

The Rationality of Student Political Choices in the 2024 Presidential Election

Rasionalitas Pilihan Politik Mahasiswa Pada Pemilihan Presiden Tahun 2024



M. Nursi^{1*}, Pebriyenni², Darwianis³, Muslim⁴, Arlina Yuza⁵

¹²³⁴⁵ Bung Hatta University

¹²³⁴⁵ Jl. Bagindo Azis Chan-Bypass, Aie Pacah, Kota Padang 25133 Sumatera Barat, Indonesia

nursi@bunghatta.ac.id^{1*}; pebriyenni@bunghatta.ac.id²; darwianis.01@gmail.com³;

muslim@bunghatta.ac.id⁴; arlinayuza@bunghatta.ac.id⁵

Corresponding Author: nursi01@bunghatta.ac.id^{1*}

ARTICLE INFORMATION

<p>Keywords <i>Rationality; Political Choice; 2024 Presidential Election;</i></p>	<p>ABSTRACT Students are one of the important social segments that are affected and have an impact on the 2024 Presidential General Election (Pilpres). Therefore, this research aims to describe the rationality of students' political choices between rational, primordial, pragmatic, and emotional preferences or types, as well as their comparison with each other. With a population of 6174 students of Hatta University, spread across 33 study programs in the Even Semester 2023-2024, namely with cluster data collection techniques and proportional random sampling, the research sample was 330 people (5.34%), using a questionnaire instrument. The results of this study show that in real and internal comparison, each type of student political choice between rational and non-rational (irrational) preferences/types is contrasting but weak, namely 60.1% compared to 11.9%, primordial type 55.6% and non-primordial type 15.3%, pragmatic type 59.8% and non-pragmatic type 15.3%, while emotional type is 60.1% and non-emotional type 11.9%. Externally and in real terms, there is no dominant (weak) difference. However, the negative preferences of the primordial and emotional types were still more prominent, namely 55.6% and 60.1% (both less strong), so that the average difference in percentage with non-primordialism and non-emotional was 44.25% (less strong)</p>
<p>Kata Kunci <i>Rasionalitas; Pilihan Politik; Pemilihan Presiden (Pilpres) 2024;</i></p>	<p>ABSTRAK Mahasiswa merupakan salah satu segmen sosial penting yang terimbas dan berdampak pada Pemilihan Umum Presiden (Pilpres) 2024. Karena itu penelitian ini bertujuan untuk mendeskripsikan rasionalitas pilihan politik mahasiswa antara preferensi atau tipe rasional, primordial, pragmatik, dan tipe emosional, serta perbandingannya satu sama lain. Dengan populasi berjumlah 6174 mahasiswa Universitas Bung Hatta, yang tersebar pada 33 program studi pada Semester Genap 2023-2024, yaitu dengan teknik pengumpulan data <i>cluster and proportional random sampling</i>, sampel penelitian 330 orang (5,34%), dengan menggunakan instrument kuesioner. Hasil penelitian ini menunjukkan bahwa secara riil dan perbandingan internal masing-masing tipe pilihan politik mahasiswa antara preferensi/tipe rasional dan non-rasional (irasional) cenderung kontras namun lemah, yaitu 60,1% berbanding 11,9 %, bertipe primordial 55,6 % dan non-primordial 15,3 %, bertipe pragmatik 59,8 % dan non-pragmatik 15,3 %, sedangkan yang bertipe emosional adalah 60,1 % dan non-emosional 11,9 %. Secara eksternal dan riil pun tidak terdapat perbedaan dominan (lemah). Namun preferensi yang bernuansa negatif yaitu tipe primordial dan emosional ternyata masih lebih menonjol yaitu 55,6% dan 60,1% (keduanya kurang kuat), sehingga perbedaan rerata persentasenya dengan yang non-primordialisme dan non-emosional adalah 44,25% (kurang kuat).</p>
<p>Article History Send 25th December 2024 Review 03th January 2024 Accepted 12th January 2024</p>	<p>Copyright ©2024 Jurnal Aristo (Social, Politic, Humaniora) This is an open access article under the CC-BY-NC-SA license. Akses artikel terbuka dengan model CC-BY-NC-SA sebagai lisensinya.</p>



Introduction

The 2024 Presidential General Election (Pilpres) is the election of the presidential and vice presidential pairs which is more unique, strategic, complex and more specific than the previous presidential elections. Because in the 2024 Presidential Election, the power struggle that occurred not only sharpened the ideological polarization of Islamism versus Nationalism but also combined with the polarization of the power of "new change" (carried out by the Anis-Muhaimin pair) with the power of "New-Jokowisme" as the representation of the incumbent by the Prabowo-Gibran and Ganjar-Mahfud MD pairs (Triono, 2023).

The three presidential and vice presidential candidates have their own characteristics of advantages and weaknesses that have sharp and tight escalations, relationships, and political battles to become winners, so that voters are really required to be observant, critical, and know the personality of the candidate pair adequately in determining their right political choices (Kompas, 2024). This means that with the considerations or preferences used by voters, it is possible to obtain a decent, competent and capable partner to be able to successfully advance Indonesia in the future. Such expectations as voters should exist among students, in particular, as people who should be intelligent, critical, objective and rational in using their political choices or references (Noupal, 2024).

