

Implications of Political Trust, Kinship Politics, and Political Participation (Makassar City Election in 2020)

Dadang Mas Bakar, Universitas Pertahanan, Indonesia*

Eri Radityawara Hidayat, Universitas Pertahanan, Indonesia

Ichsan Malik, Universitas Pertahanan, Indonesia

Abstract

Several previous studies on political participation prove that trust is an essential variable in increasing individual political participation. Besides that, Kinship politics make community participation decline. This study aims to see the implications of political trust in increasing public participation in the implementation of the 2020 regional elections simultaneously in Makassar City and how the political kinship implications are with the other two variables. In this research, a literature study approach is used by taking data on political trust and political participation and supporting theories that can reveal the implications of these two variables. The entire data found was then analyzed, which was connected to the situation in Makassar City in 2020. This research focuses on the regional elections held in Makassar City in 2020 due to the 2018 regional elections, won by empty boxes. This study found that the level of trust and political participation in Makassar city is very similar, proving the implications of these two variables. Then, several things can influence trust to increase political participation, namely kinship politics, security, and political knowledge through political education. This study also provides several recommendations for activities that can be carried out to increase political participation through a political trust approach.

Keywords:

Kinship politics; Makassar City; Political participation; Political trust; Regional head elections

INTRODUCTION

Law Number 30 of 2004 concerning Regional Government is a new chapter in the regional head election process. However, regional head elections (Pilkada) have been held since the first, even since the colonial era. Saraswati (2011), in her article in the journal *Legal Problems* entitled "Individual Candidates: Shifting Paradigm of Power

in Elections", states that there are four regional head election systems that have been implemented in Indonesia before the 2005 elections. First, the system of appointment or appointment by the centre. This system has been used since the Dutch East Indies colonial government, the Japanese occupation, and after independence. After independence, the government used this system based on Law No. 1 of 1945, Law No. 22 of 1948, and Law No. 1 of 1957.

The second, the appointment system. This system is used based on Presidential

*Correspondence: Kawasan IPSC Sentul, Sukahati, Kec. Citeureup, Kabupaten Bogor, Jawa Barat 16810 Indonesia.

Email: dadangmasbakar@gmail.com.

Decree No. 6/1959 jo. Presidential Decree Number 5 of 1960, Law Number 6 of 1956, and Law Number 18 of 1956, or what is known as the Presidential Decree era. In addition, this system was also implemented based on Presidential Decree No. 6/1959 in conjunction with Presidential Decree No. 5/1960 accompanied by reasons of "forced situation". Third, the representative election system. This system is the embodiment of Law Number 5 of 1974. With this system, the election of regional heads is carried out by the Regional People's Representative Council (DPRD).

Furthermore, the president will determine the elected regional head candidate. Fourth, the representative election system (pure). This system bases its implementation on Law No. 18/1965 and Law No. 22/1999. With this system, regional heads are elected purely by the DPRD without intervention from the central government.

The Local Government Law, also known as the Local Government Law, was implemented in 2005, signalling the opening of the door for direct community involvement or participation in determining regional heads. Pilkada directly becomes a central means as a form of existence of community involvement and participation in making political decisions in the region. The direct involvement of the community in the regional head election process has implications for the requirements for the realization of a good democratic process, namely the importance of community

participation in supporting the regional head election process.

Based on the results of a survey conducted by LIPI (2012), it shows that 63% of Indonesians are not interested in Indonesian politics and government issues, including the Pilkada. In its development, Pilkada has been transformed into Pilkada Simultaneously since December 9, 2015. Simultaneous Pilkada is present as a new tradition of democracy in Indonesia, which functions to strengthen the consolidation of democracy at the local level. Although selecting regional heads has been transformed in such a way, it still has no significant implications for the quality of community participation. This can be seen from the participation rate data in the 2015 Simultaneous Pilkada, which amounted to only 70%, followed later in 2017 to 74% (an increase of only 20%). In the 2018 Simultaneous Pilkada, the participation rate again decreased to 73.24%. Slightly lower than the KPU's target of 77.5% (Arif, 2020).

In the province of South Sulawesi itself¹, the implementation of the simultaneous local elections in 2015 was still not maximally successful². Then also based on data from the General Election Commission of South Sulawesi showing that in the gubernatorial election recently held, namely in 2018, the participation rate was only 70.54% (South Sulawesi General Election Commission, 2018). The following is data on the participation of the people of South Sulawesi Province (voters) in 2018:

¹ South Sulawesi Province is the province with the most population and is the Central Province in Eastern Indonesia

² The basis for determining the success of the election is based on the target of the General Election Commission, which is 75%

