



Elections as a means of citizens political education: A comparative study between Indonesia and Malaysia

Sunarso, Suyato, Puji Wulandari Kuncorowati, Toba Sastrawan Manik, Ali Masykur Fathurrahman

Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta

*Corresponding Author: sunarso@uny.ac.id

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study is to compare Indonesian and Malaysian elections in terms of (1) legal basis, (2) organizing institution, (3) implementation, (4) political party function, and (5) public participation. It was a library study using a qualitative approach. Documentation was used to gather information. The data were analyzed descriptively using the Miles and Haberman model. The data were collected, grouped, reduced, interpreted, and concluded. The data were interpreted based on concepts, theories, and critical analysis. Cross-checking was used as the data validity technique. The results of this study are (1) Indonesia has hosted 12 elections, some of which have been influenced by political dynamics, including Law No. 12 of 2003 concerning Elections for the 2004 Election, Law No. 10 of 2008, and Law No. 7 of 2017 concerning Elections. Malaysian elections are governed by two laws: (a) the Malaysian Law on General Election Deed 1958 and (b) the Malaysian Law on General Election Error Act 1954. (c) P.U.(A) 293/2002 concerning the General Election (Voter Registration) Regulation last amended by P.U.(A) 106/2012; (d) P.U.(A) 185/2003 concerning Election Regulation (Post Elections) 2003; (e) P.U.(A) 386/1981 concerning General Election Regulations (Execution of Grand Elections) 1981, last amended by P.U. (A) 134/2013. (2) General Election Commission (KPU) is the name of the election organizers, whereas General Election Institute is the name of the election organizers in the New Order Era (LPU). Suruhanjaya Choice Raya is the Malaysian election organizer (SPR) (3) The election system in Malaysia is simpler and more efficient. Malaysia uses the District Election System which is based on the location of the election district, not the population. The election system in Indonesia uses the proportional election system. (4) Malaysia is a constitutional monarchy and adheres to a parliamentary democracy system. Both Indonesia and Malaysia adhere to a multi-party system. (5) The average voter turnout in Malaysian elections is 85 percent, while voter turnout in Indonesia is only 74 percent. In general, Malaysian elections are worse than those in Indonesia. In Malaysia, election organizers tend to favor government parties. Suruhanjaya Choice Raya Malaysia (SPR) barred Diaspora residents in other nations from using the post in 2018, claiming that the Diaspora favored opposition parties.

Keywords: Indonesia; Malaysia; Political Education; Election

Article history

Received:

15 October 2021

Revised:

20 December 2021

Accepted:

4 January 2022

Published:

19 February 2022

Citation (APA Style): Sunarso, S., Kuncorowati, P. W., Manik, T. S., Fathurrahman, A. M. (2022).

Elections as a means of citizens political education: a comparative study between Indonesia and Malaysia
Cakrawala Pendidikan: Jurnal Ilmiah Pendidikan, 41(1), 129-141.

<https://doi.org/10.21831/cp.v41i1.44305>

INTRODUCTION

Political education is an essential aspect of democracy. Even though democracy is considered the best system, it requires several broad and complex aspects and conceptions (Heyne, 2019; Owen, 2003). Therefore, it requires the involvement and participation of citizens, not only at the level of voting but also the complex development and continuous participation (Osler & Starkey, 2006). Otherwise, the basic idea that became the initial inspiration for democracy is the empowerment of citizens or society as subjects in democracy (Alexander & Welzel, 2018). Among them are citizens who are smart and understand the use of democracy. It is expected to be fulfilled through the process of political education. Therefore, political education is very

important in improving the quality of democracy and supporting the running of government (Sunarso, 2007). In other words, political education is very vital in national life and it is very necessary to be held (Sanusi & Darmawan, 2016).

Political education is an effort to increase public knowledge, so they are able to participate optimally (Suparno & Karmanis, 2020). More broadly, Handoyo & Lestari (2017) state that political education is a form of adult education given to the younger generation by preparing political cadres to compete in politics and obtain political solutions to win in political struggles. In conclusion, political education is a systematic, structured, and planned process that differs in formal and informal forms. In general, political education can be summarized as aimed at increasing the ability, community skills, both knowledge and the right for a better life, political awareness, and responsibility (Suparno et al., 2020). Political education can be expected to develop critical awareness and a deep understanding of political, social, and civic principles to enable future generations to improvise the future and the past (Ericson, 1991).

Terminologically, political education is often equated with political socialization as it has the same meaning (Mananoma, 2015; Ticoalu et al., 2015). Political socialization is a manifestation and implementation of political education in a simpler and narrower way (Sunarso, 2007). However, they both have the same meaning. Ticoalu et al., (2015) state that political education is an activity aimed at growing and shaping an individual's political orientation. Therefore, people are aware, understand, and be responsible for all decisions and choices they give in democracy. Elections are an important institution in every democratic country (Garnett & James, 2021) and are a manifestation of people's sovereignty (Jayus, 2020). Elections are one of the things that distinguish democracy from other systems. Elections are not just a process of providing political choices. General elections are a form, time, and process of political education in democracy. In the process of making choices, citizens think deeply, evaluate, and determine political life in the future and are responsible for these choices.

Many societies assume and forget that elections are a process of political education. Elections have been considered as the result of the previous political education processes. Whereas essentially, gradual elections in a democracy with the application of democratic and open principles are indirectly a process of political education for the community.

