Master Thesis



Social media, politics, and young adults: The impact of social media use on young adults' political

The impact of social media use on young adults' political efficacy, political knowledge, and political participation towards 2014 Indonesia General Election

Indriani Rahmawati s1498436

Faculty of Behavioural Science Communication Studies Media and Communication

Examination committee: Prof. J.A.G.M. van Dijk, Ph.D M.G.M. Marloes Jansen, M.Sc

20-08-2014

Author

Indriani Rahmawati S1498436 | indrianirahmawati@student.utwente.nl Master student of Communication Studies

Host Institution

University of Twente. Faculty of Behavioral Sciences Drienerlolaan 5 7522 NB Enschede The Netherlands

Date of Graduation

20th August 2014

Examination Committee

Prof. J.A.G.M. van Dijk, Ph. D M.G.M. Marloes Jansen, M.Sc

Acknowledgement

First of all, I would like to thank Allah SWT. for His blessing. I have never been here without His permission. Thank you for giving me the opportunity to see the Netherlands, Enschede, and University of Twente. Thank you for teaching me how to respect other cultures and how to become a part of minority. Alhamdulillah!

My highest gratitude goes to Prof. J.A.G.M. van Dijk, Ph.D as my first supervisor and M.GM. Marloes Jansen, M.Sc as my second supervisor. Thank you for your assistances, feedbacks, and supports. Thank you for believing me that I could finish my master thesis. Also, I would like to thank Ministry of Communication and Information Technology for financial support during my one-year study.

My next gratitude goes to my parents, sister, and brother. I am sorry to make you worried in the middle of this journey. But, I have a lot of friends from Indonesia Student Association in Enschede who always cheer me up. Last, I would like to express my gratitude to you, who always beside me during the hardest time.

After all, this is not the end of my journey. This is the start where something bigger will happen in my future. See you when I see you the *'lekker'* cheese!

Abstract

The 2014 Indonesia General Election is a fourth general election that is conducted after the downfall of Soeharto's authoritarian regime. This is the last general election that separates parliamentary election and presidential election. As the largest group of internet users in Indonesia, young adults were occupied 30 percent of total voters in this general election. This study tried to investigate the impact of social media use for political activities on young adults' political efficacy, political participation, and political knowledge. Using an online questionnaire, a total of 593 young adults participated in this study. The results show that social media use for political activities influenced young adults' political efficacy, political participation, and political knowledge. The highest influence was on young adults' political efficacy. When trying to control social media use for political activities with frequency of general social media use, it was found that frequency of general social media use influenced social media use for political activities. Those with higher frequency of general social media use were also having higher frequency of social media use for political activities. After that, the investigation tried to work other way around. It was found that those with greater political efficacy, greater political participation, and greater political knowledge were also having higher frequency of social media use for political activities. These findings suggest that other intermediary factors may influence the relationships among variables in this study. Thus, further studies are needed to understand other intermediary factors that may influence these causal relationships.

Keywords: Indonesia, general elections, social media, young adults, politics, political efficacy, political participation, political knowledge.

Table of Content

Acknowledgement		 ii
Abstract		 iii
Table of Content		 iv
List o	of Tables	 vi
List o	of Figures	 vii
Chap	ter 1 Introduction	 1
1.1	Research context	 1
1.2	Research question	 3
1.3	Structure	 3
Chap	ter 2 Theoretical Framework	 5
2.1	Basic model	 5
2.2	Social media use for political activities	 6
2.3	Young adults in Indonesia	 8
2.4	Political efficacy	 10
2.5	Political knowledge	 11
2.6	Political participation	 12
2.7	Pemilu 2014	 12
2.8	Summary of hypotheses and	
	research model	 13
Chap	ter 3 Methodology	 16
3.1	Sample	 16
3.2	Procedure	 19
3.3	Scales	 21
3.4	Reliability test	 25
3.5	Data analysis	 25
Chap	ter 4 Result	 28
4.1	General result	 28
4.2	Multiple regressions	 28
4.3	Path analysis	 29

Chap	oter 5 Discussion and Conclusion	 45
5.1	Conclusion	 45
5.2	Discussion	 47
5.3	Limitations and directions for	
	future research	 58
5.4	Practical implications	 60
5.5	Final remarks	 61
Refe	rences	 62
Appendices		 69

List of Tables

Table 1.	Summary of hypotheses	 14
Table 2.	Demographic characteristics	
	of participants	 17
Table 3.	Summary of scales	 23
Table 4.	Reliability test and	
	Scales descriptive	 25
Table 5.	Results of multiple regressions	 29
Table 6.	Final results of hypothesis testing	 45

List of Figures

Figure 1.	Basic model	 6
Figure 2.	The proposed research model	 15
Figure 3.	Path diagram of research model	 31
Figure 4.	Path diagram of gender	 32
Figure 5.	Path diagram of education level	 33
Figure 6.	Path diagram of	
	employment status	 34
Figure 7.	Path diagram of income level	 35
Figure 8.	Path diagram of religion	 35
Figure 9.	Path diagram of frequency of	
	general social media use	 36
Figure 10.	Path diagram of age	 37
Figure 11.	Path diagram of modified model	 38
Figure 12.	Path diagram of gender	
	in modified model	 39
Figure 13.	Path diagram of education level	
	in modified model	 39
Figure 14.	Path diagram of employment	
	status in modified model	 40
Figure 15.	Path diagram of income level	
	in modified model	 41
Figure 16.	Path diagram of religion	
	in modified model	 41
Figure 17.	Path diagram of frequency of	
	general social media use in	
	modified model	 42
Figure 18.	Path diagram of age	
	in modified model	 42
Figure 19.	Path diagram of reversed model	 43

Chapter 1 Introduction

The first chapter consists of three sections: Section 1.1 explains the research context of this study, Section 1.2 describes the purpose and research question of this study, and Section 1.3 provides the structure of this paper.

1.1 Research context

Social media are currently believed to play a significant role in politics. Many recent studies have been conducted to determine the impact of social media on political fields such as political efficacy (Tedesco, 2007; Kushin & Yamamoto, 2010), political knowledge (Baumgartner & Morris, 2010), and political participation (Zhang, Johnson, Seltzer, & Bichard, 2009; Baumgartner & Morris, 2010; Bakker & de Vreese, 2011; Dimitrova & Bystrom, 2013). According to Campbell, Gurin, and Miller (as cited in Zhang et al., 2009, p. 81), political efficacy refers to the feeling that an individual citizen can play a part in carrying political and social change. While, political knowledge refers to the series of actual political information that are stored in long-term memory (Delli Carpini & Keeter, 1996). In addition, political participation refers to "behavior that could affect government action – either directly by influencing the public policies that are implemented or indirectly by influencing the elections of political actors creating those policies" (Verba as cited in Yamamoto, Kushin, & Dalisay, 2013, p.4). Furthermore, political efficacy and political knowledge are considered as strong predictors of political participation (Kenski & Stroud, 2006; Jung, Kim, & de Zuniga, 2011). Kenski and Stroud (2006) argue that a healthy democracy consists of citizens who have high levels of political efficacy, political knowledge, and political participation

Nevertheless, the impact of social media has not yet been scrutinised with Indonesia's political environment. Indonesia is a country that has 73.19 million internet users – with young people as the majority of internet users - (APJII, 2014) and has a general election in 2014. Hence, it is thought-provoking to investigate the impact of social media on young adults' political efficacy, political knowledge, and political participation towards the 2014 Indonesia General Election (Pemilihan Umum 2014/ Pemilu 2014).

Moreover, this research will focus on Indonesia for three other reasons. Firstly, as the most democratic country in South-East Asia (Ufen, 2010), the democracy system of Indonesia

is still in its infancy (Nugroho, 2011; Nugroho & Syarief, 2012). For more than three decades Indonesia was controlled by Soeharto's New Order. There was less freedom in all aspects of social, economic, and political life. In his era, only three political parties could participate in general elections, namely Indonesia Democratic Party (Partai Demokrasi Indonesia/ PDI), United Development Party (Partai Persatuan Pembangunan/ PPP), and Functional Groups Party (Partai Golongan Karya/ Golkar). Golkar always used to win the general elections, and then arranged Soeharto as a President for 32 years. The downfall of Soeharto's authoritarian regime in 1998 is a point in which Indonesia enrolled a new democracy, namely reformation (Nugroho & Syarief, 2012). Young adults have played a significant role in that moment. Nowadays, Indonesia has successfully conducted three general elections: in 1999, 2004, and 2009. In 2014, Indonesia will have another general election. Notably, Pemilu 2014 will be the last general election that separates the Parliamentary Election (Pemilihan Legislatif/ Pileg) and the Presidential Election (Pemilihan Presiden/ Pilpres). Pileg will be conducted on April 9th, 2014, while Pilpres will be conducted on July 9th, 2014. Since the Constitution Court has decided the judicial review of the Law of Republic of Indonesia No. 42 of 2008 concerning the election of the President and Vice President, Pileg and Pilpres will be conducted at the same time for future general elections.

The next reason is the current ownership of traditional mass media in Indonesia has threatens citizens' rights to obtain neutral information (Nugroho & Syarief, 2012). Presently, there are three owners of large private media groups who will participate in Pemilu 2014. The first is Aburizal Bakrie, the owner of TV One and ANTV (television) and also the Chairman of Golkar. The second is Surya Paloh, the owner of Metro TV (television) and Media Indonesia, Lampung Post, Borneo News, Prioritas (newspaper) and also the Chairman of Democrat National Party (Nasional Demokrat/ Nasdem). The third is Hary Tanoesoedibyo, the owner of MNC Group (RCTI, Global TV, MNC TV, Sindo TV, many radio stations, newspapers, and magazines) and also the Chief of Winning Election Body of People Conscience Party (Hati Nurani Rakyat/ Hanura). From 13 television stations that broadcast nationally, six are owned by these politicians. Nugroho and Syarief (2012) argue that those politicians use their mass media as political campaign tools to influence public opinion. Potential conflict of interest can be seen from their mass media attitudes that tend to be biased in contents over the last five years. Their television stations have been warned by the Indonesia Broadcasting Commission (Komisi Penyiaran Indonesia/ KPI) because they infringed the protection of citizens' right to gain neutral information in the mass media (The Jakarta Post, 2013, 2014a, 2014b). According to Sunandar (2013) and Ardipandanto (2014), these traditional mass media have failed to deliver fairly sufficient political information to citizens. They have also failed to give

equal opportunity to citizens to participate in politics (Suryati, 2014). Consequently, it harms the quality of a healthy democracy (Sunandar 2013; Ardipandanto, 2014).

Lastly, Indonesia places the fourth rank in Asia (after China, India, and Japan) and eighth in the world in terms of internet user's population (Nugroho & Syarief, 2012). Most of these internet users use the internet for social media, mainly Facebook and Twitter. There are 29.4 million Twitter users in Indonesia with Jakarta as the most active Twitter city (Semiocast, 2012). In addition, according to the Vice President of Facebook for Asia Pacific, there are 64 million Facebook users in Indonesia (Grazella, 2013). Their popularity is believed to be a way of conquering traditional mass media obstacles for citizens and also for political parties and politicians (Ediraras, Rahayu, Natalina, & Widya, 2013). Social media offer a wider scope than the previous mass media. In addition, they are cheaper (Safranek, 2012; Hong, 2013) and more independent (Safranek, 2012) than other traditional mass media. Thus, social media enable citizens to directly obtain political information, communicate, and interact with politicians and political parties.

However, very few studies of the impact of social media on general elections in Indonesia have been conducted so far. Most of these studies only focus on social media as a political marketing tool for politicians (e.g Ediraras et al., 2013; Ahmad & Popa, 2014). In order to understand the impact of social media on Pemilu 2014, therefore, it is necessary to measure social media use for political activities towards political efficacy, political knowledge, and political participation among young adults in Indonesia.

1.2 Research question

The purpose of this study is to gain a deeper understanding of how social media influence political efficacy, political knowledge and political participation among young adults in Indonesia. This study will answer the following research question: *To what extent does social media, when used for political activities, influence young adults' (a) political efficacy, (b) political knowledge, and finally (c) political participation?*

1.3 Structure

This paper is structured as follows: the introduction explains the context, purpose, research question, and structure of this research. The next section reviews relevant literatures on social media use for political activities, political efficacy, political knowledge, political participation, and Pemilu 2014. Then, the methodology explains how the research is conducted to test the hypotheses and answer the research question. Following this, the result

of data collection is discussed to make a conclusion. At the end, the limitation, direction for future research, implication, and final remarks are presented in this paper.

Chapter 2 Theoretical Framework

The second chapter consists of eight sections: Section 2.1 presents the basic model of social media use, political efficacy, political participation, and political knowledge, Section 2.2 explains social media use for political activities, Section 2.3 portrays the limit age of young adults in Indonesia and their attitude towards politics, Section 2.4 describes the concept of political knowledge, Section 2.5 describes the concept of political efficacy, Section 2.6 describes the concept of political participation, Section 2.7 explains Pemilu 2014, and Section 2.8 presents proposed research model.

2.1 Basic model

A considerable amount of literature has been published on political efficacy, political knowledge, and political participation (e.g Kenski & Stroud, 2006; Kaid, McKinney, & Tedesco, 2007; Tedesco, 2007; Baumgartner & Morris, 2010; Kushin & Yamamoto, 2010; Bakker & de Vreese, 2011; Jung, et al., 2011; Vitak, Zube, Smock, Carr, Ellison, & Lampe, 2011; Gil de Zuniga, Jung, & Valenzuela, 2012; Dimitrova & Bystrom, 2013; Strandberg, 2013). Some of these studies suggest that political efficacy and political knowledge are strong predictors of political participation (Kenski & Stroud, 2006; Kaid et al., 2007; Jung, et al., 2011).

In this present study, social media are believed can play an important role in the political environment. Social media provide venues where social media users can express political views and interact with politicians or political parties. In addition, studies by Kenski and Stroud (2006), Kushin and Yamamoto (2010), Vitak et al. (2011), Gil de Zuniga et al., (2012), and Strandberg (2013) suggest that social media are used to influence young adults' political efficacy, political, knowledge, and political participation. The relationships between social media use, political efficacy, political knowledge, and political participation are presented in the following Figure 1.



Figure 1. Basic model (adapted from Kenski & Stroud, 2006; Kushin & Yamamoto, 2010; Vitak et al., 2011; Gil de Zuniga et al., 2012; Strandberg, 2013)

2.2 Social media use for political activities

According to Kaplan and Haenlein (2010), social media are "a group of internet-based applications that build on the ideological and technological foundations of Web 2.0 and that allow the creation and exchange of user generated content" (p. 61). The terms Web 2.0 and 'user-generated content' serve as significant factors in social media. Web 2.0 is a platform in which content and applications are created and modified by all users (Kaplan & Haenlein, 2010). Thus, 'user-generated content' is "the various forms of media content that are publicly available and created by end users" (Kaplan & Haenlein, 2010, p.61).

As pointed out in the introduction, social media, particularly Facebook and Twitter, have many users in Indonesia. Facebook is a social networking site founded by Mark Zuckerberg and his friends in early 2004. Originally, Facebook was intended for Harvard students with a harvard.edu email address. In 2006, Facebook became open to the public. Now, after a decade, Facebook has become the largest social media site in the world (Constine, 2014).

According to a study by Strandberg (2013), the use of Facebook and Twitter generates a great effect to engage in politics. Social media users, who lack of interest and motivation to politics, would be more feasible to access political content consciously through social media. In general elections context, social media use for political activities is one of predictors of political participation, mainly for turnout and voting (Strandberg, 2013).

Vitak et al. (2011) suggest that there is a positive relationship between the intensity in use of Facebook for political purposes and political participation among college students.

Facebook enables college students to collect greater political knowledge and to improve political efficacy. These factors are linked to greater political participation in prior research (e.g. Delli Carpini & Keeter, 1996; Kenski & Stroud, 2006). Vitak et al. (2011) mention several political activities that exist through standard features of Facebook. These political activities are: posting status updates about politics; posting political messages on friends' walls; writing and sharing political notes within their networks; giving comments on their friend's posts; sharing political opinions; joining political groups; becoming a fan of candidates; and downloading political applications. These political activities will then appear on users' News Feed and can be seen by their friends. Facebook users can also view their friend's political activities by scrolling through the News Feed on their homepage. Currently, most of these activities also appear in Indonesia. Since Facebook is updated, however, political activities such as becoming a fan of a candidate changed into click "Like" on the candidate's page.

Moreover, Twitter is a microblogging site launched in March 2006. The basic concept of Twitter is to share a message with up to 140 characters. This message is called a tweet and can be shared (retweeted) by other users. The tweets can be categorised by using hashtag (#). Unlike other social media, the relationship between Twitter users is labeled as 'follower' and 'following'. A user can follow and be followed by other users. The user who is followed does not need to follow back the others. A Twitter user, who has many followers, is known as a celeb-twit. Furthermore, Twitter also enables their users to perform several political activities, such as posting tweets about politics, retweeting or quoting tweets about politics, following politicians and political parties, mentioning politicians or political parties. In their study, Tumasjan et al. (2010) argue that these features enable Twitter users to discuss politics and join political debate with other users. In other words, Twitter may increase their political participation. In the last five years, these activities have also appeared in Indonesia.

Nevertheless, many scholars still argue that the traditional mass media significantly shape public opinion toward politicians and political parties in Indonesia's general elections (Mukrimin, 2012; Mujani & Liddle, 2010; Liddle & Mujani 2007). In their study of Pemilu 2004, Liddle and Mujani (2007) suggest that television exposure strongly increased both political knowledge and political efficacy among voters. Their survey of the second-round's Pilpres 2004 showed that their participants followed political news from television (68%), radio (23%), and newspapers (19%). In a survey of Pemilu 2009, Mujani and Liddle (2010) suggest that television campaigns for both Parliamentary and Presidential elections are the most important factors that shape voting behaviour. Voters had obtained political news from television (88.8%), newspaper (34.9%), and radio (30%) during the election campaign

(Mujani & Liddle, 2010). The result suggests that the traditional mass media, particularly television, reach almost every single voter in Pemilu 2009 (Mujani & Liddle, 2010). Conversely, the use of internet and social media was still limited in Pemilu 2009 (Mujani & Liddle, 2010).

After Pemilu 2009, a number of researchers have investigated the impact of social media on local elections in Indonesia (e.g Ediraras et al., 2013; Ahmad & Popa, 2014). They found that social media have been widely used by politicians and political parties for their political campaign. According to a study by Ediraras et al. (2013), social media have emphasized political participation among young adults in Indonesia. By using social media to communicate and interact directly with the politicians or political parties, young adults might obtain political information that could improve their political knowledge and political efficacy (Ediraras et al., 2013).