Students as part of youth groups (millennials) are a strategic target because of the huge potential number of voters, which reaches 56.45% or around 113 million voters. Of course, students' opinions and preferences are central because their level of literacy and attention to public issues and political dynamics can have implications for the political attitudes of other voter groups. Therefore, understanding the political preferences of student groups in the 2024 Presidential Election and public issues is important to do (Minarni, 2024).

From the release of the Opinion Survey Results entitled "What are the views of University of Jambi students regarding the 2024 Presidential Election", he concluded that students understand the political issues that are currently developing, but most students are not actively involved in political activities such as discussions, seminars, or campaigns carried out by presidential and vice presidential candidates in the 2024 Presidential Election, the level of student confidence in the political promises of presidential and vice presidential candidates is less reliable. It was also revealed that for students, performance is an important factor whether the promises of presidential and vice presidential candidates can be trusted or not, and the mass media has a great influence on students' views of presidential and vice presidential candidates, even the mass media that is more trusted by students, namely social

media. In addition, students have been able to distinguish between true news and fake news (hoaxes) against news about the 2024 Presidential Election (Minarni, 2024).

The results of other researchers' studies show a diversity of considerations or factors that contribute to influencing voter voting behavior, such as cultural, social, economic, communication, political, and so on factors (Mahendra, 2005). Political choice is related to voting behavior that uses the complexity of considerations, subjective and objective argumentative conditions or values that are used as a reference or preference for voters in determining the choice of political figures or parties they support (Kaesmetan, 2019).

From the Violin research, et al (2024) which researched seven factors that have the potential to influence students' political choices (Faculty of Social and Political Sciences, Jenderal Soedirman University, Class of 2023), namely religious factors, religious groups, personalities, ethnicities, appearances, political parties, and family backgrounds, so it is the personality factor that has the greatest influence on students' political choices.

In contrast to the findings of Violin's research above, the research of Maimun and Asy'ari (2021) on the presidential and vice presidential elections in Aceh Besar Regency actually found that it is the role of religion that affects voter behavior more. Another is the findings of the Karundeng (2015) research on the behavior of choosing Chinese descent in the 2014 Presidential Election in Manado City, where the aspect of self-appearance is one of the important and key factors in influencing voter preferences. Self-appearance as a candidate for president and vice president includes the ability to build a personal positive personality in the eyes of voters. This means that in addition to selling political programs, a candidate must also sell a personal image that depicts culture, politeness, religiosity, honesty, and responsibility.

Furthermore, Arravi, et al's (2021) research on "Political Participation and Behavior of Choosing Santri in the Nahdlatul Ulama (NU) Lasem Area, Rembang Regency in the 2019 Presidential and Vice Presidential Elections", showed that the political choices of NU Lasem students in the 2019 Presidential Election were not influenced by factors of ethnicity or ethnicity (primordialism). This means that the majority of respondents (42%), who are from the Javanese tribe, do not consider the candidate's background or ethnic or ethnic similarity as the main consideration or preference for their political choices, only a small number of respondents (33%) admit that ethnic similarity is a consideration in determining their political choices.

Compared to the three studies above, this study has a different orientation, which is not only limited to describing factors or aspects that affect or become students' political choice preferences, but also identify and categorize political choice preferences according to rational nominal parameters, meaning that political choices based on logical or reasonable

judgments or considerations. The subject in question can be in the form of thoughts or ideas, considerations, judgments, arguments, attitudes, decisions or deeds or actions. According to Max Weber as an expert who first came up with the theory of rationality, dividing human rationality into two types, namely the rationality of goals and the rationality of values (Noupal, 2024).

The concept of rationality is generally grouped into three types, namely substantive rationality, practical rationality, and theoretical rationality (Noupal, 2022). The word rational (adjective/adjective) contains the meaning of a condition, ability or capacity of an idea/idea, thought, or in various expressions and manifestations based on common sense (reasonable) by being objective, factual, realistic, free from contamination by subjective things or values, feelings (let alone conjectures/prejudices), emotions (let alone emotional), or sentiments (Kompas, 2024).

Rational political choice is a concept that describes the determination or decision of individual or collective political subjects or actors over one or several choices among various alternatives to political objects in accordance with the reference of considerations, values, or preferences that are considered appropriate, correct, or believed (Greestein, 1975). The formation of political preferences itself can be categorized into various categories, namely intellectual-based preferences, emotional-based preferences, collegial-based preferences, and so on. These three forms of preferences then boil down to a rational attitude in choosing, as a reflection of an economically established society but uncertain about their political choices (Jati, 2023).

It can be ascertained that voters in deciding or determining their choice are based on the antithesis of the results of the dialectic of political views or values that are right and believed in them. Analyzing these choices or interests can be used similarity and attraction models. This model emphasizes that voters' interest in candidates is caused by the similarity of the value system or belief between the voter and the elected, so that the higher the degree of similarity between the voter and the chosen candidate, the stronger the tendency of voters to choose the person (Firmanzah, 2012).

