

**UUMILC 2017**  
**9<sup>TH</sup> UUM INTERNATIONAL LEGAL CONFERENCE**

**VOTER PARTICIPATION AND DELIBERATIVE CAMPAIGN IN  
THE ELECTION OF REGIONAL HEAD**

Rahmat Muhajir Nugroho (a)\*

\*Corresponding author

(a) Faculty of Law, Universitas Ahmad Dahlan, Yogyakarta, Indonesia. rahmat.nugroho@law.uad.ac.id

***Abstract***

This research aimed at evaluating the first election period in 2015 in three different regions in Daerah Istimewa Yogyakarta; Bantul, Sleman and Gunung Kidul. The analysis focused on the participation of people whether the participation is higher or lesser than the previous election. Secondly, this research also aimed at knowing the factors that caused low participation in election. Thirdly, it also aimed at resulting an innovation and development to run an election that could increase participation in election. This research belongs to sociological law or empirical research. It focuses on the effectiveness of a law in society. The data were collected by two different means: literature and field studies. Literature study was used to find and analyze written sources, such as books, laws, and other researches relevant to this research. Field study was conducted through interview with different parties who are competent in this field. They were commissioner of election commission in Sleman, Bantul, and Gunungkidul. The result suggested that participation in local election in Sleman and Bantul increased while in Gunung Kidul decreased to about one percent. It proved that the regulation of election commission Number 7 of 2015 is effective in increasing the number of people who attend the election in those three regions.

© 2018 Published by Future Academy [www.FutureAcademy.org.UK](http://www.FutureAcademy.org.UK)

**Keywords:** Voter Participation, Deliberative Campaign, Election, Regional Head.



## 1. Introduction

“The state of Indonesia shall be a state based on the rule of law”. The sentence is manifested in article 1 section (3) of 1945 Constitution. At first, the term “rule of law” was listed in the explanatory section of the 1945 Constitution. However, after the third amendment of the 1945 Constitution in 2001, the concept of a “*rechtsstaat*” was abolished, along with all parts of the explanation of the 1945 Constitution, which was then added into the body of the Constitution (section of the articles). The sentence contained in Article 1 section (3) of the 1945 Constitution after the amendment is a neutral sentence, i.e. without mentioning “*rechtsstaat*” or “the rule of law” which is known as the concept of the state of law on the Continental European and Anglo Saxon Legal system.

The characteristics of the rule of law are, among other things, the constitutional protection of human rights and free elections. These were granted under International Commission of Jurists. Its Conference in Bangkok in 1965 formulated the basic requirements for the implementation of democratic governance under the rule of law, which are as follow: (Budiarjo, 1989):

1. Constitutional protection, in the sense that the constitution, apart from guaranteeing the rights of individuals, must also determine the procedural means of securing the protection of guaranteed rights.
2. Independent and impartial Judicial Body.
3. Free elections.
4. Freedom to express opinions.
5. Freedom to associate/organize and oppose.
6. Civic education.

General Election is one of the characteristics of the State of Law. It is a means of the practice of people sovereignty, which is used as a mechanism for the peaceful replacement of powers in a democratic country. According to Askuri, regularly general election is people's direct control and political evaluation tools towards the state both in the past or in the future (Askuri, 2007).

In Indonesia, general election is regulated under Article 22E section (2) of the 1945 Constitution, which stated, “General elections shall be conducted to elect the members of the House of Representatives (*Dewan Perwakilan Rakyat (DPR)*), Local House of Representatives (*Dewan Perwakilan Daerah (DPD)*), the President and Vice-President, and the Regional People's Representative Council (*Dewan Perwakilan Rakyat Daerah or DPRD*).” General election in Indonesia is the rights guaranteed by the Constitution. Article 28D section (3) states that “Every citizen shall have the right to obtain equal opportunities in government” and Article 28E section (3) which mentions “Every person shall have the right to the freedom to associate, to assemble and to express opinions.” General election is a right, so the exercise of the right to vote cannot be forced.

In addition to the general election, the mechanism of filling public office, especially head of region is regulated in Article 18 section (4) of the 1945 Constitution, “Governors, Regents (*bupati*) and Mayors (*walikota*), respectively as head of regional government of the provinces, regencies and municipalities, shall be elected democratically.” Election of Regional Head held since 2005 until 2017, with various problems and dynamics come along.

