

Understanding Psychological Motives toward Politics: Developing Psychological Orientation Scale towards Politics (POSP-S) for Indonesia

487

Indro Adinugroho

Received : October 12, 2018
Revised: October 14, 2018
Accepted: October 18, 2018

Faculty of Psychology
Universitas Katolik Indonesia Atma

Jaya

indro.adinugroho@atmajaya.ac.id

How to cite this article is :

Adinugroho, I. (2018).
Understanding
Psychological Motives
towards Politics:
Developing
Psychological
Orientation Scale

towards Politics (POSP-
S) for Indonesia. *Jurnal
Studi Pemerintahan*,
9(4), 487-510.

ABSTRACT

For over 18 years, Indonesia has undergone democracy in every aspect of government decision making. After the new order (orde baru) regime fell, Indonesia has changed several regulations to implement democratic principle such as direct elections for Presidential, Gubernatorial and also local leaders. However, there are still few challenges faced by Indonesia. One of those challenges is related to human behavior which is political participation. In a democratic country, one of the primary requirements is voluntarily active participation. Voluntarily means an action without any pressure. Without voluntarily act on participation, a country cannot be listed as democratic country. As an attempt to predict voluntarily participation on politics, psychology comes up with the concept of psychological orientation on politics which is represented by three dimensions: political efficacy, political interest and political knowledge. However, different political situations and systems among countries are the reasons why there is no universal measurement of psychological orientation towards politics. This study aims to construct an instrument as an attempt to measure psychological orientation towards politics in Indonesian context. As a challenge to produce the best items and theoretical model, confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) is applied to examine the contribution of each item towards dimensions. CFA analysis finally generates 21 final items for Psychological Orientation towards Politics Scale that can be applied in Indonesian context.

Keywords: Political efficacy, political interest, political knowledge, psychology, politics

ABSTRAK

Selama kurang lebih 18 tahun, Indonesia telah menjalankan demokrasi dalam setiap aspek aktivitas pengambilan keputusan oleh Pemerintah. Setelah orde baru jatuh, Indonesia telah melakukan beberapa perubahan dalam regulasi untuk mendukung implementasi prinsip demokrasi, seperti pemilihan langsung untuk Presiden; Gubernur dan kepala daerah. Akan tetapi, masih terdapat beberapa tantangan dalam berdemokrasi di Indonesia. Salah satunya adalah terkait dengan perilaku manusia, yaitu partisipasi politik. Dalam negara demokrasi, salah satu elemen inti yang diperlukan adalah partisipasi aktif masyarakat secara sukarela. Sukarela artinya sebuah aksi tanpa ada paksaan atau tekanan. Tanpa kehadiran perilaku ini, sebuah negara tidak dapat disebut sebagai negara demokrasi. Sebagai upaya untuk memprediksi partisipasi sukarela dalam politik, psikologi telah datang dengan konsep orientasi psikologis terhadap politik yang dijelaskan dalam tiga dimensi perilaku, *political efficacy*; *political interest* and *political knowledge*. Akan tetapi, perbedaan situasi politik dan sistem yang berbeda di setiap negara menyebabkan tidak adanya pengukuran orientasi psikologis terhadap politik yang sama. Studi ini bertujuan untuk menyusun sebuah instrumen sebagai usaha untuk mengukur orientasi psikologis terhadap politik dalam konteks Indonesia. Sebagai upaya untuk menemukan aitem dengan kualitas terbaik, *confirmatory factor analysis* (CFA) digunakan untuk memeriksa kualitas aitem yang telah ditulis oleh penulis. Kesimpulannya, CFA menemukan 21 aitem terbaik yang merepresentasikan instrumen ini untuk siap diaplikasikan dalam konteks Indonesia.

Kata kunci: *Political efficacy*, *political interest*, *political knowledge*, psikologi, politik

INTRODUCTION

After the *New Order* regime fell, Indonesia has decided democracy as it layers to cover up the relation between the government and the people. In its state principle, Indonesia has defined democracy as the condition where everyone is appreciated for their freedom, ideas, opinions and thoughts. Based on this principle, Government must give a space for every citizen to voice critics and also to gather together as a group based on legal identity such as mass organization or political party. From historical perspective, Indonesia actually has already recognized the democratic principle since 1945 as its constitutional framework, also known as *Undang-undang Dasar 1945* (UUD 1945).

In the first article, Indonesia's constitution has already acknowledged that the "highest *authority of Indonesia belongs to the society*". However, this principle became desolate when Soeharto was ruled for over 32 years in Indonesia. As a democratic country, UUD 1945 is the highest state regulation that needs to be run by Government from President, Minister and the other state institutions who work to provide social justice and prosperity for Indonesian people. Until now, several changes have been implemented to enhance the quality of democracy in Indonesia from the establishment of constitutional court, direct elections, up to guarantee for all Indonesian people to gather and create independent and political organizations. However, the implementation of systems and numerous security programs to guarantee public freedom are not enough without any proper behavior to support democratic condition in Indonesia.

