



Intercultural Communication of Political Issues on Twitter Platform: Cyber Discourse Analysis

Mutiara Romi Artika^{*1}, Devi Sofilla², Raslima Simorangkir³, Vanny Wulandari⁴, Khairunnisa⁵, Dian Marisha Putri⁶

^{1,2,3,4,5,6}*Faculty of Cultural Sciences, English Literature, Universitas Sumatera Utara, Indonesia*

*Corresponding Author: mutiararomi@students.usu.ac.id

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 12 January 2025

Revised 25 January 2025

Accepted 30 January 2025

Available online

<https://talenta.usu.ac.id/lingpoet>

E-ISSN: 2964-1713

P-ISSN: 2775-5622

How to cite:

Artika, M. R., Sofilla, D., Simorangkir, R., Wulandari, V., Khairunnisa, Putri, D. M., (2025). Metaphors of Anger in Contemporary Bahasa Indonesia: A Preliminary Study. *LingPoet: Journal of Linguistics and Literary Research*, 1(1), 44-53.

ABSTRACT

This study aims to identify how high-context and low-context communication is represented in Twitter posts and to analyze the differences in communication styles between the two countries, particularly in the context of high-context and low-context communication using Edward Hall's theory. The method in this research is qualitative approach with the data are three tweets related about #KawalPutusanMK and about new American presidential election. The result in this research highlights cultural differences in tweets, with Indonesians using indirect, context-dependent language reflecting collectivism, while Americans favor direct, explicit communication reflecting individualism. These patterns underscore the need to understand cultural values to enhance cross-cultural online interactions.

Keyword: Intercultural communication, Political Issues, Twitter Platform, Twitter, Cyber Discourse Analysis



This work is licensed under a Creative

Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-

NoDerivatives 4.0 International.

<http://doi.org/10.26594/register.v6i1.idarticle>

e

1. Introduction

The impact of social media on political information has been extensively studied. Social media has brought about significant changes in both politics and society. This phenomena has made it easier for citizens to participate in the political agenda-making process, which has led political parties to employ communication channels other than the major mass media (Casero-Ripollés, 2018). In order to examine the dynamic role of political communication on social media, Casero looks at a conceptual map. The essay examines the advantages and disadvantages of social media in the political sphere. According to Chadwick (2017), the "hybrid media system" is what leads to social media's incorporation into political communication. He departs from straightforward normative assessments in terms of "threats" to or "chances" for democracy, as well as basic conceptual differences between "new" and "old." Instead, he illustrates how many the media manage to collaborate and how amateurs, pressure organizations, and volunteers battle their way into political concerns. On the other hand, he explains how the media and political establishments reconsider in the changing politico-media context. According to Tufekci (2015), algorithmic amplification is crucial to the spread of extreme opinions, the development of strongly held beliefs, and, occasionally, the results of elections. In order to

maintain user engagement, platform algorithms prioritize polarity-stimulating content, which strains political debate. These dynamics are particularly pronounced during political competitions, such elections. Twitter is the entity that most exemplifies this paradigm. According to Bilbao-Jayo & Almeida (2021), this social network was established in 2006 and has grown to be one of the most significant channels of communication between politicians and their constituents. In fact, some politicians now only use social media to make pronouncements, eschewing traditional media. How Twitter tweets depict high-context and low-context communication, as well as to use Edward Hall's theory to examine how the two nations' communication styles differ, especially when it comes to high-context and low-context communication.

In fact, many different types of scholars have viewed Twitter as a new information source that they might use to further their studies. As an example, political scientists have recognized Twitter as a platform that allows them to examine the opinions of a subset of the public without conducting costly surveys, as well as how politicians prioritize certain topics over others or what ideas they wish to convey to their followers (Bilbao-Jayo & Almeida, 2021). The fragmentation that encompasses Twitter as a crucial component of the cyber discourse, particularly during political agitations like the Arab Spring, is given particular focus in Alex Comninos' 2011 book *Twitter Revolutions and Cyber Crackdowns*. It incisively explains how Twitter turned the average user into a content creator by offering organizing tools, real-time updates, and access to previously closed media content, thereby facilitating the mobilization of the political realm and local and international activist campaigns. The article can also examine the argument made by global visibility Twitter, which fostered solidarity by connecting local struggles to the global audience.

