



DEMOCRATIZATION AND PERFORMANCE OF GENERAL ELECTION COMMISSION ON IMPLEMENTATION OF SIMULTANEOUSLY PROVINCE REGIONAL ELECTION

Risma Niswaty¹, Andi Cudai Nur², Syamsu Rijal³, Irsyad Dhahri⁴, Nasaruddin H⁵

Faculty of Social Science
Universitas Negeri Makassar^{1, 2, 4, 5}
Tourism Polytechnic of Makassar³
risma.niswaty@unm.ac.id¹
cudainur@gmail.com²
rijalsyamsu212@gmail.com³
cha4400@yahoo.com⁴
nazaruddin_1112@yahoo.com⁵

ABSTRACT

The General Election Commission (KPU) has finished carrying out regional head elections in 17 provinces in 2018. The implementation of this regional head election is the first history of the simultaneous implementation of governor elections. KPU's performance was highlighted in this simultaneous regional head election. The number of voters in the 2018 Governor and Deputy Governor Election amounted to 143,667,935. Community participation in the 2018 Concurrent Local Election is in the range of 72%. KPU has targeted community participation of 77 percent. Of the 17 provinces that held gubernatorial elections, only Papua province exceeded the voter participation target. While the disability voter participation is on average 49 percent with the highest disability voter level in Maluku at 96 percent and the lowest in Central Java 32 percent. Furthermore, the findings related to ballots are invalid. Invalid ballots in the election of governors and deputy governors were 3,098,239, equivalent to 3 percent of all election logistics used. The most invalid ballots are found in Central Java Province, namely 778,805 ballots, East Kalimantan as many as 50,110 ballots, and East Java with 782,027 ballots.

The research conducted found results that there were alleged violations that occurred in the 2018 simultaneous regional election. It was suspected that there were 1,095 violation reports and 2,038 violation findings. The number of violations in the Regional Head Election this time is greater than the previous election. This is due to the fact that the number of regions holding this year's Election is bigger than the 2017 election, which is 101 regions. The details of these violations were 291 criminal violations, 853 administrative violations, 114 violations of the code of ethics, 712 violations of other laws, and 619 categories not violations or not proven. Regarding voter voting rights, the high number of Transfer Voters List (DPPH) and Additional Voters List (DPTb). Of the total 143,667,935 people who voted in the simultaneous regional elections in 2018, there were 173,553 voters from DPPH and 2,032,556 voters from DPTb. To note, the number of DPTb is the basis for evaluating the process of updating voter data throughout the election stages. So that the performance of KPU voters' data collection is in the quite effective category.

Key Words: simultaneous regional head elections, the performance of election organizers



INTRODUCTION

Indonesia entered a period of democratic transition, so that in some aspects of the life of the Indonesian people there were still some problems that were found. The process of democratic transition or democratization process in Indonesia began when the transfer of power from President Soeharto to Vice President BJ Habibie on May 21, 1998. This became a marker of the transition period because it was at this phase that Indonesia experienced a transition from an authoritarian political system to democracy, transitioning from military supremacy to civilian supremacy, the transition from centralization to decentralization, and so on. Indonesia has moved away from the dictatorial system and is heading towards change as a democratic country. After the fall of Soeharto and the New Order, the perspective of the transition to democracy dominated the debate over the interpretation of political change in Indonesia. This perspective illustrates the process of Soeharto's fall in the framework of democratization which involves pulling forces among elites who determine the nature of political change (Hyde, 2010), (Geddes, 2009), (Tilly, 2003) .

LITERATURE REVIEW

The description of the rise of democracy and democratization in Indonesia, is seen in the opening of amazing political space, the emergence of a new generation of civil society, the liberation of media space, and also the positive spirit of demanding greater government accountability (Geddes, 2009), (Schedler, 2007), (Liddle, 2000). One of the political spaces that are open to the application of the principles of democratization is in general elections, both presidential elections and regional elections at the level of governor elections and the election of regents / mayors. In the history of electoral affairs in Indonesia, 2018 became the first history of regional elections (pilkada) to be held simultaneously. It was recorded on June 27, 2018, there were 171 regions implementing the elections, which consisted of 17 provinces for the election of governors/deputy governors, 39 elections for mayors/deputy mayors, and 115 elections for regents/vice regents (Prasetyoningsih, 2014). South Sulawesi as one of the provinces in Indonesia, is a province which in the election event, especially regional elections, has always been seen as an Indonesian political laboratory due to political dynamics and the dynamics of local democracy in South Sulawesi which is very dynamic. New developments in the post-1999 election period showed a number of changes, both those that moved towards positive and negative. With the implementation of these relatively honest and fair elections, the political positions chosen must be contested by political parties. This condition ultimately led to the formation of party government which at the same time was a new era for the bureaucracy and also the wider community, including local government (Dryzek, 2009), (Munck, 2016), (Ansell & Samuels, 2015).

