Political Participation and Socioeconomic Status (SES) the Governor Election in Kepulauan Riau

Mirza Ayunda Pratiwi*, Rizqi Apriani Putri, Mahadiansar Mahadiansar
Universitas Maritim Raja Ali Haji, Indonesia.
*mirzaayunda@umrah.ac.id

Abstract

Political participation is an individual activity that may affect a country's or government's political policy. Political participation in democracy takes many forms, such as voting, establishing a political group, engaging in legal or illegal protests, campaign involvement, discussing politics offline or online, or becoming a political party member. The term political participation in this study refers to voting participation. Voter participation is important because it creates a political and democratic climate that encourages people to participate actively in state administration. To determine strategies and policies to increase voter participation, what factors can influence someone to vote can be seen. One factor that influences a person's desire to participate in politics is a person's socioeconomic status. Therefore, this study examines how Socioeconomic Status (SES) influences political participation. Political participation in this study is seen from whether the permanent voters (DPT) exercise their right to vote in the 2020 gubernatorial election. The SES consists of socioeconomic status, which is seen from: demographic background (social status, including age, ethnicity, educational background, and religion); economic status of the average income of voters per month. Krejcie Morgan sampling method, 384 respondents were processed with Eviews 11 software using logit regression model analysis. This study found three variables significantly affect the dependent variable: Ethnic, residential election participation, and trust level in the candidate. This study recommends that the strategies used in the efforts to enhance political participation of the Riau Islands community in the regional head election are: forming volunteers democracy, dividing four segments of socialization, improving the quality of the organizing committee resources by conducting technical guidance, aggressively achieving political socialization, political publications, and the delivery of the stages of the elections using various social media platform. Moreover, implementing Good Governance will produce output from society's most economical market mechanisms. Thus, it is expected that people's political awareness will be enhanced.

Keywords: Political Participation; SES; Governor Election; Kepulauan Riau

Abstrak

Partisipasi politik adalah kegiatan individu yang dapat mempengaruhi kebijakan politik suatu negara atau pemerintah. Partisipasi politik dalam demokrasi memiliki banyak bentuk, seperti pemungutan suara, membentuk kelompok politik, terlibat dalam protes legal atau ilegal, keterlibatan kampanye, mendiskusikan politik secara offline atau online, atau menjadi anggota partai politik. Istilah partisipasi politik dalam penelitian ini merujuk pada partisipasi pemungutan suara. Partisipasi pemilih menjadi penting karena menciptakan iklim politik dan demokrasi yang mendorong masyarakat untuk terlibat aktif dalam penyelenggaraan negara. Untuk menentukan strategi dan kebijakan dalam meningkatkan partisipasi pemilih dapat diketahui faktor-faktor apa saja yang dapat mempengaruhi seseorang untuk memilih. Salah satu faktor yang mempengaruhi keinginan seseorang untuk berpartisipasi dalam politik adalah status sosial ekonomi

seseorang. Oleh karena itu penelitian ini mengkaji bagaimana Socio-Economic Status (SES) mempengaruhi partisipasi politik. Partisipasi politik dalam penelitian ini dilihat dari apakah pemilih tetap (DPT) menggunakan hak pilihnya pada pemilihan gubernur tahun 2020. SES terdiri dari status sosial ekonomi, yang dilihat dari: latar belakang demografis (status sosial, termasuk usia, etnis, latar belakang pendidikan, dan agama); status ekonomi pendapatan rata-rata pemilih per bulan. Metode pengambilan sampel Krejcie Morgan, 384 responden diolah dengan software Eviews 11 menggunakan analisis model regresi logit. Penelitian ini menemukan tiga variabel yang secara signifikan mempengaruhi variabel dependen: etnis, partisipasi pemilihan perumahan, dan tingkat kepercayaan pada kandidat. Kajian ini merekomendasikan bahwa strategi yang digunakan dalam upaya meningkatkan partisipasi politik masyarakat Kepri dalam pilkada adalah: membentuk demokrasi relawan, membagi empat segmen sosialisasi, meningkatkan kualitas sumber daya panitia penyelenggara dengan melakukan bimtek, melakukan sosialisasi politik secara gencar, publikasi politik, dan penyampaian tahapan pilkada dengan menggunakan berbagai platform media sosial. Selain itu penerapan Good Governance akan menghasilkan output dari mekanisme pasar masyarakat yang paling ekonomis. Dengan demikian, diharapkan kesadaran politik masyarakat akan meningkat.