The complexity of the aspects and dimensions of this phenomenon consciously or unconsciously has a psychological environment with the justification of the values of truth and idealism, the affiliation of social and political groups, and even with the primordial dichotomous affiliation and the winner-loser group in the 2019 Presidential Election (Nursi, 2022), moreover, the city of Padang and/or West Sumatra is the central district that resulted in the absolute defeat of the Jokowi-Makruf Amin pair with anecdotal symbolic resistance

"Cebong-Kampret-Kadrun" (Nursi, 2024). Such socio-political dynamics and phenomena directly or indirectly connected to the minds and feelings of citizens, including students, so that simultaneously there is a process of absorption and/or selection of information or values that are affirmative or non-affirmative so as to form political mindsets and come into contact with personal cognition, feelings, and affections which in turn affect the assessment and political preferences of the Presidential and Vice Presidential candidates (Efriza, 2012).

On that basis, a person's political choices can be constructed according to the categories of voters which consist of several types, namely: 1) Calculative Rational Voters, 2) Primordial Voters, 3) Pragmatic Voters, and type 4) Emotional Voters. (Efriza, 2012). It is in this consideration and context that interesting research is carried out, namely with the aim of describing how the rationality of students' political values or preferences in determining their political choices? What is the internal tendency of each type of political choice? And what about the external comparison between these types of voters?

Method

This study uses a quantitative approach with a population of 6174 Hatta University students who are actively registered in the Even Semester 2023-2024, spread across 33 study programs, with a sample of 330 people (5.34%), consisting of the 2024, 2023, 2022, and 2021 batches, and the data is taken by cluster and proportional random sampling techniques, using questionnaire instruments or questionnaires which include: 1) Rational Type, which consists of 6 indicators with 22 dimensions, 2). Primordial type, with 6 indicators, 3). Pragmatic type, with 5 indicators, and 4). Emotional Type, with 4 indicators. All of them amount to 4 types/categories of voting behavior with 21 indicators and 22 dimensions. The questionnaire contains a series of statements of the Likert Scale model with 5 alternative answer choices, each of which is weighted 1 to 5, namely Strongly Agree (SS, with a weight of 5), Quite Agree (CS, with a weight of 4), Disagree (KS, with a weight of 3), Disagree (TS, with a weight of 2), and Strongly Disagree (STS, with a weight of 1) (Firmansyah, 2021). This answer choice is written on each line/point of the descriptor. The questionnaire is distributed randomly and directly to students, to be filled out guided by researchers and team members, and after being filled out by students, the questionnaire is immediately collected.

The data analysis technique used is using frequency and percentage analysis with Excel 2013 techniques. First, analyze the frequency and percentage of each type/category of voting behavior (political choice) in line with the descriptor indicator, namely based on the alternative category of answers and their respective weights as chosen by the respondents

(Riduan, 2015), then calculate the number and percentage of the "real" of all respondents who chose the same answer category. Second, to analyze the differences or "potential" comparisons in each type of student political choice, categorization and dicotomization is carried out between the pros and cons, namely by dividing in half and/or adding half of the "disagree" category numbers to the pros and cons, so that a potential number or percentage for each can be obtained, namely by looking at the weight range criteria consisting of: SS= very strong (80 -100%), CS=quite strong (60 - <80%), KS= less strong (40 - <60%), TS= weak (20 - <40%), and STS= very weak (0 - 20%) (Sugiono, 2009). This criterion is adjusted to the context of the quality of the type of voting behavior (political choice) or the indicators used in this study.

Results and Discussion

General Description of Student Political Choices in the 2024 Presidential Election

The following is a general description of the political choices of Hatta University students based on the calculation of answers in the research questionnaire, so that the real numbers and percentages of the five answer qualifications can be obtained: strongly agree (SS), agree (CS), disagree (KS), disagree (TS), and strongly disagree (STS).

Table 1 General Description of Students' Political Choices in the 2024 Presidential Election Using Rational, Primordial, Pragmatic, and Emotional Type Considerations

Answer Qualification	Type/Category of Political Choice							
	Rationality		Primordial		Pragmatic		Emotional	
	Sum	Percent (%)	Sum	Percent (%)	Sum	Percent (%)	Sum	Percent (%)
Strongly Agree	7.392	16,0	1.712	17,3	2.351	28,5	1.096	16,6
Simply Agree	20.375	44,1	3.791	38,3	2.582	31,3	2.871	43,5
Less agree	12.936	28,0	2.880	29,1	1.617	19,6	1848	28,0
Disagree	3.465	7,5	1.376	13,9	1.460	17,7	495	7,5
Strongly disagree	2.032	4,4	141	1,4	240	2,9	290	4,4
Maximum Number of Scores	46.200	100	9.900	100	8.250	100	6.600	100
n=330,								

Source: From processing and tabulation of primary data

In Table 1 above, it can be seen that the largest number or percentage in the type of rational political choice is 20,375 (44.1%), and there is in the answer of Agree, in the type of Primordial political choice which is 3,791 (38.3) also in the choice of Agree, in the type of Pragmatic political choice which is 2,582 (31.3%) still in the answer of Agree, and then in the type of Emotional political choice it turns out that the largest number or percentage is also still in the answer of Agree, namely 2,871 (43.5%).

However, from the four types of political choices, there are different nuanced characteristics, the rational type with positive nuances, the primordial type with negative nuances, the pragmatic type with relatively positive nuances, and the emotional political choice type with negative nuances (Greestein, 1975). So in general, between the answer agreeing or strongly agreeing ("pro") on different types of political choices, the nuances will contain different meanings or meanings, in harmony with the nuances of meaning/meaning in each type of political choice related. And vice versa for students who disagree or strongly disagree ("cons") on each type of political choice. The following will be presented the political choices of students in the 2024 Presidential Election more specifically according to each type.