NO	KABUPATEN/ KOTA	KEC.	PRESENTASE PARTISIPASI		
			L (%)	P (%)	JUMLAH (%)
1	BANTAENG	8	73,88	78,58	76,31
2	BARRU	7	65,47	73,55	69,68
3	BBONE	27	69,46	73,97	73,83
4	BULUKUMA	10	56,49	63,87	60,33
5	ENRREKANG	12	74,77	78,86	76,78
6	GOWA	18	72,32	77,09	74,78
7	JENEPONTO	11	77,03	82,03	79,62
8	SELAYAR	11	74,76	80,61	77,83
9	LUWU	22	73,83	81,19	77,54
10	LUWU TIMUR	11	62,82	67,13	64,93
11	LUWU UTARA	12	64,63	69,91	67,27
12	MAROS	14	67,42	72,72	70,17
13	PANKEP	13	63,87	70,75	67,44
14	PINRANG	12	78,32	83,17	80,83
15	SIDARAP	11	78,15	82,23	80,26
16	SINJAY	9	74,39	79,78	77,16
17	SOPPENG	8	69,69	74,02	71,99
18	TAKALAR	9	66,63	77,52	72,37
19	TANA TORAJA	19	63,35	68,49	65,87
20	TORAJA UTARA	21	57,47	65,93	61,65
21	WAJO	14	80,35	82,71	81,59
22	MAKASAR	15	54,34	60,01	57,25
23	PALOPO	9	77,89	84,60	81,31
24	PAREPARE	4	76,84	83,29	80,08
	TOTAL	307	67,63	73,28	70,54

The data shows that several regions have varying levels of participation. The highest participation rate was obtained by Wajo Regency with a voter turnout of 81.59%, followed by Palopo Regency 81.31%, Pinrang Regency 80.83%, Sidrap Regency 80.26%, and then Pare-Pare City at 80.08%. Meanwhile, participation tends to increase for the Simultaneous Regional Head Elections in 2020, attended by 12 regions in the Southern Province. Still, it is not as significant as Gowa Regency, which is at 78.24% or only increased by 3.46%, Soppeng Regency, which only increased by 3.91% (to 75.9%),

Selayar Islands at 77.83% or an increase of 5.43%.

However, there are exciting things related to holding simultaneous regional elections in South Sulawesi, namely the holding of regional elections in Makassar City³.

Makassar City has held elections for two consecutive periods, namely in 2018 the same as other regions holding gubernatorial elections and mayoral elections with a participation rate of 57.25%⁴. Then in 2020, he participated in the simultaneous regional elections to re-elect the mayoral and deputy mayoral

³ Makassar City is the largest and most populous city and is the provincial capital in South Sulawesi Province

⁴ The lowest level of political participation in South Sulawesi Province

candidates for Makassar and obtained a participation rate of 59.66%. The irony is that although it was held twice, primarily to elect a mayor and deputy mayor, Makassar city has always been in the lowest position compared to other regions in South Sulawesi. Even though the city of Makassar itself is the capital city of South Sulawesi Province with the highest number of permanent voter lists (DPT), in 2018, as many as 990,836 people and as many as possible 901,087 DPT people for 2020. (General Election Commission, 2020) ⁵. Two implications are closely related to the problem of the low level of participation in Makassar City. First, people's political trust.

Low level of community participation. Basically, it is caused by low public political trust (Bakar, 2019) and distrust of the political system and politicians (Easley-Giraldo, 2016). Political trust is an individual belief regarding the goodness of individuals, other groups in carrying out their duties and fulfilling the expectations given for the common goal. Political trust is the public's expectation of a particular leader or institution such as the government, DPRD, KPU and others who are currently serving or will serve to mobilize, act and respond to community demands.

Blind (2007) suggests that the lack of trust in the current government impacts distrust of political institutions, supervisors, and the political system, which will affect people's political participation. Recent research. Hetherington (Blind, 2007)) argues that trust in government is an essential and

independent predictor in supporting policies implemented by the government that will affect political participation and public alignment.

A study conducted by Mishler and Rose (2001) in 10 countries shows that using an Institutional Theory perspective or macro-political belief in predicting people's political beliefs is considered more significant and has more impact. Other studies conducted by several previous researchers (Akhrani & Imansari, 2018; Anggraini et al., 2018; H. Wahyudi et al., 2013) conducted in various cities in Indonesia regarding the influence of political trust on political participation showed a significant relationship, meaning, the higher the individual's political trust, the higher the political participation automatically.

Second, what also affects public trust and public participation is kinship politics. Kinship politics occurs when political recruitment is based on kinship relations rather than candidate qualifications (Yuningsih, 2014). If someone fulfils the qualifications that have been determined to fulfil a political office position and through a fair and equal procedure, it can no longer be said that there is kinship politics. Purwaningsih (2013) found that the most potent political kinship phenomenon occurred in Banten and South Sulawesi provinces.

