

Anang Dwi SANTOSO*
Dhia K. RINJANY**
Oemar Madri BAFADHAL***

Social Media and Local Government in Indonesia: Adoption, Use and Stakeholder Engagement

Abstract

While social media has been extensively adopted by local governments, not all of its benefits have been achieved. One reason is that local government-owned social media is less appealing. This research argues that to increase public involvement in social media, the government needs to understand public behavior on social media by exploring public preferences on the content and media produced. This research applies a Stakeholder Engagement Index (SEI) to study public behavior on social media. The results of the study demonstrate that although content containing information about government activities has been produced, it has a low engagement level. Moreover, people prefer content with photos and videos, which apparently dominate local government posts and tweets. This research academically confirms that SEI is an alternative method for understanding public behavior on social media and practically presents choices of content categories preferred by the public.

Keywords: social media, local government, Stakeholder Engagement Index, public involvement, Twitter, Facebook

1. Introduction

The government is responsible for providing information to the public. Therefore, communication with the public is essential. Two-way communication, especially, take an important role, allowing the public to receive feedback on public policies and services. Unfortunately, communication between the government and the community is often distant and ineffective (Liu & Horsley, 2007). The government gives low priority to this problem, as seen from the small budget allocation. Information about government activities is often communicated through mass media such as television, radio, newspapers (Towner & Dulio, 2011). The mass media, however, does not facilitate two-way communication between the government and the public, resulting in the public's presumption that the government communication is mere-

* Universitas Sriwijaya, Indonesia, anangdwi@fisip.unsri.ac.id

** Universitas Gadjah Mada, Indonesia, dhia.khalila.r@mail.ugm.ac.id

*** Universitas Sriwijaya, Indonesia, oemarmadribafadhal@fisip.unsri.ac.id (corresponding author)

ly propaganda (Liu & Horsley, 2007; Liu, Horsley & Levenshush, 2010). As a consequence, the government has a poor reputation in the public's eyes because the media do not provide a space to allow good feedback from the public to the government to improve government activities in the future.

Social media presents, mediating communication crisis between the government and the public by offering the possibility to change the exchange of information from one to two directions (Agostino, 2012). It is possible to be conducted because social media allows the public to produce content online and establish communication in real-time. Social media has also emerged during government efforts in finding the right platform to increase public involvement over the past few years (Agostino & Arnaboldi, 2016; Arnaboldi, Azzone & Palermo, 2010). The government massively adopted social media to interact with the public through this potential. The social media features also offer a new way for governments to place the public in an essential position in decision making known as public involvement. Furthermore, the features are characterized by the formation of interactive relationships between the government and the public (Agostino, 2012; Agostino et al., 2017).

Unfortunately, this great potential is not being utilized as well as possible because it has been found that governments in various parts of the world do not use social media features as they should be. Governments often use social media as they maintain Web 1.0, not use it to communicate both ways (Bortree & Seltzer, 2009; Campbell, Lambright & Wells, 2014). Moreover, they do not consider public preferences as to what content the public is interested in being actively involved. Apart from the wide benefits offered by social media, the government does not use social media for two-way communication (Bonsón et al., 2012; Bortree & Seltzer, 2009; Feeney & Welch, 2016; McAllister, 2012). In Australia, although there are various indications of public involvement in government social media, the government do not use it to engage in dialogue with the public (Heaselgrave & Simmons, 2016).

We conduct a case study on local governments in Indonesia. Local governments are interesting subjects in social media studies because the decisions they make directly affect the public. Therefore, the tradition of community participation is easily found at the local level (Bonsón et al., 2012; Mossberger, Wu & Crawford, 2013). Moreover, social media has been adopted on a large scale by Indonesian people. Several surveys put Indonesia as a country with the highest level of social media adoption. Table 1 shows a summary of social media adoption in Indonesia based on the Survei Hootsuite and We are Social, 2019. The government should maximize the public presence on social media to encourage high public involvement.

Table 1. Social Media Adoption in Indonesia

Platform	Search (based on addressable advertising audience)	World Ranking
Twitter	6,425,000	9
Facebook	130,000,000	3
Instagram	62,000,000	4

Source: We Are Social & Hootsuite, 2019.

Several studies in Indonesia show that the government does not demonstrate good performance on social media, in the sense of not using it in two-way communication. Symmetrical communication between the government and the public occurs limitedly because the government

utilizes social media to broadcast information which has a low level of engagement (Idris, 2018; Marpaung & Santoso, 2019). Social media have not influenced the internal processes of the organization; rather, they are only used for disseminating information to the public (Nurmandi, Almarez & Efendi, 2018; Roengtam et al., 2017; Santoso, 2019). The study also found that social media is not utilized to collect information from the public because it is not considered a public space which facilitates interaction between the public and government.

