

## The Practice of Money Politics in Village Head Elections and Its Effect on The Participation Level of Beginner Voters

Effendi Hasan<sup>1</sup>, Aminah<sup>2</sup>, Haji Jamaie Haji Hamil<sup>3</sup>, Mukhrijal<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Universitas Syiah Kuala & Banda Aceh, Cp. 0822-4110-1686, Indonesia

<sup>2</sup> Universitas Syiah Kuala & Banda Aceh, Cp. 0853-7032-8875, Indonesia

<sup>3</sup> Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia, Kuala Lumpur, Cp. +6013-39366, Malaysia

<sup>4</sup> Universitas Syiah Kuala & Banda Aceh, Cp. 085277538041, Indonesia

Corresponding Author: aminah@unsyiah.ac.id

### Article Info

#### Article History;

Received:

2022-07-22

Revised:

2022-09-23

Accepted:

2022-10-09

**Abstract:** This study investigates the prevalence of money politics in village head elections in Gampong Gunong Meulinteung and its impact on novice voter participation. General elections are crucial to democracy, but they are often undermined by electoral fraud, particularly money politics, which seeks to sway voters through monetary and material incentives. Employing a descriptive quantitative method, data were collected through questionnaires and interviews, with statistical analysis conducted using SPSS. Results indicated that money politics manifested as money (76%), goods (57%), and services (58%) offered to voters. Correlation analysis revealed a modest influence of money politics on novice voters at 7.6%, while 92.4% based their choices on factors such as age, education, and candidate personality. This research enhances the understanding of the relationship between money politics and voter behavior, particularly among novice voters, an area where empirical data is scarce. The study's focus on the impact of money politics on first-time voters in village head elections offers fresh insights into electoral fraud at the local governance level, especially in rural Indonesia. Emphasizing the notable yet limited impact of money politics, this research underscores the necessity of providing political education to novice voters and advocates for the establishment of village-level task forces to address electoral fraud, ultimately aiming to enhance the integrity of local democratic processes.

**Keyword:** Money Politics, Village Head Election, Participation, and Beginner Voters

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.18196/jgpp.v10i1.15576>



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/).

## INTRODUCTION

Indonesia follows a democratic government system. The 1945 Constitution affirms that "Sovereignty is in the hands of the people and carried out according to the Constitution." Thus, in a democratic country, participation from the community is needed to run and be involved in the implementation of governance, one of which is participating in the general election process.

Political participation is an activity in which citizens take part and influence the policy or decision-making by the government.

One form of public political participation is voting in elections (Gaffar, 2013). In this case, the public votes for a candidate or political party. There are several types of elections in Indonesia, including the presidential and vice-presidential elections, regional head, and deputy regional head elections. Meanwhile, the Village Head Election (Pilkades) in the Aceh area is called Pilchiksung (*Pemilihan geuchik langsung* – Direct village head election), which is an activity of directly electing the village head (Geuchik) by the people of the village and appointed by the Regent/Mayor. Pilchiksung helps the people of the village because it is a form of democracy in terms of freedom to elect or be elected as the head of the village so that they can carry out village governance according to the conscience and wishes of the community.

In the election process, various problems can lead to conflict in the Pilchiksung, which can damage the integrity and existence of the people and spread the use of money politics (Agustino, 2009). Unfortunately, frauds in this election are not uncommon and have occurred in various villages in Indonesia. In Gampong Gunong Meulinteung, Panga Subdistrict, Aceh Jaya Regency, the Pilchiksung was marred by unfair competition, chaos, and money politics. It is now commonplace that to win the village head election, a person needs a large fund to finance legal or illegal activities, such as money politics, to influence the voters.

Money politics is the sale and purchase of votes, the provision of cash, goods, and services, and the act of distributing money to influence voters' votes in the political process (Ismawan, 1999; Juliansyah, 2007; Ahmad, 2015; Umam, 2006). Regarding money politics in Indonesia's reform era, Corruption Watch noted increased findings on Money Politics in every election year. For example, it can be seen from the 1999 election that there were 62 Money Politics cases, and the perpetrators were dominated by the big parties, namely PDI-P and Golkar. In 2004, the practice of money politics increased with the finding of 113 cases. Meanwhile, in the 2009 election, the number of findings of fraud and the practice of Money Politics continued to grow, reaching 150 cases, and the perpetrators were still the same, namely political party administrators (Ade, 2014).