There are several reasons why the general election can be regarded as a process of political education. First, citizens are expected to have awareness and understanding of politics, institutions, and democratic principles. Second, elections that set the age limits to citizens emphasize the need for maturity and responsibility. Third, elections are held periodically and elect representatives or fill political positions, so they become an orderly and systematic process of political education. Fourth, the election contains contents in the form of symbols, ideologies, and interests that the society must be aware of. Fifth, elections are conducted on a legal basis, objectives, and a systematically planned and structured process. They differ from other forms of political education as elections are less frequent and conducted in a limited time. Sixth, in the process of leading up to the election, the public will witness and examine several crucial issues that become a public concern and the political process. Thus, the public is more intense and open to domestic problems. Lastly, elections cannot be separated from the campaign period—there is a transfer or change of knowledge, awareness, and critical thinking of the community.

Each election will influence the attitude change or support for the political system, for example in the form of trust, cynicism, and efficacy (Banducci & Karp, 2003; Jayus, 2020). This has indirectly confirmed the existence of a process of education or political socialization through general elections.

This study is interested in examining how the election process as political education in Indonesia and Malaysia. It will explore several aspects, such as the legal basis, election management, election implementation process, and public participation in the election.

METHOD

This study uses a qualitative descriptive approach to conduct a literature review. This library study was carried out by taking an inventory and reviewing written materials in the form of law and regulation reference books, journals, magazines, newspapers, and other written materials

linked to the issues. It used the Miles and Haberman model's data analysis technique. It contrasts expert opinions in one literature with those in other literature (Bungin, 2001).

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Result

The electoral process in Indonesia and Malaysia as a political education provides political experience for people in both countries. The legal basis, election management, electoral process and community participation adopted in this study are shown in Table 1. Table 1 provides an overview of the differences between what happened in Indonesia and Malaysia.

Table 1. General Election Comparison Table in Indonesia and Malaysia

| No | Indicators | Indonesia | Malaysia |
|----|-------------------------------------|--|--|
| 1. | Legal Basis | a. Law No. 7 of 2017 concerning General Elections | a. Malaysian Election Laws of 1958 b. Malaysian Election Violation Law 1954 c. P.U.(A) 293 / 2002, The General Election Regulations (Voter Registration), last amended by P.U.(A) 106 / 2012 d. P.U.(A) 185 / 2003, General Election Regulations (Elections via Post) 2003 e. P.U.(A) 386 / 1981, General Election Regulations (Implementation of General Elections) 1981 last amended by P.U. (A) 134/2013. |
| 2. | Organizing Institution | a. General Election Commissions b. Election Supervisory Body | Malaysian Election Commission |
| 3. | Portrait of Election Implementation | General elections in Indonesia have undergone several system changes which are divided into four periods, namely: 1. Parliamentary Democracy 2. Guided Democracy Period 3. Pancasila Democracy Period 4. Reform Period | The General Election in Malaysia is carried out with a "first past the post (FPTP)" system. |
| 4. | The Role of Political Parties | In Indonesia, the political system has changed three times, separated into three periods: 1. Constitutional Democracy Period 2. Guided Democracy Period 3. Pancasila Democracy Period | |
| 5. | Public Participation | The involvement of Indonesian citizens in general elections varies from the old order to the new order to the reformation, with the new order having the highest participation. | Malaysian Citizens' Participation in General Elections tends to be stable at an average of 80%. |

The differences between the two countries can be seen in several areas studied, in terms of the legal basis used, Malaysia has used the legal basis issued in 1958, while Indonesia uses the election basis in 2017. In the election management institutions of the two countries, there are also

differences. The Malaysian Election Commission is responsible for the conduct of elections in Malaysia, while in Indonesia, the administration of elections is under the responsibility of the General Elections Commission and the Election Supervisory Body.

The portrait of the implementation of elections in the two countries provides an interesting picture, where Indonesia has undergone several system changes which are divided into four periods. Meanwhile, Malaysia has implemented an FPTP system since the beginning. Indonesia has undergone three changes to its political system, namely the period of constitutional democracy, the period of guided democracy, and the period of Pancasila democracy. In terms of community involvement in the general election, Indonesian citizens varied from the old order, new order, to the reformation period, while Malaysian citizens tended to be stable with an average involvement of 80%.

DISCUSSION

Legal Basis for Elections in Indonesia and Malaysia

Legal Basis for Elections in Indonesia

Since Indonesia's independence, the General Elections Regulations (Pemilu) have experienced various amendments. First, Law No. 12 of 1946 Concerning Renewal of Central National Committee, which provides regulations for the election of members of the Central National Committee, is the first piece of legislation that governs the conduct of elections in Indonesia (Law No. 12 of 1946). Second, Law No. 12 of 1946 is repealed and replaced by Law No. 27 of 1948 (Law No. 27 of 1948), which governs the composition of the People's Representative Council and the election of its members, and is renewed by Law No. 12 of 1949. Third, the Indonesian government passed Law No. 7 of 1953, often known as the Election Law. The regulation encompasses the notion of election legislation as well as election process control. Indonesians frequently mix up election laws and processes when appraising the effectiveness of the electoral system. Elections were held in accordance with Law No. 7 of 1953 to elect constituent members and members of the People's Representative Council (MD, 2019). On September 29, 1955, a general election was held to elect members of the DPR, and on December 15, 1955, a general election was held to elect members of the Constituent Assembly (Gaffar, 2013).