This leads to the following hypotheses:

- Hypothesis 1: Social media use for political activities positively influences social mediauser's political efficacy, political participation, and political knowledge.
- Hypothesis 1a : Higher frequency of social media use for political activities leads to greater political efficacy
- Hypothesis 1b : Higher frequency of social media use for political activities leads to greater political participation.
- Hypothesis 1c : Higher frequency of social media use for political activities leads to greater political knowledge

2.3 Young adults in Indonesia

Leman et al. (2012) claim that early adulthood ranges from the age of 18 to 40. They suggest that these young adults modify their use of logic and consideration to the various possibilities in a real life situation. They also suggest that young adults can shift between idealistic and practical solutions to a problem and better recognise the areas of greyness that often exist in real-world dilemmas and social judgments. In addition, Strauss and Howe (1991) mention that people aged between 18 and 30 are known as Generation Y. This generation is ingenious, fearless, and taking control of their future. At the moment in Indonesia, Generation Y is in higher education or in the first or second steps of their career. They have been exposed to a more politically free post-Reformasi. Chen and Syailendra (2014) state that Generation Y in Indonesia is well-informed, change seeking, opinionated, cosmopolitan, mobile, savvy, and connected.

According to the Law of the Indonesian Republic No. 8 of 2012 concerning Parliamentary Elections, a voter is a citizen of Indonesia who has reached 17 of age or who is already (or has been) married. In other words, someone who is under 17 years old and married or divorced also has a right to vote. Then, according to the Law of the Indonesian Republic No. 40 of 2009, youth are the citizens of Indonesia who have entered the important period of growth and development, ranging in age 16 to 30. Young adults ranging in 17 to 30 occupied almost 30 percent of the total voters in the List of Final Voters compiled by General Election Commission (KPU).

A recent phenomenon among young adults in Indonesia is vexation with political parties or, in other words, anti-party attitudes. They viewed political parties as corrupt, with a lack of concern for public welfare, without excellent programmes, and less competent as leaders (Chen and Syailendra, 2014). Kompas' study in 2010 (as cited in Chen & Syailendra, 2014, p. 7) showed that young adults in Indonesia are white voter, politically apathetic, less nationalistic, and politically passive.

There are various studies available on general elections in Indonesia (e.g Nugroho & Syarief, 2012; Ediraras et al., 2013; Ahmad & Popa, 2014; Chen & Syailendra, 2014). However, there are far fewer studies explaining the political efficacy, political knowledge, and political participation of young adults. Hence, this study wants to explore young adults' political efficacy, political knowledge, and political participation on the basis of frequency of general social media use and demographic characteristics such as gender, education level, employment status, income level, religion, and age.

Strandberg (2013) proposes that age, gender, education, and level of income will help to explain social media use among citizens. These demographic characteristics are repeatedly used in other research models to explain political participation and political knowledge (see e.g. Kenski & Stroud, 2006; Gil de Zuniga, Puig-I-Abril, & Rojas, 2009; Bakker & deVreese, 2011; Dimitrova, Shehata, Stromback, & Nord, 2011; Dimitrova & Bystrom, 2013; Tang & Lee, 2013). Studies by Liddle and Mujani (2007) and IFES (2010) suggest that religion is an important sociological factor in Indonesian's political participation. Currently, Indonesia has six official religions with Islam as the most dominant religion. Moreover, Lorenzini and Giugni (2012) argue that young adult's political participation has a relationship with their employment status. Anderson (2010) and Levy (2011) state that employment status is also related to political efficacy. In addition, some researchers argue that the frequency of general social media use is also positively related to political efficacy (e.g. Chan, Wu, Hao, Xi, & Jin, 2012; McKinney, Houston, & Hawthorne, 2013). Generally, those with a high socioeconomic

status tend to be higher in the level of social media use, political efficacy, political knowledge, and political participation than those lower on it (Jung, et al., 2011).

To summarize this background, the following hypotheses are submitted:

Hypothesis 2a	: Gender of social media users influences their political efficacy, political
	participation, and political knowledge.

- Hypothesis 2b : Education level of social media users influences their political efficacy, political participation, and political knowledge.
- Hypothesis 2c : Employment status of social media users influences their political efficacy, political participation, and political knowledge.
- Hypothesis 2d : Income level of social media users influences their political efficacy, political participation, and political knowledge.
- Hypothesis 2e : Religion of social media users influences their political efficacy, political participation, and political knowledge.
- Hypothesis 2f : Frequency of general social media use of social media users influences their political efficacy, political participation, and political knowledge.
- Hypothesis 2g : Age of social media users influences their political efficacy, political participation, and political knowledge.

2.4 Political efficacy

According to Campbell, Gurin, and Miller (as cited in Zhang et al., 2009, p. 81), political efficacy refers to the feeling that an individual citizen can play a part in affecting political and social change. In the same vein, Tan (as cited in Kushin & Yamamoto, 2010, p.615) defines political efficacy as an individual's belief that his or her attempts can impact political processes. Studies by Kenski and Stroud (2006), Lee (2006), and Tedesco (2007) classify political efficacy into two dimensions: internal political efficacy and external political efficacy. Internal political efficacy is an individual's belief about their competence to understand and to participate actively in politics. On the other hand, external political efficacy is an individual's belief about the responsiveness of governmental authorities and institutions to citizens' requests.

Abramson and Aldrich (1982) state that citizens should first believe that they have a capability of affecting change before they are able to realise the value of actively engaging in political change. They argue that without feelings of competency and beliefs that their actions are important, they have little stimulus to participate in politics. Levy (2013) claims that when an individual has a high level of political efficacy, she or he is more likely to vote,

contact public officials about public issues, involve himself or herself in political activism, use informational news media, and become psychologically involved in politics.

To conclude this background, the following hypothesis is submitted:

Hypothesis 3 : Greater political efficacy of social media users positively influences their political participation.

2.5 Political knowledge

The internet, including social media, enables social media users to access unlimited information. It also enables the diffusion of information rapidly and cheaply. Social media users can freely send information to other social media users. Therefore, every information consumer is also an information producer on the internet (Polat, 2005). Noveck (2000) states that information should be screened and contextualised to be knowledge so that it can be useful and give meaning. Social media users who are exposed to political information on social media, mainly in campaign period, should screen this information in order for it to become political knowledge.

Delli Carpini and Keeter (1996) define political knowledge as the series of actual political information that becomes stored in long-term memory. They claim that more knowledgeable voters are more likely to be interested to politics, committed to various forms of participation, attached to democratic principles, opinionated, and efficacious. They suggest that the functions of democracy are at the best point when citizens are politically informed. Political knowledge can be gained through formal education, news media, discussion at the office, or exposure on social media.

Political knowledge has been settled to be related to political participation (e.g Jung, et al., 2011). Kaid et al. (2007) found that young people largely attributed their lack of political knowledge to their lack of political participation. Meanwhile, Jung, et al. (2011) investigated the effect of political knowledge on political participation. The result shows that political knowledge significantly influences political participation. According to Polat (2005), people who are more informed about politics may potentially participate more because they know the impact for their lives. In contrast, there is also a possibility that those who are more political participation (Polat, 2005). However, lack of empirical evidence supported this possibility. Many scholars still argue that political knowledge could increase political participation (e.g Jung et al., 2011; Gil de Zuniga et al., 2012; Yamamoto et al., 2013).

This leads to the following hypothesis:

Hypothesis 4 : Greater political knowledge of social media users positively influences their political participation.

2.6 Political participation

According to Verba (1995), political participation refers to "behavior that could affect government action – either directly by influencing the public policies that are implemented or indirectly by influencing the elections of political actors creating those policies" (as cited in Yamamoto et al., 2013, p.4). In the same vein, Kenski and Stroud (2006) define political participation as the involvement in activities related to politics, such as making a donation to a campaign or influencing others to vote. In addition, Budiarjo (2009) defines political participation as an activity of an individual or a group to actively participate in political life by choosing the President and directly or indirectly influencing work on a political campaign, seeking party funding, being part of political campaign team, a member of political party, a volunteer of political party, seeking support for a candidate, trying to persuade others, contacting political rally, and casting a vote at the election (Gaffar, 1997; Kenski & Stroud, 2006; Vitak et al., 2011; Tang & Lee, 2013; Yamamoto et al., 2013).

Polat (2005) argues that the internet may increase political participation. The internet, including social media, provides a medium to engage in politics. The recent study by Strandbeg (2013) found that social media use is one of predictors for political participation. In his study of social media, Facebook and Twitter have greater effect on political participation than other traditional internet platform.

2.7 Pemilu 2014

According to the Law of the Indonesian Republic No. 10 of 2008, General Election refers to a medium of implementation of the citizen's sovereignty that is implemented directly, freely, generally, anonymously, and fairly based on Pancasila and the Constitution of the Indonesian Republic 1945. As pointed out in the introduction, Pemilu 2014 consists of two phases: Pileg and Pilpres. Pileg will be conducted on April 9th, 2014, while Pilpres will be held on July 9th, 2014. This will be the last general election that separate Pileg and Pilpres.

All the election processes of Pemilu 2014 are organized by KPU. KPU is an institution set up in 1998 to ensure the neutrality of election processes. KPU has successfully conducted

three general elections in 1999, 2004, and 2009. In addition to Pemilu 2014, KPU decided that the campaign period for Pileg 2014 will run from January 11th to April 5th, 2014. However, outdoor political rallies, banners, large meetings, and political advertisements in the mass media are only allowed from March 16th - April 5th, 2014. Then, April 6th-8th, 2014 has been set aside as a cooling down period.

In 2013, KPU announced 15 political parties that passed qualification procedures. However, only 12 parties had a right to participate in the national election because the three others were local political parties in Nanggroe Aceh Darussalam (one of the special areas in Indonesia). The twelve parties consist of Islamic parties such as Prosperous Justice Party (Partai Keadilan Sejahtera/PKS), National Awakening Party (Partai Kebangkitan Bangsa/ PKB), United Development Party (Partai Persatuan Pembangunan/PPP), and Crescent Star Party (Partai Bulan Bintang/PBB), and also national parties such as Democrat Party (Partai Demokrat), Indonesia Democratic Party of Struggle (Partai Demokrasi Indonesia – Perjuangan/ PDIP), National Mandate Party (Partai Amanat Nasional/PAN), Great Indonesia Movement Party (Partai Gerakan Indonesia Raya/ Gerindra), Indonesia Justice and Unity Party (Partai Keadilan dan Persatuan Indonesia/ PKPI), Golkar, Nasdem, and Hanura. Political parties that win 20 seats in Pileg 2014 or 25 % of the total votes have a right to nominate President and Vice President Candidates for Pilpres 2014.

At this time of writing, even Pileg 2014 is not conducted yet, though several political parties have announced their candidates for Pilpres 2014. Firstly, Jokowi -the Governor of Jakarta- was declared as a president candidate from PDIP. His popularity among Indonesians was believed could increase PDIP votes. Secondly, Aburizal Bakrie –the leader of Golkar- has declared himself as a president candidate from Golkar. Thirdly, Prabowo Subianto –the leader of Gerindra- has declared himself as a president candidate from Golkar. Thirdly, Prabowo Subianto –the leader of Gerindra- has declared himself as a president candidate from Golkar. Thirdly, Prabowo Subianto –the leader of Gerindra- has declared himself as a president candidate from Golkar. Thirdly, Prabowo Subianto has the leader of Gerindra- has declared himself as a president candidate from Golkar. Thirdly, Prabowo Subianto has the largest number of fans on Facebook and Jokowi has the largest number followers on Twitter (Socialbakers, 2014a, 2014b).

2.8 Summary of hypotheses and research model

All hypotheses that will be tested in this study are summarized in the following Table 1.

Table 1

Summary of hypotheses

	Hypotheses
H1	Social media use for political activities positively influence social media user's political
	efficacy, political participation, and political knowledge.
H1a	Higher frequency of social media use for political activities leads to greater political
	efficacy.
H1b	Higher frequency of social media use for political activities leads to greater political
	participation.
H1c	Higher frequency of social media use for political activities leads to greater political
	knowledge.
H2a	Gender of social media users influences their political efficacy, political participation,
	and political knowledge.
H2b	Education level of social media users influences their political efficacy, political
	participation, and political knowledge.
H2c	Employment status of social media users influences their political efficacy, political
	participation, and political knowledge.
H2d	Income level of social media users influences their political efficacy, political
	participation, and political knowledge.
H2e	Religion of social media users influences their political efficacy, political participation,
	and political knowledge.
H2f	Frequency of general social media users influences their political efficacy, political
	participation, and political knowledge.
H2g	Age of social media users influences their political efficacy, political participation, and
	political knowledge.
H3	Greater political efficacy of social media users positively influences their political
	participation.
H4	Greater political knowledge of social media users positively influences their political
	participation.



For a clear overview, this following research model presents how all hypotheses work.

Figure 2. The proposed research model

Chapter 3

Methodology

The third chapter consists of five sections: Section 3.1 describes the sample of this study, Section 3.2 explains the procedure of this study and the pilot tests, Section 3.3 describes the scales of all variables, Section 3.4 presents the result of reliability test, and Section 3.5 explains the process of data analysis.

3.1 Sample

The data were obtained from internet users, particularly social media users in researcher's network. The link of questionnaire was distributed to initial participants through Facebook, Twitter, Path, Blackberry Messenger, Whatsapp, and personal email. By using snowball sampling technique, the questionnaire has reached 1.224 participants. However, only 825 eligible participants started this questionnaire and only 640 of them finished it. Then, forty seven incomplete answers of political participation were removed, leaving the answers from 593 participants to be counted.

Most of the participants of this study live in Jakarta, Bogor, Depok, Tangerang and Bekasi (54.5%). The others live in capital city of province (24.5%) such as Bandung, Serang, Semarang, Yogyakarta, Surabaya, Denpasar, Medan, Padang, Palembang, Pekanbaru, Lampung, Tanjung Pinang, Kupang, Mataram, Makassar, Gorontalo, Manado, Palu, Balikpapan, Banjarmasin, Pontianak, Ternate, and Jayapura. The rest live in small cities (21%) namely Banyuwangi, Kediri, Boyolali, Malang, Lamongan, Gresik, Sidoarjo, Sampang, Sukoharjo, Salatiga, Jember, Jombang, Purworejo, Magelang, Bantul, Sleman, Wonogiri, Kebumen, Grobogan, Karang Anyar, Pati, Sawahlunto, Kudus, Purwokerto, Demak, Jepara, Cilacap, Brebes, Ponorogo, Temanggung, Banjar Baru, Rembang, Solok, Blora, Cilegon, Lebak, Indramayu, Cirebon, Sukabumi, Garut, Ciamis, Cimahi, Singaraja, Lombok Barat, Batu Bara, Gunung Sitoli, Bukittinggi, Aceh Tengah, Lampung Tengah, Pare-pare, Baubau, Pinrang, Palopo, Luwu, Majene, and Poliwali Mandar. The participants were between 17 up to 30 years old, with the average age was 24.1 years old (SD = 3.4). Furthermore, the demographic characteristics of participants in this study are compared with the population of internet users in Indonesia. The result is summarized in Table 2.

SOCIAL MEDIA, POLITICS, AND YOUNG ADULTS

Table 2

Demographic characteristics of participants compared with population

Demographic characteristics of participants	n	%
Gender:		
Male	313	52.8
Female	280	47.2
Age:		
17-23 years old	265	44.7
24-30 years old	328	55.3

Education level:		
Elementary school	0	0.0
Junior high school	4	0.7
High school	172	29.0
Vocational/Bachelor	364	61.4
Master/Doctor	53	8.9
Income level per month:		
less than USD 100	193	32.5
USD 100 – 300	152	25.6
USD 301 - 500	99	16.7
USD 501 – 700	66	11.1
higher than USD 700	83	14.0

Demographic	c characteristics of	%
Population		70
Gender:		
	Male	51.6
	Female	48.4
Age:		
	Younger than 15 years old	9.9
	16-19 years old	10.9
	20-24 years old	11.6
	25-29 years old	14.2
	30-34 years old	11.8
	Older than 34 years old	41.7
Education lev	vel:	
	Elementary school	7.5
	Junior high school	11.3
	High school	47.9
	Vocational/Bachelor	31.9
	Master/Doctor	1.3
Income level	per month:	
	USD 100 – 300	72.0
	higher than USD 300	28.0

Employment status:

Employment status:

SOCIAL MEDIA, POLITICS, AND YOUNG ADULTS

Unemployed	31	5.2
Student	249	42.0
Government employee	97	16.4
Employee	166	28.0
Entrepreneur	22	3.7
Others	28	4.7
Religion:		
Islam	490	82.6
Catholic	36	6.1
Christian	53	8.9
Hindu	5	0.8
Buddhist	5	0.8
Confucian	4	0.7
Daily time spend on Facebook:		
less than 30 minutes	220	37.1
30-60 minutes	141	23.8
1 - 2 hour	120	20.2
2-4 hour	13	2.2
4-7 hour	65	11.0
more than 7 hour	34	5.7
Daily time spend on Twitter:		
less than 30 minutes	332	56.0
30-60 minutes	105	17.7
1 - 2 hour	87	14.7
2-4 hour	40	6.7
4-7 hour	19	3.2
more than 7 hour	10	1.7

Unemployed	5.8
Student	25.6
Employee	53.3
Housewives	15.3

Religion:

0		
	Islam	87.1
	Catholic	1.6
	Christian	2.9
	Hindu	0.7
	Buddhist	0.1
	Confucian	0.1
	Missed	7.5

Daily time spend on Facebook:

Daily time spend on Twitter:

Notes. Based on APJII (2012) and BPS (2013). For * = not available.

*

*

Table 2 shows that 313 men (52.8%) and 280 women (47.2%) participated in this study. They consist of students (42%), employee (28%), government employee (16.4%), entrepreneur (3.7%), other worker (4.7%), and unemployed (5.2%). Most of their latest education was in vocational or bachelor degree (61.4%) and high school (29%). Most of the participants earned less than USD 100 (32.5%) and USD 100-300 (25.6%) per month. Majority of their religion is Islam (82.6%). Moreover, most of participants spent less than 30 minutes on Facebook per day (37.1%). Whilst, more than half of participants spent less than 30 minutes to access Twitter per day (56%).