## 2. Problem Statement

In general, the implementation of the simultaneously election of regional heads on December 9, 2015 had been done well and safely. Although in some places there was a bit of a riot, but it did not affect the national regional head election schedule. Nevertheless, there was one issue highlighted in this first wave of regional head elections, the low rate of voter participation, and it occurred in almost all regions in Indonesia that did not reach the target of 77% participation rate as proclaimed by the General Election Commission (KPU).

In Pacitan, East Java, the number of voter is about 60% of the total permanent voters list (Daftar Pemilih Tetap (DPT)) of 467,890 people. In Ponorogo, voter participation also reached 70% of 766,129 voters. In Malang, PDIP's version of the neutral voters was 41, 22% or the participation rate was 58.78%. In Mojokerto, the participation rate of voters reached 555,557 persons or 68.7% of the total number of voter lists of 808,207 people. In Gresik, the voter participation rate, according to the calculation of Husnul Khuluq-Achmad Rubaie's team, was 68.1% of the total voters of 922,415 people. Similar condition also happened in Surabaya.

Voter participation rate in Medan was very low as it below 50 percent. Local Government of Medan even predicted only in the range of 24 percent. This number was the monitoring results at several polling stations (TPS). Commissioner of Medan General Election Commission (Komisi Pemilihan Umum (KPU)), The Division of Operation Techniques, Pandapotan Tamba claimed that voter participation reached 30-50 percent. He was wistful for the low participation rate of elections in Medan 2015.

Similarly, the election of Head of Region in Special Region of Yogyakarta i.e. in Bantul, Sleman, and Gunung Kidul also experienced the same thing with participation rate about 70%, meaning that it was still under the target of 77,5% determined by central KPU. According to the Chairman of KPU DIY, Hamdan Kurniawan, although the target of participation was not reached but he remained grateful because the election run well. He also admitted high participation. From the monitoring results, it might not achieve the target, but they were grateful participation is still above 70% (jogja tribunews, 2015).

This low level of participation was probably caused by several factors. Among others are the number of campaign tools/minor socialization, lack of interesting figures to be elected by the society, and the rampant corruption cases that involve the heads of the region causing negative stigma in the community against candidates of leaders in the region or district.

Prof. Dr. Jimly Asshidiqie, Chairman of the Honorary Council of Election Organizing (Dewan Kehormatan Penyelenggara Pemilu (DKPP)), said that the elections were less vibrant, making the community less enthusiastic. In this election, candidates and their teams were prohibited to install campaign props by the KPU. Currently, the campaign is funded by the state sourced from National Budget Revenues and Local Budget Revenues, whereas these budgets are deficient so the cost for banners are also deficit. The second factor is the lack of society participation was inseparable from many cases involving the heads of the regions, because many problems and many of them are imprisoned, corruption and may also be about Freeport shares. (nasional republika, 2015).

Dodi Ambardi, Director of the Survey Institute, suspected that there is something to do with the alteration of campaign mode. Campaign was partially managed by the KPU so there was no competition

for media control, spending a lot on billboards, posters, and so on. Therefore, according to Dodi, the electoral election 2015 was lower than the previous election. (bbc, 2015).

One of the factors contributing to the decrease of society participation in elections was the enactment of KPU regulations that limit the candidates to create and install campaign in a certain amount. KPU Regulation Number 7 Year 2015 on the Campaign of Election of Governor and Vice-Governor, Regent and Vice-Regent of Region, and/or Mayor and Vice-Mayor, Article 5 section (2), states that Campaign executed by Provincial KPU/Independence Commission of Election (Komisi Independen Pemilihan (KIP)) Aceh or KPU/KIP in the Region, as referred to in section (1) letter a, shall be carried out by the means of: a. public debate or open debate between the candidates; b. dissemination of campaign materials to the public; c. installation of the campaign props; and/or d. advertising in printed mass media and/or electronic mass media. Under these provisions, 4 types of campaigns including installation campaign props were conducted by KPU not by candidates.

