

# Active netizens on Facebook: Case study of Indonesians' online participation regarding the 2009 presidential election

**Hamideh Molaei Farsangi**

Hamideh Molaei Farsangi is a PhD student in Media and Communication at Journalism and Media research Centre, the University of New south Wales. Her research study is on social media and politics in Indonesia. She is also interested in Intercultural Communication, having studied the intercultural sensitivities between religious groups for her Masters thesis.

## Abstract

*Since their appearance, social media and, more generally, Web 2.0 have significantly influenced the modality of social and political participation by changing different aspects of mass media communication. This new situation provides a good opportunity for citizens to participate in various societal issues and discuss them critically. In particular, Facebook has provided an appropriate arena for political discussions. Although involvement in discussions is a significant feature of active citizenship, the quality of online discussions is also an important issue that should be taken into consideration. Accordingly, this paper aims to investigate the quality of Indonesians' political discussions regarding the second direct presidential election on Facebook through qualitative and quantitative approaches.*

*The quantitative analysis shows that the total participation rate was very low in Facebook political groups. The qualitative analysis indicates that the majority of participants took part in discussions in a civil way. Civil discussions motivate people to continue further online participation, however; this approach has not been completely institutionalized in Indonesia's online sphere and there are still some groups who use uncivil ways.*

---

## Introduction

Since their appearance, social media and more generally Web 2.0 have significantly influenced the modality of social and political participation (Fortunati, 2009). Social media have changed different aspects of mass media communication in terms of distribution, production, media power, media content and producer–consumer relationships (Flew, 2009). New opportunities are provided for people to collaborate and share information in new ways (Cox et al., 2009). For instance, in the case of media production, the traditional division of labour in media organisations has been replaced with a new situation in which all people are able to create and edit their own content (Flew, 2009). This feature is known as user-created content (Vickery & Wunsch-Vincent, 2007). It is the most prominent feature of social media which makes them distinct from industrial media. Due to the unidirectional communicative model in traditional mass media, inadequate feedback is inevitable (Fortunati, 2009). So the rate of interactivity is very low and consequently there is no appropriate arena for participation. Web 2.0 applications remove this limitation. O'Reilly (2007) points to some of them:

Web 2.0 applications are . . . delivering software as a continually-updated service that gets better the more people use it, consuming and remixing data from multiple sources, including individual users, while providing their own data and services in a form that allows remixing

by others, creating network effects through an “architecture of participation”, and going beyond the page metaphor of Web 1.0 to deliver rich user experiences. (2007, p. 17)

These features have made participation easier. Consequently, the power relations have changed considerably in social media. Comparing the hierarchy of power in old and new media elaborates that centralised, top-down and command-and-control systems of domination, which is the common approach of governing media organisations (Moreira et al, 2009), has been changed to horizontal hierarchy of power in social media. “Net work power is diffused, extensive and exercised through cooperation” (Moreira et al., 2009, p. 22). Therefore, it offers a good opportunity for freedom of speech for political, social and critical aims (Vickery & Wunsch-Vincent, 2007, p. 65). In recent years, social media, and particularly blogs and social networking sites like Facebook, have increasingly been used for political purposes by both politicians and ordinary people. Applying social networking sites as platforms for advertising and fund-raising in election campaigns (Gueorguieva, 2008), using persuasive and pedagogical function of participatory videos on YouTube to introduce candidates (Tryon, 2008; Gulati & Williams, 2009) and using blogs for political discussions (Janack, 2006; Wallsten, 2008; Zhou, 2009; Koop & Jansen, 2009) are some examples of the political uses of social media.

Among different types of social media, Facebook is a very popular website with more than 400 million active users. “People spend over 500 billion minutes per month on this website” (Facebook Press Room, 2010). It is also widely utilised for political activities. On one hand, it provides people with the opportunity to create political groups to express their opinions about one specific issue and invite others to join. Therefore, it has a potential role to mobilise grass root activism. On the other hand, within the groups—in Discussion board—people discuss and express their agreeing or disagreeing viewpoints. Two interesting examples from previous studies have focused on these features of Facebook. Firstly, Neumayer and Raffl (2008) offered an example of a virtual group (*A million voices against FARC*) from Facebook to examine the role of social media in grassroots activism. In this specific case Facebook was applied to call for anti-FARS rally. It was a successful project as it led to an offline protest in Colombia. In this case a Facebook group was simply and at the same time creatively applied by a group of users for organising a social movement.

