

University of Nebraska - Lincoln

DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln

---

Library Philosophy and Practice (e-journal)

Libraries at University of Nebraska-Lincoln

---

October 2021

## The Effect of Information-Seeking Behavior on Gen-Z Political Preference: Study on 2020 District Heads Election in Depok and South Tangerang

Taufik Asmiyanto

*Universitas Indonesia*, [tasmiy@ui.ac.id](mailto:tasmiy@ui.ac.id)

Debrina Vita Ferezagia

*Universitas Indonesia*

Muhammad Hanif Inamullah

*Universitas Indonesia*

Elsa Roselina

*Universitas Indonesia*

Zaidan Abdurrahman

*Universitas Indonesia*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/libphilprac>



Part of the [Library and Information Science Commons](#)

---

Asmiyanto, Taufik; Ferezagia, Debrina Vita; Inamullah, Muhammad Hanif; Roselina, Elsa; and Abdurrahman, Zaidan, "The Effect of Information-Seeking Behavior on Gen-Z Political Preference: Study on 2020 District Heads Election in Depok and South Tangerang" (2021). *Library Philosophy and Practice (e-journal)*. 6318.

<https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/libphilprac/6318>

# The Effect of Information-Seeking Behavior on Gen-Z Political Preference: Study on 2020 District Heads Election in Depok and South Tangerang

Taufik Asmiyanto<sup>1</sup>, Debrina Vita Ferezagia<sup>2</sup>, M. Hanif Inamullah<sup>3</sup>, Elsa Roselina<sup>4</sup>, Zaidan Abdurrahman<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1, 3</sup> Department of Library and Information Science, Faculty of Humanities, Universitas Indonesia, Depok, 16424, Indonesia [tasmiy@ui.ac.id](mailto:tasmiy@ui.ac.id)<sup>1</sup> [hanifinamullah@ui.ac.id](mailto:hanifinamullah@ui.ac.id)<sup>3</sup>

<sup>2, 4</sup> Vocational Education Program, Universitas Indonesia [debrinaferezagia@gmail.com](mailto:debrinaferezagia@gmail.com)<sup>2</sup> [elsa@vokasi.ui.ac.id](mailto:elsa@vokasi.ui.ac.id)<sup>4</sup>

<sup>5</sup> Undergraduate Student, Department of Library and Information Science, Faculty of Humanities, Universitas Indonesia, Depok, 16424, Indonesia [zaidan.abdurrahman@gmail.com](mailto:zaidan.abdurrahman@gmail.com)<sup>5</sup>

## Abstract

Generation Z in Indonesia will use their political right for the first time during the upcoming 2020 District Heads Election that will be held in some cities in Indonesia, including in Depok and South Tangerang. This study aims to understand the effect of information seeking behavior on Gen-Z political preferences as new voters in the upcoming 2020 Depok and South Tangerang city mayor election. A survey will be performed to collect the data by distributing a questionnaire to 278 respondents aged 17 to 23 and live in Depok or South Tangerang. It was found that the political parties are not a factor that encourages them to seek information on the election. Information about the profiles, ideologies, leadership, and work programs of regional head candidates is the type of information they need. Political party websites, candidates personal websites and radio were not their main choices in seeking election information. Various media for candidate campaigns, including the use of celebrities, did not significantly influence their political decisions. Instagram and Twitter are the most preferred social media platforms for finding election information. Family and closest friends are one of their sources of information in obtaining information. Candidates for regional heads who have character: integrity, can bring change, understand various problems in their region and are able to offer solutions, are populist and honest / free from corruption practices; is the figure of the candidate for regional head they will elect. The racial and gender factors did not influence their political choices. Their track record, work program and ideology influence their political choices. The findings of this study will be useful to political parties in developing their future election communication strategies.

*Keywords: Information seeking behavior, information need, Z generation, political preferences, regional elections, politic-related information*

## Introduction

Generation Z, or i-Generation (internet generation) is a group of people born between 1995 to 2010 (Cilliers, 2017). The people in this generation are known to be able to do their activities both in reality and virtual simultaneously. They have been very familiar with sophisticated technology and gadgets since childhood. The interaction between themselves and technology indirectly affect their personality and behavior. For them, ICTs has become

their *life word* in their daily lives, because they were born when access of information, especially the internet has become a part of the global culture which affects their views, values, and goals. they are very proficient and independent in accessing and processing information through various ICT-based sources and media because they are connected to it every time. It affects their lifestyle and decision making in their daily lives.

