The Rationality of Preference in Presidential Candidates and Use of Social Media:
Study on Beginner Voters in Jakarta

Endang Setiowati

Vocational Education Program, Universitas Indonesia, Depok, Indonesia

Abstract: This study aims to examine how the beginner voter uses their rational choices to choose the presidential candidates, while the information from social media floods their pages. The number of beginner voters in both presidential and legislative members' election is quite significant, about 8% of total voters in 2019 elections. Beginner voters were prone to be politicized and made into political commodities to boost the popularity and electability of election contestants. One way to influence them is through social media, which is usually less accurate. The rational choice theory will be applied to analyze the rational choice to individual voter behaviour. The methodology of the study will be quantitative that will collect data from beginner voters regarding how rational they choose the presidential candidate. The result is that Jokowi's voters are more rational than Prabowo's voters. The study is expected to contribute to the development of campaign theory and also to politicians in influencing constituents.

1 INTRODUCTION

Beginner voters are community members that will be taking part in general elections for the first time. According to Law of the Republic of Indonesia, Number 42/2008 regarding the General Elections of the President and Vice President Article 1 point 21explained that those who have the right to vote in general elections are citizens Indonesia which has an age of 17 years or more. In regulations, the legislation also explained that married citizens even though he or she is not even 17 years old they have the right to elect in the presidential election. (Fachrudin, 2018) In the Potential Election Voters List (DP4) the number of beginner voters who will be 17 years old from 1 January 2018 to 17 April 2019 is 5,035,887 persons. (Andayani, 2018) However, the number of beginner voters in Presidential elections will be much more, since the beginner voters, in this case, are people who never vote for the presidential election in 2014, because they have not been 17 years old at that time. In this study, beginner voters were those who were not yet 17 years old on 9 July 2014 when the presidential election was held, until those who have been 17 years old on 17 April 2019 when elections will be held. Alternatively, those born on 10 July

1997 to 16 April 2002. According to Bambang Soesatyo, the chairman of the Indonesian House of Representative (DPR RI), the number of new voters in the 2019 election is as much as 8% or around 14 million people. (Sabran, 2018)

Beginner voters are considered to still unsTable in determining who will be elected for president. Critics often make it clear that young voters should not be involved in an election due to their inability to make a choice. Their choices often change. Research carried out in Austria, the only country that set the age of 16 as an election participant showed their failure to choose that was inexplicable. Their motivation to participate in elections tends to below, and if they choose, they are usually not different from their parents' choices. (Wagner, Johann, & Kritzinger, 2012)

The Executive Director of The Association for Elections and Democracy (Perludem) Titi Anggraeni said that young voters are indeed more than 50%, which if categorized until the age of 35, amounts to 79 million. Still, if it reaches 40 years, the number reaches 100 million. She explained that this millennial group has a political adaptation that is somewhat different from the older age groups. They are more dynamic and change their political

perceptions faster, primarily very influenced by the environment. (Sucianingsih, 2018)

The above statement is reinforced by research conducted by Damanik (2018) on "*WhatsApp and Beginner Voters in Medan City*" that was held in the North Sumatra Gubernatorial Election, concluded that the political participation of beginner voters of WhatsApp users had increased significantly. On the other side, the understanding of democracy was co-opted by the *political cleavage,* where their choices were more dependent on the social situation, family environment, relatives and peers, the influence of the pulpit and the written symbols of religion and ethnic groups. (Damanik., 2018)

