

The Relationship Between Votes, Campaign Funds and Previous Winning Political Parties in the General Elections in Indonesia

Lita Kusumasari^a, ^aSTIE YKPN School of Business, Email:
litasusumasari@yahoo.com

Campaign funds in the general election are playing a vital role. There is an assumption that the higher campaign fund could obtain higher votes. A political party is gradually increasing campaign funds to win the votes. On the other side, people have scepticism that campaign funds will be used to buy votes, also known as money politics. People consider that the more money that is used for campaign funds will lead to fraud. The transparency of the campaign fund is important as a tool for voters to choose the right one. The General Elections Commission regulates that the political party has to submit a campaign fund report that consists of a source of funds and spending forms in Indonesia. The campaign fund report would disclose whether candidates rely on their own money or from other contributions. Relying too much on other contributions would lead to nepotism and fraud in the future, due to payback. The relationship between campaign funding and electoral success is a fruitful subject for scholars. The finding is there is a positive link between spending and electoral success. The other result is that a candidate share of the vote is not substantially affected by their campaign spending. There is a gap in the result that could be explored more, especially in Indonesia where democracy is growing. Indonesia is well known for political corruption that involves legislators, governors, and mayors. Based on the issue, the purpose of this research is to determine the relationship between votes, campaign funds and previous winning political parties in Indonesia for the general election during the period of 2009–2019. The analysis method used is regression. The result is a substantially significant relationship between vote and campaign funds and previous winning political parties for the general elections in Indonesia.

Keywords: *Campaign fund, vote, general election, winner political parties.*

Introduction

The general election in Indonesia is held to elect the house of representatives (legislative) and the Mayor, Deputy, Governor and President (executives). People usually need to be endorsed by political parties to be a candidate. No independent candidate is allowed. The political party has power, especially the party that has won the general election in the past. To be a house of representatives, the elected candidate has to win votes in a certain amount and the political party has also to acquire votes of more than the threshold. Otherwise, the elected candidate who won the votes would not be elected if the political party does not win the threshold. For the presidential election, the political party has to win the threshold in the last general election before proposing the candidate.

The Indonesian general election after the 1998 reformation was held in 1999. Before the reformation, there were only three political parties. The 1999 first election with the open system had 48 political parties participating. The open system continues and gradually improves to impose a fair and peaceful democracy. The general election was held in the years 1999, 2004, 2009, and 2014. In all the years, there was a different time for choosing the legislative and the President. Starting in 2019, was the first simultaneous presidential and legislative elections. This was the largest general election in Southeast Asia (Salna & Singgih, 2019).

Close to April 2019 (general election), there was an economic boost emanating from an election campaign. The economic growth was around five per cent for most of last year. In January and February, central government spending grew to 14 per cent from the same period last year. The government spending was 145.7 trillion rupiah (\$10.3 billion) with social assistant expenditure at 70 per cent. It is used for fuel subsidies, for the conditional aid program and to regional and local governments (Salna & Singgih, 2019). Based on this spending, the economic growth reached 5.2 per cent in the first quarter. The trickle-down effect on government spending is strongly related to consumption in election preparation.

To win the campaign, there are several ways. First, the candidate could sell the vision, mission, and program towards the voters. Second, voters can see the profile of the candidates and the previous occupations they have held. Last, candidates could offer to buy votes using money or goods (Kurniawan & Hermawan, 2019). The matter of money politics could emerge on almost every step since to be a chosen candidate does not occur until winning the election (Sjafrina, Dampak Politik Uang terhadap Mahalnya Biaya Pemenangan Pemilu dan Korupsi Politik, 2019). In Indonesia, the candidate who wants to compete in the general elections (a member of house representatives, major, and President) needs to approach the political parties because they need the backing of a political party to legalise as a candidate. Sometimes to approach the political party, the candidate needs to pay for key persons that

could speak up to the leader of a political party. After that, to rally the campaign, the candidates need to pay the expenses. The main source for campaign funds in the candidate itself. The political party usually supports with minor funding. The campaign fund could go to buy the votes from the voters directly. After votes, the candidate has to secure the number of votes by giving money to the staff of the general election who have the authority to count the votes. The last one, by giving money to staff of the general election, is diminishing because the system is quite transparent and online. However, the candidate has to pay for voters and the political party is assumed to still be around. Vice President candidate, Sandiaga Uno, was assumed to have issued Rp500 billion to each party who elected him.