During the simultaneous elections in 2019, the practice of Money Politics re-emerged. Bawaslu (Indonesian Election Supervisory Board) noted that almost all political parties practice Money Politics, namely: Berkarya Party (1 violation), Demokrat Party (1 violation), Garuda Party (1 violation), Gerindra party (1 violation), Golkar Party (2 violations), Hanura Party 6 (violations), Nasdem Party (2 violations), National Mandate Party (PAN) (5 violations), Indonesian Democratic Party of Struggle (PDIP) (2 violations), Perindo Party (3 violations), Prosperous Justice Party (PKS) (2 violations), Indonesian Unity Party (PPP) (1 violation), and the Indonesian Solidarity Party (PSI) (1 violation) (Report of the Election Supervisory Body of the Republic of Indonesia). However, it turns out that Money Politics does not only occur in Indonesia. According to political and constitutional experts, money politics occurs in almost all countries, especially in developing countries that are just starting the democratization process. The spread of democratic regimes in developing countries has also contributed to the rise of money politics.

"Vote markets used to be widespread during the early stages of democracy in western Europe, but largely seemed to disappear with economic development" (Aidt and Jensen, 2012). Mary breeding conveyed the same thing in the study of comparative politics. Money politics is a common practice in countries throughout the developing world. From Mexico and Argentina to the Asian countries of Thailand and India, politicians and political parties are maneuvering, especially in low-income communities, by promising and providing material incentives to voters in exchange for political support (Mary Breeding, 2007). ).

In addition, Hans Gersbach and Felix M'uhe stated that vote buying is an instrument that is widely used by parties in developing countries to influence election results. For example, buying votes is a long tradition in the Philippines, Mexico, Taiwan, Senegal, and Thailand. In the 2002 elections (community level) in the Philippines, an estimated 3 million people were offered some form of payment. This fact corresponded to about 7% of all voting adults. In Thailand, 30% of household heads surveyed in the national sample said they had been offered money during the

1996 general election. In the 1999 Taiwan elections, 27% of random voters reported receiving cash offers during the previous election campaign. (Hans, 2011).

The practice of money politics does not only occur in developing countries. It even occurs in countries with established democracies, even in the United States of America. Richard L. Hasen revealed that.

*“Despite current law, vote buying has a long, if ignoble, history in the United States. Though vote buying probably has been around as long as voting, James Gardner traces the prevalence of the practice in the United States back to eighteenth-century England, where “treating,” that is, “treating the voters to food and drink in heroic quantities” to gain their favor,” was a universal practice: “The practice ... transformed election campaigns into contests between the candidates to provide the most whiskey to eligible voters” (Richard, 2000; Simeon, 2008).*

Likewise, politicians in Asian countries often target the poor as targets for money politics. In the Philippines, for example, an estimated three million citizens were offered money or goods in barangay elections (community level) in 2002. In Thailand, 30% of respondents who come from the head of the family said that politicians or their campaign teams offered them money or gifts. In the third largest city in Taiwan, Taichung, 27% of respondents admitted to receiving money during the 1999 election campaign (Burhanuddin Muhtadi, 2020).

Apart from the consequences, one of which can undermine the essence of elections and democracy itself, according to experts, there is empirical evidence to suggest that vote buying can contribute to increasing electoral support. In emerging democracies, parties often rely on existing patron-client networks and pre-election transfers to mobilize support. In addition, the practice of money politics also requires a political broker. Political brokers are helpers or intermediaries whose job is to persuade their neighbors and acquaintances to vote for the candidate (Stokes, Dunning, Nazarno, & Brusco, 2013; Zainal Bintang, 2019)

In an election filled with money politics practices, the candidates will only be busy building relationships with investors to get financial assistance. Therefore, the risks faced by potential candidates or election participants must consider the interests of investors and their political desires. Predictably, politicians who have succeeded in attaining political positions, whether legislative or executive, must think about “repaying” these financiers. Meanwhile, attention to the interests of the people who are their constituents is easily displaced. The bigger danger is if the interests of the investors cause an executive to make policies that benefit investors who have financed their political campaigns and even make political concessions that are not transparent and difficult to account for according to the principle of accountability. The same danger will also arise if politicians who have reached legislative positions make legislation that benefits investors who have funded the election campaigns of these legislators (Iqnas, 2009).

If most group members sell their votes, the long-term interests of these group members are less likely to be promoted by the government. However, even though money politics in elections has been proven to have adverse effects on the continuation of democracy, the fact is that not all people feel the need to fight the practice of money politics, as indicated by several survey results regarding the response or reaction of voters when offered money/goods to vote for certain candidates. For example, a survey by the Indonesian Institute of Sciences (LIPI) on the influence of money politics in the 2019 General Election (Pemilu) concluded that 40 percent of respondents received money from participants in the 2019 Election but did not consider voting for them. Meanwhile, another 37 percent admitted to receiving money and considering voting for the money giver (LIPI Survey, 2019).

Money politics is commonplace for people in an election contestation. Therefore, it is not surprising that some of them still receive money from election participants, although they do not necessarily choose the one who gave the money. Society views money as part of democracy, and it is natural. The results of research by some experts conclude that, for some voters, vote

buying/money politics is positively viewed because it can solve problems, especially for the poor (Ezequile Gonzalez, 2014; John Morgan, 2012).

