

The Alteration of Pekanbaru Public Opinion on Execution of Pekanbaru Election Commission's Task and Authority on Re-balloting of 2011 Pekanbaru Regional Leader Election

Adlin¹

¹⁾ Lecturer of Social and Political Science Faculty, Riau University

ABSTRACT

As the executor of Election and Regional Election in the independent region, Pekanbaru Regional Election Commission is required to optimally execute task and authority to increase the democracy quality in regional level. On the first round balloting of 2011 Pekanbaru Regional Leader Election, half of the citizen assess the Regional Election Commission (KPUD) of Pekanbaru take sides to one of the candidates, this stimulates the Constitutional Court (MK) decide to execute the Re-Balloting (PSU) to elect the 2011 Pekanbaru Mayor and Vice Mayor. Furthermore the execution of PSU by Pekanbaru KPUD, obtained protest from half of the Pekanbaru citizen. This research aims to know the alteration of public opinion towards Pekanbaru KPUD after the elected candidates defined by MK. This research uses the quantitative method with random sampling multistage technique toward 120 respondents in 6 districts of Pekanbaru town. Data is taken through enclosed questionnaire which further analysed and presented in the frequency table. Research findings show majority assess that Pekanbaru KPUD has worked well on the task and authority of PSU execution.

Keywords: *Public Assessment, Appropriate Work*

INTRODUCTION

On the election of 2011 Pekanbaru Mayor and Vice Mayor, there are several people who suspect that the Regional Election Commission (KPUD) of Pekanbaru is not neutral on doing the duty. One of the problem is the action of Pekanbaru KPUD about Firdaus as one of the Pekanbaru mayor candidate through SK No. 79/2011, while Firdaus is the winning candidate on the election of 2011 Pekanbaru mayor and vice mayor election. Dissatisfaction of several citizens toward the execution of Pekanbaru KPUD was seen on Monday, January 9th, 2012, as much as 500 of the society against the Pekanbaru KPU demonstrated to the Pekanbaru KPUD, codemned the bizzare action of Pekanbaru KPUD and they urged that election commission to revoke SK No, 79/2011 about the abolition Firdaus as the candidate ([http: riauterkini.com](http://riauterkini.com), accessed January 28th, 2013).

Besides the mass demonstration who protest against the Pekanbaru KPUD act, the protest also done by the winning team of the candidate Firdaus-Ayat. This winning team reports Pekanbaru KPUD to Riau local police (Polda) in relation with the act of Pekanbaru KPUD issued a decree (SK) no. 79 in 2011 about the abolition of H Firdaus as Pekanbaru Mayor Candidate, the accusation is unpleasant acts, lying and making a fake letter. (<http://sindikasi.inilah.com>, accessed January 28th,

470

Jointly Organised by

Fakultas Ilmu Sosial dan Ilmu Politik & Fakultas Perikanan dan Ilmu Kelautan
Universitas Riau, Indonesia
Institute of the Malay World and Civilisation (ATMA) The National University of Malaysia



2013). Then Firdaus-Ayat winning team also reports Pekanbaru chief election commissioner, T Rafizal, to Riau Election Commission (KPU) because assessed violates the code of ethics and not neutral (<http://sindikasi.inilah.com>, accessed January 28th, 2013).

Furthermore the constitutional court (MK) issued verdict about re-balloting (PSU) of Pekanbaru mayor and vice mayor election must be done, case no. 63/PHPU.D-IX/2011. In the case of the re-balloting, the society once again assess Pekanbaru KPUD is not neutral because still persist on the decision that Firdaus as one of the candidate is not eligible to participate in PSU. Therefore, public once again demand Pekanbaru KPUD to be more neutral. Among dozens of mass which dominated by mothers calling themselves Gerakan Soeara Rakyat (Geser) come to Pekanbaru KPUD office. Their coming to KPUD is to assert that KPUD in PSU must be professional, neutral and clean (<http://www.riautoday.com/konten/3036/psu-pekanbaru-21-desember-.html>, accessed January 28th, 2013).