Although social media has been massively used and researched, few researchers are interested in investigating public preferences on certain content that appears more often than other types. In fact, the effectiveness of communication cannot only be seen from the way the government communicates with the public, but also the public's views of the communication (Hofmann et al., 2013). Previous studies have focused more on the presence of government on social media (Medaglia & Zheng, 2017). Some of them have also explored content shared to see involvement in certain issues such as the environment, community participation, health education and so on (Bonsón, Royo & Ratkai, 2015). To fill this gap, this study explores content provided by the government to find out whether the public is interested or not in being present on government-owned social media. More specifically, this study answers two research questions which are (a) what forms of local government presence on social media? and (b) how the public responds to content produced by local governments?. The first question will be answered by presenting the adoption of social media and any content created by the local government, while the second question will be answered by testing the SEI category of post/tweet produced and the media attached to the post/tweet. This study emphasizes the importance of paying attention to how public behavior on social media in gaining the latest insights to be able to comprehend the public and ultimately gain a broad public involvement.

The following section of this paper contains the characteristics of social media and its benefits in encouraging public involvement and followed by public involvement in social media. Next, the research method, which contains the strategies used by the researchers to obtain and analyze data is explained. Then, the findings section which contains the use of social media by local governments in Indonesia is elaborated, followed by a discussion section. The final section of this paper contains conclusions.

2. Literature Review

2.1. The Characteristics and Benefits of Social Media for Governments

Social media refers to web-based applications which support inter-user interaction (Kaplan & Haenlein, 2010), that emphasizes active participation, connectivity, collaboration, and the exchange of ideas (Moss et al., 2015). In the context of the public sector, social media is defined as a technology group which enables public organizations to create greater public involvement (Criado, Rojas-Martín & Gil-Garcia, 2017). Another characteristic of social media is its potential to allow the public to actively contribute to the production of content (Norris & Reddick, 2013; Reddick, Chatfield & Ojo, 2017). Social media also facilitates the creation of a network of relationships, especially because its characteristics allow the creation of content and communication in real-time, support the creation of virtual communities, and share a variety of knowledge and ideas. Regarding these potentials, social media has become a platform which is widely adopted by governments around the world.

For the governments, their presence on social media is mainly due to their desire to increase public involvement in decision making. Transparent, open, and participatory government is the result of using social media as a means to disseminate policy news and build two-way communication with the public (Yi, Oh & Kim, 2013). The presence of government on social media opens up public opportunities to participate democratically and generate crowdsourcing solutions and innovations (Bertot, Jaeger & Grimes, 2012; Linders, 2012). Social media can increase the transparency and quality of policymaking and service delivery to the public (Bonsón et al., 2012; Kavanaugh et al., 2012). Furthermore, there are three social media tactics for the public sector consisting of (a) a push strategy; it is used by the government to provide formal information and place social media as an additional communication channel, (b) a pull strategy; it is intended to involve and incorporate the information from the public to the government, (c) a network strategy, it is involved both (push and pull) which is characterized by the use of social media respectively, interactively and in two-way communication, generating an information feedback cycle (Mergel, 2013).

2.2. Public Involvement in Social Media

Public involvement refers to the involvement of citizens in public affairs (Rowe & Frewer, 2005), including public involvement in government activities, policy-making and implementations, and improving the quality of public services (Bovaird, 2007). It also related to governance which shifts from a bureaucratic model to public involvement (Agostino, 2013; Kolsaker & Kelley, 2006). It is driven by the government needs to promote transparent and collaborative governance (Carter & Bélanger, 2005). Generally, public involvement can be divided into information, consultation, involvement, collaboration, and empowerment phases (Agostino, 2012). While information and consultation are processes related to the diffusion of facts and data to the public; engagement, collaboration, and empowerment are public involvement in the decision making the process and public placement as an important part of decision making.

Social media is a potential medium to offer new ways for governments to encourage public involvement when public participation and trust in government is low (Mergel, 2013; Yi et al., 2013). Social media features offer great benefits to support public involvement. It encourages the creation of a network of relationships, occurring not only between the government and the public but also the government and the government and the public with the public (Sobaci & Karkin, 2013). Transparency and accountability which are challenging to achieve become possible through social media, resulting in the trust of the government (Carter & Bélanger, 2005). Public preferences can also be tracked primarily to improve the quality of public services which are tailored to the needs and desires of the public (Moss et al., 2015). Social media presents a public space where the public and government interact. When governments use social media, there is a great opportunity to enrich the social-political debate, increase the diversity of public opinion and provide a free flow of information and public expression (Bonsón et al., 2012). It is convenient for the public to reach out to the government to convey ideas and complaints about government activities on social media. Interactions which occur on social media are two-way, providing intense communication and feedback between the government and the public (Bonson, Royo & Ratkai, 2017). Another benefit which can be obtained is the presence of public opinion and knowledge in the decision-making process so that the decision becomes more transparent, appealing, and participatory and offers greater possibilities for the public to be involved in the collaboration process.