In other research, Kushin and Kitchener (2009) studied the use of Facebook for political discussions. They examined the discussion between opposing groups through discourse analysis. Analysis demonstrated that Facebook was relatively effective as an appropriate forum for two disagreeing groups to discuss their ideas about state-sanctioned torture. The authors mainly focused on the quality of discussions on Facebook. Although Facebook is an appropriate platform for political activities and particularly political discussions, an important question regarding the nature of Facebook to provide constructive discussions and conversations still remains. So this study aims to investigate this issue. In the next section, I will discuss “civility”—as a conceptual framework—which is an important point in online discussions. Moreover, I will specifically address this issue in the Indonesian context, which has been chosen as the case study of this research.

## **Civility, politeness and political discussions on Facebook in the Indonesian context**

Since participation has become easier and more attractive, many people particularly in developing countries tend to use the internet and especially social media for democratic purposes. Indonesia is one of the countries in which internet usage has significantly increased over the last decade. According to the International Telecommunication Union (2010), internet users were 0.93 per cent of the whole Indonesian population in 2000. This figure climbed to 7.92 per cent in 2008. While general internet usage has risen since ten years ago, specifically the use of social media has become very popular in this country. According to Alexa.com, among the ten most popular websites in Indonesia, six are participatory websites such as Facebook, blogger, kaskus, wordpress, YouTube and 4shared. Currently, Facebook is the most-trafficked website in Indonesia (Alexa, 2010). According to an article in the UK Financial Times on 12 January 2010, "Indonesia is now the seventh-largest source of users of the site, with 8.5m registered, of which 8.2m joined after September 2008" (Cochrane, 2010).

This increasing trend of social media usage has provided good chances for political participation for ordinary people, political groups and politicians in the largest Southeast Asia country. In particular, Facebook groups are forums for Indonesian citizens to discuss the most important current political issues such as presidential elections, which is the core focus of this paper.

According to Dahl (1992), active citizens are concerned about public affairs, keep up-to-date with issues and deliberate carefully about them with other people as they seek to promote the general welfare of their society. Involvement in discussions is a significant feature of active citizenship. However, this is only one side of the "citizenship coin". In order to reach towards a democratic society, not only should citizens be well informed and actively participate in discussions, but they should also interact with others in a civil way. "Civility has always been considered a requirement for democratic discourse" (Papacharissi, 2004, p. 260). It is one of the most important principles in a democratic society that provides social welfare (Schatz, 2004). The idea of civility can be traced to Aristotle's writings on "civil society". He coined this term to refer to a kind of political association known as "state" or "polis" (Papacharissi, 2004). According to the Oxford Dictionary of English (2005), civility is derived from old French *civilite*, from Latin *civilitas*, and relates to citizens. At first it connoted citizens and good citizenship and, after that, in the middle of the 16th century, it denoted politeness. Aristotle's idea of civility was the prominent definition until the 18th century when the meaning shifted as a result of social and economic changes. For example, in Hegel's and Tocqueville's definition, civil society was separated from religion, state and family and, therefore, its meaning was considerably changed (Papacharissi, 2004). Currently, civility is a key factor in social interaction and political communication. It is also essential for promoting deliberative political discussions (Ng & Detenber, 2005). Habermas believes that logic and reason encourage discourse and help construct democratic society. From this viewpoint, two important requirements for civic discussions are courteous speaking and polite manner (Papacharissi, 2004).

In the post-Suharto era, the idea of civil society became prominent in Indonesian political discourse; however, its exact definition is still being discussed. Some Muslim groups translate it as *Masyarakat madani*, as it refers to the democratic society of the city of Medina when it was administered by the Prophet Mohammad. Some western-

influenced scholars define it as *Masyarakat Sipil*, as it emphasises the values of an independent and mature society. A third group use the term *Masyarakat Warganegara*, which means citizen community and is associated with citizens' rights (Lan, 2004). In spite of defining the term in different ways, they all agree on one common definition of civil society, which refers to "a public space that is located between the state and local communities" (Lan, 2004, p. 218).