Kata Kunci: Partisipasi Politik*; SES*; Pemilihan Gubernur; Kepulauan Riau

Introduction

People's sovereignty indicates implementing the highest state power in a democratic regime (Soifer, 2012). It participates in political activities manifested in its involvement in the democratic party or election (Ekman & Amnå, 2012). A high level of political participation means a high level of understanding and participation in government activities. Otherwise, low political participation indicates that fewer people appreciate and are interested in government issues or activities. The people not interested in political participation will tend to be apathetic and abstain from voting in elections (Dahl et al., 2017).

Therefore, the level of political participation does not merely reflect the fruitfulness of implementing a democratic system but also shows how much the public trusts and satisfies government performance. Political participation in a country reflects the people's quality of life (Weitz-Shapiro & Winters, 2008). They found a positive relationship between political participation and the level of life satisfaction, meaning that people who are satisfied with their lives tend to be more willing to vote in the election (Peverill et al., 2021; Scherer & Siddiq, 2019).

Political participation in democracy takes many forms, such as voting, establishing a political group, engaging in legal or illegal protests, campaign involvement, discussing politics offline or online, or becoming a political party member (Karp & Banducci, 2016). However, the term political participation in this study refers to voting participation. This is because voting participation involves a massive of people. Investigating political participation through voting will be more accessible and efficient. In Indonesia, the voting turnout in general elections from 1955-1999 was relatively high, and the abstention number was less than 10% (Dienaputra, 2012).

Political participation is an individual's activities influencing political decisions or general policies: public opinion, polls, general elections, and direct democracy (Purnama & Dewi, 2020). Political participation is the activity of citizens who act as individuals, influencing the Government's decision-making (Huntington & Nelson, 1994). Regular participation is individual or collective, organized or spontaneous, steady or sporadic,

peaceful or violent, legal or illegal, effective or ineffective. Political participation is a person or group actively participating in political activities by selecting the state's leadership (Wardhani, 2018). This activity includes voting in general elections, attending general meetings, becoming a party or interest group member, and establishing contact with government officials or parliament members. Political participation explicitly interprets the political participation of an individual in society voluntarily to participate in the election process to elect public officials, either directly or indirectly, in determining public policy (Deth, 2014).

Some researchers found a negative relationship of political participation with their socioeconomic status (SES). A negative relationship means higher SES is reluctant to participate in politics. The researchers who found a positive relationship state that people with high SES are likelier to participate in politics. The results' difference depends on conditions and situations, seen from a location, political culture, parties, demographic conditions, and candidate leaders. These factors may influence differences in the relationship between political participation and SES.

Socioeconomic Status (SES) is the ability to meet daily needs from the income earned, which plays a role in determining social status in society's structure (Williams, 1990). SES comprises five elements: status in community life, employment status, kinship system, position status, and religious status (Nasir & Kalla, 2017; Zablocki & Kanter, 1976). It is that four factors affect a person's socioeconomic status. First is education; higher education tends to have a better intellectual level and critical thinking to provide prerequisites for a better life (Hsieh & Huang, 2014). The second is work or livelihood; work is a unit of activity a person or group carries out to produce goods or services. The third is income; it is all revenue, either in the form of money or goods. The income received by a person can achieve from various sources in fulfilling their needs. Fourth is social status; social status means a particular role in their career or work. For example, a person with a highly prestigious job considered by society will have greater power and be more respected by the community. Therefore, socioeconomic status can act as a condition that describes a person's position in a community based on the type of work occupied, income earned and economic capacity, and material ownership such as valuables (houses, land, vehicles, assets) and education level.

