

ATINER's Conference Paper Proceedings Series

MED2017-0026

Athens, 14 November 2017

**Media Social, Engaged Citizenship and Political Participation of
Young Voters in Indonesia**

Najmuddin Rasul

Athens Institute for Education and Research

8 Valaoritou Street, Kolonaki, 10683 Athens, Greece

ATINER's conference paper proceedings series are circulated to promote dialogue among academic scholars. All papers of this series have been blind reviewed and accepted for presentation at one of ATINER's annual conferences according to its acceptance policies (<http://www.atiner.gr/acceptance>).

© All rights reserved by authors.

ATINER's Conference Paper Proceedings Series

MED2017-0026

Athens, 14 November 2017

ISSN: 2529-167X

Najmuddin Rasul, Associate Professor, Andalas Univesity, Indonesia

**Media Social, Engaged Citizenshp and Political Participation
of Young Voters in Indonesia**

ABSTRACT

This paper explores the changing trend in media use and citizenship norms among cyber generation in Indonesia and the extent to which it influences the participation of young citizens in political and civil issues. Embedded in democratic constitution are rights and freedoms that accompany citizenship, and these rights and freedoms includes participation. Participation in democracies should go beyond voting; it should include taking part in the governance process. The political process in Transition to democracy on the track. Internet researcher have reported that internet users are mainly young, well educated and affluent. A sample of 387 respondents between the ages of 17 to 40 years old. The findings show that changing media use from mass media to new media. The results further show that the internet has a significant correlation with engaged citizenship and it has a significant relationship with political participation. In addition, the internet and engaged citizenship have influence significantly to political participation. Based on the findings it can be concluded that the political euphoria in the era of transition to democracy has changed pattern media usage and citizenship norms of among the cyber generation.

Keywords: Internet, engaged citizenship, political participation, democracy, cyber generation

Introduction

The fall of the Berlin Wall was a dramatic moment in history. On 23 August 1989, Hungary opened the iron curtain to Austria, and in September more than 13,000 East Germans escaped via Hungary within three days. It was the first mass exodus of East Germans after the Berlin Wall was built in 1961. Doorenspleet (in Rasul, 2015) said that the fall of the Berlin Wall meant not only substantial change for millions of individuals living under the communist regimes but also a fundamental transformation of the international system. The end of the Cold War provided also a window of opportunity for regime change. This rapid political transformation began in Eastern Europe, spread to Latin America, and parts of Asia, and moved to parts of sub-Saharan African. The recent democratization wave has not only been more global and affected more countries than earlier waves did, but there have ---at least so far---also been fewer regressions to nondemocratic regime than in the past.

The twentieth century has commonly been labeled the century of democracy and the third wave democracy and the wave of political communication (Doorenspleet, 2006; Voltmer, 2008; and Huntington, 1993). The third wave of democracy began in the mid-1970s in Portugal and subsequently expanded in various parts of the world from South America, Eastern Europe, Latin America, Africa and Asia, including Southeast Asia. Especially Indonesia in 1998. The collapse of the political system of a non-democratic to a democratic political system called as the "end of history" (Fukuyama, 1992).

Embedded in democratic constitutions are the rights and freedoms that accompany citizenship, and these rights and freedoms include participation (Sherrod, 2008; Bogard & Sherrod, 2008). The central concept of participation is that citizens transform themselves from bystanders to actively involve themselves with issues, aiming to realize what they perceive as the public good (Meijer, Burger, & Ebbers, 2009).

According to Dalton (2008); Voltmer (2008), democratization has three main issues; Social media, citizenship and political participation. Social media is has an important role in the democratic process. Citizenship and political participation is a strategic issue in the democratization process.

The internet has played a role in facilitating young people to actively voice their opinions and different views. The internet is trusted by young people as a reliable source of information, because the internet can give information quickly and accurately. Thus, many young people make personal blocks, e-mail, Facebook and Twitter as a means of political participation and the application of search engines like Google to find and collect information, including political information. Today, the younger generation actively uses the Internet for various purposes such as political and business requirements and job opportunities.

The Internet is a source to public policy (Hindman, 2009). So, the internet has become a field study of political communication in the modern world (Bakker and Vreese, 2011; McNair 2011; Quintelier & Visser, 2008; Scheufele & Nisbet, 2002; Shah, McLeod & Yoon, 2001, Tolbert and McNeal, 2003).

Online political activity using the internet, making communities tend to be attracted to specific issues and political ideas that can arouse the political consciousness of citizens. Media Internet can transform a major information and communication process of political change (Farrell and Webb, 2002; Norris 2002). Internet and other social media such as facebook, twitter, e-mail and other exploited young people as a political forum for discussion and debate, creating opinions and sharing information. Although admittedly not everyone can access the internet, because of economic problems, education, shelter and so on (Sylvester and McGlynn 2010).

