

POLITICAL PARTICIPATION OF GETASAN COMMUNITY IN SEMARANG REGENCY ELECTIONS IN 2015

Nani Mediatati¹; Kristina Roseven Nababan²

^{1,2}Civic Education Study Program, Christian University Satya Wacana
Jl. Diponegoro No. 52-60, Sidorejo, Salatiga 50711, Indonesia
¹nani.mediatati@uksw.edu; ²kristina.nababan@uksw.edu

Received: 26th September 2019/ **Revised:** 22nd October 2019/ **Accepted:** 05th November 2019

How to Cite: Mediatati, N., & Nababan, K. R. (2019). Political participation of getasan community in Semarang regency elections in 2015. *Humaniora*, 10(3), 233-239.
<https://doi.org/10.21512/humaniora.v10i3.6019>

ABSTRACT

This research aimed to describe the form and the level of political participation of the Getasan district community in the election of Semarang Regency in 2015. Data collection techniques were through interviews, observations, and document studies. Sample research amounted to 182 respondents that were taken from 13 villages in the district of Getasan, and each village was taken 14 respondents. While secondary data of literature studies and studies of documents were both derived from the contestants, the general election commission district, the mass media, and other relevant sources. There were two candidates for the regent and vice-regent period 2015-2020; they were Mundjirin with Ngesti Nugraha that supported by three political parties, and the second, Nur Jatmiko with Mas'ud Ridwan that supported by four political parties. The results show that the form of political participation in the community of Getasan in the election year 2015 can be listed into nine activities, such as participation in one of the political parties, the committee of elections, socialization the candidate, campaign, become a victory team participated in the procurement of polling stations, participated in the voting, participated in the security voting in polling stations, and participated in the process calculation of the vote.

Keywords: political participation, elections, the society of Getasan sub-district

INTRODUCTION

The political system in Indonesia at several times change as the ruling regime changed. In democratic, political system reforms experienced strengthening and legitimate as the hope of the rise of political participation space is increasingly transparent. According to Sanit (in Wahyudi et al., 2013), members of the community need to take part or participate in the process of formulating and determining the policy of governance, in other words, every citizen without distinction of gender should be involved in the development process primarily in the political field. Therefore, the desires of every citizen are well-served. Transparency of participation in the political system is also very perceived by Indonesia society since the 2004 election, similarly democratization at the local level with the direct participation selection of regional head since 2005.

The democratic political system is also felt by the community of Semarang district, especially the Getasan sub-district, especially with the implementation of the second direct elections in the form of the election regent and vice-regent 2015-2020 period. Democracy is demonstrated

by activity in the process of politics in the district of Getasan. Democracy is defined as a form of government in which the people govern themselves, either through direct participation in formulating decisions that affect them or by selecting their representatives (Najib, 2005). Therefore, the community has a desire to develop a democratic political system.

Direct elections system by the people has shifted the representation system so that the society determines political choice is not anymore in a group of political elites whose name is legislative. Therefore, both political parties and regional head candidates should now approach the people as voters by providing their vision and mission or other efforts to participate in the political contestation that will take place. Basically, participating means having a good understanding of what the participation is, with a good understanding of the community, then participation can go well (Adi & Rahdriawan, 2016). Participation is one of the important aspects of democracy. Due to political decisions and implemented by the government concerning and affecting citizens, citizens have the right to participate in determining the content of political decisions.

The definition of political participation based on a Holt study (Salman, 2015), it has stated that participation refers to a component of conduct in political engagement as an activity that has a purpose and affects of authority. Therefore, the meaning of political participation is the participation of ordinary citizens in determining all of the decisions that concern or influence his life. Political activities are citizens who have offices in government and ordinary citizens who have no government position. Political participation that is most commonly used by society is to participate in elections. By granting voting rights in the elections, usually, the public will decide who deserves to be a servant in the region. A critical selector is a selector who combines the high orientation of the political party with the candidate who, in this case, is the regent of Semarang. It can also mean that a critical selector is a selector that will always analyze the ideology of the party with the policy made (Yusuf, 2014).