Compared to The Profile of Indonesia's Internet Users by APJII (2012), the demographic characteristics of participants more or less represented the population of Indonesia's internet users. In APJII's data, Indonesia's internet users consisted of 51.6% male and 48.4% female. APJII's data also showed that majority of internet users were employee (53.3%) and student (25.6%), with latest education was in high school (47.9%) and vocational or bachelor degree (31.9%). Furthermore, people with income less than USD 300 dominated almost three forth of all internet users (72.0%). In addition to religion, data from Indonesian Statistics showed that 87.18% of Indonesians are Islam, 1.6% Catholic, 2.9% Christian, 0.7% Hindu, 0.1% Buddhist, and 0.1 % Confucian (BPS, 2013). Nevertheless, the description of daily time spent on Facebook and daily time spent on Twitter were not described clearly in APJII's data and Indonesian Statistics.

3.2 Procedures

In order to test these hypotheses, an online questionnaire was designed. According to Wright (2005), online questionnaire enable the researcher to gain thousands of responses in less time than offline questionnaire. It also enables the researcher to reach participants outside the researcher's area. Consequently, it requires less financial resources than offline questionnaire. Moreover, the previous studies by Baumgartner and Morris (2009), Kushin and Yamamoto (2010), Vitak et al. (2011), Gil de Zuniga et al. (2012), and Yamamoto et al. (2013) have also used online questionnaire to measure the impact of social media on young adults.

In this present study, social media use for political activities on Facebook, social media use for political activities on Twitter political knowledge, internal political efficacy, external political efficacy, and political participation were measured in the online questionnaire. The first part of questionnaire was an introduction explaining the objectives of this research. There was also an announcement to win one of the prizes for participants who fill in and share this questionnaire with other people aged 17-30. The second part was questions about age and place of residence. The third part was 8 questions of social media use for political activities on Facebook. Following this, 7 questions of social media use for political activities on Twitter were presented. The fourth part was 4 questions related to political knowledge. The fifth part was 5 questions related to political efficacy and 2 questions of external efficacy. The next part was 5 questions related to political participation. Lastly, demographic characteristics questions were displayed. To close the questionnaire, the information related to prizes were provided.

Next, two pilot tests were conducted to improve the reliability and validity of the questionnaire. The questionnaire was translated into Bahasa before the first pilot test was conducted. The first pilot test consisted of ten participants. These participants were gained from the researcher's network. Each of them have specific characteristics such as male, female, high educated, student, unemployed, high income level, Islam, Christian, Catholic, or high frequency of general social media use. The concern was these participants would represent the part of population in the daily life. Moreover, the purpose of the first pilot test is to measure the reliability, validity, and clarity of the questionnaire's translation. The clarity of translation from English to Bahasa is important to gain the same meaning among participants.

In the first pilot test, the participants sat together in a small room with wireless internet connection. The researcher sent the invitation letter with a link to the questionnaire via Facebook, Twitter, Path, Whatsapp, Blackberry Messenger, and personal email to the participants. The participants could open the link through their notebook, tablet, and smartphone. After filled in the questionnaire, the researcher gave them an evaluation form to get their feedback. The results of the first pilot test suggest that the questionnaire was clear enough and could be understood by the participants. However, the results also suggest that political knowledge and political participation have insufficient scores of reliability test.

In order to improve the reliability of political knowledge and political participation, the second pilot test was conducted. Two questions of the political knowledge and two questions of political participation have been modified. The questionnaire has also been updated based on the feedback of the first pilot test. Then, the invitation of the questionnaire was distributed to 15 participants with the same characteristics as the first pilot test through Facebook, Twitter, Path, Whatsapp, Blackberry Messenger, and personal email. But, only 14 participants gave their response. The result shows that the reliability scores of political knowledge and political participation were sufficient. Therefore, it was decided that the questionnaire was ready. The complete questionnaire of this study can be seen in Appendix A.

The data collection was conducted via Qualtrics for one month, from April 11th to May 11th 2014. At that time, the Pileg 2014 has been established and still waiting for the result which

would determine the Pilpres 2014. We suggested that people have been attached to politics during that time.

3.3 Scales

In order to measure the impact of social media use for political activities on political efficacy, political knowledge, and political participation, some scales were derived from previous studies. The scales for social media use for political activities on Facebook were based on a study by Vitak et al. (2011). They developed an Index Items for Political Activity on Facebook. This index consisted of 14 items of political activities that can occur through Facebook's features. At this moment, some features on Facebook have been updated so that only eight items can be used to measure social media use for political activities on Facebook. Those items were posting a status update about politics, giving a comment on their friend's post about politics, posting or sharing a photo/video/link about politics, writing or sharing a note about politics with their network, joining or leaving a group about politics, clicking "going" for a political event, discussing a political issue on message, and clicking "like" on a political party or politician's fan page. In addition to Twitter, seven items that have been identified by Tumasjan et al. (2010) were modified for the purpose of this study. These items were *posting a tweet about politics*, retweeting or quoting a tweet about politics, following a politician or political parties, mentioning a politician or a political party, replying a tweet about politics, joining a political discussion, and *joining a political debate.* All of these social media use for political activities were measured by a 5-point scale ranging from 1 as never to 5 as very often. Social media use for political activities on Facebook and Twitter were served as an exogenous variable.

The scales of political efficacy were derived from previous studies by Kenski and Stroud (2006), Lee (2006), and Tedesco (2007). They classified political efficacy into two dimensions: internal political efficacy and external political efficacy. The internal political efficacy was an individual's beliefs about his or her competence to understand and to participate actively in politics. The external political efficacy was an individual's beliefs about the responsiveness of governmental authorities and institutions to citizens' requests. Kenski and Stroud (2006), Lee (2006), and Tedesco (2007) measured internal and external political efficacy based on items on American National Election Studies. Therefore, this research also used those items that have a strong reliability and validity to measure political efficacy. Three items of internal political efficacy (*well-qualified, better informed,* and *pretty good understanding*) and two items of external efficacy (*have a say about what the government does* and *have a say over who gets to be president*) were measured by a 5-point Likert's scale ranging from 1 as strongly disagree to 5 as strongly agree. In this study, political efficacy was served as an endogenous variable. It was

determined by social media use for political activities and controlled by gender, education level, employment status, income level, religion, frequency of general social media use, and age of participants.

Moreover, political knowledge was also served as an endogenous variable. It was driven by social media use for political activities and controlled by gender, education level, employment status, income level, religion, frequency of general social media use and age of participants. The scales of political knowledge were taken from previous studies conducted by Kenski and Stroud (2006) and Dimitrova et al. (2011). They have developed some items related to general election issues in order to measure political knowledge. Four items were modified to be used in Indonesia context. Example of statements were *'When Pileg 2014 was held in Indonesia?'* and *'How many political parties were joined Pileg 2014?'*. All of these items were open-ended questions. The *'don't know'* option was provided for each question. Later, the answers were checked one by one to decide whether it was correct. The correct answer was recorded as 1 (had sufficient knowledge) and the incorrect or 'don't know' answer was recorded as 0 (had insufficient knowledge).

Lastly, the scales of political participation were partly taken from previous studies by Tang & Lee (2013) and Yamamoto et al. (2013). Five items were used to measure general political participation. Example of statements were *'Have you ever participated in demonstrations?'* and *'Have you ever donated money for political parties or politicians?'*. *'Yes'* and *'No'* options were provided to answer these questions. Political participation was served as an endogenous variable. It was determined by social media use for political activities, political efficacy, political knowledge and controlled by gender, education level, employment status, income level, religion, frequency of general social media use and age of participants. .

Demographic characteristics such as gender, education level, employment status, income level, religion, and age were served as control variable in this study. Later, frequency of general social media use was also added to be used as control variable. Altogether gender, education level, employment status, income level, religion, frequency of general social media use, and age were used for comparison and measured by 7 close-ended questions.

The summary of scales used in the questionnaire is presented in the following Table 3.

Table 3

Summary of scales

Variables	Dimension	Items	Source		
Social media use for	Social media use for political activities on Facebook	Post a status update	Vitak et al. (2011)		
political activities		Give a comment			
		Post or share a photo/video/link			
		Write or share a note			
		Join or leave a group about politics			
		Join a political event			
		Join a discussion			
		Become a fan			
	Social media use for political activities on Twitter	Post a tweet	developed from Tumasjan et al.		
		Retweet or quote a tweet	(2010) and Vitak et al. (2011)		
		Follow			
		Mention			
		Reply a tweet about politics			
		Join a political discussion			
		Join a political debate			
Political efficacy	Internal political efficacy	Well-qualified	Kenski and Stroud (2006), Lee		
		Better informed	(2006), and Tedesco (2007)		
		Pretty goood understanding			
	External political efficacy	Have say about what government does			
		Have say over who gets to be presidents			
Political knowledge		Pileg 2014	developed from Kenski and		
C		Pilpres 2014	Stroud (2006) and Dimitrova et		

	Total number of political parties Supervision institution for general elections	al. (2011)
Political participation	Contact politicians or government officers Attend political event Participate on demonstration	Tang & Lee (2013) and Yamamoto et al. (2013)
	Donate money Vote	

3.4 Reliability test

To test whether the variables used in this study were reliable or not, a reliability test using IBM SPSS Statistic 22 was conducted. The result of reliability test is presented in Table 4.

Table 4

Reliability test and scale descriptive

Scale descriptive	N	N- Items	Rel. (α)	Mean	SD
Scales:					
Social media use for political activities on Facebook		8	.92	1.98	.87
Social media use for political activities on Twitter		7	.93	1.99	.95
Internal political efficacy	593	3	.83	3.26	.93
External political efficacy	593	2	.83	3.27	.94
Political knowledge	593	4	.72	3.17	1.15
Political participation	593	5	.70	2.19	1.44

Table 4 provides an overview of Cronbach's alpha scores. First, the 8 items of social media use for political activities on Facebook have a Cronbach's alpha of .92. Second, the 7 items of social media use for political activities on Twitter were scored .93. It was the highest reliability score among other variables. Next, internal political efficacy and external political efficacy were scored .83. The 4 items of political knowledge were scored .72. Last, the 5 items of political participation were scored 0.70. It was the lowest reliability score among other variables. Since the Cronbach's alpha score for a satisfactory reliability was .70 (Pallant, 2010), all of these scores were satisfied. Therefore, all variables in this study were reliable.

3.5 Data analysis

The collected data from Qualtrics were imported to IBM SPSS Statistic 22. After that, the codes of several control variables were changed to be used as dummy variables. First, education level was recorded to low education level (*elementary school, junior high school*, and *high school*) and high education level (*vocational, bachelor, master,* and *doctoral*). People with the highest education at elementary school, junior high school, or high school were presented in the low education level because they only have the basic knowledge. While, those with the highest education at vocational, bachelor, master, and doctoral were

presented in the high education level because they have advance knowledge. In Indonesia, citizens were required to study until junior high school only. Recently, most of the citizens continued to finish the high school to get a better job. But to be a white collar, they need to have vocational, bachelor, master, or doctoral degree.

Second, employment status was recorded to unemployed (*housewives, fresh graduates, people looking for job,* and *student*) and employed (*government employee, employee, entrepreneur,* and *other workers*). Unemployed participants usually have less knowledge and less income than employed participants. Later, student was excluded from unemployed participants to test their influence in this study. It was considered that student may have better knowledge than other unemployed participants.

Moreover, income level was recorded as low income level (*less than USD 100, USD 100-300,* and *USD 301-500*) and high income level (*USD 501-700* and *higher than USD 700*). People with income from less than USD 500 were considered as the group of people with low level of income because according to the survey by BPS (2012), they gained less than national average living cost. Whilst, people with income higher than USD 700 were considered as the group of people with high level of income because they earned money more than national average living cost (BPS, 2012).

Next, religion was recorded as Islam and other religions (*Christian, Catholic, Hindu, Buddhism, and Confucian*). The consideration was Islam has been followed by more than three forth of citizens in Indonesia. There was also a fact that four political parties in the Pemilu 2014 are Islamic political parties. There were no political parties in the Pemilu 2014 that based on Christian, Catholic, Hindu, Buddhist, or Confucian concepts.

In addition, frequency of general social media use was recorded to low frequency of general social media use (*less than 30 minutes, 31 minutes-1 hour,* and *1-2 hours*) and high frequency of general social media use (*2-4 hours, 4-7 hours*) and *more than 7 hours*). According to a study by Strandberg (2013), people who use social media less than 2 hours are the light users and those who use social media more than 2 hours are the heavy users. As a consequence, participants who use social media for general purpose less than 2 hours were considered as the group of people with low frequency of general social media use. While, those who use social media for general purpose more than 2 hours were considered as the group of general purpose more than 2 hours were considered as the group of general purpose more than 2 hours were considered as the group of general purpose more than 2 hours were considered as the group of general purpose more than 2 hours were considered as the group of general purpose more than 2 hours were considered as the group of general purpose more than 2 hours were considered as the group of general purpose more than 2 hours were considered as the group of general purpose more than 2 hours were considered as the group of general social media use

Last, age of social media user was recorded as young (*17-23 years old*) and old (*24-30 years old*). The concern was this study used a wide range of age for its participants. The younger participants may have different background with the older participants. The younger participants might be students or fresh graduates. They might be also the first-time

voters, while the older participants might be on their first or second steps of career. They may have passed one or two general elections before.

In order to test the hypotheses, the collected data were analyzed through multiple regressions and path analysis. Path analysis is an extension of multiple regression analysis that estimates the magnitude and strength of the impact within hypothesized causal model (Lleras, 2004). Path analysis attempts to examine the comparative strengths of direct and indirect relationships among variables through path coefficients. It can decompose several factors affecting the outcome into direct and indirect relationships. Path analysis helps to elaborate the various processes that underlying the specific outcome. Moreover, the relationships between variables in the path model are expressed in terms of correlations that represent hypotheses (Lleras, 2004). In other words, path model shows the theories that produce the causation.

Path analysis with maximum likelihood method was used to analyze the data. Path analysis decomposed relationship between social media use for political activities, political efficacy, political knowledge, political participation, frequency of general social media use, and demographic characteristics of participants. It tried to explain the strength of direct and indirect relationships between those variables. The results of multiple regressions and path analysis were presented in the following chapter.

Chapter 4 Result

The fourth chapter consists of three sections: Section 4.1 presents the general results of participants' answers, Section 4.2 displays the result of multiple regressions among variables in this study and Section 4.3 explains path analysis of relationships between exogenous and endogenous variables in the research, modified model, and reversed model.

4.1 General results

The answers of questionnaire were counted using IBM SPSS Statistic 22. The results show that participants of this study have used Facebook for: posting a status update about politics (63.4%), posting a comment about politics on their friend's wall (74.7%), posting or sharing a photo, video, or link about politics (57.3%), writing or sharing a note about politics (52.1%), and discussing a political issue on message (61.7%). They also have used Twiter for: posting a tweet about politics (55.6%), retweeting or quoting a tweet about politics (60.5%), following a political or a political party (56.5%), and participating in a political discussion (54.8%).

Moreover, most of participants have sufficient political knowledge. Most of them knew the date of Pileg 2014 (91.2%) and Pilpres 2014 (68%), the number of political parties that join the Pemilu 2014 (70%), and the institution that supervise the general elections (88.5%). In addition, majority of participants have high internal political efficacy. More than three-fourth of participants also have high external political efficacy. In terms of political participation, most of participants have attended an event related to politics (50.1%) and have voted in the general election (87.9%).

4.2 Multiple regressions

The analysis began by examining multiple regressions of exogenous, endogenous, and control variables. The multiple regressions were used to predict the relationships between social media use for political activities, gender, education level, employment status, income level, religion, frequency of general social media use, age, political efficacy, political participation, and political knowledge. The multiple regressions were conducted through a statistical software package namely LISREL 8.3 with a syntax command. LISREL (LInear
Structural RELation) is a statistical software package developed by Karl Jöreskog and Dag Sörbom.

The results suggest that social media use for political activities has positively significant relationships to political efficacy (β = .75, *p*< .05), political knowledge (β = .53, *p*< .05), and political participation (β = .57, *p*< .05). In addition, political efficacy and political knowledge have significant relationships to political participation. However, only two control variables that have significant relationships in the causal research model. Firstly, employment status has a significant relationship with political knowledge. Secondly, frequency of general social media use has a significant relationship with social media use for political activities and political participation. The results also suggest that those who have higher education level were employed and have high level of income. The summary results of multiple regressions among variables in this study are presented in the following Table 5.

Table 5

m 1,	c 1 1			
The result of	multinle	rearessions	amona	variantes
The result of	manupic	regressions	uniong	variables

	SMU	PE	РК	PP	GEN	EDU	EMP	INC	REL	FRE	AGE
SMU	1.000										
PE	.752	1.000									
РК	.536	.470	1.000								
РР	.576	.498	.370	1.000							
GEN	242	148	102	177	1.000						
EDU	063	.057	.094	.033	.075	1.000					
EMP	082	.022	.222	.059	.007	.403	1.000				
INC	224	067	.070	028	018	.652	.390	1.000			
REL	230	224	197	260	049	.042	.107	.246	1.000		
FRE	.242	.051	053	.138	125	177	155	241	.039	1.000	
AGE	086	.026	019	.014	.098	.175	052	.048	025	078	1.000

Notes: SMU = social media use for political activities, PE= political efficacy, PK= political knowledge, PP= political participation, GEN= gender, EDU= education, EMP= employment status, INC= income level, REL= religion, FRE= frequency of general social media use, AGE = age. p < .05.

4.3 Path analysis

The path analysis was conducted through LISREL 8.3 enables the researcher to estimates path coefficients between social media use for political activities, political efficacy,

political knowledge, political participation, frequency of general social media use, and demographic characteristics of participants. LISREL also enables the researcher to produce a path diagram. First, the data from spreadsheet was imported to LISREL 8.3. After that, the SIMPLIS syntax was written to build relationships among variables and to produce the path diagram.

To evaluate whether the causal models in Figure 3 until Figure 19 have a good fit or a poor fit, we could check on several goodness-of-fit statistics. First, the value of Chi-Square (χ^2) should be small in a good fit model. The large value of χ^2 indicates lack of satisfactory model fit (Garson; as cited in Peters, 2007, p.69). Second, the value of Goodness-of-Fit Index (GFI) should be greater than .90, others argue .95 for cut-off value. In this study, GFI greater than .90 means the model could be accepted. Third, the value of Standardized Root Mean Square Residual (SRMR) should be small. The smaller the value of SRMR, the better the model fit. Next, the value of Comparative Fit Index (CFI) should be equal or greater than .90. A value close to 1 indicates a very good fit. Last, the value of Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA) should be less than or equal to .5 for a better model fit. A value less than or equal to 0.8 means an adequate model fit. But, a value greater than .1 indicates a poor model fit. According to Garson (as cited in Peters, 2007, p. 68), overall fit test do not establish that particular paths within the model are significant. If the model has a good fit, we could interpret the path coefficients in the model. While, the path coefficients in a poor model fit are useless (Garson; as cited in Peters, 2007, p. 68).

