

## **Effect of the 2014 Election Campaign Material in Increasing Beginner Voters' Knowledge among Students**

**Sayuti, S. D.\* and Aras, M.**

*Department of Marketing Communication, Bina Nusantara University, Palmerah West Jakarta 11480, Indonesia*

### **ABSTRACT**

Campaign is a socialisation programme to deliver relevant knowledge, ideas, vision, mission and programmes of political work by individuals or political organisations with the goal to change attitudes and behaviour of voters. Similarly, programmes or activities of a political campaign are also aimed at influencing students who have reached the voting age to elect the president of Indonesia in 2014. This study carried out a context-based investigation into how political campaign material influences student voters in Third Grade Senior High School students at Bekasi West Java, Indonesia. The purpose of this study was to determine the influence of political campaign material on high school voters. This Experimental Design research consists of an experimental group and a control group. Findings indicate that there are significant effects of political campaign material on the beginner voters. Results showed that the mean scores of Experimental Group (86) was higher than Control Group (78.6), or  $t_n$  is higher than  $t_t$  ( $t_n = 2.074$  and  $t_t = 2.021$ ).

*Keywords:* Communication, Political Campaign, Campaign Material, Socialisation, Beginner Voters' Knowledge, Students, General Election

### **INTRODUCTION**

Political campaign programme is the delivery of knowledge associated with vision, mission, work programmes, and even political ideologies by certain individuals or political institutions. Political campaign aimed at the constituents include beginner voters such as senior high school students and equal (former high school senior) to improve their knowledge on their right as citizens to choose the right candidates for the House of Representatives and the regent, mayor, governor, and president (Afnaniyati, 2011).

#### **ARTICLE INFO**

*Article history:*

Received: 19 November 2015

Accepted: 04 May 2016

*E-mail addresses:*

[solatun@binus.edu](mailto:solatun@binus.edu) (Sayuti, S.D.),

[maras@binus.edu](mailto:maras@binus.edu) (Aras, M.)

\* Corresponding author

Political campaign is a form of political communication which is organised at a certain time. Political campaigns can be carried out by a person or group of people or a political organisation to gain political support from the people. It is one of the agenda in the general elections, local elections and presidential elections which have its own rules in which there is a schedule, procedures, supervision and sanctions in case of violation (Arifin, 2003; 2011, p.152-153).

Political campaigns can be a positive campaign or negative campaign (Suhartono, 2009). Positive campaign is the activity of conveying the vision, mission, and effective programmes to society such as socialisation and knowledge related to the vision, mission, and the work programme which is carried out based on government legislation. Negative campaign is often referred to as an activity that deviates from its actual mission or is prohibited, also known as a black campaign. Black campaign aims to agitate,, is inflammatory, abusive, libellous, pitting one against the other or spreading false news related to a group of people, organisations or political institutions with the aim of weakening one's political opponents (Almond et al., 1960).

This study examines at the presidential election campaign of 2014 and discusses the campaign rules as stated in Law No. 10 Year 2008 on General Election of President and Vice President. Article 41 of the Law No. 10 Year 2008 mentioned activities which are prohibited in the campaign, as well as prohibitions relating to black campaign,

namely (1) insulting one's religion, ethnicity, race, class, candidate and / or the spouse of another candidate; and (2) and pitting one against other individual or communities (Pahmi, 2010). With regards to black campaign, Article 214 states that "those who deliberately violate the prohibition of the campaign shall be punished with imprisonment of minimum 6 months and maximum 24 months and a fine of at least Rp. 6,000,000.00 and maximum Rp. 24,000,000.00".

Based on the above, the research questions of this study are: (1) Can political campaign materials increase the beginner elector's knowledge of the general election? and (2) Is there any significant difference between the students who are taught using the materials of political campaign and those who are not taught using the materials of political campaign? Therefore, the objectives of this research are: (1) To find out if the materials of political campaign can increase the beginner elector's knowledge of the general election or not, and (2) To find out the difference between students taught using the materials of political campaign and those who are not taught using the materials of political campaign.

## RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The sample population of this study was third year students of X Senior High School at Bekasi, West Java Indonesia . Random sampling technique was used, namely Social Class, which consists of 50 students from two classes.