Other variables that may affect political participation can also be seen in two factors that affect political or voting participation, long-term and short-term. Long-term factors, such as an individual's personality, identity, or extraordinary nature, could not change significantly over time (Pratiwi & Fahmi, 2012). Alternatively, it may also be called individual characteristics such as; age, gender, ethnicity, religion, marital status, geography, and ideological values. On the other hand, the short-term factors could change significantly over time, such as leadership, political attitude, campaign, issues, and the media or information.

Political participation in Indonesia is quite interesting to discuss. Indonesia is a country that has many regions at various levels. The condition of political participation in each region/district in Indonesia has varied results and issues due to geographical, multicultural, and demographic backgrounds. On 9th December 2020, the General Election Commission (KPU) held simultaneous local leader elections in Indonesia's 270 regions, consisting of 9 provinces, 224 districts, and 37 cities (Sulistyo et al., 2021).

In 2019-2020, Indonesia witnessed significant political engagement and relatively high voter turnout during important electoral events. Notably, the presidential election in 2019 saw many eligible voters exercising their democratic right to cast ballots. The presidential elections are critical in determining the country's leadership, and citizens' active participation demonstrated their commitment to the democratic process.

Additionally, local elections in various regions contributed to overall political participation in Indonesia during this period, as citizens actively elected their regional leaders, such as governors, mayors, and regents. Factors like increased political awareness, voter education initiatives, and accessible polling stations likely encouraged citizens to participate in the electoral process.

Some regions reported that they have a low voter turnout. Previously, the KPU suspected that the Covid-19 pandemic would increase the number of abstentions. However, some regions had low voter turnout in the period when the Covid-19 pandemic had not happened yet. As it occurs in Medan, voter turnout has only 45.78%, which means that the number of abstentions exceeds 50% of the final voter list. On the other hand, the number of abstentions has declined from the previous period (2015), which reached 74.44%. A few abstentions also occurred in several regions: Tangerang Selatan, Depok, Denpasar, Surabaya, and Kediri, with an abstention number of more than 40% (Saputra, 2020).

In Kepulauan Riau Province, six regions also conduct local leader elections for 2021-2025 in addition to the governor election. A recent election was conducted in Bintan, Karimun, Anambas, Lingga, Natuna, and Mayor election was conducted in Batam. As a result, the voter turnout for the governor election 2020 is 66.55%, which is quite impressive. Moreover, voter turnout has increased; 2005, 2010, and 2015 were1.97%, were 53.15%, and 55.41% (Ernel & Kosandi, 2019). On the other hand, low voter turnout in the gubernatorial election also appeared in West Sumatra, Central Kalimantan, South Kalimantan, and Jambi; respectively, the voter turnout was 61.50%, 61.66%, 65.10%, and 67.82%.

Therefore observing political participation is quite impressive, especially in the Kepulauan Riau, where the voter turnout has been relatively low for the last 1.5 decades. This study focuses on how an individual's social and economic status can affect the probability of participating in politics. Many researchers believe a relationship exists between political participation and socioeconomic status (SES) (Baker, 2014; Dohrenwend, 1990). This study also adopted the variables used in (Pratiwi & Fahmi, 2012), where the research object was in Karimun Regency during the regional head election. The SES of individuals could affect political knowledge, interests, attention to politics, attitudes, and beliefs toward the Government. However, the researchers have no consensus regarding the relationship between political participation and SES.