Bimber, Flanagin and Stohl (2005), said that the new media and communication technologies serve as a link between the private and public domain. Based new media technology can help express themselves and obtain information much more easily than ever before and can become an instrument of political participation dimension. According to Dahlgren (2005), politics is not only an instrument for achieving the objectives, but politics is an expressive activity, a clear way in the public space.

This paper explores how the relationship between social media and engaged citizenship with political participation of young voters in Indonesia. To understand this phenomenon, the paper will, explore the changing trend in media usage and citizenship norms among young generation in Indonesia. This study will further explore the extent to which this changing trend influences the participation of cyber generation in political, social and citizen's issues.

From Mass Media to New Media

Media as one of the actors in political communication. Cook (1998) said the media is not only a link between the political elite and the citizens, but the media is an active actor in designing political messages. Voltmer (2008), the media as a medium for citizens to political communication.

The traditional news media, such as newspapers, radio and television have a positive relationship with the citizenship and engaged citizen. Base on study Eveland and Scheufele (2000) on mass media reported that it has a positive and significant correlation with political participation.

Weaver and Drew (2001) find that mass media have significant correlation with engaged citizens. According to Jeffres, Lee, Neuendorf (2007), reported that mass media users connect positively with community activities and the social capital. In the study Norris (2002) found that there was a significant association between massmedia with political participation.

Early research on the internet's potential for reshaping democracy was clearly influenced by the normative values presented in the works of direct democracy and public sphere advocates (Habermas, 1989; Bohman, 1996; Dryzek, 2002; Putnam, 2000). These argued for more inclusive public participation and deliberative exchange between ordinary citizens and political elites.

Accordingly, new ICTs appeared to offer the tools with which to apply the theory. Thus, Negroponete (1995) and Rash (1997) were among the first to argue that the internet offered the potential for a renewal of direct democracy.

At the parliamentary and government levels, a spate of US and UK studies and institutional initiatives (Coleman and Gotze, 2001; Bimber, 2003; Coleman, 2004, 2005; Gulati, 2004; Ward et al., 2005; Chadwick, 2006; Lusoli et al., 2006) explored the potential for online exchanges between citizens and their elected representatives. These attempted to evaluate the possible conditions for the emergence of a 'civic commons in cyberspace' with 'citizen panels', 'e-consultation and deliberation'. A smaller group of studies have asked similar questions at the political party level (Ward and Gibson, 2000; Ward et al., 2002; Lusoli and Ward, 2003; Rommele, 2003; Gillmor, 2004; Trippi, 2004; Davis, 2005). These asked whether new media could be useful in halting the long-term declines in party membership and levels of member activism. New media could potentially reconnect party leaders to ordinary, local members, thus improving accountability as a consequence of better 'intra-party democracy'.

Another series of studies have applied such a research focus to other forums outside national, institutional politics. These have included investigations of several localized, experimental online forums, including local officials and politicians (e.g., Dahlberg, 2001; Polat, 2005; Wikland, 2005; Jensen, 2006), and within the online sites of interest groups, social movements and professional associations (Atton, 2004; Pickerill, 2004, 2006; Kavada, 2005; Dean et al., 2006; Couldry, forthcoming, 2009). Such studies discussed and evaluated these online spaces in terms of their informational and organizational capacities but, also, public sphere communicative ideals such as ease of access, inclusiveness and deliberative structures.

However, to date, early enthusiasm has given way to more pessimistic assessments of the internet's potential for reconnecting political elites to citizens or party members. Politicians, parties and government institutions have been slow to adopt online deliberative tools. Instead, new media is more likely to be viewed as an alternative tool for political organization or service delivery, or be used as an additional one-to-many promotional medium (Jackson, 2003; Gulati, 2004; Jackson and Lilleker, 2004; Chadwick, 2006).

Studies of political parties have documented a series of positive developments from improved information dissemination and organization to better linking of ordinary members and fund raising. Each of these have been particularly important for smaller political parties, such as the Liberal Democrats in the UK, and the emergence of lesser known and resourced candidates, such as Howard Dean and Barak Obama in the US (Ward et al., 2002; Lusoli and Ward, 2003; Rommele, 2003; Gillmor, 2004; Trippi, 2004). However, none of these studies has observed more than limited use of online forums for greater external policy inputs or deliberation between ordinary members and party leaders or candidates.

More generally, there appear to be several aspects of the internet which may actually be hindering the very public sphere ideals of public participation and engagement aspired to. Internet use by ordinary citizens is predominantly

consumer and leisure, rather than politically, oriented. In the UK, in the year of the last UK election (2005), only 3.3 per cent of the population used the internet as their main source of political information and only 3 per cent looked at political party sites (Lusoli and Ward, 2003). Second, encouraging internet-facilitated exchanges and deliberation, according to public sphere norms, has proved difficult and expensive in many political settings. Such difficulties have been noted in local institutional sites (Dahlberg, 2001; Dahlgren, 2011; Polat, 2005; Wikland, 2005), such as Minnesota E-Democracy, and among established interest groups, such as Amnesty, Oxfam and Friends of the Earth (Pickerill, 2004; Kavada, 2005).