4.2.1 Path analysis of the research model

The process of testing the research model begins from social media use for political activities, gender, education level, employment status, income level, religion, frequency of general social media use, and age to political efficacy, political participation, and political knowledge. In other words, the process starts from left to right for one-point of time. The result of this process is presented on path diagram in Figure 3.



Figure 3. Path diagram of research model

Figure 3 shows that the research model has a good fit with χ^2 = .48, df= 1, GFI= 1.00, SRMR= .0017, CFI= 1.00, RMSEA= .000 (90 percent confident interval for RMSEA= .000; .096). The standardized path coefficients in Figure 3 show significant direct effects of social media use for political activities on political efficacy (β = .79, *p*< .05), political knowledge (β = .60, *p*< .05), and political participation (β = .47, *p*< .05). It can be seen that the more frequent social media users use social media for political activities, the more their level of political efficacy, political knowledge, and political participation. In addition, the indirect effect of social media use for political activities to political participation via political efficacy generates a higher value of total effect (β = .55, *p*< .05). While, the indirect effect of social media use for political participation via political knowledge does not generate a higher total effect. It seems that the greater influence of social media use for political activities to political efficacy to political activities to political efficacy to political activities to political efficacy to political activities to political efficacy.

Moreover, employment status and income level also have significant direct effects to political knowledge and political participation. It also indicates that employed participants have greater political knowledge (β = .24, *p*< .05) and political participation (β = .10, *p*< .05) than unemployed participants. Meanwhile, social media user with high income level has higher level of political knowledge (β = .19, *p*< .05) and political participation (β = .14, *p*< .05) than social media user with low level of income. Last, political efficacy has direct effect to

political participation (β = .10, *p*< .05). It can be seen that social media users with greater political efficacy have greater political participation than those with poor political efficacy. The indirect effect of income level to political participation via political efficacy generates a higher total effect (β = .15, *p*< .05), but not via political knowledge. While, the indirect effect of employment status to political participation via political efficacy and political knowledge does not yield to a higher total effect.

As can be seen from Figure 3, the path diagram has succeeded to verify the research model. However, in order to gain a deeper understanding of how far the control variables control the endogenous variables, it was needed to split the research model into several partial models based on each of control variables. This was also done to ensure whether gender, education level, employment status, income level, religion, frequency of general social media use, or age actually control political efficacy, political participation, and political knowledge. The elaboration of partial models would provide a clear overview of the effects of control variables on the endogenous variables. The following Figure 4 is a path diagram of the first partial model with gender as a control variable.



Figure 4. Path diagram of gender as a control variable

As can be seen from the figure above, the model has a poor with χ^2 = 7.87, df= 1, GFI= .99, SRMR= .017, CFI= .99, RMSEA= .108 (90 percent confident interval for RMSEA= 0.048; 0.180). The standardized path coefficients in Figure 4 show significant direct effects of social media use for political activities on political efficacy, political knowledge, and political participation. However, gender has non-significant effects on political efficacy, political knowledge, and political knowledge, and political participation. In addition, the path diagram also shows that female participants may have greater political efficacy and political knowledge than male

participants, but male participants may have greater political participation than female participants.



Figure 5. Path diagram of education level as a control variable

Next, Figure 5 shows that the model has a poor fit with χ^2 = 5.44, df= 1, GFI= 1.00, SRMR= .014, CFI= 1.00, RMSEA= .087 (90 percent confident interval for RMSEA= .028; .160). The standardized path coefficients in Figure 5 show significant direct effects of social media use for political activities on political efficacy, political knowledge, and political participation. Nevertheless, education level only has significant effects on political efficacy and political knowledge. The path diagram indicates that social media users with higher level of education (*vocational, bachelor, master,* and *doctoral*) may have greater political efficacy and political knowledge than those with lower level of education (*junior high school* and *high school*).

In addition, a further analysis was conducted to measure the influence of high educated participants (*vocational, bachelor, master,* and *doctoral*). As presented in the previous chapter, high educated participants occupied 70.3% of total participants in this study. Thus, the data of high educated participants were tested into the general research model. The results indicate that the model has a good fit with χ^2 = 1.34, df= 1, GFI= 1.00, SRMR= .0014, CFI= 1.00, RMSEA= .044 (90 percent confident interval for RMSEA= .010; .112). The further analysis also tried to test the data of low educated participants into the model. Nevertheless, the results reveal that the model has a poor fit with χ^2 = 0.02, df= 1, GFI= .99, SRMR= .0012, CFI= 1.00, RMSEA= .000 (90 percent confident interval for RMSEA= .000; .062). Consequently, the findings of the present study only appropriate for high educated young adults.



Figure 6. Path diagram of employment status as a control variable

Figure 6 shows that the model has an adequate fit with χ^2 = 4.13, df= 1, GFI= 1.00, SRMR= .011, CFI= 1.00, RMSEA= .073 (90 percent confident interval for RMSEA= .011; .150). The standardized path coefficients in Figure 6 show significant direct effects of social media use for political activities on political efficacy, political knowledge, and political participation. But, employment status only has a significant effect on political knowledge. It can be argued that employed (*government employee, employee, entrepreneur*, and *other workers*) social media users may have greater political knowledge than unemployed social media users (*housewives, fresh graduates, people looking for job*, and *students*).

To determine whether particular social media users generate significant effects to political efficacy, political participation, and political knowledge, the simple linear regressions were tested between unemployed (*housewives, fresh graduates,* and *people looking for job*), students, and employed (*government employee, employee, entrepreneur,* and *other workers*) to their political efficacy, political participation, and political knowledge. Students were excluded from unemployed participants because it was considered that they might have better knowledge than other unemployed participants. The results indicate that only employed participants had a significant effect to political knowledge ($\beta = .15, t = 3.17, p < .001$). It seems that government employee, employee, entrepreneur and other kind of workers are more knowledgeable about politics. Furthermore, it was considered that students occupied almost half of total participants in this study. Then, the data of students were tested in the general research model. However, the results indicate that the model has a poor fit with χ^2 = 12.32, df= 1, GFI= .99, SRMR= .0016, CFI= .99, RMSEA= .213 (90 percent confident interval for RMSEA= .122; .256).



Figure 7. Path diagram of income level as a control variable

Figure 7 shows that the model has an adequate fit with χ^2 = 4.39, df= 1, GFI= 1.00, SRMR= .012, CFI= 1.00, RMSEA= .076 (90 percent confident interval for RMSEA= .016; .150). The standardized path coefficients in Figure 7 suggest significant direct effects of social media use for political activities on political efficacy, political knowledge, and political participation. However, income level only has significant effects on political efficacy and political knowledge. It can be seen that social media users with higher level of income may have greater political efficacy and political knowledge than those social media users with lower level of income.



Figure 8. Path diagram of religion as a control variable

As shown in Figure 8, the model has a poor fit with χ^2 = 7.26, df= 1, GFI= 1.00, SRMR= .016, CFI= .99, RMSEA= .103 (90 percent confident interval for RMSEA= .043; .180). The standardized path coefficients in Figure 8 show significant direct effects of social media use

= 4.39

= 1

=.03

=.076

for political activities on political efficacy, political knowledge, and political participation. However, religion has non-significant effects on political efficacy, political knowledge, and political participation. It can only be seen that those who were Islam have greater political efficacy, political knowledge, and political participation than other religions (*Christian, Catholic, Hindu, Buddhist,* and *Confucian*).



Figure 9. Path diagram of frequency of general social media use as a control variable

It can be seen from Figure 9 that the model has an adequate fit with χ^2 = 3.39, df= 1, GFI= 1.00, SRMR= .011, CFI= 1.00, RMSEA= .064 (90 percent confident interval for RMSEA= .000; .140). The standardized path coefficients in Figure 9 show significant direct effects of social media use for political activities on political efficacy, political knowledge, and political participation. However, frequency of general social media use has non-significant effects on political efficacy, political knowledge, and political participation. It can only be seen that the participants with lower frequency of general social media use may have greater political efficacy and political knowledge than the participants with higher frequency of general social media use may have greater social media use. In contrast, those with higher frequency of general social media use frequency of general social media use.



Figure 10. Path diagram of age of social media user as a control variable

The last path diagram in Figure 10 indicates that the model has a poor fit with χ^2 = 7.56, df= 1, GFI= .99, SRMR= .016, CFI= .99, RMSEA= .105 (90 percent confident interval for RMSEA= .045; .180). The standardized path coefficients in Figure 10 indicate significant direct effects of social media use for political activities on political efficacy, political knowledge, and political participation. However, age of social media user only has a significant effect on political efficacy. It means that the older social media users may have greater political efficacy than the younger social media users.

4.2.1 Path analysis of the modified model

After seen the results of the research model, it was considered that there is a possibility of the control variables to also control the exogenous variable. Therefore, the research model has been modified to understand whether gender, education level, employment status, income level, religion, frequency of general social media use, and age have direct relationships to social media use for political activities or indirect relationships to political efficacy, political knowledge, and political participation through social media use for political activities. The result of path analysis of modified model is displayed in the following Figure 11.



Figure 11. Path diagram of modified model

Figure 11 shows that this modified model has a good fit with with χ^2 = .48, df= 1, GFI= 1.00, SRMR= .0017, CFI= 1.00, RMSEA= .000 (90 percent confident interval for RMSEA= .000; .096). It also shows that education level (β = .16, *p*< .05) and frequency of general social media use (β = .18, *p*< .05) have direct effects to social media use for political activities. In addition, these effects generate significant effects between social media use for political activities to political efficacy, political participation, and political knowledge.

In order to ensure whether particular control variables really control the exogenous variable and the endogenous variables, the modified model was divided into each of control variables. The elaboration of these partial models was to obtain a deeper understanding of the effect of gender, education level, employment status, income level, religion, frequency of general social media use, and age on social media use for political activities, political efficacy, political participation, and political knowledge. The following Figure 12 is a path diagram of gender as a control variable of social media use for political activities, political efficacy, political participation, and political knowledge.



Figure 12. Path diagram of gender in modified model

As can be seen from Figure 12, the model has a poor fit with χ^2 = 7.87, df= 1, GFI= .99, SRMR= .017, CFI= .99, RMSEA= .108 (90 percent confident interval for RMSEA= .048; .180). The standardized path coefficient shows a non-significant direct effect of gender on social media use for political activities. Moreover, it can be seen that male participants have used social media for political activities more often than female participants.



Figure 13. Path diagram of education level in modified model

Next, Figure 13 shows that the model has a poor fit with χ^2 = 5.44, df= 1, GFI= 1.00, SRMR= .014, CFI= 1.00, RMSEA= .087 (90 percent confident interval for RMSEA= .028; .160). The standardized path coefficient shows a non-significant direct effect of education level on social media use for political activities. However, it also shows that participants with low education level used social media for political activities more often than those with higher level of education. This finding is contrast with the previous modified model in which

= 7.87

= 1

=.00

=.108

education level has a significant direct effect to social media use for political activities. Therefore, we ignore the result of this partial model due to a poor model fit.



Figure 14. Path diagram of employment status in modified model

Figure 14 indicates that the model has an adequate fit with χ^2 = 4.13, df= 1, GFI= 1.00, SRMR= .011, CFI= 1.00, RMSEA= .073 (90 percent confident interval for RMSEA= .011; .150). The standardized path coefficient indicates a non-significant direct effect of employment status on social media use for political activities. Nevertheless, it also indicates that unemployed participants (*housewives, fresh graduates, people looking for job,* and *students*) used social media for political activities more often than employed participants (*government employee, employee, entrepreneur,* and *other workers*).

To ensure whether particular social media users generate a significant effect to social media use for political activities, a further analysis was conducted. First, the participants of this study were divided into three groups: unemployed (*housewives, fresh graduates,* and *people looking for job*), students, and employed (*government employee, employee, entrepreneur,* and *other workers*). Next, the simple regressions were tested between unemployed, students, and employed to social media use for political activities. The finding suggests that students have a significant effect to social media use for political activities ($\beta = .12, t = 3.05, p < .001$).



Figure 15. Path diagram of income level in modified model

As can be seen from Figure 15, the model has an adequate fit with χ^2 = 4.39, df= 1, GFI= 1.00, SRMR= .012, CFI= 1.00, RMSEA= .076 (90 percent confident interval for RMSEA= .016; .150). The standardized path coefficient shows a non-significant direct effect of income level on social media use for political activities. But, it also shows that participant with lower level of income used social media for political activities more often than those with higher level of income.



Figure 16. Path diagram of religion in modified model

Figure 16 indicate that the model has a poor fit with χ^2 = 7.26, df= 1, GFI= 1.00, SRMR= .016, CFI= .99, RMSEA= .103 (90 percent confident interval for RMSEA= .043; .180). The standardized path coefficient indicates a non-significant direct effect of religion on social media use for political activities. However, it seems that participants who are Islam more

often used social media for political activities than those who were Christian, Catholic, Hindu, Buddhist, or Confucian.



Figure 17. Path diagram of frequency of general social media use in modified model

Figure 17 shows that the model has an adequate fit with χ^2 = 3.39, df= 1, GFI= 1.00, SRMR= .011, CFI= 1.00, RMSEA= .064 (90 percent confident interval for RMSEA= .000; .140). The standardized path coefficient shows a significant direct effect of frequency of general social media use on social media use for political activities. It means social media user with higher frequency of general social media use tend to have higher frequency of social media use for political activities.



Figure 18. Path diagram of age in modified model

Last, Figure 18 indicate that the model has a poor fit fit with χ^2 = 7.56, df= 1, GFI= .99, SRMR= .016, CFI= .99, RMSEA= .105 (90 percent confident interval for RMSEA= .045; .180). The standardized path coefficient indicates a non-significant direct effect of age on social media use for political activities. Yet, it shows that the younger participants used social media for political activities more often than the older participants.

4.2.3 Path analysis of the reversed model

After comparing and considering the findings of the research model and the modified model, it seems possible to control the process by reversing the initial research model. The process may work other way around from right to left. It suggests that the causal relationships may start from those who have greater political efficacy, political participation, and political knowledge demonstrate more social media use for political activities. The results of the reversed model are displayed in the following Figure 19.



Figure 19. Path diagram of reversed model

As can be seen from Figure 19, the reversed model has a perfect fit with χ^2 = .00 and df= 0. The path coefficients suggest that political efficacy (β = .54, *p*< .05), political participation (β = .24, *p*< .05), and political knowledge (β = .20, *p*< .05) did influence social media use for political activities. It can be seen that those with greater political efficacy, political participation, and political knowledge used social media for political activities more frequent than those with poor political efficacy, political participation, and political knowledge. It seems that there is an interaction between variables in the reversed model. The reversed model indicates a feedback relationship among political efficacy, political participation, political knowledge, and social media use for political activities.

Chapter 5 Conclusion

The fifth chapter consists of five sections: Section 5.1 presents the general conclusion of this study, Section 5.2 discusses the relationships among exogenous, endogenous, and a control variable, Section 5.3 explains the limitations and directions for future research, Section 5.4 defines the practical implications of social media use for political activities, and Section 5.5 provides the concluding remarks of this study.

5.1 General conclusion

The purpose of this study is to understand to what extent social media use for political activities influences political efficacy, political knowledge, and political participation among young adults in Indonesia. To answer that question, the results of hypothesis testing are presented in the following Table 6.

Table 6

	Hypotheses	Results
H1	Social media use for political activities positively influence social	Supported
	media user's political knowledge, political participation, and	
	political efficacy.	
H1a	Higher frequency of social media use for political activities leads to	Supported
	greater political efficacy.	
H1b	Higher frequency of social media use for political activities leads to	Supported
	greater political participation.	
H1c	Higher frequency of social media use for political activities leads to	Supported
	greater political knowledge.	
H2a	Gender of social media users influences their political efficacy,	Rejected
	political participation, and political knowledge.	
H2b	Education level of social media users influences their political	Rejected
	efficacy, political participation, and political knowledge.	
H2c	Employment status of social media users influences their political	Rejected

efficacy, political participation, and political knowledge.

H2d	Income level of social media users influences their political efficacy,	Rejected
	political participation, and political knowledge.	
H2e	Religion of social media users influences their political efficacy,	Rejected
	political participation, and political knowledge.	
H2f	Frequency of general social media users influences their political	Rejected
	efficacy, political participation, and political knowledge.	
H2g	Age of social media users influences their political efficacy, political	Rejected
	participation, and political knowledge.	
H3	Greater political efficacy of social media users positively influences	Supported
	their political participation.	
H4	Greater political knowledge of social media users positively	Rejected
	influences their political participation.	

As can be seen from the table above, hypotheses 1, 1a, 1b, 1c and 3 were supported by the findings of this study. However, hypotheses 2a, 2b, 2c, 2d, 2e, 2f, 2g, cand 4 were rejected. The results show that social media use for political activities does influence young adults' political efficacy, political knowledge, and political participation. Young adults may discover political activities in social media and by this way intensify their political knowledge, increase their political efficacy, and improve their political participation.

Moreover, a high number of students and high educated participants were detected in the sample. Further analyses, therefore, were conducted to measure the influence of students and high educated participants. The results show that the causal relationships in the general research model only fits with the data of high educated participants, but not with the data of students. As a consequence, the results of this study only appropriate for young adults with high education level.

Another important finding from the multiple regression analysis and the path analysis is that the highest influence of social media use for political activities was on their political efficacy. This is the feeling that their attempts can impact political processes. As a result, the greater political efficacy yields to greater political participation among young adults.

Moreover, the use of social media for political activities was influenced by frequency of general social media use. The more often they use social media, the more often they use social media for political activities. Conversely, demographic characteristics such as gender, education level, employment status, income level, religion, and age did not influence the frequency of social media use for political activities.

The deeper consideration of findings above will be discussed in the following section.

5.2 Discussion

5.2.1 The relationship between social media use for political activities and political efficacy

The higher frequency of social media use for political activities was hypothesized that leads to greater political efficacy. The result of research model in Figure 3 shows that social media use for political activities had a significant direct relationship to political efficacy. Moreover, the result of the modified model in which social media use for political activities was controlled by demographic characteristics and frequency of general social media use also shows that social media use for political activities had a significant direct relationship to political efficacy. Even when social media use for political activities was controlled by education level and frequency of general social media use, the influence was not yield to a different political efficacy. The score of path coefficient was still same as before controlled by education level and frequency of general social media use.

The statistical analysis indicates that higher frequency of social media use for political activities leads to greater political efficacy. When the participants used social media for political activities, it might increase their feeling that they have a significant role in political process. They might believe that their attempts have an impact in carrying political change. Therefore, the hypothesis 1a was supported.