From the New Order until 2019, Indonesia has administered 10 general elections based on different laws. The first general election during New Order 1971 was held in reference to the two main laws and regulations, namely Provisional People's Consultative Assembly Decree (TAP MPRS) Number XXII/MPRS/1966 concerning Parties/Organizations and Employment and Law No. 15 of 1969 concerning General Election of Members of Consultative People's Representative (Gaffar, 2013).

The second election of New Order was the 1977 Election. To it out, Law No. 15 of 1969 was amended by Law No. 5 of 1975. Also, Government Regulation No. 1 of 1976 relates to the implementation of Law No. 15 of 1969, relating to Elections of General Members of Consultative People's Representatives.

In 1982, the third election of the New Order was held, based on Law No. 2 of 1980 amending Law No. 15 of 1969 Governing the Election of Members of the Consultative People's Representative, as amended by Law No. 4 of 1975. In 1987, New Order held its fourth general election, based on Law No. 1 of 1985. Furthermore, during the 1987 general election, the government issued a new Government Regulation, namely Government Regulation No. 35 of 1985 Concerning the Implementation of Law No. 15 of 1969 Concerning General Election of Members of the Consultative People's Representative Council as Amended Three Times with Law No. 1 of 1985. A significant move was seen from the addition of the commander of the Armed Forces of the Republic of Indonesia (ABRI) to the Election Oversight Committee with the issuing of Government Regulation No. 35 of 1985 (Gaffar, 2013).

In 1992, the new order's fifth election was held, which was preceded by the issuance of Government Regulation No. 37 of 1990 concerning Amendment to Government Regulation No. 35 of 1985 concerning the Implementation of Law No. 15 of 1969 concerning the General Election of Members of the Consultative People's Representatives as amended several times. This

election was held on June 9, 1992 (Gaffar, 2013).

The New Order's last election was in 1997, and the Election Law, particularly Law No. 15 of 1969 as previously amended by Law No. 1 of 1985, remained unchanged. Government Regulation No. 74 of 1996 about Amendments to Government Regulation No. 35 of 1985 concerning Implementation of the General Election Law has been changed multiple times, most recently by Government Regulation No. 10 of 1995. The content changed by Government Regulation No. 74 of 1996 has nothing to do with the system, organizers, election infractions, or election settlements (Gaffar, 2013).

Elections have taken place four times since the Reformation period, in 2004, 2009, 2014, and 2019. Several laws and regulations relating to general elections have been enacted since the reformation, including Law No. 22 of 2007 governing General Election Organizers. It was renewed by Law No. 15 of 2011 concerning General Election Organizers, Law No. 10 of 2008 concerning General Election of Members of People's Representative Council, Regional Representative Council, and Regional People's Representative Council as amended by Law No. 8 of 2012 concerning General Election of Members of People's Representative Council, Regional Representative Council as well as Representative Council Regional People, Law No. 42 of 2008 concerning General Election of President and Vice President and Law No. 7 of 2017 concerning General Election.

Legal Basis for Elections in Malaysia

Malaysia gained independence from the United Kingdom in 1957. Malaysia has a multi-party political system in which a federal or state government can be formed by the political party that wins the majority of seats in the People's Council or the State Invitation Council. The existence of political parties plays an important role in Malaysian political education. The fact that political parties in Malaysia have a role and function as both representative and expressive, such as developing and transmitting popular issues, linking structured participation and competition, and holding a government position for the faction's and wider community's welfare, demonstrates the above. In contrast to Thailand, political parties in the Philippines are heavily institutionalized. Furthermore, these parties form a system that is marked by a reasonably stable pattern, broad access, deep societal roots, and a relatively consistent ideology. Malaysia follows a parliamentary system in which parties form coalitions before elections (Weiss, 2015).

The Federation of Malaysia's Constitution, as stated in Chapter 4 on Federal Legislature, is the primary legal basis for holding general elections. In the Constitution of the Federation of Malaysia, general elections are given their own section, Section VIII on Greater Elections, which has eight articles ranging from Article 113 to Article 120. The following are some of the other rules that must be adhered to 1) Malaysian General Election Law of 1958; 2) Malaysian Election Violation Law of 1954; 3) P.U.(A) 293/2002 General Election (Voter Registration) Regulations, last amended by P.U.(A) 106/2012; 4) P.U.(A) 185/2003 Election Regulations (Elections via Post) 2003; 4) P.U.(A) 386/1981 General Election Regulations (Implementation of General Elections) 1981, last amended by P.U. (A) 134/2013.

Indonesia's and Malaysia's electoral systems differ significantly. Differences between Indonesia's and Malaysia's government systems have an impact on this. Malaysia is governed by a parliamentary system, whilst Indonesia is governed by a presidential system. The frequency of changes to general election laws and regulations is also influenced by political stability. Malaysia's general election process is very steady, as the country's rules and regulations are rarely changed, and the number of political parties is quite small. Therefore, it experiences the dynamics and political turmoil caused by the general election.

Election Organizing Institutions in Indonesia and Malaysia

Citizens should be given information about the state, government, political parties, and representative institutions in general so that they have a good knowledge of the political system that the state has built. The state, governance, people's representatives, democracy, political parties, human rights, women and politics, and globalization are all topics covered in political education materials (Eko & Puji, 2017).

One party that has a crucial role in the implementation of political education is the institution that organizes the elections. The role of an active and responsive general election organizing institution in the issue of laws and regulations, socialization, and engagement with the community will all help to encourage higher political participation and understanding among people in a given country or region.

