

SURABAYA
NOVEMBER
10TH 2015

ICODA

PROCEEDING

INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE
ON DEMOCRACY AND ACCOUNTABILITY
*STRENGTHENING DEMOCRATIC ACCOUNTABILITY
FOR CREATING GOOD GOVERNANCE*

FACULTY OF SOCIAL AND POLITICAL SCIENCES
UNIVERSITAS AIRLANGGA



PROCEEDING

International Conference on Demcracy and Accountability (ICoDA)

**“Strengthening Democratic Accountability
for Creating good Governance”**

organized by

**Faculty of Social and Political Sciences
Universitas Airlangga**

Surabaya. 10 November 2015

Perpustakaan Nasional: Katalog Dalam Terbitan
©2015 Fakultas Ilmu Sosial dan Ilmu Politik Universitas Airlangga

Proceeding
International Conference on Democracy and Accountability (ICoDA) 2015

ISBN 978-602-18461-3-1

Penyunting: Nanang Haryono, Irfa Puspitasari
Asisten Penyunting: Amalia Wardahni, Agastya Wardhana, Meisa Silakarma
Tata Letak: Yashinta Andryani, Hamami Cahya Prastika
Tim Kreatif: Mayka Risyayatul Asnawiyah, Dawud Kusuma Dwijayadi

Cetakan I, November 2015

Pertama diterbitkan di Indonesia tahun 2015 oleh
Fakultas Ilmu Sosial dan Ilmu Politik
Universitas Airlangga
Jl. Dharmawangsa Dalam Surabaya 60286, Jawa Timur, Indonesia
Telp.: +62-31-5034015
Fax.: +62-31-5012442
Website: <http://www.fisip.unair.ac.id>
E-mail: info@fisip.unair.ac.id

Greetings from the ICoDA 2015 Organizer

Welcome to the International Conference on Democracy and Accountability (ICoDA) 2015.

In commemorating the 61st anniversary of Universitas Airlangga (1954-2015), Faculty of Social and Political Sciences Universitas Airlangga holds ICoDA on 10 November 2015. The main theme of this conference is "Strengthening Democratic Accountability for Creating Good Governance." This theme was formulated due to consideration that good governance could be realized only if democracy is strengthened based on public accountability values. The issue is discussed by two keynote speakers and 108 presenters attending the conference.

This conference is attended by scholars, researchers and authors from various countries including Indonesia, Malaysia, and others. The committee has accepted 103 extended abstracts from the prospective presenters. However, there are only 84 extended abstracts that are eligible to be presented at this conference.

The presenters will share ideas regarding the following subthemes: (1) Political and Election System, (2) Media and Public Sphere, (3) Democracy and Identity Issues, (4) Anti-Corruption and Development, (5) Democratization and Socio-Cultural Conflict, (6) Cosmopolitan Democracy and Global Governance, and (7) e-democracy and Open Government.

On behalf of the ICoDA 2015 organizer, I deliver my high appreciation to all presenters who are willing to take part at this conference. Thank you very much for your participation at the ICoDA 2015. Through this conference, we hope that you enjoy the exchange of ideas and open an opportunity to develop academic collaboration in the future.

Thank you.