However, the finding of the current study is contrast with the previous research. For instance, a study by Kushin and Yamamoto (2010) found that social media use for political activities only has a little impact to young adults' political efficacy. They suggested that the traditional internet platform played a greater role in affecting political efficacy than social media. They also suggested that the novelty of social media nature have discouraged any effect on political efficacy. Conversely, the relationship between social media and political efficacy was detected in the result of the present study. The result indicates that the effect of social media use for political activities was significant to political efficacy.

The inconsistency with the previous result might be caused by the timing of the study. The previous study by Kushin and Yamamoto (2010) was arranged in 2008, when Yahoo and MSN as online news portal were more popular than Facebook and Twitter as relatively new social media platform. Kushin and Yamamoto (2010) argued that the novelty of social media nature discouraged people to use social media as a source of political information. People were more familiar to find accurate political information on online news media than on social media (Kushin & Yamamoto, 2010). On the other side, the current study was conducted in 2014, when Facebook and Twitter have gained popularity among young adults. As mentioned earlier, Facebook has 64 million users whilst Twitter has 29.4 million users in Indonesia (Grazella, 2013; Semiocast, 2012). It seems possible that young adults have been more familiar with the social media nature in recent years. Social media enable young adults to gain political information directly from the political parties or politicians. Social media also enable young adults to experience politics at a more intimate interpersonal level by interacting and communicating directly with the politician (Kushin &Yamamoto, 2010).

Meanwhile, another control is needed to rule out that the direction of hypothesized relations in the model is not simultaneously reversed. Political efficacy might also lead to social media use for political activities. Using this control, the result shows that social media use for political activities was influenced by political efficacy. It seems possible that this result is affected by the affiliation of social media users on politics. Those with high political affiliation, such as party members or politicals, might be had higher political efficacy and therefore used social media for their political activities. So, a further study with more focus on political affiliation is needed.

5.2.2 The relationship between social media use for political activities and political participation

Hypothesis 1b states that higher frequency of social media use for political activities leads to greater political participation. The result of research model in Figure 3 shows that social media use for political activities had a significant direct relationship to political participation. The indirect relationship between social media use for political activities and political participation through political efficacy yielded to greater political participation. The indirect relationship between social media use for political participation. The indirect relationship between social media use for political activities and political participation through political knowledge, however, did not generate greater political participation.

Moreover, the result of modified model in which social media use for political activities was controlled by demographic characteristics and frequency of general social media use also shows that social media use for political activities had a significant direct relationship to political participation. The relationship was not significantly controlled by education level or frequency of general social media use. Comparing these results, it can be seen that higher social media use for political activities leads to greater political participation. As a consequence, the hypothesis 1b was supported. This finding supports the relation between social media use for political activities and political participation which has been described in previous study by Vitak et al. (2011), Conroy et al. (2012), Vesnic-Alujevic (2012), and Zhang et al. (2013). Vitak et al. (2011) found that social media use for political activities on Facebook was highly correlated with political participation. In addition, Zhang et al. (2013) found that social media use such as Facebook and Twitter have significant effect to political participation, online and offline.

Furthermore, the direction between social media use for political activities and political participation should also be reversed to control for another causal relationship possibility. The result indeed shows that social media use for political activities was also influenced by political participation. It seems possible that this result is caused by the engagement of social media users on politics. Social media users who have high political engagement may participate more on politics. According to Gil de Zuniga et al. (2009), those who more politically engaged are more likely to use social media for political activities. Therefore, a further study which takes political engagement into account will need to be undertaken.

5.2.3 The relationship between social media use for political activities and political knowledge

The higher frequency of social media use for political activities was hypothesized that leads to greater political knowledge. The result of research model in Figure 3 shows that social media use for political activities had a significant direct relationship to political knowledge. In addition, the result of the model with demographic characteristics and frequency of general social media use controlled the social media use for political activities shows that social media use for political activities had a significant direct relationship to political knowledge. The effect of education level and frequency of general social media use to social media use for political activities did not yield a different political efficacy. The score of path coefficient was still the same as before controlled by education level and frequency of general social media use.

The current study found that higher frequency of social media use for political activities leads to greater political knowledge. Political information that has been gained from social media was screened to be stored as political knowledge in young adult's memory. Therefore, hypothesis 1c was supported.

Nevertheless, the finding of the current study is contrast with the previous research by Dimitrova et al. (2011). Their research did not detect any relationship between social media use for political activities and political knowledge. Their finding suggests that the use of online news was more significant to influence political knowledge than the use of social media. According to their research, political interest, prior knowledge, and attention to political information on traditional mass media have influenced political learning that leads to greater political knowledge. On the contrary, the finding of the present study suggests that there was a significant effect of social media use for political activities to political knowledge. Those who have high frequency of social media use for political activities also have greater political knowledge. They may obtain more political information on social media which influence their political learning process and increase their political knowledge. Hence, the finding of the present study might be a positive empirical evidence for future researches.

Next, social media use for political activities was hypothesized that positively influence social media users' political efficacy, political knowledge, and political participation. The results of hypotheses 1a, 1b, and 1c indicate that social media use for political activities does influence social media users' political efficacy, political knowledge, and political participation positively. Therefore, hypothesis 1 was supported.

Furthermore, the direction between social media use for political activities was reversed to test another possibility of this causal relationship. The result indicates that social media use for political activities was also influenced by political knowledge. Perhaps those social media users with high political knowledge use social media to their political activities. It means that there is a feedback and reinforcement between these variables. The mechanism in this process might be a factor of interest on politics to use social media. Consequently, a further study of political interest is needed to discover this issue.

5.2.4 The relationship between gender, political efficacy, political knowledge, and political participation

Gender of social media users was hypothesized that influence their political efficacy, political knowledge, and political participation. The result of research model in Figure 3 shows that gender had non-significant direct relationships to political efficacy, political knowledge, and political participation. Furthermore, as can be seen from the result of the model with control variable maintain the relationships in Figure 11, gender shows a non-significant direct relationship to social media use for political activities. These results were unexpected and suggest that gender did not give any influence to social media use for political activities, political efficacy, political knowledge, or political participation. Therefore, the hypothesis 2a was rejected

However, the results also indicate that male participants had higher frequency of social media use for political activities than female participants. In general, there were only small

differences of political efficacy, political participation, and political knowledge between male and female participants.

The findings observed in this study may mirror those of the previous studies that have examined the effect of gender on political efficacy, political participation, and political knowledge. A study by Kenski and Stroud (2006) revealed that gender has non-significant relationships to political efficacy, political participation, and political knowledge. Zhang et al. (2013) also found a non-significant relationship between gender and political participation. Last, Jung et al. (2011) showed that gender has a non-significant relationship with political knowledge. They found online news exposure that controls the relationships between political efficacy, political participation, and political knowledge.

5.2.5 The relationship between education level, political efficacy, political knowledge, and political participation

Hypothesis 2b states that education level of social media users influence their political efficacy, political knowledge, and political participation. The result of research model in Figure 3 shows that education level has non-significant direct relationships to political efficacy, political knowledge and political participation. Surprisingly, the hypothesis 2b was rejected.

These results are failed to support the earlier studies by some researchers. Kenski and Stroud (2006) found that education level influence political efficacy, both internal and external. Next, Zhang et al. (2009), Jung et al. (2011), and Gil de Zuniga et al. (2012) found that education level has a significant effect to political participation. People with higher level of education may have greater political participation than those with lower level of education. Moreover, Jung et al. (2011), Dimitrova et al. (2011), and Kaid et al. (2007) showed that education level influence political knowledge. It can be seen that people with higher education level may have greater political knowledge.

The result of modified model in Figure 11 shows that education level had a significant direct relationship to the social media use for political activities. It indicates that those with higher education level (*vocational, bachelor, master,* and *doctoral degree*) use social media for political activities more often than those with lower education level (*elementary, junior,* and *high school*). A possible explanation for this might be that those social media users with high level of education have their own interest to use social media for political activities. They may have an objective to gain benefits from using social media for political activities. For instance, they may have better knowledge about economy development so that they request for a better economy development to the politicians in the House of Representatives, Ministries, or

other institutions through Facebook or Twitter. According to Zhang et al. (2013), education is a positive influence in increasing interest in politics. Education provides a set of cognitive skills that allows greater political interest (O'Neill, 2010).

Meanwhile, the further analysis suggests that the general research model may only valid for high educated social media users (*vocational, bachelor, master, and doctoral degree*). They occupied almost three-fourth of total participants, while those with lower education level (*elementary, junior,* and *high school*) only occupied one-fourth of total participants. In this analysis, the data of high educated and low educated participants were tested into the general research model one by one. The results indicate that the model only has a good fit with the data from high educated participants. This model has sufficient score of the goodness-of-fit statistics that used in this study.

Furthermore, we compared the result to the model in Figure 3. It seems possible that high educated participants were having a job and high level of income as presented in Figure 3. It also seems possible that they have greater political knowledge and political participation than low educated participants as displayed in Figure 3. As explained earlier, high educated participants might have interest to use social media for political activities so that enhanced their political efficacy, political knowledge, and political participation. There is also a possibility that people with high education level have more opportunity to access the internet, including social media. People with high education level may have high level of income which enables them to have personal computer, notebook, or mobile phone with internet connection. According to van Dijk (2012) people who have access to those media may participate more in politics, while those without access will be isolated in the future society.

5.2.6 The relationship between employment status, political efficacy, political knowledge, and political participation

Employment status of social media users was hypothesized that influence their political efficacy, political knowledge, and political participation. The result of research model in Figure 3 shows that employment status had significant direct relationships to political knowledge and political participation and had a non-significant direct relationship to political efficacy. Nevertheless, the result of the partial research model in Figure 6 shows that employment status had a significant direct relationship to political knowledge only, but not to political participation and political efficacy. The difference of political participation path coefficients between the partial research model in Figure 6 and the complete research model in Figure 3 is not very large. Since the partial research models were elaboration of the complete research model, we concluded that employment status had a non-significant relationship to political participation. This findings support the previous study by Lorenzini and Giugni (2012). They found that employment status only slightly influence political participation. Overall, since the results only supported political knowledge, the hypothesis 2c was rejected.

As mentioned in the previous chapter, it was considered that students were occupied almost half of the total participants in this study. Therefore, a further analysis with a simple regression was used to test the relationship between unemployed (*housewives, fresh graduates,* and *people looking for job*), students, and employed (*government employee, employee, entrepreneur,* and *others*) to their political efficacy, political participation, and political knowledge. The results indicate that employed participants had a significant relationship to political knowledge. It suggests that government employee, employee, entrepreneur and other kind of workers are more knowledgeable about politics. On the other hand, students and unemployed participants had non-significant relationships to political efficacy, political participation, and political knowledge. The reason of these results is not clear but it may have something to do with a high number of high educated participants in this study. As noted earlier, high educated participants have greater political knowledge. It seems possible that employed participants are part of high educated participants.

The result of the modified model, in which employment status controlled the social media use for political activities, shows that employment status had a non-significant direct relationship to social media use for political activities. This result was also supported in the partial modified model in Figure 14. It seems possible that these results are due to the very large number of students as participants in this study. Therefore, a further analysis with a simple regression was taken to test the effect of students when controlled social media use for political activities. The finding suggests that students have a significant relationship to social media use for political activities. It suggests that students more often use social media for political activities. Perhaps they have more interest to use social media use for political activities that might be based on their actual knowledge.

5.2.7 The relationship between income level, political efficacy, political knowledge, and political participation

Hypothesis 2d states that income level of social media users influence their political efficacy, political knowledge, and political participation. The result of research model in Figure 3 indeed shows that income level had significant direct relationships to political participation and political knowledge, but a non-significant relationship to political efficacy.

The result was also supported by the partial research model in Figure 7. Both of these results are consistent with a previous study by Jung et al. (2011). They found that people with higher income level tend to have greater political knowledge and political participation, but lack of political efficacy. Therefore, hypothesis 2d was rejected.

The result of modified model in Figure 11 shows that income level had a nonsignificant direct relationship to social media use for political activities. In addition, the result of partial modified model in Figure 15 also shows that income level had a non-significant direct relationship to social media use for political activities. However, both of these results suggest that those with lower level of income may use social media for political activities more often than those with higher level of income. These findings might be affected by the fact that majority of participants in this study are students, who have lower level of income. The previous finding has been revealed that students more often use social media for political activities.

Another potential explanation for this might be the possibility of other intermediary factors, such as personal motivation in politics, which encourage people with lower level of income to use social media for political activities. They might try to interact with politicians or political parties to communicating their request for the better welfare. However, further studies are needed to determine this possibility.

5.2.8 The relationship between religion, political efficacy, political knowledge, and political participation

The differences of religion (*Islam* and *other religions*) of social media users were hypothesized having influence on their political efficacy, political knowledge, and political participation. The result of research model in Figure 3 shows that the differences of religion had non-significant direct relationships to political efficacy, political knowledge, and political participation. Therefore, hypothesis 2e was rejected.

However, the religion in the current study are based on the answer of participants related their recognized religion. It was not measure their level of religiosity. The findings of current study suggest that political efficacy, political participation, and political knowledge may not relate to the appearance of Islamic political party or secular political party in general elections. It might be other intermediary factors, such as political engagement, political affiliation, or party identification, which controlled political efficacy, political participation, and political participation, and political knowledge among young adults.

These findings are in agreement with Liddle and Mujani (2007) findings which show that religion gave non-significant influence to political participation. They found that party leaders and party identification are the significant factors to influence political participation among voters in parliamentary and presidential elections. Moreover, they found that the differences of religion did not play a significant role in 2009, 2004, and 1999 Indonesia General Elections (Mujani&Liddle, 2010).

In addition, the result of the modified model in Figure 11, in which social media use for political activities controlled by Islam and other religions (*Christian, Catholic, Hindu, Buddhist,* and *Confucian*), shows that the differences of religion had a non-significant direct relationship to social media use for political activities. But, it can be seen that those who confess to Islam use social media for political activities more often than those who follow other religions. A possible explanation for this might be a number of Islamic parties in the general elections and the appearance of Islamic religious figures who also politicians or Islamic political party leaders acting in social media. It might be encourage those who were Islam to interact and communicate with those figures. However, further study is needed to explain this issue.

5.2.9 The relationship between frequency of general social media use, political efficacy, political knowledge, and political participation

Hypothesis 2f states that frequency of general social media use of social media users influence their political efficacy, political knowledge, and political participation. The result of research model in Figure 3 shows that frequency of general social media use had non-significant direct relationships to political efficacy, political knowledge, and political participation. The result was supported by the partial research model in Figure 9. As a result, the hypothesis 2f was rejected.

The results of the current study differ from some published studies (e.g Baumgartner & Morris, 2009; Gil de Zuniga, et al., 2012; etc) which found the influence from frequency of general social media use to political efficacy, political knowledge, and political participation. These studies suggest that general use of social media enable social media user to obtain thousands of information, including political information. In contrast, the present study suggests that higher frequency of general social media use does not directly influence political efficacy, political knowledge, and political participation. There is a possibility of other intermediary factors, such as the exposure of political information in social media, which influence the relationships between frequency of general social media use, political efficacy, political knowledge, and political participation

When controlling the social media use for political activities with frequency of general social media use, the result in Figure 11 shows that the frequency of general social media use

has a significant direct relationship to social media use for political activities. The result was also supported by the partial modified model in Figure 17. It seems that those with higher frequency of general social media use may also have higher frequency of political activities on social media. It can be argued that those who have higher frequency of general social media use were students or high educated participants. As has been found in the previous result, students and high educated participants have higher frequency of social media use for political activities.

There is a possibility that the exposure of political information in social media also influences the relationship between frequency of general social media use and social media use for political activities. Young adults probably obtained political information when using social media for general purpose such as for entertainment, communication, dating, or networking. That political information might be exposed by their social media networks through links, photos, videos, notes, messages, status updates, etc. Young adults may use social media for political activities only if they have interest or motivation to follow that political information (Polat, 2005). The possibility would be greater if that political information was exposed by the inner circle, such as family or friends (Tang & Lee, 2013).

5.1.10 The relationship between age, political efficacy, political knowledge, and political participation

Age of social media users was hypothesized that influence their political efficacy, political knowledge, and political participation. The result of research model in Figure 3 shows that age (*17-23 years old* and *24-30 years old*) has limited and almost non-significant direct relationships to political efficacy, political knowledge, and political participation. In addition, it can be seen that the older participants (*24-30 years old*) had greater political efficacy, political knowledge, and political participants (*17-23 years old*) had greater political efficacy, political knowledge, and political participation than the younger participants (*17-23 years old*). Consequently, hypothesis 2g was rejected.

Moreover, the result of modified model in Figure 11 shows that age of social media users had a non-significant direct relationship to social media use for political activities. It suggests that the younger participants (17-23 years old) more often used social media for political activities than the older participants (24-30 years old). There are several possibility explanations for these findings. First, it seems that the younger participants were normally a high school or university student. They are better informed, change seeking, opinionated, and connected about politics (Chen & Syailendra, 2014). Whilst, the older participants normally in the first or second steps of career. They are probably more mature and have been married. It seems possible that they have another priority than use social media for political activities.

Second, the older participants may have passed two general elections, but they did not see any change in politics. They might be upset with politics, then become politically passive (Chen & Syailendra, 2014). Third, the older participants were the generation that grew up during reformation era. Probably they have been apathetic to politics and become less engage with politics (Chen & Syailendra, 2014). Hence, a further study that compares the use of social media by different generation is rather interesting.

5.2.11 The relationship between political efficacy and political participation

It was hypothesized that the greater political efficacy of social media users is positively influences their political participation. The result of research model in Figure 3 indicates that political efficacy had a significant relationship to political participation. The effect of this relationship, however, was almost unnoticed through a slight path coefficient of political efficacy to political participation. In addition, the result of the model when controlled by demographic characteristics and frequency of general social media use shows the same result as in the previous research model. In contrast to earlier findings by Kenski and Stroud (2006) and Levy (2013) that failed to found the relationship between political efficacy and political participation, the impact of political efficacy on political participation in this study was detected. The effect was very slight, but still positive and significant. Therefore, the hypothesis 3 was supported.

The observed relationship between political efficacy and political participation might be explained by this way. Some researchers have speculated that young adults in Indonesia are politically apathetic (Lee, 2011; Simone, 2013; Chen & Syailendra, 2014). Even they have feeling that their attempts can play significant role in political change, they still less participate in political processes. They may give their votes in general elections, but do not do anything with other kind of political participation. Another possible explanation for this is that they have lack of respect to the members of House of Representatives. The members of House Representatives were chosen from parliamentary election, which means they were the members of political parties. According to Chen and Syailendra (2014), young adults have an anti-party attitude, of which they viewed political party as corrupt, without competent leader or good program, and lack of concern to the public welfare. However, a further study is needed to explain this matter.