Description and Discussion of Student Political Options

Description of student political choices with the Rational type can be seen in the following Table 2:

Table 2 Rational Student Political Choices in the 2024 Presidential Election

Kualifikasi	Frequency	Percent (%)	Combination of Feelings (% riil)	Pro-Contra (potential)
Very Rational	7.392	16,0	60,1	74,1 %
Quite Rational	20.375	44,1		
Less Rational	12.936	28,0		
Irrational	3.465	7,5	11,9	25,9 %
Very Irrational	2.032	4,4		
Sum	46.200	100 %	100 %	100 %
n=330				

Source: From processing and tabulation of primary data

Table 2 above shows that the strongest number or percentage of tendency is in rational political choices, which is 44.1%, and if combined with the percentage of sentimentality (serational) in real terms, then political choices that qualify rationally (positively) in real terms are 60.1% (less strong), while in irrational qualifications it is 7.5% (very low), and if combined with very irrational qualifications (4.4%) which are basically the same or enter irrational qualifications (irrational) then the amount is 11.9% (very low). Furthermore, when viewed from the percentage of pro-contra nuances in a "potential" way, the percentage of pro-rational political choices is 74.1%, while the contra is 25.9%.

The following can be described as the political choices of students with the type of Primordialism in Table 3 below:

Table 3 Primordialism of Student Political Choice in the 2024 Presidential Election

Kualifikasi	Frequency	Percent (%)	Combination of Feelings (% riil)	Pro-Contra (potensial)
Very Primordial	1.712	17,3	55,6	70,2 %
Quite Primordial	3.791	38,3		
Less Primordial	2.880	29,1		
Not Primordial	1.376	13,9	15,3	29,8 %
Very Not Primordial	141	1,4		
Sum	9.900	100 %	100 %	100 %
n=330				

Source: From processing and tabulation of primary data

In Table 3 above, it can be seen that the strongest tendency is in the Primordial ("agree") political choice, which is 38.3%, and if combined with the percentage of consensus (primordialism) in real terms, then the political choice with primordial nuances (negative) is 55.6% (less strong), while in the non-primordial qualification it is 13.9% (very low), and if combined with the very non-primordial qualification which is 1.4%) which is basically the same or qualifies not primordial, then the magnitude is 15.3% (very low). Furthermore, if you look at the percentage of pro-cons in a "potential" way, the percentage of political choices that are pro-primordialism is 70.2%, while those who are against primordialism are 29.8%. Furthermore, the political choices of students with the type of Pragmatism can be described in Table 4 below:

Table 4 Pragmatism of Student Political Choices in the 2024 Presidential Election

Kualifikasi	Frekuensi	Percent (%)	Combination of Feelings (% riil)	Pro-Contra (potensial)
Very Pragmatic	2.351	28,5	59,8	69,6 %
Simply Pragmatic	2.582	31,3		
Less Pragmatic	1.617	19,6		
Non- Pragmatic	1.460	17,7	20,6	30,4 %
Very Unpragmatic	240	2,9		
Sum	8.250	100 %	100 %	100 %
n=330				

Source: From processing and tabulation of primary data

In Table 4 above, it can be seen that the strongest number or percentage of tendency is in the very pragmatic political choice ("strongly agree") which is 28.5%, and if combined with the percentage of consensus (pragmatism) in real terms, then the political choice with pragmatic nuances is 59.8% (less strong), while in the non-pragmatic qualification it is 17.7% (very low), and if combined with the very pragmatic qualification which is 2.9%) which is basically the same or qualifies is not pragmatic, then the magnitude is 15.3% (very low). Furthermore, when viewed from the percentage that has "potential" pro-contra

nuances, the percentage of political choices that are pro-pragmatic is 69.6%, while those who are counter-pragmatic are 30.4%.

Finally, the political choices of students with the Emotional type can be described in Table 5 as follows:

Tabel 5 Political Choices for Emotional Type Students in the 2024 Presidential Election

Kualifikasi	Frequency	Percent (%)	Combination of Feelings (% riil)	Pro-Kontra (potensial)
Highly Emotional	1.096	16,6	60,1	74,1 %
Quite Emotional	2.871	43,5		
Less Emotional	1.848	28,0	28,0	25,9 %
Not Emotional	495	7,5	11,9	
Very Unemotional	290	4,4		
Sum	6.600	100 %	100 %	100 %
n=330				

Source: From processing and tabulation of primary data

In Table 5 above, it can be seen that the strongest number or percentage of tendency is in the political choice of Quite Emotional ("quite agree") which is 43.5%, and if combined with the percentage of sentiment (Emotional) in real terms, then the political choice with emotional nuances is 60.1% (less strong), while in the non-emotional qualification it is 7.5% (very low), and if combined with the very unemotional qualification which is 4.4% which is basically the same or in the qualification is not emotional, then the amount is 11.9% (very low). Furthermore, when viewed from the percentage that has "potential" pro-contra nuances, the percentage of political choices that are pro-pragmatic is 74.1%, while the anti-pragmatic is 25.9%.