The direct elections which are supposed to create voters have become autonomous. The current system makes it possible for switching voters directly and indirectly. The direct way is an attempt by visiting the voters and persuading them to choose the preferred candidates. The indirect way is providing information that could make voters choose the preferred candidates (Trihartono, 2014).

In the general election, campaign funds are playing a vital role. There is an assumption that the higher campaign fund could obtain higher votes. It is very difficult to track the money to the winner and the policy outcome relationship. It could take place in several ways where these relationships begin to take form. Transparency is important to political parties because there are risks. A high transparency would make people believe that democracy is clean. A low transparency tends to be an act of fraud. People are trying to combat corruption and prevent even just the appearance of corruption. The way people take interest in the general election is by giving campaign donations, helping to lobby, and being within the inner circle to understand the agenda. There is also an issue regarding the corruption of the legislators. They have to depend upon donations and help which will be a price to pay in the future. To overcome the issue, transparency is so essential because voters cannot play around campaign funds. The candidate could decide for the best interest and not rely on much from such kinds of sources. They know meaningfully where the spending is coming from (Krumholz, 2013).

Money politics is the act of giving money to influence people or institutions in political decision making. KPK said that political corruption emerges from corruption in the general election and high-cost politics. ICW stated that high-cost politics comes from nomination buying. The proportion of voters participating in vote-buying in the 2014 election was between 25–33 per cent. This range is comparatively high by international standards, with Indonesia's level of vote-buying being the third largest in the world (Muhtadi, 2019). Voters could change to choose a certain candidate if they are given goods assistance or giving money. To reduce money politics, we can use both capital and local (Kurniawan & Hermawan, 2019). The reasons for committing political corruption are the desire to enrich oneself, funding the political party, and the sake for election needs, as well as the

collaboration of the reasons mentioned previously (Sjafrina, Dampak Politik Uang terhadap Mahalnya Biaya Pemenangan Pemilu dan Korupsi Politik, 2019).

It is so important to elaborate deeply on the campaign fund that may lead to fraud and corruption. Based on the fraud triangle theory by Donald Cressey, it explains that someone could commit fraud because there is pressure, opportunity, and rationalisation (Cressey, 1953). Campaign funds could be financial pressure for the winner of the general election. Therefore, much evidence in Indonesia is correlated with fraud or corruption to use the money for funding campaigns or paying back the funding while doing the campaign before.

Campaign funding is recorded on campaign fund reports, based on law. There is evidence that political parties in Indonesia are not transparent and accountable for campaign funds. In general, during an election held in 2004 and 2009, political parties received campaign funds that were not legal and not reported properly to the General Elections Commission. There were five political parties that did not report campaign funds to the auditors in 2009 (Saputra, 2013).

The tendency of money politics and no transparency would lead to distrust from people. One aspect of transparency is shown in the campaign fund report. If the campaign fund is high, people assumed there is money politics to buy votes. Another assumption is that people do not see the program but just loyalty to political parties. Based on the problem, the research purpose is to determine the relationship among votes, fund campaigns, and previously winning political parties.

Literature Review

The practice of general elections in Indonesia has been discussed by many scholars. The addressing aspects are the general election itself from closed to open, and now people are seeing whether the direct election is really needed. The other aspect is campaign rules that need to enact more in the violation or adding of more regulations. Last is the campaign fund report that people still think is just a formal thing that does not really show the truth. To understand more about these issues, the following discussion will address the general election, campaign fund reporting and scholar findings as a literature review to build the hypothesis.

General Election

A reformation occurred in Indonesia in 1998. The purpose of the reformation was to fight for a democratic government and put an end to corruption, collusion, and nepotism (KKN), as accused in the Suharto regime. General elections are supposed to be based on directness,

generalisation, freedom, secrecy, honesty, and fairness. President B.J. Habibie was formerly Vice President in the Suharto era to set up for the general election. In the Suharto era there were only three political parties (Partai Persatuan Pembangunan, Golongan Karya, dan Partai Demokrasi Indonesia) which could contest in the general election. The reformation era changed the structure of the political parties. Indonesia held a direct general election for three systems: President and Vice President, head of the regional country (Governor, Mayor, and Regent) and legislative for the house of representatives from regional to national. The summaries of the general elections held from the year 1999 to 2019 are presented in Table 1 below.