Method

This research uses a mixed-mode method of quantitative and qualitative. Quantitative methods use descriptive analysis and logit regression (Creswell & Creswell, 2018). The study population is all final voter list (DPT) in Kepulauan Riau Province, which is 1,168,188. Using the Kretjie Morgan sampling formula with an error rate of 5%, the sample size was 384 respondents. Primary data was collected via a Google form and distributed online—logit regression analysis to determine the individual probability of voting in the election and proceeded by reviews software. The regression model can be in equation 1. The dependent variable is a dummy variable that states whether a person will vote, with binary choices, namely 1 = yes and 0 = no. Independent variables consist of individual attributes, socioeconomic attributes, and political attributes. The definition of each variable can be in Table 1.

$$VOTE_i = [1/(1-P_i] = C + \alpha_1 AGE_i + \alpha_2 AGE2 + \alpha_3 GDR_i + \alpha_4 ETH_i + \alpha_5 RELG_i + \beta_1 RSDNC_i + \beta_2 INC_i + \beta_2 LA_i + \beta_2 YOS_i + \delta_1 PEP_i + \delta_2 TRST_i + \varepsilon_i$$

Logit regression analysis can only explain the mathematical relationship represented as probability numbers. So qualitative studies need to enrich the analysis of quantitative results. Qualitative analysis uses in-depth interviews with selected people who participated or did not participate in gubernatorial elections. They were interviewed secretly by asking about their reasons for voting or not in a gubernatorial election. The literature review enriches the qualitative analysis.

Table 1. Definition of Variable

Variable	Description
I	Individual (i)
$\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3, \alpha_4, \alpha_5, \beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3, \beta_4, \delta_1, \delta_2,$	Parameters
Dependent	
VOTE	Governor Election Participation, 1= Voting 0=No
Individual Attributes	
AGE	Age of Respondent in 2020
AGE^2	Age of Respondent in 2020 with quadratic function
GDR	Gender, 1=Female 0=Male
ETH	Ethnic, 1=Malay 0=Not Malay
RELG	Religion, 1=Moslem 0=Not Moslem
Socioeconomic status	
RSDNC	Years of Life, 1= more than 10years 0=less than ten years
INC	Income, 1= more than regional minimum wage, 0= less than
LA	Living area, 1=Urban 0=Rural
YOS	Years of School, 1= more than 12 years, 0=less than
Political attribute	
PEP	Presidential Election Participation, 1=Yes 0=No
TRST	Trust level to a candidate, 1= Strongly distrust, seven firmly trust

Result and Discussion
1. Statistics Summary

The research questionnaire to people who registered on the final voter list in Kepulauan Riau Out of 384 respondents, 89% of respondents voted for the governor election, and 11% did not. In addition, 56% of respondents trusted the candidate they had elected, 18% untrust with the candidate, and 26% were indecisive. Respondents for those who did not vote stated various reasons; they did not trust the governor candidate; had insufficient information and were unfamiliar with the governor candidate; worried or disappointed by the elected candidate, and prevent from voting because they were outside the region the day of the election. Participation in the presidential election was also relatively high, 85% of respondents voted, and 15% did not vote.

Respondents consist of 43% male and 57% female. 51% of the respondents are Malay, and the remaining 49% are non-Malay ethnics. 86% of respondents are Muslim, and 14% are not Muslim. 44% of respondents attended school for more than 12 years, 56% for less than 12 years, and some did not even complete primary school. 44% of respondents lived in urban areas, and 55% lived in rural areas. Surprisingly the

respondents have a monthly income of more than the regional minimum wage, only 35, whereas 65% have an income less than the regional minimum wage or less than 3 million per month.

2. Logit Regression

It is allowed to make Sub Sections (if required) within each section. An author can add relevant Sub Sections, and the title must be relevant to the content. In this study, the dependent variable consists of two options, 1 and 0. The Likelihood Ratio (LR) must be the model's initial testing. LR test to know whether all independent variables in the model simultaneously affect the dependent variable. The test compares the LR-statistics value with chi-square ($\chi2$) values obtained from the chi-square distribution table with df = k=11. The criteria if LR-stat > $\chi2$-table, so the null hypothesis is rejected. The estimation result's LR statistic is 115.2324, and the chi-square value for probability 0.05, 0.01, and 0.001 each are 19.68, 24.73, and 31.26. So the LR-Stat has a more excellent value than chi-square values, meaning that at least one independent variable simultaneously affects the dependent variable.