Talking about the concept of democratization, there are three prerequisites for fulfilling effective and democratic electoral criteria, namely independence, impartiality and professionalism (Sossin, 2008), (Desai, 2009), and (Wright, 2016). Since the regional head



elections held in 2005 by the Regency/City General Election Commission, the simultaneous regional elections in 2018 are the fourth time regional elections held by these commissioners. However, there are still operational reports that do not show the independence, impartiality and professionalism of the organizers. So it is interesting to review the performance of the General Election Commission, especially in South Sulawesi related to the implementation of simultaneous regional elections.

The key concept to building a democracy of integrity is the holding of regional elections with integrity, not formal and procedural elections. To develop regional head elections with integrity requires shared awareness supported by a system of rules and supporting infrastructure that can force the application of the principle of elections with integrity in practice (Olken, 2010), (Arrsa, 2014). All parties must jointly build integrity which will ultimately give birth to the integrity of the nation. In the implementation of elections, there are 4 parties involved, namely (i) election organizers, (ii) election participants, (iii) candidates, and (iv) voters as owners of popular sovereignty. Ideally, these four parties must have integrity. The tendency of the community to appreciate the implementation of the elections shows that voter participation is declining. In various studies, news and reporting, facts were found regarding people's enthusiasm for the process and results of the election that tended to decrease. The fact that the decline in public participation shows the existence of problems in the implementation of regional elections.

There are at least 4 (four) causes of the decline in community participation in regional elections. *First*, the community consciously does not want to exercise their voting rights because it is based on apathy. For them, using or not using voting rights in the Pilkada means the same: it does not have a significant influence on daily life. *Second*, the chaotic and inaccurate Final Voters List (DPT) contributes greatly to weakening the enthusiasm of the people who originally intended to participate. *Third*, voters tend to prioritize their individual needs, such as working, farming, migrating or going to school rather than attending polling stations to exercise their right to vote. *Fourth*, participation in regional elections is driven by the spirit of community pragmatism. If there are candidates who provide benefits they want to participate, if not then there is no need to participate (Nazriyah, 2016).

Reviewing the performance of the organizers of the elections, it is related to the issue of resource capabilities, then provides an explanation that basically performance is determined by the following aspects:

1. Personal Factor. That is indicated by the level of skill, competence, motivation and individual commitment.
2. Leadership factor. That performance is also determined by the quality of encouragement, guidance and support that managers and team leaders do.
3. Team factor. That is the quality of support provided by colleagues in the work team.

4. System factor. That is concerning the quality of the work system and facilities provided by the organization.
5. Contextual or Situational factors. That is related to the problem of high and low levels of pressure and changes in the internal and external environment.

Basically performance measurement is used to assess the success or failure of the policies or programs implemented. Performance is a broad concept that is in the inside has diverse meanings, for different audiences, and different contexts. The public sector performance measurement system is a system that aims to help public managers assess the achievement of a strategy through financial and nonfinancial measurement tools (Clark, 2003), (Cascio, 2008), (Waldman, 2011).

The performance measurement system can be used as an organizational control tool, because performance measurement is strengthened by establishing reward and punishment systems (Bedarkar & Pandita, 2014), (Niswaty, Mano, & Akib, 2015). Performance measurement of public sector organizations is carried out to fulfill three purposes. *First*, to help improve government performance, performance measures are intended to help the government focus on the goals and objectives of the work unit program. This is expected to increase the effectiveness and efficiency of public sector organizations in providing services to the public. *Second*, to allocate resources and make decisions. *Third*, to realize public accountability and improve institutional communication (Ahdiyana, 2015).

The function of measuring the performance of public sector organizations is as follows:

1. Transparency: organizations can make clear what products they offer, how to analyze their input-outputs, including their costs
2. Learning: the organization becomes a step ahead if it uses performance measurement to learn, transparency that is created teaches the organization what goodness is owned and where its development is possible.
3. Appraising: performance based assessment can be said as the functioning of the organization
4. Sanctioning: assessment can be followed by positive sanctions if it turns out good performance, and negative sanctions if the performance is poor (de Bruijn, 2002).

