

# Socio-Economic Status of Samarinda City Community in Political Participation

*by* Muhammad Noor

---

**Submission date:** 21-Jan-2022 03:21PM (UTC+0700)

**Submission ID:** 1745304793

**File name:** 3433-9897-1-PB.pdf (734.72K)

**Word count:** 4920

**Character count:** 25828

## Socio-Economic Status of Samarinda City Community in Political Participation

Muhammad Noor<sup>1</sup>, Rita Kala Linggi<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1,2</sup>Faculty of Social and Political Sciences, Mulawarman University, Indonesia  
[muhammad.noor@fisip.unmul.ac.id](mailto:muhammad.noor@fisip.unmul.ac.id), [ritakalalinggi.ip@gmail.com](mailto:ritakalalinggi.ip@gmail.com)

### Abstract

*Along with the ongoing democratic process, Indonesia also showed ability in the democratic process. All elections conducted through a series of systems of government and politics, directly ask for the participation of the public. Therefore, there needs to be research to find out the participation of the people of Samarinda City with socio-economic status to political participation. This research aims to find out the Socio-Economic Status of Samarinda city community in political participation. The subjects of the study numbered 180 respondents taken on an accidental basis. The data collection method used is a political participation questionnaire. The data analysis technique used in this study is a descriptive analysis regarding the socio-economic status of the people of Samarinda City in participating in politics. The results obtained from this study found that overall political participation in society was low. As for the categorization score on the socio-economic status of the people of Samarinda City who have a low socioeconomic status in low political participation, on the socio-economic status of Samarinda city people who have a moderate socioeconomic status in low political participation, and on the socio-economic status of Samarinda city people who have a high socioeconomic status in low political participation.*

### Keywords

socio-economic; political participation; community



### I. Introduction

Indonesia as a country that adheres to a democratic system needs to be able to maintain the quality of the democratic process. As a understanding in government, democracy requires the participation of people who are certainly purely from all levels of society. Various efforts are certainly taken so that the entire democratic process produces a valuable product.

One of the democratic processes that requires public participation is elections. Some countries in the world are very focused on the role of the whole society so that political participation is perfect, in the sense that the perfection of political participation can only be seen when presenting the people to give a choice. All people as part of democracy must wherever possible give a choice without any obstacles in any aspect.

To support the right political process, the process of learning and understanding the rights, obligations, and responsibilities of every citizen in the life of the nation and state, aims to form and foster political orientations in individuals. Along with the ongoing democratic process, Indonesia also showed ability in the democratic process. All elections conducted through a series of systems of government and politics, directly ask for the participation of the public. Nonetheless, some obstacles remain that are barriers in the process of political participation.

Several studies have been conducted to find out the existence of some of the impact of accompaniment that affects political participation. Amin and Irwansyah (2006) revealed that there is a significant influence on the economic level of a person or group on political participation. This was concluded based on the results of research conducted on the Tinghoa community in Medan City. The average person in the research sample was at the upper middle level and working in a private or non-governmental sphere.

The results of this study became an important foundation that political participation could be influenced by the economic level of society. In addition, there are still several things that affect the level of political participation of the community. Other factors such as social and economic status, situation, parental political affiliation, and organizational experience. The low level of socio-economic status of the community is feared to trigger a process of political participation that is not as expected. The public may prefer parties with the promise of social welfare without realistically considering the feasibility and quality of the chosen party. In addition, people easily choose parties that can directly provide financial and economic benefits instantly. This is certainly undesirable because it can interfere with the democratic process in political participation. This kind of situation will result in the presence of representatives of the people and leaders who go through a wrong democracy.

In addition, the social service model in the community has also not shown good quality and in accordance with the mandate of the law. Damanik (2011) stated that during efforts to realize the constitutional mandate on social justice for all people, until now it must be recognized that both the quality and quantity of social services are still limited.

Moreover, political participation in 2014 will decrease according to the predictions of the survey results. Director of The Indonesian Survey Circle, through the *Republika* daily revealed "The decrease in public participation in legislative elections due to the level of trust in political parties continues to decrease," In addition, he explained, the voter participation rate in the 1999 election was 93.3 percent, in the 2004 election it fell to 84.9 percent, then in the 2009 election it fell again to 70.99 percent. Based on this in 10 years, the voter participation rate has dropped by about 20 percent from 93.3 percent to 70.99 percent (Manjani, 2012).