Indonesia is one of the countries in the world that holds many political events in order to elect a president, a regional head and even a village head. To that end, every citizen is required to have political literacy skills. They must have political insight according to their capacity. At present the need for political information can be easily fulfilled because of the numerous media and political channels based on information and communication technology (ICT). However, paradox with this ease, they find it difficult to get valid information quickly because of the flood of information. With the dynamic and continuous development of new media, the flow of political information has become unstoppable. They have altered the ways political leaders communicate, transformed the political media system, and redefined the role of journalists. New media have redefined the way elections are contested, and how citizens engage in politics.

## Methods

This study used a quantitative approach. The data were gained in May 2020. The respondents are generation Z, which is determined by accidental sampling technique. The number of samples was 278 that calculated using the Slovin formula with N (Jakarta citizen number aged 15 to 24 years in 2019) = 1.475.283 (Central Bureau of Statistics Jakarta Province, 2019), *confidence level* = 90%, *margin of error* = 5%. The data collection was conducted online using questionnaires distributed using google form. The data analysis used the univariate technique.

This research will be conducted using a quantitative approach with survey methods. In this study, the data collection process will be carried out using a questionnaire that will be distributed to respondents who are in the age of 17 to 23 and are a citizen of Depok and South Tangerang. The respondents are chosen because it met the criteria as communities representing the Z generation which is also a group of beginner voters in mayor election that will take place on 2020 in some cities in Indonesia, including Depok and South Tangerang. This research will use Wilson's model of information seeking behavior (2007) as a framework for analyzing the object of the study.

The analytical method to be performed is determinant analysis, in which a hybrid model will be obtained. This model is formed based on the selection status (Y) of the characteristics of the Z generation. The model used refers to the following model:

$$P_i = F(\beta_0 + \beta_j \sum_{j=1}^n X_{ji}) = \frac{1}{1 + e^{-Z_i}} = \frac{1}{1 + e^{-(\beta_0 + \beta_j \sum_{j=1}^n X_{ji})}}$$

## Results

### Demographic Characteristics

Demographic characteristics of the respondents are reviewed based on three criteria i.e. gender, education and jobs. Majority respondents were female (62.56%), graduated from senior high school (89.57%) dan currently as students in high schools or universities (81.99%). Table 1 showed the respondents' demographic characteristics.

Table 1  
Respondent Demographic Characteristics (N = 211)

Demographic Characteristics	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
Gender		
Male	79	37.44
Female	132	62.56
Education		
Graduated from elementary school	1	0.47
Graduated from yunior high school	10	4.74
Graduated from senior high school	189	89.57
Graduated from diploma degree	2	0.95
Graduated from bachelor degree	9	4.27
States		
Dentist	1	0.47
Entrepreneur	1	0.47
Self-employed	1	0.47
Employee	6	2.85
Students of universities	173	81.99
Students of high school	23	10.90
Jobless	6	2.85

### Knowledge of District Head Election

Majority of respondents declared that knowing information about District Head Election (94.79%), as presented in Table 2.

Table 2  
Knowledge of District Head Election (N = 211)

Knowledge	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
Yes	200	94.79
No	10	4.74
Not answer	1	0.47

### Information Needs regarding District Head Election

A few of respondents expressed not need information about District Head Election (16.59%), as showed in Table 3.

Table 3  
Information Need about District Head Election (N = 211)

Knowledge	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
Yes	176	83.41
No	35	16.59

## Curiosity about Information of District Head Election

More respondents said they wanted to know (38.86%) and were interested in information of District Head Election. Nearly half of the respondents answered that they wanted to vote in the District Head Election (44.08%) and were confused by fake news related to election information (48.82%). Table 4 shows the data in detail.