3. Research Methods

To achieve research objectives, we use case study designs which are suitable for understanding complex and contemporary social phenomena (Yin, 2014), to conduct a content analysis of the use of Twitter and Facebook in cities and districts in Indonesia. This section contains research samples, the process of data collection, and data analysis.

3.1. Samples

This study explores each Facebook and Twitter accounts of the cities and districts on Java Island. Java Island was chosen because the development of Information and Communication Technology (ICT) infrastructure on this island is more advanced, as evidenced by the higher ICT development index compared to other islands (BPS, 2017). In total, there were 119 districts and cities observed. This study began by searching Facebook and Twitter accounts by looking at the official websites; generally, the information is in the “contact us” section. If this method did not work, we typed the name of the cities or districts in the Twitter/Facebook search column. The data collection process was conducted on 15-20 July 2018 to retrieve post/tweet data which was distributed in a span of 1 month (1-30 June 2018). This process was assisted by Ncapture feature of the Nvivo 11 application.

3.2. Stakeholder Engagement Index (SEI)

Bonsón et al., (2013) proposed a valid formula to identify stakeholder involvement in a social media account. This study utilizes this formula by observing data in each account to measure Stakeholder Engagement Index. First, we measured P3, C3, and V3 before obtaining SEI. P3 measures the popularity of a Facebook or Twitter account by examining the average number of likes per post/tweet. C3 measures the level of commitment of followers by figuring the average number of comments per post/tweet. Meanwhile, V3 measures the virality of an account by calculating the average number of shares per post/tweet. Finally, the addition of P3, C3, and V3 will produce an SEI. Explanation of the formula is detailed in Table 2.

Table 2. Stakeholder Engagement Index (SEI)

Concept	Symbol	Formula	Details
Popularity	P1	Post 'liked'/ total post	The proportion of posts with 'likes'
	P2	Total 'likes'/Total posts	Average 'likes' per post
	P3	(Post/Tweets/number of followers)x 1,000	The popularity of posts among followers
Commitment	C1	Posts with comments/Total posts	The proportion of posts with comments
	C2	Total comments/Total posts	Average comments per posts
	C3	(C2/number of followers) x 1,000	Followers' engagement
Virality	V1	Posts shared/total post	The proportion of shared posts
	V2	Total shared/total posts	Average of posts shared
	V3	(V2/ number of followers) x 1,000	The virality of posts among followers
Engagement	E	P3+C3+V3	Stakeholder engagement index (SEI)

Source: (Bonsón et al., 2015).

Posts and Tweets are analyzed by labelling them with certain categories as arranged in Table 3. In general, there are six categories we obtained from the results of the literature review such as sharing information, call for participation, communication with stakeholders, greetings and service information. Eventually, we provide categories of videos, links, photos and texts to find out the type of media attached to each post and tweet.

Table 3. Information shared on social media by local government accounts

Category	Type	Category	Type
<i>Sharing information</i>	Informing government activities in the past	<i>Communication with stakeholders</i>	Communicating with other government agencies
	Informing current government activities and the city's condition		Communicating with the community
	Promoting government programs/activities		Communicating with regional heads
	Informing official activities		Communicating with other provincial, regional or central governments
	Informing community activities	<i>Greetings</i>	Sending congratulatory
	Informing the activities of the regional heads or the deputies		Sending condolences
	Clarifying hoax news		Giving reminder
	Educating communities		Sharing quotes
<i>Call for participation</i>	Asking for advice from the community	<i>Service information</i>	Promoting public services
	Asking for advice from the community		Informing new public services
	Inviting the public to attend an event		Notifying public service interruption
	Requesting information from the public		Socializing new regulations

Source: (Bolívar, 2016; Bonson, Royo & Ratkai, 2014; Bonsón et al., 2015; Heaselgrave & Simmons, 2016; Hofmann et al., 2013; Reddick et al., 2017).

3.3. Data Reliability

Coding and analysis are conducted in three stages to ensure data reliability (Bellström et al., 2016). The first stage was to assign the first author to conduct the initial round coding using the guidelines from Table 3. Separately, the second author encoded the second round in the same manner. Then, the first and second authors discussed to match the results of their coding. Different results became the subject of discussion until an agreement was reached between the two. The final round of coding was conducted by research assistants who were not affiliated with this study whose job was to ensure that tweets and posts were coded correctly.

4. Findings

4.1. Social Media Adoption

Table 4 shows the social media adoption at the provincial level in Java. We present the province data, total districts and cities in a province, and the percentage of social media adoption for each account. In general, more than half of the districts and cities in Java are present on Twitter and Facebook. Of the 119 districts and cities observed, 61% have Facebook and 72% have Twitter.

