



Influence of Voting Behavior on Political Participation in North Sumatera Governor Election Year 2018 Particularly in Stabat Sub-District

Elma Sari; Muryanto Amin; Warjio

Master of Development Studies Faculty of Social and Political Science Universitas Sumatera Utara,
Indonesia

<http://dx.doi.org/10.18415/ijmmu.v7i1.1436>

Abstract

The purpose of this research is to analyze influence of voting behavior on political participation in North Sumatera Governor Election year 2018 particularly in Stabat Sub-district. The research method used is quantitative method. Population of this research is all residents of Stabat Sub-district who have been registered as Permanent Voters (DPT) in number of 57.181 people (DPT of Stabat Sub-district in 2018: Regional Election Commission Langkat District). Sample of this research is taken by using slovin formula with 5% precision and it obtains sample of 397 people. The technique of data collection is through questionnaire and documentation. Data analysis is performed through product moment correlation, hypothesis test of t test, f test, and determination test. Result of the simultaneous test shows that significant value (sig) in F test is 0,000. Because $0,000 < 0,05$ there is significant influence between variable X and variable Y in which voting behavior and political participation in North Sumatera Governor election of 2018. From the product moment correlation test, the most influential approach among the three voting behavior approaches in which sociological (X1), psychological (X2), and rational (X3) towards Variable Y, voters participation, is the rational approach.

Keywords: *Voting Behavior; Sociological Approach; Psychological Approach; Rational Approach Voters Participation*

Introduction

Local leader election or called as direct local leader election is a policy taken by government that becomes the big political momentum towards democracy. Local leader election is a democratic event in order to choose legitimate leader directly by the qualified local administrative residents. Local leader election is a long political journey that colored by push and pull of elite interest and public will, central and regional interests, or even national and international interests (Law of the Republic of Indonesia No. 10 Year 2016).

One of the important factors in local leader and vice leader election is public as the voters. Therefore, public participation greatly influences the success of a democratic party. Candidate of local leader must know the factors that influence voting behavior to determine voters choice. The referred

voting behavior in this case is voting and non-voting.

On June 27, 2018, North Sumatera had conducted local leader election directly to vote their Governor and Vice Governor period of 2018-2023. This Governor and Vice Governor Election had two pair of candidates, namely pair Eramas and Djos. Based on the voting, pair of Eramas won with polling announced by General Election Commission (KPU) to the value of 57,6% and Djoss pair acquired polling of 42,4 %. It can be seen that the first pair won approximately with 15,4% higher than the second pair (KPU NORTH SUMATERA, 2018).

According to Benget Silitonga, one of the internal political observer, (Sumut Pos, 2018), suggested that there were interesting things in North Sumatera Governor election process in 2018. There were so many rumors that became controversy and polemic which indoctrinate and change people's mind. It can change people behavior in determining their choice. One of the rumors is political identity, origin of the candidate pair, and their promises in political campaign.

Political battle in North Sumatera indeed cannot be separated with local sense. Factor of sons of the soil is still deemed as the sufficiently important factor for most of North Sumatera people. Pair of Edy Rahmayadi-Musa Rajekshah was called as sons of the soil since at least they have ever been live in North Sumatera even though they were born elsewhere. Meanwhile their rival, Djarot Saiful Hidayat was considered as newcomers. Edy who was Aceh-born paired with Musa who was Medan-born and are Muslim. As for Djarot, he was born in Java and muslim while his pair Sihar Sitorus was Batak businessman born in Jakarta.

Result of the research by Ramadlan, et al (2018) stated that there was religious matters usage in local leader election of North Sumatera. Firstly, Kongres Umat Islam (KUI) was held in di Medan on March 31 until April 2018. The result of the congress was written in the charter of North Sumatera Muslim. One of the result asked North Sumatera people to choose Muslims candidate. Even though this support is not directly designed for Eramas pair but the only Muslims candidate is them. Secondly, subuh prayer together was performed on June 27, 2018 one day before the election. Finally, Eramas pair won the North Sumatera Governor election. Based on the result of the research, sociological factors such as religion, origin, ethnic, and others are possible to influence voting behavior.

Moreover, result of the research by Daulay et al, (2019) stated that there was political identity on North Sumatera Governor Election in 2018 such as what was performed by Eramas team by approaching traditional and religious leaders. Meanwhile, Djoss team only performed political identity process by approaching traditional leaders in various regions and participate in tradition related activities.