Semarang district is one of the areas in the province of Central Java that holds the election of the regional head (election) in 2015. Amid the preparation of the elections, a number of candidates have sprung up and nominated by political parties (*partai politik*) who are eligible to run for themselves. There are two candidates for the regent and deputy regent who have signed up and passed the administrative requirements of the general election commission. They consist of prospective candidates, who have received recommendations from the Central Board of Directors (DPP) of their respective political parties. The names and ordinal numbers of the prospective regent and deputy regent period 2015-2020 are; first, the couple Mundjirin with Ngesti Nugraha that are supported by PDIP, Gerindra, PAN. The second is Nur Jatmiko's partner with Mas'ud Ridwan supported by PKB, Golkar, PKS, Hanura.

Many people think that political participation is all about giving their votes when the election held. However, actually, political participation can be classified by conventional political participation, voting, political discussions, campaign activities, and forming and joining interest groups and individual communication. Apart from political participation, there is unfamiliar action among the people, which is categorized as political participation such as petitions, demonstrations, confrontations, strikes, and political violence against property.

A form of political participation is seen in one's political activities. The most commonly known form of political participation is voting whether to vote for the candidate's representatives or to choose the head of state/head of the region. The participation comes from the Latin that is '*pars*' and '*capere*', which means taking part in the activities or political activities of the country. In English, '*participate*' or participation means taking part or role. So participation means taking part in the political activity or activity of the country. In line with this, Huntington and Nelson (Kusmanto, 2013) have argued that political participation as a citizen's activities (the private citizen) is aimed at the decision-making by the government. From this sense, Huntington and Nelson have imposed restrictions on political participation in some of the activities of non-attitudes and beliefs, having the intention of affecting public policy, and being committed by a thug citizen (Kusmanto, 2013).

The role taken by the public can also be seen based on the typology of participation, where A. Rahman H. I. (Hendrik, 2010) has stated that in general, the typology of participation as an activity is differentiated into (1)

active participation, it is the participation of input and output processes. (2) Passive participation, for example, is participation that is oriented only on the output, in the sense of only complying with government regulations, accepting and implementing alone any government decision. (3) Abstainers or group apathy is considering the existing political system deviates from ideals.

The forms of political participation expressed by Almond (Mas'oed, 2008) are similar in two forms of conventional political participation and non-conventional political participation. The conventional political participation consists of voting, political discussions, campaign activities, and forming and joining interest groups/individual communication with political or administrative officials. While non-conventional political participation consists of petitions, demonstrations, confrontations, strikes, political violence against property (destruction, bombing, burning), and political violence against humans (abduction, murder, guerrilla warfare, revolution). As the foundation for implementing political participation, Huntington and Nelson have presented a common foundation for organizing political participation as classes, groups/communal, neighborhood, party, and group/function (Lihardja, Setiawan, & Suparman, 2017). Besides, the research results of Karim (Yustiningrum & Ichwanuddin, 2015), there are four factors that influence the political participation of young people in determining the choice of parental economic status, parental participation, youth high school activities, and parental orientation.

Frank Lindenfeld in Suharyanto (2014) has explained that the main factors that encourage a person to participate in politics are due to financial satisfaction. This is seen from the results of his research that the low economic status causes one to feel alienated from political life. On the other hand, Milbrath has added the main contributing factor to participate in the political life of the stimulant that the individual wants to participate in political life, one's personal characteristics, a person's social character situation, or the political environment itself (Suharyanto, 2014).

In addition to the driving factors, people also have reasons not to be active in political participation. Morris Rosenberg presents three reasons for community barriers to political participation in fear of the negative consequences of political activity, the notion that participating in political life is futility, and the incentive to participate in political life (Maran, 2007). Of these three, people often view political participation is a disaster. However, the role of government in the efforts to increase community participation is much needed.