Surabaya, 10 November 2015



A SAFRIL

Chairman of the ICoDA 2015

CONTENTS

Topic 1. Political and Electoral System

The Obstacles in Obtaining Sustainable Democracy: Failure in Indonesia's Current Political Party System	1
<i>Ahmad Dzulfiqar Adi, Alfionita Rizky Perdana</i>	
Strengthening Democratic Accountability Party Politics for Creating Good Governance	9
<i>Eka Suaib</i>	
Development Based on the Principles of Human Right in Indonesia as Manifestation of Democracy	15
<i>Farah Dina Herawati</i>	
Money Politics in Local Elections: Pilkada and Pilkadaes (Case Study in Two Villages of Pati Regency)	22
<i>Fitriyah</i>	
Anomalies of Direct Local Democracy in Semarang City	28
<i>Rr. Hermi Susiatingsih</i>	
Indonesia's Populist Leader Strategy in Winning 2014 General Election	36
<i>Imelda Masni Juniaty Sianipar</i>	
Indirect Election, Democratic or Not Democratic	40
<i>Juliannes Cadith</i>	
Limited Freedom: Revocation of Political Suffrage of Military Members in Indonesia	51
<i>I Gusti Agung Ayu Kade Galuh</i>	
Indonesia and Democracy: Development from the Outside	57
<i>Praja Firdaus Nuryananda, Diyan Riska Kristanti</i>	
Electoral System Design, Rational Voter Behavior	64
<i>Rizca Y. Putri, Bramantya Pradipta, Lilis Pratiwi Nsr</i>	

ANOMALIES OF DIRECT LOCAL DEMOCRACY IN SEMARANG CITY

Rr. Hermi Susiatingsih

*Government Science, Faculty of Social and Political Sciences – Diponegoro University
Jl. Prof Sudarto SH No. 13 Tembalang, Semarang, Indonesia
E-mail: h32minis22@gmail.com*

Abstract

Theoretically, direct democracy is intended to achieve three main goals, namely (1) increase public participation in political process, (2) improve public accountability and (3) enhance public welfare. However, current research in Semarang cities indicated that these three ideal goals of direct democracy do not take place. There are many obstacles and cultural context why this idealism of direct democracy does not occur. This research is aimed at exploring this interesting research findings. The research methodology is primarily based on qualitative research by deepening informant views or opinions in regard to three main focuses, namely the connection between (a) direct democracy and political participation, (b) direct democracy and public accountability and finally (c) direct democracy and public welfare. Relevant secondary data are also used such as other research reports and books.

The research results showed that there are three main anomalies happen in Semarang direct mayor election. *Firstly*, Semarang voters do not ensure themselves that direct participation is strongly needed in local political processes. They believe that participation will happen if there are money or other forms given to them as the substitution of income loss in the day of election. *Secondly*, Semarang voters do not believe that there is correlation between direct election and public accountability. They argue that there are still many corruption, collusion and nepotism occur although the mayor is directly voted by people. They perceive the meaning of democracy in very low level of understanding and knowledge. *Thirdly*, Semarang voters do not believe that democracy will be able to make their life better. They are pessimistic and hopeless to the future of direct democracy.

Keywords: direct local democracy anomalies, voters political distrust, pessimism and hopeless, various contexts.

Introduction

By direct local democracy, the local communities are more aware of their region, and would be able to make decision for their region, although intervention of the central government still needed as a commitment to the choice of the Unitary State of the Republic of Indonesia. However, some experts still questioned about achievement of the goal of democracy itself, both procedural democracy and substantial democracy, although the agenda of the five-yearly direct local election had been held hundreds of times (ie from 2004 until the upcoming local elections that would be held in December 2015).

Surbakti (2009) mentioned the existence of money politic in direct election of regional/local government head. This affects emergence of the shadow state and economic bias of the informal economy - politics that will most likely occur in local government in the post Pilkada (Hidayat, 2010). The actors of money politics and shadow state are the business rulers who tend to enter and dominate the political sphere. Finally, democracy belongs to the elite and certain groups who have access and control of the economy. Democracy became a smooth road, a pleasant place, space, and opportunity for the growth of oligarchy (Jeffrey A. Winters, 2015). Therefore, Argued that the plague of money

politics in the local elections, Fitriyah (2012) said that: “Those who spend money politics to win elections are normally expected to recover after elections their investment with a profit. If unchecked, the defense of public interests and the common weal may be on the retreat. These are crimes, and seriously undermine the integrity of elections.”. In fact, Zulkarnain (2010) argued that direct local election is rather a corruption learning, rather than democracy learning. Those phenomenon of money politics, the shadow state and olichargy are direct local democracy anomalies.