Table 1: Summary of General Election

Year	1999	2004	2009	2014	2019
Number of political Parties	48	24	38	12	16
System	Proportional	Proportional	Proportional	Proportional	Proportional
List	Closed List	Open List	Open List	Open List	Open List
Parliamentary Threshold	2%	2%	2.5%	3.5%	4%
Political Parties Won	6	17	9	10	7
Seat	500 (462 elected)	550 elected	560 elected	560 elected	575 elected
Date of Election	7 June 1999	5 April 2004	9 April 2009	5 April 2014	17 April 2019

Source: Wikipedia (2019); Wikipedia (2014) and Prihatini (2018).

The electoral system changed from 1999 to 2004, with a closed list to an open list. In 1999 when the closed list was enacted, a political party had the significant power to choose the elected candidate. Since 2004, the open list was introduced. A political party could only endorse the candidate, but they had to be selected based on the votes gathered. It reduced the power of the political parties. It changed the way to campaign too. In the closed list, political parties would dominate the campaign. Meanwhile, in the open list, the candidate should campaign for themselves and also for the political party (Supriyanto & Wulandari, 2013).

The candidates try to receive funding for the campaign. The political party could not provide support due to there being not enough fees collected from members or even funding from the government to a political party is limited to only operational purposes. The government would not help much in the campaign. The burden for the campaign is on the candidate. I needed to regulate so that the campaign would be fair.

The rule for the general election is regulated by law in Indonesia. The 1999 general election was based on Law No.3 of 1999. The law was regulated for the source of funds, donation limitation, the illegal source of funds, campaign fund reporting, sanction, and law enactment. The limitation of campaign fund spending is not regulated yet (Supriyanto & Wulandari, 2013). The general election held in 2004 was based on the Law No. 12 of 2003, and the general election in 2009 was based on the Law No. 10 of 2008. The general election in 2014 was based on Law No. 8 of 2012. The last general election in 2019 was regulated by Law No.7 of 2017.

The candidates for the DPR or local legislatures had to be endorsed by a political party and were required to resign from their non-legislative government offices. The threshold would be the set bar to eliminate any party that had failed to obtain a threshold share of the national vote. The threshold has been increased from previous years. In 2019, there are no new political parties that could win the seat due to not achieving the threshold.

The Campaign Fund Report

The general election in Indonesia is ruled by the General Elections Commission (KPU) which was founded in 1999. The KPU is independent and manages the general elections in Indonesia. Based on the authority given to the KPU, campaign fund reporting was set up. Based on KPU Rule No. 24 in 2018 about campaign funds in the general election, it basically ruled for technical campaign fund reporting as stated after this (KPU, Dana Kampanye Pemilihan Umum, 2018). Political parties own a campaign fund account in the general bank that is separated from other accounts that belong to a political party. This account is solely used to regulate cash in and out for campaign funds. The campaign fund consists of funds from political parties, the candidate and legal donations (private, group, company or non-government organisation). The forms of campaign funds are cash, materials, or service.

The political parties have an obligation to submit four reports throughout the campaign period:

1. Report for opening special account for campaign fund (Laporan Pembukaan Rekening Khusus Dana Kampanye = RKDK)
2. Initial report of campaign fund (Laporan Awal dana kampanye = LADK)
3. Campaign fund donation report (Laporan sumbangan dana kampanye = LSDK)
4. Donation and expenses of campaign fund report (Laporan penerimaan dan pengeluaran dana kampanye = LPPDK)

The donation and expenses of the campaign fund report are handed to the KPU. The KPU will give the report to a Certified Public Accountant (CPA) for auditing the report in 30 days.

It is the agreed upon audit procedure. The CPA will not issue an opinion. The result is compliance or non-compliance with the campaign fund report laws. The audited campaign fund report will be published to the public by the KPU.