The design used in this research is the experimental design as follows:

Table 1  
*Experimental Design*

Randomly	Pretest	Treatment	Post-test
Experimental Group	O <sub>1</sub>	X <sub>1</sub>	O <sub>2</sub>
Control Group	O <sub>1</sub>	X <sub>2</sub>	O <sub>2</sub>

From the experimental design above, subjects are divided into two groups: experimental group and control group. The experimental group consist of students taught using campaign material). The treatment (X) was expected to influence the dependence variable (Y). To know how the treatment (X) influenced (Y), a pretest (T<sub>1e</sub>) was given to the subject, and after the experiment ended, a post-test (T<sub>2e</sub>) was given by subtracting the result of T<sub>1e</sub> to get D<sub>e</sub>' which will show how effective the campaign materials has been in increasing knowledge of the third year students of X Senior High School at Bekasi West Java Indonesia. This research has two variables, namely independent variable and dependent variable. The independent variable consists of political campaign materials and verbal explanation, and the dependent variable is the students' mastery of the political campaign materials.

Independent variable is the classroom presentation of materials of political campaign. The students compete to teach the goal of the materials and are appreciated. The goal here is to obtain as much knowledge of the political campaign materials as possible. A dependent variable is the students' mastery

of campaign materials or the treatments. The students' knowledge of the materials relate to their achievement through post-test after learning the political campaign materials.

Data were collected through two kinds of tests, namely pretest and post-test, consisting of 40 multiple choice questions on the political campaign materials.

The pretest was aimed at finding out the students' achievement in vocabulary before being given the treatment (Training for improvement) they were given the campaign materials while the post-test was to find out the students' vocabulary strength after being given the political campaign materials.

After collecting pretest data on the achievements of both groups, the author taught campaign materials to both groups. The experimental group was given the campaign materials while the control group received none.

The data collection procedure is described below:

1. Pretest: The pretest questions were also asked on 14<sup>th</sup> April 2014 to both the experimental group and control group successively. They were given 60 minutes to answer the questions.
2. Treatment. The first treatment for the experimental group was conducted on 17<sup>th</sup> April 2014. The first treatment for the control group was also conducted on 17<sup>th</sup> April 2014. The second treatment for experimental group was conducted on 19<sup>th</sup> April 2014. The second treatment for the control group

was also conducted on 19<sup>th</sup> April 2014. The third treatment for the experimental group was conducted on 21<sup>st</sup> April 2014. The third treatment for the control group was also conducted on 21<sup>st</sup> April 2014.

3. Post-test. The post-test questions were asked on 23<sup>rd</sup> April 2014 to both the experimental group and the control group successively and they were allocated 60 minutes to answer the questions.

Data from the two tests were analysed quantitatively. Statistical calculation was used to support or reject the hypothesis. The following procedures were adopted in the quantitative analysis:

1. Tabulating the scores of both the given tests.
2. Measuring the mean of each test by using the formula:

$$M = \frac{\sum X}{N}$$

The result will be  $MT_1$  = The mean scores for pre-test and  $MT_2$  = The mean scores for the post-test.

3. Subtracting  $MT_1$  from  $MT_2$  by using the following formula:  
 $DE = MT_{1e}$  for experimental group  
 $DC = MT_{2c}$  for control group

4. To know the significance of the difference between the two means, they were analysed through statistical calculation (Hadi, 1988, p.268):  $t = \frac{(M_X - M_Y)}{\sigma_{bM}}$

Where  $\sigma_{bM} = \sigma^2 M_1 + \sigma^2 M_2$

**RESULTS**

Pretest and post-test instruments were used in this research. Before the experiment began, the pretest or  $T_1$  was conducted to both groups to discover the students' knowledge of political campaign materials in General Election 2014; the scores were ( $X_{1c}=1850$  and  $X_{1e}=1749$ ).

The post-test or  $T_2$  was conducted among students in the experimental group and control group after the political campaign materials had been taught to both groups - control group through ordinary teaching and experimental group through political campaign materials delivery. The scores were ( $X_{2c}=1965$  and  $X_{2e}=2150$ ).

