

# Comparison of Voter Participation among Generation Z, Millennial Generation, Generation X, and Baby Boomers in the 2024 General Election

Iskandar Syukur<sup>1</sup>, Era Octafiona<sup>2</sup>, Gita Leviana Putri<sup>3</sup>, Mezan el-Khaeri Kesuma<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1,2,4</sup>UIN Raden Intan Lampung, Indonesia

<sup>3</sup>Universitas Bandar Lampung, Indonesia

Email: [iskandarsyukur@radenintan.ac.id](mailto:iskandarsyukur@radenintan.ac.id)

## Abstract

The objective of this study is to analyze the comparison of voter participation among Generation Z, Millennials, Generation X, and Baby Boomers in the 2024 General Election in Lampung Province. This study employs a quantitative method with a survey approach, where the population consists of 6,539,128 registered voters, and a sample of 2,085 respondents is selected using the Slovin formula. Data were collected through a questionnaire designed to measure political knowledge, attitudes toward elections, and political participation. The discussion results indicate a significant difference in voter participation levels across generations. Generation Z exhibits a lower participation rate compared to other generations, influenced by a lack of political knowledge and interest in political issues. Meanwhile, Millennials and Generation X demonstrate more active participation, driven by an awareness of the importance of their votes in shaping policy direction. The conclusion of this study emphasizes that to enhance voter participation, particularly among Generation Z, more intensive political education efforts and effective communication strategies from political parties are needed. This study provides valuable insights for policymakers and political parties in designing programs that can improve voter participation in the future.

**Keywords:** *Baby Boomers, Gen X, Gen Y, Gen Z, Election, Politic, Vote.*



## A. INTRODUCTION

Indonesia will hold the Parliamentary and Presidential General Election of the Republic of Indonesia on February 14, 2024. This event represents the largest democratic festival, held every five years, which should ideally be celebrated with high voter participation from all citizens. However, in reality, the expectation of high participation has not been achieved due to several factors, such as inaccurate voter information collection, a lack of positive interaction between voters and politicians, and increasingly expensive elections, exacerbated by the low financial contributions from active party members, which cover election costs.

This phenomenon reflects the face of Indonesian democracy, which remains highly elitist and costly. These high costs are borne by election participants themselves, not just by the state or regional budgets (APBN or APBD). Schumpeter, as cited in Sukriono, also argues that political parties play a crucial role in exploiting the interests of unorganized voters.

Labolo & Ilham (2015) also suggest that three main problems hinder political parties today: the declining ideological values of parties, insufficient financial support,

and a decrease in new party members. For voters, this situation leads to a decline in ideological loyalty toward political parties.

Meanwhile, research by Hill (2017) states that when political manipulation occurs too quickly due to the erosion of ideological values and political agreements between parties, the public struggles to fully comprehend it. This phenomenon reduces voter loyalty and electoral participation. Instead, people remain indifferent and wait until the last moments before deciding who to vote for—or whether to vote at all. This type of voter is known as a confused voter or a swing voter.

According to Noor (2017), swing voters may arise due to a lack of information or even regret over the performance of political parties in previous election periods. This is supported by data from the Indonesian Swing Voters Association (PSV), which shows annual trends, as illustrated in Table 1.

**Table 1 Number of Swing Voters and Abstaining Voters (Non-Voters)**

No	Year of General Election/Presidential Election	Percentage of Swing Voters and Abstaining Voters (%)
1	General Election 1999	7.3%
2	General Election 2004	15.9%
3	First Round Presidential Election 2005	21.8%
4	Second Round Presidential Election 2005	23.4%
5	Legislative Election 2009	29.3%
6	Presidential Election 2009	28.3%
7	Legislative Election 2014	24.8%
8	Presidential Election 2014	29.1%
9	Legislative Election 2019	29.68%
10	Presidential Election 2019	19.24%

Source: Indonesian Swing Voters Association (*Perkumpulan Swing Voter Indonesia*)

The high number of swing voters indicates the failure of political parties to meet the people's expectations in the past, as stated by Naufel (2018). Currently, the General Elections Commission (KPU) has reported that the number of young voters, consisting of Millennials and Generation Z, continues to increase. In the 2009 election, there were 36 million young voters, which rose to 53 million out of 186 million voters in the 2014 election. According to KPU data, there are currently 113.6 million young voters, accounting for 55.64% of the total voter list (DPT) for the 2024 election, as detailed in Table 2.

**Table 2 Number of Registered Voters (DPT) by Age Group for the 2024 Indonesian Election**

No	Generation Name	Number of Voters
1	Pre-Boomer	4,970,850
2	Baby Boomer	28,127,340
3	Generation X	57,486,482
4	Millennial Generation (Y)	66,822,389
5	Generation Z	46,800,161
<b>Total Registered Voters (DPT 2024)</b>		<b>204,207,222</b>

Source: General Elections Commission (KPU) of the Republic of Indonesia

This means that more than 50% of young voters already possess significant power and influence over the election results, which will impact the nation's progress. The main issue that arises is how actively young voters will participate in the democratic process and whether they also have the potential to be a significant contributor to voter abstention (golput) in the 2024 General Election.