As the executant of re-balloting, Pekanbaru KPUD is required to be neutral on executing the re-balloting which held on December 21st, 2011. This research aims to know the extent of Pekanbaru public opinion alteration toward the execution of task and authority of Pekanbaru KPUD, because the execution of PSU runs well without constraints.

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

One of the absolute requirements of implementation of democratic election is the independence and self-sufficient principle on the task execution. Rod Hague and Martin Harrop (2001), one of the mark of democratic election is the requirement of non-partisan attitude of the election commission. Then Gerken (2009) stated that the attitude of election commission that takes sides (partisan) to one of the election contestant indicates the election is less democratic. McMillan (2012) cited Pastor (1999) that stated that the election commission cannot be ignored on the democracy process, even though most of the task of election commission is technical, but the decision that made by them has wide implication and can damage the election legitimation. According to Jinadu (1997), ruling groups do not want the independent election commission because it can inhibit their effort to manipulate and maintain their power.

Election Commission in Indonesia is expected to be independent on executing the election. This is normatively regulated in Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia No. 22, 2007, about the execution of election, Clause 1, point 6, that mention Election Commission which further called KPU, is the executant of election that national, constant, and independent. However, in practice, some of the individual members of KPU have not been able to do their task as expected, this is proved on 1 year, there are 70 KPU and Bawaslu member that fired by the Election Honor Council (DKPP) (<http://www.pikiran-rakyat.com>, accessed August 2013).

471

Jointly Organised by

Fakultas Ilmu Sosial dan Ilmu Politik & Fakultas Perikanan dan Ilmu Kelautan
Universitas Riau, Indonesia
Institute of the Malay World and Civilisation (ATMA) The National University of Malaysia

There are few tasks that have to be done by the election commission in order to create democratic election. Referring to the election in United States, Jimmy Carter et. Al (2002) explained some of the important tasks that needed to be done by the election commission: 1) reducing the potential of charred vote; 2) fixing the voter registration process in the states; 3) giving and ease the access for voter to do the election process; 4) giving basic information that easy to understand by the public voter.

The task of election commission in Indonesia is regulated on Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia No, 22, 2007 about the execution of election, Clause 10, Point 3, mention that Task and Authority of district KPU on executing the election of Regional Leaders are:

- a. plan the programme, budget, and schedule of the election of district regional leaders;
- b. arrange and establish working procedures district KPU, PPK, PPS, and KPPS on Election of district regional leaders, in regard on province KPU guidelines;
- c. arrange and establish guidelines technically for every steps of the district regional leaders election based on regulation.
- d. establish PPK, PPS, and KPPS on Province leaders election and Regional leaders election based on the working area
- e. coordinate, execute, and control all the steps of the district regional leaders election based on the regulation in regard of the province KPU guidelines
- f. update the voter data based on the population and establish the voter data as voter list;
- g. receive the voter list from PPK on election of province regional leaders and deliver to province KPU
- h. assign the candidates of district regional leaders that have been qualified.
- i. assign and announce the balloting recapitulation result of district regional leaders election based on the balloting recapitulation from all PPK in district area by making official report of balloting and sertificate of the balloting result;
- j. making the official report of balloting and sertification of balloting and must submit it to election witness, district Panwaslu, and province KPU;
- k. publish the district KPU result to legitimize the regional leaders result and announce it;
- l. announce the elected candidates of the district regional leaders and make the official report;
- m. report the district regional leaders election result to KPU through province KPU;
- n. check complaints and/or report of the violation of the code ethics that is done by PPK, PPS, and KPPS;
- o. follow up immediately findings and report by district Panwaslu
- p. temporarily deactivate and/or impose administrative sanction to member of PPK, OOS, district KPU secretary, and district KPU secretariat personnel that are proved doing disturbing actions toward steps of election that is held based on the recommendation of district Panswaslu and regulation provision.
- q. execute socialition of the regional leaders election commission in relation to district KPU task to the public

- r. execute task and authority related to rovince regional leaders election based on regulation and KPU and/or province KPU guidelines;
- s. evaluate and make the report of the election of district regional leaders;
- t. deliver the distric regional leaders election result to province house of representatives, ministry of home affairs, regent/mayor and district house of representatives; and
- u. execute other task and authority given by KPU, province KPU, and/or regulation.