Beginner voters who are millennials have the habit of using social media as a reference to find information. From the research conducted in 2018, it was found that on average, young people have more than one type of social media, and in each social media, they have more than one account. Ownership of social media accounts and anything that is done by respondents when using social media has more or less an impact on how they treat hoaxes and fake news when they get information from friends or other people. From this research, it was found that the most widely used social media was Instagram (58.8%) WhatsApp (24.4%), and Line (7.3%). When respondents get a piece of information that they think is interesting from social media the most (30.7%) do not sort or analyze first, whether or not the news needs to be spread. While those who read first and then analyze it whether it needs to be spread or not only 25.6%. These statistics mean that the possibility of spreading the hoaxes and/or fake news becomes increasingly viral. Especially with the response of the audience who chose to directly spread the information they got, without sorting and confirming whether the info was correct or not. This situation shows how hoaxes and fake news attacks are very easy to form the negative public opinion, and when public opinion has been formed, it is challenging to straighten it out. (Setiowati, 2018)

The anxiety and ignorance of the beginner voters in the election is what the political parties or presidential candidates aim. A large number of beginner voters can significantly increase vote acquisition. One of the political efforts to gain the beginner voters is by spreading the information regarding the presidential candidates through social media. One of the efforts carried out by the national campaign team of each presidential candidate was by making personal branding of the presidential candidates they carried out. According to Asri (2018) on "Anies Baswedan's Re-branding in Beginner

Voters in Gubernatorial Election of DKI Jakarta in 2017", they found that efforts to form candidate personal branding are not only the good branding for the candidate but also by creating bad branding for the opposing candidates. This effort is usually carried out using social media. (Asri, 2018)

Informing a good personal branding by displeasing an opponent can be done in several ways, among others are, first, unintentional reporting mistakes, for example, news that stated that Indonesia's debt in the Jokowi era reached the highest number. Secondly, false rumours do not originate from a particular news article. For example, there was news about Jokowi has an unreported overseas account. Thirdly, conspiracy theories are difficult to verify as true or false and typically originated by people who believe them to be true. For example, there was information regarding Jokowi as a member of the Communist Party (PKI), and he is of Chinese descent. Fourth, satire is unlikely to be misconstrued as factual. For example, there was information regarding Jokowi as Jokodok (Jokowi the Frog) and his constituents as Cebong (tadpole). Fifth, false statements were stated by politicians. For example, Ratna Sarumpaet was persecuted. Lastly, reports are slanted or misleading but not outright false (fake news is "distortion," not "filtering"). For example, there was news about seven containers of ballots that have been punched by candidate number 01. Some information is incorrect and shaped by video. In the video, a statement of prominent figures such the Pope supports Donald Trump or in Indonesia about KH Ahmad Dahlan who associates disasters that occur with the quality of leaders who are not trustees, or in the form of memes that spread through social media. (Allcott & Gentzkow, 2017)

Social media plays an increasingly important role in political communication campaign strategies by disseminating information about policies that will be carried out if won, support from respected community leaders, or also support from supporters of a candidate. The content of the message is, of course, a message construct that is tailored to the personal branding that they want to achieve for their candidates. From research carried out in the 2016 election of EU leaders, national language and message distribution by social media, volume and communication content during the campaign, as well as the factors that determine the adoption and use of social media by candidates, are things that are analyzed. Their findings show that the main candidates and their debate on television have a big influence on the volume and content of the communication. Another finding is that the content

and emotional tone that exists reflects preferences about the policies that have been implemented by incumbents. (Nulty, Theocaris, Popa, Parnet, & Benoit, 2016) Although some studies have shown that beginner voters choose their choices based on their living environment, peer groups, and parents, messages. Those reasons are constantly being conveyed from social media, which they receive more often than information from the parties mentioned above, certainly also affects their rationality in choosing a presidential candidate.

Based on the explanation above, this study will examine how the rationality of beginner voters is used in selecting presidential candidates, mainly because of a flood of misleading information about presidential candidates that is spreading in social media, in the upcoming elections in April 2019.