So, political participation is very important to both the public and the government. For society, it can be a means to give input, criticism, and advice to the government in the planning and implementation of development, while for government, political participation is a mechanism of implementation of control function government and the implementation of policies. Research on community political participation in Getasan district elections in Semarang regency as a vehicle for democratic education is going to be done because it is strongly suspected that the means will be most relied upon by future candidates are programs offered. This research shows that, at the same time, educating the public to understand political participation that can be done to influence policy. Therefore, it is interesting to be examined whether the community participation in the elections is also influenced by programs

offered by prospective partner regent and vice Regent Semarang period 2015-2020.

METHODS

The data collected in this research includes primary data and secondary data. Primary data is collected through interviews and observations. Open interview techniques and observations are used to obtain data on forms of public participation in the elections. Sample research amounts to 182 respondents taken from 13 villages in the district of Getasan, and each village is taken 14 respondents. While secondary data of literature studies and studies of documents are both derived from the contestants, the general election commission district, the mass media, and other relevant sources.

Quantitative data analysis is done with a detailed analysis of numbers and percentages. The analysis of data on interviews includes data reduction, data presentation, and draw conclusions or verification (Miles, Huberman, & Saldana, 2007). Through the process of data reduction to be made simplification, abstracting and transformation of data are obtained. This data reduction continues to take place in the process of collecting data. The data will be reduced through strict selection, summary or short description, characterizing into one wider pattern, and similar. Thus through this process is expected to occur in the processing, classification, disposal of unnecessary data, and organizing the data so that it can be concluded.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Getasan is one of the sub-districts in Semarang regency, which is located between the city of Salatiga and Magelang regency. This subdistrict is located on the slopes of Mount Merbabu, and one of its flagship attractions is Vokasi Village Kopeng. Getasan sub-district consists of 13 villages, 70 RW, and 376 RT with an area of 65,80 km². The 13 villages are Batur, Poloboga, Nogosaren, Headline, Ngrawan, Jetak, Manggihan, Getasan, Pongangan, Kopeng, Sumogawe, Wates, and Tolokan. The population was in 2014 of 49.238, consisting of 24.309 males, and 24.929 female. The livelihood of the population is mainly in the field of agriculture (farmers). Based on the religion adopted, adhering to Islamic religion 39.417 people, Christianity 7.187 people, Catholic 670 people, Buddhism 1.935 people, Hinduism 0, Confucian 0, and other 26 people.

Research of political participation in the community of the Getasan subdistrict in the elections is seen from the nine forms. They are (1) participation in one political party, (2) participation in the committee on the elections, (3) participation in the socialization of spouses candidate regent and deputy regent, (4) participation in the campaign of candidates for the regent and deputy regent, (5) participation in the successful team of prospective regent and deputy regent, (6) participation in the procurement/establishment polling station, (7) participation in voting, (8) participation in voting security in the polling station, and (9) participation in the vote-counting process.

Result from interviews of 182 respondents in the district of Getasan, political participation in the electoral process in the form of community participation in one of the political parties can be seen in Table 1.

Table 1 Participation in One of the Political Parties

Category of answers	Frequency (People)	Percentage (%)
Yes (PDIP)	3	1,65
No	179	98,35
Total	182	100

From Table 1, it can be seen that the respondent who participated in the membership of one political party that is PDI struggle as much as three people (1,65%), and who do not participate in political party membership as much as 179 people (98,35%). Joining a political party is not one of considered by the community because there are many assumptions that people who are joining one of the political party are only for people who will run in political battles. Therefore, the public does not understand that the inclusion of people in a political party is part of political participation.

The participation of community politics in the electoral process in the form of participation in the committee for the regional elections can be seen in Table 2.