Table 4. Facebook and Twitter Adoption

Province	Total District and City	Facebook	Twitter
Banten	8	88%	100%
Jakarta	6	67%	67%
West Java	27	52%	67%
Central Java	35	63%	80%
Yogyakarta	5	60%	20%
East Java	38	61%	71%
Total	119	61%	72%

Districts and cities in Banten Province have the highest adoption rate of both social media with 88% have Facebook and all of them have Twitter. Districts and cities in West Java Province ranked the lowest for Facebook adoption with a 52% rate. While on the Twitter platform, only 20% of all Districts and cities in Yogyakarta Province have the accounts.

Table 5 illustrates the five cities with the highest SEI. Furthermore, we also calculate the average of SEI of the districts and cities in Java. Overall, Twitter has a higher SEI than Facebook. It indicates that Twitter users are more active on Twitter than Facebook. Moreover, the SEI for Twitter is calculated at 10.63, while that of Facebook is only 0.08.

Table 4. Five Districts/Cities with the Highest SEI in Java

Facebook		Twitter	
Districts/Cities	SEI	Districts/Cities	SEI
Kediri City	22.54	Bandung City	25.10
Indramayu District	21.23	Banyuwangi District	12.93
Banyuwangi District	20.96	Depok City	3.17
Bogor City	9.37	Bekasi City	2.62
Banyumas District	4.68	Surabaya City	1.60
Average	0.08	Average	10.63

Moreover, the highest SEI on Facebook is obtained by Kediri City with 22.54. SEI of Indramayu District, Banyuwangi District, and Bogor City are 21.23, 20.96, and 9.37, respectively. The fifth rank of SEI on Facebook is Banyumas District, with a total SEI of 4.68. On the Twitter platform, Bandung City ranks first with an SEI of 25.10, followed by Banyuwangi District, Depok City, Bekasi City, and Surabaya City with SEI of 12.93, 3.17, 2.62, and 1.60, respectively.

4.2. Attached content and media categories

Table 5 is the result of content analysis to demonstrate content shared on Facebook and Twitter. It contains the types of information and the percentage of types of information on each platform. Overall, the type and percentage of information produced on Facebook are the same as the information generated on Twitter.

Table 5. The type of information produced on Facebook and Twitter

No	Type of Information	Facebook (%)	Twitter (%)
1	Informing government activities in the past	22,5	23,0
2	Informing the activities of the regional heads or the deputies	18,0	16,8
3	Informing current government activities and the city's condition	10,1	9,0
4	Sending congratulatory	8,1	8,2
5	Inviting the public to attend an event	8,1	7,0
6	Informing new public services	7,9	4,3
7	Educating communities	4,5	4,3
8	Promoting government programs/activities	4,1	1,5
9	Informing the activities of government officials other than the regent/mayor and their deputies	3,8	3,8
10	Promoting public services	2,6	2,2
11	Socializing new regulations	2,6	2,8
12	Giving reminder	1,5	3,0
13	Sharing quotes	1,3	1,2
14	Requesting information from the public	1,3	1,3
15	Notifying public service interruption	1,2	2,3
16	Marketing tourist destinations	1,0	4,3
17	Clarifying hoax news	0,8	0,8
18	Communicating with the community	0,2	5,2
19	Sending condolences	0,2	0,5
21	Communicating with other government agencies		1,5
22	Communicating with regional heads		0,3

Specifically, we found 19 categories on Facebook and 22 categories on Twitter. From each category of information, there is no significant percentage difference between the two social media. On Twitter and Facebook, we found that information about past events was the most frequently produced category at 22.5% on Facebook and 23.0% on Twitter. Information on the activities of the Regent/Mayor ranks second, posted as much as 18.0% and tweeted as much as 16.8%. A little below is a category of ongoing government activities and the current city condition of 10.1% on Facebook and 9.0% on Twitter. Two categories not found on Facebook but Twitter are communicating with other government agencies (1.5%) and communicating with regional heads (0.3%).

Related to content produced by the government, we also calculate the SEI for each type of post and display five types of posts/tweets which have the highest SEI. It aims to determine the type of content liked by the public so that afterwards, the government may determine the type of content should be produced more.

Table 7. The type of information with high SEI on Facebook

Facebook	SEI
Promoting government programs/activities	>0.01
Informing ongoing government activities and the current city conditions	>0.01
Inviting the community to an event	<0.01
Informing past government activities	<0.01
Informing the activities of the regional heads or the deputies	<0.01

Table 7 contains content with high SEI on Facebook. The five types of information we found were promoting government programs/activities, informing current government activities and current city conditions, inviting people to attend an event, informing government activities in the past, and informing the activities of the regional heads or the deputies.

Table 8. The type of information with high SEI on Twitter

Twitter	SEI
Sending congratulatory	>0.01
Informing new public services	>0.01
Promoting government programs/activities	<0.01
Informing the activities of the regional heads or the deputies	<0.01
Informing ongoing government activities and the current city conditions	<0.01

Table 8 contains the types of information with high SEI on Twitter. Information in this category includes sending congratulatory, promoting government programs/activities, informing the activities of regional heads or the deputies, informing the current government activities and current city conditions, and informing new public services. They are found to have high SEI on Twitter.