Election Organizers in Indonesia

Indonesia has held 15 elections since 1945, according to official records. There were variances and changes in relation to the election during the 15 times it was held. These shifts can be seen in a variety of areas, including the institutions in charge of election administration. These many alterations and enhancements were made in order to discover the most appropriate and best model for implementing Indonesian elections (Budiarjo, 2013).

The Election Office of the House of Representatives was in charge of conducting elections in the Old Order (DPR Election Office). The DPR Election Office is permanent, countrywide, but not entirely self-contained. The Election Office is appointed for a five-year term, hence the nature of the position is permanent. Because the Electoral Office is in charge of overseeing the Election Office for the election district as well as the Voting Office, it is nationwide in scope. Even though it takes its own judgments during the election, the Election Office is less independent because it is appointed and discharged by the President (Gaffar, 2013).

In the New Order, elections were held based on Law Number 15 of 1969. According to Article 8 of Law No. 15 of 1969 elections were held by the government under the authority of the President. The President formed a General Election Institution (LPU) chaired by the Minister of Home Affairs to oversee the elections. Elections were held six times during the New Order Era, according to records. There are no notable variations between the six general elections in terms of the system, organizers, ratification, infractions, and their settlement (Gaffar, 2013).

In the implementation of the Reform Era election, several laws were first developed as legal umbrellas. The General Election Law No. 3 of 1999 is one of them. The President is in charge of the General Election (Article 8 paragraph (1) of Law No. 3 of 1999). The General Election Commission (KPU) is, however, determined to be free and independent, and is accountable to the President. Members of the KPU are representatives from political parties that ran in the General Election and five government representatives, having equal voting rights for both party and government representatives. The KPU membership is for a five-year period (Gaffar, 2013).

Election Organizers in Malaysia

Based on Article 114 of the Institutional Fellowship, an election commission is called *Suruhanjaya Pilihan Raya* (SPR). It was established on September 4, 1957. At the time of its formation, the SPR consisted of a chairman and two members. YBhg. Dato' Dr. Mustafa Albakri bin Haji Hassan was the first Chairman of the Commission. Mr. Lee Ewe Boon and Mr. Ditt Singh were among the members. The number of members of the committee increased to three after Malaysia was proclaimed in 1963. On a rotating basis, additional members from Sabah or Sarawak are appointed. Suruhanjaya people's choice has the authority to uphold, supervise, and preserve the country's democratic process through free and fair elections.

The SPR is protected by Malaysian law, namely the 1957 Elections Law, in addition to being governed by the Constitution (Act 31). SPR members are given incentives, benefits, and protections under these regulations, as well as punishments for SPR violations and other problems. If an action or lawsuit is launched against a member of the General Election Commission for an act performed or omitted from his action, that member receives protection and benefits. It invites a Magistrate to act in carrying out his obligations while doing his duties as provided by the law.

The general election organizers in Indonesia and Malaysia, particularly the General Election Commission, have significant commonalities. One thing that Indonesia and Malaysia have in common is that they both have the authority to hold public election socialization. Furthermore, they lack the authority to investigate election-related offences. However, there are distinctions between the KPU and the SPR, particularly their functions in general elections. In Indonesia, the

KPU serves as the election organizer, with BAWASLU serving as the monitoring authority for the election's implementation. In Malaysia, the SPR is the only entity that conducts elections and oversees their execution (Santoso, 2009).

Elections in Indonesia and Malaysia

Political education is a process that occurs continuously. A good process is one that improves over time. In the context of political education through general elections, it is natural when the implementation of elections undergoes changes. These shifts are influenced by a variety of reasons, including political dynamics, election evaluations, country stability, and other considerations. This stems from the nature of political education as a means of maintaining a generally stable state at a given period, and it is anticipated to serve as the foundation for the democratic process (Brownhill & Smart, 1989).

Elections in Indonesia

In 1955, Indonesia held its first general election. The voting process was carried out twice to elect members of the DPR and Constituent Assembly. The system used is proportional elections (Budiarjo, 2013). The election is the first and last to be held during the reign of President Soekarno. A new election is held again in 1971.

Following the collapse of the semi-authoritarian Guided Democracy, there was enormous optimism in society that a democratic and stable political system might be established. One method is to use the election system. It was not only the long-established proportional system that was considered but also the district system, which is still relatively new in Indonesia (Budiarjo, 2013).

The reforms brought some fundamental changes in elections. To begin with, the opportunity for free movement of political parties, including the formation of new parties, has been restored. This provision was eventually reflected in the general election of 1999, which was sponsored by a number of parties. Second, for the first time in Indonesian history, direct presidential and vice-presidential elections were held in the 2004 general election. Previously, the People's Consultative Assembly (MPR) was used to elect the president and vice president (Budiarjo, 2013).

Since the reform period to date, Indonesia has held five legislative elections in 1999, 2004, 2009, 2014, and 2019. Therefore, it can be said that Indonesia has not been able to achieve the ideal democratic consolidation phase. In the first 3 elections since the reformation, it can be seen that the debate about the election system to be used has not been completed. As a result, adjustments and even replacements to the election legislation, both legislative and executive, are made every time before an election (Pahlevi, 2014). The 2009 general election, which is likened to a process of consolidating democracy to realize "substantial democracy" in practice failed to do so, demonstrating the actors' political pragmatism in order to gain power (Pahlevi, 2014).