The parties or candidates, as well as the vote-buying campaign teams, classify, select systematically, and target specific groups of voters based on their socio-economic characteristics. Poverty, in particular, has been emphasized as an essential source of vote-buying that allows candidates and their campaign teams to exploit the material needs of these deprived groups of voters by trading gifts or money in exchange for votes. Thus, as stated by Dixit and Londregan, poor voters are more likely to be the main target of money politics to attract client lists than voters. This reality is not surprising because there are sound theoretical reasons to expect targeted redistributive rewards to which the poor are preferred. For example, suppose people experience a decrease in marginal utility in income and the poor benefit from consumption goods more than the rich. In that case, it is expected that the poor to be more responsive to tactically targeted rewards (Valeria Brusco, 2004).

One of the impacts of money politics is that money politics can last a long time because election campaigns damaged by money politics will provide a stage for governance by corruption. As a losing candidate for governor in Nigeria, Kayode Fayemi, put it: "anyone willing to steal a ballot box will (also) steal public money". Vote buying allows public positions to be filled by cronies, criminals, and other influential figures who are not eligible to hold public office because they do not have the required qualifications. Policy debate will continue to be distorted where the views of the poor are muted and the preferences of the rich strengthened on key issues. More specifically, money politics will bring several adverse impacts: First, it will prevent good candidates from participating in election competitions. Good people who have quality will object to running in elections because they feel there is no point in competing in elections if, in the end, the winners are the ones who pay, not the quality ones. Second, money politics will destroy healthy competition. Third, money politics causes the destruction of representative democratic values, which is one of the causes of the disconnect between the representatives (government) and those represented (the people).

Based on the facts and data before the Pilchiksung, there was no visible money politics in the village head election. Instead, selecting and determining the village head was often influenced by the intimate and emotional relationship of a candidate for the village head because, at that time, there were not many educated people, so there was no campaign system to convey the vision and mission of the candidates. Usually, those elected to become village heads were elders who had authority and charisma in their villages. Since the reformation period, there have been major changes, including determining and electing the village heads.

The rise of money politics cases at the village level proves that money politics has a great influence in gaining power at the village level. The rise of money politics cases in Indonesia is motivated by various causes. In Rowotamtu village, a sub-district of Rambi Puji, Jember Regency, the people's motive for accepting money politics is due to complex needs, so they are willing to accept gifts from candidates for village head (Nova, 2021). In addition, La Ode Suprianto, Muh. Arsyad and Megawati A. Tawulo, in their research in Ronta Village, Bonegunu District, North Buton Regency, regarding public responses to money politics issues about community needs, found that of 66 respondents, 12 respondents (18.18%) stated that money politics was following the needs of the community. In comparison, 54 respondents (81, 82%) indicated that money politics did not meet the community's needs. However, some villagers in Ronta, whose economy is middle to lower, said that money politics helped reduce the family's economic burden (Suprianto, Arsyad, & Tawulo, 2017). The same was found in research conducted by Nuratika in Ketapang Permai Village and Tanjung Kulim Village, Meranti Islands Regency, Riau Province (Nuratika, 2017). Likewise, Lina Ulfa Fitriani, L Wiresapta Karyadi, and Dwi Setiawan Chaniago, who conducted research in Sandik Village, Batu Layar Sub-district, West Lombok Regency, found that poverty has made people think rationally to get several benefits, including when receiving rewards given by the political candidates or contestants in elections (Fitriani, Karyadi, & Chaniago, 2019).

In addition, money politics is considered normal during elections. Anas Azwar, in his research, found that money politics has been around for a long time and has become a culture in every village head election in Plosorejo Village. The village head candidate who volunteered as village head in Plosorejo Village in 2013 is a religious figure known to many who have practiced money politics (Azwar, 2014). The people themselves see this as a “normal” thing that happens when the political season comes, so they consider it a tradition (Putri, Arifani, Ratnasari, Auliavia, & Nuriyah, 2020). In other words, rural communities have a narrow view of the world of politics (Nuratika, 2015). In his research, Hasan Abdillah stated that many factors make money politics difficult to remove from this country, ranging from political, social, and juridical to cultural factors. In Pilkades, the role of *al-raisy* is often played by a successful team of irresponsible candidates. Money politics caused by cultural factors is entrenched in almost all segments of people’s lives, including the people of Tegal Ampel Village and Bondowoso Regency (Abdillah, Hasan, 2009).