Table 9. The SEI of media attached to the post/tweet

media	Facebook		Twitter	
	Percentage	SEI	Percentage	SEI
Photo	52%	>0.01	41%	>0.01
Link	36%	>0.01	38%	<0.01
Video	6%	>0.01	19%	>0.01
Text	6%	<0.01	3%	<0.01

We also calculate the SEI of media attached to the post/tweet. It aims to determine which media are liked by the public so that the government may determine the type of media should be more frequent attached to the post/tweet. Table 9 contains the SEI of the media attached to the posts and tweets. Moreover, we also display the percentage of each media from the total post/tweet which we collected.

Overall, the results of the analysis show that the SEI of the media attached to Facebook and Twitter have similar characteristics. On Facebook, the public prefers content which contains photos. Meanwhile, SEI of the photos on Twitter is lower than videos. Videos are the media with the highest SEI. After that, Facebook's content with links. Meanwhile, content which only contains text, whether on Facebook or Twitter has a low SEI. It indicates that this type of content is not preferable.

5. Discussion

This study explores content produced by the government to find out whether the public is interested or not in being present on government-owned social media. Increasing knowledge on how to engage the public on social media by studying public behavior on social media, including knowing what type of content and what media attachments they like are important to conduct to get the benefits from the government's presence on social media.

This study found differences in adoption and different levels of engagement. As stated by Hofmann et al. (2013), these findings are related to differences in communication strategies applied in each city/district, which then affect the success of online communication of local governments on Facebook and Twitter. Related to Twitter's more adoption, this study is in line with the findings of Bélanger and Carter (2008), which stated the benefits of Twitter such as its speed in publishing large amounts of information, features such as retweet used by the public to disseminate information, and limiting characters so that the information produced is concise and flexible.

This study found that social media is also used by the government to communicate with the public, even though the amount is not significant. It confirms that the public has used social media to contact the government and vice versa which indicates that the government also uses social media to communicate with the public (Bonsón et al., 2015, 2012). The dialogical nature of social media, if used appropriately, is a barometer for capturing public feedback

(Avery & Graham, 2013). As a result, a government image which is responsive, open, transparent, and participatory cannot be achieved.

This research found that social media, both Twitter and Facebook are treated in the same way. The government more often uses social media for one-way communication by informing various government activities such as past activities, the activities of regents/mayors or their deputies, and information on ongoing activities and the current condition of the city. Our findings are in line with previous research which shows that governments often do not exploit the full potential of web 2.0 techniques but only copy their 'web 1.0' behaviour (Brainard & McNutt, 2010; Hofmann et al., 2013). Moreover, we found much content with a news link on the main government website directly shared on social media without adjustments.

This research also confirms that compared to Facebook, Twitter is used by the government to communicate with other users consisting of public officials such as regents/mayors, communities, and other agencies. It is because Twitter facilitates the faster exchange of information which can be published directly (as a tweet) or re-published, with receipts from other people (as retweet) (Martín, de Rosario & Caba Pérez, 2015). Moreover, with the mention feature, Twitter can be used to send instant messages to inform others about facts or events (Bonsón et al., 2012).

Even though Facebook and Twitter are predicted to be the media for communicating with the public, it obtains minimal priority. It is, of course, an attitude that fails to recall the nature of social media that provides the ability for anyone to be heard by a wide audience by giving them the same opportunity to be heard (Kushin & Kitchener, 2009; Williamson & Parolin, 2013). Therefore, important social media features which can be used to gather information about community preferences to improve public policies and services cannot emerge (Evans-Cowley & Griffin, 2012), especially if social media is still used as a one-way platform.

The media attached to the posts or tweets which attract the most public attention both on Twitter and Facebook have similar characteristics. On Facebook, photos are the most frequently attached type of media and most attractive to the public. While on Twitter, videos are the most appealing attachment, although the number is not too significant. The text was found a little in both social media because it did not attract the attention of the public. This finding is not in line with the findings of Hofmann et al. (2013), who found that local governments rarely share posts or tweets with photos and videos. This finding also contradicts the opinion that the government still applies traditional communication skills in the new environment. Content with videos and photos will increase people's reaction (Bonson et al., 2017; Bonsón et al., 2015; Hofmann et al., 2013). Tweets and posts with links also still quite dominate local government Facebook and Twitter pages. This reinforces Magnusson, Bellström and Thoren's (2012) findings that social media is an intermediary media, not the main media where content is produced. In reality, content with links even in previous studies was found to have a lot of negative comments (Hofmann et al., 2013).

Similar to business organizations, the government also uses social media to promote various activities such as future government events, new public services, and educational information for the community. This study found that marketing-like content includes informing upcoming events and inviting the public to government activity, attracting wider public attention compared to other content. Activities to market events or public services are on the list of favorite content for the public, although it is not high on Facebook. It is in line with the findings by Bellström et al. (2016), namely that local governments use social media for marketing an event to gain more participation. By embracing the capabilities of social me-

dia, the government is trying to spur collaboration and participation,. Among others, it is applied through marketing activities on social media (Bertot, Jaeger & Grimes, 2010).