This research would focus on how anomalies of direct democracy appear in the local election in Semarang. Semarang is the provincial capital. Its population is deemed to be more politically literate because the support of better conditions and more advanced in the education aspect (formal and informal), fastness and quality of information received, modernity, health, and economy, so it would be the basic of rational consideration in political choice. Thus, the anomalies of local democracy in the election of Semarang should be different variants.

Research Objectives

This research aims to find what and how anomalies in direct local democracy appeared in the Semarang City. Then, this study formulates factors or contexts that affect the appearance of those anomalies in direct local democracy. This research findings will be contribute both empirical and theoretical knowledge to direct local democracy, especially regarding to a concern of anomalies of direct local democracy.

Statement of The Problem

The research questions are as follows:

1. What kinds of direct local democracy anomalies are found in Semarang local election?
2. Toward extends, anomaly of direct local democracy is found related to democracy and political participation?
3. Toward extends, anomaly of direct local democracy is found related to democracy and accountability?
4. Toward extends, anomaly of direct local democracy is found related to democracy and public welfare?

Theoretical-Conceptual Framework

Problems in this study is analyzed by using the theory of democracy, particularly local democracy or direct local democracy. Talking about local democracy, the theory of decentralization and regional autonomy would also be discussed, as both are local democratic tools in achieving its objectives. As for the efforts to achieve these goals, there would appear political behavior anomalies, as a result of the surrounding context.

Theory of Democracy

Democracy (*demos* = people and *krato s*= power or government, which means the highest power (sovereignty) is in the hands of the people. Giddens (1994, 330) then formulate democracy as a political system where the people hold the supreme power, not a king or nobility. This strong determination of the people of a country and the government even prompted the emergence of phrases conveyed by the 16th President of the United States, Abraham Lincoln, during his speech on November 19, 1863, which then underlies the thinking of many politicians: “*Under God, shall have a new birth of freedom-and that government of the people, by the people, for the people shall not perish from the earth*”. (<http://www.abrahamlincolnonline.org/lincoln/speeches/gettysburg.htm>).

Determination of the people in a democratic system could also be found in the opinion of Sodaro (2004, 31): “*The essential idea of democracy is that the people have the right to determine who governs them. In most cases they elect the principal governing officials and hold them accountable for their actions. Democracies also impose legal limits on the government’s authority by guaranteeing certain rights and freedoms to their citizens*”. This opinion contain 3 important and major things. *First*, democracy must provide political participation, such as in the Pilkada. *Second*, democracy encourages the emergence of public accountability for government’s actions. *Third*, in democracy, there is ownership and guarantee of the rights of the people. One of the people’s rights is the right to obtain welfare. The important role of the people in a democratic system therefore cause democracy to be able to reach all people, both in the Central and Regional or Local. For this purpose, democracy is necessary at the local level.

Idealism of Direct Local Democracy

In some matters which are local, the National Government would not be able work effectively and efficiently. By contrast, at the local level, people are more aware of their own area and needs. Thus, the existence of local democracy would be able to answer and solve the problems and meet the needs of local people. This is in line with the opinion of Sisk, et al. (2001, 11): “...inhabitants of a given area have the right and responsibility to make decisions on those issues that affect them most directly and on which they can make decisions”. Thus, decentralization (which spawned regional autonomy) that gives the right and the freedom to set their own household, can be a tool for the achievement of local democracy: a governance that is based on and in favor of local people. By Sisk, et al. (2001, 11): “Central to any meaning of local democratic governance is the concept of self-government and administration closest to the people”. Today, almost universally, decentralization becomes a trend in local government in realizing democracy at the local level (Sisk, et al., 2001, 21). In this local democracy, Smith (1985 in Hidayat 2010) confirms that the main conditions for the realization of an accountable and responsive local government, as well as the establishment of political equality at the local level, is direct local election (local government heads, Pilkada) and DPRD (local representative council).

The importance of principles or values of democracy applied at the local level makes idealism direct local democracy intended to achieve three main objectives, those are: (1) increase public participation in the political process, (2) improve public accountability, and (3) improve welfare of the society. Although idealism direct local democracy needs to be realized, but there are many unique irregularities or improprieties becoming a phenomenon in the local elections.