The 'digital divide' is another barrier which threatens to increase political participation (Golding and Murdock, 2000; Norris, 2001; Bonfadelli, 2002; Jensen, 2006; Lusoli et al., 2006). Many have noted that online political participation is correlated along the lines of income, education, age, race and, above all, an existing predisposition to participate in real-world politics. Lastly, according to Sunstein (2001) the internet encourages individuals to pick and choose sites in a way that reduces engagement with alternative viewpoints and undermines shared public forums. The consequences are the development of well-organized 'smart mobs' (Rheingold, 2002) and polarized, fragmented interest group ghettos. All of which suggest that the internet is neither widening nor deepening political participation or engagement between citizens and political leaders.

The best that might be said is that interest groups, 'citizen journalists' and others (Downing, 2001; Gillmor, 2004; Pickerill, 2004; Couldry, forthcoming, 2009) may be better placed to organize opposition to politicians and political institutions. Since such developments may also enhance the communicative abilities of those same political and corporate actors, at the centres of decision-making, such gains may be negligible (e.g. Schiller, 1996; Herman and McChesney, 1997; Golding and Murdock, 2000). It is thus easy to concur with a long line of cyber-pessimists in concluding that the internet has had a negligible impact on levels of institutional democracy.

McNair (2011) said internet can linkage between the words to the world. The others said, new media (internet) is relationship positively to social interaction and social integrity (McLuhan, 2010; Shah, et al. 2005; and McQuail 1992). The new media (internet) significant relationship with participation in political. (Quintelier & Visser (2008). Shah et al. (2001), Xenos and Moy (2007); Bimber, (2003).

Duty, Engaged and Compliance Citizenship

Citizenship is a concept with a long history in political science, and its origins can be traced back to debates between Aristotle and Plato over how an Athenian citizen should act. Through the millennia, however, the term has acquired multiple meanings. This may, in part, reflect the importance of the

idea of citizenship, so that scholars and political analysts compete to define its meaning.

Traditionally, citizenship is defined as a formal status, though at times questions about which rights (and obligations) are to be accorded may give rise political conflict. How we define citizenship is inseparable from how we define democracy and the good society. One can say that the formal status of citizenship conceptually frames much of political life in modern democracies – for example the struggles to implement genuine universality and equality – and it thus remains contested.

From another perspective, citizenship has increasingly become an object of social theory and social analysis (Turner, 1993; 1994; Beiner, 1995; Janoski, 1998), not least from the standpoint of feminist horizons and the obstacles to women achieving equality and universalism (Voet, 1998; Dean, 1997). Much of this literature casts citizenship in terms of social agency, as particular sets of practices, and the circumstances around them. Traditional social science research has already done this in some ways, emphasising the importance of certain values and norms being internalised as a prerequisite for citizenship. More recent work has taken a somewhat different, though largely complementary route. Based in cultural theory (Preston, 1997; Isin and Wood, 1999) as well as political philosophy (Clarke, 1996; Mouffe, 1993; Trend, 1996; Smith, 1998), these contributions have highlighted the dimension of identity as a key to understanding citizenship as a mode of social agency. In short, in order to be able to act as a citizen, it is necessary that one can see oneself as a citizen, as subjectively encompassing the attributes this social category may involve.

Just which attributes are relevant is a question that has become more and more complicated. Previously, for example, citizenship was defined by its relevance for the public realm. However, the neat boundaries between public and private have become increasingly problematic (Weintraub and Kumar, 1997). Today, citizenship still generally evokes the notion of a subjectivity positioned publicly – even if a ‘public’ context can be very small scale – however, with the public and private having become intertwined, citizenship as an identity becomes interlaced with other dimensions of the self. Yet, if citizenship is a dimension of the self, this does not mean that people necessarily give the word ‘citizen’ a meaning that resonates with them; they may have other vocabularies. From the standpoint of research one has to be sensitive people’s own discursive strategies for making sense of and participating in democracy.

Almond and Verba’s (1963) description of a political culture as a shared set of social norms, this study defines citizenship norms as a *shared set of expectations about the citizen’s role in politics*. A political culture contains a mix of attitudes and orientations, and I believe that images of the citizen’s role are a central part of a nation’s culture.

They tell citizens what is expected of them, and what they expect of themselves. These expectations shape citizens’ political behavior. Indeed, these norms of citizenship include many of the values that Almond and Verba stressed in defining a civic culture.

This does not mean that individuals approve of these norms, or that their personal values are consistent with these norms. The interaction between these norms and behavior is, in fact, an important research question to consider. For instance, someone might say that tolerance is an important norm for a democratic citizen – but then not be tolerant in his or her own political beliefs.