Candidates or their campaign teams often practice money politics. Mohamad Amanu showed that the campaign team used the practice of money politics. The campaign team will carry out a campaign that promises infrastructure development and financing to visit the tomb of wali lima (five saints) (Amanu, 2015). In addition, Fitriyah’s research on money politics for village head elections (Pilkades) in Pati Regency shows similarities between regional and Village Head Elections. One of the similarities occurs when the money is distributed. The distribution of the money is the responsibility of the field operator, namely the campaign staff (Fitriyah, 2015). In his research, Siswandi conducted a study on *Public Perceptions of Money Politics in the Election of the Head of South Cemaga Village, South Bunguran District, Natuna Regency*, in 2013. He found that the South Cemaga Community positively perceived money politics. The public has positive thoughts about money politics by candidates if they want to get support from the community. If the candidate does not use the money to be distributed to the public, the candidate will not win the election (Siswandi, 2016).

The lack of socialization and political education provided to the community, especially the novice voters, can facilitate money politics practices carried out by the village head candidates and their campaign teams. Beginner voters who do not fully understand the value of the votes being traded will easily accept offers in the form of money or other gifts from the candidates, as seen in the election process at the village level in Gampong Gunong Meulinteung in 2019. The public has seen beginner voters’ involvement in money politics. One example was the village head candidate giving transportation money to university students who were out of town to go home and vote for the village head candidate who had given him the money. Meanwhile, other candidates provide facilities in the form of sports clothes for young people.

Money politics that has occurred and is becoming common in the smallest government unit, namely the village, is interesting to study and investigate further. Therefore, this study aims to determine the practice of money politics in the election of village heads and its effect on the level of participation of novice voters.

## **RESEARCH METHOD**

This study employed a quantitative approach with a correlational type of research (Arikunto, 2010; Sudijono, 1997;). The quantitative approach (Azwar, 2010; Sugiono, 2013) was used to determine whether there was an influence of Money Politics on novice voters in the election of Geuchik Gampong. Gunong Meulinteung, Panga Subdistrict, Aceh Jaya Regency in 2019. The sampling technique used is cluster random sampling. The sample was obtained through the Slovin formula with an error rate of 10% in Isaac and Michael’s table, 81 people. The variables in this study were reviewed through four elements: knowledge, attitude, interpretation, and evaluation. Knowledge will refer to information obtained through the five senses and supported by experiences from novice voters related to money politics practices found during village head elections. This study’s attitude is related to novice voters’ experience and response to the practice of money politics. The view (Interpretation) will refer to a theoretical interpretation of the practice of money politics that comes from a deep mindset influenced by the

subject's background. Finally, the evaluation can be obtained from the actions that determine the assessment related to the practice of money politics during the Pilchiksung in Gampong Gunong Meulinteung, Panga Sub-district, Aceh Jaya Regency. These four elements describe the influence of money politics practices on novice voters.

Data collection methods used in this study included questionnaires, interviews, and documentation. Meanwhile, the data analysis techniques used were data interpretation, and the researcher also used an instrument of assistance in the form of a statistical application, namely SPSS. SPSS minimized the error rate in calculating the percentage of primary data recapitulation and facilitated researchers in presenting the results of processed data. This study used Pearson's product-moment correlation analysis technique with the following formula to get the results that there is an influence not between money politics and novice voters.

$$r_{xy} = \frac{n \sum XY - (\sum X)(\sum Y)}{\sqrt{\{n \sum X^2 - (\sum X)^2\} \{n \sum Y^2 - (\sum Y)^2\}}}$$

Pearson's product-moment correlation is denoted by (r), provided that the value of r is not more than the value (-1 < r < 1). If the value of r = -1, the correlation is perfectly negative. If r = 0, there is no correlation; if the value of r = 1, the correlation is solid. Meanwhile, the meaning of the value of r will be consulted with the table of interpretations of the value of r as follows:

Interpretation of Correlation Coefficient Value of r	
Coefficient Interval	Relationship Level
0.80- 1.000	Very strong
0.60- 0.799	Strong
0.40- 0,599	Fairly Strong
0.20- 0.399	Low
0.00- 0.199	Very Low

Based on these correlations, the following hypotheses can be used.

Suppose it has 0.60 and above. In that case, money politics has a big influence on novice voters' participation; if it is at 0.40 and below, there is no correlation between money politics and the participation of novice voters.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### A. Village Head Election Process

Elections for village heads in Indonesia are generally carried out through direct election by the community. Democracy at the local level is running and functioning well. The election of the village head is a means of a political process called the recruitment of village leaders. Based on Law number 5 of 1979, villages do not yet have broad authority to carry out direct village head elections because the provincial government still regulates everything. Meanwhile, based on law number 22 of 1999, villages have broad authority to carry out their village head elections. Furthermore, in law number 6 of 2005, the village government has full autonomous authority in carrying out village head elections.

The election process for the village head or Geuchik of Gampong Gunong Meulinteung, Panga Subdistrict, Aceh Jaya Regency, is the same as Pilchiksung in other villages or *gampongs* in Aceh Jaya regency. The basis used as a guideline in Pilchiksung is the Aceh Jaya Regency Qanun Number 4 of 2018 concerning Gampong governance. Therefore, Pilchiksung held in Gampong Gunong Meulinteung, Panga Subdistrict, Aceh Jaya Regency, on December 31, 2019, was one of the strategies to realize democracy starting at the village level and create leaders from the wishes of the community itself. Thus, the village head, or Geuchik Gampong, will be elected following the wishes of the community so that they can build the village into an independent, innovative, and advanced village.