The study of how individuals from two different cultures can interact and comprehend one another is known as intercultural communication. With the rise of numerous cross-cultural online platforms like Twitter, this has become even more crucial in today's culture. Regardless of the cultural norms imposed by their respective civilizations, individuals from diverse cultural backgrounds can converse about politics on social media platforms. According to Hall (1976), intercultural communication is the process through which a society's culture largely shapes its communication. According to his context theory, people from different cultures interact in different ways. A low-context culture uses explicit communication, whereas a high-context society uses implicit communication. People's ability to understand messages is influenced by their cultural background (Hall, 1976; Hall & Hall, 1990). According to Geert Hofstede (1980) (quoted in Argyle, 1982), intercultural communication is the exchange of ideas between individuals from different cultures. Communication is influenced by the comparison of the cultures' individualism, uncertainty reduction, masculinity or femininity, individualism or collectivism, and prioritization. His framework's other dimensions—individualism vs collectivism and power distance—explain how various cultural value systems affect how people anticipate interacting. Furthermore, the comprehension of national cultures has been a core principle of intercultural communication study by definition. Nations were cultures. Aside from the fact that the majority of intercultural readers started with a brief excerpt stating that individuals inside a country can occasionally differ more from one another than those from foreign cultures (Samovar et al., 1981).

According to Wu & Li (2018), a growing corpus of research in the fields of social media and intercultural communication studies has reaffirmed the idea that new communication technologies are anything but neutral tools; rather, they are influenced by culture in a number of ways that are connected to specific communication situations and results. For example, Barker & Ota (2011) studied how Japanese and American women used Facebook and Mixi. They discovered that whereas Japanese young women were significantly more inclined to utilize Mixi to communicate intimacy, young American women preferred to express themselves publicly on Facebook. According to Park et al. (2014), who looked at how emoticons vary among cultures, individuals from individualistic cultures preferred to utilize mouth-oriented, horizontal emoticons like :). In contrast to people from collectivistic societies who liked emoticons like ^_^ that were eye-oriented and vertical.

According to Hall's (1976) framework for addressing intercultural communication, Americans can be classified as low-context cultures due to their openness, directness, and greater confrontation (Xiaoxu Yang 2016 in Al-Khatib, 2021). American culture is individualistic and values strength, independence, self-reliance, and assertiveness. Meanwhile, Indonesia falls under the category of high-context communication because of its indirect communication style, or "berbelit-belit," which uses nonverbal language, encourages teamwork and cooperation, views time as an infinite resource, and fosters interpersonal relationships and social arrangements (Saputri & Saraswati, 2017). Effective intercultural communication in Indonesia necessitates knowledge of the various ethnic groups' cultural values, communication preferences, and practices. For example, one of Indonesia's most important cultural principles is collectivism. Relationships and communal peace are highly valued by Indonesians, therefore when speaking with them, one should take the needs of the group into account rather than simply their own.

Edward T. Hall's High-Context and Low-Context Communication Theory serves as the foundation for this investigation. According to Hall (1976), there are two types of cultural communication styles: high-context and low-context cultures. These cultures have an impact on how information is communicated and understood. High-context communication, which is frequently found in collectivist countries like Indonesia, mostly depends on non-verbal clues, shared understandings, and implicit signals. Low-context communication, on the other hand, is more prevalent in individualistic societies like the US and stresses clear, straightforward, and thorough verbal representation. This study builds on Hall's theory that shows how different communication styles appear in online conversation, particularly on Twitter.

Although social media sites like Twitter promote succinct and real-time engagement, they provide a special platform for cross-cultural communication. Twitter discourse is an appropriate medium for examining high- and low-context dynamics because, despite its brevity, it frequently reflects deeper cultural communication preferences and techniques. In addition, this study integrates ideas from Cyber Discourse Analysis, which is concerned with the examination of language usage in virtual spaces. The textual and contextual components of Twitter posts, such as hashtags, retweets, comments, and likes, which indicate interaction and cultural importance, are examined using this approach. Social media political discourse frequently reflects national rhetorical methods, cultural priorities, and societal standards. Therefore, this study uses the election themes of Indonesia and the US as case studies to reveal the multicultural dynamics influencing political discussions on Twitter.