5.2.12 The relationship between political knowledge and political participation

Hypothesis 4 states that greater political knowledge of social media user positively influences their political participation. Contrary to expectation, the results of this study did not find the impact of greater political knowledge on political participation of participants. First, the result of research model in Figure 3 shows that political knowledge has a nonsignificant relationship with political participation. Second, after controlling the social media use for political activities with demographic characteristics and frequency of general social media use, the result still shows that political knowledge has a non-significant relationship with political participation. Taken together, these results suggest that hypothesis 4 was rejected.

The finding of current study is rather surprising. It does not support the previous studies by Kenski and Stroud (2006), Vitak et al. (2011), and Jung et al. (2011). They found that political knowledge is an important predictor of political participation. In contrast, this study failed to detect any relationship between political knowledge and political participation. It can be argued that young adults might have sufficient political knowledge, but they did not have interest or motivation to participate in politics. According to Polat (2005), without any self-interest or self-motivation, the role of social media to increase political participation becomes less important. Hence, it is an important issue for future research.

5.3 Limitations and directions for future studies

There are several notable limitations that should be considered when interpreting the result of this study and when conducting further research. The first limitation lies in the fact that the participants in this study were obtained through snowball sampling technique. Snowball sampling is a non-probability sampling technique that might produces a sample bias. In fact, almost half of participants in this study are students which probably have higher education level and higher frequency of general social media use than other participants. There is also a fact that majority of participants are high educated people that might be have higher income level and higher frequency of general social media use than other participants. The influence of students and high educated participants perhaps impact the whole result of the study. With further analyses, we found that the general research model only fit with the data from high educated participants. Therefore, the result of this study may not be applicable to generalize the population.

The second limitation is the low score of political participation on reliability test which generates the low response of political participation items. The political participation were measured by five items such as contacting politicians or political parties, attending political events, participating in demonstration, donating money, and voting. However, 47 participants only have a response for voting and left the others blank. It seems possible that other kinds of political participation are not widely used by young adults in Indonesia. Then, the answers of these participants are not included in analysis. Moreover, this study did not distinguish between online and offline political participation to reduce the required time to fill the online questionnaire. The result of online and offline political participation like in this study. Thus, further study needs to be done to carefully measure the political participation in Indonesia context.

Third, this study uses an online questionnaire that is distributed through Facebook, Twitter, Path, Blackberry Messenger, Whatsapp, and personal email to initial participants. There is a possibility to answer political knowledge questions which is not based on their actual knowledge. The participants could answer these questions by searching on the internet first before they really write the answer. It is suggested that offline questionnaire should be used to legitimately measure the political knowledge in future studies. The participants would be more confidence to answer political knowledge questions on offline questionnaire based on their actual knowledge. However, it needs more time and other resources to collect the data with offline questionnaire. Therefore, this study used online questionnaire that could collect hundreds of response with less time needed.

Next, this study investigates the impact of social media use on political efficacy, political knowledge, and political participation only from the upper surface. This study starts when social media users used social media for political activities. It only explains the degree of effects of social media use on their political efficacy, political knowledge, and political participation when controlled by their demographic characteristics and frequency of general social media use. It would be possible that other intermediary factors that have been discussed earlier play greater role to influence the relationships among variable in this study.

Unfortunately the present study did not include political motivation when using social media for political activities. This is an important issue that missed in the present study. We regretted that the existence of political motivation was eliminated because two considerations. Firstly, the online questionnaire was already long to be filled in a limited time. It would be longer if scales of political motivation added. Secondly, the relationships among variables would be more complex if political motivation included in the causal model. Political motivation may not only predict the use of social media for political activities, but

also the level of political participation. There is also a possibility that political knowledge and part of demographic characteristics determined political motivation. Therefore, we ignored the possibility of political motivation to influence the use of social media for political activities. Later, we realized that the existence of political motivation is needed to understand the causal relationships in the research model. In the future studies, we would like to address the influence of political motivation in the causal model.

Moreover, the timing of this study may influence the whole result. This study was conducted after Pileg 2014 for one month. We chose to arrange this study after Pileg 2014 because we would like to understand the impact of social media on parliamentary election for the last time. As mentioned earlier, Pemilu 2014 is the last general election that split parliamentary election and presidential election. It seems possible that the findings will be different if the study is conducted after Pilpres 2014. According to Vitak et al. (2011), presidential elections are typically times of high political engagement, in which social media use for political activities may be greater than during periods between election cycles. These findings therefore need to be interpreted with caution.

Last, the findings of the present study could not be generalized in other countries because the political condition in Indonesia was so complex. Indonesia has its own democracy history with Soeharto's authoritarian regime that runs the country for almost 32 years. The downfall of this regime has affected the country and its citizens simultaneously. Moreover, Indonesia has its own social and cultural influence in its immature democratic system that would differ from other countries. Therefore, a future study may compare the impact of social media on young adults' political efficacy, political participation, and political knowledge in Indonesia and in other countries such as middle-east countries or western countries.

5.4 Practical implications

This study has a number of important implications for future practice. The results of this study indicate that social media use for political activities could increase social media users' political efficacy, political knowledge, and political participation. An implication of this is the possibility to utilize social media as a bridge between young adults, politicians, and political parties. On the one side, young adults may consciously or unconsciously obtain political information from politician or political parties. On the other side, politicians and political parties may promote themselves to reach young adults' attentions. Both of them may also interact and communicate with each other.

The results also indicate that the greater political participation is more determined by social media use for political activities than political efficacy or political knowledge. It suggests that social media play an important role to increase political participation among young adults. The use of social media, therefore, may be an effective way to decrease the number of young adults in Indonesia that described in previous study by Kompas (as cited in Chen & Syailendra, 2014, p. 7) as politically apathetic, less nationalistic, white voters, and politically passive.

Another important implication is that politicians and political parties may require less financial resources by using social media for political campaign than by using traditional mass media. It is possible for politicians and political parties to organize their own social media account by themselves. Perhaps in the future, they do not need to spend a lot of money for political advertisement in traditional mass media.

5.5 Final remarks

The 2014 Indonesia General Election is a fourth general election that is conducted after the downfall of Soeharto's authoritarian regime. It is the last general election which separates parliamentary and presidential elections. Meanwhile, Indonesia has a large number of social media users. The use of social media for political activities is believed can vanquishing the traditional mass media which have already influenced by their owner's political interest. In 2014 Indonesia General Election, the role of young adults is important because they are the largest group of internet users that occupy 30 percent of total voters.

This study set out to determine the impact of social media use for political activities on young adults' political efficacy, political knowledge, and political participation in the context of 2014 Indonesia General Election. The results demonstrate that when used for political activities, social media may increase political efficacy, political knowledge, and political participation. The results also demonstrate that frequency of general social media use determined frequency of social media use for political activities. It is likely that not social media per se influence political efficacy, political knowledge, and political participation. Therefore, further studies are needed to understand other intermediary factors that may influence these causal relationships.

References

- Abramson, P. R., & Aldrich, J. H. (1982). The decline of electoral participation in America. *American Political Science Review, 76*, 502-521.
- Ahmad, N., & Popa, I. L. (2014). The social media usage and the transformation of political marketing and campaigning of the emerging democracy in Indonesia. *Social Media in Politics*, 97-125. doi: 10.1007/978-3-319-04666-2_7
- Anderson, M. R. (2010). Community psychology, political efficacy, and trust. *Political Psychology*, *31*(1), 59–84. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9221.2009.00734.x
- APJII. (2012). Profil Internet Indonesia. Retrieved from http://www.apjii.or.id/v2/upload/Laporan/Profil%20Internet%20Indonesia%202012 %20%28INDONESIA%29.pdf
- APJII. (2014, January 15). Profil Terkini Internet Industri Indonesia. Retrieved from http://www.apjii.or.id/v2/index.php/read/content/info-terkini/213/press-releaseprofil-terkini-internet-industri-ind.html
- Ardipandanto, A. (2014). 2014 general election campaign and media conglomeration. Retrieved from http://berkas.dpr.go.id/pengkajian/files/info_singkat/Info%20Singkat-VI-6-II-P3DI-Maret-2014-81.pdf
- Badan Pusat Statistik. (2013). Statistik Indonesia: Statistical yearbook of Indonesia 2013. Retrieved from
 - http://www.bps.go.id/hasil_publikasi/SI_2013/index3.php?pub=Statistik%20Indonesia % 202013
- Bakker, T. P., & de Vreese, C. H. (2011). Good news for the future? Young people, internet use, and political participation. *Communication Research*, 38(4), 451-470. doi: 10.1177/0093650210381738
- Baumgartner, J. C., & Morris, J. S. (2009). MyFaceTube Politics: Social networking web sites and political engagement of young adults. *Social Science Computer Review*, *28*(1), 24–44. doi:10.1177/0894439309334325
- Bhattacherjee, A. (2012). *Social sciences research: principles, methods, and practices* (2nd ed.). Florida, USA: Creative Commons Attribution 3.0 License.

Budiarjo, M (2006). Basics of political science. Jakarta: Gramedia.

Chan, M., Wu, X., Hao, Y., Xi, R., & Jin, T. (2012). Microblogging, online expression, and political efficacy among young chinese citizens: the moderating role of information and entertainment needs in the use of Weibo. *Cyberpsychology, Behavior and Social Networking*, *15*(7), 345–9. doi:10.1089/cyber.2012.0109

- Chen, J. & Syailendra E. A. (2014). New youths: An overview of youth and popular participation in post-reformasi Indonesia. Retrieved from http://www.rsis.edu.sg/publications/WorkingPapers/WP269.pdf
- Conroy, M., Feezell, J. T., & Guerrero, M. (2012). Facebook and political engagement: A study of online political group membership and offline political engagement. *Computers in Human Behavior*, *28*(5), 1535–1546. doi:10.1016/j.chb.2012.03.012
- Constine, J. (2014, January 29). Facebook officially a mobile ad firm with 53% of ad revenue now coming from its 945m mobile users. Retrieved from http://techcrunch.com/2014/01/29/facebook-is-a-mobile-ad-company/
- Delli Carpini, M. X., & Keeter, S. (1996). *What Americans know about politics and why it matters.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Dimitrova, D. V., Shehata, A., Stromback, J., & Nord, L. W. (2011). The effects of digital media on political knowledge and participation in election campaigns: Evidence from panel data. *Communication Research*, *41*(1), 95–118. doi:10.1177/0093650211426004
- Dimitrova, D.V., & Bystrom, D. (2013). The effects of social media on political partipation and candidate image evaluations in the 2012 Iowa caucuses. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 57(11), 1568-1583. doi: 10.1177/0002764213489011
- Dooley, D. (2009). *Social research methods* (4th ed.). Essex, UK: Pearson Education Limited.
- Ediraras, D. T., Rahayu, D. A., Natalina, A., & Widya, W. (2013). Political marketing strategy of Jakarta Governor Election in the 2012s. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences, 81*(1976), 584–588. doi:10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.06.480
- Gaffar, A. (1997). Accommodating citizen political participation. *Journal of Social and Politic, 1*(1), 8-26.
- Gil De Zuniga, H., Puig-I-Abril, E., & Rojas, H. (2009). Weblogs, traditional sources online and political participation: An assessment of how the internet is changing the political environment. *New Media & Society*, *11*(4), 553–574. doi: 10.1177/1461444809102960
- Gil de Zuniga, H., Jung, N., & Valenzuela, S. (2012). Social media use for news and individuals' social capital, civic engagement and political participation. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, *17*, 319–336. doi:10.1111/j.1083-6101.2012.01574.x
- Grazella, M. (2013, June 18). Facebook has 64m active Indonesian users. *The Jakarta Post*. Retrieved from http://www.thejakartapost.com/news/2013/06/18/facebook-has-64m-active-indonesian-users.html
- Gunawan, Apriadi. (2013, September 5). Govt worries about voter apathy in 2014 elections. The Jakarta Post. Retrieved from

http://www.thejakartapost.com/news/2013/09/05/govt-worries-about-voter-apathy-2014-elections.html

- Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., Anderson, R. E., & Tatham, R. L. (2010). *Multivariate Data Analysis : A Global Perspective* (7th ed.). Upper Saddle River, New Jersey : Pearson Education Inc.
- Hong, S. (2013). Who benefits from Twitter? Social media and political competition in the U.S.
 House of Representatives. *Government Information Quarterly*, *30*(4), 464–472.
 doi:10.1016/j.giq.2013.05.009
- IFES. (2010). Indonesia electoral survey 2010. Washington DC: IFES. Retrieved from: http://www.ifes.org/~/media/Files/Publications/Survey/2010/20110119_Indonesia_E lectoral_Survey .pdf
- Jung, N., Kim, Y., & de Zúñiga, H. G. (2011). The mediating role of knowledge and efficacy in the effects of communication on political participation. *Mass Communication and Society*, 14(4), 407–430. doi:10.1080/15205436.2010.496135
- Kaid, L. L., McKinney, M. S., & Tedesco, J. C. (2007). Introduction: Political information efficacy and young voters. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 50(9), 1093–1111. doi:10.1177/0002764207300040
- Kaplan, A. M., & Haenlein, M. (2010). Users of the world, unite! The challenges and opportunities of social media. *Business Horizons*, 53(1), 59–68. doi: 10.1016/j.bushor.2009.09.003
- Kenski, K., & Stroud, N. J. (2006). Connections between internet use and political efficacy, knowledge, and participation. *Journal of Broadcasting Electronic Media*, *50*(2), 173–192. doi: 10.1207/s15506878jobem5002_1
- Kushin, M.J., & Yamamoto, M. (2010). Did social media really matter? College students' use of online media and political decision making in the 2008 election. *Mass Communication and Society*, *13*(5), 608-630. doi: 10.1080/15205436.2010.516863
- Lee, K. M. (2006). Effects of Internet use on college students' political efficacy. Cyberpsychology & Behavior : The Impact of the Internet, Multimedia and Virtual Reality on Behavior and Society, 9(4), 415–22. doi:10.1089/cpb.2006.9.415
- Lee, D. (2011). Styling the revolution: Masculinities, youth, and street politics in Jakarta, Indonesia. *Journal of Urban History*, *37*(6), 933–951. doi:10.1177/0096144211410526
- Leman, P., Bremner, A., Parke, R.D., & Gauvain, M. (2012). *Developmental Psychology*. Berkshire: McGraw-Hill Education.
- Levy, B.M. (2011). "I could make a difference": Research and theory on fostering adolescents' political efficacy and engagement. Retrieved from http://deepblue.lib.umich.edu/bitstream/handle/2027.42/86312/brettml_1.pdf?seque nce=1
- Levy, B. L. M. (2013). An empirical exploration of factors related to adolescents' political efficacy. *Educational Psychology*, *33*(3), 357–390. doi:10.1080/01443410.2013.772774
- Liddle, R. W., & Mujani, S. (2007). Leadership, party, and religion: Explaining voting behavior in Indonesia. *Comparative Political Studies, 40*(7), 832–857. doi:10.1177/0010414006292113
- Lleras, C. (2004). Path analysis: The encyclopedia of social measurement. New York: Academic Press.
- Lorenzini, J., & Giugni, M. (2012). Employment status, social capital, and political participation: A comparison of unemployed and employed youth in Geneva. *Swiss Political Science Review, 18*, 332–351. doi: 10.1111/j.1662-6370.2012.02076.x
- McKinney, M. S., Houston, J. B., & Hawthorne, J. (2013). Social watching a 2012 Republican presidential primary debate. *American Behavioral Scientist*, *58*(4), 556–573. doi:10.1177/0002764213506211
- Mujani, S., & Liddle, R.W. (2010, March 9). Personalities, parties, and voters. Retrieved from http://www.lsi.or.id/riset/384/Journal%20of%20Democracy%20Mujani%20and%20L iddie
- Mukrimin. (2012). The influence of mass media in political change in Indonesia. *Journal of Politics, 3*(2), 57-67. Retrieved from

http://ejournal.undip.ac.id/index.php/politika/article/view/4861

- Noveck, B. S. (2000). Paradoxical partners: Electronic communication and electronic democracy. The Internet, Democracy and Democratization. London: Frank Cass
- Nugroho, Y. (2011). *Citizens in @ction.* Great Britain: Manchester Institute of Innovation Research
- Nugroho, Y. & Syarief, S.S. (2012). *Beyond click-activism? New media and political process in contemporary Indonesia*. Berlin, Germany: Fesmedia Asia
- O'Neill, B. (2010). The media's role in shaping Canadian civic and political engagement. *Policy and Society*, *29*(1), 37–51. doi:10.1016/j.polsoc.2009.11.004
- Pallant, J. (2010). SPSS survival manual: A step by step guide to data analysis using SPSS (4th ed.). Berkshire, UK: McGraw-Hill.
- Peters, O. (2007). *Social psychological determinants of mobile communication technology use and adaption*. Enschede: PrintPartners Ipskamp.
- Polat, R. K. (2005). The internet and political participation: Exploring the explanatory links. *European Journal of Communication*, *20*(4), 435–459. doi:10.1177/0267323105058251
- PoliticalWave.com. (2014). Candidates' activity in social media (Press Release). Retrieved from http://www.politicawave.com/nasional

- Safranek, R. (2012). The emerging role of social media in political and regime change. ProQuest. Retrieved from http://www.csa.com/discoveryguides/social_media/review.pdf
- Semiocast. (2012, July 30). Twitter reaches half a billion accounts More than 140 millions in the US. Retrieved from

http://semiocast.com/en/publications/2012_07_30_Twitter_reaches_half_a_billion_acco unts_140m_in_the_US

- SiliconIndia. (2013, April 4th). 20 countries with biggest internet users. *Silicon India News*. Retrieved from http://www.siliconindia.com/news/technology/20-Countries-With-Biggest-Internet-Users-nid-145201-cid-2.html
- Simone, A. (2013). Cities of uncertainty: Jakarta, the urban majority, and inventive political technologies. *Theory, Culture & Society, 30*(7-8), 243–263. doi:10.1177/0263276413501872
- Socialbakers. (2014a). Indonesia Facebook statistics. Retrieved from http://www.socialbakers.com/facebook-statistics/indonesia
- Socialbakers. (2014b). Twitter society statistics. Retrieved from http://www.socialbakers.com/twitter/group/society/country/indonesia/
- Strandberg, K. (2013). A social media revolution or just a case of history repeating itself? The use of social media in the 2011 Finnish parliamentary elections. *New Media & Society*, 15(8), 1329–1347. doi: 10.1177/1461444812470612
- Strauss, W., & Howe, N. (1991). *Generations: The history of America's future, 1584 to 2069.* New York, US: Morrow
- Sunandar, H. (2013). Regulation of 2014 general election campaign: An analysis toward regulation of general election campaign in mass media. Retrieved from http://www.academia.edu/4969929/Regulasi_Kampanye_Analisis_Terhadap_Aturan_M ain_Kampanye_Pemilu_2014
- Suryati. (2013, April 11th). Pemilu 2014 and media conglomeration. *Pelita Online*. Retrieved from http://pelitaonline.com/opinions/pemilu-2014-dan-konglomerasi-media#.U0SUsVcwZ94
- Tang, G., & Lee, F. L. F. (2013). Facebook use and political participation: The impact of exposure to shared political information, connections with public political actors, and network structural heterogeneity. *Social Science Computer Review*, *31*(6), 763–773. doi:10.1177/0894439313490625
- Tedesco, J.C. (2007). Examining internet interactivity effects on young adult political information efficacy. *American Behavioral Scientist, 50*(9), 1183-1194. doi: 10.1177/0002764207300041