Candidates may only conduct campaigns in 3 types: limited meetings, face-to-face meetings, and dialogue and other activities. It has been set forth in Article 5 paragraph (3) of KPU Regulation Number 7 Year 2015:

*"the campaigns conducted by the Candidates and/or Campaign Team as referred to in section (1) letter b shall be executed by the following methods: a. limited meetings; b. face-to-face meetings, and dialogue; and/or c. other activities that do not violate the prohibition of the campaign and the provisions of legislation".*

The arrangement is actually quite good. The installation of campaign props in the form of billboards, banners, etc. can be done in an orderly and neat manner so that it does not damage public facilities and become an uncomfortably sight of visual waste and destroys the beauty of the city. However, on the other hand, the lack of campaign props/publications of candidates is assumed to decrease public participation in the elections, since the information obtained by society about the candidates who compete is minimum. However, it is uncertain whether there is another factor causing the reluctance of the public participation in the election of regional heads. It is interesting to examine the root of the problem and sought an alternative solution to overcome it.

When KPU limited candidates to campaign through props and posters, KPU should provide more space to candidates to meet face-to-face with the community. KPU can hold more dialogue between candidates and the society as potential voters. This dialogue is called deliberative campaign. This deliberative campaign model enables candidates to meet face-to-face with the society to explain their vision, mission, and to convey their ideas for the change and improvement of the region. According to Bilal (Dewansyah, 2014), this campaign model can also be a powerful mechanism to convince non-partisan voters who have only been the object of a largely one-way campaign, without being able to question the vision and mission of the candidates for regional head in substantive dialogue. Such a campaign model is hoped to increase rational participation rather than mass mobilization. Related to that matter, hence the researcher is interested to do research with topic of the Participation of the Voters and Deliberative Campaign Model in General Election of Head of Region in Special Region of Yogyakarta.

### **3. Research Questions**

Based on the explanation, the research questions of this research are:

- a. How does the voter participation rate in the election of regional heads in the Special Region of Yogyakarta in 2015?
- b. What factors affect the level of society participation in the election of regional heads in the Special Region of Yogyakarta in 2015?
- c. How does the applicable model of deliberative campaign foreseeable to increase voter participation in local elections?

### **4. Purpose of the Study**

The purposes of this study are:

- a. To know voter participation rate in the election of regional head in Special Region of Yogyakarta in 2015.
- b. To know the factors that influence the level of community participation in the election of regional heads in the Special Region of Yogyakarta in 2015.
- c. To know the applicable model of deliberative campaign foreseeable to increase voter participation in regional head election.

### **5. Research Methods**

This research belonged to sociologic law or empirical research. It focused on the effectiveness of a law in society. The data were collected by two different means; literature and field studies. Literature study was used to find and analyse written sources such as books, laws, and other researches that have relevance to this research. Field study was conducted with interview with different parties who are competent in this field. They were commissioner of election commission in Sleman, Bantul, and Gunungkidul.

### **6. Findings**

General election is the method in modern government systems for peaceful transfers or circulation of power. The transition of power is done by a civilized mechanism and does not resort to coercive or violent means, such as war or coup d'état. Joko J. Prihatmoko, quoting Aurel Croissant, points out three basic functions of the general election. First, the function of representativeness. Second, the function of integration, namely the function of the creation admission of one political party to other political parties and society to political parties. Third, the majority function is large enough to ensure the stability of government and its ability to govern (Yusuf, 2010).

Axel Hadenis (Astuti, 2010) said that an election including the direct election of regional heads is called democratic if it has "meaning". The term "meaningful" refers to three criteria, namely: (1) openness, (2) accuracy, and (3) the effectiveness of the election. All three criteria must appear not only at the time of voting, but also during campaigns and vote counting. In relation to the effectiveness of the election, according to Nazriyah (2008), the effectiveness principle of direct election is violated if access

to the central position of power is regulated in partially or completely not governed by elections, but merely on appointment.

The idea of the election simultaneously arose, along with the issuance of Constitutional Court Decision Number 14/PUU-XI/2013 on the judicial review of the Act Number 42 Year 2008 regarding the Election of President and Vice President towards the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia although the decision is applicable in 2019 (Rohim, 2014). This means that the provisions of the Law Number 42 Year 2008 on the election of President and Vice President, which states that the election of President and Vice President is held after the general election to elect members of the DPR, DPD and DPRD, is contrary to the constitution. Therefore, 2019 General Election must be held simultaneously or in conjunction with the election to elect members of DPR, DPD and DPRD (Rohim, 2014).

