

Votingbehavior as Political Participation: The Role of Trust Inpolitical Candidate and Personal Affect

Mochammad Sa'id¹, Vonny Anggraeni Prasetyo², Tutut Chusniyah³, Rakhmadiyah Dewi Noorrizki⁴

^{1,2,3,4}Faculty of Psychology, Universitas Negeri Malang

Abstract

Purpose: This study aims to investigate the role of trust in political candidate and personal affect on voting behavior.

Methodology: The population of this research is permanent voters in Sukun Subdistrict, Malang City. While the study sample amounted to 100 respondents with accidental sampling technique. This study uses 3 scales as research instruments: the scale of trust in presidential candidate, the PANAS scale (The Positive and Negative Affect Schedule), and the scale of voting behavior. The research data were then analyzed using the multiple regression analysis technique.

Results: The results showed that the variable of trust in candidate and personal affect jointly influenced voting behavior ($F=61.676$; $p<0.05$). The effective contribution made by the two predictor variables (trust in candidate and personal affect) to the criterion variable (voting behavior) was 56 percent. Based on this analysis, it can be concluded that the research hypothesis is accepted. The analysis also showed that the variable of trust in candidate ($\beta=0.455$) is stronger than personal affect ($\beta=0.388$) in predicting voting behavior.

INTRODUCTION

In a democratic country, political participation is an important indicator (Damsar, 2010). Political participation is also a major feature of political modernization. In a democratic state, the concept of «supreme sovereignty is in the hands of the people» is a thought that underlies the concept of political participation (Wahyudi et al., 2013). Huntington and Nelson (Budiardjo, 1998) define political participation as «acts of citizens as individuals to influence government decision making individually or collective, organized or spontaneously, centered or sporadic, peaceful or violent, legal or illegal, and effective or ineffective». Political participation in a democratic country can take many forms, from voting behavior on referendum policies, forming political groups, and engaging in legal or illegal protests (Weitz-Shapiro & Winters, 2008). According to Maran (Dani, 2010), the most common form of political participation is voting behavior, whether it elects people's representatives or president.

Political participation is very important for a democratic country, because it is closely related to the extent to which democratic principles are applied (Firda, 2013). A stable level of political participation of citizens indicates that the country's democracy has stabilized. Conversely, the low level of political participation means that many citizens do not pay attention to the issue of statehood (Budiardjo, 1998).

In Indonesia, the reality shows that the level of political participation of citizens has decreased periodically before finally increased in the 2014 election (Merdeka Online, 2014). This can be seen from the result of 4 legislative elections (Pileg). In the 1999 election, the level of voting behavior reached 92.74 percent, then fell in the 2004 election to 84.07 percent, and again fell in the 2009 election to 71.7 percent. After that, the 2014 election saw an increase in political participation to 75.2

percent. The decline in political participation also occurred in the presidential election (Pilpres) when compared with the 2009 presidential election and the 2014 legislative election. People participation in the 2014 presidential election was 69.58 percent, lower than the 2014 legislative election which was 75.11 percent and the 2009 presidential election which was 71.17 percent.

High and low political participation of citizens can be influenced by several factors. One of them is political trust. According to de Tocqueville (Boeckmann & Tyler, 2002), participation is influenced by community attitudes towards other community members, which creates a willingness to compromise with others and trust them. Rousseau et al. (Colquitt et al., 2007) defines trust as a psychological condition consisting of an intention to accept the person who is believed based on certain expectations of the person's actions. If trust can influence one's political participation, then it can be said that trust can also influence one's voting behavior which is part of political participation. In this case, trust in presidential candidate is an intention to accept the weaknesses or shortcomings of the candidate based on positive expectations of the candidate's actions.

According to Sullivan and Transue (Dunning et al., 2014), it is impossible for the government to survive without trust between citizens and political institutions. This indicates the importance of trust in the life of statehood, where low trust can adversely affect government. According to Oyler (Mannarini et al., 2008), trust can produce a tendency to adopt conventional forms of participation such as voting behavior. Meanwhile, according to Tarrow (Mannarini et al., 2008), distrust can increase non-conventional forms of participation such as social protests. Lack of trust can make a group of people apathetic or can get other groups involved in politics to make a change (Lamprianou, 2013). Previous research also showed that political trust has a close and significant relationship with political participation (Wahyudi et al., 2013).

