



Accountability of General Election Commission of Klaten Regency in Organizing the 2015 Election of Regent and Deputy Regent

Ika Nurmalina Dewi; Rina Herlina Haryanti; Desiderius Sudibyo

Faculty of Social and Political Sciences, Sebelas Maret University, Indonesia

<http://dx.doi.org/10.18415/ijmmu.v7i1.1370>

Abstract

General Election Commission is an election organizing institution as referred to in the Law governing election administrators who are given the task and authority in administering an election based on the provisions stipulated in the Law. Managerial accountability is expected to be able to encourage the creation of public trust in government performance. Therefore, a review of managerial accountability in public organizations is very important to be carried out in order to ensure that the values of public services are carried out clearly on the managerial performance of the organization. This study will employ a qualitative descriptive approach to gain an in-depth understanding of managerial accountability of General Election Commission of Klaten Regency in organizing the 2015 election of Regent and Deputy Regent of Klaten. The data was obtained from sources related to the research object. In this case, it is the document of the election results of regional head from General Election Commission of Klaten Regency. Collecting the informants was carried out by using purposive sampling technique by selecting who the subjects are in the best position to provide information needed by researchers. In this case, General Election Commission of Klaten Regency carried out 3 stages in managerial accountability consisting of information, action and answer, although there are still a number of activities that are not yet optimal. Society participation and stakeholders have contributed to the success of the election implementation at each stage.

Keywords: *General Election Commission; Election of Regional Heads; Managerial Accountability*

Introduction

One of the results of reforms in this country is a major change in the process of replacing regional leaders. If the previous election of regional head was carried out by the Regional House of Representatives, it is now carried out through direct election by the society. The implementation of direct elections of regional heads by the society is considered as more democratic and is a means to channel society's aspirations in determining the future of their regions for the next five years. Some positive aspects of organizing a direct election of regional heads to the life of democracy locally/ regionally, among others, is that by direct election, the elected regional heads will have strong legitimacy so that it will increase trust in the government. By having a legitimate government, the level of community

participation in supporting the development process will improve. This is the basic capital in creating good governance (Sedarmayanti, 2013).

Based on Law No. 8 of 2015 concerning amendments to Law No. 1 of 2015 concerning Establishment of Government Regulation in Lieu of Law No. 1 of 2014 concerning the Election of Governors, Regents and Mayors Becoming Laws, it is stated that the Election of Governors and Deputy Governors, Regents and Deputy Regents and Mayors and Deputy Mayors, hereinafter referred to as election is the exercise of popular sovereignty in the provinces and districts/ cities to elect the Governor and Deputy Governor, the Regent and Deputy Regent, and the Mayor and Deputy Mayor directly and democratically. Implementing direct elections of regional heads requires a professional and accountable governing agency so that society's voices can be saved and their sovereignty is realized. Law No. 8 of 2015 states that the General Election Commission is an election organizing agency as referred to in the Law governing election administrators who are given duties and authorities in administering elections based on the provisions stipulated in this Law.

The legal basis that states the General Election Commission as the organizer of the election is the 1945 Constitution article 22 E paragraph (5), the election is held by a General Election Commission that is national, permanent and independent. Furthermore, Law No. 8 of 2015 states that the Provincial General Election Commission is the organizing body of the election as referred to in the Law governing election administrators who are given the task of holding election of the Governor and Deputy Governor based on the provisions stipulated in the Law. Regency/ City General Election Commission is an election organizing institution as referred to in the Law governing election organizers who are given the task of organizing election of Regents and Deputy Regents and Mayors and Deputy Mayors based on the provisions stipulated in the Law.

In carrying out their duties, the Regency/ City General Election Commission is assisted by the District Election Committee as the organizer of elections at the District level, the Election Committee as the organizer of elections at the Village/ Sub-District level and the Voting Organizers Group as the organizer of voting at the Polling Station. Several levels in the organizational structure of the election administration body show a fairly long range of control from upstream to downstream. It requires a system that can move all elements in the election organizing agency in order to be able to carry out the mandate of the Law in organizing the election of the Governor and Deputy Governor and/or election of the Regent and Deputy Regent and Mayor and Deputy Mayor based on the provisions stipulated in the Law.