Each candidate who would advance as a village head must pass several stages. One of them was applying for a village head candidate through Pilchiksung, which was organized by a committee that had been previously formed in charge of organizing activities related to the implementation of the nomination and election program for Geuchik Gampong. Based on the results of the examination of the files submitted by the prospective candidates and the screening test by the organizing committee, it was announced that there were two prospective candidates for Geuchik Gampong Gunong Meulinteung, as follows.

1. Sulaiman M
2. Yusantri

The organizing committee then provided time for the prospective Geuchik Gampong candidates to campaign. It delivered its vision and mission one time only on a date and place determined by the committee. Submission of the vision, mission and programs for developing and prospering the people of the village was carried out in front of the public consisting of members of Tuha Peut and Tuha Lapan Gampong (the Village Consultative Body), community leaders, and the people of the village. The public listened to and recorded every program that would be carried out later by the candidates if they were elected Geuchik of the village.

Based on the stipulated rules, the installation of campaign props in the form of pictures/photos, billboards, and other types of campaign props can be carried out in various public places that are considered strategic and have a positive impact, except for schools, places of worship, offices/services/agencies, and polling places. In addition, prospective Geuchik Gampong candidates were prohibited from promising or giving anything directly or indirectly on behalf of or in any form to anyone to win them over in the general election and voting.

Gampong Gunong Meulinteung is one of the villages with a smaller population than several other villages in the Panga Sub-district, Aceh Jaya Regency. Therefore, the number of people with the right to vote in the 2019 Geuchik Gampong election was 145. During the general election of Geuchik Gampong Gunong Meulinteung, there was no delay in the Pilchiksung. Everything went according to a predetermined schedule and time, with the number of voters exercising their voting rights as many as 142 votes out of 145 registered as permanent voters.

On the same day, December 31, 2019, after the voting was completed at 1 p.m., the opening of the ballot boxes and the calculation of the number were carried out at 2 p.m., which were witnessed directly by the Geuchik Gampong candidates along with the witnesses for each Geuchik Gampong candidate and the Gampong Gunong Meulinteung community. At the end of the session, the committee announced the results of the vote count with the following results:

1. Voters registered on the Permanent Voters List were 145 people;
2. Voters who attended and exercised their right to vote were 142 people;
3. Voters who did not attend were 3 people;
4. Damaged or spoiled votes were 4 votes;
5. Geuchik candidate Sulaiman Majid received 50 Votes;
6. Geuchik candidate Yusantri received 88 Votes.

The voting and counting of ballots results showed that the candidate for Geuchik of Gampong Gunong Meulinteung was Yusantri, with a total of 88 votes.

## **B. Money Politics in Pilchiksung**

Pilchiksung is an event awaited by the people of the villages to elect a leader directly at the Gampong or Village level. In this case, it is hoped that the people can filter and find someone with the capacity to lead and bring the village into an independent, tough, and advanced village. However, the research results show that there are several reasons for people as voters to determine their choices. The reasons were education, the existence of promises, the provision of unconditional cash transfers and assistance in developing public facilities, and others. Therefore, money politics practices become obstacles to implementing democratic values in the general election of Geuchik of Gampong Gunong Meulinteung.

Money politics includes giving money and giving goods from candidates through their campaign teams. Another form of money politics given by the Geuchik candidate of Gampong Gunong Meulinteung was by holding a feast with the teams that were expected to vote for them later, which is also interspersed with invitations or campaigns to choose the candidate who holds the event. The existence of money politics is still difficult to prove, and if it occurs, it can be classified as an act that violates the law. However, money politics is an unavoidable and normal activity in every Geuchik Gampong election or village head election, as expressed by one of the voters.

“We, as the people who always participate in this democracy festival, see the practice of money politics in every general election. It is a natural thing and has become a habit repeated every time before the election. Whether it is village head elections, regional head elections, legislative elections, or general elections for president and vice president, we all know that it (money politics) is not allowed but is always done by people with interests. So, in my opinion, this is usually done before the election. In terms of money politics here, it is not only given in the form of money but also in the form of staple foods, prayer equipment, and even a feast that is held so that people will choose the person who held the feast” (Agus, Interview November 20, 2021)

Mila also expressed the same thought.