Performance appraisal is done to emphasize undesirable behavior, through feedback on performance results also awards both intrinsic and extrinsic. So that it can be concluded that the main purpose of performance assessment was to motivate employees to achieve organizational goals and to adhere to predetermined standards of behavior, so as to produce desired actions and results. Ivanovich and Gomes in Narimawati said that there are eight dimensions or criteria that need attention in assessing or measuring performance



based on specific behavioral descriptions, namely: Quantity of work, the amount of work done in a specified time period. It is the quality of work achieved based on the conditions of conformity and readiness. Job knowledge is the breadth of knowledge about work and skills. Creativeness is the authenticity of ideas raised and actions to solve problems that arise. Cooperation, the willingness to cooperate with other people. Dependability is awareness and can be trusted in terms of attendance and completion of work. Initiative is the enthusiasm for carrying out new tasks and in enlarging their responsibilities. Personal qualities concern of personality, leadership, hospitality, and personal integration (Umi Narimawati, 2007).

METHODOLOGY

This study uses an evaluative survey approach (Fink, 2010), (Chaddad, 2006), (Lowell Bishop & Verleger, 2013), (Lu & Weng, 2007), to analyze and explain various aspects of democratization and the performance of electoral commissions in implementing simultaneous regional elections in South Sulawesi. Through this approach: (1) exploration of concepts, theories, research results, and relevant and up-to-date data; (2) trace and inventory various issues and performance contract documents, (3) deepen cases, at the election stage; (4) a retrospective analysis of the determinants of independent, impartial and professional elections in South Sulawesi.

The technique of collecting data using a questionnaire (complete survey) as the main technique, supported by focus group techniques, observation techniques, and documentation techniques.

The survey was conducted on 30 respondents (each of 10 regional election organizers from 3 districts/cities). Group discussions were conducted together with KPU, Bawaslu, PPK, and PPS members in each district. Documentation data about the stages of local election reports, especially in 3 municipal districts.

The results of data analysis of this study were carried out using descriptive qualitative-quantitative analysis techniques and shift-share analysis (Cheng, 1995), (Artige & van Neuss, 2014), (Barff & III, 1988). Descriptive analysis is carried out with a comprehensive description of qualitative-quantitative data obtained through field data searches, surveys, and documentation. The results of this analysis are very valuable inputs for the organizers of regional head elections in describing the implementation of their duties at each stage of work and the achievement of their employment contracts. Next, shift-share analysis is carried out. The approach used to conduct comparative analysis is to look at the implementation of regional elections in other provinces.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The implementation of simultaneous regional elections in 2018 shows that the performance of the South Sulawesi election commission is in the sufficiently performing category, even though from the results of institutional performance reports through Government Institution Performance Accountability Reports (LAKIP), it is in the CC



category (quite good). The highest value of LAKIP evaluation is AA (satisfying), with a score of 85 - 100, while A (very good) the score is 75 -85, CC (quite good) with a score of 50 - 65, C (somewhat less) with a score of 30-50, and the value of D (less) with a score of 0 - 30. Even harder efforts must be made by the General Election Commission to improve the quality of its financial statements. This is because from 2010 to 2016 the KPU still received a Fair With Exception (WDP) opinion (Ichsan, Hasanuddin, & Rahim, 2017), (Ansori, 2018).

In the assessment of LAKIP, the material evaluated includes 5 components. The first component is performance planning, consisting of strategic plans, annual performance plans, and performance determination with a weight of 35. The second component, namely performance measurement, which includes the fulfillment of measurements, quality of measurement, and implementation of measurements with a weight of 20. Performance reporting which is the third component, consists of fulfilling reports, presenting performance information, and utilizing performance information, given weighting 15. While performance evaluation consisting of fulfillment of evaluation, quality of evaluation, and utilization of evaluation results, is given weight 10. For performance achievement, the weight is 20, consisting of reported performance (output and outcome), and other performance. With the performance appraisal by the Ministry of Administrative Reform, the KPU institution began to develop strategic plans and work plans based on key performance indicators (KPIs) (Peterson, 2006), (Parmenter, 2010).

The 2015-2019 KPU Strategic Plan has been determined and set forth in the KPU Decree Number 63/Kpts/KPU/2015 which was then amended by KPU Decree Number 90/Kpts/ KPU/2016. However, the KPU Strategic Plan for the 2015-2019 period was deemed it is necessary to make improvements, adjustments, and improvements as a result of the enactment of Law Number 7 of 2017, the simultaneous Election of 2019, plans for changes in the KPU's institutional structure, and changes in leadership within the KPU. KPU is a state institution that is constitutional importance and has national, permanent and independent institutions in holding direct, general, free, confidential, honest and fair elections. The strategic role is reflected in the description of duties, authority, and obligations carried out by the KPU (Nur'aini, 2016), (Ansori, 2018), and (Ichsan et al., 2017).