The source of the campaign fund would not change from the 1999 to the 2019 general election. Basically, there are only three sources allowed:

1. Political parties
2. The candidates
3. Legal donation from other parties (individual, group, company or non-government organisation)

The limitation of campaign funds per source would depend on the individual or group. The individual donation was set to a limit of only Rp100 million in the general election in 2004, but increased to Rp1 billion in 2009 and 2014. In the general election of 2019, the limitation for individual donation was Rp2.5 billion. The group donation was set to a limit of Rp750 million in 2004. It increased to Rp5 billion in 2009, and again to Rp7.5 billion in 2014. A further increase in group donations for the general election in 2019 reached Rp25 billion. There is no set limitation for candidates and political parties. The limitation on the individual and entity are not followed by the limitation on the overall campaign spending. Candidates can be expected to spend their resources as much as possible to win the election. This can extend to paying off voters at dawn on election day, a dirty practice known as “dawn attack” (serangan wajar) (Sukma, 2019).

Based on the law, political parties are not be allowed to use illegal donations. Any donation that exceeds the limit and comes from a foreigner, no identity person, regional government, a state-owned company, a regional owned company, and the village government, has to give back to the country before being audited.

Basically, the campaign fund report consists of revenue and expenses. The revenue comes from political parties, candidates, and legal donations. The expenses are divided into two components which are operational expense and capital expenditure. The operational expenses are limited meetings, head to head meetings, advertising in online and offline media, the development of campaign tools, the disbursement of campaign tools, and other activities that do not violate the law. The capital expenditure is vehicles, tools, and others.

The responsibility for producing the legislative campaign fund report rests with political parties. The legislative campaign fund report is signed by the Chairman and Treasurer of a political party. Both parties must sign a responsibility letter that states that all the presented data in the campaign fund report is true and based on law. It covers tax and does not violate

any laws. If there is a violation regarding the legislative campaign fund report, it would be their responsibility.

The Former Research Finding

The general election in Indonesia has been alleged to create a financial trap system. It is strongly believed there is a correlation between money politics and political corruption. The political parties need to reform regarding the recruitment of election candidates, political party financing, and voter education (Sjafrina, Dampak Politik Uang terhadap Mahalnya Biaya Pemenangan Pemilu dan Korupsi Politik, 2019). Many politicians have been arrested due to corruption allegations in Indonesia. There have been 78 Governors, Mayors and Regents caught due to corruption in Indonesia since 2004, and until 2017 (Kompas, 2017). Corruption scandals affect the perceptions of democracy. People lose trust and think that politics is related to corruption and self-enrichment (Insight, 2013).

The financial accountability of political parties could be seen in the financial report of a political party and in the campaign fund reports. According to constituents' perceptions, the financial accountability of political parties is low, both in yearly financial reports or campaign fund reports (Kholmi, Persepsi Konstituen terhadap Akuntabilitas Keuangan Partai Politik (Studi di Kota Malang), 2010). The same result was found from the perceptions of accounting students and postgraduate students towards the accountability and transparency of financial reports of political parties (Kholmi, Persepsi Mahasiswa Akuntansi Terhadap Akuntabilitas dan Transparansi Keuangan Partai Politik, 2010). The reasons for low accountability include that there are not enough human resources who have mastered the political party financial reporting process, the Treasurer has no accounting background education, and the training is still limited.

People try to influence voters in many different ways including from public meetings, media campaigns, rallies, direct campaigns, and polling. Polling is a new instrument in the local leader elections. Polling has challenged the traditional approach towards party candidates by pushing political parties to be more open to selecting popular and electable candidates. Polling has been used beyond capturing the voice of the people (Trihartono, 2014).

The compliance of the submitted data and donation campaign fund reporting from the big five political parties in Bali is at 92 per cent. The political parties that were not compliant were because they did not win the general election in Bali. There is no impact on the political party who did not submit (Sugiwa, Arifah, & Farobi, 2015).

The campaign fund report is not accountable because transactions for campaign activities were done via the cash method. The off-balance transaction occurred because of the cash

method and not using the banking system. We were not able to trace the donation incurred. Based on the issues, it is relevant to limit or ban the cash transactions to reduce such issues (Saputra, 2013). The way the candidates manage their campaign funding shows the strengthening of political clienteles on one hand and the waning of programmatic politics on the other (Sukmajati & Disyacitta, 2019).