Table 4  
Curiosity about Information of District Head Election (N = 211)

Curious of Information	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
Does not curious		
Strongly disagree	36	17.06
Disagree	82	38.86
Agree	52	24.65
Strongly agree	12	5.69
Not answer	29	13.74
Does not interesting		
Strongly disagree	36	17.06
Disagree	82	38.86
Agree	52	24.65
Strongly agree	12	5.69
Not answer	29	13.74
Does not want to vote		
Strongly disagree	53	25.12
Disagree	93	44.08
Agree	29	13.74
Strongly agree	8	3.79
Not answer	28	13.27
Confused with fake news		
Strongly disagree	7	3.32
Disagree	25	11.85
Agree	103	48.82
Strongly agree	49	23.22
Not answer	27	12.79

## Information Seeking regarding District Head Election

Majority of respondents declared that conducting information seeking about District Head Election, as presented in Table 5.

Table 5  
Information Seeking about District Head Election (N = 211)

Information Seeking	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
Yes	152	72.04
No	57	27.01
Not answer	2	0.95

## The Reasons that Respondents do not Want to Search Information

More respondents stated that the reason for seeking information was because they had access (38.86%), they knew how to search (31.76%), they cared (39.34%), they believed (36.02%), and they had no choice (28.91%). Meanwhile, when looking for information, they

said that they were confused by the large amount of information (33.65%) and were busy with their activities (31.28%). Table 6 shows the data in detail.

Table 6  
The Reasons to Search Information of District Head Election (N = 211)

Reasons	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
Does not have access		
Strongly disagree	32	15.17
Disagree	82	38.86
Agree	29	13.74
Strongly agree	5	2.37
Not answer	63	29.86
Does know how to search		
Strongly disagree	26	12.32
Disagree	67	31.76
Agree	53	25.12
Strongly agree	6	2.84
Not answer	59	27.96
Does not care		
Strongly disagree	29	13.74
Disagree	83	39.34
Agree	31	14.69
Strongly agree	8	3.79
Not answer	60	28.44
Does not believe		
Strongly disagree	12	5.69
Disagree	76	36.02
Agree	55	26.07
Strongly agree	8	3.79
Not answer	60	28.43
Confused with lots information		
Strongly disagree	7	3.32
Disagree	55	26.07
Agree	71	33.65
Strongly agree	18	8.53
Not answer	60	28.43
Busy with activities		
Strongly disagree	6	2.84
Disagree	41	19.43
Agree	66	31.28
Strongly agree	39	18.49
Not answer	59	27.96
Already has choice		
Strongly disagree	18	8.53
Disagree	61	28.91
Agree	53	25.12
Strongly agree	19	9.00
Not answer	60	28.44

### Motivation in Seeking District Head Election Information

Most of the respondents agreed on motivation in seeking district head election information are to make the right choice (46.44%), to know the track record of candidates (58.29%), to pay attention on sustainability (58.77%), and to update the latest of information (57.82%). On the contrary they expressed their disapproval regarding motivation are to do

duties or work related to District Head Election (43.60%) and driven by a political party (33.18%), as shown in table 7.

Table 7  
Motivation in Seeking District Head Election Information (N = 211)

<b>Motivation</b>	<b>Frequency (n)</b>	<b>Percentage (%)</b>
To make the right choice		
Strongly disagree	2	0.95
Disagree	8	3.79
Agree	98	46.44
Strongly agree	83	39.34
Not answer	20	9.48
To know the track record of candidates		
Strongly disagree	3	1.42
Disagree	10	4.74
Agree	123	58.29
Strongly agree	56	26.54
Not answer	19	9.01
To pay attention on sustainability		
Strongly disagree	5	2.37
Disagree	16	7.58
Agree	124	58.77
Strongly agree	47	22.27
Not answer	19	9.01
To update the latest of information		
Strongly disagree	5	2.37
Disagree	25	11.85
Agree	122	57.82
Strongly agree	40	18.96
Not answer	19	9.00
To do duties or work related to District Head Election		
Strongly disagree	35	16.59
Disagree	92	43.60
Agree	49	23.22
Strongly agree	12	5.69
Not answer	23	10.90
Driven by a political party		
Strongly disagree	60	28.44
Disagree	70	33.17
Agree	50	23.70
Strongly agree	10	4.74
Not answer	21	9.95

### Preferred Types of Information

More than half of the respondents voted in favor of the preferred information are Candidate Profile (64.46), Ideology (58.77), Leadership (62.09), Candidate Programs (61.14), and The Political Party (56.87), as presented in Table 8.