One of the significant indicators stated the progress of democracy in Indonesia is direct election. Since 2000, Government of Indonesia has been thrilled to establish independent institution that is responsible for elections in Indonesia, namely *Komisi Pemilihan Umum Indonesia* (KPU: Indonesia National Commission for Election). KPU is an independent state institution where all the commissioners were chosen by the Government with the approval from parliament (DPR). In this process, DPR is also responsible for conducting fit & proper test as their political tool to identify the capacity, track record, vision and mission from the candidates. In day to day activities, KPU is highly responsible in organizing and conducting all the elections in national or provincial level across island in Indonesia. In its position as independent state institution, KPU is the only one institution which can decide the winner of all elections in Indonesia. From this fact, it is acknowledged that the role of KPU is massively strategic to decide the fate of Indonesia. Besides technical works related to elections, KPU is also responsible to frame a grand design strategy to enhance participation among people to vote (voting) in elections. Voting is one of the indicators that represents political participation in society.

The impact of the establishment of democratic principle causes several changes in governance across island in Indonesia. As the biggest island nation in the world, Indonesia finally decided decentralization as the nation system to accommodate government activities across island. Decentralization is a governance system that allows government's autonomy in provincial and district level (Fossati, 2016). Decentralization causes several changes in election process in Indonesia. Due to decentralization regulation, until now Indonesia has four (4) types of elections: presidential, legislative, gubernatorial and major-regent. This fact indicated that Indonesia is clearly describing the robustness of its democracy. Otherwise, this fact also proposes a high cost for the state. As an attempt to make democracy in Indonesia more effective, all citizens need to be active to participate in politics. This is the reason why an attempt to identify the variables that drive people to participate in politics is crucial for Indonesia. Political psychology has been stated that the psychological orientation towards politics (POSP) is a strong indicator to predict political participation (Burns, Schlozman & Verba, 2001). POSP is defined as psychological motives that drive people's intention to participate in influencing the government. POSP is also categorized by three dimensions: *political interest* (PI), *political efficacy* (PE) and *political knowledge* (PK). Based on these dimensions, we can identify whether the participation in politics is due to voluntary or involuntary.

In a democratic country, a study to measure the degree of political participation based on measurement tool is not a clear solution to understand the dynamic of democracy in one country. However, an attempt to examine the degree of psychological orientation towards politics is the alternative to understand the society and the democracy they faced. In this study, author focused on POSP with three dimensions inside it as the alternative to find an answer of the underlying motives that make Indonesians participate in politics.

Moreover, identifying basic motives is also an alternative to measure and describe the quality of democracy in Indonesia that has been established for over 18 years. Basic motives in politics are described through three behavioral dimensions that emerged from psychological approach: belief or *efficacy* (Bandura, 1977) defined as *PE*; knowledge or capacity (Hunt, 2003) defined as *PK* and emotion or *interest* (Silvia, 2008) defined as *PI*. These three behavioral dimensions will emerge due to specific psychological object. In politics, the psychological object related to these three variables is the real political condition in one country.

As a young democratic country along with decentralization governance, the study to examine basic motives towards politics has become a crucial issue. For Indonesia, this study is needed due to an attempt to create an effective and efficient democracy. If the government knows how to mobilize active citizens, then our democratic investment which is election will not be wasted. To achieve this goal, comprehensive study needs to be conducted with a proper measurement tool. In this study, author focused on the development of measurement tool to assess POSP for Indonesia. Three dimensions (*PE*, *PK* and *PI*) were used to represent POSP as a whole. In the making process, author is also being guided under Burns et al. (2001) framework on the psychological orientation towards politics. This is also an attempt to calibrate the theory within Indonesian context. In the process of making the instrument, author also considered several political issues that need to be adjusted in the item development process. Real political issues are fundamental when developer tries to measure a variable that related to politics due to different political conditions in many countries. Several issues related to the items are Indonesian political term, election in Indonesia (regional and presidential) and also political parties.

The construction of POSP scale is conducted in three (3) primary steps. First step is related to the construction of test specification and items writing.

Test specification is a framework that explains the appropriateness between construct (POSP); the three dimensions (PE, PK and PI); indicators and the items (Cohen & Swerdlik, 2009). Test specification is made based on Burns et al. (2001). In test specification, author also defined each dimension into theoretical and operational definition as guidance for developing items. Theoretical definition is related to general definition based on the theory, whereas operational definition is a term that made by the author as a guidance for item construction. After the final test specification, author continued with the second process, item writing. In this process, author with the help of his assistant drafted the pool items by using test specification. After the item pool was developed, they discussed and made the final decision. The last process is validity identification which is conducted to identify the best items represented by three dimensions in *POSP-Scale* (POSP-S). Author used factor analysis by using two methods, exploratory (EFA) and confirmatory factor analysis (CFA). Both of these methods are part of structural equation modeling method (SEM) which is able to construct factors and indicators that fit with the factors. In the end, EFA and CFA are able to identify whether the theoretical model is comply with the data collected (sample).

THREE COMPONENTS OF PSYCHOLOGICAL ORIENTATION TOWARDS POLITICS

POLITICAL EFFICACY: BELIEF TOWARDS POLITICS

POSP consists of three significant components in predicting engagement towards politics. These three components are PE, PI and PK (Burns et al., 2001). PE is originated from the basic theory of *self-efficacy* developed by Albert Bandura (1977). In psychological definition, *self-efficacy* (SE) refers to a belief that a person is able to complete specific task due to internal capacity that one has.