Citizenship norms are defined as what the individual feels is expected of the good citizen. These norms would lead one to vote out of a sense of duty or to feel a duty to be civically active. In contrast, the young reflect a new political reality and stress alternative norms that should encourage a more rights conscious public, a socially engaged public, and a more deliberative image of citizenship. Categorizes citizenship norms as duty-based citizenship and engaged citizenship. The present young generation is not subscribing to the same duty-based norms as their elders. In fact, citizenship norms are shifting from the traditional duty-based citizenship to engaged citizenship.

Support for government policies and voting in elections is expected in duty-based citizenship, whereas challenge to authorities and greater participation in civic activities may be expected in engaged citizens

Dalton (2008) defines citizenship as a set of norms of what people think people should do as good citizens. How, then, might citizenship be defined? The exact meaning of citizenship is open to multiple interpretations. The concept of citizenship has a history dating from the first democratic polity, and theorists – republicans, liberals, neoliberals, communitarians, social democrats and others – differ substantially in their definitions of citizenship (Heater, 2004). In other work (Dalton, 2008), identify four broad principles that are intertwined with past definitions of citizenship.

First, public participation in politics is broadly considered to be a defining element of democratic citizenship (Dahl, 1998; Pateman, 1970; Verba *et al.*, 1995). Unless citizens participate in the deliberation of public policy, and their choices structure government action, then democratic processes are meaningless. Often this presumes participation in free and fair elections that select government officials, but the range of political participation can be, and should be, much broader. Thus, the norm of political participation should be an essential element of democratic citizenship.

A second related category taps what has been called autonomy (Pettersson *et al.*, 1998). Autonomy implies that good citizens should be sufficiently informed about government to exercise a participatory role. The good citizen should participate in democratic deliberation and discuss politics with other citizens, and ideally understand the views of others. Dahl (1998) and others have discussed how access to information and the free debate of opinions is essential to produce meaningful democratic participation. Other researchers have described such items as representing critical and deliberative aspects of citizenship (Denters *et al.*, 2007).

A Third, Philosophical discussions sometimes overlook the commitment to social order and the acceptance of state authority as essential elements of citizenship. Even democratic governments emphasize the role of the loyal law-abiding individual as a prime criterion of citizenship. Indeed, acceptance of the

legitimacy of the state and the rule of law is often the implied first principle of citizenship, since without the rule of law meaningful political discourse and discussion cannot exist. Political philosophy is replete with those who stress the acceptance of state sovereignty – from Bodin to Hobbes to Hamilton – even before the participatory elements of democracy. Similarly, this logic appears in how the US government presents itself to its new citizens.

A fourth potential element of citizenship involves our relation to others in the polity. T. H. Marshall (1992) [1950] described this as social citizenship. The expansion of civil and political rights led to new categories of social rights, such as social services, providing for those in need and taking heed of the general welfare of others. Citizenship thus may include an ethical and moral responsibility to others in the polity, and beyond. The framework of distributive justice provides a theoretical base for equality as a basis of citizenship. Unless individuals have sufficient resources to meet their basic social needs, democratic principles of political equality and participation lack meaning. Although initially identified with the European welfare state and social democratic critiques of capitalism, this idea of citizenship has been embraced by liberal interests in America (Shklar, 1991; Walzer, 1983).

Each of these elements represents potential elements of citizenship, and can make positive contributions to a democratic political culture. However, the public's actual adherence to these norms is unclear.

I define citizenship to three sub dimensions. First, duty citizenship that associated with traditional values. Second, engaged citizenship associated with new and liberal values. Third, I called as compliance citizenship. It is an external factors, like are intimidation, pressure, money politics and the primordial factor. Mann (2004) called as the dark side of democracy (the dark side of democracy). The factor compliance could bring in the citizens disbelief, mistrust and Scepticism to the political actors Lilleker (2006).

Hopenhaym (2001), said that globalization has challenged the current model in various ways. Rahim et.al (2012) said that the impact of globalization on citizenship takes place in at least two different ways: first, in a political and cultural nature, as reflected in the increasing worldwide spread of ascertain sensitivity to democratic values and respect for human rights; and second, in the assertion of differences and the promotion of diversity. Matters such as religious minority, sexual rights, drug consumption, and gender rights, which were once covered exclusively in private negotiation, now become matters of society as a whole. Hoikkala (2009) reminds us that globalization has become a challenges in democracy transition, like social norms, culture, and democratic values.

From Traditional to Modern Participation

Participation in democracies should go beyond taking part in voting and should include taking part in the governance process. Dalton (2008) suggest three forms of participation: political participation, policy participation, and

social participation. Political participation consists of actions of citizens that aim to influence the selection and behaviour of political decision makers. Policy participation focuses on the role of citizens in regulation. Social participation refers to relations between citizens and government but includes interactions between citizens. Active involvement among citizens may take the form of putting demands on the political and administrative system, and it includes developing systems of mutual support to reach common goals.