The direct election of the region head has been carried out since 2005. Then, in 2015, it was held simultaneously as mentioned in article 3 paragraph (1) of Law No. 8 of 2015, that the election is held once every 5 (five) years simultaneously throughout the territory of the Unitary Republic of Indonesia. It was the result of an evaluation conducted by the General Election Commission and delivered in a hearing with the Commission II of the House of Representatives of the Republic of Indonesia on September 7, 2015. The Chairperson of the General Election Commission of the Republic of Indonesia, Husni Kamil Manik, stated that of the 269 regions that held the election of head Concurrent regions in 2015, five of which had time to postpone because of a court decision. This was revealed by Husni in the National Seminar: Evaluation of the 2015 simultaneous election of regional heads, at the Post-Graduate School of Law Faculty of the Islamic University of Indonesia (postcasarjanahukum.uui.ac.id). The five areas include Central Borneo Province, Pematang Siantar, Simalungun, Fak-Fak, and Manado City. This delay was related to the problem of candidacy entering the realm of law, thus hampering the stage of election of regional heads.

Some other problems that occurred in organizing the 2015 election of regional heads were the low voter turnout. Based on data from the General Election Commission, general voter turnout is only around

64.23 percent or lower than the target set by the General Election Commission at around 75.5 percent. A number of districts/ cities with low participation rates include Medan City, North Sumatra (26.88 percent); Serang Regency (50.84 percent); Surabaya City (52.18 percent); Jember Regency (52.19 percent); and Tuban Regency (52.25 percent). The low number of voter participation cannot be separated from the process of voter data collection which is not yet perfect, the number of unregistered voters, and the existence of double registered voters (pascasarjanahukum.uui.ac.id).

The process of updating voter data is one of the long stages in organizing the election of regional heads. The implementation involves the organizer from the lowest level, the Voter Data Update Officer, at each polling station and recapitulation conducted by the Provincial General Election Commission and/or Regency/ City General Election Commission. Is the invalid data voter due to the long range of control or management performance of the General Election Commission that has not been optimal? According to Husni Kamil, the problems surrounding the holding of the election of regional head were related to many things such as the nomination process, budget, campaign logistics, Permanent Voter Register, and logistics for election. Problems that occur in the voter data collection process show that the management information system in the implementation of the election of regional head is not running optimally.

Novianti (2015), in her research, stated that the rise in filing lawsuits on the results of the election of regional heads to the Constitutional Court shows that there are problems that occur in the stages of organizing the election of regional heads. In fact, several Constitutional Court decisions ordered the election of regional heads in several areas by the General Election Commission to be repeated. It showed that the political accountability of the General Election Commission cannot be assessed well. Other study conducted by Trianggoro et al., (2015) found that the dimensions of the inhibition of the performance of the General Election Commission of Semarang City were the limited number and quality of human resources owned, not optimal socialization carried out, and minimal distribution of funds received by the General Election Commission of Semarang City.

Another problem that becomes an obstacle in the implementation of election of regional heads is the procurement and distribution of election logistics simultaneously which allows obstacles in the field due to weather, geographical location, transportation facilities and availability of election logistics needs. In addition, there are several regions that are experiencing delays in providing funds for the needs of the election of regional heads.

Various problems that occur in the implementation of the election of regional heads are interesting to study such as about how the accountability process of organizing the election of regional head. Mardiasmo (2009) explains that accountability is a form of obligation to account for the success or failure of the implementation of the organization's mission in achieving the goals and objectives that have been set previously through a media of accountability carried out periodically. Furthermore, public accountability according to Mahmudi & Nurhayati (2015) is the obligation of the agent (government) to manage resources, report, and disclose all activities and activities related to the use of public resources to the mandate (principal). Public accountability that must be carried out by public sector organizations consists of several aspects. According to Mahmudi & Nurhayati (2015) that the accountability dimension that must be met by public institutions includes:

1. Honesty and legal accountability related to avoidance of misuse of office and guarantee of compliance with the law required in the use of public funding sources;
2. Managerial accountability related to whether the procedures used in carrying out the task are good enough in terms of the adequacy of accounting information systems, management information systems, and administrative procedures;

3. Program accountability related to the consideration of whether or not the objectives set can be achieved, and whether they have considered alternative programs that provide optimal results with minimal costs;
4. Policy accountability related to the responsibility of both central and regional government for policies taken by the government towards the House of Representatives/ Regional House of Representatives and the wider society;
5. Financial accountability related to the accountability of political institutions to use public money economically, efficiently and effectively, without waste and leakage of funds and corruption.

This study is more focused on discussing managerial accountability in organizing elections of regional heads. It is about how the procedure is used by the organizer of the election of regional heads at each level; whether it is in accordance with the specified system or not. Implementation of the election of regional head requires human resources (HR) and non-HR. It involves human resources as organizers starting from the district level to the village/ sub-village. Meanwhile, non-HR is in the form of funds and equipment. The use of resources in organizing the election of regional heads must be accounted for in accordance with the applicable laws and regulations. In the context of the election of regional head, the implementation of the budgeting has been regulated in articles 5 and 6 of the Minister of Home Affairs Regulation No. 44 of 2015 concerning Management of Election of Governor and Deputy Governor, Regent and Deputy Regent Funds, Mayor and Deputy Mayor.

Klaten Regency, is one of the regencies in Central Java that has a fairly extensive administrative area that covers 26 districts and 401 villages/ sub-districts. With a wide enough territory, good managerial skills are needed to hold an election. The General Election Commission of Klaten Regency has held three election of regent and deputy regent in 2005, 2010, and 2015. The implementation of the three election of regional heads always decreased voter turnout: in 2015 reached 74.56%, election of regional heads in 2010 voter turnout fell to 66.32% and in 2015 reached 66.08% (General Election Commission of Klaten Regency 2016).

The decline in voter turnout in Klaten, to the lowest point, was precisely in the holding of the simultaneous election of regional heads in 2015. The problem of recruitment of the governing agency at the lowest level, the Voting Organizing Group, was about independence. During the 2015 election of regional heads, there were two members of the Election Organizing Group that had to go through Inter-Time Substitution the day before the vote because they proved to be members of political parties. This shows ineffective range of control. Another problem related to logistical distribution is about ballots to the Voting Organizers Group. There is a difference of opinion between the District Election Committee and the District Superintendent regarding the time for sending logistics to the polling station. This shows the lack of communication between the organizers of the election of regional heads which resulted in chaos at the grass root level.

Managerial accountability is important to study. As stated by Demirel (2014), managerial accountability guarantees the use of public resources consistently and the protection of the value of public services to control abuse of authority. Guaranteed use of public resources and the protection of the value of public services is a tangible manifestation that public services always seek efficiency in their performance. Through managerial accountability, the organization seeks to provide guarantees to the public that bureaucrats do not misuse organizational resources which have an impact on state losses and the ineffectiveness of public services. In addition, managerial accountability is expected to be able to encourage the creation of public trust in government performance. Therefore, a review of managerial

accountability is very important for public organizations in order to ensure that the values of public services are carried out clearly on the organization's managerial performance.

Based on the explanation in the above background, the formulation of the problem in this study is how is the managerial accountability of the General Election Commission of Klaten Regency in organizing the 2015 election of regional heads?

Theoretical Framework

According to Ali (2015) accountability is the process through which a person or group can be held accountable for their behavior. Whereas Chandler & Plano in Widodo (2001) states that accountability refers to states that accountability refers to intuition about checks and balances in the administration system. Accountability in general is a condition in which public organizations can provide accountability for services to the society. Dwiyanto (2012) added that the concept of public accountability refers to how much the policies and activities of public organizations are subject to political officials elected by the society. Kumorotomo (2005) states that "accountability is a measure that indicates whether public bureaucratic activities or services carried out by the government are in accordance with the norms and values adopted by the people and whether the public services are able to accommodate the actual needs of the society."