This research addresses the gap by examining Twitter posts related to Indonesia's #KawalPutusanMK movement and the U.S. presidential election. By analyzing tweets with the highest engagement, such as likes, comments, and retweets, this study provides insights into how different cultural communication styles shape political discourse on social media. The significance of this study lies in its contribution to understanding how cultural factors influence digital political engagement. By applying Hall's theory and Cyber Discourse Analysis, this study not only bridges the gap between intercultural communication and political discourse but also offers a new perspective on how Twitter serves as a platform for cross-cultural political interactions. Ultimately, this research enhances our comprehension of how digital media continues to reshape political communication in culturally diverse societies.

There are several previous studies that related to low – high context. An article journal with title "Typical Responses in Giving Evaluation: An Analysis of High and Low Context Culture Communication" by Arifin et al. (2013). The researchers used Hall's theory with the data taken at undergraduate campus with ten responses given by ten students of different sexes. The focus of this article is to know about the high and low context in aspect of direct-indirect, simple-complex response, and the relationship orientation. The result in this article is that using indirect and complex responses can maintain harmonious relationships with others.

An article journal by Acar & Deguchi (2013) "Culture and Social Media Usage: Analysis of Japanese Twitter Users" analyzed 4,000 tweets from 200 college students in Japan and the USA. The researchers used Hall's theory to analyze the data. The result of the data showed that Japanese college students post more self-related messages and ask fewer questions compared to American college students. It was also found that tweets that refer to TV are more common in Japan, whereas sports and news tweets stand out in the USA.

An article journal "Humanitarian Behavior Across High-/Low Context Cultures: A Comparative Analysis Between Switzerland and Colombia" by Alizadeh Afrouzi (2021). This article used Hall's theory and tries to analyze the influence of personal context culture on humanitarian behavior intention in a low-context-culture country (Switzerland) and a high-context-culture country (Colombia). The results indicated that once exposed to implicit social media posts of the ICRC, the Colombian showed slightly higher behavior intention compared to the Swiss and participants' personal context-culture score fully accounted for this difference.

Another article journal that analyzed using Hall's theory is "High-Low Context Communication in Business Communication of Indonesian" by Saputri & Saraswati (2017). This study aims to analyze the communication style in Indonesia, determining whether it aligns with high-context or low-context communication. The research was conducted through interviews and Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) involving 25 exchange students from Vienna University and 25 participants, including lecturers, politicians, and employees in Bandung. The findings indicate that Indonesia predominantly practices high-context communication. This is evident in the emphasis on physical contact, interpersonal relationships, internalized meanings, non-verbal cues, physical and social settings, and cultural values. It is suggested that Indonesia adapts its communication approach to align with other high-context cultures, particularly in business and political contexts.

Mahmud (2024) discusses the reflections of high- and low-context marketing communication styles in Youtube video ads. It is a comparative study of FMCG companies in Finland and India". The application examines how cultural frameworks shape online video advertising strategies. Finnish ads primarily showcase

low-context traits, such as direct communication and explicit product demonstrations, reflecting Finland's individualistic culture. In contrast, Indian ads emphasize high-context features like storytelling and indirect communication, aligning with the country's collectivistic culture. Notably, some Finnish ads include high-context elements, while Indian ads adopt low-context features, indicating a blend of cultural influences in advertising strategies.

Although there have been many studies on intercultural communication or social media trends using Hall's theory, none have specifically analyzed the theme of elections in Indonesia and the United States through Twitter posts. This study differs from previous research as no articles have addressed the political context of elections in Indonesia and the United States. Additionally, there is no research discussing #KawalPutusanMK and the newly trending U.S. presidential election on Twitter. This study focuses on analyzing Twitter posts with the highest engagement, such as likes, comments, and retweets.