Political participation that has decreased with the election stage from time-to-time in Indonesia needs to know the cause. The decline in participation is influenced by various aspects and the socioeconomic status of the community is assumed to be one of the significant causes. Different levels of social status will result in differences in the level of political participation. It is important to be able to provide more data on the influence of socioeconomic status on political participation. Political participation becomes important to be able to know and predict people's political participation in the next election. It should also be understood that the democratic process can run well when political participation can run well as well. Socioeconomic status can be an obstacle in ensuring political participation.

But more research is needed to prove this. This research will be conducted on the people of Samarinda City. Samarinda City Community is a community as part of a society that has diverse political participation and tiered socioeconomic status, so it is appropriate to be thorough. This research is important to be able to provide more information about the economic status of the community and its effect on the political participation of the community. Therefore, various related data are needed through research so that this research can be used as a foundation in designing democratic system policies.

Research on political participation has been conducted by several researchers before. Muryanto Amin (2006) conducted research related to the economic level relationship to the political participation of the Tiong Hoa ethnic community in the 2005 direct regional head election of Medan City in ward VI of Medan Market Center Village, Medan Kota16 District. Chinese are one of the ethnic groups in Indonesia that live mostly in the private sector, and they have extensive access to ownership of economic resources, and rightly have implications at the level of high-value stores economically. But their involvement in politics is very low and insignificant.

The results of Aan Sapta (2005) research at Semarang State University with the title "Political Participation in Elections in Magelang Regency 2005" which focuses on how many people vote in elections compared to people who do not vote in elections.<sup>17</sup> The results of the study focused on people's political participation in elections, it's just different stages and levels. The results also showed factors that influence the President and Vice President of the public in elections. Based on the description above, the purpose of this study is to find out the participation of the people of Samarinda City with socio-economic status to the political participation of Samarinda City.

## **II. Research Method**

### **2.1 Type of Research**

This type of research is quantitative research with a quantitative approach caused and effect. Researchers will trace data related to research variables and then give conclusions about the effect of one variable on another. This type of research was chosen on the grounds that quantitative research is considered appropriate to be able to provide a generalist picture of societal social phenomena.

### **2.2 Research Subjects**

The population in this study was the entire community of Samarinda City who were registered as permanent voters in the Samarinda Municipal Election Commission. In this study, the sampling technique used was to use Non-Probability Sampling. Non-Probability Sampling techniques researchers use accidental sampling method (accidental side).

According to Santoso & Tjiptono (2001) accidental sampling (convenience sampling) is a sampling procedure that selects samples from people or units that are most easily found or accessed. Meanwhile, according to Sugiyono (2015) accidental sampling is taking respondents as samples based on chance, i.e. anyone who coincidentally meets with researchers can be used as a sample, if the person who happens to be found suitable as a data source with the main criteria is that the person is a Samarinda City Community registered as a permanent voter in the Samarinda Municipal Election Commission.

### **2.3 Data Collection Techniques**

The data collection in this study used questionnaires to measure the impact of economic status on political participation. This questionnaire is compiled using Google Form which will be disseminated to the people of Samarinda City using closed questions (Closed Questionnaire) with Dichotomous question type questions. The purpose of this questionnaire is to obtain the data and background of an individual or group used for research samples and to gather several information relevant to the interests of the research conducted.



## 2.4 Data Analysis Techniques

Research data analysis techniques use descriptive analysis. Descriptive analysis is intended to be able to provide an overview of research data. Descriptive analysis provides information on the frequency, category, and empirical average of research. According to Sugiyama (2014) descriptive analysis methods are statistics that are used to analyze data by describing or describing data that has been collected as is without intending to make conclusions that apply to the public or generalization.