Academically, we confirm that SEI is a measuring tool which can be used to determine public preferences for content produced by the government because if the public is interested, they will engage and vice versa. Also, the list of categories of information shared on social media found in this study may complement the categories found in previous studies. Based on the main findings, this study has a series of practical implications, especially to encourage the use of social media in two-way communication by the local government. To gain higher engagement, the government must share videos and photos more often than content with links or contains text. Multimedia features like this may be used when the government intends to educate. It aims to change public behavior because this kind of media will be more appealing and easier to understand.

This study has several limitations. The first limitation is that the sample of this study is limited to Twitter and Facebook accounts of the local governments in Java. Therefore, the results cannot be generalized. For this reason, future research may broaden the scope of research to see the uniqueness of each local government. Future research should also examine the adoption of other social media such as YouTube and Instagram, which are currently being adopted by local governments. The last recommendation arises because this research was only conducted by observing local government social media accounts. In the future, research needs to interview local governments, especially about their commitment to utilizing social media to conduct two-way communication with the community.

6. Conclusion

Our analysis of how local governments use social media reveals that governments are present on social media. However, the main features of social media are not utilized properly, especially for communicating with the public. Although local governments still treat social media like web 1.0, primarily by sharing one-way information, we find that they have made efforts to increase engagement by sharing content which contains promotion of government activities. Moreover, the strategy used is to share content with photos and videos. Social media can be utilized to communicate both ways with the community and other actors. Unfortunately, this type of content is not found much compared to content with information on the activities of the government and public officials.

By looking at the results of social media management, we conclude that social media is still treated half-heartedly. To gain great benefits, this study recommends that local governments manage their social media more professionally especially by regularly updating information, making adjustments to the news on the official website, and monitoring interactions which occur on their profile pages. It is intended to gain broad public involvement because we believe that broad public involvement is the key to harvesting the benefits of social media. We also emphasize that the main purpose of managing social media is no longer sharing information because the information is already in the official government website. Rather, it is about the way to create an interactive Facebook page and Twitter account.

Reference

- Agostino, D. (2012). The Effectiveness of Social Software for Public Engagement, 1–10. <http://doi.org/10.5772/54475>
- Agostino, D. (2013). Using social media to engage citizens: A study of Italian municipalities. *Public Relations Review*, 39(3), 232–234. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.pubrev.2013.02.009>
- Agostino, D., Arena, M., Catalano, G., & Erbacci, A. (2017). Public engagement through social media: the spending review experience. *Public Money & Management*, 37(1), 55–62. <http://doi.org/10.1080/09540962.2016.1249596>
- Agostino, D., & Arnaboldi, M. (2016). A Measurement Framework for Assessing the Contribution of Social Media to Public Engagement: An empirical analysis on Facebook. *Public Management Review*, 18(9), 1289–1307. <http://doi.org/10.1080/14719037.2015.1100320>
- Arnaboldi, M., Azzone, G., & Palermo, T. (2010). Managerial innovations in central government: not wrong, but hard to explain. *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, 23(1), 78–93. <http://doi.org/10.1108/09513551011012349>
- Avery, E. J., & Graham, M. W. (2013). Political Public Relations and the Promotion of Participatory, Transparent Government Through Social Media. *International Journal of Strategic Communication*, 7(4), 274–291. <http://doi.org/10.1080/1553118X.2013.824885>
- Bélanger, F., & Carter, L. (2008). Trust and risk in e-government adoption. *The Journal of Strategic Information Systems*, 17(2), 165–176. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsis.2007.12.002>
- Bellström, P., Magnusson, M., Pettersson, J. S., & Thorén, C. (2016). Facebook usage in a local government: A content analysis of page owner posts and user posts. *Transforming Government: People, Process and Policy*, 10(4), 548–567. <http://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1108/TG-12-2015-0061>
- Bellström, P., Magnusson, M., Pettersson, & Sören, J. (2016). Facebook usage in a local government: A content analysis of page owner posts and user posts. *Transforming Government: People, Process and Policy*, 10(4), 548–567. <http://doi.org/doi:10.1108/TG-08-2013-0026>
- Bertot, J. C., Jaeger, P. T., & Grimes, J. M. (2010). Using ICTs to create a culture of transparency: E-government and social media as openness and anti-corruption tools for societies. *Government Information Quarterly*, 27(3), 264–271. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.giq.2010.03.001>
- Bertot, J. C., Jaeger Paul T., & Grimes, Justin, M. (2012). Promoting transparency and accountability through ICTs, social media, and collaborative e-government. *Transforming Government: People, Process and Policy*, 6(1), 78–91. <http://doi.org/10.1108/TG-03-2016-0016>
- Bolívar, M. P. R. (2016). Designing Social Media Policy for Local Governments: Opportunities and Challenges. In M. Z. Sobaci (Ed.), *Social Media and Local Governments: Theory and Practice* (15th ed., Vol. 15, pp. 37–58). Switzerland: Springer US. <http://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-17722-9>
- Bonson, E., Royo, S., & Ratkai, M. (2014). Facebook Practices in Western European Municipalities: An Empirical Analysis of Activity and Citizens' Engagement. *Administration & Society*, 49(3), 0095399714544945-. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0095399714544945>
- Bonson, E., Royo, S., & Ratkai, M. (2017). Facebook Practices in Western European Municipalities: An Empirical Analysis of Activity and Citizens' Engagement. *Administration & Society*, 49(3), 320–347. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0095399714544945>
- Bonsón, E., Royo, S., & Ratkai, M. (2015). Citizens' engagement on local governments' facebook sites. an empirical analysis: The impact of different media and content types in western europe. *Government Information Quarterly*, 32(1), 52–62. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.giq.2014.11.001>
- Bonsón, E., Torres, L., Royo, S., & Flores, F. (2012). Local e-government 2.0: Social media and corporate transparency in municipalities. *Government Information Quarterly*, 29(2), 123–132. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.giq.2011.10.001>
- Bortree, D. S., & Seltzer, T. (2009). Dialogic strategies and outcomes: An analysis of environmental advocacy groups' Facebook profiles. *Public Relations Review*, 35(3), 317–319. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.pubrev.2009.05.002>
- Bovaird, T. (2007). Beyond Engagement and Participation: User and Community Coproduction of Public Services. *Public Administration Review*, 67(5), 846–860. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6210.2007.00773.x>