These registered voters (DPT) are spread across 34 provinces in Indonesia, one of which is Lampung Province, often referred to as a miniature Indonesia due to its diverse socio-cultural conditions. Lampung is a land of diversity. Covering an area of 35,587 km<sup>2</sup>, it was once part of the Tarumanagara and Sunda Kingdoms and is home to various ethnic groups. The population consists of Javanese (60.10%), native Lampung people (21.9%), Sundanese (10.50%), Minangkabau (3.57%), Balinese (1.7%), as well as Chinese, Malay, and others (2.15%). In Sang Bumi Ruwai Jurai, all ethnic groups coexist harmoniously.

Lampung is the southernmost province of Sumatra. As its name suggests, Lampung is often called Alam Penampung (a land of shelter) because of its long history of welcoming newcomers. This openness made it a key location for transmigration programs during the New Order government. Indigenous people and migrants coexist peacefully in this land without conflicts over religion or ethnicity.

All state-recognized religions are present in Lampung. The religious demographics include Islam (93.55%), Protestant Christianity (2.32%), Hinduism (1.63%), Catholicism (1.62%), Buddhism (0.87%), and Confucianism (0.01%). The province is also linguistically diverse, with people speaking Sundanese, Javanese, and Balinese in addition to the Lampung language. However, what stands out the most is that despite having different mother tongues, people predominantly use Bahasa Indonesia in daily interactions. Not only in offices or formal events, but Indonesian is also the primary language of communication in markets and coffee shops.

Similar to Indonesia as a whole, Lampung Province is also dominated by young voters, as illustrated in Table 3. In percentage terms, the number of young voters in Lampung, categorized as Generation Y and Z, reaches 49.98%. This indicates that young voters in Lampung also hold significant power and influence over the outcome of the 2024 General Election.

**Table 3. Number of Registered Voters (DPT) by Age Group in Lampung Province for the 2024 Election**

No	Generation Name	Number of Voters
1	Pre-Boomer	145,210
2	Baby Boomer	1,145,273
3	Generation X	1,980,330
4	Millennial Generation (Y)	2,094,127
5	Generation Z	1,174,188
<b>Total Registered Voters (DPT 2024)</b>		<b>6,539,128</b>

Source: General Elections Commission (KPU) of Lampung Province

However, Lampung is among the ten provinces with the lowest voter participation rates in the 2019 election. This issue requires collective attention. In addition to low voter participation, Lampung is also known for its high crime rate.

Therefore, research on voter behavior will impact all aspects of policymaking, particularly in Lampung and generally at the national level.

A fundamental understanding of generational classification is that a group of people referred to as a generation is influenced by historical events and cultural phenomena that occur and are experienced during their lifetime (Nobel & Schewe, 2003; Twenge, 2000).

According to Dencker et al. (2018), these events and phenomena, which affect individuals' lives, shape collective memory. In agreement with Caspi et al. (2005), historical, social, and cultural impacts, along with other elements, influence a person's behavior, values, and character.

Therefore, it is crucial to understand how voters interact across generations. The study of voter behavior is particularly interesting because voter behavior determines the success of presidential and vice-presidential candidates. Those elected by voters may become legislative members at various levels, such as the House of Representatives (DPR), Provincial Councils, and City/Regency Councils, depending on whether they are new candidates or incumbents. To represent regional aspirations at the national level, voters can also elect representatives through the Regional Representative Council (DPD).

Voter behavior is significantly influenced by the prevailing political climate. As democracy evolves, sociocultural diversity and democratic political dynamics shape democratic life. Aminah (2014) stated that at certain times, voters are indifferent to the electoral commotion, similar to what happened during the New Order elections when many voters did not choose freely but were influenced by external forces. In other circumstances, voters fully participate in the decision-making process based on their own preferences. This could be driven by money politics, persuasive outreach from candidates that motivates voters to go to polling stations, or voters' awareness of the importance of electing leaders and representatives who align with their aspirations.

## **B. LITERATURE REVIEW**

### **1. Political Culture Theory**

Gabriel A. Almond and Sidney Verba state that political culture consists of an individual's attitudes and political orientations toward the political system, its components, and their own role within the system. They view political objects cognitively through three components: the ability related to a person's level of knowledge and understanding, as well as their trust and beliefs.

The evaluative component integrates information and feelings with value standards and criteria, while the affective component concerns the emotional responses of citizens toward the political system and the roles that can influence their choices regarding political subjects. According to Eagly and Chaiken, the evaluation of political objects determines voters' attitudes. Cognitive, affective, and behavioral processes shape these attitudes. Based on this review, attitudes resulting from intergenerational voting loyalty are derived from cognitive, affective (emotional), and behavioral responses—three distinct ways of perceiving an object.

