than 20 tweets or even no interaction at all. Of the 51 cities / districts, only 16 regions responded the tweets /posts or 31% of all districts/ cities that actively use twitter. The sum of tweets / posts recorded from 51 districts / cities is 559 tweets with the number of replies (reply) as much as 57 or only 10% of all tweet recorded. Regencies / cities that reply to tweets posted by netizen are: Situbondo, Malang, Surabaya, Blora, Batang, Karanganyar, Pemalang, Indramayu, Karawang, Bekasi, Depok, Sukabumi, Pandeglang, Tangerang City, South Tangerang City and Tangerang Regency.

Based on the percentage of reply to all tweets addressed to local government accounts during August 2017, there are only 4 regencies / cities with relatively high reply rate: Batang Regency (75%), Karanganyar Regency (75%), Indramayu Regency (75%), Sukabumi (67%) and Surabaya (45%). The other 11 districts / cities have low reply rates. South Tangerang City and Pemalang Regency are the two regions

with the lowest reply rate. Only 1 of 20 tweets are responded by Tangerang Selatan's official account, the same number also occurs in the official account of Pematang District. The reply rate of these two regions is only 5%. The city of Blora also has a very low reply rate, which is only 1 reply from 16 tweets addressed to a local government account or 6%. Other findings important to note that there are some official local government accounts which are oftenly mentioned by society but there is no single reply, such as: Banyuwangi, Jember, Brebes, Cilacap, Jepara, Pekalongan, Purbalingga, Semarang, Solo, South Jakarta, Tegal and Bogor.

To describe completely the level of speed in responding (speed to reply) and reply quality (reply quality), the authors describe the findings in more detail.

A. Speed to reply

Based on the data that has been collected, the authors perform data analysis by arranging the response category based on the level of government speed in responding or replying netizen tweets. Replies are categorized into 2 categories, fast reply if the tweet is responded within a period of no more than 24 hours since the tweet is posted and slow reply if the tweet is replied exceed 24 hours. Of the 57 replies, 43 reply is fast reply and 14 reply included in slow reply category. As much as 75% response / reply is given in a short period of time, ie less than 24 hours while 25% replies are given in a relatively slow period. Based on these two categories, Malang City, Surabaya and Indramayu have the highest speed of reply.

Table 9. Speed to reply

No	Kabupaten/ Kota	Average of Reply Speed
1	Situbondo	1D 5H 43M
2	Malang	10H 29M
3	Surabaya	10H 40 M
4	Blora	1D 18H 15M
5	Batang	1D 5H 27M
6	Karanganyar	1D 7H 8M
7	Pemalang	7H 2M
8	Pandeglang	5H 13M
9	Kab Tangerang	1H 39M
10	Kota Tangerang	6H 24M
11	Tangerang Sel	1D 10M
12	Indramayu	2H 56M
13	Sukabumi	3D 4H 40M
14	Karawang	1D 11H 11M
15	Bekasi	1H 6M
16	Depok	2H 55M

After calculating to get the average speed of reply from each twitter account of local government, that is by summing the duration of speed of reply with the number of tweet that reply, there is little difference with categorization which classify speed of reply into 2 categories (fast and slow). Once calculated, 4 regions have the highest average of reply speeds. Bekasi is an area with the fastest speed of reply (1 hour 6 minute), followed by Tangerang Regency with speed 1 hour 39 minute. Depok has an average of 2 hour 55 minute and Indramayu is calculated 2 hour 56 minute. It should be noted, this calculation is certainly strongly influenced by the reply speed range of each tweet and the number of tweets that responded. It will obviously show the consistency of speed of reply. The average speed of reply of each official account that respond to tweets from the public is presented in Table IX.

Based on the data, some local twitter accounts with longest average of reply speed or more than 1 day is Situbondo, Blora, Batang, Karanganyar, South Tangerang, Sukabumi and Karawang. The official twitter account of the local government of Sukabumi was recorded as the longest average of reply speed. The account response to the tweet of the society in average 3 days 4 hours and 40 minutes.