If we consider civility as courteous speaking and polite manner, we can find several relevant cultural points in Indonesians' language and behaviour. Indonesians rarely swear or show anger, and this characteristic is reflected in their language. Since they try to avoid using offensive words, they use the word *Kurang* as a polite negative. For example, they would call a stupid person *Kurang pintar* (less smart) rather than *bodoh* (stupid). In their interpersonal communication, they try to avoid offending others: a person should be polite (*sopan santun*), friendly (*ramah*), happy (*gembira*) and smooth (*polos*) (Cork, 1994). Terms of address that show people's social and economic status are very important in Indonesia and if they are used wrongly they can be offensive (Sneddon, 1994).

As civility is an important notion in Indonesia's culture, this study aims to investigate the modality of Indonesians' online discussions in terms of civility on Facebook.

This study is going to answer two main questions:

- Q1: To what extent did the supporters of different candidates participate on Facebook groups?
- Q2: To what extent did Indonesians participating on Facebook, discuss the presidential election issue in a civil and polite way?

This paper is organised into four sections. Firstly, I explain the 2009 presidential election process in Indonesia and the role of Facebook in this event. Secondly, I explain the methodology. In the third part, I discuss the results and, fourthly, I expound the conclusion of the paper.

## **Facebook: the specific role in 2009 presidential election in Indonesia**

The latest presidential election in Indonesia was held on 8 July 2009 to choose the president and vice-president until 2014. After the fall of Suharto's authoritarian regime in 1998, it was the second election in which Indonesians voted for their president directly. The three candidates were the representatives of the three main political parties in Indonesia. Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono, the incumbent president, was from the Indonesian Democratic Party<sup>1</sup>. The Indonesian Democratic Party Struggle<sup>2</sup> (PDIP) selected Megawati Sukarnoputri as their representative and Jusuf Kalla, the incumbent vice-president, was chosen from the Golkar party<sup>3</sup>.

The candidates registered at the central General Election Commission office in Jakarta on 16 May. The election was held on 8 July and finally Mr Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono won more than 60 per cent of the votes. The General Election Commission officially

---

<sup>1</sup> Partai Demokrat

<sup>2</sup> Partai Demokrasi Indonesia Perjuangan

<sup>3</sup> Partai Golongan Karya

declared his victory on 21 July and he became president of Indonesia for the second term.

Among different types of social media, Facebook has provided unique opportunities for campaign elections. First of all, it allows people around the world to voice their opinions and share them with others by inviting them to political groups. Within the groups they provide political information and news and, at the same time, they are able to discuss with each other (Westling, 2007). Like other people, politicians can participate in groups to communicate with members, but the difference with the real world is that they cannot impose their opinions on others. They can also use Facebook as a mobilising tool or a means for fund-raising (Westling, 2007).

During the 2009 presidential election in Indonesia, Facebook was utilised as one of the possible ways of advertising and disseminating election news. There were some Facebook groups that provided people with general information about elections and tended to educate them about this event, as it was assumed a very significant event for Indonesia's democracy. "Presidential Election 2009—Pemilihan Presiden Indonesia 2009" group is a good example of this case. Moreover, people showed a great eagerness to use Facebook as they created more than 400 political groups to advocate for or criticise candidates or political parties. As it is not possible for ordinary citizen to meet their popular candidates all the time to express their viewpoints, Facebook was an alternative for electorates during the presidential election and even afterwards. It also provided candidates with an informal forum to express their opinions. It was the first time that Indonesian candidates could provide such a participatory medium for both their supporters and opponents to converse directly. The candidates' Facebook pages—like other typical Facebook pages—included different parts such as "Wall", "Info", "Discussion", "photo", "video" and "Notes". In the Info section, basic information about candidates such as biography, personal life, education, administration experiences, favourite political party, their strategic program for presidency, their election slogans and also hyperlinks to their official website or political party were available.

Moreover, a collection of candidates' photos and videos with different topics were accessible in photo and video links. In particular, those were related to positive activities they had done before. One interesting thing about this part was fan participation to post videos for popular candidates. For example, in "Vote JK—WIN (Jusuf Kalla—Wiranto)" group, which is one of the samples of this study, there were interesting videos posted by fans that show Jusuf Kalla as a popular candidate among all Indonesians, including different age and gender groups and people with different social and economic status. There was another video that showed many Indonesian people gathered together to pray for Jusuf Kalla. This video also demonstrated his popularity among people. These types of videos or photos that were a part of candidates' propaganda are good examples of political advertising through Facebook and they need comprehensive analysis as well.