In general, when we look at the implementation of the regional elections in Makassar, there has been a decline. Moving on from the polemic of the implementation of the regional election in

⁵ Makassar City previously held elections in 2018 which was won by an empty box with a participation rate of only 57.25% and because it

was won by an empty box, it was finally held again in 2020 with a participation rate of only 59.66%

Makassar, which varies from belief, kinship politics, education, security, knowledge and others that make people's participation low. This has prompted researchers to look deeper into the implications of public political trust in increasing public participation in the 2020 simultaneous regional elections case study by formulating the following problems: First, how are political trust and public participation in the city of Makassar?. Second, what are the factors that can influence people's trust? And third, how to increase public participation through the approach of public political trust.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Participation

Political participation is the activity of a person or group of people to actively participate in political life by choosing state leaders and directly or indirectly influencing government policies (public policy) (Budiardjo, 2008; Fadli et al., 2018). These activities include voting in general elections, attending general meetings, contacting or lobbying with government officials or members of parliament, becoming a party member or one of the social movements with its direct action and so on. Furthermore, political participation is the activity of citizens who act as individuals, which are intended to influence political decision-making by the government. Participation can be individual or collective, organized or spontaneous, steady or sporadic, peaceful or violent, legal or illegal, effective or ineffective (Huntington & Nelson, 1994). The state is said to be successful when it can guarantee the right

of public participation in elections (Wijaya et al., 2019).

Political participation is divided into two forms, namely, the first conventional and the second non-conventional. Conventional forms of participation include voting, participating in political discussions, participating in campaign activities, forming and joining interest groups, conducting individual communication with political and administrative officials. While the non-conventional forms are filing petitions, demonstrations, confrontations, strikes, acts of violence against property (Mas'oed & MacAndrews, 2000). Meanwhile, Huntington and Nelson (1994) divide participation into five forms, namely 1) Election Activities, 2) Lobbying, 3) Organizational Activities, 4) Contacting, and the last one is 5) Violence.

Participation is a hallmark of political modernization. In a country where people's lives are still classified as traditional, and the nature of political leadership is determined by a group of ruling elites, citizens' participation in influencing decision-making and influencing the life of the nation and state is relatively meagre.

Meanwhile, in countries with good political modernization processes, the level of citizen participation tends to increase. As a country in political modernization, Indonesia should be based on the spirit of popular sovereignty, especially in selecting regional heads as an essential joint in the administration of the state, which is reflected by the high level of public participation. But ironically, the level of community participation is still an unresolved problem.

Participation Factors. According to Margono (2003) states that community participation will basically be realized when it meets several supporting factors, namely,

- a. the existence of an opportunity, namely creating an atmosphere or environmental condition so that the community has the opportunity and sense to participate.
- b. The existence of desire, namely the existence of causes that encourage or raise individual interests and attitudes to be encouraged to participate. Willingness and ability are potentials possessed by actors individually or in groups. The level of willingness is determined by psychological factors, such as expectations of the program's benefits and motivation to be involved in the program. A person's encouragement to carry out an activity to achieve a goal is very dependent on the amount of hope that will achieve that goal. The hope of getting certain benefits or rewards, especially in meeting the basic needs of life, namely the feeling of community security, is a source of motivation to participate in development activities.
- c. Ability, namely knowledge or belief in his ability to participate, can be thought, energy, time or other means and material forms. The level of mastery of information about the program is a factor that can lead to a person's willingness to participate.

Research conducted by Martey et al. (2014) showed that the desire to participate was influenced by age (Eckstein et al., 2012), the perceived trust and sense of security. The age factor

found that those under 40 years of age had a higher desire to participate.

Forms of Participation aggressive forms of participation, such as taking part in protests or rallies; forms of discursive participation, such as discussing politics with others or attending public meetings; and online participation, such as signing online petitions or posting news to social networks (Myers et al., 2020).

According to Cohen et al. (1980), participation is divided into 4 forms, namely: (1) participation in decision-making; (2) participation in implementation; (3) participation in benefits; and (4) participation in evaluation.

Political Trust

Political trust is an individual belief regarding the goodness of individuals, other groups in carrying out their duties and fulfilling the expectations given for the common goal. Political trust is the public's expectation of a particular leader or institution such as the government, DPRD, KPU and others who are currently serving or will serve to mobilize, act and respond to community demands.

Hetherington (1998) suggests that a political trust is a form of people's evaluative orientation to the political process or an ongoing process based on individuals responding to societal normative expectations. Political trust does not only stop at trust in the government but also in the inherent elements. Political trust is defined as the government's feelings on individuals or the public (Letki, 2018). Political trust is a cognitive evaluation of the relationship of individuals with government institutions

through the performance of government institutions (Van Der Meer, 2018).

Goodwin (2019) argues that political trust is an evaluation of the government shown in the government's suitability to behave and behave according to people's expectations. Political trust involves an upbeat assessment of the performance of governments, political parties and leaders, combined with optimism and confidence in their intention to do good as expected (Dermody & Hanmer-lloyd, 2008). Political trust maintains attitudes and behaviour to make regulations and programs that do not trigger and create distrust in the community (Krastev, 2012).