According to Dalton (2008), the reasons for developing forms of citizen participation vary, from the recognition of basic human rights concerning democracy and procedural justice to a practical recognition that public participation may result in more support for government policies. He said that political participation has undergone a significant transformation – from involvement in interest groups to new social movements, from the conventional repertoires of interest groups to protest politics, and from state orientation to a multiplicity of target agencies.

The internet is one of the new political forums of the youth. Communication approaches have changed from direct linear communication to network-based approaches. In a global report on voter turnout, reference [18] suggest that confidence in the political institutions and a high level of social inequality in a society, which results in a greater bias against the political participation of socially deprived groups, could be among the reasons why young people lack interest in the democratic process. In addition, attribute the erosion of citizenship to expressions of individualization and a decline in public space.

Based on a study argues that social trust and civic engagement declined significantly in the United States at the end of the twentieth century. A study in eight EU countries shows that majority of interviewed youths were not very interested in politics. They also showed little trust in political parties, although many felt close to a certain party. These young people are termed lazy voters.

The third dimension of this study is participation. Participation is the key concept in democracy. According to Huntington and Nelson (2010), it is the political participation of citizens who act as individuals that are intended to influence the decision making by the government. Political participation is to influence public decisions.

In any democratic society, citizens are encouraged to participate in the decision making that affects their lives. Kim (2007) suggests that participation in democracies should go beyond taking part in voting and should include taking part in the governance process. Meijer, Burger, and Ebbers (2009) suggest three forms of participation: political participation, policy participation, and social participation. Political participation consists of actions of citizens that aim to influence the selection and behaviour of political decision-makers. Policy participation focuses on the role of citizens in regulation. Social participation refers to relations between citizens and government but includes interactions between citizens.

Active involvement among citizens may take the form of putting demands on the political and administrative system, and it includes developing systems of mutual support to reach common goals. Rowe and Frewer (2009), the

reasons for developing forms of citizen participation vary, from the recognition of basic human rights concerning democracy and procedural justice to a practical recognition that public participation may result in more support for government policies. Political participation has undergone a significant transformation – from involvement in interest groups to new social movements, from the conventional repertoires of interest groups to protest politics, and from state orientation to a multiplicity of target agencies.

Rahim et.al (2012) argues that social trust and civic engagement declined significantly in the United States at the end of the twentieth century. A study in eight EU countries shows that majority of interviewed youths were not very interested in politics. They also showed little trust in political parties, although many felt close to a certain party. These young people are termed lazy voters. The EU finds a trend of disengaging from traditional forms of political participation. With the declining turnout, Dalton (2008) suggests that the political process is not at risk even though politics does not work as it did in the past.

In fact, the shifting in norms does not reduce participation but instead increases participation in many ways other than the traditional voting in elections. It reaffirms that rather than erode participation, this norm shift is altering and expanding the patterns of political participation. A study by Rahim, et.al (2011) suggests that more young people are making an effort to directly contact their elected representatives and government officials especially through the online facilities. At the same time these young people are also working with informal groups in their respective communities to address local problems (Norris, 2002; Zukin et.al., 2006).

In this case, political participation consists of three sub dimensions, namely; the traditional political participation, modern political participation, and civic/social political participation.

Firstly, traditional participation relates to voting and participating in the processes of government involved. Secondly, Modern political participation (on-line and off-line) relates to activities how to use of social media use and demonstrations. Thirdly, civic/social political participation related with activities social and voluntary that organized by non-governmental organizations (NGOs).

Methodology

A total of 387 respondents were interviewed for this study. Trained undergraduates acted as enumerators for the field face-to-face interviews, which were conducted from 1 to 30 April 2014. Respondents interviewed ranged from 17 to 40 years of age. In Indonesia, they are called as young voters. To ensure that the youth population was reflected in the sampling, 48% of the total samples were senior high school, 32% were junior high school, and 29% were elementary school. Among the respondents, 51% were men and 49% were women. Slightly more than half (77%) of the respondents were married and the rest were single.

The main variables used in this study were media penetration, citizenship norms and political participation. First, media penetration had three dimensions: media environment, access to media and media orientation.

Second, citizenship Norms had three dimensions: duty citizenship, engaged citizenship, and compliance citizenship. Third, political participation had three dimensions: traditional political participation, modern political participation, and civic political participation.

To determine media environment, three items were used with two response categories, YES OR NO. Read news paper had three items with a Cronbach's alpha of .90. The three items measuring having media. Media orientation had 33 items with a Cronbach's alpha of .85; 11 items measuring newspaper, 11 items measuring watching television and 11 items measuring internet surfing.