In Numerous educational Psychological Studies, Self- Efficacy is empirically Shown as Variable that drives human achievement with the establishment of expectation (Bandura, 1993; Zimmerman, 2000). Expectation is seen as a variable that drives people to set standards in order to achieve their goals. In psychological point of view, human efficacy is categorized into two primary dimensions: (1) *general self-efficacy* and (2) *social self-efficacy* (Bandura, 1977; Bandura, 1993). *General self-efficacy* (GSE) is known as a cognitive belief concerning the perception of own capability to perform in a specific task; whereas GSE is focusing on internal factor, *social self-efficacy* (SSE) is focusing on external factors that affect one's capability. Both of these dimensions are correlated with each other due to its function as aggregated variables. High level of SSE and GSE indicates high level of self-efficacy, which means that one has a belief on its own capacity and positive point of view towards the environment.

For over 30 years ago, Albert Bandura (1977), a well-established psychologist has defined SE as one of the psychological variables that emerged due to specific task or issue. This argument is addressing that one can have high self-efficacy due to his or her interest on any specific issue. In political context, the issue is related to real political condition occurred in one country from political parties, issues, political leaders and others. In political study, SE is considered as a variable that is able to predict political participation in democratic country, also known as political efficacy (PE, Burns et al., 2001). By empirical definition, PE is a belief that politics is a tool for change (Burns et al., 2001; Kenski & Stroud, 2006; Karp & Banducci, 2008; Sulitzeanu-Kenan & Halperin, 2012). High level of PE indicates people who trust that politics will bring significant change for society. PE is represented with two primary dimensions, (1) internal and (2) external. Internal PE represents individual belief of its own capability to influence politics, whereas external represents individual belief towards related external factors such as political institutions, condition, actors and parties. Internal PE is similar with GSE and external PE is similar with SSE.

Both of these dimensions are positively associated where external efficacy is considered as facilitating variable in determining internal efficacy (Craig & Maggiotto, 1982). High level of internal and external PE will lead to the quality of person as changemaker (Zaheer, 2016). Trait as changemaker is needed in order to avoid oppression, discrimination and also supporting justice among citizens and government.

By applying the general principle of SE and PE, author constructed PE scale in Indonesian context as a part of POSP scale. In the process of developing the items, author also considered several political issues and terms that existed in Indonesia, such as the type of Indonesia’s election, political institution, political party, politicians, political terms, state law and also the structure of Indonesian government. These elements are significantly important for SE scale as an attempt to construct effective stimulus (items) to drive the evaluation based on participant’s efficacy towards politics. Table 1 shows the example of items represent PE. All of these items were assessed through *summated rating scale* or usually known as *Likert Scale*, consists of six points scale range. All of the items are constructed through Indonesian language. Table 1 shows several items that represent internal and external PE in Indonesia and English language.

Table 1. Example of POSP items measuring internal and external political efficacy (PE)

Variable	Indonesia	English	Type of item
Internal PE	<i>Suara saya berharga untuk proses demokrasi negeri ini</i>	My voice is valuable for the democratic process in my country	1 - Strongly disagree 2 - Disagree 3 - Rarely disagree 4 - Rarely agree 5 - Agree
External PE	<i>Saya rasa pemerintah melihat saya sebagai kalangan yang memiliki pengaruh terhadap</i>	I think government see me as a person who can influence their policy	6 - Strongly agree

Political Interest: Emotion towards Politics

In psychological definition, interest is considered as human emotion that drives human motivation in a specific task or activity.

Interest is also known as knowledge emotion due to its function to guide behavior until one achieves the goal through several process or activities (Silvia, 2008). As emotion, interest is playing as subjective variable in human cognition. The term subjective means a person can have high degree of interest on one object, whereas the others are not.

Like other emotions, interest also emerged due to emotional object (Ekman, 1992; Russell, 2003). The function of interest to drive specific human behavior will occur if one is attached with specific emotional object. The role of interest will not only guide common behavior (safe), but it also drives people for an extreme behavior (unsafe). For example, bungee jumping in rational point of view is considered as extremely dangerous sport; however some people are enjoying this sport and make it as their hobby. In empirical point of view, interest as subjective evaluation towards emotional object can overcome rational and finally drive people to conduct specific behavior.

In politics, interest is playing a significant role, especially for democratic country. High level of political interest (PI) in public will accelerate a country to have a healthy democracy. It is a key for survival and development of democracy (Russo & Stattin, 2017). According to Prior (2010), high degree of PI will positively correlate with high political participation, a behavior to directly contribute in many political actions, such as voting, protest and joining political party. In addition, political participation is massively important variable due to its positive correlation with life satisfaction in democratic country (Flavin & Keane, 2012). Burns et al.(2001) also consider political interest as a part of psychological orientation towards politics. Based on this framework, author finally decided to construct items to assess political interest. Different with PE, PI is constructed without sub-dimensions. Several items were developed to assess the attachment of participants towards various political issues that occurred in Indonesia. Similar with PE, PI items also constructed with *summated rating scale* which has six (6) point scale range.

Table 2 is an example of items in Indonesia and English version.