Elections in Malaysia

The Malaysian Federal Constitution (FC) establishes a Parliament with a House of Representatives and a Senate, as well as a State Legislative Assembly in each state. Eligible voters cast ballots every five years (Article 55(3), FC) to elect members of Parliament or the House of Representatives at the national level (art. 55(4), FC) and members of the Legislative Assembly at the state level (art. 71, Schedule 8, section 9(3), FC). The party with the most seats in the election is declared the winner and forms the government (Hai, 2002).

In Malaysia, general elections are held using the "first past the post (FPTP)" method, which involves winning lots of lots. The FPT method, often known as the majority winning system, is implemented by voting rights holders utilizing ballots to exercise their voting rights. The winner of the general election will be the candidate who receives the majority of votes or the most votes (Schwartz, 2014). Deputy chairman of the Malaysian general election commission, Dato' Wan Ahmad Wan Omar said that every voter is given the right to choose a candidate for some constituents and whoever gets the highest vote from the process will be declared as the winner (Utusan Malaysia, 11 August 2013). In other words, this system is synonymous with the term "winner take all", ignoring the results of elections by voters who have voted for the losing party,

and the fact that the losing party may have secured a fairly qualified and substantial number of parliamentary seats (Ides, 2011).

Members of the Honorary Election Organizing Council (DKPP) said that the election system in Malaysia is simple and efficient. Even in Malaysia, the results of the vote in the election were no longer need to be disputed by the Constitutional Court (MK). Although, the difference is only a few points. According to him, Indonesia needs to consider holding elections that are not too complicated. Alfitra (Ides, 2011) gave an example that Malaysia uses a district election system, namely a system based on the location of the election district, not population. Therefore, when a candidate in that election district wins, he immediately becomes a member of DPR.

Malaysian voter turnout in elections is around 85 percent, significantly higher than Indonesia's objective voter turnout of 74 percent. As a result, he urged each presidential candidate duo to focus on a political topic in order to boost voter turnout.

There is a significant difference in the dynamics of election implementation in Indonesia. Despite the fact that Malaysia gained independence in 1957, the country's electoral process has proven to be positive. It is proven by a healthy relationship between Malaysia's political parties, both those in power and those in opposition, as well as the high level of citizen participation in the general election, which reached 85 percent. This is a positive sign that Malaysia has implemented a relatively good democratic process. Despite the fact that Indonesia has held elections dozens of times, it has yet to develop a system that is deemed the best. Furthermore, the dynamics of regulatory reforms, as well as the connection between political parties that favor group ego, continue to be obstacles to Indonesia's efforts to achieve a significant democratic process through general elections. This is confirmed by the fact that Indonesian citizens' political involvement in elections is lower than Malaysia's, which remains at 74 percent post-reform. By referring to these data and facts, political education becomes a basic need in an effort to encourage a more positive implementation of democracy in Indonesia.

The Role of Political Parties in Indonesia and Malaysia

The existence of political parties has a vital role in an independent and sovereign state. One indicator of how citizens use their right to congregate, associate, and express opinions is the founding, preservation, and growth of political parties (Pasaribu, 2017). Through political parties, the people can realize their right to express their aspirations in society and the state. In the context of political education, a political party has an important role, especially in encouraging citizen participation, implementing political socialization, and realizing direct, general, free, and secret elections.

The Role of Political Parties in Indonesia

Since the Old Order, Indonesia has embraced multi-party from various principles. There are parties that adhere to the political principle of religion, such as the Islamic Union and the Catholic Party. Besides, there are socially-based parties, such as Budi Utomo and Muhammadiyah. While those who adhere to secular principles are *Partai Nasional Indonesia (PNI)* and *Partai Komunis Indonesia (PKI)*.

The party system during the New Order only recognized two political parties and one class of work. Apart from *Golongan Karya (Golkar)*, *Partai Persatuan Pembangunan (PPP)* and *Partai Demokrat Indonesia (PDI)* are the result of the "fusion" imposed by the New Order regime. The emergence of a new party is forbidden.

In the year 1998, the reform movement arose. The election law, among other reforms to the political system, was enacted. 48 parties participated in the 1999 elections, whilst 24 parties participated in the 2004 elections. According to Sulaksono (2016), selective rejection of the party system can also be found in Indonesian political parties. As a result, the general populace has been socialized to accept Golkar as the dominant party. After the fall of Suharto selective rejection of the party, the system has been found, there is a plan to simplify the multi-party system through a relatively high percentage of both election and parliamentary thresholds, and by narrowing the size of the territory.

According to Simbolon's research (2016), there is an increasing number of political parties

in the Reform Era. Through this aspect, the market structure of political parties in Indonesia changes to a structure that is more likely to become perfect competition. The emergence of new parties has an impact on the changing structure of the political market into perfect competition. In this perspective, political parties will be competitive if they can show excellence in raising personas and work programs that can provide solutions to the nation's problems (Simbolon, 2016).

The Role of Political Parties in Malaysia

Malaysia is a constitutional monarchy with a parliamentary democracy system in which the prime minister and other ministers are chosen by the public every five years.

Political parties are a key part of political life in Malaysia. Sartori (1976) claims that position is the primary cause, arguing that political parties in Malaysia perform roles and functions that are both representative and expressive, such as developing and transmitting popular issues, linking structured participation and competition, and holding a government position for the faction's and the wider community's welfare. Political parties are highly structured in Malaysia, unlike in neighboring countries such as Indonesia, Thailand, and the Philippines, and personality is not only powerful but also constitutes a fundamental contest of commitment to Malaysian politics. Moreover, these parties coalesce as a system that is characterized by a relatively stable pattern, wide access, having strong roots in society, and having a fairly consistent ideology. Malaysia adheres to a parliamentary system, coalitions are formed before the election, not after the election (Weiss, 2015). The existence of a dominant party system in Malaysia has given rise to broad and strong patronage. The party system in Malaysia today is still similar to the Indonesian party system in the New Order Era.