To determine citizenship norms, 21 items were used with five response categories, ranging from "not important" to "very important. The items were subjected to factor analysis and produced a three-factor loading. The three factors were conceptualized as duty citizen, engaged citizen and compliance citizen.

Duty citizen had eight items with a Cronbach's alpha of .88. Eight items measuring duty citizen were related to voting in general election, local election, chairman of the neighborhood election, chairman of the family election, obey the law, pay taxes, Concerned for the criminal acts, moral and ethics.

Engaged citizenship has eight items, namely, related to the political activities in mass media, opposition, social care social, social activities, NGO, active in religious, environmental and human rights issues. The eight items had a Cronbach's alpha of .84.

Compliance citizen had five items Cronbach's alpha of .89. The five items measuring compliance citizen related to external factors, as intimidation, pressure, money politics, family factor.

To measure political participation, respondents were asked to respond to 31 items based on a five-point Likert Scale; "never" to very frequently. These items were then factor analysed, which subsequently produced three factors loading. The three factors were conceptualized as traditional participation, modern participation and civic participation.

Traditional participation had seven items related to close campaign, open campaign, convoy, sharing T-shirt, Baliho, sticker, legal team. These seven items had a Cronbach's alpha of .89.

Modern participation had eight items to on-line and seven items to off-line participation. Items to participation in on-line media such as to send emails to political party leaders, candidates and comments in the block, FB, Twitter, Website political party, sharing e-mail and comment in private block. Items off-line political participation, such as signing petitions, demonstrations, roundtable discussion with community leaders. Fifteen items had a Cronbach's alpha of .91.

Civic participation, had nine items related to taking action in human rights, environment, humanities activities, business, hobby, social care, consumer foundation, sports, and religion activities. These nine items had a Cronbach's alpha of .87.

Results

Media, citizenship norms and political participation are central issue in transition to democracy. Media as democratic institution or fourth estate that keeps political authorities accountable by monitoring their activities and investigating possible abuse of political power. Citizenship norms have evolved over time. The young generation’s lack of interest in politics is due to changing norms and participation.

The data in Table 1 shows media usage by age. News paper is highest among those from ages 36 to 40 years (M=2.4). The highest in watching television (M=3.6) and internet use (M=3.5) is also from age gorup 36 to 40 years. The lowest mean for news paper was 17 to 21 years (M=1.5). Watching television (M=2.4) and Internet use (M=2.8) is also from age gorup 17 to 21 years.

Table 1. Age and Media Usage

Age	News paper	Television	Internet
17-21	1.5	2.4	2.8
22-25	1.7	2.9	3.1
26-30	1.7	3.1	3.4
31-35	2.1	3.3	3.3
36-40	2.4	3.6	3.5

The subsequent data are about media usage and education. It is assumed that those with higher education would have a higher degree media use. However, the data in Table II show that educational attainment does not have much influence in media usage. Elementary school-level education and university stronger compared with those having senior high school in reading news paper. And Senior high school-level and university stronger compared with those having elementary school.

Table 2. Education and Media Usage

Education	News Paper	TV	Internet
Elementary School	2.0	2.5	2.9
Senior High School	1.6	3.1	3.2
University	2.0	3.0	3.3

Based on the analysis of Pearson correlation $r = .11$ at $p < 0.05$ level indicates that media usage has a significant correlation with engaged citizenship, not to compliance citizenship.

Table 3. Media Usage and Political Participation

Pearson Correlation	Duty Citizenship	Enggaged Citizenship	Compliance Citizenship
Media Usage	.21	.11	-.06
R ² Adjusted	.05	.02	.00
Sig	.00	.03	.13

$p > 0,05$

Pearson correlation shows significant correlations citizenship norms with traditional, modern, civic and total political participation.

Table 3. *Citizenship Norms and and Political Participation*

Pearson Correlation	Political Participation			
	Traditional	Modern	Civic	Political Participaion
Citizenship Norms	.44	.36	.38	.38
R ² Adjusted	.19	.13	.11	.14
Sig.	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

The subsequent analysis seeks to determine the extent to which citizen norms influence participation. Based on Pearson correlation analysis, as shown in Table IV, engaged citizen has a stronger relationship with modern political participation ($r = 0.31$) than with traditional participation ($r = 0.14$) and civic participation ($r = 0.25$). On the other hand, internet use has a stronger relationship with traditional participation ($r = .86$) than with civic participation ($r = .41$) and with modern participation ($r = .23$). These data support the notion that engaged citizens are more inclined to participate in modern politics on-line such as e-mail, face book, twitter, and off-line such as demonstration, petition, public opinion and discussion. On the other hand, table 5 indicated that internet use has not significant correlation with civic participation such as human right, social and humanities, religion activities.