- The Jakarta Post. (2013, December 6). KPI reprimands partisan TV stations. *The Jakarta Post.* Retrieved from http://www.thejakartapost.com/news/2013/12/06/kpi-reprimandspartisan-tv-stations.html
- The Jakarta Post. (2014, January 17). Watchdogs demand KPI punish partisan TV stations. *The Jakarta Post.* Retrieved from http://www.thejakartapost.com/news/2014/01/17/watchdogs-demand-kpi-punish-

partisan-tv-stations.html

- The Jakarta Post. (2014, June 2). KPI warns TV stations over unbalanced campaign coverage. *The Jakarta Post*. Retrieved from http://www.thejakartapost.com/news/2014/06/02/kpi-warns-tv-stations-over-unbalanced-campaign-coverage.html
- Tumasjan, A., Sprenger, T. O., Sandner, P. G., & Welpe, I. M. (2010). Predicting elections with Twitter : What 140 characters reveal about political sentiment. *Proceedings of the Fourth International AAAI Conference on Weblogs and Social Media Predicting*, (pp. 174-185).
- Ufen, A. (2010). The legislative and presidential elections in Indonesia in 2009. *Electoral Studies*, *29*(2), 281–285. doi:10.1016/j.electstud.2010.02.003
- Valenzuela, S., Park, N., & Kee, K.F. (2009). Is there social capital in a social network site? Facebook use and college students' life satisfaction, trust, and participation. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 14, 875-901. doi:10.1111/j.1083-6101.2009.01474.x
- van Dijk, J.A.G.M. (2012). *The Network Society* (3rd ed.). London: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- van Dijk, J.A.G.M. (2013). Digital democracy: vision and reality. Retrieved from http://www.utwente.nl/gw/vandijk/research/itv/itv_plaatje/Digital%20Democracy-%20Vision%20and%20Reality.pdf
- Vesnic-Alujevic, L. (2012). Political participation and web 2.0 in Europe: A case study of Facebook. *Public Relations Review*, *38*(3), 466–470. doi:10.1016/j.pubrev.2012.01.010
- Vitak, J., Zube, P., Smock, A., Carr, C. T., Ellison, N., & Lampe, C. (2011). It's complicated: Facebook users' political participation in the 2008 election. *Cyberpsychology, Behavior* and Social Networking, 14(3), 107–14. doi:10.1089/cyber.2009.0226
- Wright, K. B. (2005). Researching internet-based populations: Advantages and disadvantages of online survey research, online questionnaire authoring software packages, and web survey services. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 10(3), 00. doi: 10.1111/j.1083-6101.2005.tb00259.x
- Yamamoto, M., Kushin, M. J., & Dalisay, F. (2013). Social media and mobiles as political mobilization forces for young adults: Examining the moderating role of online political

expression in political participation. *New Media & Society, 0*(0), 1-19. doi: 10.1177/1461444813518390

- Yasih, D.W.P. (2014). Youth, 2014, and the future of democracy. *The Jakarta Post*. Retrieved from http://www.thejakartapost.com/news/2014/03/02/youth-2014-and-future-democracy.html
- Zhang, W., Johnson, T.J., Seltzer, T., & Bichard, S. (2009). The revolution will be networked: The influence of social networks on political attitudes and behaviors. *Social Science Computer Review*, *28*(1), 75-92. doi: 10.1177/0894439309335162
- Zhang, W., Seltzer, T., & Bichard, S. L. (2013). Two sides of the coin: Assessing the influence of social network site use during the 2012 U.S. Presidential Campaign. *Social Science Computer Review*, 31(5), 542–551. doi:10.1177/0894439313489962

Appendices

Appendix A. Invitation letter and questionnaire

(English version) Invitation Letter

Dear Sir/Madam,

I would like to invite you to take part in my study titled The Impact of Social Media on Young Adults' Political Efficacy, Political Knowledge, and Political Participation toward 2014 Indonesia General Election. The purpose of this study is to gain deeper understanding of how social media influence political efficacy, political knowledge, and political participation.

By filling this questionnaire, you may win one of the following prizes*.

- Ajax scarf (1)
- Ajax cap (2)
- Gift voucher(3)

You will have bigger opportunity to win that prize if you share the link of this questionnaire to minimal 15 people. Therefore, I strongly encourage you to share the link of questionnaire to your friends, families, or colleagues who are aged between 17-30 years old. Please do not miss this opportunity. Just <u>click here</u> to start the questionnaire!

If you have questions regarding the questionnaire, please send me an email at indrianirahmawati@student.utwente.nl

*The announcement and delivery of the prize will be held in June, 2014.

Yours faithfully Indriani Rahmawati

Questionnaire

This questionnaire is conducted as part of my research, titled The Impact of Social Media on Young Adults' Political Efficacy, Political Knowledge, and Political Participation toward 2014 Indonesia General Elections. The aim of this research is to gain deeper understanding of how social media influence political participation, political knowledge, and political efficacy in Indonesia.

All data and measurements obtained from this research study will be stored confidentially. Only the researcher will have access to view any data collected during this research. The research intends to cause no physical or psychological harm or offense and to abide by all commonly acknowledged ethical codes.

You voluntarily agree to participate in this research project by filling the following questionnaire. You have the right to ask the researcher any question regarding this research. You also have the right to reject participation. You may withdraw from this research any time you wish.

This may take 15 minutes of your time. Please make sure that you have responded to every question.

How old are you?

If your age ranges in 17-30 years old, please continue to following questions.

Where do you live?

Please tick in one of following choices.

- □ Capital city of Indonesia (including Bogor, Depok, Tangerang, Bekasi)
- □ Capital city of province, please specify ...
- $\hfill\square$ Others city, please specify ...

No	How many times did you	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Very often
	do the following					
	statements on Facebook					
	in the last one year?					
1.	Posting a status updates					
	about politics					
2.	Posting a wall comment					
	about politics					
1						

3.	Posting or sharing a			
	photo/video/link about			
	politics			
4.	Writing or sharing a note			
	about politics			
5.	Joiningor left a group			
	about politics			
6.	Clicking "Going" for a			
	political event			
7.	Discussing a political			
	issue on message			
8.	Clicking "Like" on a			
	political party or			
	politician's fan page			

No	How many times did you	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Very often
	do the following					
	statements on Twitter in					
	the last one year??					
9.	Posting a tweet about					
	politics					
10.	Retweeting or quoting a					
	tweet about politics					
11.	Following a politician or a					
	political party on Twitter					
12.	Mentioning a politician or					
	a political party on					
	Twitter					
13.	Replying a tweet about					
	politics					
14.	Joining a political					
	discussion on Twitter					
15.	Joining a political debate					
	on Twitter					

16. When is Pileg 2014?

🗆 I don't know

17. When is Pilpres 2014?

🗆 I don't know

18. How many political parties were joined Pileg 2014? (exclude local parties for Aceh only)

🗆 I don't know

19. What is the institution that supervised general elections in Indonesia?

🗆 I don't know

No.	How much do you agree	Strongly	Disagree	Neither	Agree	Strongly
	with the following	Disagree		Agree or		Agree
	statements?			Disagree		
20.	I consider myself well					
	qualified to participate in					
	politics.					
21.	I think that I am better					
	informed about politics					
	and government than					
	most people.					
22.	I feel that I have a pretty					
	good understanding of the					

	important political issues			
	facing our country.			
23.	People like me do have			
	say about what the			
	government does.			
24.	People like me do have			
	say over who gets to be			
	the president.			

25. Have you ever contacted politicians or government officers?

□ Yes □ No

26. Have you ever attended an event related to politics?

 \Box Yes \Box No

27. Have you ever participated in demonstration?

 \Box Yes \Box No

28. Have you ever donated money for a political party or a politician?

 \Box Yes \Box No

29. Have you ever voted in general elections?

□ Yes □ No

- 30. What is your gender?
 - □ Male
 - □ Female
- 31. What is your highest education?
 - a. Elementary school
 - b. Junior high school
 - c. High school
 - d. Diploma/Bachelor
 - e. Master/Doctor
- 32. What is your current employment status?
 - a. Unemployed
 - b. Student
 - c. Government employee
 - d. Employee
 - e. Entrepreneur
 - f. Others, please specify

- 33. How much your income per month?
 - a. <\$100
 - b. \$100-300
 - c. \$301-500
 - d. \$501-700
 - e. >\$701
- 34. What is your religion?
 - a. Islam
 - b. Catholic
 - c. Christian
 - d. Hindu
 - e. Buddhist
 - f. Confucian
- 35. How much time do you spend on Facebook per day?
 - a. < 30 minutes
 - b. 31 minutes 1 hour
 - c. 1 2 hours
 - d. 2 4 hours
 - e. 5 7 hours
 - f. > 7 hours
- 36. How much time do you spend on Twitter per day?
 - a. < 30 minutes
 - b. 31 minutes 1 hour
 - c. 1 2 hours
 - d. 2 4 hours
 - e. 5 7 hours
 - f. > 7 hours

Thank you for your participation!

Please write your email address for further information about the prize.

(Bahasa Indonesia version)

<u>Undangan</u>

Yth Bapak/Ibu,

Saya ingin mengundang Anda untuk berpartisipasi dalam studi saya yang berjudul Dampak Media Sosial terhadap Keyakinan Politik, Pengetahuan Politik, dan Partisipasi Politik Dewasa Muda dalam Pemilu 2014. Tujuan dari studi ini adalah untuk mendapatkan pemahaman tentang bagaimana media sosial mempengaruhi keyakinan politik, pengetahuan politik, dan partisipasi politik.

Dengan mengisi kuesioner ini, Anda memiliki kesempatan untuk mendapatkan salah satu hadiah* di bawah ini:

- Scarf Ajax
- Topi Ajax
- Voucher

Anda akan mendapatkan kesempatan yang lebih besar jika berbagi tautan kuesioner ini kepada minimal 15 orang. Oleh karena itu, saya mendorong Anda untuk berbagi tautan kuesioner ini kepada teman, keluarga, atau kolega Anda yang berusia 17-30 tahun. Jangan lewatkan kesempatan ini. Cukup meng-<u>klik disini</u>untuk memulai kuesioner!

Jika Anda memiliki pertanyaan terkait kuesioner ini, silahkan mengirimkan email ke alamat saya indrianirahmawati@student.utwente.nl

*Pengumuman dan pengiriman hadiah akan dilakukan di bulan Juni 2014.

Salam, Indriani Rahmawati

<u>Kuesioner</u>

Kuesioner ini merupakan bagian dari penelitian saya yang berjudul Dampak Media Sosial terhadap Keyakinan Politik, Pengetahuan Politik, dan Partisipasi Politik Dewasa Muda dalam Pemilu 2014. Tujuan dari penelitian ini adalah untuk mendapatkan pemahaman tentang bagaimana media sosial mempengaruhi keyakinan politik, pengetahuan politik, dan partisipasi politik.

Semua data dari penelitian ini akan disimpan secara rahasia. Hanya peneliti yang berhak mengakses semua data yang dikumpulkan dari penelitian ini. Penelitian ini tidak bermaksud menyebabkan kerugian fisik dan psikologis, dan tetap berusaha untuk memenuhi semua kode etik yang umum diakui.

Anda secara sukarela menyetujui untuk berpartisipasi dalam penelitian dengan mengisi kuesioner ini. Anda berhak untuk mengajukan pertanyaan terkait penelitian ini kepada peneliti. Anda juga berhak untuk menolak berpartisipasi dalam penelitian ini. Anda dapat membatalkan keikutsertaan Anda dalam penelitian ini kapanpun Anda inginkan. Anda membutuhkan waktu kurang lebih 15 menit untuk mengisi penelitian ini.

Pastikan Anda menjawab semua pertanyaan.

Berapa umur Anda?

Jika umur Anda berkisar antara 17-30 tahun, silahkan lanjutkan ke pertanyaan berikutnya.

Dimanakah Anda tinggal?

□ Jakarta (termasuk Bogor, Depok, Tangerang, dan Bekasi)

🗆 Ibukota provinsi, sebutkan

🗆 Kota lainnya, sebutkan

No	Berapa kali Anda	Tidak	Jarang	Kadang-	Sering	Sangat
	melakukan pernyataan	pernah		kadang		sering
	berikut di Facebook					
	dalam setahun terakhir?					
1.	Memperbarui status yang					
	berkaitan dengan politik					
2.	Memberikan komentar di					
	dinding yang berkaitan					

	dengan politik			
3.	Bergabung atau			
	meninggalkan grup yang			
	berkaitan dengan politik			
4.	Memasang atau berbagi			
	foto/ video/ tautan			
	mengenai politik			
5.	Menulis atau berbagi			
	catatan mengenai politik			
6.	Mengklik "Gabung" untuk			
	acara politik			
7.	Berdiskusi mengenai isu-			
	isu politik dalam pesan			
8.	Mengklik "Suka" di			
	halaman tokoh politik			

No.	Berapa kali Anda	Tidak	Jarang	Kadang-	Sering	Sangat
	melakukan pernyataan	pernah		kadang		sering
	berikut di Twitter dalam					
	setahun terakhir?					
9.	Memasang tweet					
	mengenai politik					
10.	Me-retweet atau meng-					
	quote tweet mengenai					
	politik					
11.	Mengikuti (follow)					
	politikus atau partai					
	politik					
12.	Menyebutkan (mention)					
	tokoh politik atau partai					
	politik					
13.	Membalas tweet					
	mengenai politik					
14.	Mengikuti diskusi politik					
15.	Mengikuti debat politik					

- 16. Kapan Pileg 2014 diadakan di Indonesia?

🗆 Tidak tahu

17. Kapan Pilpres 2014 diadakan di Indonesia?

🗆 Tidak tahu

18. Berapa partai yang berpartisipasi dalam Pileg 2014?

🗆 Tidak tahu

19. Apa institusi yang bertugas mengawasi jalannya pemilu di Indonesia?

🗆 Tidak tahu

No.	Seberapa setuju Anda	Sangat	Tidak	Tidak	Setuju	Sangat
	dengan pernyataan	tidak	setuju	setuju		setuju
	berikut ini?	setuju		ataupun		
				setuju		
20.	Saya menganggap diri					
	saya memenuhi syarat					
	untuk berpartisipasi					
	dalam politik.					
21.	Saya berpikir bahwa diri					
	saya terinformasi dengan					
	baik mengenaik politik					
	dan pemerintah					
	dibandingkan kebanyakan					
	orang					
22.	Saya merasa bahwa saya					
	memiliki pemahaman					
	yang baik mengenai isu-					
	isu politik yang terjadi di					
	negara saya					
23.	Orang seperti saya bisa					
	bicara tentang apa yang					
	pemerintah lakukan					
24.	Orang seperti saya bisa					
	bicara tentang siapa yang					
	harus menjadi presiden					

25. Apakah Anda pernah menghubungi politikus atau pejabat pemerintah?

□ Ya □ Tidak

26. Apakah Anda pernah menghadiri acara yang berkaitan dengan politik?

 \Box Ya \Box Tidak

27. Apakah Anda pernah berpartisipasi dalam demonstrasi?

🗆 Ya 🛛 🗆 Tidak

28. Apakah Anda pernah mendonasikan uang untuk partai politik atau politikus?

 \Box Ya \Box Tidak

29. Apakah Anda pernah memilih dalam pemilu?

🗆 Ya 🛛 🗆 Tidak

- 30. Apakah jenis kelamin Anda?
 - 🗆 Laki-laki
 - □ Perempuan
- 31. Apakah pendidikan terakhir Anda?
 - a. SD
 - b. SMP
 - c. SMA
 - d. Vokasi/Sarjana
 - e. Magister/Doktor
- 32. Apakah pekerjaan Anda saat ini?
 - a. Tidak bekerja
 - b. Pelajar
 - c. PNS/TNI/POLRI
 - d. Pegawai BUMN/ BUMD
 - e. Karyawan swasta
 - f. Pengusaha
 - g. Lainnya, sebutkan
- 33. Berapakah penghasilan Anda dalam satu bulan?
 - a. < Rp 1.000.000,-
 - b. Rp 1.000.000 Rp 3.000.000,-
 - c. Rp 3.000.001 Rp 5.000.000,-
 - d. Rp 5.000.001 Rp 7.000.000,-
 - e. > Rp 7.000.000,-
- 34. Apakah agama Anda?
 - a. Islam
 - b. Katolik
 - c. Kristen
 - d. Hindu
 - e. Budha
 - f. Konghucu

- 35. Berapa banyak waktu yang Anda habiskan untuk menggunakan Facebook per hari?
 - a. 30 menit
 - b. 31 menit sampai 1 jam
 - c. 1 2 jam
 - d. 2 4 jam
 - e. 5 7 jam
 - f. > 7 jam

36. Berapa banyak waktu yang Anda habiskan untuk menggunakan Twitter per hari?

- a. 30 menit
- b. 31 menit sampai 1 jam
- c. 1 2 jam
- d. 2 4 jam
- e. 5 7 jam
- f. > 7 jam

Terima kasih atas partisipasi Anda!

Silahkan tuliskan alamat email Anda untuk informasi lebih lanjut mengenai hadiah.

Appendix B. Frequency of participants

Frequency Table

	What is your gender?								
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent				
Valid	Male	313	52.8	52.8	52.8				
	Female	280	47.2	47.2	100.0				
	Total	593	100.0	100.0					

What is your highest education?

-	-	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Junior high school	4	.7	.7	.7
	High school	172	29.0	29.0	29.7
	Vocational/Bachelor Degree	364	61.4	61.4	91.1
	Master/Doctor	53	8.9	8.9	100.0
	Total	593	100.0	100.0	

What is your current employment status?