- Brainard, L. A., & McNutt, J. G. (2010). Virtual Government–Citizen Relations. *Administration & Society*, 42(7), 836–858. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0095399710386308>
- Campbell, D. A., Lambright, K. T., & Wells, C. J. (2014). Looking for Friends, Fans, and Followers? Social Media Use in Public and Nonprofit Human Services 655. *Public Administration Review*, 74(5), 655–663. <http://doi.org/10.1111/puar.12261>
- Carter, L., & Bélanger, F. (2005). The utilization of e-government services: citizen trust, innovation and acceptance factors *. *Information Systems Journal*, 15(1), 5–25.
- Criado, J. I., Rojas-Martín, F., & Gil-García, J. R. (2017). Enacting social media success in local public administrations. *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, 30(1), 31–47. <http://doi.org/10.1108/IJPSM-03-2016-0053>
- Evans-Cowley, J. S., & Griffin, G. (2012). Microparticipation with Social Media for Community Engagement in Transportation Planning. *Transportation Research Record: Journal of the Transportation Research Board*, 2307(1), 90–98. <http://doi.org/10.3141/2307-10>
- Feeney, M. K., & Welch, E. W. (2016). Technology–Task Coupling Exploring Social Media Use and Managerial Perceptions of E-Government. *The American Review of Public Administration*, 46(2), 162–179. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0275074014547413>
- Heaselgrave, F., & Simmons, P. (2016). Culture, competency and policy: Why social media dialogue is limited in Australian local government. *Journal of Communication Management*, 20(2), 133–147. <http://doi.org/10.1108/JCOM-07-2015-0059>
- Hofmann, S., Beverungen, D., Räckers, M., & Becker, J. (2013). What makes local governments' online communications successful? Insights from a multi-method analysis of Facebook. *Government Information Quarterly*, 30(4), 387–396. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.giq.2013.05.013>
- Idris, I. K. A. K. (2018). Government Social Media in Indonesia?: Just Another Information Dissemination Tool. *Jurnal Komunikasi (Malaysian Journal of Communication)*, 34(4), 337–356.
- Kaplan, A. M., & Haenlein, M. (2010). Users of the world, unite! The challenges and opportunities of Social Media. *Business Horizons*, 53(1), 59–68. <http://doi.org/10.1016/J.BUSHOR.2009.09.003>
- Kavanaugh, A. L., Fox, E. A., Sheetz, S. D., Yang, S., Tzy, L., Shoemaker, D. J., ... Xie, L. (2012). Social media use by government?: From the routine to the critical. *Government Information Quarterly*, 29(4), 480–491. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.giq.2012.06.002>
- Kolsaker, A., & Kelley, L. L. (2006). Citizen-centric e-government: a critique of the UK Model. *Electronic Government, an International Journal*, 3(2), 127. <http://doi.org/10.1504/EG.2006.009214>
- Kushin, M. J., & Kitchener, K. (2009). Getting political on social network sites: Exploring online political discourse on Facebook. *First Monday*, 14(11). <http://doi.org/10.5210/fm.v14i11.2645>
- Linders, D. (2012). From e-government to we-government?: De fi ning a typology for citizen coproduction in the age of social media. *Government Information Quarterly*, 29(4), 446–454. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.giq.2012.06.003>
- Liu, B. F., & Horsley, J. S. (2007). The Government Communication Decision Wheel: Toward a Public Relations Model for the Public Sector. *Journal of Public Relations Research*, 19(4), 377–393. <http://doi.org/10.1080/10627260701402473>
- Liu, B. F., Horsley, J. S., & Levenshus, A. B. (2010). Government and corporate communication practices: Do the differences matter? *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 38(2), 189–213. <http://doi.org/10.1080/00909881003639528>
- Magnusson, M., Bellström, P., & Thoren, C. (2012). Facebook usage in government – a case study of information content. In *AMCIS 2012 Proceedings* (pp. 1–10). Washington: AIS Electronic Library (AISeL).
- Marpaung, Z. S., & Santoso, A. D. (2019). Performer, Reporter, and Marketer: Three Different Local Parliament Faces on Social Media. *Policy & Governance Review*, 3(3), 272. <http://doi.org/10.30589/pgr.v3i3.154>
- Martín, A. S., de Rosario, A. H., & Caba Pérez, C. (2015). Using Twitter for Dialogic Communication: Local Government Strategies in the European Union. *Local Government Studies*, 41(May), 421–444. <http://doi.org/10.1080/03003930.2014.991866>
- McAllister, S. M. (2012). How the world's top universities provide dialogic forums for marginalized voices. *Public Relations Review*, 38(2), 319–327. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.pubrev.2011.12.010>