To apply the statistical calculation of the pretest ( $T_{1e}$ ) and post-test ( $T_{2e}$ ) of the experimental group, the scores ( $X_{1c}=1749$  and  $X_{2e}=2150$ ). The mean scores of the  $T_{1E}$  was obtained by dividing the total of all the  $T_{1E}$  scores (1749) with the number of subjects (25) which equals 69,96. Similarly, the mean of the  $T_2$  was calculated by dividing the total of all the  $T_{2E}$  scores (2150) by the number of subjects (25), which was equal to 86.

The progress made by the experimental group is seen in the difference between the

two means ( $D_E$ ) that is, by subtracting the mean of  $MT_{1E}$  from  $MT_{2E}$ :

$$DE = MT_{2E} - MT_{1E} \\ = 86 - 69.96 = 16.04$$

To compare the two groups the scores of control group found in pretest ( $T_1C$ ) and post-test ( $T_2C$ ) were tabulated,  $X_{2C}=1965$  and  $X_{2E}=2150$ .

To find out the mean scores for the control group in the pretest ( $T_1C$ ) and post-test ( $T_2C$ ) the same formula was used as for the experimental group.

$$MT_{1C} = X/N = 1850/25 = 74; \\ MT_{2C} = 1966/25 = 78.64$$

The result of the post-test ( $T_2C$ ) showed some progress which can be seen from the difference between the mean of  $T_2C$  and the mean of  $T_1C$  in the following calculation:

$$DC = MT_{2C} - MT_{1C} = 78.64 - 74 = 4.64$$

After obtaining the mean difference between the experimental group ( $D_E$ ) and the control group ( $D_C$ ) in the pre test and post test scores it was found that the difference for Experimental Group ( $D_E$  16.04) was higher than the Control Group ( $D_C$  4.64), namely 11.4.

To test the significance of the mean difference between correlated samples, such as those used in this experiment, the author used the long T-Formula as discussed in the methodology.

1. First, we have to find out the  $SD_{bM}$  or the value of:

$$SD_{bM} = SD^2M^X + SD^2M^Y$$

2. To calculate  $SD_{bM}$ , we have to find the value of  $SD^2M^X$  and  $SD^2M^Y$  as shown below:

- a. The value of mean group X and group Y

$$MX = Fx/N = 2150/25 = 86; \\ My = Fy/N = 1965/25 = 78.6$$

- b. The value  $\sigma^2$  of group X and group Y

$$\sigma^2_{MX} = Fx^2/N = 144 ; \\ \text{Likewise } \sigma^2_{My} = Fy^2/N = 161.44$$

- c. The value of  $\sigma$  of mean group X and group Y

$$\sigma_{Mx} = \sigma^2_{MX} / (N-1) = 6; \\ \sigma_{My} = \sigma^2_{My} / (N-1) = 6.73$$

- d. The difference errors of mean value of group X and Y.

$$\sigma_{bM} = 3.5679$$

- e. The degree of freedom (d.f)

$$d.f = (N_x + N_y) - 2 = 25 + 25 - 2 = 48$$

3. The value of  $t = \frac{Mx - My}{SD_{bM}}$

Where  $M_x = F_x/N = 86$ ;  $M_y = 78.6$

Finally,  $t = (86 - 78.6)/3.5679 = 2.0740$

The final analysis shows  $t = 2.0740$ . From the “ $t$ ” value 2.021, it can be seen that the degree of freedom  $d.f = N_x + N_y - 2$  ( $25 + 25 - 2 = 48$ ) was 2.021. The value of “ $t$ ” (2.0740) was rejected by using the level of significance 0.05, where ‘ $t_n$ ’ is higher than ‘ $t_t$ ’ ( $2.074 > 2.021$ ).

## DISCUSSION

This experiment was conducted to discover if political campaign materials can increase student (beginner voter) knowledge of the general election in Indonesia. Is there any significant difference between students that were taught the materials of political campaign and those who were not? This research question was aimed at finding if teaching campaign materials yielded better or worse result than ordinary teaching ( $H_a: X_e = X_c$ ). The research hypothesis is as follows: Materials of political campaign can increase the students’ knowledge of the general election, and there is no significant difference between the students taught using materials of political campaign and those who are not taught using political campaign materials”.