“Money politics here is not something to be afraid of anymore. It has become a tradition in every general election event. Although money politics is vulnerable to occur, it often does not follow the candidate’s expectations in determining the vote. Many candidates who had practiced money politics lost when the vote count was over. This will make money givers more careful in capturing potential voters” (Mila, Interview November 22, 2021)

Money Politics can be interpreted as a politically motivated transaction or transaction plan that aims to influence the recipient as a target to take or not to act for the giver’s benefit, which includes indications of bribery, attachment, and even in the form of coercion. All the above has proven that money politics has occurred and is considered a common thing in the Village Head Election. However, it is difficult for the village head candidates to predict whether victory will be on their side even though they use the practice of money politics.

### **C. Beginners Voter in Pilchiksung**

Currently, most people of Gampong Gunong Meulinteung are aware of politics, as shown by the respondents’ answers about their interest in participating in the village head election process, where 100% agreed. The level of community participation at the village level positively impacts the realization of a democratic country. Political participation is an activity of citizens whose purpose is to influence decision-making. This political participation is voluntary, not a form of coercion, let alone being mobilized by a group or class.

The people of Gampong Gunong Meulinteung who gave their voting rights and participated in the general election of Geuchik Gampong were people who have met the requirements to vote, including having reached the age of 17 and having an E-KTP, having been married or divorced even though they not yet reached the age of 17, and voting for the first time. In this case, they are considered beginner voters (people conducting general elections for the first time).

Novice voters greatly influence the development of a democratic country in the future. Therefore, in addition to the increasing number, the potential critical power of young people will also be able to determine an election result that can be said to be significant and have much influence. Therefore, voters who participate in the Pilchiksung in Gampong Gunong Meulinteung should maintain their integrity and not vote for the Geuchik Gampong candidate.



#### **D. The Effect of Money Politics on Beginner Voters**

between money politics, goods and services, and the level of political participation of novice voters in the Geuchik Gampong Gunong Meulinteung general election. Based on the interpretation, the number 0.276, rounded to 0.28, is referred to as the rxy correlation index number. Therefore, the rxy correlation figure is interpreted as follows.

1. The correlation number obtained was 0.28 when compared to the critical value of the correlation table for the value of r. For a significance level of 5%, the critical number was 0.220. Based on this, the correlation number obtained was  $0.28 > r_{\text{table}} (0.220)$ , so it can be concluded that money politics influence novice voters' participation.
2. The rxy value was 0.28, which is between 0.20-0.40, in the sense that there is a relationship between the money politics variable and the participation of novice voters. However, the correlation is weak or low. So the correlation was ignored, or it can be considered that there is no correlation between money politics and the participation of novice voters.

Furthermore, a simple linear regression formula was used to determine the magnitude of the influence of the money politics variable on the level of political participation of novice voters, namely using the SPSS version 24.00. The coefficient of determination  $R^2$  shows how much the independent variable can explain the dependent variable. Based on the output of SPSS, it shows that the value of the R square was 0.076. The variable contribution of money politics to the level of political participation of novice voters is only 7.6%. In comparison, the other 92.4% were influenced by various other factors, such as the socio-political environment, the economic system, the cultural system, and social media.

In the election process of Gampong Gunong Meulinteung village head in 2019, the involvement of beginner voters in the practice of money politics seems to have been visible to other people. Based on the results of monitoring and research, researchers saw money politics carried out by the candidates for Sidomukti.

The money politics practice carried out by the candidate for the village head of Gampong Gunong Meulinteung was the provision of donations in the form of staple food and cash, especially for students outside the village to return to the village so that they could participate in village head elections. They call this donation alms or money for the poor and students.

The findings in the field show that the novice voters in Gampong Gunong Meulinteung, Panga sub-district, and Aceh Jaya regency are more dominated by rational voters. Rational voters are highly oriented toward "policy problem solving" and lowly toward ideological factors. One of the factors that determine the thinking of beginner voters is the level of education they have. The higher the level of education that voters have, the better they think about politics.

Based on this, money politics cannot fully buy votes from novice voters. The participation of novice voters in the Pilchiksung of Gampong Gunong Meulinteung is already relatively high, as indicated by as many as 98% of the people using their voting rights out of 145 who are included in the permanent list. The results showed a relationship between money politics and the political participation of novice voters in Pilchiksung in Gampong Gunong Meeulinteung. The factors influencing beginners' participation level in the Geuchik Gampong Gunong Meulinteung election are social characteristics, as described by Milbrath in Faturohman (2002), as shown by 53% of the public agreeing to money politics.

The practice of money politics in Pilchiksung is often not touched by law enforcement because of the difficulty of proving it due to the absence of clear boundaries regarding money politics. Besides, some people consider it as something normal. Society is increasingly permissive to money politics in elections. This lack of political education is used by candidates for Geuchik or village heads in various regions to launch the actions and practices of money politics.