Anomalies of Direct Local Democracy

According Dictionary.com and Oxford Dictionary of Politics, “Anomali” is mentioned as a deviation from the common rule, type, arrangement, or form. The synonyms of the word anomaly are abnormality, exception, peculiarity, an odd, unusual, peculiar, or strange condition, irregularity etc. Something anomalous is something different, abnormal, peculiar, or not easily to be classified.

Direct local democracy has idealism that is implicitly referring to principal meaning of local government that is from, by and for the local people. By direct local democracy, people of the local level would be closer and reachable, have more opportunities to participate, able to oversee public accountability, and eventually improve sosial welfare. However, if it is then during the implementation of direct local democracy, the meaning as well as goal of idealism is twisted by deviation actions that injure democracy, then this deviation action is called anomaly of direct local democracy.

According on the explanation above, anomaly of direct local democracy could be conceptualized as an unusual political action that occur in direct local elections. It is called anomalous act because the direct local democracy which is intended to increase political participation, public accountability, and welfare of the local people, is twisted by political action that is deviate, for the sake of certain

interests. Actions irregularities such as money politics, shadow state, and oligarchy that occur in local level are examples of anomaly behaviour in direct local democracy.

Methods

Methods used in this research is combining qualitative type and documentation. Qualitative type relies very much on in depth interviews with several key informants in Semarang City. This interview is used in order to get insight data in regard to the political behavior of voters of Semarang City. There are 10 key informants interviewed namely people of election committee, election watching body, political expert and government officials.

Documentation is based on related research reports produced by any person or research institution in regard to Semarang political behavior. This documentation may be from expert research report, mass media, newspaper or survey reports by any related institution.

There are two type of data used in this research, namely primary and secondary data. Primary data are collected from 10 key informants using in depth interview method. Secondary data are collected from documentation related to political attitude and behavior of Semarang people.

Analyzing data is using interpretative, as one strong method in qualitative research. As Creswell (2014) confirms that quality of qualitative research is very much depending on capacity of the researcher to read the transcript, categorize the data and interpret them in scientific analysis and judgment. Data interpretation may lead to figure out trends or may be generalization in the qualitative research method.

Findings and Argument

In regarding to several anomalies of direct local election in Semarang City, research data resulted from documentation namely political survey by Central Java Research Institute (CJRI: 2015) indicates that there is strong anomaly in Semarang voters attitude and behavior toward money politics. Political survey which conducted by CJRI that take 1,000 respondents concludes that 71,9% of Semarang voters is having permissive views on money politics. Big majority of Semarang voters states that receiving or hoping to have money from political competition to substitute their vote is totally accepted and logically right.

Interestingly, Semarang voters view money politics as something usual or normal. They also view that money political is logically right and no moral obligation is broken. This is definitely anomaly since there are twist in political trust. Money politics is something bad but people perceive this is something good. Money politics break the main element of political morality. This public perception or views is contradictory to social ad political norms that is believed that money politics or vote buying is something bad to the future of democracy and political rightness or morality.

Further, political survey by CJRI (2015) continues to confirm that 61,9% of respondents of Semarang voters is egoistic in respond to money politics or vote buying. Majority of Semarang voters confirms that when anyone give them money to vote someone in mayor election, they will surely accept the gifted money, but the choice or who will be elected inside the ballot station is in the hand of themselves. Similar findings obtained from the results of the Hermeni research (2015, 630). This political behavior is not only immoral, but also wrong in the context of political correctness. However, interviews with several respondents, they say that this is not wrong but rational choice since the autonomy in electing someone is not other business but their own political business or decision.

Similar political survey conducted by Centre for Elections and Political Parties (CEPP 2015) also confirm similar results in regard to money politics or vote buying. Occupying less number of respondents than CJRI (namely 200 respondents), CEPP also concludes that majority of Semarang

people is materialistic since they refer or hope to be given money to stimulate their willingness to come to ballot stations.