Discussion

Student Political Choices in the 2024 Presidential Election Using Rational, Primordial, Pragmatic, and Emotional Type Considerations

Based on the data in Table 2 above, it can be seen that students' political choices tend to use rational considerations in real terms is 60.1% (less strong), while in irrational qualifications it is 11.9% (very low). Then from Table 3 it can be seen that political choices tend to be Primordial 55.6% (less strong), while the anti-primordial is 15.3% (very low). Furthermore, the political choice of students whose preferences or considerations are pragmatic (in real terms) is 59.8% (less strong), and those who are counter-pragmatic are 15.3% (very low). Then those who tend to be emotional are 60.1% (less strong), and those who are not emotional are 11.9% (very low). From the position of the tendency of considerations used by students in the 2024 Presidential Election between those with positive nuances, namely rational and pragmatic (an average of 59.95%) and those that use negative nuanced considerations, namely primordialism and

emotion with an average of 57.85%, the pros and cons in real terms of each of the four types of political choices show a balance of positive and negative preferences. This means that with this slight difference, there is a weak polarization of pros and cons. This is relevant to the findings of research on the polarization of students' political attitudes (Nursi, 2024).

Comparison of Student Political Choices between Pros and Cons (internally) in Each Type of Political Choice in the 2024 Presidential Election

Referring to all Tables 2, 3, 4, and 5 that have been explained earlier, an overview of the tendency to balance preferences with positive nuances (rational and pramatic) and negative nuances (primordialism and emotional) used by students in determining their political choices in the 2024 Presidential Election is obtained. This finding shows that on the one hand, some students have had adequate political knowledge and awareness in dealing with political intrigues and maneuvers or political agitation, especially on social media which is so intense and even heated up during the period and process of winning each pair of presidential candidates (Presidential Candidate) and Vice Presidential Candidate (Vice President), even to the point of waiting for the Constitutional Court's decision in hearing the case of the results of the Presidential Election vote.

Students with their political knowledge and awareness, they are not easily influenced or provoked by information or news that develops, including on social media. They are very aware that in the name of political competition, it is not surprising and even seen as commonplace if various issues arise and there is confusion of information including hate speech, fake news (hoaxes) everywhere, especially on social media (Kaesmetan, 2019). As stated or the findings of Triyanto's research, at al. (2021) that students are seen as agents of change so that good knowledge from students will bring good knowledge to society. The results of his research show that students have good knowledge and are in line with the information provided by the government (Triyanto, 2021). Such information, including its sharing with various circles, is seen by most students as a distorted, unrealistic phenomenon, and more as an outlet for narrow interests and political confrontation.²² In short, students have the power to differentiate and selectivity towards the development of information which distorts ethical values and political civilization (Jati, 2023).

Comparison of Types of Political Choices Likely to Be Used by Students in the 2024 Presidential Election

From the description of the data in the tables ahead, it is also evident that there is no extreme difference between the types of political choices that exist. This means that, externally or as a whole, there is no one type of political choice that conspicuously dominates students' political choices. This is shown by the balance (slight difference) between the type of political choice that is positive (rational and pragmatic) and negative (primordial and emotional) (Noupal, 2024). However, it is slightly different from the internal comparison of each type of political choice, where in the positive type there is a significant difference (difference), such as in the rational type there is a pro-con comparison, which is 60.1% (less strong) than rational, 11.9% (very low) for irrational qualifications. It is also for the type of pragmatic political choice, where the pro is 59.8% (less strong), and the anti-pragmatic is 15.3% (very low). On the other hand, the internal comparison in the negative type is the primordialism type and the emotional type. In the primordialism type, there is a comparison of pros and cons. For the pro primordial type it is 55.6% (less strong), while the anti-primordial is 15.3% (very low). Almost the same as the emotional type, where the pro-emotional is 60.1% (less strong), and the counter/non-emotional is 11.9% (very low).

However, what and how the image, impression, perception, judgment and political beliefs that affect students' attitudes or political choices in the 2024 Presidential Election, which are primordial and emotional, can be said to be situational, or its stickiness to the memorial of student political cognition and psychology at this time can be said to be "fading", which of course turns to clearer thoughts, considerations and beliefs, positive, objective and rational. That is what is called political intelligence (Yutisia, 2021). In the intelligence of students' political attitudes, as stated by Meligli Ellen Vrana, one of the political writers from the US (Nopal, in Gramedia Blog, 2024), namely: Integrity, in the political attitude of students, the value of integrity can be seen, where students have the ability of people to stand firm to principles, even if circumstances pressure them to act against their own principles. Politics must be filled with noble values of humanity. Self-awareness, in students, also understands their own strengths and weaknesses, both as citizens, as ethnic and religious citizens, when they need to be firm in their beliefs and when they need to be tolerant, speak, and when they need to be silent, and observe the existing situation. Empathy, which is the ability to see from the perspective of others, as the basis of the attitude of how the attitude should be in determining their choices when dealing with their role as political citizens (voters).