Variable	Coefficient	Antilog	Mean	MEM
VOTE				
C	-4.3285	0.0132		
AGE	0.0535	1.0550	29.3912	0.0016
			1017.000	
AGE^2	-0.0006	0.9994	0	
GDR	0.1383	1.1483	0.5697	0.1340
ETH	1.182486*	3.2625	0.5134	1.1462
RSDNC	-0.3907	0.6766	0.9120	-0.3787
INC	-0.3250	0.7226	0.3496	-0.3150
LA	-0.1054	0.9000	0.5575	-0.1022
RELG	-0.4361	0.6466	0.9487	-0.4227
YOS	-0.6327	0.5311	0.4352	-0.6133
PEP	2.062979*	7.8694	0.8533	1.9997
TRST	1.173029*	3.2318	4.7873	0.0349

MEM= marginal Effect of Mean
*significant at 5%

Furthermore, McFadden's R-squared also must be tested. McFadden's R-square tends to be smaller than the R-square, but in the most practical application, the R2 range is 0.2 to 0.6, and values of 0.2 to 0.4 are considered highly satisfactory (Gujarati & Porter, 2003). Small R2 is not a problem because the logit and qualitative response models are generally not essential and challenging to interpret. The categorical variable McFadden's R2 of logit estimation is 0.406476, which means the model is considered highly satisfactory. By using the model in equation 1, transform the coefficient number to the model, and it in the following equation:

$$VOTE_i = [1/(1-P_i] = -4.3285 + 0.0535AGE_i - 0.0006AGE2 + 0.1383GDR_i + 1.182486ETH_i - 0.4361RELG_i - 0.3907RSDNC_i - 0.3250INC_i - 0.1054 - 0.6327YOS_i - 0.6327PEP_i + 1.173029TRST_i + \varepsilon_i$$

The dependent variable (VOTE) is the political participation implemented by participation in the gubernatorial election in 2020. The answer choices are 1 and 0, 1 for those who vote in the governor election, and 0 if they do not. The estimation results show that three independent variables significantly affect the dependent variable, i.e., Ethnic (ETH), presidential election participation (PEP), and trust level in the candidate (TRST). The logit estimation coefficient's interpretation was unfamiliar and not attractive, and it is better to interpret the antilog or odds ratio. In the logit model, the slope coefficient of the variable gives the change in the log of the odds associated with a unit change in the variable, holding all other variables constant (Gujarati & Porter, 2003). The odds ratio is in Table 2. So this interpretation is based on the odds ratio number instead of its coefficient.

In the individual characteristics factor, there are five independent variables, i.e., age (AGE), age in quadratic function (AGE2), gender (GDR), ethnicity (ETH), and religion (RELG). Ethnic (ETH) is the only variable that significantly affects political participation. The positive coefficient and odd ratio inform that the probability of voting in Malay is more significant than 3.2625 in non-Malay. Although other variables were not significant, their interpretation needs to explain. AGE opportunity for voting on a year older voter is 0.0132 greater than younger voters. AGE2 (0.003) is an age variable with a quadratic function with an open-down parabolic pattern. The maximum age number with the lowest probability could get from the calculation –b/2a, where b is the AGE coefficient, and b is the AGE2 coefficient. So, -0.0535/2(-0.0006) equals -42.8136 simplified to 43, which means that before the voters are 43 years old, their probability of voting will decrease. Still, after the age of 43, their probability of participating in voting will increase by 0.9994.