In the candidates' pages, there were also two other options—i.e. "Discussion board" and "Notes". The contents of discussion boards were publicly available to all but active participation was only possible for those who joined the group. People could write their comments on the wall; however, discussion board was a better place for further serious and long discussions. Accordingly, samples of this study have been chosen from this part. The majority of people participating in Facebook discussions show their real identity to others rather than being unknown. Due to this kind of identity

representation and because of transiting offline network of friends and expanding it to Facebook, investigating the modality of political discussions in terms of civility and politeness regarding a controversial issue like presidential election in a platform like Facebook is noticeable. In next section I elaborate how I am going to examine this issue in Indonesian context.

## **Methodology**

This research utilised both quantitative and qualitative analysis to investigate the extent and modality of Indonesian's online participation regarding the 2009 presidential election on Facebook.

## **Procedure**

There are a great number of virtual groups on Facebook that are created by Facebook users for different purposes. The majority of Facebook groups' content is accessible to everyone, so it is easy for researchers to observe and analyse them. The main feature of these groups is that people who are interested in them can join the group and invite others to do so.

To understand the extent of Indonesians' participation in terms of taking part in discussions, I searched Facebook groups for the names of the three Presidential candidates and selected the top three groups with the highest number of supporters (each group represented one candidate). The total number of discussions in each group was considered as an index of active participation.

The second part was related to examining civility and I applied a content analysis method to do so. Several indicators for civility have been introduced by some scholars. Ng and Detenber (2005) consider some factors such as rude comments, name-calling and personal attacks as indices of uncivility. Papacharissi (2004, p. 265) distinguishes between civility and politeness and nominated "name calling, aspersions, synonyms for liar, hyperbole and words that indicated non-cooperation and pejorative speak" as indicators of impoliteness and "verbalizing a threat to democracy, assigning stereotypes and threatening other individuals' rights" as indicators of uncivility.

In this study, I borrowed the civility index from Kushin and Kitchener's study (2009). They identified four types of discussions: "informational, productive argument, unproductive argument and miscellaneous". According to the authors, informational posts were defined as offering new information specifically by referring to other sources. I also consider all the posts containing at least one news value within this category. The second category includes opinion posts that tended to refer to others' viewpoints in a polite way. These kinds of posts are identified as productive argument. The third category also includes the posts in which people express their opinions and argue with others but the dominant feature of this category (i.e. unproductive argument) is that the arguments contain offensive words and are accompanied by insults or personal attacks on others. The last category contains the posts that do not have a clear orientation in their message. This category is known as miscellaneous. According to Kushin and Kitchener (2009), unproductive arguments are identified as uncivil discussions and productive arguments and informational statements are categorised as civil discussions. I also consider all the relevant polite questions and statements that do not include offensive words in this category.

## Sampling

All the data was collected on 13 January 2010 from [www.Facebook.com](http://www.Facebook.com). To select the samples, the top three groups with the highest number of supporters were selected as mentioned above. Within each group, the top five discussions with the highest number of posts were chosen to indicate the most significant topics regarding the presidential election issue and, within each discussion, three posts were selected randomly. A total of 45 posts were chosen to be analysed as to whether they were civil or uncivil.

## Results

This part is divided into two sections. In the first section I discuss the results of quantitative analysis and in the second part I present the results of qualitative analysis.

### Quantitative analysis

Quantitative analysis has been conducted to make clear the extent of Indonesians' participation on Facebook groups. As mentioned before, discussions about social and political affairs are a significant characteristic of active citizens. Hence, in this part I measured the number of discussions within the top three Facebook groups which had the highest number of supporters as an index of participation. The results are demonstrated in Table 1.