RESEARCH METHOD

This research is using the quantitative method taking respondent with random sampling multistage technique. From 12 sub-district in Pekanbaru, 1 sub-district is taken, 1 village is taken from each sub-district, and each village in 1 balloting place (TPS) and 20 respondent is taken from each TPS, so the total of this research respondents are 120 respondents. The data is taken with questionnaire that include enclosed questions to selected respondent. Then the collected data will be analysed through the research findings data frequence in the form of single tabulation.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

1. Public Assessment Generally Toward Pekanbaru KPUD Performance on Executing PSU

Pekanbaru KPUD performance on first round balloting gets a lot of criticism from the society because Pekanbaru KPUD decide to abort PAS candidate who got the most voting, with the excuse of that the candidate has made fake personal data. But the Constitutional Court (MK) ignore the Pekanbaru KPUD decision to abort PAS candidate and still decide to execute Re-balloting with the same candidate, PAS candidate (firadus-Ayat Cahyadi) against Berseri candidate (Septina-Erizal Muluk) After PSU that held again based on MK verdict, the public assessment of Pekanbaru KPUD performance on executing PSU can be described in Table 1.

Table 1. Performace of Pekanbaru KPUD on Executing PSU

Question	Answer			Total (Amount/%)
	Yes (Amount/%)	No (Amount/%)	Do Not Know (Amount/%)	
Does the performance of Pekanbaru KPUD on executing PSU already satisfactory?	77 (62,2)	10 (8,3)	33 (7,5)	120 (100)



The data on table 1 shows that public majority (62,2%) are very satisfied with the the Pekanbaru KPUD performance who successfully held PSU. This satisfaction is caused by the process of the execution with no constraints, and in the establishment of the result is well-suited with people's expectation. Pekanbaru KPUD neutrality on executing PSU gets appreciation from the citizen of Pekanbaru.

2. Public Assessment About Pekanbaru KPUD Arranging Budget, Programme and Schedule of PSU

Budget problem is the vital thing on executing the election event, including regional leaders election. Re-balloting, was delayed more than 3 months based on deadlines given by MK, because Pekanbaru KPUD finding difficulties on getting fund from Pekanbaru APBD, held by Mayor and Regional Secretariat at that time suspected taking sides on the losing candidate in the first round, candidate Septina-Erizal Muluk. The delay of the fund to Pekanbaru KPUD allegedly as an effort to slow the execution of PSU. This makes Pekanbaru KPUD as if being part of the effort to slow the execution of PSU on time. Table 2 describes public assessment about the performance of Pekanbaru KPUD in arranging PSU budget, programme, and schedule.

Table 2. Pekanbaru Arranging PSU Budget, Programme, and Schedule

Question	Answer			Total (Amount/%)
	Yes (Amount/%)	No (Amount/%)	Do Not Know (Amount/%)	
Does the performance of Pekanbaru KPUD arranging PSU budget, programme, and schedule is well?	61 (50,1)	23 (19,9)	36 (30)	120 (100)

Table 2 data shows that majority (50,1%) of Pekanbaru citizen consider Pekanbaru KPUD is well on arranging PSU budget, programme, and schedule. Most of the Pekanbaru citizen already know that the fund delay is not caused by Pekanbaru KPUD, but because of the government of Pekanbaru who at that time sabotage the fund and do not deliver the fund to Pekanbaru KPUD, in order to slow the execution of PSU. The excuse of the town government at that time was the financial of Pekanbaru town government in deficit situation, but that excuse is denied after ministry of home affairs, ministry of political and security affairs, and regional house of representatives (DPRD) urge the town government to disburse PSU fund, because basically that fund is already budgeted.