## III. Results and Discussion

### 3.1 Characteristics of the Subject

This research was conducted in Samarinda City the individual who was the subject of this study was the people of Samarinda City. The sample used in this study was 180 people. The characteristics of the research subject can be seen in the following table:

**Table 1.** Characteristics of Subjects Based on Age<sup>1</sup>

No.	Age	Sum	Percentage
1	17-25	78	43%
2	26-35	60	33%
3	36-45	27	15%
4	45-55	11	6%
6	>56	4	2%
<b>Sum</b>		<b>180</b>	<b>100</b>

Based on the table it can be known that the research subjects in Samarinda City, namely people aged 17-25 amounted to 78 respondents (43%), ages 26-35 amounted to 60 respondents (33%), ages 36-45 amounted to 27 respondents (15%), age 45-55 totaled 11 respondents (6%), and with the age of >56 amounted to 4 respondents (2%). So, it can be concluded that the study subjects in Samarinda City are dominated by the age of 17-25 years, which is 78 (43%).

**Table 2.** Characteristics of Subjects Based on Gender

No.	Gender	Sum	Percentage
1	Man	107	59%
2	Woman	73	41%
<b>Sum</b>		<b>180</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based on the table, it can be known that the study subjects in Samarinda City who are male numbered 107 respondents (59%) and study subjects with female sex amounted to 41 respondents (41%). So, it can be concluded that the study subjects in Samarinda City are dominated by respondents with male sex, which is 107 respondents (59%).

Descriptive data is used to describe the condition of the distribution of data in Samarinda city. Empirical and hypothetical mean are derived from the response of research samples through political participation questionnaires. Categories based on the comparison of hypothetical and empirical mean can be directly done by looking at descriptive research data. According to Azwar (2010) basically the interpretation of the questionnaire score is normative, meaning the meaning of the score against a norm (mean) theoretical population score as a parameter so that the measuring tool in the form of numbers (quantitative) can be interpreted qualitatively.

Normative reference makes it easier for users to understand the results of measurements. Any empirical mean score significantly higher than the hypothetical mean can be considered an indicator of the high state of the subject group on the variables studied, and vice versa. Empirical mean and mean hypothetical research can be seen in the table of empirical mean and mean hypotheses:

**Table 3.** Mean Empirical and Mean Hypotensive Results Of Respondents

Variable	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Status
	Empirik	Empirik	Hipotetik	Hipotetik	
Political Participation	20.99	2.371	22.5	2.5	Low

Through the table above is known to illustrate the distribution of data on research subjects in general in the people of Samarinda City. Based on the results of measurements through questionnaires that have been filled obtained an empirical mean of 20.99 lower than the hypothetical mean of 22.5 with meaning it can be concluded that the entire subject has political participation with a low category. The distribution of data frequencies for this scale is as follows:

**Table 4.** Categorization of Overall Score

Tendency Interval	Score	Category	F	Percentage
$X \geq M + 1.5 SD$	$\geq 26$	Very High	1	1%
$M + 0.5 SD < X < M + 1.5 SD$	24 – 26	High	26	14%
$M - 0.5 SD < X < M + 0.5 SD$	21 – 23	Medium	69	38%
$M - 1.5 SD < X < M - 0.5 SD$	19 – 20	Low	65	36%
$X \leq M - 1.5 SD$	$\leq 19$	Very Low	19	11%

Based on the categorization of the overall score in the table above, the people of Samarinda City who have a range of political participation values that are in the moderate and low categories with values between 21-23 and 19-20 have a frequency of 69 and 65 respondents with percentages of 38% and 36%. This shows that the people of Samarinda City have moderate and low political participation.

is the score of the empirical mean value and the hypothetical mean of the study based on socioeconomic status in the people of Samarinda City. Empirical mean and mean hypoetic research can be seen in the table of empirical mean and mean hypotheses:

**Table 5.** Empirical and Mean Hypothetical Results Based on Socioeconomic Status in Political Participation

Socioeconomic	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Status
	Empirik	Empirik	Hipotetik	Hipotetik	
Low	20.9	2.44	22.5	2.5	Low
Medium	20.77	2.632	22.5	2.5	Low
High	21.3	2.003	22.5	2.5	Low

Through the table above is known to illustrate the distribution of data on research subjects in general in the people of Samarinda City. Based on the results of measurements through questionnaires that have been filled obtained empirical mean 20.99 lower than the hypothetical mean of 22.5 at low socioeconomic status which means it can be concluded that the people of Samarinda City who have low socioeconomic status have low political

participation. In the socio-economic status is being obtained an empirical mean value of 20.77 lower than the hypothetical mean of 22.5 which means it can be concluded that the people of Samarinda City who have a moderate socioeconomic status also have low political participation. Furthermore, in high socioeconomic status, the empirical mean value of 21.3 is lower than the hypothetical mean of 22.5 which means it can be concluded that the people of Samarinda City who have a high socioeconomic status also have low political participation. The frequency of the data is as follows:

**Table 6.** Categorization of Low Socioeconomic Status Scores in Political Participation

Tendency Interval	Score	Category	F	Percentage
$X \geq M + 1.5 SD$	$\geq 26$	Very High	1	1.7%
$M + 0.5 SD < X < M + 1.5 SD$	24 – 26	High	6	10%
$M - 0.5 SD < X < M + 0.5 SD$	21 – 23	Medium	25	41.7%
$M - 1.5 SD < X < M - 0.5 SD$	19 – 20	Low	19	31.7%
$X \leq M - 1.5 SD$	$\leq 19$	Very Low	9	15.0%

Based on the categorization in the table above, the people of Samarinda City with low economic status have a range of values in the moderate category with a value range of 21-23 and a frequency of 25 respondents with a percentage of 14%. This shows that the people of Samarinda city with low economic status have low political participation. Moderate socioeconomic status obtained the empirical mean of 20.77 is lower than the hypothetical mean of 22.5 with a low category. This proves that the people of Samarinda City who have socio-economic status are in low political participation. The distribution of data frequencies for this scale is as follows:

**Table 7.** Categorization of Socioeconomic Status Scores While Participating in Politics

Tendency Interval	Score	Category	F	Percentage
$X \geq M + 1.5 SD$	$\geq 26$	Very High	0	0%
$M + 0.5 SD < X < M + 1.5 SD$	24 – 26	High	10	16.7%
$M - 0.5 SD < X < M + 0.5 SD$	21 – 23	Medium	17	28.3%
$M - 1.5 SD < X < M - 0.5 SD$	19 – 20	Low	25	41.7%
$X \leq M - 1.5 SD$	$\leq 19$	Very Low	8	13.3%

Based on the categorization in the table above, it can be seen the people of Samarinda City who with moderate economic status have a range of values in the low category with a value range of 19-20 and a frequency of 25 respondents with a percentage of 41%. This shows that the people of Samarinda City with economic status are having low political participation. High socioeconomic status obtained empirical mean 21.3 lower than the hypothetical mean of 22.5 with a low category. This proves that the people of Samarinda City who have a high socioeconomic status in participating in politics are low. The distribution of data frequencies for this scale is as follows:

**Table 8.** Kategorisasi Skor Status Sosial Ekonomi Sedang Dalam Berpartisipasi Politik

Tendency Interval	Score	Category	F	Percentage
$X \geq M + 1.5 SD$	$\geq 26$	Very High	0	0%
$M + 0.5 SD < X < M + 1.5 SD$	24 – 26	High	10	16.7%
$M - 0.5 SD < X < M + 0.5 SD$	21 – 23	Medium	27	45.0%
$M - 1.5 SD < X < M - 0.5 SD$	19 – 20	Low	21	35.0%
$X \leq M - 1.5 SD$	$\leq 19$	Very Low	2	3.3%

Based on the categorization in the table above, it can be seen the people of Samarinda City who with high economic status have a range of values in the moderate category with a value range of 21-23 and a frequency of 27 respondents with a percentage of 45%. This shows that the people of Samarinda City with high economic status have low political participation.

### 3.2 Discussion

Political participation is very important in a country that adheres to a democratic system in the election of the head of government. Indonesia as one of the democracies must be able to encourage all its population to vote in elections. The process of voting in this general election is part of the political participation of the people. There is so much activity that describes political participation and one of the most important is to make a choice in elections.

During the election process there is a general election campaign process. The process also actually provides an opportunity for the community to give its political participation. In the end, the vote was the culmination of the giving of people political participation. Nevertheless, all opportunities to be able to provide political participation are not directly utilized by the public and this becomes one of the concerns of researchers.

Research on political participation in the Samarinda City area was conducted by researchers involving 180 respondents. Data on people's political participation is needed by researchers to provide an overview of the level of political participation. To be able to find out the level of political participation of the research community use questionnaires to record responses from the entire sample of the study.