Literature Review

Voting behavior according to Ramlan Surbakti is voting activity by individual that closely related to decision making in order to vote or not to vote in a general election. If the voters choose to vote so they will choose or support certain candidate. The voters are defined as all parties that become candidates' main aim to be persuaded and convinced to support and vote for the particular candidate. Voting behavior may be in form of voting and who will be chosen in the related general election. Voting behavior is closely related to ideology between voters and the candidate or political party since the candidates have their respective ideology. During the campaign period, assessment or ideology similarity is identified by people towards the ideology embraced by candidates. People will categorize themselves to the candidate with the same ideology as them and draw themselves from the different ideology.

Theoretically, the behavior of voters or voting behavior is analyzed by three approaches, namely sociological approaches, psychological approaches (Michigan schools) and economic approaches (rational choice) (Asfar, 2006). Political participation is the participation of ordinary citizens in determining the decisions that concern or influence his life (Budiardjo, 2008). Political participation is the involvement or participation of a person to the achievement of the objectives and responsible in it, the participation of the political community is a form of democratic process (Surbakti, 1992).

People's political participation emphasizes on individual or group involvement to perform active political activities. According to Miriam Budiardjo, political participation in general is defined as a form of individual or group active involvement in political life in which through directly or indirectly vote for state leader that influences government policy (Budiardjo, 2008). In democratic states, basically the higher people participation the better the state since the people feel responsible to participate. It happens since people feel have the responsibility and role on each policy or regulation made by the government. Otherwise, the lower people participation the worse the state since the people do not care to their own state and tend to being apathetic and prioritize individual interest.

Methodology

The method used in this research is simple quantitative method with descriptive approach. Descriptive quantitative approach is an attempt to depict an occurred condition. In this research, the researcher depicts the condition in form of simple quantitative through statistical analysis. Population in this research is all residents of Stabat Sub-district who have been registered as permanent voters (DPT) with number of 57.181 people (DPT of Stabtab Sub-district in 2018: KPUD Langkat District). Sample is a part of total and characteristic owned by the population. In determining number of sample, the researcher uses Slovin formula with confidence level 95%, and the result shows that the sample needs 397 people. Type of data in this research is quantitative data. Quantitative data is numerical data obtained from questionnaire distributed to people who are registered as permanent voters in North Sumatera Governor Election of 2018 and becomes the sample of this research. In this research, the data consist of primary and secondary data, questionnaire collection technique, and documentation. Testing technique of Hypothesis Test, according to Sugiyono (2015:93), t statistical test is used to know the extent of one independent variable influence individually in explaining dependent variable variation. T test is used to establish whether independent variable partially has significant influence on dependent variable.

Significance Level :

- a. Significance Level used is 0,05 ($\alpha = 5\%$)
- b. If calculated t significance > 0.05 , it means H_0 is accepted or H_a is rejected
- c. If calculated t significance < 0.05 , it means H_0 is rejected or H_a is accepted

Simultaneous test is intended to establish correlation between independent and dependent variables by testing all independent variables (together) with dependent variables. F test is a testing on regression coefficient simultaneously. This test is performed to establish the influence of all independent variables within the model simultaneously on the dependent variables. F test in this research is used to test significance of voting behavior with sociological, psychological, and rational approaches on the voters participation simultaneously and partially. The result of this calculation is compared to the result from calculation using risk level or 5% significance level or with degree freedom = k (n-k-1) along with criteria as follows:

- rejected if $> \alpha$ or value of sig $< \alpha$
- accepted if $< \alpha$ or value of sig $> \alpha$

Correlation analysis can be continued by calculate coefficient of determination to establish the percentage of variable X influence on variable Y. According to Gujarati (2012:172), in order to see the big of influence for each independent variable on dependent variable partially, a calculation by using the following formula is performed: Information: $Kd = \text{zero order } X \beta X 100\%$ $Kd = \text{coefficient of determination}$ $\text{Zero Order} = \text{Correlation coefficient } \beta = \text{beta coefficient}$. Meanwhile, R is compound correlation coefficient that measures correlation level between dependent variable (Y) with all independent variables which explain together and the value is always positive.

Result of the Research

Sociological Approach (X1)

From of sociological approach answer classification, among 397 respondents 26 of them (6,5%) are classified as voting behavior with very poor sociological approach, 195 respondents (49,1) of voting behavior with poor sociological approach, 153 respondents (38,5%) of voting behavior with good sociological approach, and 23 respondents (5,8%) of voting behavior with very good sociological approach. Therefore, it can be concluded that most of respondents of voting behavior have poor sociological approach.