Conclusion

Based on the description and discussion of the results of the above study, the conclusion of this study can be stated that in reality, students' political choices in the 2024 Presidential Election between rational and irrational preferences are contrasting, namely 60.1% (less strong) compared to 11.9% (very weak), in the Primordial type of preference or consideration 55.6% (less strong) and non-primordial 15.3% (very weak), in the pragmatic type 59.8% (less strong) and non-pragmatic 15.3% (very weak), and in the emotional type it was 60.1% (less strong) compared to non-emotional 11.9% (very weak). Meanwhile, potentially, students' political choices in the 2024 Presidential Election between rational and irrational preferences are contrasting, namely 74.1% (quite strong) compared to 25.9% (weak), in the Primordial type of preference or consideration 70.2% (quite strong) and non-primordial 29.8% (weak), in the pragmatic type 69.6% (quite strong) and non-pragmatic 30.4% (weak), and in the emotional type it is 74.1% (quite strong) compared to non-emotional 25.9% (weak). Externally and in real terms, among the four types of political preference, there is no dominant political preference (very strong), in general the difference is "less strong", where the rational type is 60.1% (less strong), the Primordial type is 55.6% (less strong), the pragmatic type is 59.8% (less strong), and the emotional type is 60.1% (less strong). And externally and potentially, among the four types of political choice preferences, there is actually a dominant political preference (very strong), in general the difference is "strong", where the rational type is 74.1% (quite strong), the Primordial type is 70.2% (quite strong), the pragmatic type is 69.6% (quite strong), and the emotional type is 74.1% (quite strong).

Thus, among the four types of preferences or considerations of political choices, the negative preferences of students in the 2024 Presidential Election, namely primordial and emotional, are still more prominent in real terms, which are 55.6% and 60.1% (both are less strong), but the average difference in percentage with non-primordialism and non-emotional is 44.25% (less strong). On the other hand, in the type of political choices with positive nuances, namely rational and pragmatic, the potential dominance is 74.1% and 69.6% (both are quite strong), while the irrational and non-pragmatic ones have the potential to be 25% and 30% (both weak). The average difference with the dominant one was 48.2% and 39.2% (both weak). From the results of this study, it can be seen that the study is more emphasized on quantitative-percentive descriptions and comparisons between types of political choices. For the next study, there is a gap to complete the research on the typology of political choices

by examining how much influence each category of preferences or types of political choices on political choice decisions with a causal-quantitative approach.

Acknowledgments

For the completion of both the research and the writing of this article until it was published, it is inseparable from the moral and material support from the Rector of Hatta University and his representatives through LPPM Hatta University, then the Head of the PPKn Study Program and the Dean of FKIP Hatta University, and friends in the Research Team.

References

- Alwie, A. F., Pratiwi, D., Anggraini, N., Agnes, M., & Harianja, B. (2022). Voting Decision of Generation Z as Novice Voter in the 2019 Presidential Election in Pekanbaru City. *International Journal of Multicultural and Multireligious Understanding*, 3(1), 141–159.
- Apaut, Y., Bainus, A., & Kartini, D. S. (2018). Faktor-Faktor Yang Mempengaruhi Perilaku Pemilih Pemula Pada Pemilihan Kepala Daerah Kabupaten Ngada Tahun 2015. *Jurnal TAPIS*, 14(02), 67-91.
- Arravi, M. A., Kushandajani, & Martini, R. (2021, Juni). Partisipasi Politik dan Perilaku Memilih Santri di Wilayah Nahdlatul Ulama (NU) Lasem Kabupaten Rembang dalam Pemilihan Presiden dan Wakil Presiden Tahun 2019. *Journal of Politic and Government Studies*, 10(3), 311-327.
- Asfar, A. M., Akbar Asfar, A. M., & Halamury, M. F. (2019). *Teori Behaviorisme (Theory of Behaviorism)*. Research Gate, 1-32. doi: DOI: 10.13140/RG.2.2.34507.44324 Blishen.
- Budiarjo, M. (2006). *Dasar-Dasar Ilmu Politik*. Jakarta: PT. Gramedia Pustaka Utama.
- Cash, T.F & Pruzinsky, T. (2002). *Body Image: A Handbook of Theory, Research and Clinical*. New York: Guilford Publications.
- Ceicila, C. A., Sinuraya, Y. E., Suryaningsih, A., & Fadillah, R. N. (2023). Analisis Faktor-Faktor yang Mempengaruhi Pilihan Masyarakat Pada Pemilihan Umum (Studi Kasus Pada Pemilihan Umum Presiden Indonesia). *Das Sollen: Jurnal Kajian Kontemporer Hukum dan Masyarakat*, 1(2), 1-25.
- Efriza. (2012). *Political Explore : Sebuah Kajian Ilmu Politik*. Alfabeta, Bandung.
- Firmansyah, Herlan. (2021). "Teori Rasionalitas Dalam Pandangan Ilmu Ekonomi Islam". *EL-ECOSY: Jurnal Ekonomi dan Keuangan Islam*. 1 (1): 34–50. doi:10.35194/eei.v1i1.1136. ISSN 2774-4418.