Gabriel A. Almond classifies political culture into three categories:

- a. Parochial Political Culture, where people are highly uninvolved in politics due to cognitive reasons, such as low levels of education.
- b. Subject or Subjective Political Culture, where the community is somewhat developed but remains passive.
- c. Participant Political Culture, where people are highly aware of politics.

The author uses these three components to identify political culture across generations.

## **2. Orientation and Attitudes in Voter Culture**

The behavioral approach examines how people interact with one another. These interactions are always related to an individual's knowledge, attitudes, and values. The orientation that results from this approach shapes political culture. A person's political culture is ultimately influenced by politics, which then establishes a social order.

Political culture is a direct outcome of a broad socio-cultural system. It is formed through a process of political socialization, which enables voters to recognize, understand, and internalize specific political principles that influence their daily political attitudes and behaviors. A person's social, cultural, and religious values are typically linked to their political values. Alfian suggests that a person's political orientation is shaped by their cultural environment.

Personal experiences, culture, religion, media, and influential individuals are some of the factors that shape attitudes. According to Eagly and Chaiken (1993), the evaluation of political objects determines attitudes. These political objects are formed through cognitive processes—comprising cognitive, affective, and behavioral aspects. The evaluation results in attitudes toward objects based on various observations, emotions, and behaviors.

## **3. Generational Theory**

One of the fundamental understandings of generational classification is that a generation consists of a group of people influenced by historical events and cultural phenomena that occur and are experienced during their lifetime. These events and phenomena shape collective memory, which impacts individuals' lives. Consequently, historical, social, and cultural influences, along with other components, shape a person's behavior, values, and personality.

This explanation encompasses two main elements that define generational grouping, according to Parry and Urwin (2011). The first element is sociological factors, particularly a shared birth year range. The second element is event factors, which refer to significant past events. The second factor is more commonly used as the foundation for studies on generational differences.

According to Howe & Strauss (2000), three characteristics better identify generations than birth years: 1. Perception of group identity, especially during adolescence and young adulthood. 2. Common habits and actions, including attitudes

toward family, career, personal life, politics, religion, and decisions related to work, marriage, children, health, and crime. 3. Historical context, such as changes in political perspectives and significant historical events like wars and natural disasters that occur during adolescence and young adulthood.

Parry & Urwin (2010) argue that since geographical location differs from historical event locations, spatial differences also contribute to debates on generational classification. This is because generational groupings are often conceptualized based on historical events in the United States.

Therefore, a universally accepted generalization is needed for generational classification. In practice, researchers have used the same labels for generational groups, although there are still some differences regarding the start and end dates of each generation.

**Table 3 Generational Classification**

Source	Label				
Tapscott (1998)	-	Baby Boom Generation (1946-1964)	Generation X (1965-1975)	Digital Generation (1976-2000)	-
Howe & Stratuss (2000)	Silent Generation (1925-1943)	Boom Generation (1943-1960)	13 <sup>th</sup> Generation (1961-1981)	Millennial Generation (1982-1999)	-
Zemke et al. (2000)	Veterans (1922-1943)	Baby Boomers (1946-1964)	Gen-Xers (1960-1980)	Nexters (1980-1999)	-
Lancaster & Stillaman (2002)	Traditionalist (1900-1945)	Baby Boomers (1946-1964)	Generation Xers (1965-1980)	Generation Y (1981-1999)	-
Martin % Tulgan (2002)	Silent Generation (1925-1942)	Baby Boomers (1946-1964)	Generation X (1965-1977)	Millennials (1978-2000)	-
Oblinger & Oblinger (2005)	Matures (< 1946)	Baby Boomers (1946-1964)	Generation Xers (1965-1980)	Gen-Y/NetGen (1981-1995)	Post Millennials (1995-Present)

Source: Yanuar Surya Putra (2017)

**Table 4 Overview of Characteristics Across Generations**

Factors	Baby-Boom	X Generation	Y Generation	Z Generation
<b>View</b>	Communal, unified thinking	Self-centred and medium-term	Egotistical, short term	No sense of commitment, be happy with what you have and live for the present
<b>Relationship</b>	First and foremost personal	Personal and virtual networks	Principally virtual, network	Virtual and superficial
<b>Self-Realization</b>	Solid existence	Multi-environment, secure position	Rivalry for leadership position	Live for the present
<b>Aim</b>	Conscious career building	Rapid promotion	Immediate	Questions the need for it at all
<b>IT</b>	It is based on self-instruction and incomplete	Uses with confidence	Part of its everyday life	Intuitive
<b>Values</b>	Patience, soft skills, respect for	Hard work, openness, respect for	Flexibility, mobility, broad but	Live for the present, rapid

	traditions, EQ, hard work	diversity, curiosity, practicality	superficial knowledge, success orientation, creativity, freedom of information takes priority	reaction to everything, initiator, brave, rapid information access and content search
<b>Other possible characteristics</b>	Respect for hierarchy, exaggerated modesty or arrogant inflexibility, passivity, cynicism, disappointment	Rule abiding, materialistic, fair play, less respect for hierarchy, has a sense of relativity, need to prove themselves	Desire for independence, no respect for tradition, quest for new forms of knowledge, inverse socialization, arrogant, home office and part-time work, interim management, undervalue soft skills and EQ	Differing viewpoints, lack of thinking, happiness, pleasure, divided attention, lack of consequential thinking, no desire to make sense of things, the boundaries of work and entertainment overlap, feel at home anywhere