#### **CONCLUSION**

Based on the study's results, money politics in the village head elections in Gampong Gunong Meulinteung was carried out behind closed doors, packed with social activities and joint celebrations. Even so, money politics did not affect the determination of the votes given by

beginner voters in determining their choice. The political influence of money, services, and goods provided by prospective Geuchik to beginner voters in 2019 had a weak correlation. The participation rate of beginner voters increases with the advent of money politics. However, money politics does not guarantee those beginner voters to vote for candidates who give them money. Novice voters are also more careful about money politics in determining their choices during elections because novice voters are more critical and literate about democracy.

## REFERENCES

- Abdillah, Hasan, (2009), *Money Politic Dalam Pilkades Di Desa Tegal Ampel Kecamatan Tegal Ampel Kabupaten Bondowoso Dalam Perspektif Hukum Islam* [Money Politics in Village Head Election in Tegal Ampel Village, Tegal Ampel Subdistrict, Bondowoso Regency in the Perspective of Islamic Law], Skripsi, Fakultas Syariah, Universitas Islam Negeri Sunan Kalijaga Yogyakarta
- Abdullah Bin Abdul Muhsin. (2001). *Jariimatur-Rasyati Fisy-Syarri'atil Islamiyyati (terj. Muchotob Hamzah dan Subakir Saerozi)*. Jakarta: Gema Insani.
- Ade Irawan, dkk, (2014). *Panduan Pemantauan Korupsi Pemilu [Election Corruption Monitoring Guide]*, Jakarta: Indonesia Corruption Watch.
- Agustino, Leo. (2009). *Pilkada dan Dinamika Politik Lokal [Pilkada and Local Political Dynamics]* Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.
- Ahmad, Ikhsan. (2015). *Pilar Demokrasi Kelima [The Fifth Pillar of Democracy]*. Yogyakarta: Budi Utama.
- Amanu, M. (2015). *Politik Uang dalam Pemilihan Kepala Desa (Studi Kasus di Desa Jatirej Kecamatan Banyakan Kabupaten Kediri)* [Money Politics in the Election of Village Heads (Case Study in Jatirej Village, Banyakan Subdistrict, Kediri Regency)].
- Arikunto, S. (2010). *Prosedur Penelitian Suatu Pendekatan Praktik [Research Procedure: A Practical Approach]*. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta
- Aspinall, Edward dan Sukmajati, Mada. (2015). *Politik Uang di Indonesia [Money Politics in Indonesia]*. Yogyakarta: Polgov.
- Azwar, A. (2014). *Kiai, Money Politic dan Pragmatisme Politik dalam Perspektif Siyasah Syar'iyah: Studi Kasus Pilkades Plosorejo Tahun 2013 [Kiai (Islamic Religious Leader), Money Politics and Political Pragmatism in the Perspective of Siyasah Syar'iyah: Case Study of Plosorejo Head Village Election of 2013]*. IN RIGHT Jurnal Agama Dan Hak Azazi Manusia, 5(2), 226.
- Azwar, Saifuddin. (2010). *Metode Penelitian [Research methods]*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar Offset.
- Burhanuddin Muhtadi, (2020). *Kuasa Uang, Politik uang dalam pemilu paca orde baru [Money Power, Money politics in post-Orde Baru]*, Jakarta: Keputakaan Populer Gramedia.
- Deti Mega Purnamasari, (2019) "Survei LIPI: Masyarakat Memandang Politik Uang Bagian dari Pemilu, Tidak Dilarang", <https://nasional.kompas.com/read/2019/08/29/05213291/survei-lipi-masyarakat-memandang-politik-uang-bagian-dari-pemilutidak?page=all>