Table 8  
Preferred Types of Information (N = 211)

<b>Preferred Types of Information</b>	<b>Frequency (n)</b>	<b>Percentage (%)</b>
Candidate Profile		
Strongly disagree	3	1.42

Disagree	14	6.64
Agree	136	64.46
Strongly agree	52	24.64
Not answer	6	2.84
<b>Ideology</b>		
Strongly disagree	2	0.95
Disagree	24	11.37
Agree	124	58.77
Strongly agree	52	24.64
Not answer	9	4.27
<b>Leadership</b>		
Strongly disagree	3	1.42
Disagree	10	4.74
Agree	131	62.09
Strongly agree	59	27.96
Not answer	8	3.79
<b>Candidate Programs</b>		
Strongly disagree	3	1.42
Disagree	8	3.79
Agree	129	61.14
Strongly agree	62	29.38
Not answer	9	4.27
<b>The Political Party</b>		
Strongly disagree	12	5.69
Disagree	32	15.17
Agree	120	56.87
Strongly agree	36	17.06
Not answer	11	5.21

### Preferred Resources for Seeking Information

More than half of the respondents answered agree to the following sources of information: Social Media (63.50%), Friends/Family (59.72%), Online News Website (59.24%), Television (52.61%) and Search Engine (51.66%). Respondents expressed disagreement with the source: Political Party Sites (56.87%), Radio (56.40%), and Candidate Personal Website (53.55%). Table 9 shows the data in detail.

Table 9  
Preferred Resources for Seeking Information (N = 211)

Preferred Resources	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
<b>Online News Website</b>		
Strongly disagree	8	3.79
Disagree	22	10.43
Agree	125	59.24
Strongly agree	45	21.33
Not answer	11	5.21
<b>Political Party Sites</b>		
Strongly disagree	25	11.85
Disagree	120	56.87
Agree	47	22.27
Strongly agree	9	4.27
Not answer	10	4.74
<b>Candidate Personal Website</b>		
Strongly disagree	18	8.53
Disagree	113	53.55
Agree	56	26.54



	Strongly agree	14	6.64
	Not answer	10	4.74
Social Media			
	Strongly disagree	7	3.32
	Disagree	20	9.48
	Agree	134	63.50
	Strongly agree	41	19.43
	Not answer	9	4.27
Search Engine			
	Strongly disagree	10	4.74
	Disagree	31	14.69
	Agree	109	51.66
	Strongly agree	50	23.70
	Not answer	11	5.21
Television			
	Strongly disagree	12	5.69
	Disagree	52	24.64
	Agree	111	52.61
	Strongly agree	27	12.79
	Not answer	9	4.27
Radio			
	Strongly disagree	38	18.00
	Disagree	119	56.40
	Agree	40	18.96
	Strongly agree	5	2.37
	Not answer	9	4.27
Friends/Family			
	Strongly disagree	16	7.58
	Disagree	33	15.64
	Agree	126	59.72
	Strongly agree	27	12.79
	Not answer	9	4.27

### Frequency in Accessing Information about District Head Election

From those providing response, almost half of them expressed that sometimes accessing Information about District Head Election from official website of Indonesian Government (39.81%) as shows in Table 10.

Table 10  
Frequency in Accessing Information about District Head Election (N = 211)

Frequency in Accessing Information	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
Once	34	16.11
Rarely	61	28.91
Sometimes	84	39.81
Often	8	3.79
Always	14	6.64
Not answer	10	4.74

### Engagement of Social Media as Sources of Information

There were two social media used as the dominant information sources for respondents in seeking information regarding District Head Election. They were Instagram (52.13%), and Twitter (19.91%), which is presented in Table 11.

Table 11

Engagement of Social Media (N = 211)

Social Media	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
Instagram	110	52.13
Twitter	42	19.91
Youtube	17	8.06
Whatsapp	12	5.69
Facebook	8	3.79
Line	7	3.32
Tik Tok	3	1.42
Not answer	12	5.69

**Duration of Social Media in Accessing Information about District Head Election**

From respondents who provided their reasons, majority of them accessed the information about district head election less that one hour per day (58.77%) as seen in Table 12.