This research explores how high-context and low-context communication is represented in Twitter posts? and compares how the two countries express opinions through the platform? The purpose of this article is to identify how high-context and low-context communication is represented in Twitter posts and to analyze the differences in communication styles between the two countries, particularly in the context of high-context and low-context communication. This study aims to provide a deeper understanding of the differences in communication styles influenced by the cultural backgrounds of each country.

2. Method

A method for looking into and understanding the significance that people or groups assign to a social or human issue is qualitative research. Emerging questions and methods, data that is usually gathered in the participant's environment, data analysis that builds inductively from specifics to broad themes, and the researcher's assessment of the data's significance are all part of the research process. The final written report's structure is adaptable (Creswell, 2014).

This study examines high-context and low-context communication styles as they are seen on Twitter using a qualitative methodology to examine Edward T. Hall's intercultural communication theory. The data taken from the most liked by Twitter's users according to the context. The publicly available Twitter posts that exhibit these communication patterns served as the source of data for this study. Indirect messaging and inferred meanings are characteristics of high-context communication postings, which were recognized by their reliance on shared cultural or situational awareness. Low-context communication posts, on the other hand, were chosen because to their clear and simple messaging, which required little outside background. Politically and culturally significant tweets were prioritized in the sample process in order to thoroughly examine the dynamics of various communication modes.

According to Hall's definitions, the research divided tweets into high-context and low-context styles. It looked at language traits including tone, structure, and directness as well as how much they relied on cultural connotations and shared information. The data source was taking a screenshot to a tweet that has many likes, which included the hashtag #KawalPutusanMK and about new American presidential election, and the data are sentences twitted by the users of the twitters The next step was to compare high-context and low-context communication in order to find trends and distinctions. And for the last step, the researchers then compare the differences between these two countries.

3. Result and Discussion

The results are described below:

High and Low Context Represented on Twitter

Table 1. The Data of High and Low Context

High-Context	Low-Context
Data 1 <i>Gak usah tersinggung dikatakan anak abah, itu yg dikatakan anak haram konstitusi aja biasa2 aja koq</i> ("Don't get offended when you're called 'Abah's child'; even those who are called 'illegitimate children of the constitution' remain calm.")	Data 1 “Kamala Harris was very clearly and directly asked: Are the American people better off now than they were 4 years ago? She could not say yes because the answer is no-the American people are worse off today because of Kamala Harris and Joe Biden's policies.”
Data 2 <i>Bang kalo masih middle class gausah sok2 ignorant</i> ("Bro, if you're still middle class, don't act to ignore.") <i>Fr. Lu yakin negara ini akan becus dipegang keluarga yang satu itu... Malu!</i> <i>#KawalPutusanMK</i> <i>#TolakPolitikDinasti</i> ("Fr. Do you believe this country will be properly managed by that one family... Shameful! #MonitoringforMKDecision #RejectDynasticPolitics")	Data 2 “Kamala Harris repeating the "mass rape" lie on the biggest stage on earth makes her an enemy of Palestine. Anyone still pretending she's better than Biden on Palestine is full of shit.”
Data 3 <i>I love this</i> <i>*difoto seizin ybs</i> <i>Image: (Sulung IPK rendah. Bungsu usia rendah. Bapak moralitas rendah</i> <i>#KawalKeputusanMK</i> ("I love this This photo taken with permission" Image: (the oldest child is low GPA, the youngest child is low age, and the father is low morals #MonitoringforMKDecision.	Data 3 “If you go to America, you will understand politics. What most people are doing here is "any where belle face". Democrats are strictly democrats, along with their families, same as republican. It is almost like a religion there. And they hardly change to the other party.”

In the data 1 of high culture, the tweet post:

“*Gak usah tersinggung dikatakan anak abah, itu yg dikatakan anak haram konstitusi aja biasa2 aja koq*”
 ("Don't get offended when you're called 'Abah's child'; even those who are called 'illegitimate children of the constitution' remain calm.")

This tweet exemplifies high-context communication as it conveys meaning indirectly without explicitly mentioning names or specific entities. Instead, it relies on cultural and situational context to deliver its message. Indonesian readers, familiar with the context, can infer the intended subjects and the underlying criticism. It only refers to a 'term,' which Indonesian readers can understand due to the context, even though

the name or specific institution is not explicitly mentioned. This is considered a high-context post because it indirectly conveys its opinion.