Table 2
POSP items measuring political interest (PI)

Variable	Indonesian version	English	Type of item
PI	<i>Saya mencari tahu calon pejabat yang memiliki kasus tertentu pada masa lampunya</i>	I try to find out a candidate who has a case in the past	1 - Strongly disagree 2 - Disagree 3 - Rarely disagree 4 - Rarely agree 5 - Agree
	<i>Saya mengekspresikan pengetahuan politik saya dalam bentuk tulisan</i>	<i>senang</i> I like to express my political knowledge in the form of writing	6 - Strongly agree

Political Knowledge: The capacity of Citizens

The basic principle of democracy is the authority which is hold by the people and for the people (Weber, 2010). By this principle, democracy will be fully functioning if the people are critical and willing to participate in the process of influencing the government. In a democratic country, people as the highest authority have a big responsibility to control government by election, political parties, parliament and other activities related to influencing policies such as demonstration. Political knowledge (PK) in society is crucial in order to create a robust democracy. Johann (2012) has found the importance of specific political knowledge in Germany as a democratic country. Knowledge regarding political actors is important for voters in election, although knowledge on rules of the game is essential for any other types of participation. However, both of them are crucially significant in raising citizen's participation.

Based on psychological point of view, knowledge refers to a characteristic of a person that influence one's behavioral potential (Hunt, 2003). However, another point of view sees knowledge as beliefs which are true and justified. Knowledge as one of psychological variable will function as a guidance to determine human behavior (Fiske & Taylor, 2008). In an operational definition, knowledge must be assessed with true and false principle which means the measurement of knowledge needs to be conducted by test (Cohen & Swerdlik, 2010).

Based on psychological framework on knowledge, the existence of PK is a significant variable to determine how society manages their country. High level of PK will drive people to deliver critics for the government if they have done something wrong in governance process.

Moreover, if society is critical to determine the nation's fate, they will use election process to punish former government if they created any inappropriate policies. Various studies have shown that PK is positively correlated with political participation, the main behavioral requirement in democratic country (Carpini & Keeter, 1993; Galston, 2001; Lasorsa, 2009). Political knowledge as the cognitive element will evoke through specific human emotion namely interest. Besides, in political setting, this emotional label is also known as PI. The emergence of interest will lead the people to conduct specific behavior called learning on specific issues (politics). On the other hand, learning is an activity where people gather and collect information and process it into knowledge (Fiske & Taylor, 2008). By this definition, Burns et al. (2001) also define PK as a part of psychological orientation towards politics. In this study, author translated PK framework into true and false principles in item development process. Forced choice item was selected as the stimulus to assess PK. In psychometric principle, forced choice is the type of items where participants are forced to choose one true answer from two options (true or false) in order to response the item (Crocker & Algina, 1986; Cohen & Swerdlik, 2009).

Table 3 shows the example of POSP items measuring PK.

Table 3
POSP items measuring political knowledge (PK)

Variable	Indonesia	English	Type of item
PK	Indonesia <i>mendeklarasikan kemerdekaannya di Jakarta</i>	Indonesia declared its independence in Jakarta	<input type="checkbox"/> True <input type="checkbox"/> False
	<i>Masa pemerintahan Soekarno seringkali disebut sebagai masa orde baru</i>	When Indonesia is lead by Soekarno, it is oftenly called as new order regime	

METHOD

PARTICIPANTS AND DATA COLLECTION PROCESS

In this study, author collected the data by using digital platform. The platform was distributed through various social mediums such as *facebook*, *twitter* and *whatsapp*.

ITEM POOL DEVELOPMENT

The attempt to construct POSP scale for Indonesian context first started with item pool development process. Based on the item specification with Burns' framework, author wrote 68 items in total. PI is represented with 21 items with six-point scale range; PE with two sub-dimensions inside it was represented with 15 items also with six-point scale range and PK was being represented with 31 items which measured optimal performance on political knowledge. However, PK dimension was quite different from the others. Due to its function to measure political knowledge as ability, PK was constructed with ability test construction principle which consists of item difficulty and discrimination (Cohen & Swerdlik, 2009). Before validating the items by using psychometric methods, author with the help of his assistant proofread all the items from various points of view, including the typo, sentence length and the suitability between dimension and the items.

ITEM ANALYSIS: SELECTING THE BEST ITEMS

After the process of item pool development, author began the next process by analyzing the best items. Item total correlation was conducted to examine the contribution of each item by using correlation analysis for PI and PE dimensions (Cohen & Swerdlik, 2009). Judgment of excluding any items from the item pool was conducted based on *Cronbach Alpha* coefficient (CA). CA is psychometric method to assess internal reliability in psychological instrument. The higher CA score indicates good internal reliability (Tavakol & Dennick, 2011). For PK dimension, author examined the items by using item difficulty and item discrimination analysis. Item difficulty is psychometric analysis to assess the difficulty level among items in psychological instrument, whereas item discrimination is used to examine the capacity of items in differentiating the trait or ability (Cohen & Swerdlik, 2009). Conducting item difficulty analysis is crucial to explore the items with high or low difficulty level. In ability test, the exact proportion of low and high difficulty level is important to properly examine the degree of participant's ability.

Thus, item discrimination is used to test the ability of each item in differentiating participant with high and low political knowledge. As for the ability test, PK dimension needs to be assessed with these two methods to achieve its optimal function.