Table 12  
Duration in Accessing Information using Social Media (N = 211)

Duration of Social Media	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
Less than 30 minutes	124	58.77
30 minutes to one hour	50	23.70
One to two hours	11	5.21
More than two hours	13	6.16
Not answer	13	6.16

**Knowledge about the Candidates**

Majority of respondents (75.36%) declared that knowing the candidates for mayor and deputy mayor in Depok and South Tangerang, as presented in Table ....

Table ...  
Knowledge about the Candidates (N = 211)

Knowledge	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
Yes	159	75.36
No	50	23.70
Not answers	2	0.95

**The Candidates Personal Qualifications and Character**

As shown in Table ..., when the respondents asked about the personal qualification and characters of the candidates, the most of the respondents choose candidates who have character and personality: honest, integrity, change agents, experience, populis, understanding the problems, and higher education.

Table 7  
Preferred Types of Information (N = 211)

The Figures of the Candidates	Frequency (n)	Valid Percentage (%)
-------------------------------	---------------	----------------------

---

Honest or Clean		
Strongly disagree	2	0.95
Disagree	6	2.84
Agree	77	36.49
Strongly agree	118	55.92
Not answer	8	3.79
Integrity		
Strongly disagree	3	1.42
Disagree	1	0.47
Agree	82	38.86
Strongly agree	120	58.87
Not answer	5	2.37
Changed agents		
Strongly disagree	2	0.95
Disagree	4	1.9
Agree	85	40.28
Strongly agree	116	54.98
Not answer	26	10.4
Experience		
Strongly disagree	3	1.42
Disagree	13	6.16
Agree	100	47.39
Strongly agree	89	42.18
Not answer	6	2.84
Populis		
Strongly disagree	1	0.47
Disagree	6	2.84
Agree	94	44.55
Strongly agree	104	49.29
Not answer	6	2.84
Understand the local issues		
Strongly disagree	2	0.95
Disagree	2	0.95
Agree	86	40.76
Strongly agree	116	54.98
Not answer	5	2.37
Higher Education and related		
Strongly disagree	2	0.94

---

Disagree	32	15,16
Agree	120	56,87
Strongly agree	50	23.69
Not answer	7	3.32

### The Leadership Personality Types of Candidates

Majority respondents (58.77%) choice a candidates had choleric personality. Meanwhile, Meanwhile, other types of leadership are chosen with different variations: melancholic (15.17%), phlegmatic (10.9%) and sanguine (7.11%) as seen in Table ...

Table ...  
The Leadership Personality Types of Candidates (N = 211)

The Personality Types	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
	(n)	(%)	(n)	(%)
Choleric	124	58.77	73	28,9
Sanguine	15	7.11	110	43.5
Melancholic	32	15.17	130	51.4
Phlegmatic	23	10.90	190	75.1
Not know	11	5.21	201	79.4
Not answer	6	2.84		

### The Main Considerations is not Selecting the Candidates

There are two main considerations for respondents not to choose candidates: does not program for the next 5 years (50.24%) and money politics (31.75%). Interestingly, they don't really care about whether the potential candidates interact with or pay attention to the interests of Generation Z, as seen in Table ...

Table ...  
The Main Considerations is not Selecting the Candidates (N = 211)

The Personality Types	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
	(n)	(%)	(n)	(%)
Money politics	67	31.75	73	28,9
Does not program for the next 5 years	106	50.24	110	43.5
Does not interaction with Gen Z	9	4.27	130	51.4
Does not raise of the Gen Z interest	18	8.53	190	75.1
Not answer	11	5.21	201	79.4

### The Main Factors Considered in Choosing Candidates

Unlike other factors such as: gender, track record, programs, ideology and political parties; it turns out that age and sara do not really make a real difference as a factor influencing their choice. This is evident in the table that the percentages of age and age do not show a sharp difference, as seen in the Table ...

