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ABSTRACT

Student organizations have roles to play in the political processes, namely guarding government policies with their movements and contributing their intelligence as students to achieve a renewal of the Indonesian nation. This study examined the relationship between political efficacy and political participation in the cadres of the student association. The research method used in this study was a quantitative method with a Likert scale. The subjects in this study were 92 cadres of the Islamic Student Association who were 18 - 24 years old with a membership period of at least six months. This study adjusted and adapted the Political Participation and Efficacy scales based on theory. The data analysis technique used in this study was product-moment correlation. The study found a significant relationship between political efficacy and political participation in student organization cadres. The implication of this study was to determine the relationship between political efficacy and political participation in Islamic student association cadres.
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INTRODUCTION

As indicated by the growth of political parties (Yalvema, 2012), political developments in Indonesia have been proliferating from the Dutch colonial period until independence. The efforts of the Indonesian, especially students, have brought about changes in political history. The most significant phase in Indonesia's political history involves constitutional changes and democracy building. Indonesia has historically succeeded in developing democracy and the state administration system, resulting in a much better political and economic balance (Rusfiana & Nurdin, 2017). The success of democratic development is shown by the level of political participation in post-reform Indonesian society, which has received much praise internationally as a country that can achieve a level of political participation in elections of 92.7% of the total population or more than 202 million people. (Abdurrahman, 2014).

Students have a role in political dynamics, and student movements significantly influence the political process. This is historically shown that student movements led to the preservation of independence, the birth of the new order, and the reformation period (Novianto, 2016). Students aged 18 to 40 are included in the category of early adulthood (Hurlock, 1991). According to Danim (2013), the responsibilities of individuals in early adulthood are related to attitudes, behavior, and skills. Ideally, these developmental tasks should be completed according to their developmental age. It was further explained that students who fall into the category of early adulthood must actively participate in the political process as individuals who are part of Indonesian society.
As a student organization, the Islamic Student Association (HMI) certainly participates in the movement to defend the independence and realize social welfare (Alfian, 2013). The Islamic Student Association (HMI) cannot be separated from the socio-political dynamics of the Indonesian nation. Historically, the Islamic Student Association (HMI) was formed to defend the Republic of Indonesia and to exalt Indonesian people, to uphold and develop the teachings of Islam (Sitompul, 2008). Further explained by (Sitompul, 2008), the Islamic Student Association (HMI) is the oldest Islamic student organization in Indonesia which was established on 5 February 1947. In the mid-1960s, the Islamic Student Association (HMI) had become the largest student organization in Indonesia with more than 100,000 cadres. The cadres of the Islamic Student Association organization are identified as the cadres of the people and the nation because they are characterized as true Muslims and highly nationalistic. Therefore, they are expected to play an active role in solving problems of Islam and problems of the nation (Alfian, 2013).

According to Budiardjo (2008), political participation is an act of choosing a leader by individuals or groups through intermediaries or not, and an activity of monitoring and influencing government policies in achieving public welfare. Budiardjo (2008) further explained that political participation includes five aspects, namely voting, attending general meetings, establishing relationships, being involved in social movements, and being a member of a political party.

The level of political participation among youth in the United States is low. This was indicated by the number of people aged 18 years and over, totaling 245.5 million and around 157.6 million registered voters. However, only 136.8 million people used their right to vote in general elections (Desilver, 2017). The low level of political participation in Malaysia is shown in the results of Ting and Ahmad's (2021) research on political participation with 62 subjects, showing that out of 28 teenagers, only ten teenagers voted in the general election even though 15 had registered as voters. Based on the results of his research, none of the youth was the member of political parties, and only 20% of adolescents attended general elections.

Then, political participation in Indonesia was shown from data from several regions, namely in the areas of Jambi and Telanaipura sub-district. The results of Zarkasi and Rizal's research (2020) showed a decrease in the community's political participation level. The decline in political participation was shown in the 2018 local elections which reached only 21,443 votes, from 29,650 votes reached in the 2013 local elections. Then, the research by Djuyandi and Herdiansah (2018) showed the low level of political participation in the areas of West Java. There were 31,974,728 people listed in DPT of these areas. The number of the voters was spread over nine cities and 18 regencies in the province of West Java. Based on this, only 30% of novice voters did political participation. The condition of political participation in the areas of West Java was similar to that shown in several regions in Indonesia.