Voting behavior is also very likely to be influenced by the personal affect of the voters. What is meant by personal affect is the form of emotions experienced and realized by individuals, which consists of pleasant feelings (pleasantness) and unpleasant feelings (unpleasantness) (Watson et al., 1988). However, there is still little research that tries to show how personal affect of voters determines their voting behavior. Based on literature research, there are two studies that examine the relationship between personal affect and voting behavior, namely Mari & Rosema (2009) and Dewi (2014). Both researches prove that the condition of the positive affect of voters will encourage them more towards voting behavior, while the negative affect will more encourage them towards non-voting behavior. Positive or negative affect here relates to political candidates, the electoral system, and political events.

In addition, there is Marcus and MacKuen's research (Cottam et al., 2012) that shows how affect influences individual voting behavior. In relation to candidates and political events, there are two affects that emerge in response: enthusiasm and anxiety. Enthusiasm affects who the candidate will be chosen for, while anxiety increases efforts to find information about the candidate. Voters with high anxiety (anxious voters) have a more rational tendency to vote, namely based on information about the personal quality of the candidate rather than subjective preference.

Based on the presentation of various theories and research results above, this study was conducted to investigate the role of trust in presidential candidate and personal affect on voting behavior in the 2014 presidential election.

RESEARCH METHODS

This research was conducted using a quantitative-correlational research design. The population of this study was the permanent voters of the 2014 presidential election in District of Sukun,

Malang City, which totaled 141.584 people. While the study sample numbered 100 people with accidental sampling technique. The sample selection was taken by visiting houses or residents in District of Sukun, Malang City, that could be found and willing to fill in the research instruments.

This study uses three psychological scales as research instruments: the scale of trust in presidential candidate, the PANAS scale (The Positive and Negative Affect Schedule), and the scale of voting behavior. The scale of trust in presidential candidate was adapted from the one developed by Nadhifah (2011). This scale consists of 10 items, where the answer score for each item moves from 5 for SS answer (Very Appropriate), 4 for S (appropriate) answer, 3 for N (Neutral) answer, 2 for TS (Non-Corresponding) answer, and +1 for the STS answer (Very Unsuitable). The PANAS scale in this study uses the one that was adapted by Azhaary (2016) from Watson et al. (1988). The PANAS scale consists of 20 items with 4 answer choices, namely 1 (very weak), 2 (weak), 3 (strong), and 4 (very strong). While the scale of voting behavior was developed based on the theory of Bratton (2013). This scale uses three indicators of voting behavior, namely participation in political campaign, attendance at general election, and choosing whom to vote for. This scale consists of 11 items and uses 4 categories of answer, namely Strongly Agree (SS), Agree (S), Neutral (N), Disagree (TS), and Strongly Disagree (STS).

The process of analyzing research data begins with descriptive statistical analysis. After that, the assumption test is done, including tests of normality, linearity, and multicollinearity. After fulfilling these four assumptions, a hypothesis test was performed using a multiple regression analysis technique with statistical software.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Research Data Description

The respondents of this study were 100 people consisting of 43 men and 57 women. In addition, of the 100 respondents, there were 55 people who were in the early adult stage, 41 people in the middle adult stage, and 4 people in the late adult stage. In terms of marital status, 37 people have never been married (BM) and 63 people have or have been married (M).

Table 1. Description of empirical and hypothetical research data

Empirical Data					
Variable	N	Mean	SD	Min	Max
Trust in Political Candidate	100	30,95	4,389	13	39
Personal Affect	100	56,95	12,695	31	77
Voting Behavior	100	30,83	5,422	12	39
Hypothetical Data					
Variable	N	Mean	SD	Min	Max
Trust in Political Candidate	100	30	6,666	10	50
Personal Affect	100	50	10	20	80
Voting Behavior	100	27,5	5,5	11	44

The data description is presented in hypothetical and empirical mean obtained from the responses of respondents' answers to each given scale. Description of research data can be seen in Table 1.