Confirmatory Factor Analysis: Testing the Theoretical Model As an attempt to identify the best items represented in each dimension, author applied factor analysis as its validity measurement. Factor analysis is a psychometric method to assess the congruity between constructed theoretical model and collected data by using *goodness of fit* statistic (Kline, 2011).

Factor analysis can identify the best items which have the highest and lowest contribution toward the model based on *factor loading*. In definition, *factor loading* is a statistical score that represents the degree of contribution in each item towards dimension. In this study, the cutoff score used by author to consider eliminating the items is following on Leung, Wong, Chan and Lam (2013). Factor loading score below ($<$) 0, 4 will be considered for elimination. However, factor loading is not the only guidance to eliminate the items. Author is also considering item specification, advice from colleagues and experts and also, test specification. After the elimination, the validity measurement will be replaced again without eliminated items. This process is conducted to identify the combination of the items that is best to represent our theoretical model.

In this study, CFA is not only used as a measurement tool to find best items but it is also used to assess and identify whether our model is good enough to apply in Indonesian context. In order to achieve that, four types of *goodness of fit statistic* (GFS) were applied to examine POSP model. Those

2

GFS methods are *chi-square* (χ^2), *root mean square error of approximation* (RMSEA), *standardized root mean square residual* (SRMR) and *comparative fit index* (CFI). Chi-square is referring to a method that assesses the appropriateness of theoretical model with our collected sample (Hooper, Coughlan & Mullen, 2008). Chi-square test is commonly considered as badness of fit test due to its function in examining how bad our model complies with our sample.

It will identify if a model is reputed fit based on insignificant p-value ($>.05$ or $>.01$) founded on selected confidence interval or alpha level. Similar with chi-square test, RMSEA is also measuring the appropriateness of theoretical

model with collected sample (Kline, 2011). The closest RMSEA score to null (0) is showing that our model is fit enough. If chi-square and RMSEA are focusing to test the quality of a model, SRMR is focusing on the degree of error in a model. The closest SRMR to null (0), it means the model contains tiny level of error. The last is CFI which refers to goodness of fit statistic for comparing theoretical model and null model. Null model refers to hypothetical statement where there is no significant correlation between factors and the items. SRMR score is ranging between 0 and 1, where score closest to 1 indicates fit theoretical model (Kline, 2011).

CORRELATION BETWEEN MODELS

The process of CFA and item elimination will produce more than one theoretical model. In this process, author must decide the best theoretical model to be applied in Indonesian context. With guided by CFA and item elimination, the difference between models is located on the length of test items. In order to examine the validity of the produced models, correlation between models is conducted up to dimension level (PI, PK and PE). Different models based on test length represent different measurement tool. As an attempt to examine the validity between final model and the existing model, statistical correlation is conducted. In psychometric point of view, this method is also known as *multi-trait multi-method matrix* (MTMMM; Crocker & Algina, 1986; Cohen & Swerdlik, 2009). MTMMM is an attempt to identify the relation between different variables with different measurement methods. To achieve the result, author applied *pearson correlation* (PC) test to identify the statistical correlation between the three dimensions to gain the significant or insignificant result (Field, Miles & Field, 2012). PC is also applicable to identify whether the relation between dimensions is due to empirical pattern or just happened by coincidence with the role of *significance* and *confidence interval*.

RESULT AND ANALYSIS

PARTICIPANTS DEMOGRAPHIC

In total, 295 participants are involved in this study. All of them are college students from various universities in Indonesia. With the aim to describe its characteristics, author used three variables for demographic explanation: age, sex and faculties. Besides age and sex, examining faculty is crucial to look whether the sample is originated from political or non-political science. This action is taken due to primary variable in this paper which is strongly related to politics. Participants who originated from political science faculty tend to be more aware of POSP than non-political science and finally could bring bias in research result. Description of three variables is also significant due to its function to draw inferences about collected data. Table 4 shows the demographic characteristic of participants who involved in current study. Most participants (students) who are involved in this study are young people who are taking undergraduate degree from various Indonesian universities. Description of participants' characteristics is crucial in social science study to declare a limitation on how to interpret the research result.

Table 4

Demographic Characteristic of Participants

Variables	Descriptive Statistic
Age (mean)	21,43
Sex (%)	
Male	31,6
Female	68,4
Faculty/ subject (%)	
Social & political sciences (SPS)	12,5
Non-SPS	87,5

POSP TEST SPECIFICATION

Test specification is needed to clearly examine the appropriateness between psychological construct, dimensions, indicators and items (Cohen & Swerdlik, 2009). In this study, author constructed test specification as an attempt to theoretically evaluate the quality of developed items before data collection process is being conducted. The test specification also included theoretical definition and operational definition as guidance in constructing test items activity.

Table 5 shows the test specification for POSP scale in three dimensions; PE, PI and PK. In the three dimensions, only PE has two sub-dimensions. Indicators in Table 4 are constructed as guidance for item writing and development.