With the decision of the Constitutional Court, it is necessary to develop the idea of organizing the election simultaneously, in order to achieve the objective of the process of effective and efficient elections, both from the political and economic side (Rohim, 2014). One of the positive implications of the implementation that obtained from the implementation of ideas of elections simultaneously is the existence of budget efficiency and cost savings. This means that holding the election simultaneously saves money, since the costs should be incurred twice (the first budget to finance the regent/mayor's election and the second budget to finance the Governor's election) can be merged for one election only. The issue of cost is not only charged to the Provincial Budget Revenues only, but also to the Regional Budget Revenues (Rohim, 2014).

## **6.1.The voter participation rate in the election of regional heads in the Special Region of Yogyakarta in 2015**

### **6.1.1. The Voter Participation Rate in Sleman District**

Simultaneous Election of Regional Head in the Special Region of Yogyakarta, Indonesia, namely Bantul, Sleman, and Gunungkidul ran well. The implementation of this 2015 election in Sleman Regency run well and met no no obstacles. This was proven by the absence of lawsuits against the implementation of local elections in Sleman Regency, from the registration of candidates to the implementation of the voting, including the campaigns that have new rules about campaign funding by KPU sourced from Regional Income and Expenditure (Yulianto, 2016).

The difference between the 2015 election with the previous election is about its rules of implementation. The rules for the implementation of the elections in 2015 were very virtuous, from beginning of preparation phase until the implementation phases. All were set up completely. The society participation rate in 2015 increased even though only 1 (one) percent. In 2010 election, the participation rate was 70.67%. (Yulianto, 2016).

There are 2 (two) pairs of candidates in 2015 Election of Regional Head in *Sleman* Regency namely *Sri Purnomo-Sri Muslimatun* and *Yuni Satia Rahayu-Danang Wicaksono Sulistyono*. The election results of the Regent and Vice Regent in *Sleman* 2015 are as follow:

**Table 01.** Recapitulation of Vote Counts in the Election of the Regent and Vice-Regent of Sleman in 2015

No.	Pairs of Candidates	Votes
1.	Dr.Hj. YuniSatiaRahayu, SS., M.Hum. danDanangWicaksanaSulistya, ST.	227.633
2.	Drs. H. Sri Purnomo, M.Si. dan Dra. Hj. Sri Muslimatun, M. Kes.	297.267
	Total of valid votes	524.900
	Total of invalid votes	38.189
	Total of valid and invalid votes	563.089

(Source: KPU of Sleman Regency, 2016)

The voter participation rate in the election of Regent and Vice-Regent of Sleman in 2015 can be seen in the following table.

**Table 02.** The Voter Participation Rate in Sleman Regency at the Election of Regent and Vice-Regent of Sleman in 2015

No.	Voters	Amount	Percentage
1.	Registered voters	779.588	72,22%
2.	Voters using the right to vote	563.089	

(Source: KPU of Sleman Regency, 2016)

Sleman Regency has the highest number of voters compared to voters in two other districts, *Bantul* and *Gunungkidul*. In terms of participation, KPU targets a participation rate of 77.5%. The data in the above table concluded that the level of voter participation in the election of Regent and Vice-Regent in *Sleman* in 2015 reached 72.22%. Despite an increase of 1.55% from 2010 (70.67%), the level of participation did not match the expectations of the central *KPU* targeting a participation rate of 77.5%.

*KPU* of *Sleman* Regency had made various efforts to increase the participation of the voters, among others by doing the following activities: the program is a political literacy education and *KPU* goes to campus/school. In addition, *KPU* of *Sleman* Regency has conducted campaign facilitation toward candidates as mandated by *KPU* Regulation Number 7 Year 2015. There are 4 (four) kinds of campaign facilitation conducted by *KPU Kabupten Sleman* based on PKPU No. 7 of 2015: first, public debate conducted three times; second, campaign material dissemination; third, installation of campaign props consisting of billboards and banners, exclude street banner due to its ineffective use (Yulianto, 2016).

The upcoming system improvement and simultaneous electoral mechanisms are suggested to improve the integrity of *KPU* commissioners, then strengthening the institution itself. With the improvement of integrity and institutional strengthening, the implementation of the next election will run better (Yulianto, 2016).