Table 4. *Correlation between Engaged citizen and Internet use with Participation*

Pearson Correlation	Tradisional Participation	Modern Participation	Civic Participation
Engaged Citizenship	.14**	.31**	.25**
Sig.	.01	.00	.00
Internet Use	.86**	.23**	.41**
Sig.	.00	.00	.00

sig $p < 0.05$

Conclusion

Citizen participation in a democratic society is often taken for granted, especially by the younger generation. The lack of interest among the young generation in Indonesia to register themselves as voters could be explained by the shifting in citizenship norms. The shifting of citizenship norms from a traditional duty-citizen to an engaged-citizen norm does not necessarily mean the end of democracy as it is traditionally defined. Instead the results show that members of the young generation have expanded their avenues for participation in a democratic environment with the adoption of new citizenship norms. Besides participating in voting and being actively involved with political parties, they are also connected to a new form of participation such as volunteering their

time to offer assistance to the less fortunate segment of society, becoming involved in environmental conservation, and showing respect for law and order.

Media usage by age shows that news paper is highest among those from ages 36 to 40 years (M=2.4). The highest in watching television (M=3.6) and internet use (M=3.5) is also from age group 36 to 40 years. The lowest mean for news paper was 17 to 21 years (M=1.5). Watching television (M=2.4) and Internet use (M=2.8) is also from age group 17 to 21 years.

The subsequent data are about media usage and education. It is assumed that those with higher education would have a higher degree media use. However, the data in Table II show that educational attainment does not have much influence in media usage. Elementary school-level education and university stronger compared with those having senior high school in reading news paper. And Senior high school-level and university stronger compared with those having elementary school.

Pearson correlation shows significant correlations citizenship norms with traditional, modern, civic and total political participation.

The subsequent analysis seeks to determine the extent to which citizen norms influence participation. Based on Pearson correlation analysis, as shown in Table IV, engaged citizen has a stronger relationship with modern political participation ($r = 0.31$) than with traditional participation ($r = 0.14$) and civic participation ($r = 0.25$). On the other hand, internet use has a stronger relationship with traditional participation ($r = .86$) than with civic participation ($r = .41$) and with modern participation ($r = .23$). These data support the notion that engaged citizens are more inclined to participate in modern politics on-line such as e-mail, face book, twitter, and off-line such as demonstration, petition, public opinion and discussion. On the other hand, table 5 indicated that internet use has not significant correlation with civic participation such as human right, social and humanities, religion activities.

The changing trend in citizenship norms will have a major implication for political strategy in Democracy. In the near future, political parties cannot build their strength solely by recruiting new membership especially among the young citizens. Young citizens might not be members of a political party, but they would support political parties that support the cause and ideas they pursue through voluntary and nongovernmental organizations. It is a logical move for political parties to comprehend the changing trends in citizenship norms in order to understand why many young citizens now participate less in the traditional voters' registration exercises.

References

- Almod, G & Verba, S. (1963). *The citizenship culture: political attitudes and democracy in the five nations*. Princeton. Princeton University Press.
- Bakker Tom P. Dan Claes H. De Vreese (2011). Good news for the future? Young people, internet use, and political participation: *Communication Research* 38(4) 451–470: Sage Publication.

- Barnes, S.H. and Kaase, Max. (1979). Political action: mass participation in five western democracies: *sage publications*.
- Bimber, B. (2005). Reconceptualizing collective action in the contemporary media environment', *Communication Theory*, 15(4), 365-388.
- Bimber, B., Flanagin, A. & Stohl, C. (2005). 'reconceptualizing collective action in the contemporary media environment', *Communication Theory*, 15(4), 365-388.
- Blummer Dan Kavanagh (1999). The Third Age Of Political Communication Influences And Features'. *Political Communication* 16(3): 209-30.
- Cook (1998). *Public policy and political economy professional issues*. American behavioral scientist. Sage Publishing.
- Curran, J. 1991. Mass Media And Democracy. A Reappraisal, In Curran And M. Gurevitch (Eds) *Mass Media And Society*. London: Arnold, 82-117.
- Dahlgren, P. (2005). *Young citizens and political participation: on line media and citizenship cultures*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Dalton, R. (2008). Citizenship norms and political participation in America: the good news is ... the bad news is wrong. CDACS Occasional Paper 2006-1.
- Dean, D. (2012). *Digital media trends for 2012*. PORTADA Publishing.
- Dionne, E. J. 1991. *Why Americans Hate Politics*. Newyork: Simon & Schuster.
- Doorenspleet, R. (2006). Democratic transition: *exploring the structural sources of the fourth wave*. Boulder: Lynne Rienner Publisher.
- Downing, J.D.H. (1996). Internationalizing media theory, power, culture, reflection on media in russia, poland and hungary, 1980-1995. London: *Sage Publication*.
- Eveland dan Scheufele (2000). Communication and citizenship participation: A proposed research agenda. In J. Harper & T. Yantek (Eds.), Symposium on democracy: *Media, profits, and politics* (pp. 77-90). Kent, OH: Kent State University Press.
- Farrell, D. Dan Webb, P. 2008. 'Political parties as campaign organization', in Dalton and Wattenberg (eds): *Parties Without Partisans: Political Change In Advance Industrial Democracies*, Pp. 103-25. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Fukuyama (1992). *The end of history and the Last Man*. New York: Free Press.
- Helander, S. (2012). *Political participation*. Sage Publication. London.
- Hindman, (2009). Hindman, K.Y. 2009. *Cable TV and Internet Deals*. SPECTRUM Publishing.
- Hoikkala, T. (2009). The diversity of youth citizenships in the European Union, Young. Vol. 17(1):5-24
- Huntington, S. Dan Nelson, M. (2010). *Political participation and democracy*. Rajawali Perss, Jakarta.
- Inglehart, R. dan Welzel, C. (2005). Modernization, Cultural Change, and Democracy: The Human Development Sequence: *Cambridge; Cambridge University Perss*.
- Jacobsen, R. dan Linkow, T.W., (2012). The engaged citizen index: examining the racial and ethnic citizenship and political engagement gaps of young adults. *Circle Working Paper*.
- Jeffres, Lee, Neuendorf dan Atkin (2007). *Communication technology and social change*. Newspaper Research Journal. Vol. 28.
- Lawson Dan Merkle (1998). Politics As Usual: *The Cyberspace 'Revolution'*. London: Sage.
- Lilleker, D.G. (2006). *Key Concepts In Political Communication*. Sage Publications Ltd. London.
- Mann, M. (2004). *The dark side of democracy: explaining ethnic cleansing*. Cambridge: University Perss.