CEPP tries to link this political attitude toward economic capacity of Semarang people. The center tends to make conclusion that this people political attitudes may be caused by big number of people living under poverty line in Semarang. Poverty may contribute to general perception of the Semarang society to money politics or vote buying. In this condition, Hemini (2015, 628-630) mentioned the same thing.

Interviews with AM (2015), election watching committee of Semarang City is stated that:

“memang menghadapi persepsi publik masyarakat yang permisif dan tidak melihat politik uang sebagai sesuatu yang buruk dalam demokrasi langsung membuat tugas kami di panwas kota menjadi sangat berat. Apalagi jumlah pengawas kami yang hanya sedikit kami semakin kesulitan menghadapi gejala masyarakat seperti ini. Namun demikian, sebagaimana tugas pokok kami, maka kami akan tetap memerangi dan melawan serta memproses politik uang tersebut” (because of people perception that money politics in election is not viewed as bad things, this make our job is the heavier. Number of limited officials also contribute in our difficulty to war money politics. However, as our main job or vision, we will always war and proceed money politics in law enforcement processes).

Data resulted from AM is similar to the social figure opinion of AT (2015). AT also confirms that:

“seluruh proses politik selalu didasari atas praktik suap dan politik uang. Sehingga kondisi seperti ini tidak akan mungkin mampu menghasilkan pemimpin yang baik yang benar-benar mampu menindaklajuti aspirasi masyarakat. Karena perilaku pemilih dan yang dipilih sama-sama terhadap politik uang maka masa depan demokrasi menjadi tidak menentu arah dan tujuannya” (all political processes are dominated by money politics so that this condition will not be able to lead to this society into elected leaders who are able to follow people aspiration up. Since political behavior of voters and candidates toward money politics is similar, it is then hopeless to the future of democracy).

Above data resulted from political surveys and interviews confirm strong first anomaly that money politics is then becoming the bottom line of political behavior in Semarang City. This may lead the uncertainty of quality of direct democracy in Semarang City especially and Indonesia generally.

Second strong anomaly is related to relation between election and accountability. Political survey by CJRI (2015) that occupies massive respondents (1,000 people) confirms that Semarang people do not believe in relation between election or direct democracy and accountability. 78.6% of total respondents states that direct democracy can not guarantee public accountability. This refers to the case of Soemarmo (former Semarang City mayor) who have corruption problems. Although Soemarmo is elected by people, but he is not accountable and have a problem of corruption.

Interviews with HW (2015) in regard to the case of corruption, he states that:

“Kasus korupsi yang menimpa Soemarmo memang membentuk opini publik bahwa demokrasi langsung sekalipun tidak mampu menghasilkan atau mejamin tata kelola pemerintahan yang baik khususnya menyangkut akuntabilitas. Sebagai pemimpin birokrasi ternyata korupsi oleh Soemarmo membawa banyak pihak lain seperti Sekda, Kepala Dinas ataupun anggota DPRD”. (Case of Soemarmo corruption leads to public opinion that direct election can not be able to guarantee good governance, especially accountability. This Soemarmo's corruption case brings other actors such as CEO city leader and local parliament members).

Political expert from Diponegoro University, TY (2015) also similarly confirms that:

“Kasus korupsi Soemarmo menjadikan kesulitan para pejuang demokrasi untuk menunjukkan bahwa demokrasi akan menghasilkan kebaikan. Perilaku politik yang by pass dan menghalalkan segala cara menjadi hal yang mencoreng demokrasi langsung di Kota Semarang” (Soemarmo's corruption case make it difficult for democracy activists to confirm

that democracy may result in goodness. By pass politics and doing everything to get power then undermine the significance of direct democracy in Semarang City).

Political surveys by CJRI, CEPP and LPSI (2015) confirm the danger of immoral political behavior toward the future of direct local democracy in Indonesian cities, include Semarang City. These research institutes warn this anomaly may lead to the trust of democracy in very local level.