3. Public Assessment of Pekanbaru KPUD Performance on executing all the steps of PSU well and on time

With the fund availability of PSU, Pekanbaru KPUD starts the execution steps of PSU, Public assessment of Pekanbaru KPUD performance about it can be described on Table 3.

Table 3. Performance of Pekanbaru KPUD on executing all the steps of the PSU well and on time

Question	Answer			Total (Amount/%)
	Yes (Amount/%)	No (Amount/%)	Do Not Know (Amount/%)	
Does the performance of Pekanbaru KPUD on executing all the PSU steps is well?	61 (50,8)	12 (10,0)	4 (9,2)	120 (100)

The data on table 3, once again shows that majority (50,8%) of the citizen consider the Pekanbaru KPUD has executed all the PSU steps well and on time. Based on the interview with the chief of Pekanbaru KPUD, Tengku Rafizal AR, on June 2013:

“we are not surprised if Pekanbaru citizen are quite satisfied with our performance on executing all the PSU steps, because we obey the MK verdict and has worked optimally based on the regulation, the PSU constraint yesterday, is just the fund problem that are delayed to be disbursed”

That interview has appropriate with public assessment in which Pekanbaru KPUD has executed all the steps of PSU well and on time.

4. Public Assessment of Pekanbaru KPUD has formed election executant up to the level TPS

When MK decide to re-do the PSU for Pekanbaru town, then Pekanbaru KPUD once again do the self consolidation up to the level TPS based on the first round election. Public assessment of Pekanbaru KPUD performance about it can be described on Table 4.

Table 4. Performance of Pekanbaru KPUD has formed the executant of election up to the level TPS

Question	Answer			Total (Amount/%)
	Yes (Amount/%)	No (Amount/%)	Do Not Know (Amount/%)	
Does the performance of Pekanbaru KPUD has formed the executant of election up the level TPS well?	68 (56,7)	13 (10,8)	39 (32,5)	120 (100)

From the data on table 4, once again shows that majority (56,7%) of the citizen consider Pekanbaru KPUD has formed the executant of election up to the level TPS well. Chief of Pekanbaru KPUD, Tengku Rafizal AR, on June 2013 stated:

“When PSU is the verdict from MK, we move quickly to consolidate by using the existing source, contacting the people who work at the first round willing to work on PSU, in consideration that they already have adequate experience”

The interview shows that Pekanbaru KPUD is able to form PSU executant, because accurately using human resource whom they trained on the first round election. This turns out accelerate the formation of PSU executant who works quite well based on Pekanbaru public assessment.

5. Public assessment about the performance of Pekanbaru KPUD on treating the candidates

Eventhough according to most of the people, there is an impression of Pekanbaru KPUD taking sides on Berseri candidate on the first round, furthermore the public assessment toward Pekanbaru KPUD on treating the candidates fair and equal can be described on table 5.

Table 5. Performance of Pekanbaru KPUD on treating the candidates

Question	Answer			Total (Amount/%)
	Yes (Amount/%)	No (Amount/%)	Do Not Know (Amount/%)	
Does KPUD treat all the candidates fair and equal?	76 (63,3)	13 (10,8)	31 (25,9)	120 (100)

The data on table 5 also show that majority (63,3%) of the citizen consider that Pekanbaru KPUD has treated all the candidates fair and equal on the execution of PSU. The assessment is caused by the attitude of Pekanbaru KPUD that exerts neutral on PSU execution, as the chief of Pekanbaru KPUD, Tengku Rafizal AR, on June 2013 said:

“We are fully obey the regulations, we treat both candidates well, we are neutral and there is no problem between us and the candidates and their team. Problem that occurred before was just dissent and it is reasonable in democracy”

The interview shows that Pekanbaru KPUD has treated both candidates fair and equal, even on the first round there was a conflict between PAS winning team with Pekanbaru KPUD, but those does not make Pekanbaru KPUD differentiate the treatment to the candidates. This shows that Pekanbaru KPUD is trying to be professional on doing the task as the executant of election by trying to make PSU held fair and square.