Source: Beesik & Machova (2016)

#### 4. Political Participation Theory

The bureaucratic polity, as a form of political system, demonstrates that power and political participation tend to be restricted to elite circles, such as the military and high-ranking bureaucratic officials. In this context, it is crucial to recognize that empowering society plays a key role in creating a more inclusive and sustainable system.

One way to achieve societal empowerment is by increasing their participation in planning and decision-making processes. This is considered an essential prerequisite for achieving sustainable development. In other words, active public involvement is fundamental in realizing positive and sustainable progress for a country or region.

In the context of public participation, the concept of political marketing becomes relevant. This study emphasizes the adaptation of political marketing strategies aimed at influencing voters. Political entities, in this regard, engage in persuasive promotion to encourage greater public participation in political processes.

Interestingly, Fenyapwain (2013) presents findings that illustrate a strong correlation between local election campaign advertisements and political participation among first-time voters. This suggests that through specific media, such as campaign advertisements, the public can be influenced to participate more actively in political processes, particularly in local elections.

Thus, involving society in political processes and utilizing appropriate political marketing strategies can serve as important steps in building a more responsive, inclusive, and sustainable political system.

## C. METHOD

This study examines voter participation across different generations in Lampung Province during the 2024 General Election. The population consists of 6,539,128 individuals, based on the 2024 Fixed Voter List (DPT) from the General Elections Commission (KPU). The sample includes 2,085 respondents, determined using Slovin's formula with a 95% confidence level. To ensure generational representation, a minimum of 30 respondents per regency/city were selected to complete the questionnaire, following the group sampling theory proposed by Gay & Airasian.

The study employs a qualitative research approach, focusing on factors that influence voter participation and decision-making across different generations. Data is collected through in-depth interviews, field observations, and questionnaire surveys. Informants are chosen purposively, meaning they are selected based on their knowledge and ability to provide detailed insights into the research topic. The researcher directly engages in fieldwork, conducting interviews and observations to capture real-world phenomena related to voter behavior.

To analyze the data, this study follows the Miles & Huberman model, which consists of three main stages: data reduction, data presentation, and conclusion drawing. Data reduction involves selecting and summarizing key information to focus on the most relevant aspects. Data presentation organizes findings into concise descriptions, tables, or graphs, making it easier to interpret trends in voter participation among different generations. Finally, conclusion drawing and verification ensure that findings are consistent and supported by the data.

An inductive approach is used in this study, allowing for a deeper exploration of the relationships between voter literacy, political participation, and generational differences. By structuring data collection and analysis interactively, this research provides a comprehensive understanding of voter participation patterns in the 2024 General Election.

## D. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### 1. Factors Influencing Voter Participation in the 2024 Election

**Table 1. Factors Influencing Voter Participation in the 2024 Election**

Voter Group	Factors	Data Sources
<b>Baby Boomer (1946-1964)</b>	Economic and Social Factors: Their involvement is often influenced by economic stability and trust in political institutions. They tend to view elections as highly important and consequential, which increases their motivation to vote. Media Influence: Baby Boomers' political participation is increasingly linked to their engagement with online media, which provides a platform for political discourse.	Interviews, Surveys, and Journals

<b>Generation X (1965-1980)</b>	Digital Engagement: While not as active as Generation Z, Generation X has also begun using digital media to obtain political information, influencing their participation. Perception of Political Relevance: They tend to have a more positive view of elections compared to younger generations, which can enhance their motivation to participate.	Interviews, Surveys, and Journals
<b>Millennials (1981-1996)</b>	Economic Factors: Student debt and economic insecurity serve as significant barriers to their participation. Role of Social-Media: Social-media plays a crucial role in mobilizing them to participate in elections, although they have historically shown lower participation rates.	Interviews, Surveys, and Journals
<b>Generation Z (1997-2012)</b>	Digital Engagement: As "digital natives," Generation Z demonstrates growing engagement with political issues through social media platforms, although they face challenges in political knowledge. Structural Barriers: They often lack the necessary political knowledge to participate effectively, which may hinder their participation rates.	Interviews, Surveys, and Journals