2 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The word "rational" is normative. Particularly if it is associated with rationality in choosing. Rationality consists of two components: Choice must be consistent, and it must be instrumental. A choice is rational if it is the best way to achieve something, which logically eventually becomes consistent. There is no assessment of whether the objectives are normatively good. In terms of preference for one presidential candidate, one's choice will be consistent if they have to choose which one they think is best or to follow their interests. For example, someone can consistently explain why he chose a presidential candidate and not choose another candidate. Even though he was given other information, he still believed that he rationally chose candidates who were always the same. Consistency is also related to utility. If beginner voters assume that by choosing a presidential candidate, they can accept a utility, then he will elect the presidential candidate. (McGann, 2016)

The second component of rationality is instrumental. In simple English, it means people do something for a reason. This assumption is not unique for people who apply the "rational choice" model. Indeed, Weber (1978) argues that this is important to do in all types of interpretive social sciences. To understand why someone does something, we have to ask what is the reason. If the citizens follow Weber's example, to interpret why someone chooses a presidential candidate, we must ask what the reason he chose the presidential candidate is. Weber argues that it is necessary to adopt the establishment of methodological rationalism to assume that the person

is rational and do interpretative social science. Of course, people might turn out to be irrational, but this can only be learned by trying to find a rational explanation and eliminate it. (McGann, 2016)

An assumption based on research conducted by Antunes (2010) that human behaviour when choosing consists of three basic premises, namely all decisions made either by voters or political parties are rational; triggered by their interests or interests, and reinforced by the principle of maximum usability. Democratic political systems show a degree of predictive consistency that supports the consequences of decisions made by voters and political parties. Therefore, their agents, voters, parties and governments are responsible and trustworthy. This state makes it possible to make predictions about the consequences, resulting from differences choice. The system assumes that regardless of the consistency, it has a degree of uncertainty for different choices. (Antunes, 2010)

To apply how rational the beginner voters are when choosing a president, two types of statements about the two presidential candidates will be submitted, both in the form of negative information and positive information that can be seen in the following matrix:

Table 1: Information that is spreading in social media.

Candidates	Negative Statement	Positive Statement
Joko Widodo	1. Member of Indonesian Communist Party (PKI)	1. A devout and righteous Muslim prays on time, any-where in the Musholla closest to where he is—visiting an area together with the people.
	2. Selling State Assets	2. Save the country's assets by acquiring 51% of Freeport's shares
	3. Increase State Debt	3. Paying off previous government debt and using new debt for

Candidates	Negative Statement	Positive Statement
		infrastructure development for the betterment of the people
	4. Siding with foreigners particularly China (foreign and non-local agents)	4. Jokowi wants Indonesia to be more independent by dissolving the Petral oil mafia and taking over management of the Mahakam block to be managed by Pertamina
	5. Anti-Islamic, anti-ulema, ban the call to prayer and abolish religious studies	5. Jokowi has always worked to improve the welfare of the people and the quality of Indonesian human resources so that they can compete with foreign workers globally.
Prabowo Subianto	1. Human rights violators by kidnapping and eliminating students or activists	1. A commander who is concerned with the interests of his soldiers
	2. Will bring back the New Order Era	2. Prabowo will bring people who are now getting poorer to become more prosperous
	3. Supporters of the caliphate in power	3. President selected based on the fall of ulema so that he can save the

Candidates	Negative Statement	Positive Statement
		oppressed Islam
	4. US accomplice because his brother Hasyim has promised the US parliament will put US interests first if Prabowo wins	4. If Prabowo does not become president, then Indonesia will be destroyed in 2030
	5. Have assets hidden in Panama Paper and control thousands of hectares of plantation land in Sumatra and Kalimantan	5. If Prabowo becomes the president of Indonesia, the state and the people of Indonesia will be more prosperous

In addition to negative and positive information, the consistency of votes is conveyed through several statements (Table 2).

Table 2: Consistency in Presidential Choice.