Public participation can determine the wisdom of Government for every citizen through elections. The existence of these elections can accommodate a more democratic political system. The election of public officials in this case study, the 2020 Riau Islands gubernatorial election, is directly considered a democratization process—direct elections by the people to increase the legitimacy of the selection of public officials (Riantoby, 2021). Direct elections as evidence of building a decent government (Good Governance). Political participation is a form of influence from future political decision-making. Implementing Good Governance will produce output from society's most economical market mechanisms. Thus, it is expected that people's political awareness will be high. The implementation of the election system must be free from various interests so that accountability and fairness will be created. People's political participation will be the control of a government. Therefore, good Governance is needed to improve the quality of people's political participation to avoid various election irregularities.

In 2020, there is still a COVID-19 pandemic. Even so, the General Election will still be held because no one can predict when this pandemic will end, and the five years of regional head leadership must be changed. Thus, this gubernatorial election will still be carried out by implementing strict health protocols. In the 2020 Governo Election, there are several proposed candidates. Governor Election in Kepulauan Riau 2020, of the three candidates, the number 3 pairs, namely Ansar-Marlin, won the 2020 governor election contest in Kepulauan Riau with a result of 43.9%. There are three variables in the relationship between socioeconomic status and community participation in the General Elections: Education, low income, and Rough workers (Putra & Adnan, 2019; Vargo & Hopp, 2016)

Conclusion

These three variables can determine political involvement in the 2020 Governor Election in the Kepulauan Riau. In the questionnaire that researchers conducted from 384 respondents, 89% of respondents voted for the gubernatorial election, and 11% did not. In addition, 56% of respondents trusted the candidate they had chosen, 18% did not trust the candidate, and 26% hesitated to participate politically in the 2020 Riau Islands Gubernatorial Election contest. The number of people in the Riau Islands who did not participate in the general election can be analyzed based on variables in socioeconomic status that play a role in increasing community participation in the 2020 Governor election in Kepulauan Riau.

Political participation based on social and economic status shows that there is still disparity regarding social status in a society where people exercise their right to vote based on high social status. Political participation is an individual activity influencing political policies and the state or Government. Apart from that, political participation is also citizen involvement in all stages of policy, from decision-making to decision evaluation, including opportunities to implement decisions to determine their choices in regional leadership. The significance of voter participation will build a political and democratic climate that encourages people to be actively involved in administering the state. It can be concluded that the strategies used in the efforts of the political participation of the Riau Islands community in the regional head election are: forming volunteers Democracy, dividing four segments of socialization, improving the quality of the organizing committee resources by conducting technical guidance, aggressively conducting political socialization, political publications, and the delivery of the stages of the elections using social media.

References

Baker, E. H. (2014). Socioeconomic Status, Definition. In *The Wiley Blackwell Encyclopedia of Health, Illness, Behavior, and Society*. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (Fifth). Sage Publications.

Dahl, V., Amnå, E., Banaji, S., Landberg, M., Šerek, J., Ribeiro, N., Beilmann, M., Pavlopoulos, V., & Zani, B. (2017). Apathy or alienation? Political passivity among youths across eight European Union countries. *European Journal of Developmental Psychology*, *15*(3), 284–301.

Deth, J. W. van. (2014). A conceptual map of political participation. *Acta Politica*, *49*(3), 349–367.

Dienaputra, R. D. (2012). Dinamika Penggunaan Banteng Dalam Lambang Partai-Partai Politik (1955-1999): Kajian Sejarah Visual. *Patanjala: Journal of Historical and Cultural Research*, *4*(2), 214–226.

Dohrenwend, B. P. (1990). Socioeconomic status (SES) and psychiatric disorders. *Social Psychiatry and Psychiatric Epidemiology*, *25*(1), 41–47.

Ekman, J., & Amnå, E. (2012). Political participation and civic engagement: Towards a new typology. *Human Affairs*, *22*(3), 283–300.

Ernel, N. N., & Kosandi, M. (2019). Low Voter Turnout in Kepulauan Riau Province Gubernatorial Election. *Proceedings of the First International Conference on Administration Science*, 417–422.