## 2. Levels of Factors Influencing Voter Participation in the 2024 Election

**Table 2 Levels of Factors Influencing Voter Participation in the 2024 Election**

Voter Group	Factors	Level of Influence	Data Sources
Baby Boomers	Media Engagement	High	Interviews, Surveys, and Journals
	Economic Stability	High	
	Perception of Political Relevance	Moderate	
Generation X	Digital Engagement	Moderate	Interviews, Surveys, and Journals
	Perception of Political Relevance	High	
	Voting Experience	Moderate	
Generation Y/Millennials	Economic Stability	High	Interviews, Surveys, and Journals
	Role of Social-Media	High	
	Political Disappointment	Moderate	
Generation Z	Digital Engagement	High	Interviews, Surveys, and Journals
	Structural Barriers	High	
	Political Knowledge	Moderate	

The findings of this study reveal that voter participation in the 2024 election is influenced by various factors that differ across generations. While some influences are universal, the extent of their impact varies significantly among Baby Boomers, Generation X, Millennials, and Generation Z. Understanding these generational differences is crucial for developing strategies that enhance voter engagement and ensure a more inclusive electoral process.

Media engagement plays a significant role in shaping voter participation, with each generation exhibiting distinct preferences in consuming political information. Baby Boomers continue to rely on traditional media sources such as television and newspapers, although their engagement with digital platforms is increasing. Generation X, while still influenced by traditional media, has adopted digital platforms for political discourse. Millennials and Generation Z, on the other hand, rely

almost entirely on social media and online platforms for political information. This shift in media consumption underscores the importance of tailoring political messaging to effectively reach different generational groups. However, the increasing reliance on digital media also presents challenges, particularly for younger generations who are more susceptible to misinformation and algorithm-driven content.

Economic factors also play a crucial role in determining voter engagement. Baby Boomers, who generally experience greater financial stability, tend to participate in elections as they perceive them to have a direct impact on their economic security. Generation X shows moderate participation, with financial considerations influencing their voting behavior. However, Millennials and Generation Z face significant economic challenges, such as student debt, job insecurity, and rising living costs, which can lead to political disengagement. These findings highlight the importance of policies that address economic disparities and provide younger generations with a stronger incentive to participate in elections.

Trust in political institutions is another key factor affecting voter participation. Baby Boomers generally perceive elections as highly significant and feel a strong sense of civic duty, which motivates them to vote. Generation X exhibits a moderate level of trust, shaped by their experiences with past political events. In contrast, Millennials and Generation Z often express skepticism toward political institutions, with concerns about governance, corruption, and lack of representation leading to political apathy. Rebuilding trust through transparency, accountability, and youth engagement initiatives is essential to encouraging higher voter turnout among these younger generations.

The rise of digital engagement presents both opportunities and challenges for voter participation. While social media serves as a powerful tool for mobilizing younger voters and raising political awareness, it also contributes to the spread of misinformation and political polarization. Younger generations are particularly vulnerable to misinformation, which can lead to disengagement or misinformed decision-making. Addressing these challenges requires educational initiatives that promote digital literacy, critical thinking, and fact-checking skills to ensure that young voters are well-informed.

Structural barriers also hinder participation, particularly among Generation Z. Despite being highly active in digital political discussions, many young voters face obstacles such as a lack of familiarity with the voting process, bureaucratic challenges, and a sense of detachment from formal political structures. Overcoming these barriers through voter education programs, simplified registration procedures, and targeted outreach efforts can significantly improve participation rates among young voters.

These findings suggest that efforts to increase voter engagement should be tailored to the unique characteristics of each generation. Strategies should focus on enhancing media literacy, addressing economic concerns, rebuilding trust in political institutions, leveraging digital platforms effectively, and eliminating structural barriers to participation. By adopting a generation-specific approach, policymakers,

electoral bodies, and civil society organizations can develop more effective voter engagement strategies that foster a more informed and active electorate, ultimately strengthening democratic participation in future elections.

## E. CONCLUSION

The conclusion from the analysis of voter participation among Generation Z, Millennials, Generation X, and Baby Boomers shows that each generation has unique characteristics and challenges that influence their engagement in elections. Baby Boomers tend to have high participation rates, driven by historical experiences and engagement with traditional media. Generation X demonstrates moderate participation, with an increasing influence of digital media. Meanwhile, Millennials have historically had lower participation rates, hindered by economic factors such as student debt and political disappointment. Generation Z, although politically active, faces structural barriers and a lack of political knowledge, which can hinder their participation. It is important to understand that voter engagement is influenced by factors such as media consumption, political relevance, and trust in institutions. Therefore, tailored strategies and effective political education are essential to increasing participation among younger generations. Building trust and demonstrating the relevance of the electoral process will be key to encouraging greater engagement in future elections.