Based on the empirical descriptive analysis for the data of trust in political candidate, the maximum score was 39 and the minimum score was 13. While the mean score showed that the empirical mean ($x = 30.95$) was higher than the hypothetical mean ($\mu = 30$). This shows that trust of research respondents in political candidate is quite high.

The results of comparison of deviation standard indicate that the empirical deviation standard ($\sigma = 4.389$) is lower than the hypothetical deviation standard ($\sigma = 6.666$). **This shows that trust of** research respondents in political candidate has a low variation. In other words, trust in the candidate between one respondent and the other is similar or uniform.

Based on empirical descriptive analysis for personal affect data, the maximum score is 77 and the minimum score is 31. While the mean score shows that the empirical mean ($x = 56.95$) is higher than the hypothetical mean ($\mu = 50$). This shows that personal affect of research respondents are included in the high category.

The results of the comparison of deviation standard indicate that the empirical deviation standard ($\sigma = 12.695$) is higher than the hypothetical deviation standard ($\sigma = 10$). This shows that the personal affect of research respondents have high variation.

Based on the empirical descriptive analysis for the data of voting behavior, a maximum score of 39 and a minimum score of 12. While the mean score indicates that the empirical mean ($x = 30.83$) is higher than the hypothetical mean ($\mu = 27.5$). This shows that voting behavior of research respondents is included in the high category.

The results of comparison of deviation standard indicate that the empirical deviation standard ($\sigma = 5.422$) is higher than the hypothetical deviation standard ($\sigma = 5.5$). This shows that voting behavior of research respondents has a low variation.

Hypothesis testing

Based on the results of the multiple regression analysis, it is known that the value of $F = 61.676$ ($p < 0.05$). These results indicate that trust in candidate and personal affect jointly influence voting behavior. Based on this analysis, it can be concluded that the research hypothesis is accepted. The effective contribution made by the two predictor variables (trust in the candidate and personal affect) to the criterion variable (voting behavior) was 56 percent. The analysis also shows that trust in the candidate ($\beta = 0.455$) is stronger in predicting voting behavior than personal affect ($\beta = 0.388$).

Discussion

The results of this study indicate that the majority of respondents have fairly high trust in candidate. One of the factors that can influence the level of the trust is emotion. Research conducted by Dunn and Schweitzer (2005) found that emotions can affect a person's trust, where positive emotions such as happiness and gratitude can increase one's trust, while negative emotions such as anger can decrease one's level of trust. So if the voters like a candidate, they will tend to trust her/him. However, if they do not like or are angry with the candidate, then they have a tendency to distrust her/him.

Another factor that can influence the level of trust is risk perception (Firdayanti, 2012). Risk perception is someone's perception of loss that might be obtained from his decision on a matter. The loss or risk perceived by the voters in this case is related to the performance that will be shown by the candidate. Among them are concerns that the candidate's performance is not as expected, concerns that the candidate will not fulfill the wishes of the voters, or even that his/her policy has a

negative impact on the people. So the higher the voters risk perception, the lower the level of their trust in the candidate.

In addition to the two factors above, the level of trust in the candidate is very likely to be influenced by three factors derived from the characteristics of the candidate (Colquitt et al., 2007; Agung et al., 2013). First, abilities that refer to the candidate's competencies and characteristics. Second, benevolence: the willingness of the candidate to meet expectation of the voters. Third, integrity, which is related to the honesty and personality of the candidate in carrying out his/her duties. This indicates that the more good competence candidate has, the more his/her ability to satisfy citizens as voters, and the more good his/her behavior and habits in carrying out duties, the higher the voter's trust in him/her.