*Table1 The results of quantitative analysis of Indonesians' participation in Facebook discussions*

<b>Name of groups</b>	<b>Total number of discussions</b>	<b>Total number of supporters</b>
Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono	801	490,218
Pedi Perjuangan and Megawati SK For (Megawati Sukarnoputri)	43	1,532
Vote JK - WIN (Jusuf Kalla - Wiranto)	14	28,897

The results in Table 1 indicate that the supporters of Mr Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono (the victorious candidate) were the most active group on Facebook in terms of taking part in political groups generally and in discussions particularly in comparison with two other groups. Comparing the total number of group members with the total number of discussions shows that the active participation rate is very low in all groups.

### Qualitative analysis

Civil discussions motivate people to continue further online participation (Ng & Detenber, 2005). Due to the importance of civility for online discussions, qualitative analysis has been conducted to examine the extent of Indonesians' civil participation on Facebook.

As was mentioned in the sampling section, three groups from each of the five top discussions with the highest number of posts were chosen and within each of them three posts were chosen randomly. A total of 15 topics plus 45 discussions were examined to determine whether they were civil or uncivil. Four types of post were identified under the civil posts category—i.e. informational, productive argument, polite

question and polite statement—and one type under the uncivil category—i.e. unproductive argument. The results of analysing the 15 main topics show that, among 15 discussion topics, 12 (80% of all posts) were expressed in a civil, polite way. Only one post (6.66%) was uncivil. Thirteen per cent of posts were unclear—neither civil nor uncivil (see appendix A).

There is another important point about this result. Only two posts (nos. 1 and 10) concerned controversial matters such as the national economy or politics, and the rest only discussed issues either supporting or criticising candidates and did not contain serious and important issues. Although these 15 topics are not representative of all other discussions, as they are selected according to the number of their comments, they show the users' priorities and interests in choosing topics to discuss.

To understand how people express their opinion about topics, three posts from every 15 main discussions were selected randomly. Where there were only three posts under each topic, all of them were selected. In total, 45 posts were analysed according to Kushin and Kitchener's civility index (Kushin & Kitchener, 2009).

The results indicate that the majority of posts (i.e. 67%) were conveyed in a civil way (see appendix B). It shows that most people try to use polite sentences instead of using offensive words to support their favoured candidate or criticise other candidates. For example, one participant states his opinion that "SBY is appropriate to be 2009 president" in this way:

In my opinion, he has the charisma figure to lead this nation forward and he was supported by 80% of the parliament members. I believe many people support him. Besides that, he does not fall into any scandal. Many people tried to drop him. But I believe he will be able to be the best. Bravo Mr SBY. Many people are supporting you.

This type of statement was categorised under productive argument, in which the participants try to provide evidence for their argument. At the same time, they are cautious about using polite language and to avoid offensive words. Analysing the whole sample of this study shows almost 35 per cent of the discussions were expressed in this way (see appendix B). Actually, it is a positive point as civil discussion encourages further discussions.

Some posts had an informational role as they provided more detail or they referred to other links or references to make the topic clearer.

Approximately 11 per cent of the whole discussions were Informational. By providing additional information, people explain their attitude in detail. While some provide a link to other websites, others post a complete news report from one or several news resources to strengthen their arguments. In this way they can also better convince others and their discussions will be more constructive.

In response to the post "PDIP and Golkar", one person wrote:

Anything can happen in politics. I don't mind as long as it's good for the people and for the country. I wish for a better Indonesia, lead by Ibu Megawati because Ibu Megawati and PDIP has learnt from experience.

This kind of statement is categorised in polite statements that form 15 per cent of all discussions. The results also indicate one-third of all posts (i.e. 15) contain rude and offensive words. The example below shows how one Facebook user criticised the opposing candidate:

Mr . . . likes getting a windfall wealth. He is envy and he has a kind of nepotism.

Another one states:

Mr . . . is a huge body but not necessarily have a high social life. He is somewhat slow in taking a decision, not firm, not straightforward, not fast and has never felt part of poor people.

One-third of all posts are coded as uncivil posts, which contain offensive words. At first glance this figure seems relatively high but we have to take into account that in such an informal and friendly sphere like Facebook these kinds of discussions are inevitable.