The term "anak abah" refers to presidential candidate number 1, where many of his supporters call him "abah" or meaning father. While "anak haram Konstitusi" refers to someone who caused this demonstration, which many people oppose the issue of dynasty politics. This person in question created a heated debate around legal and political issues, especially those related to the Pilkada Law. By avoiding direct references, this tweet criticizes the assumption held by some parties that student protests are primarily driven by loyalty to a particular presidential candidate for the 2024 election, when in fact people are protesting to avoid dynasty politics and are not siding with any presidential candidate. The tweet suggests that these protests stem from broader concerns, such as opposing political dynasties and advocating for democratic principles. The nuanced and indirect expression, typical of high-context cultures, reflects Indonesia's communication style, where shared cultural understanding allows readers to grasp the full meaning without overt explanations.

The second example of high-context communication involves a tweet and its reply, both of which rely on indirectness and shared cultural understanding to convey their messages. The tweet reads:

"Bang kalo masih middle class gausah sok-sok ignorant"
 ("Bro, if you're still middle class, don't act to ignore.")

This statement subtly criticizes the person addressed, implying that they are either pretending to be unaware of or genuinely ignorant about issues relevant to the middle class. The critique is indirect, relying on context and the assumed shared understanding between the sender and the receiver. The use of casual language, such as "Bang" (Bro), suggests familiarity and positions the critique within a relatable, informal framework. It calls attention to a perceived inconsistency between the individual's socio-economic status and their behavior or attitude toward societal issues.

The reply further develops this critique:

"Fr. Lu yakin negara ini akan becus dipegang keluarga yang satu itu... Malu! #KawalPutusanMK #TolakPolitikDinasti"

("Fr. Do you believe this country will be properly managed by that one family... Shameful!
 #MonitoringforMKDecision #RejectDynasticPolitics")

This response implicitly criticizes the concept of political dynasties, suggesting that leadership by "that one family" is inappropriate or ineffective. Like the initial tweet, the reply avoids directly naming individuals or providing explicit details. Instead, it presumes that the audience understands the political context, such as the ongoing debates surrounding dynastic politics and the decisions being monitored by the Constitutional Court (MK). The hashtags reinforce the post's alignment with broader societal concerns about democracy and political accountability.

Although the reply adopts a more formal tone, it still presumes the audience's familiarity with recent political events and public discourse. The criticism is conveyed through a combination of implication and cultural cues, reflecting high-context communication typical in societies where indirectness and shared knowledge play a significant role. This exchange highlights how high-context communication operates on subtlety and mutual understanding. Instead of stating concerns explicitly, the posts rely on the audience's ability to infer meaning from the context, cultural references, and social dynamics. This approach reflects Indonesia's communication style, where much of the message is embedded in the context rather than in the words themselves.

The third data:

I love this
**difoto seizin ybs*

Image: (Sulung IPK rendah. Bungsu usia rendah. Bapak moralitas rendah #KawalKeputusanMK
 ("I love this

This photo taken with permission"

Image: (the oldest child is low GPA, the youngest child is low age, and the father is low morals
 #MonitoringforMKDecision.

In the tweet the protester holding a sign that says, "SULUNG IPK RENDAH, BUNGSU USIA RENDAH, BAPAK MORALITAS RENDAH, #KawalKeputusanMK," is shown in the tweet's image. Even

though the statement seems straightforward, it has complex meanings that only people who are aware of the protest's social and political background can completely comprehend. By repeatedly using the term "rendah" (low), the sign expresses harsh condemnation of those who are thought to lack morality or integrity in decision-making processes without specifically mentioning any particular people or decisions. In the context of the photo, it implies a family involved in politics which became dynasty politics. Although the person did not directly explain about this "family", but the people who participated in the protest must have understood who was meant in the photo of the writing.