### 6.1.2. The Voter Participation Rate in Bantul District.

The implementation of simultaneous election in *Bantul* Regency in 2015 ran well. Although *KPU* of *Bantul* Regency faced some obstacles, they can solve them. The prominent difference between 2015 elections and the previous election was the regulation, especially the campaign regulation that was partially facilitated by *KPU* (Syachrudin, 2016).

The election of the Regional Head of 2015 was participated by two pairs of candidates namely *Suharsono-Abdul HalimMuslih* and *Sri Surya Widati-MisbakhulMunir*.

**Table 03.** Recapitulation of Vote Counts Selection of Regent and Vice-Regent of Bantul in 2015

No.	Pairs of Candidates	Voters
1.	Suharsono-Abdul HalimMuslih	261.412
2.	Sri Surya Widati-MisbakhulMunir	233.677
	Total of valid votes	495.089
	Total of invalid votes	28.728
	Total of valid and invalid votes	523.817

(Source: KPU of Bantul Regency, 2016)

**Table 04.** The voter participation rate in Bantul Regency At the Election of Regent and Vice-Regent of Bantul in 2015

No.	Voters	Amount	Percentage
1.	Registered voters	695.855	75,28%
2.	Voters using the right to vote	523.817	

(Source: KPU of Bantul Regency, 2016)

The table above shows the number of voters in *Bantul* Regency is lower, compared to the number of voters in *Sleman* Regency. However, the voter participation rate in *Bantul* Regency is higher than that of *Sleman* which is 75.28%. However, the participation rate has not been able to achieve the target set by the Central KPU of 77.5%. The level of society participation in 2015 direct elections increased by 1.59% compared to previous election (73.69%), although the increase was not significant (Syachrudin, 2016).

The increase of participation is resulted from efforts of the *KPU Bantul* to increase society participation by conducting various activities. Among others are to intensively socialize the community, conduct various socialization to attract voters and to draw a map related to the participation rate (Syachrudin, 2016). Furthermore, according to Syachrudin, in order to establish a better upcoming general election, it required various improvements: improvements to the existing listed voters, effective budget use, and improvement of regulation (Syachrudin, 2016).

### 6.1.3. The voter participation rate in *Gunung Kidul* Regency.

Normatively, the implementation of elections in 2015 in *Gunung Kidul* Regency had run well and there are no serious obstacles. In *Gunung Kidul* district there are 4 pairs of candidates for Regent carried by political parties and independent candidates, compared to *Sleman* Regency and *Bantul* Regency, *Gunung Kidul* Regency is very complete as the candidates were from individual/independent party.

The prominent difference between the elections in 2015 and the previous election was on its implementation which partially facilitated by *KPU* funded from the Local Income and Expenditures. The society participation rate in 2015 election in *Gunungkidul* Regency decreased. Compared to the previous years, the implementation of elections in 2015 was the lowest level of participation.

The results of the election of Regent and Vice-Regent of *Gunung Kidul* in 2015 are as follow:



**Table 05.** Recapitulation of Vote Counts Selection of Regent and Vice-Regent of Gunung Kidul in 2015

No.	The pairs of candidates	Voters
1.	Hj. Badingah, S.SosdanDr. Drs ImawanWahyudi, MH	167.915
2.	Benyamin Sudarmadidan Haji Mustangid	98.379
3.	H. DjangkungSudjarwadi, SH, LL.M dan Endah Subekti Kuntariningsih, SE	104.440
4.	H. Subardi, BA, TS danDr. Ir. H. WahyuPurwanto, MSIE	54.076
	Total of valid votes	424.810
	Total of invalid votes	9.668
	Total of valid and invalid votes	434.478

(Source : KPU Kabupaten Gunung Kidul, 2016)

**Table 06.** The voter participation rate in Gunungkidul Regency at the Election of Regent and Vice-Regent of Gunung Kidul in 2015

No.	Voters	Amount	Percentage
1.	Registered voters	619.825	70,10%
2.	Voters using the right to vote	434.478	

(Source : KPU Kabupaten Gunung Kidul, 2016)

The number of voters in *Gunung Kidul* Regency is the lowest compared to *Sleman* and *Bantul* districts. Similarly, the voter participation rate is also the lowest among the 2 other districts, which is 70.10%, decreasing compared to 2010 election (71.87%) of 1.77%. This is very far from the target of the Central *KPU* which requires a voter turnout of 77.5%. Factors affecting voter participation rate will be explained on the next section.