## **Conclusion**

This study is a contribution to understanding one angle of political participation through Facebook in Indonesian society, by investigating the extent and quality of Indonesians' political discussions regarding the 2009 presidential election on this social network. The results of qualitative analysis demonstrate that 67 per cent of posts were conveyed in a civil way. Some important points should be taken into account regarding "civility" as a normative mode of communication in social media and particularly Facebook. Anonymity and lack of social cues that are two common features of online identities make people feel free in their online conversations. Moreover, if the untraceability aspect of online communication is added to them, then the general lack of civility in online discussions becomes inevitable (Witschge, 2002; Ng & Detenber, 2005). Facebook—as an online network—is expected to have common characteristics of other online websites, but it has a specific feature that makes it distinct from them. In Facebook, most people use their real identity rather than being anonymous. In addition, Facebook is a kind of social network that enables people to expand and transit their offline network into the online sphere and communicate with their real friends, colleagues, relatives and many people they know in the real world. This feature of Facebook has removed the anonymity and untraceability and provides a sphere like offline communication. Moreover, as soon as one Facebook user provides any type of content, the report of it appears on his/her wall and can be observed by his/her friends. That is why most people tend to discuss in a civil way, as the results of this study confirmed. This feature might lead to a degree of conservatism by users and they might prefer to transfer serious discussions into more anonymous forums. It is suggested for further study to examine the issue of civility in both anonymous and non anonymous forums.

Moreover, if we add the Indonesians' tendency to be polite in their conversations, as mentioned before, the results of this research on this small sample of Facebook users seem to make sense; however, it is not true in all situations. As it is apparent that Facebook is a platform for free discussions and the dominant culture of Facebook is friendly and informal, it is normal that some people prefer to criticise others in an uncivil way. The other point is that the findings of this study cannot be generalised to all situations and we may discover different findings in other cultural contexts.

Facebook has provided good opportunities for political participation. Despite being such a pluralistic political forum, the quantitative analysis of this study about the extent of political participation of Indonesians on Facebook shows that, although the number of political groups on Facebook and the number of people who participate in them was relatively high, the number of people who actively engaged in discussions was not noticeable. This reflects the real world in that only people concerned with politics tend

to discuss these issues with others, especially when they can receive feedback from other users.

In addition, comparing the large number of Facebook group members with the small number of active participants can refer to the main function of Facebook, which is socialising with other people. By joining a specific political group, people can represent their political identity and consequently they can better show their political interests, attitudes and viewpoints to their friends. In this case and as the results of this paper confirm, being a member of political groups does not necessarily signify active political engagement. Interestingly enough, the quantitative analyses indicate that the number of supporters of each candidate in Facebook match with the rate of their vote share in the real world. The victorious candidate, Mr Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono, won the election with more than 60 per cent of the votes; the number of his supporters in Facebook group was more than the supporters of the two other candidates.

## References

- Civility. (2005). *The Oxford Dictionary of English*. Retrieved February 10, 2010, from <http://www.oxfordreference.com/views/ENTRY.html?subview=Main&entry=t140.e14152>>
- Cochrane, J. (2010, January 12). Indonesians take protests off the streets. *Financial Times*.
- Cork, V. (1994). *The T.I.F.L project: Introductory Indonesian cultural notes*. Commonwealth of Australia.
- Cox, C., Burgess, S., Sellitto, C. & Buultjens, J. (2009). The role of user-generated content in tourists' travel planning behavior. *Journal of Hospitality Marketing & Management*, 18(8), 743-64.
- Dahl, R. A. (1992). The problem of civic competence. *Journal of Democracy*, 3(4), 44-59.
- Facebook Press Room. (2010). Retrieved June 15, 2010, from <http://www.facebook.com/press/info.php?statistics>
- Flew, T. (2009). Democracy, participation and convergent media: case studies in contemporary online news journalism in Australia. *Communication, Politics and Culture*, 42(2), 87-115.
- Fortunati, L. (2009). Online newspaper interactivity and E-Participation: A balance. *Communication, Politics and Culture*, 42(2), 65-86.
- Gueorguieva, V. (2008). Voters, MySpace and YouTube: The impact of alternative communication channels on the 2006 election cycle and beyond. *Social Science Computer Review*, 26(3), 288-300.
- Gulati, G. J. & Williams, C. B. (2009). *Congressional Candidates' use of YouTube in 2008: Its frequency and rationale*. Paper presented at the YouTube and the 2008 Election Cycle in the United States, Amherst, April 17, 2009. Retrieved from <http://ssrn.com/abstract=1429603>
- International Telecommunication Union. (2010), Internet indicators, subscribers, users and broadband subscribers, *World telecommunication indicators, 2002*. Retrieved February 19, 2010, from <http://www.itu.int/ITU-D/ict/statistics/>