In high-context cultures, messages like this rely heavily on the audience's understanding of the broader social, political, and cultural context. The sign does not elaborate on the background or reasons behind the critique, assuming that the audience is already aware of the controversies involving the Constitutional Court and the related public discontent. The hashtag "#KawalKeputusanMK" provides an additional clue but still requires deeper contextual knowledge to fully grasp the intended message. Communication in high-context cultures prioritizes symbolism and associations over explicit explanations. By using an implicit approach, the sign allows for rich interpretation by its audience while effectively delivering its critique to those who understand the context of the protest.

Then, the data of low context such as in the first data:

"Kamala Harris was very clearly and directly asked: Are the American people better off now than they were 4 years ago? She could not say yes because the answer is no-the American people are worse off today because of Kamala Harris and Joe Biden's policies."

This tweet directly criticizes Kamala Harris and the Joe Biden administration by focusing on a moment when Harris was clearly asked whether the American people are better off now than they were four years ago. The tweet points out that Harris could not say "yes" because, according to the author, the answer is clearly "no." The claim is that the American people are worse off today due to the policies of Harris and Biden. The tweet uses this instance to argue that the current administration has led to negative consequences for the country, particularly in terms of the well-being of the American people.

The tweet does not go into specific policies or issues but instead focuses on the implication that Harris's inability to provide a positive answer is evidence of the failure of the administration. The tone is direct and confrontational, which is characteristic of low-context communication in cultures like the United States, where criticism is often clear and straightforward without relying on much background information. The audience is expected to understand that the reference to the American people being "worse off" relates to broader issues such as economic difficulties, inflation, and dissatisfaction with the administration's handling of various policies. Through this straightforward criticism, the tweet highlights the belief that the current administration, led by Harris and Biden, has not improved the lives of ordinary Americans and has, in fact, contributed to their decline. The emphasis on Harris's failure to answer the question directly reinforces the argument that the leadership under Biden-Harris has been ineffective, portraying them as unable to positively affect the lives of the American public.

This communication fits the low-context culture model because it provides a direct and explicit answer to a clear question. The message does not require the listener to infer or understand implicit meanings; it is straightforward and lacks ambiguity. In a low-context culture, such as the United States, this type of communication is typical and expected to ensure clarity and avoid misunderstandings.

The second data of low-context:

"Kamala Harris repeating the 'mass rape' lie on the biggest stage on earth makes her an enemy of Palestine. Anyone still pretending she's better than Biden on Palestine is full of shit."

This tweet criticizes Kamala Harris, the Vice President of the United States, for repeating what the author describes as a "mass rape" lie during a major international event or widely broadcast speech, referred to as "the biggest stage on earth." The context suggests that the "lie" in question relates to claims of widespread sexual violence within the Israel-Palestine conflict. The author implies that these statements are untrue and harmful, framing them as antagonistic to the Palestinian cause and labeling Harris as "an enemy of Palestine." Additionally, the tweet directly dismisses those who believe Harris is better than Joe Biden on issues concerning Palestine, using strong language to discredit such opinions.

The context of this criticism reflects a low-context communication style, where opinions are expressed clearly and explicitly. The tweet assumes that its audience is familiar with the ongoing geopolitical and humanitarian issues related to the Israel-Palestine conflict, as well as the broader critique of U.S. foreign policy

in the region. The phrase “mass rape” likely refers to allegations or narratives used in conflict zones, which the author accuses Harris of perpetuating to unfairly demonize Palestinians or support a pro-Israel agenda. By doing so on a global platform, the author suggests that Harris’s actions exacerbate tensions and misrepresent the situation in ways that harm the Palestinian cause.

The tone of the tweet reflects frustration with perceived U.S. bias against Palestine, a longstanding point of contention in debates about justice, human rights, and Middle East foreign policy. The author uses this instance to highlight their disapproval of Harris and, more broadly, the American leadership’s handling of issues related to Palestine, reinforcing the narrative of systemic bias and harm. The tweet exemplifies low-context communication by being highly specific and clear about its criticism. It directly states that Kamala Harris’s actions make her an “enemy of Palestine,” using explicit terms like “lie,” “mass rape,” and “enemy of Palestine” without requiring further interpretation.