Jokowi	Prabowo
Although there is information that Jokowi is only imaging when visiting the people directly, I still believe that Jokowi is the best presidential candidate for Indonesia for doing his job sincerely for the people of Indonesia	Although there is information that Prabowo is suffering from Bipolar, so his emotions are often unsTable I still believe that Prabowo is the best presidential candidate for Indonesia
Although there is information that Jokowi is secretly actually engaging in several development projects, I believe that it is slander, because Jokowi is an honest person	Although there is information that Prabowo has the assets of corruption, collusion, and nepotism (KKN) from the Cendana family, I believe Prabowo will share his wealth with the people if he becomes president
Although there is information that Jokowi often uses state facilities	Although there is information that Prabowo's father was a

for personal use, I still believe that it is indeed the protocol standard for a president, because Jokowi and his family always get on an economy class plane when travelling for personal matters.	traitor to the nation by supporting the PRRI / Permesta separatist movement during the Soekarno era, I believe that Prabowo was a true nationalist who would defend the Indonesian nation and state

3 METHODOLOGY

Research carried out with a quantitative approach using google form. Samples were obtained with the Snowball Sampling technique in which the research period of one month was started from 12 March to 11 April 2019. During the down period, there were 189 respondents, but as many as 17 respondents did not have complete answers, so only 172 respondents were used.

Beginner voters are those who were not yet 17 years old on 9 July 2014 when the presidential election was held, until those who have been 17 years old on 17 April 2019 when elections were held. The criteria for respondents are that they must be aged between 17 and 22 years and for the first time in voting for the presidential election,

To measure respondents' answers, researchers used the Likert scale with four levels of agreement, i.e

1 - Strongly Disagree
2 - Disagree
3 - Agree
4 - Strongly Agree

To measure the level of validity of the results of the study used reliability with a minimum Cronbach alpha value of 0.6 and validity with a factor analysis measurement, based on a minimum KMO value of 0.5 with a maximum significance of 0.05. the results of the validity test are all reliable and valid. This results can be seen in Tables 3, 4, 5 and 6 below

Table 3: Reliability of Positive vs Negative Info.

	Reliability Negative info Jokowi	Reliability Negative info Prabowo	Reliability Positive info Jokowi	Reliability Positive info Prabowo
N	5	5	5	5
α Cronbach	0.968	0.951	0.953	0.836

Table 4: Reliability of Consistency in Choice.

	Reliability Consistency Jokowi	Reliability Consistency Prabowo
N	3	3
α Cronbach	0.725	0.921

KMO and Bartlett's Test		
Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		.745
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	3756.609
	df	78
	Sig.	.000

Figure 1: Validity Regarding Jokowi.

KMO and Bartlett's Test		
Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		.750
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	3578.704
	df	78
	Sig.	.000

Figure 2: Validity Regarding Prabowo.

4 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Information

The research obtained the youngest respondent was born on 24 October 2001, and the oldest was born on 16 July 1998/ The respondents consisted of 71 men (41.3%) and 101 women (58.7%). Their domiciles are 101 people in DKI Jakarta (58.7%), Bodetabek (outer Jakarta) 30 people (17.4%), and outside Jabodetabek (Jakarta and outer Jakarta) 41 people (23.8%). While their most professions are college/university students, namely 145 people (84.3%), high school students as many as 15 people (8.7%), and employees as many as 12 people (7.0%).

From the 172 respondents, 92 people (53.5%) chose Jokowi as president, while the remaining 80 people (46.5%) chose Prabowo as president.

A cross-table was conducted between their opinions on information about presidential candidates and their presidential choices to find out the rationality of respondents in determining presidential choices. The following results are obtained.

Table 7: Negative Info Regarding Jokowi.

Level of Agreement	Jokowi President	Prabowo President	Total
1	72	20	92
2	20	10	30
3	0	30	30
4	0	20	20
Total	92	80	172

From Table 7, we can see that all Jokowi voters disagree with the negative information circulating on social media. While some Prabowo voters agreed that negative information about Jokowi is as many as 50 people (62.5%), some disagreed that they are as many as 30 people (37.5%).

Table 8: Negative Info Regarding Prabowo.