Finally, third strong anomaly is showed by survey results by CJRI (2015) that 76,5% of respondents (of 1,000 people) does not believe that direct local election will be able to guarantee public welfare. CEPP also releases similar picture related to this. Hermini research results (2015, 629) also mentions similar data

Majority of Semarang people view there is no direct relation between city mayor election and improvement of public welfare. The people simply think that city mayor can directly affect the life of the people to become better. The say that the city mayor can not improve their family economy or even the city mayor can not help them to find a job.

This anomaly is responded by an expert MTA (2015) by asserting that:

“Masyarakat tidak memiliki kemampuan berfikir yang mendalam bahwa relasi demokrasi dan kesejahteraan rakyat adalah relasi tidak langsung. Artinya ada variable antara demokrasi dan kesejahteraan rakyat, yakni bahwa demokrasi langsung bisa menghasilkan pemimpin yang baik, kemudian pemimpin yang baik bisa menghasilkan tata kelola pemerintahan yang baik, dan akhirnya tata kelola pemerintahan yang baik akan menghasilkan kesejahteraan rakyat. Ini seharusnya yang diajarkan kepada rakyat, sehingga mereka tidak mispersepsi terhadap demokrasi langsung” (people do not have deep capacity to understand the relation between direct democracy and social welfare. The relation between them is indirectly. Democracy produces good leaders, good leaders produce good governance, and good governance produces public welfare. This should be learned to the people, so they are not misperception to the importance of direct democracy).

KPU member of Semarang City, AK (2015) supports the importance of voters education in Semarang City in respond this third anomaly. AK further confirms that:

“pendidikan politik penting, yang harus dimulai dari pemilih pemula agar mereka benar dalam memahai demokrasi, khususnya demokrasi langsung. Masyarakat sejak awal sudah harus dikenal dengan nilai-nilai dasar demokrasi, sehingga mereka memiliki pemahaman yang benar tentang democracy”. (political education is important and need to be started from first people who use their right in political election. From the early time, society need to be given knowledge about basic principles of democracy so that they have right concept of democracy).

Conclusions

Referring to above research findings and analysis, there are several important conclusions regarding to political anomalies of the local election can be noted, as the following points.

Firstly, voters participation in direct local election of Semarang City is not motivated based on voters sincerely political will to attend the election. They come to the ballot station are mainly caused by material stimulus namely money. Money is then becoming big issue in mobilizing participation of people in political actions. In Semarang social perception of the people, it is mixed understanding between money politics (vote buying) and political costs. Money politics and political costs must be differentiated each other. Money politics is inappropriate in political competition since using money to buy votes or political support. Whereas, political costs is accepted and appropriate since money is needed to back political success up in political competition. This first political anomaly is currently viewed as something normal in political life, although it is totally wrong.

Secondly, there is other anomaly that people of Semarang City do not believe about relation between election and accountability. There are many causes that happen in Semarang in which the City leaders who are elected by people are having problems in dealing with corruption and bad governance. Former mayor of Semarang City (Soemarmo HS) was an example of a leader committed in corruption in which he was a political elected person. This example leads to instant people conclusion that local election is not guarantee the accountability.

Finally, there is developing distrust that election will not guarantee a social welfare. This anomaly is caused by the fact that there are lots of political leaders (both in provincial or city/regency levels) who are corrupted and not able to increase public happiness and welfare. People mindset of Semarang City is very simple that local election must result in welfare. However, this high hope is disappointed by elected mayor or vice mayor so that people behavior and attitude become negative and pessimistic to the politics. Less capacities of the elected political leaders to follow public aspiration up also make this political behavior grows highly.