Psychological Approach (X2)

From of psychological approach answer classification, among 397 respondents 26 of them (6,5%) are classified as voting behavior with very poor psychological approach, 170 respondents (42,8%) of voting behavior with poor psychological approach, 171 respondents (43,1%) of voting behavior with good psychological approach, and 30 respondents (7,6%) of voting behavior with very good psychological approach. Therefore, it can be concluded that most of voting behavior respondents have good psychological approach.

Rational Approach (X3)

From of rational approach answer classification, among 397 respondents 15 of them (3,8%) are classified as voting behavior with very poor rational approach, 83 respondents (20,9%) of voting behavior with poor rational approach, 173 respondents (43,6%) of voting behavior with good rational approach, and 126 respondents (31,7%) of voting behavior with very good rational approach. Therefore, it can be concluded that most of respondents of voting behavior have good rational approach.

Political Participation (Y)

From of Participation answer classification, among 397 respondents 2 of them (0,5%) are classified as voting behavior with very poor voters participation, 48 respondents (12,1%) with poor voters participation, 234 respondents (58,69%) with good voter participation, and 113 respondents (28,5%) with very good voters participation. Therefore, it can be concluded that most of the respondents are classified as good political participation with percentage of 58,9%.

Hypothesis Test

Correlation of Product Moment

The analysis result is as follows :

- a. Influence of Sociological Approach on Voting Participation

Based on the tables above, it can be seen that correlation coefficient of person product moment for political participation is $-.054$. It means that correlation is in very low position at interval $0,00 - 0,199$ and not even reach 1.

b. Influence of Psychological Approach on Voting Participation

Based on the tables above, it can be seen that correlation coefficient of person product moment for political participation is $.0568$. It means the correlation is in the medium position at interval $0,40 - 0,599$ and far closer to 1.

c. Influence of Rational Approach on Voting Participation

Based on the tables above, it can be seen that correlation coefficient of person product moment on political participation is 0.279 . It means the correlation is in low position at the interval $0,20 - 0,399$ and far closer to 1.

Partial Test (T Test)

T test is used to establish whether independent variables are partially influence the dependent variable evidently or not. The significance degree used is $0,05$.

a. Sociological Approach Towards Political Participation

The result of calculated t value = 12.625 while t value in table at $dk = 397-2$ is 395 with 5% significance level in the value of $1,625$. It can be said significance if the result of t calculated value = 0.746 is smaller than t on the table $1,625$. Therefore, it is obviously can be said that there is no correlation and significant influence between sociological approach variable (X1) on political participation (Y) in the North Sumatera Governor Election of 2018.

b. Psychological Approach towards Political Participation

Based on the calculation, calculated t value = 12.625 while t value in the table at $dk = 397-2$ is 13.211 with 5% significance level of $1,625$. It can be said significant if calculated t value = 4.609 is bigger than t table $1,625$. Therefore, it is obviously can be said that there is significant correlation between variable X2 and variable Y in which psychological approach on voters participation in North Sumatera Governor Election of 2018.

c. Rational Approach on Political Participation

Based on calculation, calculated t value = 12.625 while t value in the table at $dk = 397-2$ is 13.211 with 5% significance level in the value of $1,625$. It can be said significant if calculated t value = 13.211 is bigger than t table $1,625$. Hence, it clearly can be said that there is significant influence between variable X3 and variable Y in which rational approach and political participation in North Sumatera Governor Election of 2018.

Simultaneous Test (F Test)

Requirements that need to be fulfilled in order to interpret coefficient of determination value is the result of significant F test. It means that "There is influence of variable x simultaneously on variable Y". Otherwise, if the result of internal F test analysis is not significant, the coefficient of determination value cannot be used to predict contribution of variable x influence on variable y simultaneously. Based on table of "Anova" above, it is known that significance value (sig) in F test is $0,000$. Since $0,000 < 0,05$, therefore as the basis of decision making in F test, it can be concluded that voting behavior (X) simultaneously affect political participation in North Sumatera Governor Election of 2018. Thus, the requirements in order to interpret coefficient of determination value in multiple linear have been satisfied.

Determination Test

Determination Test (R^2) is used to measure the capability of regression model to explain dependent variation. It is shown by the number of coefficient of determination.