Table 2 Participation in the Committee for Regional Elections

Category of answers	Frequency (People)	Percentage (%)
Yes (Polling Station supervisor)	9	4,95
No	173	95,05
Total	182	100

From Table 3, it can be seen that the respondents who participate in the committee on the administration of the elections as much as 9 people (1,65%), namely as the supervisor of the polling station and who do not participate in the committee for the elections as many as 173 people (95,05%) with a busy reason to work in the fields and at home. The results show that the community is expected to be more involved in the committee when there is a general election. It is hoped that they take a short break from work and focus on escorting during the election process in their area.

The participation of public politics in the electoral process in the form of participation in the socialization of candidates by the general election commission Semarang district can be seen in Table 3.

Table 3 Participation in Socialization of Candidate Partners

Category of answers	Frequency (People)	Percentage (%)
Yes (Getasan subdistrict)	8	4,40
No	174	95,60
Total	182	100

From Table 3, it can be seen that the respondents, who participate in the socialization of the candidate in the elections by general election commission of Semarang

district in Getasan district as much as 8 people (4,40%), and who do not participate in the socialization of the candidate by general election commission Semarang district as much as 173 people (95,60%) by unknown reasons. In political socialization, many assume that the socialization only consists of a candidate pair either through the success team or a political party that supports the candidate pair. It makes the community disappoints that the task of socialization is not their responsibility. Because of that, the community must be given more understanding that socialization is also a part of political participation that can be consisted of the community.

The participation of public politics in the electoral process in the form of participation in the campaign of the candidate in the elections can be seen in Table 4.

Table 4 Participation in a Prospective Partner Campaign

Category of answers	Frequency (People)	Percentage (%)
Yes	5	2,75
No	177	97,25
Total	182	100

From Table 4, it can be seen that the respondents who participated in the campaign of candidates in the elections as much as 5 people (2,75%). In the form of meeting/relationship, especially the number one candidate (Mundjirin and Ngesti), and who do not participate in the campaign of the candidate in the elections as much as 177 people (97,25%) For neutral reasons.

The participation of community politics in the electoral process in the form of participation in the successful team of candidates in elections can be seen in Table 5.

Table 5 Participation in a Successful Team of Prospective Partners

Category of answers	Frequency (People)	Percentage (%)
Yes	7	3,85
No	175	96,15
Total	182	100

From Table 5, it can be seen that the respondents who participated in the success team candidate in the elections as much as 7 people (3,85%), especially the number one candidate (Mundjirin and Ngesti) and who do not participate in the successful team of candidates in the elections as many as 175 people (96,15%) for neutral reasons. The success team is formed with the aim of working to identify voter data, attach stickers, and distribute business cards and clothes with the images of the candidates' faces. Besides, this team works as a shaper of the candidate pair in the eyes of the community. Although the results of the data collection show that only a few people participated in the success team. Whereas, if look at the culture that exists in Java indirectly, many people have built or herded public opinion both their families, people around them who have helped build the image of a candidate pair both good and bad images.

The participation of public politics in the electoral process in the form of participation in the establishment/procurement of polling stations can be seen in Table 6.

Table 6 Participation in the Establishment/Procurement of Polling Station

Category of answers	Frequency (People)	Percentage (%)
Yes	29	15,93
No	153	84,07
Total	182	100

From Table 6, it can be seen that the respondents who participated in the establishment/procurement of the polling station as many as 29 people (15,93%) by assisting the committee to organize the place, arrange table chairs, clean the place, and provide food. Moreover, the respondents who do not participate in the establishment/procurement of the polling station as much as 153 people (84,07%) with the reason busy working in the rice fields.

The participation of community politics in the electoral process in the form of community participation in the voting process can be seen in Table 7.

Table 7 Participation in Voting

Category of answers	Frequency (People)	Percentage (%)
Yes, comes with its own consciousness	120	65,93
Yes, come with other people's invitations	5	2,75
Not come	57	31,32
Total	182	100

From Table 7, it can be seen that the respondents who come to the polling station with its own awareness as much as 120 people (65,93%), who came to the polling station with the invitation of others as much as 5 people (2,75%), and who do not come to the polling station as much as 57 people (31,32%) with a busy reason to work and go out of town. The results show that the public is enthusiastic to vote in the general election. This is influenced by the emotional and sense of belonging that is owned by residents of Getasan, especially the presence of a candidate pair native from the sub-district.