Based on this opinion, it is clear that accountability plays a role in ensuring that public services are able to meet society's needs. The implications of accountability in an organization are important to encourage effectiveness and efficiency in the delivery of public services. The effectiveness and efficiency of public services is one of the goals of the emergence of good governance in the government system. Therefore, the application of accountability in the performance of public organizations needs to be a concern.

Christensen & Lægreid (2015) explain that managerial accountability requires clear assignment of responsibility for each bureaucrat's actions, a clear statement of purpose and a focus on results and performance in relation to output. Checkland et al., (2013) explained that managerial accountability is a process that is mostly technical, where people with authority are able to account for performance according to established criteria. Managerial accountability focuses on the role of bureaucrats in carrying out service procedures to achieve planned results. Widodo (2001) explains that managerial accountability focuses on the input side and encourages continuous attention to the use of public resources so that waste does not occur. Of the three statements above, managerial accountability is interpreted as a process of taking responsibility for organizational activities related to the suitability of procedures with the performance and management of organizational inputs in the form of public resources. The input referred to in this study covers human resources, financial resources, and organizational property in the form of land and buildings.

Demirel (2014) explains the main purpose of managerial accountability is to guarantee the consistent use of public resources and the protection of the value of public services to control abuse of authority. Guaranteed use of public resources and the protection of the value of public services is a tangible manifestation that public services always seek efficiency in performance. Through managerial accountability, the organization seeks to provide guarantees to the society that bureaucrats do not abuse organizational resources which have an impact on state losses and the ineffectiveness of public services. In addition, managerial accountability is expected to encourage the creation of public trust in government performance. Therefore, a review of managerial accountability is very important for public organizations in order to ensure that the values of public services are carried out clearly on the organization's managerial performance.

Widodo (2001) explains that managerial accountability has similarities with legal and political forms of accountability where all three have a reference to procedures and rules in their performance. However, related to the direction of accountability, the three have differences. Goodin in Christensen & Lægveid (2015) explained that political accountability aims to make leaders always involve the society through dialogue and public debate in making procedures and evaluations. In other words, the direction of political accountability is towards the society. Meanwhile, Widodo (2001) explained that legal accountability has a direction of responsibility to the legislative body as the regulator. In contrast to both, Demirel (2014) explained that managerial accountability has a direction of accountability to superiors and the society. Among these differences, political, legal and managerial accountability still have the same mission of creating the effectiveness and efficiency of public services through supervision so that they can encourage service improvement and increase public trust.

The success of an organization in implementing the principle of managerial accountability can be seen through the process. Mark Schacter in Demirel (2014) describes the three-stage process of accountability as follows:

1. Information

The effectiveness of accountability in every public organization depends on accurate, timely and reliable information on every executive's activities. The object of managerial accountability follows the rules and regulations in implementing instructions for implementing decisions at a higher level. In this context, the manager has the right to request information about bureaucratic operations from a lower level. Employees are required to provide reporting on the performance of the organization within a certain period. In addition, a report is considered reliable if the information in the financial statements is free from misleading notions and material errors, honestly presents every fact, and can be verified (Ole et al, 2015). The element of reliability is the basis that there is no element of manipulation in preparing the accountability report. Sedarmayanti (2013) explained that the report on organizational accountability is basically a reflection of the achievement of targets in a certain period. In addition, information provided to superiors also includes the use of organizational funding sources in a certain period of time. Reporting the performance of the organization functioned to ensure the openness and balance of information received on each line.

2. Action

After obtaining the information, the institution or employer in the organization must take action based on that information. Institutions or superiors must ask for an explanation of each executive activity and the reasons for each implementation of the activity. In public services, organizations must implement existing service procedures. Bureaucratic operations in the context of public services include employee performance where employees are required to behave in accordance with the norms of values and norms in providing public services. In addition, superiors can ask opinions from the society or parties who get services regarding organizational performance for consideration if necessary.