Based on the results of an analysis of data on the political participation of the people of Samarinda City, researchers found that the highest political participation score was 30 and the lowest score was 15. That is, the highest respondents to the study in Samarinda city had a political participation score of 30 and a low of 15. In addition, researchers also found that the average political participation score of the community in Samarinda City was 20.99.

The results of this study showed that people's political participation was relatively low by only having a score of 30 as the highest score obtained by only one respondent. In addition, the average value of respondents for political participation is 20.99, when compared to the value that can be achieved through the research questionnaire of 15-20, the average political participation is relatively low.

In addition, the low political participation of the community can be caused by various things, one of which is the occurrence of alienated or politically alienated. Alienated is filtered from political life that results in a person becoming political apathy. There are two indicators that explain patterns of political participation. First, political awareness is a person's awareness of his rights and obligations as a citizen with his knowledge of the environment of society and the politics in which he lives. Second, political trust is an assessment of the government and the existing political system, whether the government and the system can be trusted and can be influenced or not (Damsar, 2010). Both may be a trigger for low political participation of the community in Samarinda City.

Socioeconomic status is the level of a person's status socially that is influenced by the state of the economy and prestige owned. This social status can be a social status obtained by hard work or obtained due to the giving of heredity or inheritance. Socioeconomic status is important because based on several research results show that socioeconomic status has a contribution to the political participation of a person and



society. Nevertheless, political participation itself is not solely influenced by a person's socioeconomic status.

Socioeconomic status is one of the variables that research participated in. Research through a series of data collection techniques and data analysis techniques in a descriptive manner managed to obtain an overview of the socio-economic status of the people of Samarinda City. The data obtained is data from a sample of 180 respondents.

Based on the results of the analysis of research data, researchers grouped into three socioeconomic levels from low, medium, and high. Furthermore, the researchers took respondents from each level as many as 60 respondents from the low socioeconomic level, 60 respondents from the moderate socioeconomic level, and 60 respondents from the high socioeconomic level. The purpose of this respondent's intake is for balance to occur in the results of the analysis.

The results of measurements through questionnaires that have been filled obtained empirical mean 20.99 lower than the hypothetical mean of 22.5 at low socioeconomic status which means it can be concluded that the people of Samarinda City who have low socioeconomic status have low political participation. In the socio-economic status is being obtained an empirical mean value of 20.77 lower than the hypothetical mean of 22.5 which means it can be concluded that the people of Samarinda City who have a moderate socioeconomic status also have low political participation. Furthermore, in high socioeconomic status, the empirical mean value of 21.3 is lower than the hypothetical mean of 22.5 which means it can be concluded that the people of Samarinda City who have a high socioeconomic status also have low political participation.

Low levels of socioeconomic status of a society can be affected by several factors. According to Gilbert and Kahl in Engel, Blackwell and Miniard (2013) mentions that there are nine variables that determine a person's social status or class, the nine variables are classified into three categories, namely 1). Economic variables, namely, Employment status, Income, Property. 2). Interaction Variables, namely, Individual prestige, Association, Socialization. 3) Political variables, namely, Power, Class consciousness, mobility.

Do not rule out the possibility that the whole variable occurs interactions, such as economic variables that relate to interaction variables, interaction variables related to political variables, even political variables related to economic variables. This led researchers to understand that the low of one variable of socioeconomic status can be related to the low of other variables.

The main purpose of this study is to find out the socioeconomic status of the Samarinda City Community in participating in politics. This study analyzed political participation in view of the socio-economic status of the people of Samarinda City. As explained earlier that political participation is important in a democratic system, the higher the level of political participation of the community, the better the democratic system runs. Conversely, the lower the level of political participation, it will be a threat to the democratic process in Indonesia even more so with the direct election process embraced by Indonesia. The socioeconomic status of the community in some previous studies has been shown to have an influence on people's political participation. This was again examined by researchers involving 180 respondents who were elected accidental residents in Samarinda City.

The results of research based on socioeconomic status of low socioeconomic status are found that the participation rate is low, in socio-economic level communities are in political participation is also low, and in high socioeconomic status communities also found that in low participation. The results led researchers to conclude that the level of

political participation of the community can be reviewed from the level of socio-economic status of the community. This is certainly in line with previous research on the influence of socioeconomic status on people's political participation.