In this situation, some people do not vote at the time of the election. The reason for not vote is generally due to busyness at work. Even though it is off from work when the general election is held, many people take advantage of the holiday by taking a vacation or doing other work. In addition, because the majority of the Getasan people are farmers, they use this opportunity to work in the fields and advantage their children who are on holiday to help in the fields. This should be considered in the future to inhibit the growth of abstentions.

The participation of public politics in the electoral process in the form of participation in the voting place (polling station) can be seen in Table 8.

Table 8 Participation in Polling Station Security

Category of answers	Frequency (People)	Percentage (%)
Yes	28	15,38
No	154	84,62
Total	182	100

From Table 8, it can be seen that the respondents who participated in the polling station securing 28 people (15,38%) by reason as the Hansip/Linmas, as the supervisor of the polling station, as a witness, as a successful team, as a good citizen for the smooth voting. Moreover, the participants who do not participate in the polling station security as much as 154 people (84,62%) for a reason there are guards and organizers.

The participation of public politics in the electoral process in the form of participation in the voting places in the polling stations (polling station) can be seen in Table 9.

Table 9 Participation in Vote Counting in Polling Station

Category of answers	Frequency (People)	Percentage (%)
Yes	57	31,32
No	125	68,68
Total	182	100

From Table 9, it can be seen that the respondents who participated in the vote-counting in the polling station as much as 57 people (31,32%) by reason as the Hansip/Linmas, as the supervisor polling station, as the committee, as a witness, as a successful team, as a good citizen so want to see and listen to the vote counting. Furthermore, 125 people (68,68%) do not participate in counting votes at the polling station with the reason there is already a committee who is supervising the results of elections. Generally, in the calculation of the ballot at the end of the election, it is followed by fathers who are concerned about the results of elections. In addition, successful teams from both sides (candidates) participate in the course of counting the ballot.

Based on the data of various political participation in the community of Getasan district in the election of Semarang district, it can be noted that the participation of the highest percentage (68,68%) is participating in voting, and the lowest is a participation in one political party (1,65%). More clearly, the percentage of community participation forms in Semarang district elections in 2015 can be seen in Table 10.

The forms of political participation carried out in Table 10 belong to conventional political participation in the form of voting, political discussions, campaign activities, forming and joining interest groups, and individual communication with political or administrative officials. This shows that people's attitudes in political participation are wider and are a form of consciousness to participate in a democratic feast.

The percentage of participation in the high voting of 182 respondents as the sample, also corresponds to the percentage of use of suffrage compared to the number of voters in the DPT (fixed selector list) for 13 villages in the Getasan sub-district as a population. It can be seen in Table 11.

Table 10 Forms of Political Participation in the Community of Getasan District in the Election of Semarang at 2015

Category of answers	Frequency (People)	Percentage (%)
Forms of political participation	Frequency (People)	65,93
Participation in one of the political parties	3	1,65
Participation in the Committee for regional elections	9	4,95
Participation in the socialization of candidate partners	8	4,40
Participation in a prospective partner campaign	5	2,75
Participation in a successful team of prospective partners	7	3,85
Participation in Polling Station Procurement	29	15,93
Participation in voting	125	68,68
Participation in polling station Security	28	15,38
Participation in vote counting in polling station	57	31,32

Table 11 The Percentage of Voting Rights in The Elections in 2015 of Each Village in The District of Getasan