Table 1. Percentage of Voter Participation in Election of the Governor of South Sulawesi and Deputy Governor of 2018

| No. | Regency / City | Number (%) |
|-------|----------------|--------------|
| 1 | BANTAENG | 76.31 |
| 2 | BARRU | 69.68 |
| 3 | BONE | 71.83 |
| 4 | BULUKUMBA | 60.33 |
| 5 | ENREKANG | 76.78 |
| 6 | GOWA | 74.78 |
| 7 | JENEPONTO | 79.62 |
| 8 | SELAYAR | 77.83 |
| 9 | LUWU | 77.54 |
| 10 | LUWU TIMUR | 64.93 |
| 11 | LUWU UTARA | 67.27 |
| 12 | MAROS | 70.17 |
| 13 | PANGKEP | 67.44 |
| 14 | PINRANG | 80.83 |
| 15 | SIDRAP | 80.26 |
| 16 | SINJAI | 77.16 |
| 17 | SOPPENG | 71.99 |
| 18 | TAKALAR | 72.37 |
| 19 | TANA TORAJA | 65.87 |
| 20 | TORAJA UTARA | 61.65 |
| 21 | WAJO | 81.59 |
| 22 | MAKASSAR | 57.25 |
| 23 | PALOPO | 81.31 |
| 24 | PAREPARE | 80.08 |
| Total | | 70.54 |

The total percentage of voter participation is far from the initial target of the South Sulawesi Election Commission, which is 78 percent participation rate. Nevertheless, voter

participation in 2018 increased compared to voter participation in the 2013 South Sulawesi regional election which was only at 69 percent of community participation. Based on the findings regarding the performance of the South Sulawesi KPU, it appears in table 2.

Table 2. Percentage of Performance Achievement of South Sulawesi KPU in 2018


| No. | Indicators | Performance (%) |
|-----|---|-----------------|
| 1 | Goal 1. Increased implementation of democratic General Elections | |
| | Percentage of increasing voter participation and quality in elections | 100 |
| | Percentage of voter participation in General Election | 77.5 |
| | Percentage of female voter participation in General Elections | 75 |
| | Percentage of disability voter participation in General Election | 75 |
| | Percentage of voters entitled to vote but not on the voter list | 0.2 |
| 2 | Objectives 2. Implementation of Safe, Peaceful, Honest, and Fair General Elections | |
| | Percentage of Regency / City General Election Commissions that carry out General Elections without conflict | 95 |
| | Percentage of General Election Organizers who are proven to have committed electoral violations | 3 |
| | Percentage of legal disputes won by the KPU | 86 |

Objective 1. Increased Implementation of Democratic Elections


The success of the first performance target is measured based on the level of honesty, dignity and fairness. To measure the performance of the South Sulawesi Election Commission regarding this first target, there are 5 performance indicators that must be observed, namely: 1) Percentage of increasing voter participation and quality in elections; 2) Percentage of voter participation in General Election; 3) Percentage of female voter participation in General Elections; 4) Percentage of disability voter participation in General Election; and 5) Percentage of voters entitled to vote but not on the voter list.

In the 2018 South Sulawesi election, there were 4 candidate pairs, namely: Nurdin Halid-Abd Aziz Qahhar Mudzakkar (number 1); Agus Arifin Nu'mang-Tanribali Lamo (Number 2); Nurdin Abdullah-Andi Sudirman Sulaiman (Number 3); and Ichsan Yasin

Limpo-Andi Mudzakkar (Number 4). From the Bawaslu report, it was found that the South Sulawesi regional election was ranked the highest for 2018 regional election complaints reports, as many as 506 cases with classification:



The details based on the type of violation are illustrated in the following diagram:



South Sulawesi, which is often the national spotlight in the implementation of elections and regional elections, turned out to end without any lawsuits in court or election disputes to the Constitutional Court.

The performance target related to voter participation was 8 points from the initial target of the South Sulawesi Election Commission, more due to the low participation in some regions which also carried out the election of regents/deputy regents and mayors/deputy mayors. One of them happened in Makassar. Makassar City has the lowest public participation in the gubernatorial election. This is due to the interest of the Makassar community who did not come to the polling station. In Makassar when that happened the pair Munafri Arifuddin - Andi Rachmatika Dewi (Appi-Cicu) faced with an empty box. This is the first time the empty box won in the history of regional head elections in Indonesia.

In addition, data from Gowa district was also obtained about the non-invitation of the voter (C6), so many voters did not know the location of the polling place. Women's voter participation was achieved at 73.28 percent or only reached 75% of the performance target. Disability voters who use their voting rights are also only 75% of the target.