Political trust is basically a form of public expectations of the government or leaders who are assessed through the performance, design, and political system to meet the suitable needs of the community and under what is expected and needed by the community.

Political trust is divided into macro and micro (Blind, 2007). Macro and micro political trust depend on making policies that align with people's expectations. Good, honest, fair policies and based on perceptions of performance related to policies exist and meet policy determination and performance expectations. Political belief, in particular, is divided into macro means seeing the government as a unit and seeing the political institutions that are part of the government. Macro political trust includes individual expectations of groups. These political institutions exist as a unit seen as the general government of a country which refers to people's evaluations of the overall performance of the political system and government. Anggraini et al. (2018) argue that trust in

the government is an individual's assessment of the government as an institution. Political trust is built on organizational trust, which refers to a view oriented towards community issues regarding whether or not they are satisfied with the alternative policies made (Pedersen et al., 2014).

Blind (2007) suggests that micro-political trust means seeing the government in the context of political figures who play a role, such as certain governors, presidents. Micro or individual political trust occurs when trust is directed towards specific individuals in politics, which involves a perspective oriented towards public trust in the government through individuals. According to Citrin (Blind, 2007), individual political trust involves a perspective-oriented form of trust or distrust of the public to the government because of their approval or disapproval of individuals who are confident political leaders.

Kinship Politics

Kinship politics is political recruitment that makes family members who occupy a political/government position not based on their abilities through appropriate procedures but based on kinship relationships such as family (Anggariani, 2013; Purwaningsih, 2013, 2015). Kinship politics occurs when political recruitment is based on kinship relations rather than candidate qualifications (Yuningsih, 2014). If someone fulfils the qualifications that have been determined to fulfil a political office position and through a fair and equal procedure, it can no longer be said that there is kinship politics.

Purwaningsih (2013) found that the most potent political kinship phenomenon occurred in Banten and South Sulawesi provinces.

Kinship politics aims to maintain power by forming families that are included in the political system at the local level. They will tend to be supported by big parties who are the primary support and gather in a big party to become party officials and support the political elite (Haboddin, 2017). ; Ultimate, 2018). The same thing is supported by the statement that the trend of kinship politics that develops in Indonesia is actually inseparable from the function of political parties because, after all, the mechanism of political recruitment is carried out by parties. However, there is a tendency for political family members to be administrators of political parties, thereby strengthening kinship politics (Pamungkas, 2018; Purwaningsih, 2015). This kinship politics basically provides an opportunity to strengthen nepotism, patron-client, patrimonialism, and a non-transparent recruitment system with various derivatives.

Basically, kinship politics can be divided into several forms, namely: 1) Oligarchy-meritocratic kinship politics is kinship politics produced through democratic procedures, sourced from cadres and based on the competencies possessed by candidates, but not entirely based on the merit system; namely because of the oligarchic tendency in decision-making which weakens the impersonal aspect of the merit-system. 2) Transactional kinship politics, namely kinship politics that occur based on political transactions/remuneration

between the two parties, are not by the procedures outlined by the party and ignore the quality aspects of candidates. 3) Pragmatic kinship politics, namely kinship politics that are elitists recruited from cadres/non-cadres who pay more attention to short-term interests to gain votes than the quality of candidates (Purwaningsih, 2013).

METHODS

This study uses a qualitative approach, which is a research procedure that can produce descriptive data. The main strength of this study is the researcher with qualitative data collection techniques. Data analysis is inductive (Sugiyono, 2007).

This research emphasizes more on exploratory, which aims to find out and explain the initial problems that occur in general, then find and reveal the problems needed and become research questions. The qualitative method used in this research is a literature study approach that contains related descriptions of theories, findings, and other research materials obtained from reference materials for research activities.

The description in the literature review is directed to develop a clear framework of thinking about solving the problems described previously in the formulation of the problem. In this study, the literature review used is in the form of reviews, summaries and thoughts of the authors sourced from various existing library sources such as books, articles, other research related to the topics discussed in this study.

Data analysis was conducted through library research. Conduct library research by reading the literature to obtain the

necessary data by reading all the information in the research, whether the available information is provided under the background of the research problem, then collecting sources of research materials related to the research problem, and citing the information in it. Readings can be in the form of quotation marks, paraphrasing, writing the results of research into the cards provided, first checking the essential things, then doing research to take important notes. Things at the back of the Index book to find the pages related to the pages recorded in the cards provided, summarize the results and explain the results.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Political Trust and Political Participation in Makassar City

In the regional head election (Pilkada) of Makassar City, voter participation was only 57% with the final voter list (DPT) in 2018 as many as 990,836 people (General Election Commission, 2018), the low participation at that time was considered based on the fact that in 2018 it was because at that time the city of Makassar only had one candidate pair and was fighting an empty box. In addition, the lack of participation is considered to be due to a form of politicization of other candidates until they are disqualified⁶. But, unfortunately in the 2020 Makassar City Election, which incidentally was followed by four pairs of candidates and no candidate was disqualified. The participation rate only increased by 2.6% from 2018, 59.6%, with the number of permanent voter lists

(DPT) of 901,087 people (KPU Makassar City, 2020).