Based on table of spss "Model Summary" above, it is known that coefficient of determination or R square is $0,378$. This value of R square $0,378$ comes from squaring the correlation coefficient value "R" in which $0,615 \times 0,615 = 0,378$. The coefficient of determination value (R square) is $0,378$ or equal to

37.8%. The value means that voting behavior with sociological approach (X1), psychological approach (X2), and rational approach (X3) simultaneously affect variable (Y) of political participation to the value of 37.8%. Meanwhile, the remaining percentage ($100\% - 37.8\% = 62.2\%$) is influenced by other variables outside this regression equation or the unexamined variable.

Discussion

Research which is done in Stabat Sub-district analyzes voting behavior on political participation in North Sumatera Governor Election of 2018. After hypothesis test is carried out simultaneously there is significant influence between variable X and variable Y in which voting behavior with sociological approach X1, psychological approach X2, and rational approach X3 with political participation in North Sumatera Governor Election of 2018. The amount of coefficient of determination value (*R square*) is 0,360 or equal to 36%. The value means that voting behavior variable simultaneously affects variable (Y) of political participation to the value of 36%. Meanwhile the remaining value ($100\% - 36\% = 64\%$) is influenced by other variables outside this regression equation or unexamined variables.

Nevertheless, based on hypothesis test partially, among three voting behavior approach variables in which sociological approach X1, psychological approach X2, and rational approach (X3) upon variable Y of voting participation, the psychological approach (X1) actually does not influence variable Y. If it is seen from calculation result, calculated t value = 12.625 while t value in table at dk = 397-2 is 395 with 5% significance level of 1,625. It can be said significant if calculated t value = 0.746 is smaller than t table value of 1,625.

The most influential approach on voters participation if it is seen from result of product moment correlation test among three approaches namely sociological approach (X1), psychological approach (X2), and rational approach (X3) on Variable Y of voters participation is the rational approach where calculation by using product moment correlation shows coefficient correlation of person product moment to the value of 0.568. It means that the enormity of correlation is in the average position at interval 0,40 – 5,99. Meanwhile, voting behavior with sociological approach is in very low correlation with coefficient of correlation person product moment of political participation is -.054, it means the correlation enormity is in very low position. In addition, the rational approach shows coefficient of correlation person product moment of political participation to the value of .0279. It means the enormity correlation is in low position.

Voting behavior in making decision or action to determine voters choice often influenced by various factors. Theoretical explanation on voting behavior is analyzed by three approaches namely sociological approach (Colombia school of thought), psychological approach (Michigan school of thought) and economic approach (*rational choice*) (Asfar, 2006). Voting behavior according to Ramlan Surbakti is activity of voting by individual that closely related to decision making to vote or not to vote in a general election. If the voters decide to vote they will choose or support certain candidate.

Behavior committed by someone or group is aimed to fulfill rights and obligations as citizen. Each citizen is obliged to carry out their rights and obligations in performing political behavior. Example of citizen political behavior is voting for leaders, follow and entitled to be political people that participate in a political party, participate in democratic party, criticize or put down the authorized political actors, has the right to be political leader, and obliged to perform their obligation and rights in order to do well political behavior arranged by the constitutional law and prevailing legislations.

Political participation is general citizens involvement in determining all decisions that relating to or influence their life (Surbakti, 1992). Political participation is someone's involvement to achieve a goal

and someone's responsibility within the involvement itself. Political participation is a form of democracy process. Citizen participation emphasizes on individual or group involvement to perform active political activity. According to Miriam Budiardjo, political party in general is defined as someone or group activity to actively follow political life by voting the state leader directly or indirectly that influence government policy (Budiardjo,2008).

In democratic states, basically the higher people's participation the better the state democracy. It is caused by citizens who feel responsible to participate and they have a role in each policy or regulation made by government. Likewise, the lower citizens participation the worse the state democracy since the people do not care about their state and tend to be apathetic also prioritize their personal interest over group interest.

Conclusion

Simultaneous test of significance value (sig) in F test is 0,000. Since $0,000 < 0,05$. There is significant influence between variable X and variable Y in which voting behavior and political participation in North Sumatera Governor Election of 2018. The amount of coefficient of determination (*R square*) is 0,378 or equal to 37.8%. The number means that voting behavior with sociological approach (X1), psychological approach (X2), and rational approach (X3) simultaneously influence variable (Y) of political participation to the value of 37.8%. Meanwhile the remaining percentage ($100\% - 37.8\% = 62.2\%$) is influenced by other variables outside this regression equation or unexamined variable. Moreover, the most influential approach on voting behavior is the rational approach.