In general, the implementation of simultaneous elections in 3 districts in the Special Region of Yogyakarta ran smoothly. However, the voter participation rate in the elections in 2015 did not reach the target as expected by the Central *KPU*. Different from *Sleman* and *Bantul* where the voter participation rate increased, the voter participation rate in *Gunungkidul* decreased.

The whole process of vote counting is done by officers who have been trained and sworn, so that they can work professionally and with integrity. In addition, there is an electoral supervisory body assigned to oversee the entire electoral process including the vote count at the polls, to ensure that the vote counting process is not fraudulent and in accordance with the procedures and regulations.

## **6.2.Factors that affect the level of society participation in the election of regional heads in the Special Region of Yogyakarta in 2015.**

According to Imanda Yulianto, the voter participation rate in *Sleman* Regency indeed increased compare to the previous year or period. Factors influencing the rise of the rate are the figure of candidates, campaign process, socialization conducted by *KPU* of *Sleman* Regency, and the level of political education of society in *Sleman* regency (Yulianto, 2016).

There is an opinion that the declining voter participation rate are caused by *KPU* Regulation Number 7 Year 2015 on the Campaign, which regulates the facilitation of some campaign models by *KPU*, thereby reducing public participation in campaigning. In fact, this opinion is incorrect proven by the increase of public participation rate in the election of regional heads, especially in *Sleman* Regency in

2015. The regulation is considerably more effective because the candidates can shift the campaign props budget to the dialogues with society (Yulianto, 2016).

Similarly, in *Bantul*, public participation rate increased even though it did not reach the target set by the Central *KPU*. Factors affecting the rise of the rate are (Syachrudin, 2016): the socialization conducted by *KPU* of *Bantul* and the campaign facilitated by *KPU* as well as on-facilitated campaign.

The simultaneous election campaign mechanism is set forth in Regulation of Commission Number 7 Year 2015. The *KPU* of *Bantul* District facilitated the campaign in several forms. First, public debate among candidates which is broadcasted by *Jogja* TV and repeatedly by TVRI. Second, the distribution of campaign props i.e. pamphlets which were not resulted from the coordination between *KPU* and candidates. The installation of campaign props is handed over to the third parties, and if any damage became the responsibility of the third parties. However, the cost incurred for repair only 10% and the rest shall be granted by *KPU*. Installation is delayed by a narrow time. Advertising in print and electronic mass media were also implemented but the design was delayed.

Similar to the opinion of *Sleman*, *KPU* Commissioners, Syachrudin, the member of *Bantul KPU* denied the statement saying that the decreasing public participation rate in the elections was the enactment of Regulation of Commission Number 7 Year 2015 which limits the candidates create and install campaign props denied by Syachrudin *Bantul KPU* member. According to him the opinion was not true and has no basis because practically simultaneously elections in 2015 have increased. (Syachrudin, 2016).

The condition in *Gunungkidul* Regency is different from *Sleman* and *Bantul*. Public participation rate decreased compared to the previous election. Factors contributing to the decline of the rate are:

- 1) Many people who migrated out of town are listed as registered voters;
- 2) The weather in *Gunungkidul* regency (when the election established it was raining then many people went to their farms and forgot the election);
- 3) many elderly people in *Gunung Kidul* Regency;
- 4) many disabled who did not perform their right to vote (Ikhsan, 2016).

According to *Zaenuri*, Regulation of Commission Number 7 Year 2015 might be one of the factors declining the public participation rate. Society might less aware of how the vision and mission of the candidates for regional head was. (Ikhsan, 2016).

### **6.3.A model of applicable deliberative campaigns that foreseeable to increase voter participation in simultaneous regional head elections in the second wave of elections**

The terminology of “deliberative” theoretically arises from the term deliberative democracy. Deliberative democracy is a form of government in which free and equal citizens justify the decision-making process whereby they provide other reciprocal reasons acceptable and accessible with the aim of reaching current binding conclusions to every citizen but open to future sued (Dewansyah, 2014).