This shows that the democratic system and public participation in Makassar City are poor, even though Makassar City itself is the centre of the South Sulawesi Province and is the largest city in Eastern Indonesia. With these advantages and disadvantages, Makassar City should have a high level of participation, especially since Makassar City should be the centre of education in the eastern part of Indonesia. A democratic election fulfils the three prerequisites of democracy, namely, the existence of competition for and maintaining power, the participation of the people, and the guarantee of civil and political rights. (Marijan, 2010) argue, If public participation is low or less present in the election or general election, it can be said that the election was not conducted democratically (Sutrisno, 2017). This significantly injured the simultaneous local elections that had been carried out both in 2018 and 2020.

Before we look at the level of public political trust in the Makassar city government, we first look at the level of trust in the central government. The CSIS survey (2017) shows that public trust in political parties is deficient, at only 44.2%. Indonesian people's trust in the government, based on the trust index model, has shown an increase since 2012-2018, namely 36%, 49%, 49%, 65%, 58%, 71% and 73% (Edelman, 2018) and in 2019 at 75% points (Edelman, 2019). Which means that the time is increasing.

⁶ In 2018, initially there were 2 candidates but one of them was disqualified because it was considered a violation, so that the 2018 regional

election was only carried out by 1 candidate against an empty box

Then, the level of trust of the people of Makassar in the DPRD is only 53.9% (Ilham & Pratama, 2016). Then in the 2014-2019 period, it was 80%, and in 2009-2014 only 57.7% (Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development, 2018). Then the saddest thing is that the level of public trust in political parties is only 32.5% (Merdeka.com, 2018). Then, similar data were also found related to the level of public trust. Still, in this case, youth in the government, DPRD and political parties in 2019 with percentages of 62%, 50% and 45%, respectively (Bakar, 2020) and the level of youth trust in Young candidates in the province of South Sulawesi in 2018 only 27% of youth believed in young candidates (Bakar, 2018). Then, in 2020, 55% to the government and 53% to the DPRD. This really illustrates how the form of political mockery and public distrust.

Research related to trust and participation in Makassar City shows that few examine the level of political trust, even though this indicator of trust dramatically influences community participation.

Thus, in answering this first research question, it was found that the level of participation and political trust in the community basically always go hand in hand. When people give their trust, they will automatically participate in the Pilkada. Unfortunately, in the 2020 Simultaneous Pilkada, public trust is still deficient, so community participation is automatically low. This proves that increasing community participation through public trust is essential, which becomes the second hypothesis in this study.

Factors Affecting Public Trust That Leads to Low Participation in the 2020 Simultaneous Pilkada

Low level of community participation. Basically, it is caused by the low level of public political trust (Bakar, 2019). The factor of political trust dramatically influences the level of public political participation (Surbakti, 2010) and distrust of the political system and politicians (Easley-Giraldo, 2016). Political trust is an individual belief regarding the goodness of individuals, other groups in carrying out their duties and fulfilling the expectations given for the common goal. Political trust is the public's expectation of a particular leader or institution such as the government, DPRD, KPU and others who are currently serving or will serve to mobilize, act and respond to community demands.

The low level of public political participation in elections is also related to political trust in the organizers, the current government, and candidates or political parties participating in the election. The problem of decreasing the quality and quantity of youth political participation strongly indicates that the public's understanding of the beliefs of Indonesian youth is not sufficient. They hope that through DPRD seats, the government and elections can provide hope for leaders who voice the people's voice. Political trust is used to solve problems faced by countries that adhere to a democratic system. Political trust is used to understand the degree of trust based on democracy in democratic countries (Rinjani & Hasan, 2016).

Several factors are considered to influence people's political beliefs, which

have implications for community participation. Trust is basically influenced by rational factors. Trust is influenced by knowledge (Bouckaert & Walle, 2014; Handaningrum & Rini, 2014; Rompf, 2012) and security (Febrieta & Pertiwi, 2018; Lewicki, 2006; Maslow, 1987; Vornanen et al., 2018). These two factors become essential things which will then be reviewed as follows:

a. Sense of safety

Security is a need that encourages individuals to obtain peace, certainty and order from environmental conditions. Safety is one of the needs that include being protected and away from sources of danger, both physical and psychological threats (Maslow, 1987). One of the factors that influence the growth of the trust is that people can have a sense of trust when they have a positive psychological orientation, namely the condition of positive emotional relationships in the form of a sense of security (Lewicki, 2006). Without security, there is no welfare. Safety is built every day by a sense of security (Vornanen et al., 2018). Based on research conducted by Febrieta & Pertiwi (2018), it was found that a sense of security had a 71% effect on increasing trust.