References

- Abdillah S, Ubed. 2002. Politik Identitas Etnis: Pergulatan Tanda Tanpa Identitas. Magelang: Yayasan Indonesiatara.
- Arifin Anwar. 2015. Perspektif Ilmu Politik. Jakarta: PT Raja Grafindo Persada.
- Bartels, Larry M. 2009. "The Study of Electoral Behavior" in Jan E. Leighley (ed), *The Oxford Handbook of American Elections and Political Behavior*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Buchari, Sri Astuti. 2014. Kebangkitan Etnis Menuju Politik Identitas. Jakarta: Yayasan Pustaka Obor Indonesia.
- Budiardjo Miriam. 2008. Dasar-Dasar Ilmu Politik Edisi Revisi. Jakarta: PT Gramedia Pustaka Utama.
- Dauly, S. M., Kusmanto, H., & Kadir, A. 2019. Politik Identitas Pada Pemilihan Gubernur Sumatera Utara tahun 2018. *Jurnal Administrasi Publik (Public Administration Journal)*, 9(1), 49-56.
- E.G. Carmines and R. Huckfeldt. 1996. Political Behavior: An Overview. In R.E. Goodin and H.D.
- Evans, Jocelyn A J. 2004. *Voter and Voting: An Introduction*. London: Sage Publications.
- Fachrudin, Achmad. 2008. Pilkada DKI 2007 Demokrasi Civil Society. Jakarta: PT Nusa Utama.
- Gaffar Afan.1992. Javanese Voters: A Case Study of Election Under A Hegemonic Party System. Gajahmada University Press: Yogyakarta.

- Harrison, Lisa. 2009. *Metodologi Penelitian Politik*. Jakarta: Kencana.
- Hefner, Robert W. 2007. *Politik Multikulturisme. Menggugat Realitas Kebangsaan*. Yogyakarta: Impulse.
- Hemay, I., & Munandar, A. (2016). Politik Identitas dan Pencitraan Kandidat Gubernur terhadap Perilaku Pemilih. *POLITIK*, 12(1), 1737.
- Hidayat, Sedarmayanti. 2002. *Metode Penelitian*. Jakarta: Mandar Maju Key V. O. 1996. *The Responsible Electorate*. Cambridge: Harvard University.
- Lexy, J. Moleong. *Metodologi Penelitian Kualitatif*. Bandung. Remaja.
- Marijan, Kacung. 2011. *Sistem Politik Indonesia. Konsolidasi Demokrasi Pasca Orde Baru*. Jakarta: Kencana.
- Mc Closky Herbert. 1972. *Political Participation*. International Encyclopedia of the Social Science Edisi 2. New York: The Macmillan Company.
- Mujani, S. & R.W. Liddle & K. Ambardi (2012). *Kuasa Rakyat*. Jakarta: Mizan.
- Mujani, Saiful and R. William Liddle. 2010. Personalities, Parties and Voters. *Journal of Democracy*. Volume 21, Number 2.
- Mujani, Saiful. 2007. *Muslim Demokrat: Islam, Budaya Demokrasi, dan Partisipasi Politik di Indonesia Pasca Orde Baru*. Jakarta: Gramedia Pustaka Utama.
- Nawawi, Hadari. 2003. *Metode Penelitian Bidang Sosial*. Yogyakarta: Gadjah Mada University Press.
- Newman, W. Lawrence. 2013. *Metodologi Penelitian Sosial. Pendekatan Kualitatif dan Kuantitatif*. Jakarta: Indeks.
- Nursal, Ahmad. 2004. *Political Marketing: Strategi Memenangkan Pemilu*, Gramedia Jakarta.
- Ramadlan, F. S., & Masykuri, R. 2018. Marketing Isu Agama Dalam Pemilihan Kepala Daerah Di Indonesia 2015-2018. *Jurnal Penelitian Politik*, 15(2), 249-265.
- Sugiyono. 2014. *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif Kualitatif dan R&D*. Bandung: Alfabeta.
- Surbakti Ramlan. 2010. *Memahami Ilmu Politik*. Jakarta: PT Grasindo.
- Venus, Antar, 2004. *Manajemen Kampanye*. Bandung,: Remaja Rosda Karya.
- Widayanti, titik. 2009. *Politik subalter: pergulatan Identitas Waria*. Yogyakarta: UGM.

Copyrights

Copyright for this article is retained by the author(s), with first publication rights granted to the journal.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).