6. Public Assessment of Pekanbaru KPUD on updating the PSU data voters

One of the verdict of MK is to order Pekanbaru KPUD fixing the shortage on Data Voters (DPT). Public assessment on the Pekanbaru KPUD attempt to fix DPT can be described on table 6.

Table 6. Pekanbaru KPUD performance on updating the PSU Data Voters

Question	Answer			Total (Amount/%)
	Yes (Amount/%)	No (Amount/%)	Do Not Know (Amount/%)	
Does Pekanbaru KPUD has updated PSU Data Voters well?	55 (45,8)	19 (15,8)	48 (38,3)	120 (100)

The data on table 6, also shows that most of the respondents (45,5%) of the society consider that Pekanbaru KPUD has updated DPT data well. Pekanbaru KPUD has fixed DPT as ordered by Berseri candidate. Pekanbaru candidate has cooperated with Pekanbaru civil service on fixing the DPT problem. However, there is also 38,3% respondents that said do not know about the DPT fixing, this is caused by the mass media information of KPUD role on fixing DPT did not reach respondents, so that the respondents said do not know about it.

7. Public Assessment of Pekanbaru KPUD performance to assign PSU winning candidate

The provision of PSU winner is the most important part of all the Pekanbaru KPUD tasks. On the first round, KPUD assigned the provision that confused the public by winning the PAS candidate and in the same provision, abort the candidate

caused by faking the personal data. Furthermore, how is the public assessment on Pekanbaru KPUD's performance to assign PSU winning candidate can be described on Table 7

Table 7. Performance of Pekanbaru KPUD to assign PSU winning candidate

Question	Answer			Total (Amount/%)
	Yes (Amount/%)	No (Amount/%)	Do Not Know (Amount/%)	
Does the Pekanbaru KPUD has assigned well of the PSU winning candidate?	70 (58,3)	11 (9,2)	39 (32,5)	120 (100)

Table 7 shows that majority (58,3%) of respondents consider Pekanbaru KPUD has assigned the PSU winning candidate as it should. This means public assess the provision of PAS candidate as the elected candidate of Pekanbaru KPUD has been appropriate and based on the fact of that candidate got more votes than Berseri candidate.

CONCLUSION

Public opinion alter from considering Pekanbaru KPUD taking sides on one of the candidate to Pekanbaru KPUD has executed the task and authority well on execution of PSU. Including on the task of planning PSU programme, budget, and schedule; arranging steps of PSU execution; forming PPK, PPS, and KPPS; updating data voters based on the population and assign the data voters as list of voters; assign the qualified district regional leader candidates; follow up immediately findings and reports from district Panwaslu.

REFERENCES

- Alistair McMillan. *The Election Commission of India and The Regulation and Administration of Electoral Politics*. Election Law Journal, Vol. 11, Number 2, 2012.
- Carter, Jimmy et al. *To Assure Pride and Confidence in the Electoral Process: Report of the National Commission on Federal Election Reform*. Washington, D.C. Brookings Institution Press, 2002.
- Gerken, Heater K, *The Democracy Index : Why Our Election Is Failing And How To Fix It*. New Jersey : Princeton University Press, 2009.
- Hague, Rod & Harrop Martin. *Comparative Government & Politics : An Introduction : 5. Ed*, Hampshire : Palgrave, 2001.
- L. Adele Jinadu. *Matters Arising : African Elections and The Problem Electoral of Administration*. African Journal Political Sciences, 1997, Vol. 2, No.1
- Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia Nomor 22 Tahun 2007 Tentang Penyelenggara Pemilihan Umum.