The legitimacy of a country can be seen from the extent to which its citizens carry out political participation. The high or low level of political participation can show a country's legitimacy (Budiardjo, 2008). As a democratic country, Indonesia must have a high level of legitimacy because the democratic process in a country can run smoothly through the political participation of its citizens (Abdurrahman, 2014). Students' political participation can impact the development through critical and analytical thinking (Martadinata, 2019). On the
other hand, low political participation will impact the public's shared understanding of politics (Yustiningrum & Ichwanuddin, 2015). This opinion is strengthened by the research of Yoriza and Putra (2021), which showed that the low level of political participation reflects the public inability to understand the importance of democracy, and then lead to the indifference to politics.

According to Smets and Ham (2013), there are several factors that influence the high and low of political participation. The factors that influence political participation can be seen through six models: the psychological model, resource model, mobilization model, rational model, socialization model, and institutional political model. The psychological model consists of political interests, knowledge, efficacy, ambivalence, and personality. Researchers chose political efficacy in this study as the reason for the election. According to Berman (1997), political efficacy in the range of 20% and above indicated a better individual preference for political activities, whereas political efficacy in the range of 20% and below indicated a low preference for political participation in individuals.

According to Kaid and Bacha (2008), political efficacy is a term that refers to an individual's feeling that the activities he/she performs can impact political processes. Further explained by Kaid and Bacha (2008), the aspects of political efficacy are external and internal political efficacy. Internal political efficacy is the belief that one can influence the political process. External political efficacy is the belief that the political system, government, or state can influence the political process.

Individuals who participate in politics are motivated by the belief that they can channel common interests to reach a binding decision (Budiardjo, 2008). The involvement in political participation activities is due to a feeling of trust that the activities he/she carries out in political participation can influence the decision-making process, and that the activities he/she undertakes can provide democratic satisfaction (Wahyudi et al., 2013).

It is also explained by Houghton (2009) that individuals who have self-confidence can influence the political process, tend to carry out political participation activities in elections, and become cadres of political parties. Reichert (2016) also shows that high political efficacy has a high preference for individual participation in political activities in the form of social movements such as demonstrations. The results of Anwar and Kuncoro's (2021) research showed that novice voters with good political efficacy have confidence when talking about politics, attending political discussions, and making contacts with officials.

Politics is intrinsically interested in how well it could influence. Individuals that have political efficacy have positive views about attending meetings, making long-term political goals, and conducting political dialogues. Due to their feelings, which may have an impact on political decisions, they take action on their own (Stattin et al., 2016).

On the other hand, low political efficacy can lead to indifference toward politics and not being aware that political activities are essential things to do (Yoriza & Putra, 2021). This is also found in the results of research by Matulessy and Samsul (2013), stating that when individuals have low political efficacy, it will give rise to a feeling that the political activities carried out cannot change the situation. Low political efficacy also indicates that people have a common political understanding (Yustiningrum & Ichwanuddin, 2015).

The results of research conducted by Fitriah (2014) showed a positive correlation between political efficacy and political participation in the strong category. So, it
explains that high political efficacy can affect high political participation. Then, the results of Anwar and Kuncoro's (2021) research also showed a significant correlation between political efficacy and political participation, meaning that political efficacy is a factor that influences political participation. It is also supported by the research results by Khoiriyah and Sari (2021), which also showed that political participation is closely related to political efficacy. High levels of political efficacy will contribute to high individual’s interest in political activities and vice versa.

Based on previous studies, researchers have not found a specific study that discusses the relationship between political efficacy and political participation of the cadres of the Islamic student organization—students who are intellectual and have a driving role. So, the researcher was interested in conducting the research on the cadres of the Islamic student organization.

Based on the explanation above, the researcher aimed to determine the positive relationship between political efficacy and political participation in the cadres of the Islamic student organization. This research was expected to theoretically contribute and add information to the field of Social Psychology, especially on the relationship between political efficacy and political participation in the Islamic student organization cadres.