Table 5
Test Specification for POSP-S in Three (3) Dimensions

Primary construct	Dimensions	Sub-dimensions	Indicators
Psychological orientation towards politics (POSP)	Political efficacy - belief towards politics (PE)	Internal (PE)	One is clearly sure that his or her ability is usefull for the country
		External (PE)	One believes that government has a care towards people
	Political interest - emotion towards politics (PI)		One has an attachment to any political trend and issues
	Political knowledge - capacity on politics (PK)		One is capable to know Indonesia's political condition

ITEM ANALYSIS

Based on psychometric theory, there is no standard guidance for how many items represent proper quality of measurement tool. However, too many items will affect variance score to be distended (Crocker & Algina, 1986). To avoid this statistical error, author decided to select the best items to represent each dimension; 10 items for PI, 11 items for PE and 11 items for PK. The decision to revise the item length is made to avoid variance error due to too many items (Crocker & Algina, 1986; Cohen & Swerdlik, 2009). Items which dropped based on psychometric calculation are stored in item pool bank and it is not totally eliminated. The decision to drop the items in PI and PE dimensions is conducted through inter-item correlation, which was focusing on correlation between item score and dimension (r) and also *Cronbach Alpha* analysis. Different with PI and PE, PK as an ability test is analyzed with *D-index* (D) and *item difficulty* (p). The decision to drop the items is based on how items can differentiate participants with high and low political knowledge. Item difficulty is also considered to re-arrange the items in POSP-S. Items with low difficulty are placed in the first, whereas items with high difficulty are placed in the end. Table 4 shows the result of item analysis for selected items in the three dimensions.

Table 4
Items Selected for POSP Model 1

PI (11)	r	PE (10; I & E)	R	PK (11)	p	D
Item 12	.75	Item 6 (I)	.39	Item 37	.82	.21
Item 13	.72	Item 7 (I)	.46	Item 42	.63	.47
Item 17	.76	Item 9 (E)	.37	Item 45	.21	.43
Item 19	.75	Item 14 (I)	.47	Item 46	.22	.37
Item 20	.71	Item 15 (E)	.56	Item 49	.69	.44
Item 21	.80	Item 16 (I)	.58	Item 51	.46	.60
Item 29	.56	Item 26 (E)	.30	Item 53	.50	.49
Item 34	.63	Item 30 (I)	.39	Item 55	.43	.52
Item 36	.78	Item 31 (E)	.49	Item 56	.57	.42
		Item 33 (I)	.42	Item 59	.50	.60
				Item 64	.58	.53

CONFIRMATORY FACTOR ANALYSIS

As an attempt to identify the robustness of POSP theoretical model, CFA is applied to examine the model. *Lisrel* 8.0 is used as the software to assess the *goodness of fit* of the model. In this study, CFA is applied in two steps. First step is related with examination of factor loadings in each item by using Model 1. In this phase, author reviewed items with factor loadings beyond standard score (<0, 4) are eliminated. Elimination after CFA examination is conducted to achieve better result of *goodness of fit statistic* (chi-square; RMSEA; SRMR). After the elimination process is conducted, author used CFA to examine the second theoretical model (Model 2) again. Table 5 shows the result for factor loadings in Model 1 (31 items) and Model 2 (21 items). In specific, factor loadings in Table 5 represent standardized score factor loadings in *Lisrel* that describes the contribution score of items toward each dimension for Model 1 and Model 2.

Table 5
Factor Loadings for Each Item in Model 1 and Model 2

PI	Model	Model	PE	Model	Model	PK	Model	Model
	1 (9)	2 (9)		1 (10)	2 (6)		1 (11)	2 (6)
Item 12	.80	.80	Item 6 (I)	.41	.37	Item 37	.26	-
Item 13	.75	.75	Item 7 (I)	.39	-	Item 42	.50	.51
Item 17	.79	.79	Item 9 (E)	.34	-	Item 45	.41	.40
Item 19	.79	.79	Item 14 (I)	.74	.77	Item 46	.28	-
Item 20	.75	.75	Item 15 (E)	.78	.78	Item 49	.47	-
Item 21	.84	.84	Item 16 (I)	.54	.49	Item 51	.31	-
Item 29	.55	.56	Item 26 (E)	.29	-	Item 53	.28	-
Item 34	.67	.68	Item 30 (I)	.72	.76	Item 55	.46	.46
Item 36	.81	.81	Item 31 (E)	.39	.33	Item 56	.37	.36
			Item 33 (I)	.29	-	Item 59	.60	.61
						Item 64	.45	.46

CFA analysis with *Lisrel* finally found 21 items that best suited with POSP theoretical model. These are the items that have highest factor loadings from the examination with Model 1. For the goodness of fit of these two Models, *Lisrel* also

504

calculates the GFS by various calculations. In this study, author only focuses on four GFS that best represented the quality of POSP theoretical model. GFS examination for Model 1 and Model 2 indicates *model fit* for Model 1 and Model 2. However, after the items' elimination by considering factor loadings in each item, Model 2 provides better *model fit* than Model 1. Psychometric evidence for these two Models is represented in Table 6. The significant difference is located in RMSEA score for the two Models which indicates the approximation of error contained in the theoretical model (Kline, 2011). RMSEA score is located under 0,7 indicates the theoretical model is due to empirical pattern not just occurred by coincidence.