Female voters and disability experienced obstacles due to: natural factors (rain and even flooding in several polling locations), female voters who worked as shopkeepers (sales clerks) in several shops in Makassar and did not get permission to go home, female students who only holidays on voting day only, and some voters who stated they did not want to use their voting rights.

Participation of voters who are entitled to vote but not listed on the final voter list is 0.60%, higher than the target of 0.20%. This is caused by several factors, which are:

1. delay in recording e-KTP (electronic identity card) voters
2. some voters who have just entered the age of 17 a week up to 1 day before the elections, so it is not possible to be included in the special voter list
3. Members of the Army/Police who enter retirement periods for a week up to 1 day before the election, so that it is not possible to be included in the special voter list;
4. Civil society who are members of the Army/Police and lose their right to vote; and
5. Voters who moved to domicile or moved to polling stations because they continued their education, assignments/services, but did not take care of the information moved to vote.

Objectives 2. Implementation of Safe, Peaceful, Honest, and Fair General Elections / Elections

The essence of this second target is the achievement of all stages of the 2018 governor and deputy governor election which take place safely, honestly, fairly and with dignity for all participants, organizers and the community at large, well organized and in accordance with the stages, programs and schedules has been established. The success of the second performance target is measured based on the level of honesty, dignity and fairness. To measure the performance of the South Sulawesi Election Commission regarding this first target, there are 3 performance indicators that must be observed, namely: 1) Percentage of Regency/City General Election Commissions that carry out General Elections without conflict; 2) Percentage of General Election Organizers who are proven to have committed electoral violations; and 3) Percentage of legal disputes won by the KPU. There are several stages that are considered crucial and potentially reported problematic to Bawaslu, namely: the stages of the campaign; logistics distribution stages; establishment of an adhoc committee; voting; and vote count. The study of the performance of the South Sulawesi Election Commission in the implementation of the 2018 governor's election found:

1) Percentage of Regency / City General Election Commissions that carry out General Elections without conflict. Some performance indicators that show the implementation of regional elections without conflict can be traced to crucial stages in the South Sulawesi pilgub, namely:

Campaign Stage

Implementation of the Campaign Stages carried out by the candidate pairs is held safely. However, there is a lawsuit from serial number 4 Ichsan Yasin Limpo-Andi Mudzakkar about the determination of the schedule and location of the grand campaign in the city of Makassar. KPU Sulsel only set a schedule grand campaign for 3 other candidate pairs. This lawsuit was reported to the South Sulawesi Bawaslu and it overturning the decision of the South Sulawesi Election Commission and ordering the respondent or South Sulawesi Election Commission to issue a Decree that stipulates the schedule and place of campaign for General Meetings in each pair of 2018 Governor and Deputy Governor of South Sulawesi based on legislation valid no later than one day before the second round General Meeting campaign. Regarding the campaign also, several state civil servants (ASN) were reported to the South Sulawesi Bawaslu and the ASN Commission for violating its neutrality as an ASN by campaigning for certain candidate pairs. Reports from this campaign stage were also found related to black campaigns against certain candidate pairs (Rasaili, 2016) and (David Dodu, 2017). The practice of violations that also occur and recur in the 2018 South Sulawesi is an alleged intervention by the regent/mayor utilizing a government structure for certain candidates. One indicated is the regent of Gowa, Adnan Purichta Ichsan, who is the son of candidate number 4 governor, Ichsan Yasin Limpo. The same thing was reported to candidate number 3 governor, Nurdin Abdullah, who was a former regent of Bantaeng 2 periods.

Stage of Logistics Distribution

The stages of management and distribution of logistical requirements for voting and counting on 27 June 2018 in South Sulawesi can be completed from the management, distribution and return to the KPU Warehouse well. Anticipation is carried out by South Sulawesi KPU by first sending logistics to the islands and the outermost and farthest polling stations.

Formation of Adhoc Committee

At the level of the Adhoc Committee (PPK, PPS, and KPPS) and the Regency KPU there was no violation of the code of ethics, this was evidenced by the absence of the Panwaslu report or from the Community Leaders. The case of sticking ethics was not related to the implementation of gubernatorial elections. but in elections mayors/ regents at the city/regency level, among others, occurred in Palopo City Election Commission and Makassar City Election Commission.

Voting Stage



In the Stages of Collection, both pre and at the time of voting on 27 June 2018 all took place safely and conducive both at the TPS, PPS and PPK levels, at the Regency KPU level, as well as at the provincial KPU. This stage is well implemented, all thanks to the support of various stakeholders, the community and adhoc organizers and the election participants and campaign teams of each candidate pair.