Gujarati, D., & Porter, D. C. (2003). *Basic econometrics*. McGrew Hill Book Co.

Hsieh, H. H., & Huang, J. T. (2014). The Effects of Socioeconomic Status and Proactive Personality on Career Decision Self-Efficacy. *The Career Development Quarterly*, *62*(1), 29–43.

Huntington, S. P., & Nelson, J. M. (1994). *Partisipasi politik di negara berkembang*. PT Rineka Cipta.

Karp, J. A., & Banducci, S. A. (2016). Party Mobilization and Political Participation in New and Old Democracies. *Party Politics*, *13*(2), 217–234.

Nasir, R., & Kalla, A. K. (2017). Kinship System, Fertility and Son Preference among the Muslims: A Review. *The Anthropologist*, *8*(4), 275–281.

Peverill, M., Dirks, M. A., Narvaja, T., Herts, K. L., Comer, J. S., & McLaughlin, K. A. (2021). Socioeconomic status and child psychopathology in the United States: A meta-analysis of population-based studies. *Clinical Psychology Review*, *83*, 101933.

Pratiwi, M. A., & Fahmi, M. (2012). Socio Economic Background and Political Participation: The Case of Karimun Regency. *Academia.Edu*, 1–11.

Purnama, R., & Dewi, M. T. F. (2020). Pengaruh Status Sosial Ekonomi Terhadap Partisipasi Politik Pemilihan Umum Kepala Daerah Pada Masyarakat Kecamatan Langensari Kota Banjar Tahun 2018. *Moderat: Jurnal Ilmiah Ilmu Pemerintahan*, *6*(2), 245–256.

Putra, A. N. E., & Adnan, M. F. (2019). Hubungan Status Sosial Ekonomi dengan Tingkat Partisipasi Politik Masyarakat Dalam Pemilihan Walikota Padang Tahun 2018. *Jurnal Teori Dan Riset Administrasi Publik*, *3*(1), 18–27.

Riantoby, A. O. (2021). Pilkada 2020 & Covid 19; Partisipasi politik dan perilaku pemilih dalam pendekatan Budaya Politik. *Jurnal Bawaslu Provinsi Kepulauan Riau*, *3*(1), 85–121.

Saputra, M. G. (2020). *Deretan Panggung Pilkada Dimenangkan Golput*. Merdeka.Com. https://www.merdeka.com/peristiwa/deretan-panggung-pilkada-dimenangkan-golput.html

Scherer, R., & Siddiq, F. (2019). The relation between students' socioeconomic status and ICT literacy: Findings from a meta-analysis. *Computers & Education*, *138*, 13–32.

Soifer, H. D. (2012). State Power and the Economic Origins of Democracy. *Studies in Comparative International Development*, *48*(1), 1–22.

Sulistyo, A. Q. P., Santoso, A., & Usman, U. (2021). Neutrality of the State Civil Apparatus in the Democratic Party of Regional Head Election (Pilkada). *Unnes Law Journal: Jurnal Hukum Universitas Negeri Semarang*, *7*(2), 203–224.

Vargo, C. J., & Hopp, T. (2016). Socioeconomic Status, Social Capital, and Partisan Polarity as Predictors of Political Incivility on Twitter. *Social Science Computer Review*, *35*(1), 10–32.

Wardhani, P. S. N. (2018). Partisipasi Politik Pemilih Pemula dalam Pemilihan Umum. *JUPIIS: Jurnal Pendidikan Ilmu-Ilmu Sosial*, *10*(1), 57–62.

Weitz-Shapiro, R., & Winters, M. S. (2008). *Political participation and quality of life* (Vol. 683). Inter-American Development Bank, Research Department, Washington, DC.

Williams, D. R. (1990). Socioeconomic Differentials in Health: A Review and Redirection. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, *53*(2), 99.

Zablocki, B. D., & Kanter, R. M. (1976). The Differentiation of Life-Styles. *Annual Reviews*.