## REFERENCES

1. Akhmedova, J. D., & Bykov, I. A. (2022, April). Personification as a Communication Strategy in Digital Society. In *2022 Communication Strategies in Digital Society Seminar (ComSDS)* (pp. 142-145). IEEE.
2. Alkhalwaldeh, A. M., Salleh, S. M., & Halim, F. B. (2016). An empirical study in voting behavior and political brand. *International Business Management*, *10*(18), 4365-4372.
3. Aminah, S. (2011). *Negara pasar dan masyarakat: Sebuah studi sosio-ekonomi dan budaya pembangunan BRT-Transjakarta* (Doctoral dissertation, Universitas Indonesia).
4. Aminah, S. (2014). *Kuasa Negara Pada Ranah Politik Lokal*. Jakarta: Kencana Prenada Media Group.
5. Andersen, K., Ohme, J., Bjarnøe, C., Bordacconi, M. J., Albæk, E., & De Vreese, C. H. (2021). *Generational gaps in political media use and civic engagement: From baby boomers to generation Z*. Taylor & Francis.
6. Antono, B., Solihah, R., & Bintari, A. (2021). Faktor-Faktor Yang Mempengaruhi Partisipasi Politik Pemuda Dalam Pemilihan Kepala Daerah Kabupaten Majalengka Tahun 2018 (Studi Pada Organisasi Kepemudaan Kecamatan Bantarujeg). *ASPIRASI*, *11*(2), 36-49.
7. Arniti, N. K. (2020). Partisipasi politik masyarakat dalam pemilihan umum legislatif di kota denpasar. *Jurnal Ilmiah Dinamika Sosial*, *4*(2), 329-348.
8. Azirah, A. (2024). Partisipasi politik pemilih pemula dalam pesta demokrasi. *Journal of Law and Government Science*, *10*(2), 10-21.

9. Badan Pusat Statistik Provinsi Lampung. (2023). *Jumlah Penduduk Provinsi Lampung*. Lampung: Badan Pusat Statistik Provinsi Lampung.
10. Barber, M., & Holbein, J. B. (2022). 400 million voting records show profound racial and geographic disparities in voter turnout in the United States. *Plos one*, 17(6), e0268134.
11. Beribisky, N., & Cribbie, R. A. (2024). Evaluating the performance of existing and novel equivalence tests for fit indices in structural equation modelling. *British Journal of Mathematical and Statistical Psychology*, 77(1), 103-129.
12. Cao, X. (2023). The application of structural equation model in psychological research. *CNS Spectrums*, 28(S1), S17-S19.
13. Caspi, A., Roberts, B. W., & Shiner, R. L. (2005). Personality development: Stability and change. *Annu. Rev. Psychol.*, 56, 453-484.
14. Charles, H. W., & Jameson-Charles, M. (2022). A review of the socio-political context of youth participation in the Caribbean. *Youth Participation in the Caribbean*, 16-30.
15. Dencker, J. C., Joshi, A., & Martocchio, J. J. (2008). Towards a theoretical framework linking generational memories to workplace attitudes and behaviors. *Human Resource Management Review*, 18(3), 180-187.
16. Dunggio, S., & Yantu, I. N. (2021). Studi Kasus Partisipasi Politik Masyarakat Dalam Pemilihan Kepala Daerah Kabupaten Bone Bolango Di Tengah Pandemi Covid 19. *Publik*, 8(2), 156-169.
17. Eagly, A. H., & Chaiken, S. (1993). *The Psychology of Attitudes*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
18. Enli, G. S., & Skogerbø, E. (2013). Personalized campaigns in party-centred politics: Twitter and Facebook as arenas for political communication. *Information, communication & society*, 16(5), 757-774.
19. Fauzi, A. M. (2019). Perilaku pemilih menjelang Pemilu 2019. *Journal of Islamic Civilization*, 1(1), 40-48.
20. Febriantory, F., Antuhni, T., Marhayadi, M., Adiwijaya, S., Batubara, M. Z., & Saragih, O. K. (2024). The Impact of Social Media on Political Enthusiasm Study of the Young Generation in the General Election of Jekan Raya City, Palangka Raya City. *The Easta Journal Law and Human Rights*, 2(03), 157-164.
21. Finseraas, H., Kotsadam, A., & Polavieja, J. (2022). Ancestry culture, assimilation, and voter turnout in two generations. *Political Behavior*, 44(1), 201-226.
22. Fox, S. (2024). Social action as a route to the ballot box: Can youth volunteering reduce inequalities in turnout?. *European Journal of Political Research*, 63(1), 111-131.
23. Harmel, R., Svåsand, L., & Mjelde, H. (2024). Personalization and de-institutionalization: Our common conceptual framework. *Social Science Quarterly*, 105(3), 399-402.
24. Hemafitria, H., Novianty, F. N. F., & Fitriani, F. (2021). Partisipasi Politik Dalam Pemilihan Umum Kepala Daerah Di Desa Perapakan Kabupaten Sambas. *Jurnal Pendidikan PKN (Pancasila Dan Kewarganegaraan)*, 2(1), 37-51.