In the World Justice Project (2020) survey on the indicators of order and security, Indonesia is ranked 82 out of 128 countries, with 0.68 points, the right to live and feel safe 0.51. Then, Indonesia, in the 2020 world happiness index report, is ranked 84th or with 5,286 points, and there has been no significant change since 2008. Even the changes tend to be minus 0.004 points (Layard et al., 2020). That is, indicating that the sense of security has not been felt well.

This is, of course, very relevant also to how the level of security associated with the level of political trust conveyed in the previous point has powerful implications. So, when people feel insecure, they will automatically not give confidence. This will result in not giving them participation in the elections, in this case, the 2020 simultaneous elections.

b. Political Knowledge and Education

Knowledge is the result of curiosity and individual experience processed through the five senses, resulting in forming a point of view and mindset on an object to recognize and understand the events or conditions that occur. Knowledge itself has levels, namely: 1). Know, recalling material that has been studied previously specifically. 2). Comprehension is the ability to correctly explain the object being studied and interpret it correctly and measurably. 3). Application, using concepts that have been learned in everyday life. 4). Analysis, describe and describe more broadly the core of the concept being studied. 5). Synthesis, linking learning outcomes with various other objects, and 6). Evaluation, assessing material and object objectively.

Knowledge in the political system plays a role in developing and strengthening attitudes among citizens or training citizens to carry out appropriate roles. Suppose the community knows enough about the existing political system. In that case, it can distinguish its various components and understand how it can participate and be implemented by the community itself. Knowledge affects individual beliefs. With individuals having knowledge of positive things, they tend to put trust (Rompf, 2012). One of the

variables that are often mentioned is education. It is hoped that the higher the level of public knowledge, the more trust the government has (Bouckaert & Walle, 2014).

Talking about public knowledge related to politics will automatically relate to political education in the community. Political parties are a forum for political participation. Based on Article 1 of Law no. 2 of 2008 concerning Political Parties (2008) states that "a political party is an organization that is national in nature and is formed by a group of Indonesian citizens voluntarily based on common will and ideals to fight for and defend the political interests of members, society, nation and state, and maintain the integrity of the Unitary State of the Republic of Indonesia based on Pancasila and the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia". Then, Article 11 paragraph (1) explains the function of political parties.

"Political education for members and the wider community to become Indonesian citizens who are aware of their rights and obligations in the life of society, nation and state."

Based on the description above, it can be concluded that the primary function of political parties is to increase the political participation of citizens through political education, creating a conducive climate or, in this case, a political trust which will have a significant impact on the democratic climate. However, when we look at how political parties play a role in political education in Makassar City, it is still infrequent to find activities or efforts made by political parties to provide political education openly and publicly to

the public, whether during the Pilkada or not.

This also causes the level of public trust to decrease. People do not know anything about politics and the system, so people feel uninvolved and feel that politics is not their business, which causes people to be reluctant and apathetic about politics.

Implications of Trust and Kinship Politics

Kinship politics occurs when political recruitment is based on kinship relations rather than candidate qualifications (Yuningsih, 2014). If someone fulfils the qualifications that have been determined to fulfil a political office position and through a fair and equal procedure, it can no longer be said that there is kinship politics. Purwaningsih (2013) found that the most potent political kinship phenomenon occurred in Banten and South Sulawesi provinces.

It can also be clearly seen in South Sulawesi Province that many regional heads (regencies/cities) are relatives of other regional heads, even governors such as the most famous Syahrul Yasin Limpo clan. As happened in South Sulawesi, namely oligarchic-meritocratic kinship politics, which is kinship politics produced through democratic procedures, sourced from cadres and based on the competencies possessed by candidates, but not entirely based on the merit system; namely because of the oligarchic tendency in decision-making which weakens the impersonal aspect of the merit-system (Purwaningsih, 2013).

This is also what in the South Sulawesi Provincial Election became a "sensitive issue in 2018. At that time, Mr

Ichsan Yasin Limpo⁷, a family member of Syahrul Yasin Limpo who has completed his duties as Governor of South Sulawesi for 2 Periods, volunteered to be a candidate for Governor. South Sulawesi. With the advancement of Mr Ichsan, many "Issues related to oligarchy or kinship" were made, and this became a serious problem for Ichsan Yasin Limpo because through this it was "issued by several parties" to reduce public trust and participation in Ichsan Yasin Limpo and in the end failed to occupy the position. Governor's seat by only managing to become the owner of the third most votes out of the four candidates for Governor. From this, it is evident how the issue of kinship politics is very sensitive and very likely to affect people's political trust.

Then, what also happens in Makassar City is transactional kinship politics, which is a kinship politics that occurs based on political transactions/remuneration between the two parties, so it is not under the procedures outlined by the party. It does not pay attention to the quality aspect of the candidate (Purwaningsih, 2013). In addition, there is also a lot of pragmatic kinship politics, namely kinship politics that are elitist recruits from cadres/non-cadres who pay more attention to short-term interests to gain votes than the quality of candidates (Purwaningsih, 2013). This is clearly a lot and often happens during the election of mayors or members of the Makassar City DPRD, wherein some candidates for deputy mayor it is more indicated to gain votes or just as a form of 'promotion' to complete

the abilities of the candidate pairs for mayor and deputy mayor.