3. Answer

The effectiveness of accountability ultimately depends on how the organization executes the information needed. Institutions are required to provide responses and follow-up on information and reports received through performance evaluations. In addition, managerial accountability requires every public official to take responsibility for every action taken. This is because every action of public officials

is very influential on the output of the organization. Public officials must also accept any consequences for their actions in the form of sanctions and rewards. In accountability, employee performance is always followed by sanctions. According to Steets (2010), in carrying out relationships on accountability patterns, the ability of superiors to apply sanctions as well as employee anticipation to avoid sanctions can be a control of employee behavior. Sanctions are given to employees as a consequence of their behavior. Checkland, et al (2013) explain that one form of sanctions applied in managerial accountability related to procedural violations is the loss of authority and function of a person in the organization and the deduction of income (employee rights) for their performance. In addition, superiors also need to pay attention to employee rewards for certain achievements.

Research Method

This study will use a qualitative descriptive approach to gain an in-depth understanding of the managerial accountability of the General Election Commission of the Klaten Regency in organizing the Election of the Regent and Deputy Regent of Klaten in 2015. The data sources were obtained from sources relating to the object of research. In this case, it is the document of the result of the election of regional head of the General Election Commission of Klaten Regency. Sources of data in this study are primary data from various informants or speakers from the General Election Commission of Klaten Regency, Election Supervisory of Klaten Regency, as well as various agencies related to the implementation of election of regional heads in Klaten Regency. Secondary data is data that has been collected from various sources that have been there before.

The technique of gathering informants is performed by using purposive sampling technique by selecting which subjects are in the best position to provide the information needed. The data collection technique used in this research is the study of documentation and interview. The validity technique used in this study is the triangulation technique.

Findings and Discussion

Based on General Election Commission Regulation No. 5 of 2008 concerning the Work Procedures of the General Election Commission, the District General Election Commission and the Regency/ City General Election Commission, the membership of the Regency/ City General Election Commission consists of a chairman concurrently member and members totaling 5 (five) people. The General Election Commission's vision of the Klaten Regency is to realize the General Election Commission as the organizer of an election that has: 1) integrity, 2) professional, 3) independent, 4) transparent and 5) accountable for creating quality Indonesian democracy based on Pancasila and the 1945 Constitution in the Unitary Republic of Indonesia. Referring to the vision of the General Election Commission of Klaten Regency, accountability is a goal that needs to be achieved so that the results of the election of regional heads can be a reference to achieve quality Indonesian democracy.

In carrying out their duties, the Regency General Election Commission is facilitated by a secretariat that provides technical and administrative support. The Secretariat of the Regency General Election Commission is headed by a secretary assisted by 4 (four) heads of sub-sections in accordance with their respective fields of work. The head of the subdivision at the Secretariat of the General Election Commission of Klaten Regency was assisted by several implementing staff.

The magnitude of the role of employees and work skills in the General Election Commission of the Klaten Regency secretariat can be measured by productivity. To get the results of a good performance

process, the leader—in this case the secretary—coordinates and consolidates for the smooth implementation of the tasks and functions that will increase effectiveness and efficiency.

In managerial accountability, the General Election Commission of Klaten Regency uses 3 stages consisting of information, action and answer. In the first stage of information, the General Election Commission of the Klaten District obtained information from the society and the District Supervisors as in the recruitment stage of the ad hoc Organizing Agency where there was a stage of public response on behalf of the prospective ad hoc organizers.

The second stage, action, is applied in taking action based on information received. General Election Commission of Klaten Regency clarified candidates for ad hoc organizers during the interview stage.

The third stage, answer, is the result of clarification conducted in the interview. Then, the results are determined in a plenary meeting so that the General Election Commission of Klaten Regency determines the names of the selected ad hoc organizing agency.

The implementation of managerial accountability is not only carried out in the recruitment stage of the ad hoc organizing body but is also used in each stage of organizing the election; for instance, candidacy, updating voter data, voting and counting of votes, recapitulation and counting of election results.