25. Hill, S. J. (2017). Learning together slowly: Bayesian learning about political facts. *The Journal of Politics*, 79(4), 1403-1418.
26. Howe, N., & Strauss, W. (2000). *Millennials rising: The next great generation*. Vintage.
27. Hrehorowicz, A., & Kowalczyk, T. (2023). Wiedza wyborcza pokolenia „Z” w perspektywie badania ilościowego nad warszawskimi licealistami. *Przegląd Prawa Konstytucyjnego*, 2 (72), 119-139.
28. Hudson, R. B. (2013). The transformed political world of older boomers. *Journal of Gerontological Social Work*, 56(2), 85-89.
29. Iswardhana, M. R., Arisanto, P. T., Chotimah, H. C., Wibawa, A., Risky, L., & Pratiwi, T. S. (2023). Sosialisasi Pendidikan Politik Menyongsong Pemilu 2024 Terhadap Generasi Z di SMAN 4 Yogyakarta. *Jurnal Abdi Masyarakat Multidisiplin*, 2(1), 6-10.
30. Jones, B. (2019). *Are they Young, or are they Different? A Comparative Study of Voting Millennials and Baby Boomers*. University of Lynchburg.
31. Khakim, M. S. (2023). Partisipasi Politik Generasi Muda pada Pemilihan Umum Tahun 2024. *Jurnal Administrasi Pemerintahan Desa*, 4(1), 98-116.
32. Komisi Pemilihan Umum. (2023). *Keputusan Komisi Pemilihan Umum Provinsi Lampung Nomor 48 Tahun 2023 Tentang Penetapan Rekapitulasi Daftar Pemilih (DPT) Provinsi Lampung Dalam Penyelenggaraan Pemilihan Umum Tahun 2024*. KPU Provinsi Lampung.
33. Konsorsium Instansi dan LSM Peduli Lingkungan. (2008). Nasionalisme Konservasi dan Investasi Hijau. *PROSIDING AGENDA 21 BALIKPAPAN Nasionalisme Konservasi dan Investasi Hijau*, 165.
34. Kustami, E., & Sulistiyono, E. (2023). Personalisasi Pemasaran Email dalam Meningkatkan Program Loyalitas: Sebuah Konsep Komunikasi Pemasaran. *Jurnal Ilmiah Manajemen, Ekonomi dan Bisnis*, 2(2), 74-87.
35. Labolo, M., & Ilham, T. (2015). *Partai Politik dan Sistem Pemilihan Umum di Indonesia*. Depok: Raja Grafindo Persada.
36. Latner, M. (2023). *How to Improve Voter Turnout and Build Power in Historically Marginalized Communities*. Union of Concerned Scientists.
37. 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 (ekonomi, sosial, budaya, dan hukum)*, 3(2), 14-28.
38. Lynch, F. (2008). Immigrants and the Politics of Aging Boomers: Renewed Reciprocity or 'Blade Runner' Society?. *Generations*, 32(4), 64-72.
39. Malian, M. (2016). Pengaruh Kualitas Pelayanan, Penanganan Komplain, Citra Dan Kepuasan Terhadap Bank Bri Unit Kebun Bunga Palembang. *Jurnal Bisnis Darmajaya*, 2(2), 52-61.
40. Maulida, K., Hertanto, H., Cahyadi, R., & Warganegara, A. (2022). Menakar Partisipasi Pemilih Pemula dalam Pemilihan Kepala Daerah di Masa Pandemi Covid-19. *Perspektif*, 11(1), 286-298.