These three things clearly have apparent implications for the people's political trust, especially in Makassar City, especially in South Sulawesi Province itself, because people are tired of trusting candidates who have the possibility of creating kinship politics. Either through the form of oligarchy-meritocratic, transactional, or pragmatic.

Efforts to Increase Community Political Participation in Simultaneous Local Elections in Makassar City

There are several strategic plans as an effort to increase public participation in the elections, Which is:

- a. Affirming to political parties to carry out their duties according to their functions, namely carrying out political education, it can also be carried out with joint programs related to political education, which is commanded by the government and in collaboration with political parties and impose sanctions on political parties that do not carry out political education with programs that have been implemented.
- b. Don't just invite the public to participate in voting, but increase public awareness through providing information related to the Simultaneous Pilkada/Election at each existing event so that the public is more educated and understands related to the system and also the functions of the Simultaneous Pilkada/Election

⁷ who from 2008 to 2013 was the Governor of South Sulawesi Province and currently the

Minister of Agriculture of the Republic of Indonesia

- c. Provide a sense of security and comfort at the simultaneous local elections, both during the campaign period until the time of the election and the announcement of the vote count results.
- d. Improving performance and innovative and precise work carried out by the government and election organisers to increase public trust so that people feel that the votes cast can be appropriately accounted for.
- e. The open involvement of the community in the political education process and the existing Pilkada process by providing open and transparent access to the entire community.

CONCLUSION

- a. The level of participation and political trust of the people in Makassar in the 2018 and 2020 Simultaneous Pilkada shows a deficient level, so community participation is automatically low. This proves that it is essential to increase community participation through public trust by looking at what factors affect public trust.
- b. Three main factors affect public trust, namely: First, a sense of security, when people feel insecure, the community will automatically not give trust, and this will result in not giving them participation in the elections. Those who feel they do not understand the system and feel they have no obligation to vote will feel that they are not obliged to vote. This is due to a lack of knowledge so that public awareness is low, which causes people to be reluctant and

- reluctant to exercise their right to vote. This is clearly a joint and particular task for political parties, through their obligations enshrined in the Political Party Law to carry out political education in the community.
- c. The implications of trust and kinship politics are evident in Makassar City. Still, the form of kinship politics that most often occurs and has clear implications for trust is the oligarchic-meritocratic kinship politics that has occurred and is proven in Makassar City according to public trust.
- d. Efforts that can be made to increase political participation through a trusted approach are: First, increasing political education. Second, inviting and making people aware through political education and understanding related to the existing political system. Third, carry out activities that can increase people's political knowledge. Fourth, maintain a sense of security of the community in every line of life. Fifth, Increase and maintain public trust in the government and election organizers by increasing transparency and performance to meet people's expectations.

REFERENCES

- Agustin, M. (2015). Partisipasi Masyarakat dalam Perencanaan Pembangunan Desa Melalui Musrebang. *Jurnal Mahasiswa Unesa*, 4(1), 1–14.
- Akhrani, L. A., Imansari, F., & Faizah. (2018). Kepercayaan politik dan partisipasi politik pemilih pemula. *Jurnal MediaPsi*, 4(1), 1–6. <https://doi.org/10.21776/ub.mps.2018.04.01.1>