As for the alleged violations at the voting stage, namely the South Sulawesi C1 Pigub form sheet that was filled out before the voting day. It was found in Parang Layang Village, Bontoala District, Makassar City, Monday (6/25/2018) night. The form sheet was found in 9 polling stations in Bontoala District. The sheet has been signed by members of the Voting Organizing Group (KPPS) but the name is not included in the letter C1.

The Election Supervisory Board (Bawaslu) recommends re-voting (PSU) at 4 polling stations in 3 regencies in South Sulawesi. The four polling stations were 1 polling station in Barru Regency, 1 in Gowa district, and 2 polling stations in Pinrang. For PSU in Barru it was recommended because there were 2 voters who chose 2 times and 1 representing their mothers who were sick again. The PSU in Gowa was carried out because there were residents who chose to use a family card (KK), even though what was required was a Certificate from the Population and Civil Registry Service and/or an electronic resident card. For the PSU in Pinrang district, TPS 4 in Binanga Karaeng Village, Lembang Subdistrict because the KPPS Chairperson opened the ballot box the night before the voting and signed 400 pieces of ballots of 200 for each regent and 200 for the governor. Whereas TPS 1 Pekkabata, Duampanua Subdistrict, there were 18 ballots that were not signed and used by voters to cast their ballots.

Stage of Vote Counting

At the stage of the 2018 South Sulawesi Pilgub vote counting there were also no violations that hampered the performance of the South Sulawesi Election Commission.

The vote results of the candidate pairs are shown in the following diagram:


The percentage of South Sulawesi Pilgub votes namely NA-ASS is 43.87%; NH-Aziz at 27.32%; IYL-Cakka is 18.97%; and Agus-

Tanri at 9.85%.

2) Percentage of General Election Organizers who are proven to have committed electoral violations;

Regarding the Election Code of Ethics, the term "Code of Ethics", defined as a unitary foundation of moral, ethical and philosophical norms that serves as a guideline for the conduct of obligatory, prohibited, appropriate or inappropriate conduct of general elections in all actions and sayings.

2018 South Sulawesi Election Pilgrimage Acquisition



The purpose of this code of ethics is to maintain the independence, integrity and credibility of Election Organizers, which are in accordance with the principles of Election Implementation, namely: (1) independent; (2) honest; (3) fair; (4) legal certainty; (5) orderly; (6) public interest; (7) openness; (8) proportionality; (9) professionalism; (10) accountability; (11) efficiency; and (12) effectiveness. For handling violations of the ethics code of election administrators, Election Organizers Honor Council (DKPP) has been formed which has the authority to examine the implementation of the code of ethics in the implementation of general elections and regional head elections.

Given the large number of complaints compared to the total number of DKPP members who were only 7 people, it was impossible for DKPP to examine all cases that were reported optimally, and therefore in 2014 the DKPP-RI established a Regional Examination Team (TPD) to examine alleged violations. Election Code of Ethics conducted by Election Organizers at the district / city level.

American Speech Language Hearing Association (ASHA) as quoted by Jimly Asshiddiqie, that in the system of ethical sanctions, the forms of sanctions that can be applied are:

1. Reprimand or reprimand;
2. Censure or statement of no confidence that is stated openly and published in the media association to be known by fellow members and the wider community;
3. Revocation or revocation of membership status for a certain time, namely for 5 (five) years or can also be dropped for a lifetime (until death);
4. Suspension or suspension of membership temporarily;
5. Withholding or suspension of suspension of membership registration process; and
6. Cease and desist orders or in addition to other forms of sanctions.

With regard to the form of sanctions mentioned above, the function of ethical sanctions is more preventive, as well as enforcement. Ethical sanctions are usually

determined in the form of reprimand or multilevel warnings, ranging from verbal reprimand, written reprimand or mild reprimand and strong rebuke (Chakim, 2014).

No data was found regarding the organizers of the election in South Sulawesi in 2018 which were suspected of violating the code of ethics. There are 2 commissioners in the city of Makassar and Palopo who have experienced an honor council hearing, but the trial of both is not related the implementation of gubernatorial elections, but on the implementation of the mayor/deputy mayor election which coincides with the pilgub schedule.

At the Adhoc committee level, both at the sub-district level (PPK), village / kelurahan (PPS), as well as at the TPS (KPPS) also showed good performance.

3) Percentage of legal disputes won by the KPU

Changes in other electoral systems after the constitutional changes are given the authority of the judicial authority implementing agencies to settle disputes over the results of general elections, both legislative and executive elections. The authority to settle the General Election Results Dispute (PHPU) of DPR members, DPD members, and DPRD members, as well as the president and vice president is given to the Constitutional Court (MK). While the regional head elections, which were originally based on Law 32 of 2004, constituted the authority of the Supreme Court to dispute the election of the Governor and Deputy Governor and the authority of the High Court for the election of Regents / Mayors transferred to the Constitutional Court since November 1, 2008 (Zoelva, 2013).