Table ...  
The Main Factors Considered in Choosing Candidates(N = 211)

The Main Factors Considered	Frequency (n)	Valid Percentage (%)
<b>Age</b>		
Strongly disagree	14	6.64
Disagree	99	46.92
Agree	78	36.97
Strongly agree	16	7.58
Not answer	4	1.90
<b>SARA</b>		
Strongly disagree	49	23.22
Disagree	77	36.49
Agree	51	24.17
Strongly agree	29	13.74
Not answer	5	2.37
<b>Gender</b>		
Strongly disagree	55	26.07
Disagree	101	47.87
Agree	38	18.01
Strongly agree	11	5.21
Not answer	6	2.84
<b>Track records</b>		
Strongly disagree	5	2.37
Disagree	10	4.74
Agree	113	53.55
Strongly agree	74	35.07
Not answer	9	4.27
<b>Programs</b>		
Strongly disagree	1	0.47
Disagree	5	2.37
Agree	123	58.29
Strongly agree	76	36.02
Not answer	6	2.84
<b>Ideology</b>		
Strongly disagree	4	1.90
Disagree	8	3.79
Agree	123	58.29
Strongly agree	69	32.70

Not answer	7	3.32
<b>Political Parties</b>		
Strongly disagree	18	8.53
Disagree	56	26.54
Agree	100	47.39
Strongly agree	31	14.69
Not answer	6	2.84

### The Candidate's Programs Priority

As shown in Table ..., almost all programs are approved to be a priority for candidates to develop. However, specifically regarding the provision of housing, the respondents' answers did not seem too prominent: agree (43.13%), strongly agree (18.96), disagree (24.64%) dan strongly disagree (5.69%)

Table ...  
Preferred Types of Information (N = 211)

<b>The Priority of the Candidates Programs</b>	<b>Frequency (n)</b>	<b>Valid Percentage (%)</b>
<b>Economic resilience</b>		
Strongly disagree	1	0.47
Disagree	9	4.27
Agree	132	62.56
Strongly agree	57	27.01
Not answer	12	5.69
<b>Health issues</b>		
Strongly disagree	2	0.95
Disagree	3	1.42
Agree	106	50.24
Strongly agree	88	41.71
Not answer	12	5.69
<b>Education quality</b>		
Strongly disagree	1	0.47
Disagree	2	0.95
Agree	90	42.65
Strongly agree	106	50.24
Not answer	12	5.69
<b>Infrastructures</b>		
Strongly disagree	4	1.90
Disagree	13	6.16
Agree	116	54.98
Strongly agree	66	31.28

Not answer	12	5.69
<b>Governments Governance</b>		
Strongly disagree	1	0.47
Disagree	2	0.95
Agree	96	45.50
Strongly agree	100	47.39
Not answer	12	5.69
<b>Employment expansion</b>		
Strongly disagree	2	0.95
Disagree	5	2.37
Agree	94	44.55
Strongly agree	99	46.92
Not answer	11	5.21
<b>Public services</b>		
Strongly disagree	2	0.95
Disagree	8	3.79
Agree	101	47.87
Strongly agree	87	41.23
Not answer	13	6.16
<b>Public transportations</b>		
Strongly disagree	1	0.47
Disagree	13	6.16
Agree	116	54.98
Strongly agree	70	33.18
Not answer	11	5.21
<b>Housing</b>		
Strongly disagree	12	5.69
Disagree	52	24.64
Agree	91	43.13
Strongly agree	40	18.96
Not answer	16	7.58
<b>COVID-19 Pandemic</b>		
Strongly disagree	3	1.42
Disagree	7	3.32
Agree	74	35.07
Strongly agree	112	53.08
Not answer	15	7.11

## Opinion regarding Districs Head Election

Almost half of respondents were trust in information related to Pilkada in social media (48.8%). On the other hand, others conveyed their doubt regarding the information (44.5%) Majority of respondents revealed that they re-checked the information if feeling doubt regarding the obtained information (63.6%). However, they continued to spread the information eventhough understanding that the news was invalid (4,7%) as presented in Table 8.

Opini regarding Election	Frequency (n)	Valid Percentage (%)
Agree with money politics		
Strongly disagree	4	1.6
Disagree	2	0.8
Agree	61	24.6
Strongly agree	108	43.6
Not answer	73	29.4
Discussing with friends about election		
Strongly disagree	20	8.0
Disagree	38	15.2
Agree	125	50.0
Strongly agree	36	14.4
Not answer	31	12.4
Agree with election time		
Strongly disagree	15	6.0
Disagree	36	14.4
Agree	121	48.4
Strongly agree	52	20.8
Not answer	26	10.4

## The Main Considerations of Choosing the Candidates

There are four reasons to spend time during the PSBB period. Most of the respondents because of time spent (80.2%). Most half of the respondents reduced boredom (71.9%), reduced stress (66.0%) and self-amuse (62.1%). as respresented detail in Table 15.