B. Quality of reply

Based on the quality of reply given by the local government in responding to the tweet of the community, the authors classify withinin 2 categories, namely solutive reply and not solutive reply. Replies are categorized as solutive reply if it is able to answer the tweet thoroughly to the subject matter. If the tweet is replied but the reply is unfinished or still blurry then it is classified as not solutive reply. Of the 57 replies, 49 tweets or 86% are replied thoroughly and solutively and only 8 tweets or 14% of replies are less or even not solutive. The highest percentage of quality of reply is Surabaya, Karanganyar, Indramayu and Bekasi.

Category III shows the regency/city of active twitter users with a low speed reply but solutive. The areas are Situbondo, Batang, Tangerang Selatan and Sukabumi. Category IV is the active twitter user that are considered with low speed reply and the quality of replies that are not solutive. Cities or regencies which are in this category are Blora and Karawang. Tangerang entered in Category II because its twitter account reply to twitter quickly but not solutive. For the best category, Category I, there are 11 local government in this quadrant, namely Situbondo, Malang City, Surabaya, Karanganyar, Pemalang, Pandeglang, Tangerang City, Indramayu, Bekasi, Depok and Sukabumi. There are two regions that fall into two quadrants at once namely Situbondo and Sukabumi, this is because these two regions have the same percentage in one category so that the authors put these two areas in two quadrants at once.

III. DISCUSSION

This paper aims to explore the interaction between communities and governments on Twitter as a part of implementation of the dialogic communication theory. [23] reveals that the use of principles in dialogic communication will be particular useful in order to monitor the relation of governance and society. Theory presents a framework that can

be used as a guideline for evaluating the communication between the organization and the public [24].

From the various principles of dialogic communication, this paper focuses on the dialogic loop principle. The principle does not only emphasize in the opportunity to ask questions and get answers but each actor also gets feedback because of the interaction [24]. [25] reveals that this principle is the most important in holding important roles to increase public participation. Based on a limited empirical research that attempts to analyze the relationships of government and society through social media, this writing attempts to describe the interaction of society and government in social media by proposing two research questions.

The first research question questioned about the type of information the government receives through its twitter account. By analyzing 591 tweets that mention a single governmental account, it was found that there were six different tweet's categories, namely: Suggestion, Complaint and request, Informing an event, Expression (appreciation), Asking for something, and Report. In more detail, this paper finds a message through its social media which is often tweeted by the community was asking for something' category and Informing an Event' Category. In the category of asking for something, the community often use the twitter to ask about the procedure of public service. In contrast, in the category of information to an event, the community use twitter to inform a particular event to the government. They give the event' information in order to do marketing strategy or socialization of the event.

The results of this study are similar to the research conducted by [13]. In his research, they found that requesting information' category and sharing information' category were the most common message' category sent by netizens. Thus, it can be concluded that different platforms do not make the information shared by netizens to be different.

Another finding in this research was the other function of social media by users, namely providing suggestion, complaining public services and giving a report to the government. Those categories was the lower category. [13] also stated the low level of using twitter for giving reports, suggestions and complaints due to the citizen often deliver that message' category by the telephone.

Furthermore, in order to answer the issue of the problem, we explore whether the district administrations in java used twitter to conduct communications on the same basis. The results of the study show that from 51 regencies and active urban areas used twitter until 2017, there were only 16 (31%) districts responded the tweets from the public. Meanwhile, other local governments use twitter only for one-way communication. Some local governments actively publish particular information to the community, yet they do not respond the message sent by public through twitter. We found that 35 districts and cities did not respond communities' comment.

This research confirms the study conducted by [25] which found that although social media allows for the exchange of public and government information, yet Government do not

use social networks to do so. Information flow tends to be one way communication. In other words, governments tend to use twitter to publish their activities, yet they do not use twitter to create better relationships with the community. This study also coincided with the study undertaken by [6] which placed governments in organizations that knew the benefits of social media, however in fact they did not use it to dialogue with the public.

The use of social media for communications is a part of dialogic communication as described by [24]. This study describes the key components of the most important dialogic communication namely the dialogic loop principle. Social media hold an important role as a medium to exchange information with each other. As an example, the community use twitter to ask something which is proposed to the government through its social media. Then, the Government' official wshould respond the community' question.

This research also explains a more detailed description related to two-way communication between communities and governments. The result is that not all districts and cities sampled in this research answer the questions solutively and quickly. We divide cities and districts into four categories.