Hypothesis Development

In the 2004 and 2009 general elections, it was believed that the political party which spent significantly on a campaign would be the winner and acquire the most seats won. This premise worked not only for the big political parties, but for the new parties too. In Indonesia, the evidence came from the Gerindra and Hanura parties in the 2009 general election (Saputra, 2013). The first hypothesis of this study is stated as follows:

H1: The campaign fund has a positive impact on the votes gathered in the general election this period.

One of the studies of behaviour in electing during a general election is a psychological model. This model is called democratic culture or civic culture, specifically the culture of political participation to explain political participation (Almond, 1963). According to this model, a citizen participates in the general election due to his interest in politics. He has a close feeling to a political party (party identity), has enough information to elect, feels that his votes are meaningful, and believes that his choice will improve the condition (Fuad, 2014).

The political preferences of most voters are family, fellow workers or friends, religionists with respondents, the guidance of Islamic scholars, people who are older in age, have a higher economic status, neighbours, parents, campaigners and being top of work. The reason to consider to choose the candidates are the figure, idea or program, integrity, attractive personality, performance, and being of the same religion (Irtanto, 2014). Based on the finding, that party identity and being top of work will have an impact on the political party winner, then the second hypothesis of this study is stated as follows:

H2: The previous political party winner has a positive impact on the votes gathered in the general election this period.

Based on the previous hypothesis, both factors will have a positive impact on the votes gathered in the general election this period. Consequently, the third hypothesis of this study is stated as follows:

H3: The campaign fund and previous political party winner have a positive impact on the votes gathered in the general election this period.

Methodology/Materials

Data

The data was collected from the political parties' campaign fund reporting that was uploaded on the KPU website and other resources since the general elections held from 2009–2019. The population is political parties who rally for the general election. The purposive sampling method is used based on the criteria that the political party submitted the audited campaign fund and the data of the campaign fund reported is complete. The total sample is 38 political parties from 52 political parties.

The campaign fund accounting is gathered from the General Election Commission (KPU) website and the votes are gathered from the Statistics Indonesia (Biro Pusat Statistics = BPS) website. The political party is listed on Table 2 below:

Table 2: Sample of Political Parties

No.	Political Party	2009	2014	2019
1	Partai Hati Nurani Rakyat	√	√	√
2	Partai Gerakan Indonesia Raya	√	√	√
3	Partai Keadilan Sejahtera	√	√	√
4	Partai Amanat Nasional	√	√	√
5	Partai Kebangkitan Bangsa	√	√	√
6	Partai Golongan Karya	√	√	√
7	Partai Persatuan Pembangunan	√	√	√
8	Partai Bulan Bintang	√	√	√
9	Partai Demokrasi Indonesia Perjuangan	√	√	√
10	Partai Demokrat	√	√	√
11	Partai Keadilan dan Persatuan Indonesia	-	√	√
12	Partai Nasional Demokrat	-	√	√
13	Partai Gerakan Perubahan Indonesia	-	-	√
14	Partai Solidaritas Indonesia	-	-	√
15	Partai Berkarya	-	-	√
16	Partai Persatuan Indonesia	-	-	√
	Total	10	12	16

Source: BPS (2017) KPU (2019)

Methodology

The data collected are votes gathered and campaign spending. The independent variable is the amount of campaign spending and the winner of the previous general election. The dependent variable is the votes gathered. The campaign spending and votes gathered are treated by ln. The winning political party is the dummy variable consisting of one (1) and zero (0). The five big political parties in the previous general election are given one (1) and the others are given zero (0). The dependent variable is the votes gathered. The level of significance is five per cent.

SPSS is used to analyse the relationship between the votes gathered as the dependent variable, and campaign spending and the winning dummy as an independent variable using simple regression. The classic test would be imposed before running the data. The regression model used in this research is presented in the following equation:

$$\text{Votes} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \text{ Spending} + \beta_2 \text{ Winner} + \varepsilon$$

The IBM SPSS Statistic 23 is used for the classic test and regression. The classic test is normality and heteroscedasticity. The normality test is used to view the normality distribution for data. The Kolmogorov-Smirnov method is also used. It is normal when the significance is greater than alpha. The heteroscedasticity is to observe whether there are uneven variances from residual error. Using the Glejser test, if the value of significant probability is greater than alpha, then there is no heteroscedasticity.