The implementation of managerial accountability has been largely effective. However, there are obstacles in updating voter data where many related parties influence the success in this stage including: public awareness to actively participate in checking voter lists, not all voters updating data officers perform their duties correctly, there are still many residents who have not registered the e-ktp so that the stages of action of the General Election Commission of Klaten Regency are less than optimal.

Conclusion

The General Election Commission of Klaten Regency has carried out the stages of election of the Regent and Deputy Regent in 2015 based on the applicable laws and regulations. In its performance, the General Election Commission of Klaten Regency has carried out stages in managerial accountability although there are still a number of activities that are not yet optimal. Community participation and stakeholders have contributed to the success of the election implementation at each stage.

References

- Ali, M. (2015). Governance and Good Governance: A Conceptual Perspective. *The Dialogue*, 10 (1). Di akses pada 1 Nopember 2017, dari http://www.qurtuba.edu.pk/thedialogue/dialogue10_1.htm.
- Checkland, K., Allen, P., Coleman, A., Segar, J., McDermott, I., Harrison, S., ... & Peckham, S. (2013). Accountable to whom, for what? An exploration of the early development of Clinical Commissioning Groups in the English NHS. *BMJ open*, 3(12), e003769.
- Christensen, T., & Lægveid, P. (2015). Performance and accountability—A theoretical discussion and an empirical assessment. *Public Organization Review*, 15(2), 207-225.

- Demirel, D. (2014). Accountability and the Changing Function of the Control. *Yönetim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 12 (24).
- Dwiyanto, A. (2012). *Reformasi Birokrasi Publik di Indonesia*. Yogyakarta: Gadjah Mada University Press.
- Kumoro, W. (2005). *Akuntabilitas Birokrasi Publik: Sketsa pada Masa Transisi*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.
- Mahmudi, B., & Nurhayati, E. (2015). The influence of board governance characteristics on intellectual capital performance (empirical study on listed banks in BEI 2008-2012). *Review of Integrative Business and Economics Research*, 4(1), 417.
- Mardiasmo, D. (2009). *Akuntansi Sektor Publik*. Yogyakarta: ANDI.
- Novianti, V., Suryono, A., & Hanafi, I. (2016). Akuntabilitas Politik Komisi Pemilihan Umum Daerah pada Pelaksanaan Pilkada 2010 Kabupaten Situbondo. *JISIP: Jurnal Ilmu Sosial dan Ilmu Politik*, 4(3).
- Ole, H.R., Nangoi, G., & Wokas, H.R.N. (2015). Analisis Sistem Pengendalian Intern Dan Pemanfaatan It Governance Terhadap Keandalan Laporan Keuangan Pemerintah Daerah Kabupaten Minahasa Tenggara Menggunakan Framework Cobit (Control Objectives For Information And Related Technology). *Going Concern: Jurnal Riset Akuntansi*, 10(1). Diakses dari <https://ejournal.unsrat.ac.id/index.php/gc/article/viewFile/7368/6912>.
- Sedarmayanti. (2013). *Reformasi Administrasi Publik, Reformasi Birokrasi, dan Kepemimpinan Masa Depan (Mewujudkan Pelayanan Prima dan Kepemerintahan yang Baik)*. Bandung: Refika Aditama.
- Steets, J. (2010). *Accountability in Public Policy Partnership*. Hampshire: Palgrave MacMillan. Di akses pada 17 Desember 2016, dari www.oapen.org/download?type=document&docid=392745.
- Trianggoro, D., Larasati, E., & Widowati, N. (2015). Analisis Kinerja Komisi Pemilihan Umum Kota Semarang (Dalam Pemilihan Umum 2014). *Journal of Public Policy and Management Review*, 4(2), 85-95.
- Widodo, J. (2001). *Good Governance: Telaah Dimensi Akuntabilitas dan Kontrol Birokrasi pada Era Desentralisasi dan Otonomi Daerah*. Surabaya: Insan Cendekia.

Copyrights

Copyright for this article is retained by the author(s), with first publication rights granted to the journal.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).