The first category is the local governmnet which respond the community solutively and quickly. We found 11 Districts in this category. In the second category, there is one district, namely tangerang district which give quick replies, however it is not solutive respond. The third category is the local government those which reply to questions slowly, yet they give the solutive answer. There are 3 districts in this category. The last category is the district that reply to the question not quickly nor solutively. We found 2 districts in this category. Among the districts and cities there are also districts and cities that fall into two categories namely Sukabumi and Situbondo. This is because these two districts have two different types of responses. Therefore, we categorize these districts into two categories at once.

This research is useful both in theoretical and managerial aspects. Theoretically, this research is able to show evidence of dialogic communication theory, especially in the principle of dialogic loop. Methodologically this research can describe the use of social media by local government in Java Island. This research is one form of evaluation on social media use performance by local government in Java Island. By looking at the results of research, social media officers can develop strategies to monitor the relationship with the community.

IV. CONCLUSION

This paper presents an overview of community and government interactions in social media. By analyzing 591 tweets, the researchers found six categories of twitter used by the community, namely: asking for something, expression and appreciation, complain and request, reporting, suggestion, and informing an event. Among these categories, there are two categories which often used by citizen, namely: informing an event and asking for something.

The next finding in this research is that not all local governments in Java Island use social media as a two-way communication media. 69% of the sample use social media for

one-way communication by sharing information related to the organization's activities to the public. The officials seem to be active yet in fact they do not reply to the public's question. Other areas use social media for two-way communication. They respond to almost every question posed by society. Most districts that use social media in these categories answer questions quickly and solutively. Yet there are several districts and cities which are not solutive nor fast respond.

As a recommendation, we suggest that the government formulate social media policy. The absence and uniformity of social media use is a proof of the absence of social media policy in Indonesia. In addition, The government also should conduct training on social media officers to increase their capacity in managing social media.

This study has several drawbacks. Firstly, the researcher only takes a maximum of 20 tweets from the district and / or city that are part of the research sample. But researchers believe that 20 tweet has been representative. Future research is expected to increase the number of samples to give a more complete results and descriptions. Secondly, this research is only done in social media account owned by local government public relations. More intense interactions may lie within a particular agency. Future research is expected to explore the application of the dialogic communication theory in social media of a particular agency.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This research is inspired by the work of Alejandro Sáez Martín, Arturo Haro de Rosario & María Del Carmen Caba Pérez entitled Using Twitter for Dialogic Communication: Local.

REFERENCES

[1] E. Ferro, E. N. Loukis, Y. Charalabidis, and M. Osella, "Policy making 2.0: From theory to practice," *Gov. Inf. Q.*, vol. 30, no. 4, pp. 359–368, 2013.

[2] P. Panagiotopoulos, A. Z. Bigdeli, and S. Sams, "Citizen-government collaboration on social media: The case of Twitter in the 2011 riots in England," *Gov. Inf. Q.*, vol. 31, no. 3, pp. 349–357, 2014.

[3] D. Valle-Cruz, R. Sandoval-Almazan, and J. R. Gil-Garcia, "Citizens' perceptions of the impact of information technology use on transparency, efficiency and corruption in local governments," *Inf. Polity*, vol. 21, no. 3, pp. 321–334, 2016.

[4] A. S. Martín, A. H. de Rosario, and C. Caba Pérez, "Using Twitter for Dialogic Communication: Local Government Strategies in the European Union," *Local Gov. Stud.*, vol. 41, no. May, pp. 421–444, 2015.

[5] R. Sandoval-Almazan and J. R. Gil-Garcia, "Are government internet portals evolving towards more interaction, participation, and collaboration? Revisiting the rhetoric of e-government among municipalities," *Gov. Inf. Q.*, vol. 29, no. SUPPL. 1, pp. S72–S81, 2012.

[6] D. S. Bortree and T. Seltzer, "Dialogic strategies and outcomes: An analysis of environmental advocacy groups' Facebook profiles," *Public Relat. Rev.*, vol. 35, no. 3, pp. 317–319, 2009.

[7] S. M. McAllister, "How the world's top universities provide dialogic forums for marginalized voices," *Public Relat. Rev.*, vol. 38, no. 2, pp. 319–327, 2012.