The results of this study also showed that the majority of respondents had high personal affect. This can be caused by several factors. First, the image of the candidate (Nursal, 2004). The qualities possessed by candidate that radiate from within themselves can affect the affect of the voters. Each person has their own ideal type, so affect on the candidate depends on the ideal type of each voter. Second, identification of the candidate into outgroup or ingroup (Cottam et al., 2012). Identifying candidate as outgroup is often associated with negative affect, while identifying him/her as ingroup is associated with positive affect. This is because individuals tend to perceive outgroup as a group that threaten and become obstacles to ingroup goals.

The results of this study indicate that trust in candidate is one of the significant predictors of voting behavior in election. The more trust of individual in candidate, the more his/her tendency to vote in election day. The results of this study confirm previous research that political trust is positively correlated with political participation (Wahyudi et al., 2013). Political trust can produce a tendency to increase conventional forms of political participation such as selecting certain candidate in election (Oyler et al., 2003; Mannarini et al., 2008). Conversely, political distrust can increase non-conventional forms of political participation such as social protest (Tarrow, 1998; Mannarini et al., 2008). These results are reinforced by the results of our interview with some respondents. Respondents stated that one of the reasons they vote was because they believed that their chosen candidate was the right figure for this country.

The results of this study also found that personal affect significantly influenced voting behavior. This fact is in line with research conducted by Dewi (2014) that positive affect has an important role in encouraging voting behavior. As stated by Allport (1945), a person who participates in a real job or task is not only physically involved, but also their self/ego. In this context, participation is the involvement of thoughts and feelings (affect). Thus, whether someone participates or not, can be seen from the level of affect that arises from him/her.

In this study, the effective contribution made by the two predictor variables (trust in the candidate and personal affect) to the criterion variable (voting behavior) was 56 percent. This shows that both predictors have a significant influence on voting behavior. However, there are some other factors that might influence voting behavior (Harder & Krosnick, 2008). First, age. The increase of one's age - especially in early adulthood to middle adulthood - can increase one's tendency to vote. Whereas after a person is in around 75 years old, the tendency to vote will decrease. Second, marriage. Someone who is married has a higher level of voting behavior than someone who is single. In addition, there are also several other factors such as social image (social grouping), party identification, and political policy and issues.

CONCLUSION

Based on the results and discussion of research on the predictive role of trust in political candidate and personal affect on voting behavior in the 2014 presidential election in Sukun District, Malang, it was concluded that voting behavior is significantly influenced by trust in candidate and personal affect. Both predictors made an effective contribution to voting behavior by 56 percent. However, the variable of trust in candidate is stronger in predicting voting behavior compared to personal affect.

This research has proven that trust in candidate and personal affect are predictors that determine the level of voting behavior of voters. However, further research needs to be developed that examines other predictors of voting behavior. In addition, further research also needs to expand the population and number of samples in order to obtain a more representative sample.

REFERENCES

- Agung, I.M., Masyhuri, & Hidayat. (2013). Dinamika ketidakpercayaan terhadap politisi: Suatu pendekatan psikologi indigenus. *Jurnal Psikologi*, 9(1), 25-30.
- Allport, G. W. (1945). The psychology of participation. *Psychological Review*, 52(3), 117-132. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/h0056704>
- Azhaary, E.P.E. (2016). Afek sebagai prediktor terhadap perilaku memilih pada pemilih pemula di SMK Ma'arif NU 4 Pakis Kabupaten Malang. Undergraduate Thesis. Malang: Faculty of Psychology, Universitas Negeri Malang.
- Boeckmann, R.J., & Tyler, T.R. (2002). Trust, respect, and the psychology of political engagement. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 32(10), 2067-2088.
- Bratton, M. (2013). *Voting and democratic citizenship in Africa* (ed.). Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers.
- Budiardjo, M. (1998). *Partisipasi dan partai politik*. Jakarta: Yayasan Obor Indonesia.
- Colquitt, J.A., Scott, B.A., & LePine, J.A. (2007). Trust, trustworthiness, and trust propensity: A meta-analytic test of their unique relationships with risk taking and job performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(4), 909-927.
- Cottam, M.L., Beth, D., Mastors, E., & Preston, T. (2012). *Pengantar psikologi politik* (2nd edition). Translated by Ellys Tjo. Jakarta: Rajawali Pers.
- Damsar. (2010). *Pengantar sosiologi politik*. Jakarta: Kencana Prenada Media Group.
- Dani, W.R. (2010). *Partisipasi politik pemilih pemula dalam pelaksanaan pemilu tahun 2009 di Desa Puguh Kecamatan Boja Kabupaten Kendal*. Undergraduate Thesis. Semarang: Faculty of Social Sciences, Universitas Negeri Semarang.
- Dewi, F.P. (2014). *Interpretasi pemilih pemula terhadap calon legislatif, partai politik, dan isu-isu pada pemilu legislatif 2014 di Kota Pasuruan*. Retrieved from https://www.academia.edu/14239318/Interpretasi_Pemilih_Pemula_terhadap_Calon_Legislatif_Partai_Politik_dan_Isu-Isu_pada_Pemilu_Legislatif_2014_di_Kota_Pasuruan
- Dunn, J.R., & Schweitzer, M.E. (2005). Feeling and believing: The influence of emotion on trust. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 88(5), 736-748. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.88.5.736>
- Dunning, D., Anderson, J. E., Schlösser, T., Ehlebracht, D., & Fetchenhauer, D. (2014). Trust at zero acquaintance: More a matter of respect than expectation of reward. *Journal of Personality*