	-	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Unemployed	31	5.2	5.2	5.2
	Student	249	42.0	42.0	47.2
	Government employee	97	16.4	16.4	63.6
	Employee	166	28.0	28.0	91.6
	Entrepreneur	22	3.7	3.7	95.3
	Others	28	4.7	4.7	100.0
	Total	593	100.0	100.0	

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	< Rp 1.000.000,-	193	32.5	32.5	32.5
	Rp 1.000.000 - Rp 3.000.000,-	152	25.6	25.6	58.2
	Rp 3.000.001 - Rp 5.000.000,-	99	16.7	16.7	74.9
	Rp 5.000.001 - Rp 7.000.000,-	66	11.1	11.1	86.0
	> Rp 7.000.000,-	83	14.0	14.0	100.0
	Total	593	100.0	100.0	

How much your income per month?

What is your religion

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Islam	490	82.6	82.6	82.6
	Catholic	36	6.1	6.1	88.7
	Christian	53	8.9	8.9	97.6
	Hindu	5	.8	.8	98.5
	Buddhist	5	.8	.8	99.3
	Confucian	4	.7	.7	100.0
	Total	593	100.0	100.0	

How much time do you spend on Facebook per day?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	< 30 minutes	220	37.1	37.1	37.1
	31 - 60 minutes	141	23.8	23.8	60.9
	1 - 2 hours	120	20.2	20.2	81.1
	2 - 4 hours	13	2.2	2.2	83.3
	4 - 7 hours	65	11.0	11.0	94.3
	> 7 hours	34	5.7	5.7	100.0
	Total	593	100.0	100.0	

		-	-		
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	< 30 minutes	332	56.0	56.0	56.0
	31 - 60 minutes	105	17.7	17.7	73.7
	1 - 2 hours	87	14.7	14.7	88.4
	2 - 4 hours	40	6.7	6.7	95.1
	4 - 7 hours	19	3.2	3.2	98.3
	> 7 hours	10	1.7	1.7	100.0
	Total	593	100.0	100.0	

How much time do you spend on Twitter per day?

How old are you? (please specify with number)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	17	16	2.7	2.7	2.7
	18	16	2.7	2.7	5.4
	19	17	2.9	2.9	8.3
	20	33	5.6	5.6	13.8
	21	59	9.9	9.9	23.8
	22	58	9.8	9.8	33.6
	23	66	11.1	11.1	44.7
	24	70	11.8	11.8	56.5
	25	43	7.3	7.3	63.7
	26	52	8.8	8.8	72.5
	27	43	7.3	7.3	79.8
	28	36	6.1	6.1	85.8
	29	31	5.2	5.2	91.1
	30	53	8.9	8.9	100.0
	Total	593	100.0	100.0	

Appendix C. LISREL Output

Research model

DATE: 7/02/2014 TIME: 16:00 LISREL 8.30 BY Karl G. Jöreskog & Dag Sörbom This program is published exclusively by Scientific Software International, Inc. 7383 N. Lincoln Avenue, Suite 100 Chicago, IL 60646-1704, U.S.A. Phone: (800)247-6113, (847)675-0720, Fax: (847)675-2140 Copyright by Scientific Software International, Inc., 1981-99 Use of this program is subject to the terms specified in the Universal Copyright Convention. Website: www.ssicentral.com The following lines were read from file C:\INDRI\BARU\BR.SPJ: **Observed Variables** SMU PE PK PP GEN EDU EMP INC REL FRE AGE **Covariance Matrix** 1.00 0.75 1.00 0.54 0.47 1.00 0.58 0.50 0.37 1.00 -0.24 -0.15 -0.10 -0.18 1.00 $-0.06\ 0.06\ 0.09\ 0.03\ 0.07\ 1.00$ $-0.08\ 0.02\ 0.22\ 0.06\ 0.01\ 0.40\ 1.00$ -0.22 -0.07 0.07 -0.03 -0.02 0.65 0.39 1.00 -0.23 -0.22 -0.20 -0.26 -0.05 0.04 0.11 0.25 1.00 0.24 0.05 -0.05 0.14 -0.13 -0.18 -0.16 -0.24 0.04 1.00 -0.09 0.03 -0.02 0.01 0.10 0.18 -0.05 0.05 -0.02 -0.08 1.00 Means $0.00\ 0.00\ 0.00\ 0.00\ 0.00\ 0.00\ 0.00\ 0.00\ 0.00\ 0.00$ 0.00 Sample Size = 593 Relationships PE PP PK = SMU GEN EDU EMP INC REL FRE AGE PP = PE PKPath Diagram **OPTIONS ME=ML AD=OFF IT=300** Iterations = 250Method of Estimation: Maximum Likelihood End of Problem Sample Size = 593 Covariance Matrix to be Analyzed

PE PK PP SMU GEN EDU

PE	1.00					
РК	0.47	1.00				
PP	0.50	0.37	1.00			
SMU	0.75	0.54	0.58	1.00		
GEN	-0.15	-0.10	-0.18	-0.24	1.00	
EDU	0.06	0.09	0.03	-0.06	0.07	1.00
EMP	0.02	0.22	0.06	-0.08	0.01	0.40
INC	-0.07	0.07	-0.03	-0.22	-0.02	0.65
REL	-0.22	-0.20	-0.26	-0.23	-0.05	0.04
FRE	0.05	-0.05	0.14	0.24	-0.13	-0.18
AGE	0.03	-0.02	0.01	-0.09	0.10	0.18

Covariance Matrix to be Analyzed

	EMP	INC	REL	FRE	AGE
EMP	1.00				
INC	0.39	1.00			
REL	0.11	0.25	1.00		
FRE	-0.16	-0.24	0.04	1.00	
AGE	-0.05	0.05	-0.02	-0.08	1.00

Number of Iterations = 0

```
LISREL Estimates (Maximum Likelihood)
```

```
PE = 0.79*SMU + 0.015*GEN + 0.017*EDU + 0.047*EMP + 0.059*INC - 0.052*REL -
0.10^{*}FRE + 0.087^{*}AGE. Errorvar.= 0.40 . R<sup>2</sup> = 0.60
    (0.029) (0.028) (0.037) (0.029) (0.038) (0.028) (0.028) (0.027)
(0.023)
0.60
       27.12
              0.54
                                     1.54 -1.83 -3.72 3.19
                     0.47 1.59
                                                                       17.09
   PK = 0.60*SMU + 0.028*GEN - 0.12*EDU + 0.24*EMP + 0.19*INC - 0.12*REL - 0.12*FRE +
0.043^{*}AGE, Errorvar.= 0.59 , R<sup>2</sup> = 0.41
    (0.035) (0.033) (0.045) (0.036) (0.046) (0.034) (0.034) (0.033)
                                                                             (0.035)
      17.05
            0.85 -2.58 6.66 4.01 -3.55 -3.56 1.30
                                                                    17.09
1
   PP = 0.10*PE + 0.0044*PK + 0.47*SMU - 0.051*GEN - 0.072*EDU + 0.10*EMP + 0.14*INC -
0.18*REL + 0.065*FRE + 0.067*AGE,
    (0.051) (0.042) (0.060) (0.034) (0.046) (0.038) (0.048) (0.035) (0.035)
(0.034)
                  7.92 -1.49 -1.56 2.68 3.01 -4.97 1.84 1.98
     2.05 0.10
      Errorvar.= 0.61 , R^2 = 0.39
          (0.036)
           17.09
```

Correlation Matrix of Independent Variables

SMU GEN EDU EMP INC REL SMU 1.00 (0.06) 17.09 GEN -0.24 1.00 (0.04) (0.06) -5.64 17.09

EDU -0.06 0.07 1.00
(0.04) (0.04) (0.06)
-1.45 1.69 17.09
EMP -0.08 0.01 0.40 1.00
(0.04) (0.04) (0.04) (0.06)
-1.93 0.24 8.98 17.09
INC -0.22 -0.02 0.65 0.39 1.00
(0.04) (0.04) (0.05) (0.04) (0.06)
-5.19 -0.48 13.17 8.78 17.09
REL -0.23 -0.05 0.04 0.11 0.25 1.00
(0.04) (0.04) (0.04) (0.04) (0.04) (0.04)
-5.42 -1.21 0.97 2.64 5.86 17.09
EDE 0.24 0.12 0.18 0.16 0.24 0.04
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$
$\begin{bmatrix} (0.04) & (0.04) & (0.04) & (0.04) & (0.04) \\ \hline $
5.04 - 5.12 - 4.28 - 5.82 - 5.04 0.97
ACE -0.09 0.10 0.18 -0.05 0.05 -0.02
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$
-217 240 428 -121 121 -048
-2.17 2.70 7.20 -1.21 1.21 -0.70

Correlation Matrix of Independent Variables

FRE AGE FRE 1.00 (0.06) 17.09 AGE -0.08 1.00 (0.04) (0.06) -1.93 17.09

> **Goodness of Fit Statistics** Degrees of Freedom = 1Minimum Fit Function Chi-Square = 0.48 (P = 0.49) Normal Theory Weighted Least Squares Chi-Square = 0.48 (P = 0.49) Estimated Non-centrality Parameter (NCP) = 0.0 90 Percent Confidence Interval for NCP = (0.0; 5.42)Minimum Fit Function Value = 0.00082 Population Discrepancy Function Value (F0) = 0.0 90 Percent Confidence Interval for F0 = (0.0; 0.0093)Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA) = 0.0 90 Percent Confidence Interval for RMSEA = (0.0; 0.096)P-Value for Test of Close Fit (RMSEA < 0.05) = 0.72 Expected Cross-Validation Index (ECVI) = 0.24 90 Percent Confidence Interval for ECVI = (0.24; 0.25)ECVI for Saturated Model = 0.23 ECVI for Independence Model = 3.26 Chi-Square for Independence Model with 55 Degrees of Freedom = 1883.08

Independence AIC = 1905.08 Model AIC = 152.48 Saturated AIC = 132.00 Independence CAIC = 1964.32 Model CAIC = 561.76Saturated CAIC = 487.42 Root Mean Square Residual (RMR) = 0.0017 Standardized RMR = 0.0017 Goodness of Fit Index (GFI) = 1.00 Adjusted Goodness of Fit Index (AGFI) = 0.99 Parsimony Goodness of Fit Index (PGFI) = 0.015 Normed Fit Index (NFI) = 1.00 Non-Normed Fit Index (NNFI) = 1.02 Parsimony Normed Fit Index (PNFI) = 0.018 Comparative Fit Index (CFI) = 1.00 Incremental Fit Index (IFI) = 1.00 Relative Fit Index (RFI) = 0.99 Critical N (CN) = 8137.75 The Problem used 68944 Bytes (= 0.1% of Available Workspace) Time used: 0.070 Seconds

Modified model DATE: 7/03/2014 TIME: 12:17 LISREL 8.30 BY Karl G. Jöreskog & Dag Sörbom This program is published exclusively by Scientific Software International, Inc. 7383 N. Lincoln Avenue, Suite 100 Chicago, IL 60646-1704, U.S.A. Phone: (800)247-6113, (847)675-0720, Fax: (847)675-2140 Copyright by Scientific Software International, Inc., 1981-99 Use of this program is subject to the terms specified in the Universal Copyright Convention. Website: www.ssicentral.com The following lines were read from file C:\INDRI\BARU\BR.SPJ: **Observed Variables** SMU PE PK PP GEN EDU EMP INC REL FRE AGE **Covariance Matrix** 1.00 0.75 1.00 0.54 0.47 1.00 0.58 0.50 0.37 1.00 -0.24 -0.15 -0.10 -0.18 1.00 $-0.06\ 0.06\ 0.09\ 0.03\ 0.07\ 1.00$ $-0.08\ 0.02\ 0.22\ 0.06\ 0.01\ 0.40\ 1.00$ -0.22 -0.07 0.07 -0.03 -0.02 0.65 0.39 1.00 -0.23 -0.22 -0.20 -0.26 -0.05 0.04 0.11 0.25 1.00 0.24 0.05 -0.05 0.14 -0.13 -0.18 -0.16 -0.24 0.04 1.00 -0.09 0.03 -0.02 0.01 0.10 0.18 -0.05 0.05 -0.02 -0.08 1.00 Means $0.00\; 0.00$ 0.00 Sample Size = 593 **Relationships** PE PP PK SMU = GEN EDU EMP INC REL FRE AGE PP = PE PK SMUPE PK = SMUPath Diagram **OPTIONS ME=ML AD=OFF IT=300** Iterations = 250Method of Estimation: Maximum Likelihood End of Problem Sample Size = 593 Covariance Matrix to be Analyzed SMU EDU PE РК PP GEN ----- ------SMU 1.00

PE 0.75 1.00

РК	0.54	0.47	1.00			
PP	0.58	0.50	0.37	1.00		
GEN	-0.24	-0.15	-0.10	-0.18	1.00	
EDU	-0.06	0.06	0.09	0.03	0.07	1.00
EMP	-0.08	0.02	0.22	0.06	0.01	0.40
INC	-0.22	-0.07	0.07	-0.03	-0.02	0.65
REL	-0.23	-0.22	-0.20	-0.26	-0.05	0.04
FRE	0.24	0.05	-0.05	0.14	-0.13	-0.18
AGE	-0.09	0.03	-0.02	0.01	0.10	0.18

Covariance Matrix to be Analyzed

	EMP	INC	REL	FRE	AGE
EMP	1.00				
INC	0.39	1.00			
REL	0.11	0.25	1.00		
FRE	-0.16	-0.24	0.04	1.00	
AGE	-0.05	0.05	-0.02	-0.08	1.00

```
Number of Iterations = 0
LISREL Estimates (Maximum Likelihood)
   SMU = - 0.23*GEN + 0.16*EDU - 0.0051*EMP - 0.23*INC - 0.20*REL + 0.18*FRE -
0.074^*AGE, Errorvar.= 0.81, R^2 = 0.19
      (0.038) (0.052) (0.042) (0.053) (0.039) (0.039) (0.038)
                                                                      (0.047)
      -6.20
            3.13 -0.12 -4.36 -5.08 4.74 -1.92
                                                            17.10
   PE = 0.79*SMU + 0.015*GEN + 0.017*EDU + 0.047*EMP + 0.059*INC - 0.052*REL -
0.10^{*}FRE + 0.087^{*}AGE, Errorvar.= 0.40^{-}, R<sup>2</sup> = 0.60^{-}
    (0.029) (0.028) (0.037) (0.029) (0.038) (0.028) (0.028) (0.027)
(0.023)
0.60 27.14 0.54 0.47 1.59 1.54 -1.83 -3.73 3.19
                                                                       17.10
   PK = 0.60*SMU + 0.028*GEN - 0.12*EDU + 0.24*EMP + 0.19*INC - 0.12*REL - 0.12*FRE +
0.043^{*}AGE, Errorvar.= 0.59 , R<sup>2</sup> = 0.41
     (0.035) (0.033) (0.045) (0.036) (0.046) (0.034) (0.034) (0.033)
                                                                             (0.035)
                    -2.58 6.67 4.02 -3.55 -3.57
      17.06
             0.85
                                                       1.30
                                                                    17.10
1
   PP = 0.47*SMU + 0.10*PE + 0.0044*PK - 0.051*GEN - 0.072*EDU + 0.10*EMP + 0.14*INC -
0.18*REL + 0.065*FRE + 0.067*AGE,
     (0.060) (0.051) (0.042) (0.034) (0.046) (0.038) (0.048) (0.035) (0.035)
(0.034)
            2.05 0.10 -1.49 -1.56 2.68 3.01 -4.98 1.84
     7.92
                                                                      1.98
     Errorvar.= 0.61 , R^2 = 0.39
          (0.036)
           17.10
```

Correlation Matrix of Independent Variables

GEN EDU EMP INC REL FRE GEN 1.00 (0.06) 17.10 EDU 0.07 1.00

	(0.04)	(0.06)				
	1.69	17.10				
EM	P 0.0	01 0.40	0 1.00			
	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.06)			
	0.24	8.98	17.10			
INC	-0.0	2 0.65	0.39	1.00		
	(0.04)	(0.05)	(0.04)	(0.06)		
	-0.48	13.18	8.79	17.10		
REI	-0.0	0.04	ł 0.11	0.25	1.00	
	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.06)	
	-1.21	0.97	2.64	5.87	17.10	
			-		-	
FRE	E -0.1	-0.18	8 -0.16	-0.24	0.04	1.00
	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.06)
	-3.12	-4.28	-3.82	-5.64	0.97 1	7.10
	0112	1120	0102	0101	0177	
AGI	E 0.1	0 0.18	3 -0.05	0.05	-0.02	-0.08
	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.04)
	2 41	4 28	-1 21	1 21 -	.0.48 -	1 93
	2.71	7.20	-1.41	1.41	0.10	1.75

Correlation Matrix of Independent Variables

AGE ------AGE 1.00 (0.06) 17.10

> Goodness of Fit Statistics Degrees of Freedom = 1Minimum Fit Function Chi-Square = 0.48 (P = 0.49) Normal Theory Weighted Least Squares Chi-Square = 0.48 (P = 0.49) Estimated Non-centrality Parameter (NCP) = 0.0 90 Percent Confidence Interval for NCP = (0.0; 5.42)Minimum Fit Function Value = 0.00082 Population Discrepancy Function Value (F0) = 0.090 Percent Confidence Interval for F0 = (0.0; 0.0093)Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA) = 0.0 90 Percent Confidence Interval for RMSEA = (0.0; 0.096) P-Value for Test of Close Fit (RMSEA < 0.05) = 0.73 Expected Cross-Validation Index (ECVI) = 0.24 90 Percent Confidence Interval for ECVI = (0.24; 0.25)ECVI for Saturated Model = 0.23 ECVI for Independence Model = 3.26 Chi-Square for Independence Model with 55 Degrees of Freedom = 1883.08 Independence AIC = 1905.08 Model AIC = 152.48Saturated AIC = 132.00 Independence CAIC = 1964.32 Model CAIC = 561.76Saturated CAIC = 487.42

-

Root Mean Square Residual (RMR) = 0.0017 Standardized RMR = 0.0017 Goodness of Fit Index (GFI) = 1.00 Adjusted Goodness of Fit Index (AGFI) = 0.99 Parsimony Goodness of Fit Index (PGFI) = 0.015 Normed Fit Index (NFI) = 1.00 Non-Normed Fit Index (NNFI) = 1.02 Parsimony Normed Fit Index (PNFI) = 0.018 Comparative Fit Index (CFI) = 1.00 Incremental Fit Index (IFI) = 1.00 Relative Fit Index (RFI) = 0.99 Critical N (CN) = 8137.75 The Problem used 69120 Bytes (= 0.1% of Available Workspace) Time used: 0.070 Seconds