Table 15  
The Main Considerations of Choosing the Candidates (N = 253)

The Main Considerations	Yes		No	
	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
Family members	203	80.2	50	19.8
Colleagues, friends	182	71.9	71	28.1



Speeches by religious leaders	167	66.0	86	34.0
The Candidates campaigns	157	62.1	96	37.9

## Conclusion

Generation Z in Indonesia need information about the profiles, ideologies, leadership, and work programs of regional head candidates. Information about political party websites, candidates' personal websites, candidate campaigns, and the use of celebrities were not their main choices in seeking election information. The social media, Instagram and Twitter are the most preferred for finding election information. The candidates character for regional heads who have character: integrity, can bring change, understand various problems in their region and are able to offer solutions, are populist and honest / free from corruption practices; is the figure of the candidate for regional head they will elect. The choleric personality type of the candidate for regional head is more preferred by them. The racial and gender factors did not influence their political choices. Their track record, work program and ideology influence their political choices. The findings will be useful to political parties in developing their future election communication strategies .

## ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This research is supported by Universitas Indonesia (PUTI Q3 2020)

## References

- Arnold, Jeffrey B., Erlich, Aaron, Jung, Danielle F., & Long, James D. (2018). Covering the Campaign: News, Elections, and the Information Environment in Emerging Democracies. 1-19.
- Berg, Linda; Oscarsson, Henrik (2020). The Swedish regional elections 2018. *Regional & Federal Studies*, DOI: 10.1080/13597566.2020.1739656
- Cole, Ashley, Napier, Trena, & Marcum, Brad. (2015). Generation Z: Facts and Fictions. In *Not Just Where To Click: Teaching Students How To Think About Information* (pp. 107-137). Chicago, : American Libraries Association.
- Dolot, Anna. (2018). The characteristic of Generation Z. *e-mentor*, 44-50.
- Fatmayani, M., Drs.Pawito, & Muktiyo, W. (2019). Information Seeking in the Elite PDI Perjuangan about Gibran Election as the Solo Mayor . *International Journal of Multicultural and Multireligious Understanding* , 10-20.
- Himelboim, Itai, Hansen, Derek, and Bowser, Anne. (2013) Playing in the same Twitter network: Political information seeking in the 2010 US gubernatorial election. *Information, Communication, and Society*, Vol 16, 2013
- Lancaster, L. C. (2003). The click and clash of generations. *Library Journal*, 36-39.
- M. Utych, S., & Kam, C. D. (2013). Viability, Information Seeking, and Vote Choice . *The Journal of Politics*, 152-166.

- Majid, Shaneen, Foo, Schubert, Dumauual, Hannah Trinity, and Suri, Venkata Ratnadeep. (2017). Information Needs and Seeking Behaviour of Voters during Singapore General Election 2015 . *Singapore Journal of Library and Information Management* , 16-37.
- Peterson, Erick, & Iyengar, S. (2019). Partisan Gaps in Political Information and Information-Seeking Behavior: Motivated Reasoning or Cheerleading? 1-12.
- Rue, Penny. (2018). Make Way, Millennials, Here Comes Gen Z . *About Campus*, 5-12.
- Scherer, A. (2014). *The Impact of Political Cues on Information Seeking and the Need for Cognitive Closure*. Iowa: University of Iowa.
- Stein, Jonas; Folkestad, Bjarte; Aars, Jacob and Christensen, Dag Arne (2020): The 2019 local and regional elections in Norway: The periphery strikes again, *Regional & Federal Studies*, DOI: 10.1080/13597566.2020.1840364
- Wilson, T.D. (2007). Evolution in information behavior modeling: Wilson's model. In, K. Fisher, S. Erdelez & L. McKechnie, (Eds.). *Theories of information behavior*, (pp. 31-36). Medford, NJ: Information Today. [Slightly revised and updated October 2007]
- Zemke, R. Raines. (1999). Generation Gaps in the Classroom. *Training*, 48-54.
- . (2001). Generation Markers. *Across the Board*, 20.