Results and Findings

Descriptive Statistics

The minimum number of votes is 312,775 and the maximum is 27,053,961. The minimum number of votes is from Partai Keadilan dan Persatuan Indonesia in the general election of 2019. The maximum number of votes is from Partai Demokrasi Indonesia Perjuangan in the general election of 2019. The mean for the number of votes is 9,256,752.

The minimum campaign fund is Rp3,361,424,903 from Partai Gerakan Perubahan Indonesia in the general election of 2019. Partai Gerakan Perubahan Indonesia did not pass the threshold requirement. The maximum campaign fund is Rp455,031,140,324 from Partai Gerakan Indonesia Raya in the general election of 2014. Partai Gerakan Indonesia Raya is in the third position of vote winner in 2014, after Partai Demokrasi Perjuangan Indonesia and Partai Golongan Karya. The average of the campaign fund from 2009–2019 is Rp158,455,613,196. The result can be seen in Table 3.

Table 3: Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Voters	38	312,775.00	27,053,961.00	9,256,752.1053	6,799,506.56
Fundcamp	38	3,361,424,903.00	455,031,140,324.00	158,455,613,196.8158	13,1425,036,121.69
Winner	38	0.00	1.00	0.3947	0.49536
Valid (listwise)	N 38				

Result of Normality Test

There are 38 data in the normality test. The result is normal for votes and campaign fund. The significant of the campaign fund is 0.193 higher than 0.05. The same result for votes is 0.200 higher than 0.05. It can be concluded that the data is normal, as seen in Table 4.

Result of Glejser Test

The campaign fund as an independent variable does not have a heteroscedasticity problem. Using the Glejser test, the t-statistics from the independent variable (campaign fund) is not significant. The value of significance is 0.064, which is higher than 0.05; therefore, there is no problem of heteroscedasticity. The result can be seen in Table 4.

Table 4: Summary of Classic Test

Test	Methods	Result of Significant with $\alpha = 5\%$	Result
Normality test	One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test	Fund Campaign 0.193 Votes 0.200	Data is normal
Heterocedasticity	Glejser Test	Fund Campaign 0.064	No heteroscedasticity

Source: Data from SPSS

Result of Regression

The independent variables (campaign fund and previous winner) can explain 64.5 per cent of the votes gathered. Statistics evidence is R square 0.648 and R is 0.805. The other variables may explain the rest impact. Many variables, such as political situation, the figure of candidates, religion, fans and devoted people towards the political parties or candidates, could have various impacts on the votes gathered.

Based on the regression result, the significant value on the campaign fund is 0.000 which is lower than 0.05 (alpha). The result shows that hypothesis one is supported and statistically significant. The campaign fund has a positive impact on the votes gathered in the general elections. The same result of the previous winning political party in the general election has a positive impact on the votes gathered in the general election. This hypothesis two is supported and statistically significant due to the significant value of 0.000, that is lower than 0.05 (alpha). The result can be seen in Table 5.

Table 5: Regression Result

Coefficients ^a						
Model		Unstandardised Coefficients		Standardised Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	2422026.115	1097590.854		2.207	0.034
	Fundcamp	2.535E-5	0.000	0.490	4.736	0.000
	Winner	7138800.498	1419969.093	0.520	5.027	0.000

a. Dependent Variable: voters

The model simultaneously could explain the relationship between campaign fund expenditure and the winner of the previous general election towards the votes gathered. The statistical evidence that could be seen from the significant figure is 0.000, which is lower than 0.05 (alpha). The model is significant. The other evidence is the F test value, which is 32.187, that is higher than F table 3.3. If the F test value is higher than the F table, then the Ha is accepted. Hypothesis three is statistically significant and supported.