- Medaglia, R., & Zheng, L. (2017). Mapping government social media research and moving it forward: A framework and a research agenda. *Government Information Quarterly*, 34(3), 496–510. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.giq.2017.06.001>
- Mergel, I. (2013). A framework for interpreting social media interactions in the public sector. *Government Information Quarterly*, 30(4), 327–334. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.giq.2013.05.015>
- Moss, G., Kennedy, H., Moshonas, S., & Birchall, C. (2015). Knowing your publics: The use of social media analytics in local government. *Information Polity*, 20(4), 287–298. <http://doi.org/10.3233/IP-150376>
- Mossberger, K., Wu, Y., & Crawford, J. (2013). Connecting citizens and local governments? Social media and interactivity in major U.S. cities. *Government Information Quarterly*, 30(4), 351–358. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.giq.2013.05.016>
- Norris, D. F., & Reddick, C. G. (2013). Local E-Government in the United States: Transformation or Incremental Change? *Public Administration Review*, 73(1), 165–175. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6210.2012.02647.x>
- Nurmandi, A., Almarez, D., & Efendi, D. (2018). To what extent is social media used in city government policy making? Case studies in three asean cities. *Public Policy and Administration*, 17(4), 600–618. <http://doi.org/10.13165/VPA-18-17-4-08>
- Reddick, C. G., Chatfield, A. T., & Ojo, A. (2017). A social media text analytics framework for double-loop learning for citizen-centric public services: A case study of a local government Facebook use. *Government Information Quarterly*, 34, 1–16. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.giq.2016.11.001>
- Roengtam, S., Nurmandi, A., Almarez, D. N., & Kholid, A. (2017). *Does social media transform city government? A case study of three ASEAN cities: Bandung, Indonesia, Iligan, Philippines and Phuket, Thailand. Transforming Government: People, Process and Policy* (Vol. 11). <http://doi.org/10.1108/TG-10-2016-0071>
- Rowe, G., & Frewer, L. J. (2005). A Typology of Public Engagement Mechanisms. *Science, Technology, & Human Values*, 30(2), 251–290. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0162243904271724>
- Santoso, A. D. (2019). Social media campaigns on disability awareness: A content analysis of official government Twitter accounts. *Life Span and Disability*, 22(I), 95–112. Retrieved from https://scholar.google.co.id/citations?user=Cqu_syQAAAAJ&hl=en
- Sobaci, M. Z., & Karkin, N. (2013). The use of twitter by mayors in Turkey: Tweets for better public services? *Government Information Quarterly*, 30(4), 417–425. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.giq.2013.05.014>
- Towner, T. L., & Dulio, D. A. (2011). The web 2.0 Election: Does the online medium matter? *Journal of Political Marketing*, 10(1–2), 165–188. <http://doi.org/10.1080/15377857.2011.540220>
- Williamson, W., & Parolin, B. (2013). Web 2.0 and Social Media Growth in Planning Practice: A Longitudinal Study. *Planning Practice and Research*, 28(5), 544–562. <http://doi.org/10.1080/02697459.2013.840996>
- Yi, M., Oh, S. G., & Kim, S. (2013). Comparison of social media use for the U.S. and the Korean governments. *Government Information Quarterly*, 30(3), 310–317. <http://doi.org/10.1016/J.GIQ.2013.01.004>
- Yin, R. K. (2014). *Case Study Research: design and methods*. London: Sage. <http://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511803123.001>