- Marshall, T. (1992). *Citizenship and social class*. Bottomore, London: Pluto Press.
- McLuhan (2011). *Transforming: cultural. Critical, and postmodern perspective*. Peter Lang Publishing, Inc., New York.
- McNair, B. (2011). Media, communication and democracy: global and national environments. *Conference in Melbourne* (31 August 1-2 September 2011).
- McQuail (2000). *The internet on political participation*, Rajawali Press, Jakarta.
- Morse, T.E. Dan Hibbing, J.R. (2005). Citizenship And Citizenship. *Political Communication*. 25; 345-365. Routledge
- Norris, P. (2003). *Democratic phoenix: Reinventing political activism*. New York. Cambridge University Press.
- Putnam, (2000). Bowling Alone: America's Declining Social Capital. *Journal Of Democracy*, 1, 65-78.
- Quientlier, E. & Vissers S. (2008). *The effect of internet use on political participation*. Social Science Computer Review. Sage Publication. Volume 26 Number 4.
- Scheufele, D. A., & Nisbet, M. C. 2002. Being a citizen online: new opportunities and dead ends. *Harvard International Journal Of Press/Politics*, 7(3), 55-75.
- Shah, D.V et al. (2005). *The Role of Recreational Media Use in Youth Socialization: Extending the Citizen Communication Mediation Model*. Online Journal of Communication and Media Technologies. Volume: 4.
- Shah, McLeod, and Yoon (2001). The Role of Recreational Media Use in Youth Socialization: Extending the Citizen Communication Mediation Model. *Online Journal of Communication and Media Technologies*. Volume: 4.
- Sylvester D.E. Mcglynn Adam J. (2010). The Digital Divide, Political Participation, And Place. *Social Science Computer Review February 2010 Vol. 28 No. 1 64-74*
- Tabroni, R. (2012). *Komunikasi Politik Pada Era Mutlimedia*, Bandung: Simbiosia Rekatama Media. Hlm. 78
- Theocharis, Y. (2011). Young people, political participation and online postmaterialism in Greece, *New media and society*, Sage, London.
- Tolbert, C. J., & Mcneal, R. S. (2003). Unraveling the effects of the internet on political participation? *Political Research Quarterly*, 56(2), 175-185.
- Vacari, C. (2008). From the air to the ground: the internet in the 2004 US presidential campaign. *New Media Society*, 10(4), 647-665. SAGE Publication.
- Verba, S., & Nie, N. (1972). *Participation In America: Political Democracy And Social Equality*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Voltmer, K. (2008). *Mass media and political communication in new democracies*. Routledge. London.
- Weaver dan Drew (2001). *Voter Learning in the 2004 Presidential Election: Did the Media Matter?* Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly. Vol. 83, no. 1, pp. 25-42.
- Xenos, M. dan Moy, P. (2007). Digital Media And Traditional Political Participation, *Journal Of Social Issues*, 58, 49-74.
- Zamudio (2004). *Citizenship identity and social inequality*. Sage Publications Ltd. London.
- Zmerli, Sonja. (2009). *Social Capital and Norms of Citizenship: an ambiguous relationship*. Sage Publication.