The last data of the low-context:

“If you go to America, you will understand politics. What most people are doing here is “any where belle face”. Democrats are strictly democrats, along with their families, same as republican. It is almost like a religion there. And they hardly change to the other party.”

The tweet discusses American politics, pointing out the strong loyalty people have to their political parties. It says that Democrats and Republicans often stay committed to their party, including their families, and rarely switch sides. This loyalty is compared to a religious commitment, showing how deeply rooted and unwavering it is. This is an example of low-context communication, which is common in places like the United States. In low-context cultures, messages are clear, direct, and don’t rely heavily on shared knowledge or context. The aim is to make sure the message is understood by anyone, even if they don’t have background knowledge about the topic. This approach reduces confusion and helps people from different backgrounds understand the message easily.

The tweet does this by clearly explaining American political loyalty without assuming that the reader knows much about it. It uses simple language and a relatable comparison (“almost like a religion”) to make the point. By including all the needed information in the tweet itself, it follows the principles of low-context communication. Low-context cultures often value individualism and diversity, so communication should be easy to understand for people with different experiences. The straightforward style of this tweet fits this communication approach, making it easy for a wide audience to understand.

That tweet is very specific and clear about political behavior in America and do not require additional context for understanding. It uses direct language, with terms like “being anywhere” and “the Democrats are the real democrats,” reflecting a straightforward style. The sentences are linear and simple, such as “There, politics is almost like a religion. And they hardly ever switch to another party.” This low-context approach focuses on the main information about political behavior, emphasizing explicit language and a clear structure without needing further explanation.

The Differences of Communication Styles Between the Two Countries

The cross-cultural comparison of Indonesian and American tweets reveals key features of interaction based on culture with specific references to the Indonesian and the American ones. These differences follow Edward T. Hall’s (1976) high and low context communication distinction and are further elaborated in theories of cultural communication, including Hofstede’s six dimensions of cultural difference (2001). In supporting data, Indonesian tweets are low-context and deferent to contextual and cultural indicators. For example, as indicated in data one: Sometimes Indonesian users discuss some issues like the Regional Election Law (UU Pilkada) for example, they may not mention a specific person or an organization. However, this indirect approach is also consistent with the cultural factors that hold dear socially acceptable decisions and nonconfrontational conflict resolution, in Indonesian society which is a collectivist society according to Hofstede (2001). The clues of these categories are developmentally preset in the assumption that the receiver of the tweets will have the contextual knowledge of the topics under discussion. On the other hand, American tweets are observed to be cultures of low contextual content that has been subjected to less use of gestures, ambiguity, and indirectness. This is evident in Data four to six whereby the American users use relatively simple language when they are presenting their political matters so that everyone gets a well understood message without necessarily referring to anything else. For examples in the Data five, the information in the tweet is particularly negative, proxied by the words “enemy of Palestine” and “lie” to directly point out Kamala Harris. This kind of directness is actually typical of the ‘high power distance’ cultural profile of the United

States whereby words as the primary mode of communication are expected to be direct and clear (Ting-Toomey, 1999).

The main difference between Indonesian and American tweets, as it has been mentioned earlier, is the extent of contextual dependence. The findings therefore disclosed that Indonesian twitters employ a lot of implicit meanings, contextual and relational meanings besides the contextual meanings as opposed to American twitters who use direct meanings, individual and isolated meanings. These differences are reflective of broader cultural tendencies: Collectivism, power distance, and perspective of relationship are important Indonesian cultural values and so is communication that is considered as inconspicuous. Individuals of Indonesia are most important cultural value which is known as collectivism. Indonesians pay much attention to relationships and communal peace, therefore, while communicating with them, one should think not only about his or her own needs, but also about the needs of a group. American society, in particular, which is based on individualism and egalitarianism, Computerized Business Communication is direct and clear in order to save time and avoid misunderstanding. The American culture is individualistic and the culture supports power, efficiency, autonomy and proactivity. These differences are further expanded among the Twitter social media, given that cultural norms determine the way individuals adjust their ways of communication for purposes of the public domain. These findings further stressed the need to find out cultural communication patterns in international virtual interactions. Intercultural communication scholars and professionals should understand these differences in order to improve cross cultural interactions and thus improve the nature of online interactions.