- International Telecommunication Union. (2010), Internet indicators, subscribers, users and broadband subscribers, *World telecommunication indicators, 2008*. Retrieved February 19, 2010, from <http://www.itu.int/ITU-D/ict/statistics/> accessed 19 February 2010
- Janack, J. A. (2006). Mediated citizenship and digital discipline: A rhetoric of control in a campaign blog. *Social Semiotics, 16*(2), 283-301.
- Koop, R. & Jansen, H. J. (2009). Political blogs and blogrolls in Canada Forums for Democratic Deliberation? *Social Science Computer Review, 27*(2), 155-73.
- Kushin, M. J. & Kitchener, K. (2009). *Getting political on social network sites: Exploring online political discourse on Facebook*. Paper presented at the annual convention of the Western States Communication Association. Phoenix, AZ.
- Lan, T. J. (2004). Ethnicity and the civil rights movement in Indonesia. In L. H. Guan (Ed.), *Civil society in Southeast Asia* (pp. 217-34). Pasir Panjang: Institute of Southeast Asian Studies.
- Moreira, M. A., Mathias, M., Gerhardt, G. & Ladner, A. (2009). *E-society and E-democracy*. Paper presented at the e-Government-Symposium. Berne, Switzerland. Retrieved from <http://science.amazee.com/edemocracy.pdf>
- Ng, E. & Detenber, B. (2005). The impact of synchronicity and civility in online political discussions on perceptions and intentions to participate. *Journal of computer mediated communication, 10*(3), article 4. Retrieved from <http://jcmc.indiana.edu/vol10/issue3/ng.html>
- Neumayer, C. & Raffi, C. (2008). *Facebook for global protest: The potential and limits of social software for grassroots activism*. Paper presented at the Prato CIRN 2008 Community Informatics Conference: ICTs for Social Inclusion: What is the Reality?
- Oreilly, T. (2007). What is Web 2.0: Design patterns and business models for the next generation of software. *Communications & Strategies, 1*, 17-37.
- Papacharissi, Z. (2004). Democracy online: civility, politeness and the democratic potential of online political discussion groups, *New media and society, 6*(2), 259-83
- Schatz, M. C. S. (2004). Social tolerance and social civility: Key elements for transitioning democratic countries. *New Global Development, 20*(1), 23-31.
- Sneddon, J. (1994). *The T.I.F.L project: Introductory Indonesian grammar notes*. Commonwealth of Australia.
- Top sites in Indonesia, (2010) Retrieved June 3, 2010 from <http://www.alex.com/topsites/countries/ID>
- Tryon, C. (2008). Pop politics: Online parody videos, intertextuality and political participation. *Popular Communication: The International Journal of Media and Culture, 6*(4), 209-13.
- Vickery, G. & Wunsch-Vincent, S. (2007). *Participatory web and user created content: Web 2.0, Wikis and social networking*. Retrieved from <http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/57/14/38393115.pdf>
- Wallsten, K. (2008). Political blogs: Transmission belts, soapboxes, mobilizers or conversation starters? *Journal of Information Technology & Politics, 4*(3), 19-40.

- Westling, M. (2007). Expanding the public sphere: The impact of Facebook on political communication. Retrieved from [http://www.thenewvernacular.com/projects/facebook\\_and\\_political\\_communication.pdf](http://www.thenewvernacular.com/projects/facebook_and_political_communication.pdf)
- Wills, D. & Reeves, S. (2009). Facebook as a political weapon: Information in social networks. *British Politics*, 4(2), 265-81.
- Witschge, T. (2002). *Online deliberation: Possibilities of the Internet for deliberative democracy*. Paper presented at the Electronic Networks & Democratic Engagement, Amsterdam.
- Zhou, X. (2009). The political blogosphere in China: A content analysis of the blogs regarding the dismissal of Shanghai leader Chen Liangyu. *New Media Society*, 11(6), 1003-22.