41. McAllister, I. (2015). The personalization of politics in Australia. *Party politics*, 21(3), 337-345.
42. Miles, M. B., Huberman, M. A., & Saldana, J. (2014). *Qualitative Data Analysis*. USA: Sage Publications.
43. Mo, C. H., Holbein, J. B., & Elder, E. M. (2022). Civilian national service programs can powerfully increase youth voter turnout. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 119(29), e2122996119.
44. Mochtar, C. O. (2019). Factors Affecting Millennial Generation Voting Decision In The 2019 General Election In Surabaya. *POLITICO*, 19(2), 87-102.
45. Moleong, L. J. (2002). *Metodologi Penelitian Kualitatif*. Bandung: Remaja Rosdakarya.
46. Moraru, V. (2023). New media strategies: personalization of politics. *Moldoscopia*, 2(97), 137-44.
47. Munger, K. (2022). *Why the Baby Boomers Still Dominate American Politics and Culture*. New York Chichester, West Sussex: Columbia University Press.
48. Nadipa, S. P., & Afifah, S. (2024). Political Trust as a Predictor of Vote Buying Attitudes among New Voters. *Psikoborneo: Jurnal Ilmiah Psikologi*, 12(1), 124-128.
49. Noble, S. M., & Schewe, C. D. (2003). Cohort segmentation: An exploration of its validity. *Journal of business research*, 56(12), 979-987.
50. Noor, F. (2012). Evaluasi Kondisi Kepartaian 14 Tahun Reformasi Dalam Perspektif Pelembagaan Sistem Kepartaian. *Masyarakat Indonesia*, 38(2), 221-250.
51. Parry, E., & Urwin, P. (2011). Generational differences in work values: A review of theory and evidence. *International journal of management reviews*, 13(1), 79-96.
52. Perdana, K. (2019). Efektivitas Alat Peraga Kampanye Calon Anggota Legislatif: Studi Pendahuluan Pemasaran Politik Pada Generasi Milenial di Provinsi Lampung, Indonesia. *Jurnal Wacana Politik*, 4(1).
53. Putra, Y. S. (2017). Theoretical Review: Teori Perbedaan Generasi. *Among makarti*, 9(2), 123-34.
54. Putri, N. E. (2017). Dampak Literasi Politik Terhadap Partisipasi Pemilih Dalam Pemilu. *Jurnal Agregasi: Aksi Reformasi Government Dalam Demokrasi*, 5(1).
55. Rollán, V. O. D. (2018). Participación política de las personas mayores: Más allá de ir a votar. *Aposta. Revista de Ciencias Sociales*, (79), 164-180.
56. Rubenson, D., Blais, A., Fournier, P., Gidengil, E., & Nevitte, N. (2004). Accounting for the age gap in turnout. *Acta Politica*, 39, 407-421.
57. Sathyanarayana, S., & Mohanasundaram, T. (2024). Fit indices in structural equation modeling and confirmatory factor analysis: Reporting guidelines. *Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting*, 24(7), 561-577.
58. Sarofah, R. (2023). Pengaruh pendidikan politik Gen Z dan Millennial terhadap upaya mewujudkan Pemilu serentak tahun 2024 yang berintegritas. *Jurnal Ilmu Politik dan Pemerintahan*, 9(1).
59. Sturgis, P., & Jennings, W. (2020). Was there a 'Youthquake' in the 2017 general election?. *Electoral Studies*, 64, 102065.
60. Sukriono, D. (2009). Menggagas Sistem Pemilihan Umum di Indonesia. *Jurnal Konstitusi*, 2(1), 1-17.

61. Sutjipto, V. W., Putri, M. L., Sary, M. P., Putri, A. D., Wulandari, H., & Fauziyah, H. N. (2023). Pengaruh Kesadaran Berpolitik Terhadap Partisipasi Politik Kaum Millennial. *Al-KALAM: Jurnal Komunikasi, Bisnis dan Manajemen*, 10(2), 117-127.
62. Szabó, L. P. (2022). *It's nothing personal?—A linguistic account of the personalization of American political communication* (Doctoral dissertation, Budapesti Corvinus Egyetem).
63. Szabó, L. P. (2022). Personalization is in the details: A case study of political personalization in American politics. *Studia Linguistica Hungarica*, 34, 102-117.
64. Taghizadeh, J. L. (2016). Are Political Parties More Responsive to Advocacy Groups Mobilising Core Voters or Swing Voters? Political Responsiveness to Citizens' Protest Movements in Swedish Local Governments. *Scandinavian Political Studies*, 39(2), 161-184.
65. Tekingündüz, S., & Gün, M. (2024). Determination of Factors Affecting Loyalty through Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM). *Authorea Preprints*.
66. Towner, T. L., & Muñoz, C. L. (2018). Baby boom or bust? The new media effect on political participation. *Journal of Political Marketing*, 17(1), 32-61.
67. Twenge, J. M. (2000). The age of anxiety? The birth cohort change in anxiety and neuroticism, 1952–1993. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 79(6), 1007.
68. Ustaahmetoğlu, E., & Toklu, İ. T. (2023). Z ve X kuşağının bireyci ve kolektivist reklam mesajlarına yönelik tutum ve satın alma niyeti üzerine bir araştırma. *Hitit Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 16(1), 171-189.
69. Utari, U., Wulandari, Y., Colby, C., & Crespi, C. (2023). Political Participation of the Millennial Generation in General Elections: The Influence of Education, Social Media, and Economic Factors. *Jurnal Ilmu Pendidikan Dan Humaniora*, 12(3), 183-198.
70. Wauters, B., Bouteca, N., & De Vet, B. (2021). Personalization of parliamentary behaviour: Conceptualization and empirical evidence from Belgium (1995–2014). *Party Politics*, 27(2), 246-257.
71. Whalen, E. A., Bowen, J. T., & Baloglu, S. (2024). Comparison of generational loyalty models and loyalty programs for Millennial, Generation X, and Baby Boomer hotel customers. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Insights*, 7(4), 2328-2346.
72. Yusrin, Y., & Salpina, S. (2023). Partisipasi generasi millennial dalam mengawasi tahapan pemilu 2024. *Journal on Education*, 5(3), 9646-9653.