[8] L. A. Brainard and J. G. McNutt, "Virtual Government–Citizen Relations," *Adm. Soc.*, vol. 42, no. 7, pp. 836–858, 2010.

[9] G. H. M. Oliveira and E. W. Welch, "Social media use in local government: Linkage of technology, task, and organizational context," *Gov. Inf. Q.*, vol. 30, no. 4, pp. 397–405, 2013.

[10] M. Yildiz, N. Ocak, C. Yildirim, K. Cagiltay, and C. Babaoglu, "Usability in Local E-Government: Analysis of Turkish Metropolitan Municipality Facebook Pages," *Int. J. Public Adm. Digit. Age*, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 53–69, 2016.

[11] J. H. Park, C. Lee, C. Yoo, and Y. Nam, "An analysis of the utilization of Facebook by local Korean governments for tourism development and the network of smart tourism ecosystem," *Int. J. Inf. Manage.*, vol. 36, no. 6, pp. 1320–1327, 2016.

[12] C. G. Reddick, A. T. Chatfield, and A. Ojo, "A social media text analytics framework for double-loop learning for citizen-centric public services: A case study of a local government Facebook use," *Gov. Inf. Q.*, vol. 34, pp. 1–16, 2017.

[13] P. Bellström, M. Magnusson, J. S. Pettersson, and C. Thorén, "Facebook usage in a local government: A content analysis of page owner posts and user posts," *Transform. Gov. People, Process Policy*, vol. 10, no. 4, pp. 548–567, 2016.

[14] E. Bonsón, L. Torres, S. Royo, and F. Flores, "Local e-government 2.0: Social media and corporate transparency in municipalities," *Gov. Inf. Q.*, vol. 29, no. 2, pp. 123–132, 2012.

[15] C. G. Reddick and D. F. Norris, "Social media adoption at the American grass roots: Web 2.0 or 1.5?," *Gov. Inf. Q.*, vol. 30, no. 4, pp. 498–507, 2013.

[16] M. Taylor, M. L. Kent, and W. J. White, "How activist organizations are using the Internet to build relationships," *Public Relat. Rev.*, vol. 27, no. 3, pp. 263–284, 2001.

[17] T. Seltzer and M. A. Mitrook, "The dialogic potential of weblogs in relationship building," *Public Relat. Rev.*, vol. 33, no. 2, pp. 227–229, 2007.

[18] J. D. Fraustino, B. Liu, and J. Yan, "Social Media Use during Disasters: A Review of the Knowledge Base and Gaps," in *National Consortium for the Study of Terrorism and Responses to Terrorism*, 2012, pp. 1–39.

[19] J. B. Houston *et al.*, "Social media and disasters: a functional framework for social media use in disaster planning, response, and research," *Disasters*, vol. 39, no. 1, pp. 1–22, 2014.

[20] E. Bonson, S. Royo, and M. Ratkai, "Facebook Practices in Western European Municipalities: An Empirical Analysis of Activity and Citizens' Engagement," *Adm. Soc.*, vol. 49, no. 3, p. 0095399714544945-, 2014.

[21] M. Z. Sobaci, "Social Media and Local Governments: An Overview," in *Social Media and Local Governments: Theory and Practice*, 15th ed., vol. 15, M. Z. Sobaci, Ed. Switzerland: Springer US, 2016, pp. 3–22.

[22] C. A. on Statistics, "ICT Development Index 2012-2015 Indonesia," Jakarta, 2016.

[23] A. Lovari, V. Martino, and J.-N. Kim, "Citizens' relationships with a municipality and their communicative behaviors in negative civic issues," *Int. J. Strateg. Commun.*, vol. 6, no. 1, pp. 17–30, 2012.

[24] M. L. Kent and M. Taylor, "Building dialogic relationships through the world wide web," *Public Relat. Rev.*, vol. 24, no. 3, pp. 321–334, 1998.

[25] A. Sáez Martín, A. Haro de Rosario, and M. D. C. Caba Pérez, "Using Twitter for Dialogic Communication: Local Government Strategies in the European Union," *Local Gov. Stud.*, vol. 41, no. 3, pp. 421–444, 2015.