Randall and Svåsand's (2002) used a matrix to assess several aspects of the Malaysian parties such as system proficiency, value inculcation, autonomy to make decisions, and reification which is in the end show relatively even results. Furthermore, each party in Malaysia is interrelated as a system, which is shown through the stability and style of competition, broad access to the stipulation of regulations that directly or indirectly affect political parties, a reputation that has been rooted in the community, and party ideology that is maintained in its consistency (Randall & Svåsand, 2002). This is unusual because most countries with a parliamentary system create coalitions years before elections, however, in Malaysia, each party can participate in what is known as "patterned interaction" (Mainwaring & Scully, 1995).

Political parties have a vital function in the democratic political life of a country. It is because political parties have a function as a means of political communication, political socialization, political recruitment, and conflict regulators (Pasaribu, 2017). In general, it can be concluded that political parties in Indonesia and Malaysia have carried out this role more dominantly than other political institutions. However, its implementation must always be developed over time to achieve substantially more optimal democracy.

Citizens' Participation in Indonesian and Malaysian Elections

Participation of citizens in Indonesian elections

Participation in elections is an important indicator of democracy. If this form of community participation can be carried out broadly and effectively, it will also determine the quality of voter participation in elections (Surbaki & Supriyanto, 2013). The political participation rate of voters in the 1955 elections reaches 91.4% with the abstention rate being 8.6%. The political participation rate in the 1971 election was 96.6%, with 3.4% of voters abstaining. Political participation in the 1977 and 1982 general elections was nearly comparable, with 96.5 percent voting and 3.5% abstentions. In the 1987 election, 96.4% of voters participated in politics, with only 3.6% abstaining. In 1992, 95.1% of voters participated in politics, while 4.9% abstained. In the 1997 election, voters participated in politics 93.6% of the time, with only 6.4% of the time abstaining. In 1999, 92.6% of eligible voters cast ballots, with 7.3 percent not voting. The turnout in the 2004 election was 84.1 percent, with 15.9 percent of voters abstaining.

In the first round of the presidential election, the political participation rate of voters reached 78.2% and the number of non-voters was 21.8%, while in the is around the political participation rate of voters reached 76.6% and the number of abstentions was 23.4%. In the 2009 presidential

election, the political participation rate of voters reached 71.7% and the number of abstentions reached 28.3% (Pratomo & Firdaus, 2014). Meanwhile, the General Elections Commission documented and reported that voter turnout in the 2019 general election was higher than in the previous election. In comparison to 2014, there was an almost 10% increase in participation (Farisa, 2019).

Citizen participation in Malaysian elections

The wave of voters who voted to replace Najib Rajak began in the 2013 election. This is the first election in which the Barisan Nasional (BN) Coalition has lost the most votes (popular vote) to the Pakatan Harapan (PH) Coalition, making it a historic election (Moniruzzaman & Farzana, 2018). The BN Coalition received only 47.38 percent of the vote (5,237,699), while the PH Coalition received 50.87 percent (5,623,984). The 2013 election saw the largest voter participation in Malaysia's history, with 84.84 percent of voters (11,257,147 out of 13,268,002) voting. The desire to replace Najib's decaying administration, such as corruption (Case, 2017), to reminisce on the Malay glory of Mahathir's period and the desire for strong politics are the results of the 2018 Malaysian elections (Nadzri, 2018).

Indonesia and Malaysia have held elections since their independence. In the process, Indonesia tends to fluctuate regarding the level of participation in elections. This can be seen in the level of political participation of voters in the 1955 elections that reached 91.4% with an 8.6% abstention rate. In the 1971 election, the political participation rate was 96.6% and the number of abstentions was 3.4%. The 1977 and 1982 elections were almost similar with the political participation reaching 96.5% and the number of abstentions was 3.5%. In the 1987 election, the political participation rate of voters was 96.4% and abstentions were 3.6%. In 1992, voter political participation reached 95.1% and abstention reached 4.9%. In the 1997 election, the political participation rate of voters was 93.6% percent and the number of abstentions was 6.4 percent%. In 1999, the voter participation rate was 92.6% and the number of non-voters was 7.3%. In the 2004 election, it fell to 84.1% and the number of abstentions was 15.9%.

In the first round of the presidential election, the political participation rate of voters reached 78.2% and the number of non-voters was 21.8%. In the second round, the political participation rate of voters reached 76.6% and the number of abstentions reached 23.4%. In the 2009 legislator election, voter politics accounted for 70.9% of the vote, with abstentions accounting for 29.1%. The level of voter political engagement in the 2009 presidential election was 71.7%, while the number of abstentions was 28.3%, rising to 81% in the 2014 election (Pratomo & Firdaus, 2014). Meanwhile, Malaysia has a relatively stable political participation rate in several elections amounting to 80%.