- Ezequiel Gonzalez Ocantos, Chad Kiewiet de Jonge, and David W. Nickerson, (2014), *The Conditionality of Vote-Buying Norms: Experimental Evidence from Latin America*, American Journal of Political Science, Volume 58 issue 1 2014, hlm. 198
- Fitriani, L. U., Karyadi, L. W., & Chaniago, D. S. (2019). Fenomena Politik Uang (Money Politic) Pada Pemilihan Calon Anggota Legislatif di Desa Sandik Kecamatan Batu Layar Kabupaten Lombok Barat [The Phenomenon of Money Politics in the Election of Candidates for Legislative Members in Sandik Village, Batu Layar Subdistrict, West Lombok Regency]. RESIPROKAL: Jurnal Riset Sosiologi Progresif Aktual, 1(1), 53–61. <http://doi.org/10.29303/resiprokal.v1i1.5>
- Fitriyah. (2015). *Cara Kerja Politik Uang (Studi Kasus Pilkada dan Pilkades di Kabupaten Pati)* [How Money Politics Work (Case Study of Regional Head Election and Village Head Election in Pati Regency)], 6(2), 101–111.
- Gaffar, J. M. (2013). *Demokrasi dan Pemilu di Indonesia (Konstitusi)* [Democracy and Elections in Indonesia (Constitution)]
- Hans Gersbach and Felix Muehe, (2011). *Vote-Buying and Growth, Macroeconomic Dynamics*, Volume 15, issue 5,
- Irawan, Dedi. (2015). *Studi Tentang Politik Uang (Money Politic) dalam Pemilu Legislatif Tahun 2014: Studi Kasus di Kelurahan Sempaja Selatan* [A Study on Money Politics in the 2014 Legislative Election: A Case Study in the Sempaja Selatan Village]. Jurnal Ilmu Pemerintahan, Maret 2015.
- Ismawan, Indra. (1999). *Money Politics Pengaruh Uang dalam Pemilu* [Money Politics The Effect of Money in Elections]. Yogyakarta: Media Presindo.
- John Morgan and Felix Vardy, (2012), *Negative Vote Buying and the Secret Ballot*, *Journal of Law Economics and Organization*, Volume 28, issue 4, 2012, hlm. 818
- Juliansyah, Elvi. (2007). *PILKADA: Penyelenggaraan Pemilihan Kepala Daerah dan Wakil Kepala Daerah* [Election of Regional Heads and Deputy Regional Heads]. Bandung: Mandar Maju.
- Mary Breeding, (2007). *Vote-Buying: Is it a Threat to Democratic Policy Representation?* *Political Science & Politics*, Volume 40, issue 4,
- Nova Saha Fasadena, (2021) *Motif Masyarakat Menerima Money Politik Dalam Memilih Calon Kepala Desa (Studi Kasus Pemilihan Kepala Desa Di Desa Rowotamtu Kec. Rambipuji Kab. Jember)* [Community Motives for Accepting Political Money in Choosing Village Head Candidates (Case Study of Village Head Elections in Rowotamtu Village, Rambipuji Subdistrict, Jember Regency)], *The Journal of Islamic Communication and Broadcasting*, Vol. 1 No. 1 Agustus 2021
- Nuratika, N. (2017). *Politik Uang Pemilihan Kepala Daerah Di Desa Ketapang Permai Dan Desa Tanjung Kulim Kabupaten Kepulauan Meranti Tahun 2015* [Money Politics for Regional Head Elections in Ketapang Permai Village and Tanjung Kulim Village, Meranti Islands Regency in 2015]. *Jom FISIP*, 4(2), 1–15.
- Nuratika. (2015). *Politik Uang Pemilihan Kepala Daerah di Desa Ketapang Permai dan Desa Tanjung Kulim Kab Kepulauan Meranti tahun 2015* [Money Politics for Regional Head

Elections in Ketapang Permai Village and Tanjung Kulim Village, Meranti Islands Regency in 2015], 4(2), 1–15.

- Peter Sandholt Jensen and Mogens K. Justesen, (2014), Poverty and Vote Buying: Survey-Based Evidence From Africa, *Electoral Studies*, volume 33.
- Putri, Arifani, Ratnasari, dkk, (2020), *Politik Dan Tradisi: Politik Uang Dalam Pemilihan Kepala Desa* [Politics and Tradition: Money Politics in Village Head Elections], *Jurnal ISIP: Jurnal Ilmu Sosial dan Ilmu Politik* | Vol. 17, No. 2, 2020
- Richard L. HasenSource, (2000). Vote Buying, *California Law Review*, Vol. 88, No. 5 (October, 2000)
- Simeon Nichter, (2008). Vote Buying or Turnout Buying? Machine Politics and the Secret Ballot, *American Political Science Review*, Volume 102 issue 1 2008.
- Siswandi. (2016). Persepsi Masyarakat terhadap Politik Uang dalam Pemilihan Kepala Desa Cemaga Selatan Kec Bunguran Selatan Kab Natuna tahun 2013 [Public Perceptions of Money Politics in Cemaga Selatan Village Head Election, South Bunguran Subdistrict, Natuna Regency in 2013], 1–25.
- Stokes, S., Dunning, T., Nazareno, M., & Brusco, V. (2013). *Brokers, Voters, and Clientelism: The Puzzle of Distributive Politics (Cambridge Studies in Comparative Politics)*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Doi: 10.1017/CBO9781107324909.
- Sudijono. (1997). *Pengantar Statistik Pendidikan* [Introduction to Educational Statistics]. Jakarta: Raja Grafindo. Persada
- Sugiyono. (2013). *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif dan R&D* [Quantitative, Qualitative and R&D Research Methods]. Bandung: Alfabeta.CV.
- Umam, Ahmad Khoirul. (2006). *Kiai dan Budaya Korupsi di Indonesia* [Kiai and the Culture of Corruption in Indonesia]. Semarang: Rasail.
- Valeria Brusco, Marcelo Nazareno, and Susan C. Stokes, (2004). *Vote Buying in Argentina, Latin American Research Review*, Vol. 39, No. June 2, 2017:
- Zaman, Rambe Kamarul. (2016). *Perjalanan Panjang Pilkada Serentak* [The Long Journey of Simultaneous Local Elections]. Jakarta: Expose.