Within the context of representative democracy, deliberation still occurs, but often only between state organizers in taking a political decision, forming legislation or public policy in general. Even if the public is involved, the degree of involvement is only as a participant, or just an additional to the hearing (Dewansyah, 2014). The idea of deliberative democracy really wants to open up the broadest possible

space for people to be directly involved in important decision-making in a country or region. According to Graeme Orr, (Dewansyah, 2014) "deliberative theory of democracy is the integration of deliberation as an ideal discussion and participative equality".

The practice of deliberative democracy at the time or in the election process is very rare, especially at the local level and has never been a formal mechanism especially in the campaign. In Indonesia, the practice of deliberative democracy is widened in the election period, first applied in the Constituent Forum program in the election of Regent and Vice-Regent of Bandung in 2010. But the two deliberative democratic practices were not official mechanism in the election (Dewansyah, 2014).

The idea of applying deliberative democracy as an official mechanism in the election process was once conceived by Ackerman and Fishkin through the idea of "Deliberation Day" imagined as a new national holiday in the context of elections in the United States in which registered voters conducted deliberations, one Week before the ballot (Dewansyah, 2014). In order to establish attractive simultaneous local elections in Indonesia, it would be interesting to apply a campaign model that would bring the candidate closer to the constituents. Thus, people can test their vision, mission, as well as assessing the commitment of each candidates when they were elected.

The idea of a deliberative campaign, according to *Sleman KPU* member Imanda Yulianto, strongly agrees with a deliberative campaign or a dialogical campaign between candidate and society. This campaign model is considered a very effective campaign motive because the community can directly ask questions to candidates. However, Imanda does not agree if the deliberative campaign is regulated in *KPU* regulations because it is the right of the candidate. Therefore, if regulated under the regulation of *KPU*, the candidates did not have the flexibility in campaigning. According to Imanda, the campaign process was handed back to the candidates, but the implementation was supervised or regulated by *KPU* (Yulianto, 2016).

In regards with the idea of a deliberative campaign, Syachrudin, *KPU* Commissioner of *Bantul*, strongly agreed and it should be developed because this deliberative campaign is regarded as the most effective campaign. It can be effective in increasing the level of public participation. Yet, Syachrudin does not agree that deliberative campaign is regulated and facilitated by *KPU*, because the costs incurred will increase and burden the Local Income and Expenditure. He thinks deliberative campaigns shall be handed to each candidate.

The idea of deliberative campaign is deemed to be an effective campaign as an effort by the candidates to invite voters to vote for them. Deliberative campaigns might be an effective campaign model to increase the public participation rate, not only because of deliberative campaigns but also reinforced by other processes. As the election commissioner, *KPU Gunungkidul* can only implement what has been determined by the government. As citizens, we agree if it aims to increase voter participation (Ikhsan, 2016). But we disagree if deliberative campaigns are facilitated by the *KPU* as it will increase the burden of Local budget. Thus, deliberative campaign is the right of the candidates. *KPU* shall not limit it. If all the campaign process is facilitated, it will limit the candidates to meet face-to-face with society (Ikhsan, 2016).

Thus, all commissioners agreed to the application of deliberative campaign, but respondents disagreed if the deliberative campaign was facilitated by *KPU*, as it would burden the local budget and

limit the campaign of the candidates. Three commissioners essentially agree with the application of deliberative campaign model, by means of mechanisms and supervision are arranged by KPU, but the establishment shall be submitted to candidates.

## 7. Conclusion

### a. The voter participation rate in the election of regional heads in the Special Region of Yogyakarta in 2015

The public participation rate in the election of regional heads in *Sleman* and *Bantul* regency increased compared to the previous period of elections. This proves that KPU Regulation Number 7 of 2015, which regulates campaign facilitation to candidates, is effective in encouraging the rise of public participation in both districts.

### b. Factors that affect the society participation rate in the election of regional heads in the Special Region of Yogyakarta in 2015.

#### 1. In *Sleman* and *Bantul* Regency.

*Factors leading to the rise of rate:*

- a. The socialization carried out by KPU of *Bantul* and *Sleman* Regency is done massively through various media so as to provide sufficient understanding for the prospective voters to make choices on the day of voting;
- b. The facilitation of campaigns conducted by the KPU of *Bantul* and *Sleman* Regency is quite effective in providing information about the candidates to the community so that the voters are willing to vote in the voting place.
- c. The level of education in both districts also contributes to increased participation.
- d. The figures of clean candidates figure and there are candidates who challenge incumbent candidate which make election to be more competitive and attractive to the voters.