- Greestain, Fred I. (1975). "Personality and Politics" dalam Fred I. Greenstein an Nelson W.Polsby. Hanbook of Political Sciense: Micropolitical Theory. Addition-Wesley Publishing Campany. dalam Yoserizal dan A, Asrinaldi. *Preferensi dan Rasionalisasi Pilihan Politik Perempuan Minang*. DEMOKRASI Vol. VIII No. 2 Th. 2009:190
- Habsy, MHA. (2023). "Mahasiswa, Nalar Publik, dan Pemilu 2024." *Kompas*. <https://www.kompas.id/baca/opini/2023/11/10/mahasiswa-nalar-publik-dan-pemilu-2024>
- Jati, W. R. (2023). Perilaku Memilih Rasional dalam Pemilu Indonesia Kontemporer: Perbandingan Pemilu 2014 dan Pemilu 2019. *Jurnal Adhyasta Pemilu*, 5(2), 70–84. <https://doi.org/10.55108/jap.v5i2.195>. Diakses 20 Januari 2024
- Kaesmetan, OTH. (2019). Studi Perilaku Pemilih pada Pemilihan Calon Anggota Dewan Perwakilan Rakyat Daerah Provinsi Nusa Tenggara Timur Tahun 2014 Daerah Pemilihan Timor Tengah Selatan. *Jurnal KPU RI*. Edisi I Tahun 2019. <file:///C:/Users/Samsung/Downloads/116-Article%20Text-388-5-10-20200318-6.pdf>. Diakses 14 Januari 2024.
- Kurniawati, M. (2023). Pengaruh Keluarga, Tokoh Agama dan Teman terhadap Perilaku Memilih para Pemilih Pemula (The Influence of Family , Religious Leaders and Friends on Voting Behavior of New Voters). *Ilmiah Psikologi Mind Set Khusus TIN*, 2(1), 106–111.
- Karundeng, M. (2015). Perilaku Politik Warga Negara Indonesia Keturunan Tionghoa dalam Pemilihan Presiden dan Wakil Presiden Tahun 2014 di Kota Manado Kecamatan Wenang. *Politico: Jurnal Ilmu Politik*, 3(1), 1-10.
- Kodiyat MS, B.A. (2019). Fungsi Partai Politik dalam Meningkatkan Partisipasi Pemilih Pada Pemilihan Umum Kepala Daerah di Kota Medan. *Jurnal EduTech*, 5(1), 1-12. doi:DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30596/edutech.v5i1.2756>
- Kurniawati, M. (2023). Pengaruh Keluarga , Tokoh Agama dan Teman terhadap Perilaku Memilih para Pemilih Pemula (The Influence of Family , Religious Leaders and Friends on Voting Behavior of New Voters). *Ilmiah Psikologi Mind Set Khusus TIN*, 2(1), 106–111.
- Kompas, Analisis Litbang: Mencermati Preferensi Politik Publik Berdasarkan Tingkat Pendidikan. <file:///D:/1.%20LPPM%20&%20PKM/2024/Sumber%20teori/Analisis%20Litbang%20Kompas%20Mencermati%20Preferensi%20Politik%20Publik%20Berdasarkan%20Tingkat%20Pendidikan%20-%20Kompas.id.html>
- Liando, D. M. (2016). Pemilu dan Partisipasi Politik Masyarakat (Studi Pada Pemilihan Anggota Legislatif dan Pemilihan Presiden dan Calon Wakil Presiden di Kabupaten Minahasa Tahun 2014). *Jurnal LPPM Bidang EkoSosBudKum*, 3(2), 14-28.
- Mahendra, A.A.Oka. (2005). *Pemilu Pilkada 2005 Pilkada Ditengan KonflikHorizontal*. Jakarta: Milenium Publisher

- Maimun, & Asy'ari. (2021). Perilaku Politik Masyarakat Pada Pemilihan Presiden dan Wakil Presiden Republik Indonesia (Suatu Penelitian di Kecamatan Ingin Jaya, Kabupaten Aceh Besar). *Jurnal Hurriah: Jurnal Evaluasi Pendidikan dan Penelitian*, 2(1), 1-16.
- Martani, S. (2022). Pengaruh Keluarga Terhadap Partisipasi Politik Pemilih Pemula Kelurahan Bugel Kabupaten Kulon Progo. *E-Civics*, 11(02), 225–235.
- Meliala, W. (2020). Faktor-Faktor yang Mempengaruhi Pemilih dalam Pemilihan Umum Kepala Daerah dan Penerapan Strategi Bertahan dan Menyerang Untuk Memenangkan Persaingan. *Jurnal Citizen Education*, 2(2), 12-24.
- Minarni. (2024). “Bagaimana pandangan mahasiswa Universitas Jambi mengenai Pemilihan Presiden 2024”. <https://www.unja.ac.id/pandangan-mahasiswa-universitas-jambi-mengenai-pilpres-2024>
- Nouval, Selvilla. (2022) Rasional Adalah: Jenis, Tipe, Ciri-Ciri, Hingga Tanda dan Pentingnya Berpikir Rasional (dalam Gramedia Blog). <https://www.gramedia.com/literasi/rasional/> Disadur dari: Liputan6.com (Penulis: Ayu Rifka Sitoresmi, Editor: Nanang Fahrudin. Published: 8/6/2022). Diakses 14-1-2024
- Nursi, M, Pebriyenni & Darwianis. (2022). “Sikap Politik Mahasiswa Kota Padang Terhadap Kebijakan Pemerintah dalam Penanganan Covid-19”. *Journal Of Moral and Civic Education*, Volume 6 No 2 2022 ISSN: 2549-8851
- Nursi, M. (2023). *Ilmu Politik (Suatu Pengantar)*. Padang: LPPM Universitas Bung Hatta
- Nursi, M. (2024). Polarization and Rationality of Political Choices of the People of Padang City in the 2024 Presidential Election. *Journal Research of Science, Economics, and Management (JRSSEM)*, 2024, Vol.3, No. 07, 1529-1544.
- Pasaribu, P. (2017). Peranan Partai Politik dalam Melaksanakan Pendidikan Politik. *JPPUMA: Jurnal Ilmu Pemerintahan dan Sosial Politik UMA*, 5(1), 51-59.
- Puspita, I. (2017, Maret). Fungsi Kerjasama Pada Kegiatan Remoh Masyarakat Madura di Desa Durian Kecamatan Sungai Ambawang Kabupaten Kuburaya. *Sociologique, Jurnal S-1 Sosiologi*, 5(1), 1-10.
- Rauta, U. (2014). Menggagas Pemilihan Presiden yang Demokratis dan Aspiratif. *Jurnal Konstitusi*, 11(3), 601-616. doi:<https://doi.org/10.31078/jk11310> ISSN: 2442-8663 36 (Faktor-Faktor yang ...)
- Riduan, (2015), *Skala Pengukuran Variabel-Variabel Penelitian*. Bandung: CV Alfabeta.
- Rohaeni, H., Hikmah, A. H., & Rahmayani, R. (2018). Be Good Atitude Dalam Berpenampilan Pada UMKM "Mang Piat" Kabupaten Bandung Barat. *Jurnal Abdimas BSI: Jurnal Pengabdian Kepada Masyarakat*, 1(1), 142-148.