Level of Agreement	Jokowi President	Prabowo President	Total
1	0	50	50
2	10	20	30
3	32	10	42
4	50	0	50
Total	92	80	172

From Table 8 above, it appears that the majority of Prabowo voters as many as 70 people (87.5%) disagree with negative information about Prabowo circulating on social media. Meanwhile, 82 people (89.1%) of Jokowi's voters agreed with negative information about Prabowo. However, there are ten people (12.5%) Prabowo voters agree with negative information about Prabowo, while there are ten people (10.9%) Jokowi voters disagree with negative info about Prabowo circulating on social media.

Table 9: Positive Info Regarding Jokowi.

Level of Agreement	Jokowi President	Prabowo President	Total
1	0	10	10
2	0	30	30
3	20	40	60
4	72	0	72
Total	92	80	172

From Table 9, it appears that all Jokowi voters believe in positive information about Jokowi circulating on social media. Uniquely, Prabowo's voters of 40 people (50%) also believed in positive information about Jokowi while the other 50% do not trust positive information about Jokowi.

Table 10: Positive Info Regarding Prabowo.

Level of Agreement	Jokowi President	Prabowo President	Total
1	20	0	20
2	62	50	112
3	10	20	30
4	0	10	10
Total	92	80	172

From Table 10 above, it appears that the majority of Jokowi's voters, as many as 82 people (89%) do not believe in positive information about Prabowo

circulating on social media. Meanwhile, Prabowo's voters are also in the majority. Namely, 50 people (62.5%) do not believe in negative information about Prabowo. Ten Jokowi voters believe in positive information about Prabowo, while 30 voters believe in positive information about Prabowo (37.5%).

4.2 Consistency

Table 11 shows how respondents will continue to elect Jokowi's president despite the negative issues concerning Jokowi. From Table 10, it can be seen that the majority of Jokowi's voters, namely 82 people (89%) decided to continue to vote for Jokowi. However, the funny thing is there are 30 people (37.5%) Prabowo voters agree that Jokowi deserves to be elected president.

Table 11: Consistency on Jokowi.

Level of Agreement	Jokowi President	Prabowo President	Total
1	0	0	0
2	10	50	60
3	30	30	60
4	52	0	52
Total	92	80	172

Table 12: Consistency in Prabowo.

Level of Agreement	Jokowi President	Prabowo President	Total
1	50	10	60
2	32	20	52
3	10	30	40
4	0	20	20
Total	92	80	172

From Table 12 above, it appears that the majority of Jokowi's supporters, namely 82 people (89%) do not trust Prabowo as president, while Prabowo voters who believe in Prabowo deserve to be president only 50 people (62.5%). The rest, however, did not believe that Prabowo was worthy of being president.

Rationality consists of two components: Choice must be consistent, and it must be instrumental. A choice is rational if it is the best way to achieve something, which logically eventually becomes consistent. In terms of preference for one presidential candidate, one's choice will be consistent if they have to choose which one they think is best or to follow their interests. Even though he was given other information, he still believed that he rationally chose candidates who were always the same. Consistency is also related to utility. If beginner voters assume that by choosing a presidential candidate, they can accept a utility, then he will elect the presidential candidate.

Jokowi voters do feel that by choosing Jokowi, they will get tangible benefits because, in the first period of his leadership, it has been seen that the differences made by Jokowi in Indonesia have a very positive impact on the equality of the people's welfare in eastern Indonesia and the border areas. The number of respondents who chose Jokowi was always consistent at a minimum of 89%. While Prabowo's voters appear to have been inconsistent because, in some positive statements about Jokowi, around 37.5% agreed or believed positive things about Jokowi.

The second component of rationality is instrumental. In simple English, it means people do something for a reason. If seen from what the reasons they continue to vote for Jokowi, they also show their consistency, which is whatever the issue, they still believe in Jokowi and still choose Jokowi. However, Prabowo's voters seemed unsure of his choice because around 37.5% believed Jokowi who deserves to be president (Tables 11 and 12).