CONCLUSION

Elections are a form of political education in which individuals are encouraged to become politically educated and to use their political rights. The countries of Indonesia and Malaysia have been picked as the subjects of study. The following are the research findings. Elections in Malaysia are quite stable. They keep the rules and regulations in place, as well as the existence of political parties. In contrast, Indonesia is still looking for the best and most appropriate general election system. Furthermore, the number of political parties has an effect on political dynamics and the regularity with which laws are changed in relation to general elections. There are several similarities between the general election organizers in Indonesia and Malaysia, namely the General Election Commission in Indonesia and *Suruhanjaya Pilihan Raya* (SPR) in Malaysia. One of the similarities between KPU and SPR is that they have the authority to organize election socialization to the public. Both KPU and SPR also have differences. The difference is that the Indonesian KPU serves as an election organizer, with BAWASLU serving as a supervisory body for election implementation, but the SPR in Malaysia serves as the single election organizer and supervisor.

There are substantial contrasts in the dynamics of the Indonesian and Malaysian elections. Despite the fact that Malaysia gained independence in 1957, the country's elections have shown favorable results. This is shown by a positive association between political parties and a high

voter turnout of 85% in elections. While Indonesia has yet to establish the optimum system, changes in rules and political party connections tend to place a premium on the collective ego. This is confirmed by the fact that Indonesian citizens participate in politics at a lower rate than Malaysian citizens, who remain at 74% post-reform. In Indonesia and Malaysia, political parties have exercised dominance over other political institutions. It must, however, be continually refined over time in order to accomplish the substantial goal of being a more ideal democracy. Citizen engagement in election implementation is a key metric for determining the success of political education. The level of election turnout in Indonesia has a tendency to fluctuate. This is proven by the fact that in the 1955 elections, 91.4% of voters participated in politics, with 8.6 % abstaining. The political participation rate in the 1971 election was 96%, with 3.4% abstentions. Political participation in the 1977 and 1982 elections was nearly identical, with 96.5% voting and 3.5% abstaining. In the 1987 election, the political participation rate of voters was 96.4% and abstentions were only 3.6%. The 1992 voter political participation reached 95.1% and abstention reached 4.9%. In the 1997 election, the political participation rate of voters was 93.6% percent and the number of abstentions was 6.4 percent%. The 1999 vote participation rate is 92.6% and the number of non-voters was 7.3%. The 2004 election fell to 84.1% and the number of abstentions was 15.9%. In the first round of the presidential election, the political participation rate of voters reached 78.2% and the number of abstentions was 21.8%, while in the second round the political participation rate of voters reached 76.6% and the number of abstentions was 23.4%. In the 2009 legislative elections, the political participation rate of voters was 70.9% and the number of abstentions was 29.1%. In the 2009 presidential election, the level of voter political participation reached 71.7% and the number of abstentions reached 28.3%. Then, in the 2014 election, it jumped to 81 percent. Meanwhile, Malaysia maintains a very constant political participation rate, with an average of 80% in several elections.

REFERENCES

- Alexander, A. C., & Welzel, C. (2018). Measuring effective democracy: The human empowerment approach New York, stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/23040646>, Linked references are available on JSTOR for this article: The Human Empowerment Approach. *Comparative Politics*, 43(3), 271–289.
- Banducci, S. A., & Karp, J. A. (2003). How elections change the way citizens view the political system: Campaigns, media effects and electoral outcomes in comparative perspective. *British Journal of Political Science*, 33(3), 443–467, <https://doi.org/10.1017/S000712340300019X>.
- Brownhill, R., & Smart, P. (1989). *Political education*. Routledge.
- Bungin, B. (2001). *Metode penelitian kualitatif*. PT Rajagrafindo Persada.
- Case, W. (2017). Stress testing leadership in Malaysia: The 1MDB scandal and Najib Tun Razak. *Pacific Review*, 30(5), 633–654. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09512748.2017.1282538>.
- Eko, H., & Puji, L. (2017). *Pendidikan politik*. Pohon Cahaya.
- Ericson, D. P. (1991). Humanization, democracy, and political education. *Studies in Philosophy and Education*, 11(1), 31–43. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00368402>.
- Farisa, F. C. (2019). *KPU sebut partisipasi pemilih pada pemilu 2019 capai 81 persen*. Retrieved from <https://nasional.kompas.com/read/2019/05/27/16415251/kpu-sebut-partisipasi-pemilih-pada-pemilu-2019-capai-81-persen>.
- Gaffar, J. M. (2013). *Demokrasi dan pemilu di Indonesia*. Konstitusi Pers.
- Garnett, H. A., & James, T. S. (2021). Measuring electoral integrity: Using practitioner knowledge to assess elections. *Journal of Elections, Public Opinion, and Parties*, 31(3), 348–367. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17457289.2020.1824186>.
- Hai, L. H. (2002). Electoral politics in Malaysia: 'Managing' elections in a plural society. *Electoral Politics in Southeast {&} East Asia*, 101–148. Retrieved from <http://library.fes.de/fulltext/iez/01361inf.htm>.
- Heyne, L. (2019). Democratic demand and supply: A spatial model approach to satisfaction with democracy. *Journal of Elections, Public Opinion, and Parties*, 29(3), 381–401. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1080/17457289.2018.1544904>