Table 6
Goodness of Fit Statistics for Model 1 and Model 2

POSP-S	χ^2	df	RMSEA	SRMR	CFI
Model 1	915,58	431	.071	.066	.96
Model 2	429,92	227	.057	.051	.98

Based on two psychometric method, item analysis and factor analysis, author finally decided to choose 21 items for the final version (Model 2). These 21 items are the items which have the biggest statistical contribution toward three dimensions (PE, PI and PK) that could be seen in Table 5. The decision to choose 21 items is also supported by GFS result in Table 6. In comparison, Model 2 has lower RMSEA (.057) than Model 1 (.071) which indicates minimum error which contributes and affects the Model. Besides RMSEA, GFS based on *Lisrel* 8.8 was also calculating CFI which indicates the quality of our theoretical model (Kline, 2011). CFI's score near to 1 indicates fit quality of theoretical model.

Based on Table 6, Model 2 has the higher CFI score than Model 2; however the difference is not significant. In conclusion, these two GFS calculation conclude that POSP model with 21 items (Model 2) is ready to apply for various social researches in Indonesian context.

Multitrait Multimethod Matrix

There are two models produced by CFA, Model 1 consists of 31 items and Model 2 consists of 21 items. For the final version, author decided to choose Model 2 to apply in any research regarding political issues in Indonesia. In order to support the validity of Model 2 with shorter item version, MTMMM is applied to clearly examine the statistical relation between Model 2 and the longest version, Model 1. To identify the relation, PC is applied up to dimensional level. Table 7 describes the result of MTMMM between Models. Basically, all the dimensions in both Models are positively correlated with each other. In conclusion, both of the dimensional scores between Model 1 and Model 2 are significantly correlated with each other. This result also complies with POSP theoretical framework where these three dimensions are simultaneously variables which play a role in political setting.

Table 7
Multitrait-multimethod matrix between Model 1 and Model 2

	Model 1 (POSP-31)			Model 2 (POSP-21)		
	PI	PE	PK	PI	PE	PK
Model 1						
PI	1					
PE	.682**	1				
PK	.416**	.417**	1			
Model 2						
PI	1	.682**	.416**	1		
PE	.744**	.937**	.408**	.744**	1	
PK	.380**	.384**	.911**	.380**	.387**	1

* $p < .05$
** $p < .01$

Discussion

Democratic country is not only concerning on state's system. One of the elements that needs to be considered is active participation in society. If we take a look in psychological point of view, participation is related to human behavior which emerged due to complex factors in mind, emotion and attitude (Fiske & Taylor, 2008).

Understanding psychological orientation (POSP) in politics is the alternative to understand human behavior in political setting, especially in democratic country like Indonesia. Three primary variables represent psychological orientation towards politics are *efficacy* (PE), *knowledge* (PK) and *interest* (PI). Many political scientists have stated that political knowledge plays an important role in explaining political attitude and behavior (Galston, 2001; Mondak & Anderson, 2004). In this recent days where internet plays a significant role in producing various information and news, PE among citizens can function as barrier to filter many political information between hoax and reality. Hoax can be defined as rumor, information that is not true according to reality. With high degree of political knowledge in citizens, it can prevent any information categorized as hoax becoming public opinion. If PK relies heavily on cognitive function in human, PI relies on emotional function. Emotion is considered as marker of human behavior (Russell, 2003). PI is powerful to predict many forms of political behavior, such as voting and public discussion (Glenn & Grimes, 1968; Prior, 2010). In Indonesian context, the interest of citizens in politics can emerged not only by education but also shared information in public, such as news. Finally, the last dimension, PE refers to psychological condition that involves belief and cognitive process in human regarding political issues. High internal and external PE will lead to high degree of social mobilization, one of aspect in political participation (Osborne, Yogeewaran & Sibley, 2015). All of these studies have shown the importance of PE, PI and PK in shaping political environment, especially for democratic country with diverse background like Indonesia.

CONCLUSION

This study focused on developing POSP scale for Indonesian context.

Factor analysis on the items has found several items that suitable to use in Indonesian context based on theoretical model from Burns et. al (2001). These three dimensions of POSP can be used as the variable that addressed psychological motives inside human when they act in political environment. Also, the three dimensions of psychological orientation towards politics can be divided and become an independent variable to explain political attitudes and behavior (participation). Oftenly, many political scientist only consider state system as the primary environment that encourages people to act in political setting. However, system and people are two different issues, beneath at all, understanding people also crucial to shape better political environment, especially in a democratic country where people are the highest authority (Weber, 2010; Beerbohm, 2015). Indonesia, as a country where the democratic environment is highly unpredictable by filed survey, these three dimensions are the alternative to understand grassroot condition. The nature of these three dimensions are consistently fix among others so that it cannot be change rapidly through campaign or opinion.

REFERENCES

- Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a Unifying Theory of Behavioral Change. *Psychological Review*, 84(2), 191-215.
- Bandura, A. (1993). Perceived self-efficacy in cognitive Development and functioning. *Educational Psychologist*, 28(2), 117-148.
- Beerbohm, E. (2015). Is democratic leadership possible? *American Political Science Review*, 109(4), 639-652.
- Burns, N., Schlozman, K. L., & Verba, S. (2001). *The Private Roots of Public Action: Gender, Equality and Political Participation*. Harvard University Press.
- Carpini, M. X. D., & Keeter, S. (1993). Measuring political knowledge: Putting first things first. *American Journal of Political Science*, 37(4), 1179-1206.
- Coffe, H. (2013). Women stay local, men go national and global? Gender differences in political interest. *Sex Roles*, 69, 323-338.