Table 6: ANOVA

ANOVA ^a						
Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	25.884	2	12.942	32.187	0.000 ^b
	Residual	14.073	35	0.402		
	Total	39.957	37			

a. Dependent Variable: log_vote

b. Predictors: (Constant), log_fund, winner

a. Dependent Variable: log_vote

There is a positive relationship between campaign funds and the previous winning political parties. This premise is important to signal that the campaign funds could trigger corruption in the end. The data used is legal campaign fund reporting from the KPU. The campaign



spending that the parties have actually reported seems reasonable but people believe it is only a small fraction of the total. The example of the Jokowi-Kalla and Prabowo-Hatta campaign in 2014 was reported to cost \$37 million. The University of Indonesia's Institute for Economic and Social Research estimated the real campaign costs at \$920 million (25 times what was reported) (Quraishi & Staak, 2015).

Corruption in Indonesia's political campaign is a highlight. There are acts that could limit the relationship between corruption and political campaigning (Sukma, 2019). First, they should support legislation that would impose strict limits on the amount of money a candidate can spend. Second, they should support legislation that would require public disclosure of all campaign-related expenditures. Finally, they should support strict enforcement and harsh penalties for violation of these requirements. Lowering the cost of campaigning would allow equal chances to rich and poor candidates in future elections (Quraishi & Staak, 2015).

The general election in Indonesia is improving to be fair, transparent, and peaceful. The KPU is managing the general election by technically giving guidance through the issuing of laws. One of the laws is campaign fund reporting. There are so many deficiencies for campaign funding in practice. It is still assumed to be money politics which could lead to committing an act of fraud. The higher the campaign fund, the higher the possibility for corruption and fraud based on political payback for supporting while campaigning.

It is statistically proven that votes are correlated with campaign funds and previous winning political parties. The larger campaign fund will contribute to the higher number of votes gathered. The previous winning political party has fans that are loyal, no matter what program is offered. They just cast the vote to the political party. It is statistically significant evidence that the previous winning political party could obtain higher votes. Based on the result, there are many fields to be fixed, such as imposed law and limitation on donation and spending so that the general election can be fair and transparent.

Acknowledgment: This research work is supported by the fundamental research scheme supported by the Ministry of Research, Technology and Higher Education of the Republic of Indonesia.



REFERENCES

- Almond, G. A. (1963). *The Civic Culture, Political Attitudes, and Democracy in Five Nations*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- BPS. (2017, December 18). Hasil Penghitungan Suara Sah Partai Politik Peserta Pemilu Legislatif Tahun 2004-2014. Retrieved from Badan Pusat Statistik: <https://www.bps.go.id/statictable/2009/03/04/1573/hasil-penghitungan-suara-sah-partai-politik-peserta-pemilu-legislatif-tahun-2004-2014.html>
- Cressey, D. R. (1953). *Other People's Money: A Study of the Social Psychology of Embezzlement*.
- Fuad, A. B. (2014). Political Identity and Election in Indonesian Democracy: A Case Study in Karang Pandan Village – Malang, Indonesia. 4th International Conference on Sustainable Future for Human Security, Sustain 2013. 20, pp. 477 – 485. *Procedia Environmental Sciences*.
- Insight, E. (2013, January 19). Executive Summary: 2013 Edelman Trust Barometer. Retrieved from Edelman Trust Barometer: <https://www.edelman.com/trust-downloads/executive-summary>
- Iran to. (2014). Political Behavior of Voters on Mayoral Election of Kediri, East Java Indonesia. *Academic Research International*, 5(2), 309-324.
- Kholmi, M. (2010). Persepsi Konstituen terhadap Akuntabilitas Keuangan Partai Politik (Studi di Kota Malang). *Jurnal Akuntansi Multiparadigma*, 1(2), 207-222.
- Kholmi, M. (2010, Juni). Persepsi Mahasiswa Akuntansi Terhadap Akuntabilitas dan Transparansi Keuangan Partai Politik. *Ekonomika-Bisnis*, 1(2), 215-226.
- Kompas. (2017, September 17). Hingga September 2017, 5 Kepala Daerah Terjaring OTT KPK, Siapa Saja Mereka? Retrieved 2019, from nasional.kompas.com: Kompas.com
- KPU. (2018, Juli 18). Dana Kampanye Pemilihan Umum. Peraturan KPU No. 24. Jakarta, Indonesia: KPU.
- KPU. (2019, Juni 18). Hasil Audit Laporan Dana Kampanye Peserta Pemilu 2019. Retrieved from KPU: https://kpu.go.id/index.php/pages/detail/aRUrQN3btDzuK8ryx0CwzO0lvSHwpX4z752L8XCFyl48hyRJYSSFqJOQijogn5V4TShA4WCEitlTwd3OGw_ftw~/~/xitLPyOepOf3K5XsS_ZSj2ZzCdXtRBstXtIZiRt-Obytuap1iQbWD_z2RjeUVci8-O6HhQGhOc07qD3Ni_hUcw~~