Village	Final Voter list	Voters	Percentage (%)
Batur	5498	4889	88,92
Getasan	2265	1948	86
Jetak	3070	2457	80,03
Kopeng	5234	4820	92,09
Manggihan	1258	1010	80,28
Ngrawan	1129	969	85,82
Nogosaren	1167	1048	89,80
Poloboga	3187	2706	84,90
Samirono	1775	1454	81,91
Sumogawe	6192	5269	85,09
Tajuk	3061	2670	87,22
Tolokan	2205	1925	87,30
Wates	2319	2139	92,23
Total	38.360	33.304	86,82

Based on Table 11, it shows that the political participation of the community of the Getasan subdistrict in the form of the use of suffrage or participation in the vote is classified as high as 33,304 (86,82%). Participation in voting in each village is all above 80%. The highest participation is Wates village 92,23%, and Kopeng village is 92,09%. People in the district of Getasan are very enthusiastic at *pencoblosan* (voting). This also happened at the time of the election legislative year 2014; the community participation in the vote was also above 80%.

It has been stated in the introduction that the partner of the regent and deputy regent in Semarang district elections in 2015, there are two pairs of number 1 is the spouse of Mundjirin with Ngesti Nugraha, which is carried by PDIP, Gerindra, and PAN. Moreover, ordinal number 2 is Nur Jatmiko's partner with Mas'ud Ridwan, which is carried by PKB, Golkar, PKS, and Hanura. The use of community voting rights of Getasan to elect the spouse of the regent and deputy regent can be seen from the acquisition of votes of each prospective spouse, which can be seen in Table 12.

Table 12 Vote of Each Candidate in the Election of Semarang Year 2015 in The District of Getasan

Village	No. 1	No. 2	Invalid	Total Voters
Batur	4172	613	104	4889
Getasan	1755	143	50	1948
Jetak	1917	360	180	2457
Kopeng	4388	295	137	4820
Manggihan	916	70	24	1010
Ngrawan	891	32	46	969
Nogosaren	975	36	37	1048
Polobogo	2350	268	88	2706
Samirono	1226	154	74	1454
Sumogawe	4741	365	163	5269
Tajuk	2332	238	100	2670
Tolokan	1668	195	62	1925
Wates	2014	67	58	2139
Total	29345	2836	1123	33304

Based on Table 12, it shows that of the 33.304 users voting rights in the District of Getasan, the candidate's spouse number 1 gets 29.345 votes, and number 2 candidate pairs get 2836 votes, and invalid sound of 1123 votes. So the number 1 candidate receives a vote of 88,11%, and the couple's number 2 candidate receives a vote of 8,52% and an invalid sound of 3,37%.

The most votes for the number 1 candidate pair can be understood because the people of Getasan subdistrict are already very familiar with the candidate's spouse, Mundjirin is the regent of Semarang. In the election of 2015, he is the nomination of Semarang regent the second time, while Ngesti Nugraha is a native citizen of Getasan village. Thus the popularity of candidates affects the victory of the number 1 candidate in this Getasan subdistrict. Overall in Semarang district, the highest voice acquisition of Mundjirin and Ngesti is recorded in the district of Getasan, which is the hometown of Ngesti Nugraha, with 88,11% of the vote (29.345 votes). While in Ambarawa, where the domicile of the regent candidate Mundjirin, this pair grosses 66% of the vote of 15.488 votes.

The victory of number 1 candidate, Mundjirin and Ngesti Nugraha, is not only in the district of Getasan but overall in Semarang district with 65% of the vote (315.617 votes). From 19 sub-districts in Semarang regency, the number 1 candidate is superior in 18 sub-districts, only 1 sub-district, namely West Ungaran candidate number 2, Nur Jatmiko and Mas'ud Ridwan, is superior. The acquisition of the vote of the number 2 candidate is overall in the

Semarang district that is 35% (169.956 votes).

The number of voters in Semarang regency in the 2015 election amounted to 740.684, and the users the right of the election are 519.061 (70,08%). This shows that the political participation of the people in the Semarang district in the 2015 election amounted to 70,08%. When compared with the election in 2010, where the political participation of the Semarang district community is only 66%, in the election year 2015, it increases by about 4%. The number of voters in Semarang regency in the 2010 election amounts to 735.418, and the users the right of the election are 489.405 (66%). However, it is important to note that public political participation in the elections is in the form of participation in voting.