#### 2. In *Gunung Kidul* Regency

*Factors causing the decreasing participation rate:*

- a. Many people who migrate out of town were listed in the registered voters;
- b. The weather in *Gunung Kidul* regency (during the election was raining then many people went to their farms and forgot the election);
- c. Many elderly people in *Gunung Kidul* Regency;
- d. Many disabled people who do not execute their rights to vote.

### c. An applicable model of deliberative campaigns that foreseeable to increase voter participation in simultaneously regional head elections.

1. Concerning the discourse on the implementation of deliberative campaigns in the future election, three commissioners agreed to apply it because it increasingly gives a good impact for rising public participation. The model of a deliberative campaign or a dialogical campaign in the community will bring the candidates closer to the voters, so

that people can directly assess the quality of each candidates as well as the means of recording campaign promises if they are elected;

2. Three commissioners did not agree if deliberative campaign shall be under facilitation of KPU on the grounds: it did not give the candidates the ability to directly dialogue to the people and increase the cost of establishing the election so would burden more the local budget.

## References

- Askuri. (2007). *Panduan pendidikan pemilih, mengantarkan pemilih cerdas*. Yogyakarta: Komisi Pemilihan Umum Propinsi Daerah Istimewa Yogyakarta.
- Astuti, R.Y. (2010). *Calon perseorangan dan problematikanya pasca pemberlakuan Undang-Undang Nomor 12 tahun 2008*. Jurnal Konstitusi, Volume III, No. 1, 59.
- Budiarjo, M. (1989). *Dasar-dasar ilmu politik*. Jakarta: PT Gramedia.
- Dewansyah, B. (2014). Model kampanye deliberatif dalam desain pilkada serentak. In C. S. Khairul Fahmi, *Pemilihan Umum Serentak* (p. 466; 467; 469). Jakarta: PT Raja Grafindo.
- <http://jogja.tribunnews.com/2015/12/10/tingkat-partisipasi-pilkada-2015-di-diy-belum-mencapai-target>. (2015, December 14).
- <http://nasional.republika.co.id/berita/nasional/pilkada/15/12/12/nz8f5v361-jimly-ungkap-alasan-rendahnya-tingkat-partisipasa-pilkada-serentak>. (2015, December 14).
- [http://www.bbc.com/indonesia/berita\\_indonesia/2015/12/151210\\_indonesia\\_pilkada](http://www.bbc.com/indonesia/berita_indonesia/2015/12/151210_indonesia_pilkada). (2015, December 14).
- <http://www.koran-sindo.com/news.php?r=6&n=12&date=2015-12-11>. (2015, December 14).
- <http://www.riapos.co/94833-berita-bah-angka-partisipasi-pemilih-di-medan-cuma-24-persen.html#.Vm78Y14dnMw>. (2015, December 14).
- Ikhsan, M.Z. (2016, October 12). *Tingkat partisipasi pemilih di kabupaten Gunung Kidul*. (R. M. Nugroho, Interviewer)
- Nazriyah, R. (2008). *Kewenangan mahkamah konstitusi dalam penyelesaian sengketa pemilihan kepala daerah*. Jurnal Konstitusi, Volume 1, No. 1, 12.
- Rohim, N. (2014). *Gagasan pemilukada serentak dan implikasinya terhadap pesta demokrasi yang efektif dan efisien*. Konferensi Hukum Tata Negara dan Anugerah Muhammad Yamin Award (p. 568). Sawahlunto, Sumatera Barat: Pusat Studi Konstitusi, Universitas Andalas.
- Syachrudin. (2016, October 3). *Tingkat partisipasi pemilih di kabupaten Bantul*. (R. M. Nugroho, Interviewer)
- Yulianto, I. (2016, September 30). *Tingkat partisipasi pemilih di kabupaten Sleman*. (R. M. Nugroho, Interviewer)
- Yusuf, S. E. (2010). Kedaulatan Rakyat dalam Perspektif Pancasila. In A. Wahyudi (Ed.), *Kongres Pancasila* (p. 335). Yogyakarta: Sekretariat jenderal dan Kepaniteraan Mahkamah Konstitusi Republik Indonesia.