- Krumholz, S. (2013). Campaign Cash and Corruption: Money in Politics, Post-Citizens United. *Social Research*, 4, 1119-1134.
- Kurniawan, R. C., & Hermawan, D. (2019). Strategi Social Pencegahan Politik Uang di Indonesia. *Jurnal Antikorupsi Integritas*, 5(1), 29-41.
doi:<https://doi.org/10.32697/integritas.v5i1.338>
- Muhtadi, B. (2019). The Prevalence of Vote Buying in Indonesia: Building an Index. In B. Muhtadi, *Vote Buying in Indonesia: The Mechanic of Electoral Bribery* (pp. 45-79). Singapore: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Prihatini, E. S. (2018, January 25). How can Indonesia Increase the Number of Women Legislators? Retrieved from theconversation.com: <http://theconversation.com/how-can-indonesia-increase-the-number-of-women-legislators-90446>
- Quraishi, S. Y., & Staak, S. V. (2015, April 27). Asia's Big Democracies Are Drowning in Campaign Cash. Retrieved from Foreign Policy: www.foreignpolicy.com
- Salna, K., & Singgih, V. (2019, March 26). Election Cash Splash Spurs Indonesia's Economy. Retrieved from The Jakarta Post: www.thejakartapost.com
- Saputra, R. (2013). Mendorong Transparansi dan Akuntabilitas Dana Kampanye melalui Pembatasan Transaksi Keuangan Tunai. *Jurnal Pemilu dan Demokrasi*, 6, 1-18.
- Sjafrina, A. G. (2019). Dampak Politik Uang terhadap Mahalnya Biaya Pemenangan Pemilu dan Korupsi Politik. *Jurnal Antikorupsi INTEGRITAS*, 5(1), 43-53.
doi:<https://doi.org/10.32697/integritas.v5i1.389>
- Sjafrina, A. G. (2019). Dampak Politik Uang terhadap Mahalnya Biaya Pemenangan Pemilu dan Korupsi Politik. *Jurnal Antikorupsi Integritas*, 5(1), 43-53.
- Sugiwa, I., Arifah, M. P., & Farobi, H. K. (2015). Analisa Tingkat Kepatuhan Pelaporan Dana Kampanye Partai Politik Peserta Pemilu Berdasarkan Hasil Audit Laporan Dana Kampanye di Provinsi Bali Pada Pemilu Legislatif 2014. *Ekonomi dan Bisnis*, 14(1), 35-40.
- Sukma, A. N. (2019, March 13). Indonesia Needs Transparency in Campaign Funding. Retrieved from Asia Times: www.asiatimes.com
- Sukmajati, M., & Disyacitta, F. (2019). Pendanaan Kampanye Pemilu Serentak 2019 di Indonesia: Penguatan Demokrasi Patronase? *Jurnal Antikorupsi Integritas*, 5(1), 75-95.
doi:<https://doi.org/10.32697/integritas.v5i1.398>



Supriyanto, D., & Wulandari, L. (2013). *Basa Basi Dana Kampanye: Pengabaian Prinsip Transparansi dan Akuntabilitas Peserta Pemilu*. Jakarta: Yayasan Perludem.

Trihartono, A. (2014, April). Beyond Measuring the Voice of the People: The Evolving Role of Political Polling in Indonesia's Local Leader Elections. *Southeast Asian Studies*, 3(1), 151-182.

Wikipedia. (2014). 2014 Indonesian Legislative Election. Retrieved from Wikipedia: http://en.m.wikipedia.org/wiki/2014_Indonesian_Legislative_Election

Wikipedia. (2019, November 3). 2019 Indonesian General Election. Retrieved from wikipedia: http://en.m.wikipedia.org/wiki/2019_Indonesian_general_election