Recommendations

Recommendations may be addressed to the above problems or anomalies are as follows:

- a. Strong political education is needed to guarantee that voters behavior is not materialistic and transactional. It is needed to be design a mechanism of political learning from the government and strong civil society to improve or restore this first anomaly.
- b. It is important to raise the significance of accountability in political process in Semarang City level. Many stakeholders need to make sure that accountability is one main element in a process to build good governance. Good governance is one important way to guarantee public welfare and justice.
- c. It is needed to develop the understanding of the public about the robust relation between election and social welfare. The logic is that election will produce good political leaders, and good political leaders will then create social welfare.
- d. Finally, in the Indonesian or Semarang political context, it is important to implement a role model or “*keteladanan*” model so that people will trust to political leaders. Political leaders (namely City mayor and vice mayor) must provide a good example or good manners to guarantee good governance and public welfare.

References

- Creswell J.W., 2009. *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative and Mixed Methods Approaches*, Third Edition. Los Angeles: SAGE Publication.
- Democracy Index, 2014: *Democracy and its discontents A report from The Economist Intelligence Unit*, The Economist Intelligence Unit Limited
<http://www.sudestada.com.uy/Content/Articles/421a313a-d58f-462e-9b24-2504a37f6b56/Democracy-index-2014.pdf>
- Dictionary.com (<http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/anomaly>).
- Fitriyah, Dra., MA., 2012: “*Fenomena Politik Uang Dalam Pilkada*”, *Politika: Jurnal Ilmu Politik*, Universitas Diponegoro, Vol 3, No. 1. Access of <http://ejournal.undip.ac.id/index.php/politika/article/view/4824/4373>,
- Hermi. Susiatingsih., Rr., 2015: *Street Level Politics of Election: Grass Root Political Behaviour in Semarang, Indonesia*, Proceedings Books ICONPO V, Published by Asia Pasific Society for Public Affairs.

- Hidayat, Syarif, 2010: "Demokrasi Elitis? Relasi Kekuasaan Pasca Pilkada", Journal Unair, Volume 23, Nomor 3, http://journal.unair.ac.id/abstract_download.html
-2001: "Pola Hubungan Penguasa dan Pengusaha di Tingkat Local" Sebuah Refleksi, Renai, Jurnal Penelitian ilmu Sosial dan Humaniora, (Pustaka Percik, tahun 1 no 1 Oktober 2000-Maret 2001)
- Huntington, S. P. (1993). *The Third Wave: Democratization in the Late Twentieth Century*. Oklahoma: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Giddens, Anthony., (1994) *Beyond Left and Right — the Future of Radical Politics*. Cambridge
- Sisk.Timothy D., et al., (2001), *Democracy At The Local Level*, International IDEA Handbook Series 4, Publications Office, International IDEA, Strömsborg, SE 103 34, Stockholm, Sweden.
- Sodaro. Michael J. (2004). *Comparative Politics. A Global Introduction*, New York: Mc Graw Hill.
- Surbakti, Ramlan., 2009, *Politik Uang dalam Pilkada*, dalam Harian Kompas
- The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Politics , (<https://www.questia.com/read/54855453/the-concise-oxford-dictionary-of-politics>)
- Winters, Jeffrey A. , 2015: *Oligarchy*, Published by Cambridge University Press
- Zulkarnain, (2010) : *Kajian Penegakan Hukum Pasca Pemilihan Kepala Daerah*, Jurnal Konstitusi, Vol. III, No. 2, PUSKASI FH Universitas Widyagama, Malang
- Research reports & Mass Media:
- Central Java Research Institute, 2015: *Political Survey of Semarang Political Behaviour*, CJRI, Semarang
- Center for Election and Political Partie, 2015: *Survey on Political Participation in City Mayor Election*, CEPP UNDIP, Semarang
- Kompas.Com, Jumat, 10 April 2015 | 19:31 WIB , "Peneliti LIPI: Belum Semua Masyarakat Melek Politik" <http://nasional.kompas.com/read/2015/04/10/19310811/Peneliti.LIPI>.
- Lembaga Pengkajian Survey Indonesia, 2015: *Survey Perilaku Politik di Jawa Tengah*, LPSI, Semarang.
- Website :
- (<http://www.abrahamlincolnonline.org/lincoln/speeches/gettysburg.htm>).



ICODA