5 CONCLUSION

Rationality consists of consistency and necessary components. In this case, the beginner voter who chose Jokowi was more consistent in choosing Jokowi as president, compared to the beginner voter who chose Prabowo. Meanwhile, instrumental also shows the reasons for Jokowi's voters who are more fixed in choosing Jokowi rather than Prabowo's voters. It can be concluded that Jokowi's voters are more rational than Prabowo's voters.

This finding can be a reference for further research on beginner voters, primarily to find out the reasons why voters are inconsistent with their political choices.

REFERENCES

Allcott, H., & Gentzkow, MH (2017), Social Media and Fake News in The 2016 Election, *Journal of economic Perspectives, 31 (Number 2 - Spring 2017), 211-236*

Andayani, D. (2018, September 17). *Ada 5 Juta Pemilih Pemula di Pemilu 2019*. llcott, H.. & Gent(Detik.Com) Retrieved January 24, 2019, from https://news.detik.com/berita/d-4215354/ada-5-juta-pemilih-pemula-di-pemilu-2019

Antunes, R. J. (2010). Theoretical Models of Voting Behavior. *Exedra , 4*, 145-170.

Asri, R. (2018). Re-Branding Personal Anies Baswedan Di Kalangan Pemilih Pemula" Analisis Isi Kampanye "tweet jahat" Paslon Anies - Sandi pada PILKADA DKI 2017. In *Media dan Dinamika Sosial Politik Indonesia - ISBN : 978-602-7369-07-8* (pp. 93-110). Purwokerto: FISIP Universitas Jenderal Soedirman bekerjasama dengan Yayasan Literasi Bangsa.

Damanik., E. L. (2018). WHATSAPP DAN PEMILIH PEMULA DI KOTA MEDAN: Partisipasi Politik Era Demokrasi Digital pada Pemilihan Gubernur Provinsi Sumatera Utara 2018. *The Journal of Society & Media , 2*(2), 81-108.

Fachrudin, A. (2018, October 3). *Menyelamatkan Pemilih Pemula*. (Detik.Com) Retrieved December 5, 2018, from https://news.detik.com/kolom/4240110/menyelamatkan-pemilih-pemula

McGann, A. (2016, August). *Voting Choice and Rational Choice.* Retrieved 18 January, 2019, from http://oxfordre.com/politics/view/10.1093/acrefore/9780190228637.001.0001/acrefore-9780190228637-e-79?print=pdf

Nulty, P., Theocaris, Y., Popa, S. A., Parnet, O., & Benoit, K. (2016). Social Media and Plitical Communication in the 2014 Elections to The European Parliament. *Electoral Studies, 44*(429e444), 429-444.

Sabran, A. (2018, April 6). *14 Juta Pemilih Pemula di 2019 Diharap Tidak Golput*. (Wartakota Live.com) Retrieved January 24, 2019, from http://wartakota.tribunnews.com/2018/04/06/14-juta-pemilih-pemula-di-2019-diharap-tidak-golput

Setiowati, E. (2018). Bagaimana Mahasiswa Membedakan dan Memperlakukan Hoax serta Fake News: Studi tentang Mahasiswa Komunikasi di Jakarta. *Jambore Nasional Komunikasi II - 2018 Optimalisasi Sinergi Pendidikan Tinggi Ilmu Komunikasi dengan Industri di Era Digital.* Jakarta.

Sucianingsih, A. A. (2018, August 15). *Pemilih pemula dominasi pemilu 2019, apa dampaknya?* (Kontan.Co.Id) Retrieved December 5, 2018, from https://nasional.kontan.co.id/news/pemilih-pemula-dominasi-pemilu-2019-apa-dampaknya

Wagner, M., Johann, D., & Kritzinger, S. (2012). Voting at 16: Turnout and the Quality of Vote Choice. *Journal of Electoral Studies, 31*, 372-383.