- Saksono, H., et al. (2023). Teori Belajar Dalam Pembelajaran. Batam: Yayasan Cendikia Mulia Mandiri. Satriawan, I., Gunawan, Y., Sulaiman, K. F., & Hafiz, M. A. (2020). Pemilih Pemula, "Cerdas Pemilu". *Jurnal Pengabdian Masyarakat J-DINAMIKA*, 5(2), 122-126. doi:<https://doi.org/10.25047/jdinamika.v5i2.1468>
- Subiyanto, A. E. (2020). Pemilihan Umum Serentak yang Berintegritas sebagai Pembaruan Demokrasi Indonesia. *Jurnal Konstitusi*, 17(2), 355-371. doi:<https://doi.org/10.31078/jk1726>
- Sugiyono. (2009). *Metode Penelitian Pendekatan Kuantitatif, Kualitatif dan R & D*. Bandung: Alfa Beta.
- Suryo, H., & Aji, H. K. (2019). Media Sosial dan Pesan Politik (Persepsi Pemilih Pemula Dalam Menerima Pesan Politik Pada Pemilihan Umum 2019 Melalui Media Sosial). *Research Fair Unisri*, 4(1), 87-94. doi:<https://doi.org/10.33061/rsfu.v4i1.3390>
- Suwandi, S. (2021). Analisis Data Research dan Development Pendidikan Islam. *Journal of Islamic Education El Madani*, 1(1), 1-13.
- Triono, Aru Lego. (2023). Citra Capres 2024 Berdasarkan Karakter, Kebijakan, dan Ideologi. *NU On Line*, <https://nu.or.id/nasional/citra-capres-2024-berdasarkan-karakter-kebijakan-dan-ideologi-x3igr>
- Triyanto, et.al. (2021). "Rasionalitas Pengetahuan dan Kemampuan Penanganan Covid-19 (Studi Pemahaman Mahasiswa di Aceh Barat)". *Jurnal Community: Pengawas Dinamika Sosial*.
- Violin. S.A., at al. (2024). "Faktor-Faktor yang Mempengaruhi Keputusan Pemilihan dalam Pilpres 2024 pada Mahasiswa Fakultas Ilmu Sosial dan Ilmu Politik Universitas Jenderal Soedirman Angkatan 2023". *Jurnal Socius: Jurnal of Sociology Research and Education* Volume 11 Nomor 1 2024, pp 25-36
- Wance, M., & Suhu, B. L. (2019). Partisipasi Pemilih Pemula Dalam Menentukan Pilihan Politik Pada Pemilihan Kepala Daerah Maluku Utara. *Jurnal of Government - JOG (Kajian Manajemen Pemerintahan & Otonomi Daerah)*, 4(2), 91-115. doi:<https://doi.org/10.52447/gov.v4i2.1455>
- Wardhani, P. S. (2018). Partisipasi Politik Pemilih Pemula dalam Pemilihan Umum. *Jurnal Pendidikan Ilmullmu Sosial*, 10(1), 57-62. doi:<https://doi.org/10.24114/jupiis.v10i1.8407.g9060>
- Yahmini, E. (2019). Kecenderungan Impulse Buying Pada Mahasiswa Ditinjau Dari Latar Belakang Keluarga (Studi Kasus Mahasiswa di Lima Universitas Di Yogyakarta). *EXERO Journal of Research in Business and Economics*, 2(1), 41-56. doi:doi.org/10.24071/exero.2019.02.01.03
- Yustisia, Whinda. (2021). *Psikologi Politik*. Jakarta: Penerbit Buku Kompas.

UU Nomor 10 Tahun 2016 tentang Perubahan Kedua Atas Undang-undang Nomor 1 Tahun 2015 Tentang Penetapan Peraturan Pemerintah Pengganti Undang-undang Nomor 1 Tahun 2014 Tentang Pemilihan Gubernur Bupati dan Walikota Menjadi Undang-undang

Undang-Undang Nomor 7 Tahun 2017 tentang Pemilihan Umum.