Based on the scores of experimental group,  $T_{1E}$  and  $T_{2E}$  ( $X_{1C}=1749$  and  $X_{2E}=2150$ ), data indicated that the scores of  $T_{1E}$  was 1749, so the mean of  $T_{1E}$  was 69.96 and the scores of  $T_{2E}$  was 2150, so the mean of  $T_{2E}$  was 86. This indicated that the

materials of political campaign can increase student knowledge of general election and has an influence over them.

The scores of the control group in their  $T_{1C}$  and  $T_{2C}$  was ( $X_{1C}=1850$  and  $X_{2C}=1965$ ), indicating that the score of  $T_{1C}$  was 1850, so the mean of  $T_{1C}$  was 74. This showed that the materials of political campaign can increase the students’ knowledge of the general election. After teaching the materials, they were tested (post-test). The score of  $T_{2C}$  was 1965, so the mean score of  $T_{2C}$  was 78.6. The results indicated that both the Experimental Group and Control Group made better progress after being taught the same period of time by using the same materials but by using different teaching techniques. The mean difference of the experimental group was (86) which was higher than the control group (78.6), and the difference was 7.36. The fact that DE was higher than DC showed that the experimental group yielded better result than the control group. It means that delivery of political campaign materials was better than the ordinary teaching in the class.

Furthermore, to know whether the differences were significant or not, final analysis by using  $t - test$  formula showed that  $t$  was 2.0740. By looking at the table  $t$  value (2.021), it can be seen that the degree of freedom  $d.f = N_x + N_y - 2 = 25 + 25 - 2 = 48$  was 2.021. The value of  $t$  (2.0740) was rejected by using the level of significance 0.5, where  $t_n$  is higher than  $t_t$  ( $2.074 > 2.021$ ). The differences between the two teaching techniques were significant.

## CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

### Conclusion

Based on the findings above, below are some conclusions that can be drawn from this research experiment:

1. The political campaign materials related to the General Election yielded better results than that of ordinary socialisation for beginner elector in the case of the third year students of X Senior High School in school at Bekasi West Java Indonesia. Data showed that the mean score of Experimental Group (86) was higher than Control Group (78.6).
2. There was a significant difference in terms of knowledge of the general election between those that were taught the political campaign materials and those who were not. Data showed that  $t_n$  is higher than  $t_t$  ( $t_n = 2.074$  and  $t_t = 2.021$ ).

### RECOMMENDATION

Below are some suggestions as to how student knowledge of the general election can be improved:

1. Materials related to political campaigns should be taught to third year students as a beginner elector in a General Election in order to increase their knowledge of political campaigns and political issues.

2. Every Senior High School must be socialised in the political campaign material so that they become an informed beginner elector in the general election.

### REFERENCES

- Afnaniyati, M. (2011). *Pengaruh Tingkat Pendidikan Pemilih Pemula Terhadap Angka Golput Pada Pilkada Lamongan 2010 di Kec. Kedungpring Kab. Lamongan*. Retrieved from Digital Library UIN Sunan Ampel: <http://digilib.uinsby.ac.id/8961/5/BAB%20II.pdf>
- Almond, G. A., & Coleman, J. S. (1960). *Introduction: A functional approach to comparative politics*. Boston: Little Brown.
- Arifin, A. (2003). *Komunikasi politik: paradigma-teori-aplikasi-strategi dan komunikasi politik Indonesia*. Jakarta: Balai Pustaka.
- Arifin, A. (2011). *Komunikasi politik: filsafat-paradigma-teori-tujuan-strategi dan komunikasi politik Indonesia*. Yogyakarta: Graha Ilmu.
- Hadi, S. (1988). *Statistik Jilid 2*. Jakarta. Andi Offset. Litbang Kompas/Gianie. *Memetakan Minat pemilih pemula*. Retrieved from [www.Indonesiamemilih.com](http://www.Indonesiamemilih.com)
- Pahmi, S. (2010). *Politik pencitraan*. Jakarta: Gaung Persada Press.
- Suharto, Djahrudin, and Suripto. (2009). Tingkat Kesadaran Politik Pemilih Pemula Dalam Pilkada Suatu Refleksi School-Based Democracy Education (Studi Kasus Pilkada Provinsi Banten dan Jawa Barat). *Jurnal Civicus*, 13(2), 9-25.