RESEARCH METHODS

Subject and Procedure

The subjects in this study were the cadres of the Islamic Student Association (HMI), totaling 92 subjects. The criteria of them were having a membership period of at least six months and being 18-24 years old.

Instrument

This study used a Likert scale created by researchers concerning the theory proposed by Budiardjo (2008). The Political Participation Scale consisted of 30 items using alternative answers, namely Very inappropriate (STS), Inappropriate (TS), Appropriate (S), and Very Appropriate (SS). The Political Participation Scale compiled by the researcher had gone through trials. The researcher used a criterion limit of 0.25. The test results found that 29 items met the criteria for the item-total coefficient with a validity coefficient of 0.339 - 0.785 and a reliability coefficient of 0.940 before the dropped item was removed. After removing the dropped item, the reliability coefficient alpha (α) was obtained at 0.942.

The political efficacy scale created by the researcher was based on the theory described by Kaid and Bacha (2008). The Political Efficacy Scale consisted of 18 items and had been tested on the Political Efficacy Scale with a validity coefficient of 0.290 – 0.795 and a reliability coefficient alpha (α) of 0.948. These results indicated that the scale of this study is reliable because it is close to 1.00 (Azwar, 2019).

Statistical Analysis

Analysis of the data in this study used product-moment correlation from Karl Pearson to determine the relationship between political participation and political efficacy. Product moment correlation is appropriate to be used in this study because it can determine the relationship between two variables (Sugiyono, 2009). Then the data were processed using statistical analysis.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The results of the description of research data used the levels of categorization of research variables based on hypothetical scores. The average value describes hypothetical score data (mean), the distribution distance (range), standard deviation, minimum, and maximum. Based on the
analytical results of the 29-item of Political Participation Scale, the lowest value was one, and the highest was 4. Hypothetical data with a minimum subject value of 1 x 29 = 29 and a maximum value of 4 x 29 = 116, hypothetical average (29 + 116): 2 = 72.5 and standard deviation (116 - 29): 6 = 14.5. Furthermore, the results of the hypothetical data on the Political Efficacy Scale were the subject's minimum value of 1 x 18 = 18 and the maximum value of 4 x 18 = 72, the hypothetical mean (18 + 72): 2 = 45 and standard deviation (72 - 18): 6 = 9. The results of the scores of the hypothetical data on the Political Participation Scale and Political Efficacy Scale can be seen in the following table:

Table 1
Description of Research Data on Political Participation and Political Efficacy Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Hypothetical Data</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Participation</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>72.5</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Efficacy</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Next, the researcher categorized the subjects according to their groups in the order adjusted to the series of measured signs (Azwar, 2021). The categorization of variable scores can be seen in the following table:

Table 2
Political Participation Scale Categorization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Guidance</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>X&lt; (µ-1σ)</td>
<td>X&lt;</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently</td>
<td>(µ-1σ) s/d (µ+1σ)</td>
<td>X&lt; ≤ X&lt;</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>80.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>X&gt; (µ+1σ)</td>
<td>X≥</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>92</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the categorization of political participation variables, the results obtained were as follow: high 35.9% (33 subjects), medium category 64.1% (59 subjects), and low category 0% (0 subjects).

Prerequisites and Hypothesis Testing

Table 3
Political Efficacy Scale Categorization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Guidance</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>X&lt; (µ-1σ)</td>
<td>X&lt;</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently</td>
<td>(µ-1σ) s/d (µ+1σ)</td>
<td>X&lt; ≤ X&lt;</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>80.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>X&gt; (µ+1σ)</td>
<td>X≥</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>92</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the categorization of political efficacy variables, the high category was 16.3% (15 subjects), the medium category was 80.4% (74 subjects), and the low category was 3.3% (3 subjects).

Table 4
The Results of The Normality Test of The Research Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Kolmogorov-Smirnov</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Political Participation</td>
<td>0.066</td>
<td>0.200</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Efficacy</td>
<td>0.080</td>
<td>0.186</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the table of normality test results on the political participation and political efficacy variables, the significance value of the political participation variable was 0.200 (p > 0.05), and the political efficacy variable was 0.186 (p > 0.05). The normality test results indicated that the data from the two variables were normally distributed.