- Cozby, P. C., & Bates, S. C. (2012). *Methods in Behavioral Research* 11th ed. McGraw-Hill.
- Craig, S. C., & Maggiotto, M. A. (1982). Measuring political efficacy. *Political Methodology*, 8(3), 85-109.
- Crocker, L., & Algina, J. (1986). *Introduction to Classical and Modern Test Theory*. Harcourt Brace Jovanovich College Publishers.
- Ekman, P. (1992). An argument for basic emotion. *Cognition and Emotion*, 6(3/4), 169-200.
- Field, A., Miles, J., & Field, Z. (2012). *Discovering Statistics Using R*. Sage Publication.
- Fiske, S. T., & Taylor, S. E. (2008). *Social Cognition: From Brains to Culture*. NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Flavin, P., & Keane, M. J. (2012). Life satisfaction and political participation: Evidence from the United States. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 13, 63-78.
- Fossati, D. (2016). *The State of Local Politics in Indonesia: Survey Evidence from Three Cities*. ISEAS: Yusof Ishak Institute.
- Galston, W. A. (2001). Political knowledge, political engagement, and civic education. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 4, 217-234.
- Glenn, N. D., & Grimes, M. (1968). Aging, voting and political interest. *American Sociological Review*, 33(4), 563-575.
- Hooper, D., Coughlan, J., & Mullen, M. R. (2008). Structural equation modelling: Guidelines for determining model fit. *The Electronic Journal of Business Research Methods*, 6(1), 53-60.
- Hunt, D. P. (2003). The concept of knowledge and how to measure it. *Journal of Intellectual Capital*, 4(1), 100-113.
- Johann, D. (2012). Specific political knowledge and citizen's participation: Evidence from Germany. *Acta Politica*, 47(1), 42-66.
- Karp, J. A., & Banducci, S. A. (2008). Political efficacy and participation in twenty-seven democracies: How electoral systems shape political behavior. *British journal of political science*, 38, 311-334.
- Kensi, K., & Stroud, N. J. (2006). Connections between internet use and political efficacy, knowledge, and participation. *Journal of Broadcasting and Electronic Media*, 50(2), 173-192.
- Kholid, A., Husein, R., & Mutiarin, D. (2015). The influence of social media towards student political participation during the 2014 Indonesian presidential election. *Journal of Government and Politics*, 6(2), 246-264.
- Kline, R. B. (2011). *Principles and practice of structural equation modeling*. The Guilford Press.
- Lasorsa, D. L. (2009). Political interest, political knowledge, and evaluations of political news sources: Their interplay in producing context effects. *Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly*, 86(3), 533-544.

- Weber, E. T. (2010). Democratic Political Leadership. In R. Couto (Eds.), *Political and Civic Leadership: A reference Handbook* (pp. 105-110). Washington D.C: Sage Press.
- Osborne, D., Yogeewaran, K., & Sibley, C. G. (2015). Hidden consequences of political efficacy: Testing an efficacy–apathy model of political mobilization. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, 21*(4), 533-540. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/cdp0000029>
- Zaheer, L. (2016). Effects of watching political talk shows on political efficacy and political participation. *Journal of Political Studies, 23*(2), 357-372.
- Zimmerman, B. J. (2000). Self-efficacy: An essential motive to learn. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 25*, 82-91
- Leung, D. Y. P., Wong, E. M. L., Chan, S. S. C., & Lam, T. H. (2013). Psychometric properties of the big five inventory in a chinese sample of smokers receiving cessation treatment: A validation study. *Journal of Nursing Education and Practice, 3*(6), 1-10.
- Miller, Warren E., Arthur H. Miller, and Edward J. Schneider. 1980 American National Election Studies Data Source-? book: 1952-1978. Cambridge, Massachusetts: [Harvard University Press](#).
- Mondak, J. J., & Anderson, M. R. (2004). The knowledge gap: A reexamination of gender-based differences in political knowledge. *The Journal of Politics, 66*(2), 492-512.
- Prior, M. (2010). You’ve either got it or you don’t? The stability of political interest over the life cycle. *The Journal of Politics, 72*(3), 747-766.
- Russell, J. A. (2003). Core affect and the psychological construction of emotion. *Psychological Review, 110*(1), 145-172.
- Russo, S., & Stattin, H. (2017). Stability and change in youth’s political interest. *Social Indicators Research, 132*, 643-658.
- Schwartz, S. H. (2006). A theory of cultural values orientations: Explication and applications. *Comparative Sociology, 5* (2-3), p.137-182.
- Schwartz, S. H. (2012). An overview of the Schwartz Theory of Basic Values. *Online Readings in Psychology and Culture, 2*(1), pp.1-20.
- Silvia, P. J. (2008). Interest –the curious emotion. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 17*(1), 57-60.
- Swerdlik, M. E., & Cohen, R. J. (2009). *Psychological Testing and Assessment: An Introduction to Tests and Measurement 7th.ed.* McGraw-Hill.
- Tavakol, M., & Dennick, R. (2011). Making sense of cronbach’s alpha. *International Journal of Medical Education, 2*, 53-55.

Zimmerman, B. J. (2000). Self-efficacy: An essential motive to learn.
Contemporary Educational Psychology, 25, 82-91