The Constitutional Court, since 2004, has tried disputes over the election results of members of the DPR, DPD and Provincial DPRD as well as the Regency/City DPRD throughout Indonesia, as well as the election of the President and Vice President. This experience later became a valuable provision for the Constitutional Court in handling the case of the Regional Head PHPU. In handling election results, both legislative elections (DPR, DPD, and DPRD. President and Deputy Resident) since 2004 and also post-conflict local elections since 2008, all applicants for election results disputes always blame not only the election vote count determined by the election organizers, but also various violations in the process and in all stages of the election. As a result, the number of disputed election results that entered and were handled by the Constitutional Court was very large with a grace period very short (30 days for legislative elections and 14 days for presidential elections and post-conflict local elections).

Furthermore, in the case of violations of the General Election of Regional Heads, in the regional government law the type of violation is classified into administrative violations and criminal violations. Administrative violations, namely violations of election laws which are not criminal provisions of elections and violations of other provisions stipulated in the General Election Commission regulations (Iza Rumesten RS, 2014).

In the election of the governor of South Sulawesi in 2018, there were no reported cases of electoral disputes, either to the District Court or to the Constitutional Court.



CONCLUSION

South Sulawesi regional head elections (Pilgub) held by the South Sulawesi Election Commission have been carried out quite in accordance with predetermined performance indicators. Even though it has structured performance indicators, starting from the KPU level to the Regency/city KPU, the compiled indicators are still very technical in nature. The KPU should adopt several principles of democratization in the implementation of more independent, impartial and professional regional and regional elections.

REFERENCES

- Ahdiyana, M. (2015). Memperkuat Manajemen Strategis Dengan Pengukuran Kinerja Dalam Organisasi Sektor Publik. *Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta*. <https://doi.org/10.1200/JCO.2008.17.2015>
- Ansell, B. W., & Samuels, D. J. (2015). Inequality and democratization: An elite-competition approach. In *Inequality and Democratization: An Elite-Competition Approach*. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511843686>
- Ansori, A. (2018). Legalitas Hukum Komisi Pemilihan Umum Daerah dalam Menyelenggarakan Pilkada. *Jurnal Konstitusi*. <https://doi.org/10.31078/jk1435>
- Arrsa, ria casmi. (2014). Pemilu Serentak dan Masa Depan Konsolidasi Demokrasi. *Jurnal Konstitusi*.
- Artige, L., & van Neuss, L. (2014). A New Shift-Share Method. *Growth and Change*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/grow.12065>
- BARFF, R. A., & III, P. L. K. (1988). Dynamic Shift-Share Analysis. *Growth and Change*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2257.1988.tb00465.x>
- Bedarkar, M., & Pandita, D. (2014). A Study on the Drivers of Employee Engagement Impacting Employee Performance. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.04.174>
- Cascio, W. F. (2008). The economic impact of employee behaviors on organizational performance. In *America at Work: Choices and Challenges*. <https://doi.org/10.1057/9781403983596>
- Chaddad, F. R. (2006). Performance Measurement of User-Owned Organizations: An Evaluative Survey of the Literature. *EnANPAD*.
- Chakim, M. L. (2014). Desain Institusional Dewan Kehormatan Penyelenggara Pemilu (DKPP) Sebagai Peradilan Etik. *Ejournalmahkamahkonstitusi.Go.Id*.
- Cheng, Y. (1995). Mean Shift, Mode Seeking, and Clustering. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*. <https://doi.org/10.1109/34.400568>