- Ides, A. (2011). *Loyola of Los Angeles law review approximating democracy: A proposal for proportional representation in the California legislature approximating democracy: A proposal for proportional representation in the California legislature*. 44(2). Retrieved from <https://digitalcommons.lmu.edu/llr/vol44/iss2/2/>.
- Jayus. (2020). The general election results as the manifestation of popular sovereignty. *Journal of Law, Policy and Globalization*, 93(15), 169–180. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.7176/jlpg/93-18>
- Kartono, K. (1989). *Pendidikan politik*. Mandar Maju.
- Mainwaring, S., & Scully, T. (1995). *Building democratic institutions: Party systems in Latin America*. Stanford University Press.
- Mananoma, S. R. (2015). Peran media elektronik dalam pendidikan politik masyarakat yang ada di kelurahan Ondong. *Politico: Journal Ilmu Politik*. Retrieved from <https://media.neliti.com/media/publications/1052-ID-peran-media-elektronik-dalam-pendidikan-politik-masyarakat-yang-ada-di-kelurahan.pdf>.
- MD, M. (2019). *Politik hukum di Indonesia*. PT Rajagrafindo Persada.
- Budiarjo, M. (2013). *Dasar-dasar ilmu politik edisi revisi*. Gramedia Pustaka Utama.
- Moniruzzaman, M., & Farzana, K. F. (2018). Malaysia' 14th general election: End of an epoch, and beginning of a new? *Intellectual Discourse*, 26(1), 207–228. Retrieved from <https://journals.iium.edu.my/intdiscourse/index.php/id/article/view/1121>.
- Nadzri, M. M. N. (2018). The 14th general election, the fall of Barisan Nasional, and political development in Malaysia, 1957-2018. *Journal of Current Southeast Asian Affairs*, 37(3), 139–171. <https://doi.org/10.1177/186810341803700307>.
- Osler, A., & Starkey, H. (2006). Education for democratic citizenship: A review of research, policy, and practice 1995-20051. *Research Papers in Education*, 21(4), 433–466. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02671520600942438>.
- Owen, D. (2003). Democracy. In R. Bellamy & A. Mason (Eds.), *Political concepts*, 105–117. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Pahlevi, I. (2014). Dinamika sistem pemilu masa transisi di Indonesia. *Politica*, 5(2), 111–135. Retrieved from file:///C:/Users/hendrik/Downloads/339-658-1-SM.pdf
- Pasaribu, P. (2017). Peranan partai politik dalam melaksanakan pendidikan politik. *JPPUMA: Jurnal Ilmu Pemerintahan dan Sosial Politik*, 5(1), 51–59. <https://ojs.uma.ac.id/index.php/jppuma/article/view/1125>
- Pratomo, Y., & Firdaus, R. F. (2014). *Ini tingkat partisipasi pemilih dari Pemilu 1955-2014*. Retrieved from <https://www.merdeka.com/politik/ini-tingkat-partisipasi-pemilih-dari-pemilu-1955-2014.html>.
- Randall, V., & Svåsand, L. (2002). Party institutionalization in new democracies. *Party Politics*, 8(1), 5–26. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1354068802008001001>
- Santoso, T. (2009). Kewenangan "electoral management bodies" dalam menangani tindak pidana pemilu. *Hukum Internasional*, 6(4), 551–561. <http://dx.doi.org/10.17304/ijil.vol6.4.215>
- Sanusi, A. R., & Darmawan, C. (2016). Implementasi pendidikan politik dalam membentuk karakter kepemimpinan lintas budaya pada generasi muda demi mewujudkan budaya politik pancasila. *Jurnal Pendidikan Ilmu Sosial*, 25(1), 24–40. <https://ejournal.upi.edu/index.php/jpis/article/view/3668>
- Schwartz, B. (2014). *Proportional representation for Canada ?* 28(2).133-137. Retrieved from <https://canlii.ca/t/2cfj>.
- Simbolon, F. (2016). Political marketing mix in Indonesia parties. *Binus Business Review*, 7(1), 103. <https://doi.org/10.21512/bbr.v7i1.1490>
- Sugiyono. (2015). *Metode penelitian kualitatif, kuantitatif, dan R&D*. Alfabeta.
- Sulaksono, T. (2016). Soft anti-party sentiment in Indonesia. *International Conference on Sosial Pilitics*.
- Sunarso, S. (2007). Pendidikan politik dan politik pendidikan. *Jurnal Civics: Media Kajian Kewarganegaraan*, 4(2). <https://doi.org/10.21831/civics.v4i2.6026>
- Suparno, & Karmanis. (2020). The role of political education in building a democratic system in Semarang, Central Java, Indonesia. *International Journal of Advanced Science and*

- Technology*, 29(4), 1743–1748.
<http://sersc.org/journals/index.php/IJAST/article/view/7390>
- Suparno, S., Karmanis, K., & Sunaryo, A. (2020). Government strategy in political education as public participation improvement to reach democracy system in Semarang city. *Politik Indonesia: Indonesian Political Science Review*, 5(1), 86–101.
<https://doi.org/10.15294/ipsr.v5i1.23793>
- Surbakti, R., & Supriyanto, D. (2013). *Partisipasi warga masyarakat dalam proses penyelenggaraan pemilihan umum*. Kemitraan bagi Pembaruan Tata Pemerintahan.
- Ticoalu, T. W. (2015). Pemberdayaan media massa dalam meningkatkan pendidikan politik pada masyarakat kelurahan wewelen kecamatan Tondano Barat, kabupaten Minahasa. *E-Journal Acta Diurna Universitas Sam Ratulangi Manado*, IV(3), 1–15.
<https://ejournal.unsrat.ac.id/index.php/actadiurnakomunikasi/article/view/8006>
- Weiss, M. L. (2015). *Routledge handbook of contemporary Malaysia*. Routledge.