4. Conclusion

In conclusion, this study explores the significant differences in communication styles of the post and commentary on Twitter between Indonesian and American users, reflecting the cultural characteristics of high-context and low-context communication based on T. Hall's theory. In light of the collectivist society, Indonesian tweets refuse directly conflict in favor of using implicit post and commentary, contextual allusions, and common understanding to express meaning. In contrast, American tweets, which are characterized by explicitly post and commentary, employ straightforward language to ensure universality and clarity. These findings explore how cultural values, such as collectivism versus individualism, and high versus low power distance, shape online interactions and message delivery. For high-context cultures, this means leveraging shared understanding and implicit cues, while for low-context cultures, clarity and explicit messaging are vital to encourage effective cross-cultural communication on digital platforms.

References

- Acar, A., & Deguchi, A. (2013). Culture and Social Media Usage: Analysis of Japanese Twitter Users. *International Journal of Electronic Commerce Studies*, 4, 21–32.
- Alizadeh Afrouzi, O. (2021). Humanitarian behavior across high-/low-context cultures: A comparative analysis between Switzerland and Colombia. *Journal of International Humanitarian Action*, 6(1), 2. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41018-020-00088-y>
- Al-Khatib, M. A. (2021). (Im) politeness in intercultural email communication between people of different cultural backgrounds: A case study of Jordan and the USA. *Journal of Intercultural Communication Research*, 50(4), 409–430.
- Argyle, M. (1982). Intercultural communication. *Cultures in Contact: Studies in Cross-Cultural Interaction*, 61–80.
- Arifin, F., Wigati, F., & Lestari, Z. (2013). Typical Responses in Giving Evaluation: An Analysis of High and Low Context Culture Communication. *PAROLE: Journal of Linguistics and Education*, 3(1 April), 85–92.
- Barker, V., & Ota, H. (2011). Mixi diary versus Facebook photos: Social networking site use among Japanese and Caucasian American females. *Journal of Intercultural Communication Research*, 40(1), 39–63.
- Bilbao-Jayo, A., & Almeida, A. (2021). Improving Political Discourse Analysis on Twitter With Context Analysis. *IEEE Access*, 9, 104846–104863. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ACCESS.2021.3099093>
- Casero-Ripollés, A. (2018). Research on Political Information and Social Media: Key Points and Challenges for The Future. *El Profesional de La Información*, 27(5), 1699–2407.
- Chadwick, A. (2017). *The Hybrid Media System: Politics and Power* (2a ed.). Oxford University Press.
- Creswell, J. W. (2014). *RESEARCH DESIGN: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches*, Fourth Edi (4th ed.). SAGE Publication.

- Hall, E. T. (1976). *Beyond Culture*. Anchor Press/Double day.
- Hall, E. T., & Hall, M. R. (1990). *Understanding cultural differences: Germans, French and Americans*. Intercultural Press.
- Mahmud, T. (2024). Reflections of high- and low-context marketing communication styles in Youtube video ads: A comparative study of FMCG companies in Finland and India. *OSUVA*.
- Park, J., Baek, Y. M., & Cha. (2014). Cross-cultural comparison of nonverbal cues in emoticons on Twitter: Evidence from big data analysis. *Journal of Communication*, 64, 333–354.
- Samovar, L. A., Porter, R. E., & Jain, N. (1981). *Understanding Intercultural Communication*. Wadsworth.
- Saputri, M. E., & Saraswati, G. T. (2017). High-Low Context Communication in Business Communication of Indonesian. *Proceedings of the 3rd International Conference on Transformation in Communications 2017 (IcoTiC 2017)*. <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>
- Ting-Toomey, S. (1999). *Communicating across cultures*. Guilford Press.
- Tufekci, Z. (2015). Algorithmic harms beyond Facebook and Google: Emergent challenges of computational agency. *Colo. Tech. LJ*, 13, 203.
- Wu, D. D., & Li, C. (2018). Emotional branding on social media: A cross-cultural discourse analysis of global brands on Twitter and Weibo. *Intercultural Communication in Asia: Education, Language and Values*, 225–240.