- and Social Psychology, 107(1), 122-141.
- Firda, N. (2013). Partisipasi politik di negara demokrasi. Retrieved from http://www.kompasiana.com/ryriie/partisipasi-politik-di-negara-demokrasi_552847f66ea8348c3b8b4573.
- Firdayanti, R. (2012). Persepsi risiko melakukan e-commerce dengan kepercayaan konsumen dalam membeli produk fashion online. *Journal of Social and Industrial Psychology*, 1(1), 1-7.
- Harder, J., & Krosnick, J.A. (2008). Why do people vote? A psychological analysis of the causes of voter turnout. *Journal of Social Issues*, 64(3), 525-549.
- Lamprianou, L. (2013). Contemporary political participation research: A critical assessment. Nicosia: Department of Social and Political Science, University of Cyprus.
- Mannarini, T., Legittimo, M., & Talo, C. (2008). Determinants of social and political participation among youth: A preliminary study. *Psicologia Politica*, 36, 95-117.
- Mari, S., & Rosema, M. (2009). The emotional underpinning of partisanship and vote choice. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/242243491_The_emotional_underpinning_of_partisanship_and_vote_choice
- Merdeka Online. (2014, April 12). Ini tingkat partisipasi pemilih dari Pemilu 1955-2014. Retrieved from <https://www.merdeka.com/politik/ini-tingkat-partisipasi-pemilih-dari-pemilu-1955-2014.html>
- Nadhifah, K. (2011). Pengaruh dimensi trust terhadap partisipasi pelanggan e-commerce di Kabupaten Jember. Undergraduate Thesis. Jember: Faculty of Economy, Universitas Jember.
- Nursal, A. (2004). Political marketing: Strategi memenangkan pemilu. Jakarta: Gramedia Pustaka Utama.
- Oyler, D., Campbell, J.E., & Mattei, F. (2003). How does trust in the government affect voter turnout? The non-linearity hypothesis. Prepared for delivery at the 61st Annual National Meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association, April 3-6, at the Palmer House, Chicago, IL.
- Tarrow, S. (1998). *Power in movement: Social movement and contentious politics*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Wahyudi, H., Fernando, T., Ahmad, A., Khairani, A., Fatimah, F., Agung, I.M., Milla, M.N. (2013). Peran kepercayaan politik dan kepuasan demokrasi terhadap partisipasi politik mahasiswa. *Jurnal Psikologi*, 9(2), 94-99.
- Watson, D., Clark, L.A., & Tellegen, A. (1988). Development and validation of brief measures of positive and negative affect: The PANAS scale. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 54(6), 1063-1070.
- Weitz-Shapiro, R., & Winters, M.S. (2008). *Political participation and quality of life*. Washington: Inter-American Development Bank, Research Department.