The linearity test was carried out with a significance level of 0.05. If the significance value < 0.050, it indicates that there is a linear relationship between the independent variable and the dependent variable. Based on the linearity test on the political participation and political efficacy variables, F = 36,318 with a significance level of p = 0.000 was obtained.
This explained a linear relationship between political participation and political efficacy.

Table 5
The Results of The Linearity Test of The Research Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Political</td>
<td>2.945</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>36.31</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Political</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficacy</td>
<td>1.554</td>
<td>.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groups</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linearity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deviation from</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linearity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the analysis results of product-moment correlation analysis (Pearson correlation) in this study, the correlation value \((r_{xy}) = 0.510\) was obtained, meaning there was a positive relationship between political efficacy and political participation. Moreover, the analysis results also produced a coefficient of determination \((R^2) = 0.260\), which indicated that the political efficacy variable contributed 26% to political participation, and the remaining 74% was contributed by another cause unknown to the researcher.

Table 6
Hypothesis Test Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Political Efficacy</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>92</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.510**</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Political Participation</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>92</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.510**</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is a difference in the results of the research conducted by the researcher with the previous research conducted by Wibowo et al. (2020), showing that political efficacy does not significantly affect political participation in elections. This is due to the difference in the subjects used in the previous study who were specific subjects from certain university students and the division of online and offline types of political participation. However, this study also obtained significant results on online political activities, explaining that political efficacy can significantly affect online political activities.

The results of research conducted by Anwar and Kuncoro (2021) were in line with present research that political efficacy contributes positively to political participation. It was further explained that high political efficacy can contribute to high political participation. On the other hand, low political efficacy can trigger low political participation.

Another research conducted by Khoiriyah and Sari (2021) also showed that the high level of political efficacy in individuals indicates a high level of individual’s belief in their ability to participate in politics. Another study by Schulz (2005) showed that adolescents with a high level of efficacy will consistently participate in political participation activities and have hopes that their activities will have a lasting impact on themselves and society.

The research from Ikeda et al. (2008) also showed that individuals with good political efficacy tend to be more active in political activities. Furthermore, this was supported by Basri (2011), who stated that political efficacy is an indicator of individuals in political participation, and individual’s involvement in political participation is influenced by political efficacy. Additionally, Berman (1997) stated that individuals who have a level of political efficacy with a range...
of 20% and above are indicated to have a high preference for political participation.

According to Kaid and Bacha (2008), political efficacy consists of two aspects: external and internal political efficacy. External political efficacy is the belief that the political system and the government can influence the process of public policy-making and decision-making. It was supported by the results of field data showing that research subjects had confidence that the government system or an official could influence the political process, and they had confidence in the actions taken by government officials in the political process to achieve public welfare. With these conditions, they actively participated in political activities. They supported the government system, the process of formulating general policies, and the decision-making process carried out by government officials.

Internal political efficacy is the belief that one can influence the process of public policy-making and decision-making through his participation in political participation (Kaid & Bacha, 2008). It was reinforced by the field data results showing that the research subjects had confidence that they could change positively by participating in political activities.

This research examined the individual’s political behavior in political processes such as decision-making and general policy-making (Staerkle, 2015). So, this research could then be used as a reference source to develop strategies to increase political participation in society in general. In addition, the weakness of this study was that the population was specific, so it did not represent political behavior in students in general.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, this study shows a positive relationship between political efficacy and political participation in the cadres of the Islamic student organization. This study improves our understanding of the relationship between political efficacy and political participation in Islamic student organization cadres. This study certainly has limitation that the subject population is vast with little research relations, so it has not been able to meet the subject entirely. It is recommended to expand the relationship so that it can cover the subject as a whole. According to the results of this study, individuals who have a high level of trust in government, political candidates, and the entire political process are more likely to participate in politics.

It is recommended that the subjects are expected to maintain and increase their political participation by regarding and believing that they and the government system can influence the political process. Additionally, it is suggested that further researchers examine other factors that can influence political participation in subjects such as students or society.
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