CONCLUSIONS

The political participation of the community in the district of Getasan at the elections in 2015 is a good place where the community participated in nine political activities. Based on the data of various political participation in the community of the Getasan subdistrict in the election of Semarang district of the research samples, the participation of the highest percentage (68,68%) is participating in the lowest voting and participation (1,65%) is a participation in one political party. People in the district of Getasan are enthusiastic during voting. Political participation in Getasan subdistricts proves that people have carried out political actions or participation in terms of conventional participation. However, it is a little offensive to non-conventional participation. It is just that people still do not know the political action repertory. Therefore it is necessary to socialize political participation, which emphasizes not only conventional participation but also emphasizes non-conventional participation.

The limitations of this research are found in the distribution of samples found in the field. In addition, researchers cannot find a correlation between money politics and political participation. This creates opportunities for further research and challenges to the field to further develop and ascertain findings in the field.

REFERENCES

- Adi, I. K., & Rahdriawan, M. (2016). Kajian partisipasi masyarakat dalam pengelolaan sanitasi berbasis masyarakat (PSBM) di kelurahan Mangunharjo, Semarang. *Jurnal Pengembangan Kota*, 4(2), 151-159. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.14710/jpk.4.2.151-159>.
- Hendrik, D. (2010). Variabel-variabel yang mempengaruhi rendahnya partisipasi politik masyarakat dalam pilkada walikota dan wakil walikota Padang tahun 2008. *Demokrasi*, 11(2), 137-148.
- Kusmanto, H. (2013). Peran Badan Permusyawaratan Daerah dalam meningkatkan partisipasi politik masyarakat. *Jurnal Ilmu Pemerintahan dan Sosial Politik*, 1(1), 39-47.
- Lihardja, N., Setiawan, K., & Suparman, M. Y. (2017). Partisipasi politik generasi muda Tionghoa pasca orde baru. *Conference on Management and Behavioral Studies*. Jakarta, Indonesia. pp 137-146.

- Maran, R. R. (2007). *Pengantar sosiologi politik*. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.
- Mas'ood, M. D. (2008). *Perbandingan sistem politik*. Yogyakarta: Gadjah mada University Press.
- Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldana, J. (2007). *Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook* (3rd Ed.). USA: Sage Publications.
- Najib, M. (2005). *Dasar-dasar ilmu politik*. Jakarta: PT Gramedia Pustaka Utama.
- Salman, F. A. (2015). Partisipasi politik belia secara 'online' melalui ruang demokrasi maklumat media baru. *Jurnal Komunikasi Malaysian Journal of Communication*, 31(1), 81-100.
- Suharyanto, A. (2014). Partisipasi politik masyarakat Tionghoa dalam pemilihan kepala daerah. *Jurnal Ilmu Pemerintahan dan Sosial Politik*, 2(2), 151-160. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.31289/jppuma.v2i2.920>.
- Wahyudi, H., Fernando, T., Ahmad, A., Khairani, A., & Fatimah. (2013). Peran kepercayaan politik dan kepuasan demokrasi terhadap partisipasi politik mahasiswa. *Jurnal Psikologi UIN Sultan Syarif Kasim*, 9(1), 94-99.
- Yustiningrum, E., Ichwanuddin, W. (2015). Partisipasi politik dan perilaku memilih pada Pemilu 2014. *Jurnal Penelitian Politik*, 12(1), 117-135. doi: <https://doi.org/10.14203/jpp.v12i1.533>.
- Yusuf, A. (2014). Pengaruh persepsi masyarakat pada caleg terhadap perilaku memilih dalam pemilihan legislatif 2014 di Sidoarjo. *Jurnal Review Politik*, 4(2), 272 – 292.