- Clark, R. E. (2003). Fostering the work motivation of individuals and teams. *Performance Improvement*. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pfi.4930420305>
- David Dodu, A. B. (2017). Regulasi Pemilu Terkait Dengan Black Campaign Dan Efektivitasnya Dalam Penindakan (Studi Kasus Pilkada Kabupaten Banggai Tahun 2015). *Jurnal Wacana Politik*. <https://doi.org/10.24198/jwp.v2i1.11315>
- de Bruijn, H. (2002). Performance measurement in the public sector: Strategies to cope with the risks of performance measurement. *International Journal of Public Sector Management*. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09513550210448607>
- Desai, J. P. (2009). The Power of Public Accountability. *Universal Consulting India Pvt Ltd*.
- Dryzek, J. S. (2009). Democratization as deliberative capacity building. *Comparative Political Studies*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0010414009332129>
- Fink, A. (2010). Survey research methods. In *International Encyclopedia of Education*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-08-044894-7.00296-7>
- Geddes, B. (2009). What Causes Democratization? In *The Oxford Handbook of Comparative Politics*. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199566020.003.0014>
- Hyde, S. D. (2010). Experimenting in Democracy Promotion: International Observers and the 2004 Presidential Elections in Indonesia. *Perspectives on Politics*. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s1537592710001222>
- Ichsan, M. F., Hasanuddin, M., & Rahim, S. (2017). KINERJA KOMISI PEMILIHAN UMUM DAERAH (KPUD) DALAM PEMILIHAN UMUM KEPALA DAERAH TAHUN 2012 DI KABUPATEN TAKALAR. *Otoritas: Jurnal Ilmu Pemerintahan*. <https://doi.org/10.26618/ojip.v3i2.71>
- Iza Rumesten RS. (2014). Dilema dan Akibat Hukum Putusan Mahkamah Konstitusi Mengenai Kewenangan Memutus Sengketa Pilkada. *Jurnal Konstitusi*.
- Liddle, R. W. (2000). Indonesia in 1999: Democracy Restored. *Asian Survey*. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3021218>
- Lowell Bishop, J., & Verleger, M. (2013). The Flipped Classroom: A Survey of the Research. *American Society for Engineering Education*. <https://doi.org/10.1109/FIE.2013.6684807>
- Lu, D., & Weng, Q. (2007). A survey of image classification methods and techniques for improving classification performance. *International Journal of Remote Sensing*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01431160600746456>
- Munck, G. L. (2016). What is democracy? A reconceptualization of the quality of democracy. *Democratization*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13510347.2014.918104>
- Nazriyah, R. (2016). PENGATURAN PELAKSANAAN PEMILIHAN KEPALA DAERAH SERENTAK. *JURNAL HUKUM IUS QUIA IUSTUM*. <https://doi.org/10.20885/iustum.vol22.iss1.art6>



- Niswaty, R., Mano, J., & Akib, H. (2015). An analysis of the public service performance based on human development index in makassar city, Indonesia. *International Journal of Applied Business and Economic Research*.
- Nur'aini, N. (2016). POLITIK HUKUM LARANGAN PENGUNDURAN DIRI ANGGOTA KOMISI PEMILIHAN UMUM. *JURNAL CITA HUKUM*.
<https://doi.org/10.15408/jch.v1i2.3001>
- OLKEN, B. A. (2010). Direct Democracy and Local Public Goods: Evidence from a Field Experiment in Indonesia. *American Political Science Review*.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/s0003055410000079>
- Parmenter, D. (2010). Key Performance Indicators (KPI). In *Zhurnal Eksperimental'noi i Teoreticheskoi Fiziki*. <https://doi.org/978-0470545157>
- Peterson, E. T. (2006). The Big Book of Key Performance Indicators. In *Web Analytics Demystified*.
- Prasetyoningsih, N. (2014). Dampak Pemilihan Umum Serentak bagi Pembangunan Demokrasi Indonesia. *Dampak Pemilihan Umum Serentak Bagi Pembangunan Demokrasi Indonesia*.
- Rasaili, W. (2016). Budaya Politik dan Kualitas Demokrasi Dalam Pilkada 2015-2020. *Aristo*. <https://doi.org/https://doaj.org/article/7772891c09624fbf8aadb089a4270c57>
- Schedler, A. (2007). The Nested Game of Democratization by Elections. *International Political Science Review*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0192512102023001006>
- Sossin, L. (2008). The Puzzle of Independence for Administrative Bodies. *National Journal of Constitutional Law*.
- Tilly, C. (2003). Inequality, Democratization, and De-Democratization. *Sociological Theory*.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9558.00174>
- Umi Narimawati, S. (2007). The Influence of Work Satisfaction, Organizational Commitment and Turnover Intention Towards the Performance of Lecturers at West Java's Private Higher Education Institution. *Journal of Applied Sciences Research*.
- Waldman, D. A. (2011). THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF TOTAL QUALITY MANAGEMENT TO A THEORY OF WORK PERFORMANCE. *Academy of Management Review*.
<https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1994.9412271811>
- Wright, M. L. (2016). WILLIAMS-YULEE V. FLORIDA BAR: JUDICIAL ELECTIONS, IMPARTIALITY, AND THE THREAT TO FREE SPEECH. *DENVER LAW REVIEW*.
- Zoelva, H. (2013). Problematika Penyelesaian Sengketa Hasil Pemilukada oleh Mahkamah Konstitusi. *Konstitusi*.