The results are in line with the opinions of Samuel P. Huntington and Joan M (Budiarjo, 2013) who stated that political participation is influenced by the first, political culture of the local community. It is related to some values believed by the community such as indigenous values and the value of traditions, religions, and so on. Second, participation is also influenced by social status. Social status includes education, economics, and social class of society. The second point of the opinion is very in accordance with the results of the study.

Furthermore, Frank Lindenfeld (Damsar, 2010) found that the main factor that drives people to participate in political life is financial satisfaction. In his study Lindenfeld also found that low economic status causes a person to feel alienated from political life. In addition, the person concerned becomes apathetic. This is not the case with people who have economic capabilities.

Based on the above theory it can be understood that the low level of socioeconomic status in the people of Samarinda City leads to low political participation of the people in the region. However, political participation influenced by socioeconomic status may be different due to other factors. High socioeconomic status can not necessarily directly trigger political participation if it is not supported by other factors or even inhibited by other factors.

Muryanto Amin (2006) conducted research related to the economic level relationship to the political participation of the Tiong Hoa ethnic community in the 2005 direct regional head election of Medan City in ward VI of Medan Market Center Village, Medan City District. Based on the results of the study found that the People of Tiong Hoa have a high socioeconomic status but the involvement of the Tiong Hoa community in politics is very low and insignificant. This shows that there are other variables that determine political participation and socioeconomic status contribute only 11.2% of all factors that trigger political participation.

#### **IV. Conclusion**

There are several conclusions from the results of the study as follows:

1. Overall political participation is low.
2. The socio-economic status of the people of Samarinda City who have a low socioeconomic status in participating in politics is low.
3. The socioeconomic status of the people of Samarinda City who have socio-economic status is in low political participation.
4. The socio-economic status of the people of Samarinda City who have a high socioeconomic status in participating in low politics.

## References

- Sapta, Aan. 2005. Partisipasi Politik dalam Pemilu di kabupaten Magelang, Semarang: Universitas Negeri Semarang.
- Amin, M., dan Irwansyah, B. (2006). Hubungan tingkat ekonomi terhadap partisipasi politik masyarakat etnis Tionghoa pada pemilihan kepala daerah langsung 2005 Kota Medan di lingkungan VI Kelurahan Pusat Pasar Medan Kecamatan Medan. *Jurnal Wawasan*. Vol. 12 No. 1, hal. 1-39.
- Azwar, S. (2016). *Metode Penelitian*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar
- Budiarjo, M (penyunting), (2013), *Partisipasi dan Partai Politik: Sebuah Bunga Rampai*, Edisi Ketiga. Jakarta: Yayasan Obor Indonesia.
- Damanik, J. (2011). Menuju Pelayanan Sosial yang Berkeadilan. *Jurnal Ilmu Sosial dan Ilmu Politik*. Vo. 15, No. 1 hal: 1-14.
- Damsar. (2010). *Pengantar sosiologi politik*. Jakarta: Kencana Prenada Media Group.
- Mujani, S. (2012). Partisipasi Politik Pemilu 2014 akan Kurang dari 50 Persen?. (Online) [Republika.co. id](http://Republika.co.id).
- Nurfaa, S. (2013). Faktor-Faktor Penentu Kelas Sosial. (Online)
- Rush, M. & Althoff, P. (2008). *Pengantar Sosiologi Politik*, alih bahasa Kartono Kartini. Jakarta: Rajawali Pers.
- Santoso, S., & Tjiptono. (2001). *Riset Pemasaran Konsep dan Aplikasi dengan SPSS*. Elex Media Komputindo: Jakarta.
- Sugiyono. (2015). *Metode Penelitian dan Pengembangan (Research and Development)*. Bandung: Alfabeta.

# Socio-Economic Status of Samarinda City Community in Political Participation

---

ORIGINALITY REPORT

---

9%

SIMILARITY INDEX

9%

INTERNET SOURCES

5%

PUBLICATIONS

5%

STUDENT PAPERS

---

MATCH ALL SOURCES (ONLY SELECTED SOURCE PRINTED)

---

4%

★ e-journals.unmul.ac.id

Internet Source

---

Exclude quotes On

Exclude matches < 1%

Exclude bibliography On