## Appendix A The results of qualitative analysis of Indonesian discussions in terms of civility or uncivility

The name of groups	The most discussed issues	Number of posts	civil	uncivil	unclear
Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono	Indonesia debt has increased to 1667 trillion	1268	Yes / I <sup>1</sup>	-----	-----
	Who do you think deserves to become SBY's vice?	389	Yes / PQ <sup>2</sup>	-----	-----
	Do you support SBY in 2009 presidential election?	298	Yes / PQ	-----	-----
	The best candidate to accompany SBY for vice president:	296	Yes / PS <sup>3</sup>	-----	-----
	SBY is appropriate to be 2009 president	157	Yes / PS	-----	-----
Pedi Perjuangan and Megawati SK	The latest survey results: Indonesian Democratic Party – Struggle became number 3.	21	Yes / I	-----	-----

For (Megawati Sukarnoputri)	PDIP and Golkar	13	----	----	Yes
	Who is your most favourite selected president and vice-president?	9	Yes / PQ	----	----
	Why should Megawati become the candidate of PDIP?	8	Yes / PQ	----	----
	Escaped Christian college candidate in west Sumatra is threatened to convert.	6	Yes / I	----	----
Vote JK - WIN (Jusuf Kalla - Wiranto)	Why do you choose JK? And Why do you believe JK Will Bring Better Indonesia again?	7	Yes / PQ	----	----
	SBY does not advocate citizenry	5	----	Yes / UA <sup>4</sup>	----
	Beyond defeat, JK win	3	Yes / PS	----	----
	Provide messages of JK win	3	Yes / PS	----	----
	Emergency, emergency! (Very Important, please read)	3	----	----	Yes
Total	15	----	12	1	2
percentage	100%	----	80%	6.66%	13.33%

- 1 Informational
- 2 Polite Question
- 3 Polite Statement
- 4 Unproductive Argument

## Appendix B The results of qualitative analysis of Indonesian discussions in terms of civility or uncivility

Type/ Number of posts	civil				uncivil	unclear
	Informational	Productive argument	Polite question	Polite statement	Unproductive argument	
1	Yes	----	Yes	----	----	----
2	Yes	----	----	----	----	----
3	----	Yes	----	----	----	----
4	----	----	Yes	----	----	----
5	----	----	----	Yes	----	----
6	----	----	----	Yes	----	----
7	----	Yes	----	----	----	----
8	----	----	----	Yes	----	----
9	----	----	----	----	Yes	----
10	----	----	----	Yes	----	----
11	----	Yes	----	----	----	----

12	----	----	----	----	Yes	----
13	----	Yes	----	----	----	----
14	----	----	----	Yes	----	----
15	----	Yes	----	----	----	----
16	Yes	----	Yes	----	----	----
17	----	----	----	----	Yes	----
18	----	----	----	----	Yes	----
19	----	Yes	----	----	----	----
20	----	Yes	----	----	----	----
21	----	----	----	----	Yes	----
22	Yes	----	----	----	----	----
23	----	----	----	Yes	----	----
24	----	----	----	Yes	----	----
25	----	Yes	----	----	----	----
26	----	----	----	----	Yes	----
27	----	Yes	----	----	----	----
28	Yes	----	----	----	----	----
29	----	Yes	----	----	----	----
30	----	----	----	----	Yes	----
31	----	Yes	----	----	----	----
32	----	----	----	----	Yes	----
33	----	----	----	----	Yes	----
34	----	----	----	----	Yes	----
35	----	Yes	----	----	----	----
36	----	Yes	----	----	----	----
37	----	----	----	----	Yes	----
38	----	----	----	----	Yes	----
39	----	Yes	----	----	----	----
40	----	Yes	----	----	----	----
41	----	----	----	----	Yes	----
42	----	----	----	----	Yes	----
43	----	----	----	----	Yes	----
44	----	Yes	----	----	----	----
45	----	----	Yes	----	----	----
Total number/45	5	16	4	7	15	0
				30 <sup>1</sup>	15	0
Percentage/100	11.11	35.55	8.88	15.55		

Percentage/100	67%	33%	0%
----------------	-----	-----	----

- 1 The total number of civil posts is 30, but as can be seen in table 3, posts 1 and 16 are both informational and polite question and so they are counted twice, once in the informational column and once in the polite question column. This explanation is also valid regarding the percentage of civil posts.