- Anggariyani, D. (2013). Politik Kekkerabatan. *Jurnal Politik Profetik* Volume 2 Nomor 2 Tahun 2013 Dewi Anggariyani. *Jurnal Politik Profetik*, 2(2). <http://103.55.216.56/index.php/jpp/article/view/954>
- Angraini, M., Asrinaldi, & Zetra, A. (2018). Pengaruh kesadaran dan kepercayaan politik terhadap partisipasi politik masyarakat Dharmasraya pada pilkada 2015. *Jurnal Madania*, 8(1), 109–132.
- Arif, M. S. (2020). Meningkatkan Angka Partisipasi sebagai Upaya Menjamin Legitimasi Hasil Pemilihan Kepala Daerah dan Wakil Kepala Daerah ditengah Pandemi Covid-19. *Jurnal Tata Kelola Pemilu Indonesia*, 2(1), 18–40.
- Bakar, D. M. (2018). *Fraksi Muda Indonesia Rilis Survei Kepercayaan Politik Caleg Muda, Ini Hasilnya*. Fraksi Muda Indonesia Rilis Survei Kepercayaan Politik Caleg Muda, Ini Hasilnya
- Bakar, D. M. (2019). Tingkat kepercayaan politik pemuda Sulawesi Selatan pada calon legislatif pada pemilu 2019. *Pustaka Pemilu*, 2(1), 36–45.
- Bakar, D. M. (2020). *Kepercayaan politik pemuda aktivis dan nonaktivis pada pemerintah, DPRD dan partai politik ditinjau dari motif sosial*. Universitas Negeri Makassar.
- Blind, P. K. (2007). Building trust in government in the twenty-first century: Review of literature and emerging issues. *7th Global Forum on Reinventing Government*, June, 1–31.
- Bouckaert, G., & Walle, S. Van De. (2014). Government Performance and Trust in Government. *Paper for the Permanent Study Group on Productivity and Quality in the Public Sector at the EGPA Annual Conference, Vaasa, Finland, 2001: Trust Building Networks - How the Government Meets Citizen in the Post-Bureaucratic Era: Citizen Directed Government*, May.
- Budiardjo, M. (2008). *Dasar-dasar ilmu politik*. PT Gramedia.
- Cohen, J., Uphoff, N., Univ, C., Ithaca, & Committee, N. Y. (1980). Rural Development Participation: Concept and Measures for Project Design. Implementation and Evaluation. *World Development*, 8(1), 213–235. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/37882394_Rural_Development_Participation_Concept_and_Measures_for_Project_Design_Implementation_and_Evaluation
- Dermody, J., & Hanmer-lloyd, S. (2008). An empirical investigation into the relationships between British young peoples ' trust, cynicism and efficacy in explaining youth (Non) voting attitudes and behaviour. *International Political Marketing Conference*, 1–19.
- Easley-Giraldo, T. M. (2016). *Global sojourners: Women's political efficacy and political ambition in the face of political cynicism and gender barriers*. University of Kansas.
- Eckstein, K., Noack, P., & Gniewosz, B. (2012). Attitudes toward political engagement and willingness to participate in politics: Trajectories throughout adolescence. *Journal of Adolescence*, 35(3), 485–495. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.adolescence.2011.07.002>
- Edelman. (2018). *2018 Edelman Trust Barometer Global Report*.
- Edelman. (2019). *2019 Edelman Trust Barometer Global Report*.
- Fadli, M., Bailusy, M. K., Nas, J., & Zulfikar, A. (2018). Keterlibatan Elit Lokal dalam Peningkatan Partisipasi Politik pada Pemilihan Bupati dan Wakil Bupati Kabupaten Toraja Utara Tahun 2015.

- Aristo*, 6(2), 301. <https://doi.org/10.24269/ars.v6i2.1025>
- Febrieta, D., & Pertiwi, Y. W. (2018). Rasa aman sebagai prediktor kepercayaan masyarakat dengan hadirnya polisi. *Journal MediaPsi*, 4(2), 68–75. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.21776/ub.mps.2018.004.02.2>
- Goodwin, M. (2019). The end of trust in our political class: One of the worrying things about Britain is that our diffuse support for the political system was on the wane long before the Brexit vote. *New Statesman America*. <https://www.newstatesman.com/politics/uk/2019/05/end-trust-our-political-class>
- Haboddin, M. (2017). Politik Keluarga dalam Pilkada Serentak. *Jurnal Transformative*, 3(2), 1–15. <https://transformative.ub.ac.id/index.php/jtr/article/view/110/165>
- Handaningrum, R., & Rini, R. A. P. (2014). Persepsi terhadap kualitas calon legislatif (Caleg), dan kepercayaan politik (political trust) dengan partisipasi politik. *Persona: Jurnal Psikologi Indonesia*, 3(03), 233–236. <https://doi.org/10.30996/persona.v3i03.1578>
- Hetherington, M. J. (1998). The political relevance of political trust. *American Political Science Review*, 92(4), 791–808.
- Huntington, S., & Nelson, J. (1994). *Partisipasi Politik di Negara Berkembang* (S. Simamora (ed.)). Rineka Cipta Koalisi.
- Ilham, L., & Pratama, M. A. (2016). Hubungan antara tingkat kepercayaan dan kepuasan masyarakat terhadap kinerja anggota DPRD kota Makassar (Studi pada Masyarakat Kecamatan Tamalanrea Kota Makassar). *Journal Supermasi*, 11(2), 193–200.
- Komisi Pemilihan Umum. (2018). *Daftar Pemilih Tetap Pilkada Serentak Tahun 2018*. <https://infopemilu.kpu.go.id/pilkada2018/pemilih/dpt/1/SULAWESI SELATAN/KOTA MAKASSAR>
- Komisi Pemilihan Umum Sulawesi Selatan. (2018). *Presentase partisipasi pemilih pada pemilihan gubernur dan wakil gubernur tahun 2018*. <https://sulsel.kpu.go.id/wp-content/uploads/2018/11/PERSENTAS E-PARTISIPASI-PEMILIH.pdf>
- KPU Kota Makassar. (2020). *Daftar Pemilih Tetap Pilwali Makassar 2020*.
- Krastev, I. (2012). *Can democracy exist without trust?* TED. https://www.ted.com/talks/ivan_krastev_can_democracy_exist_without_trust#
- Layard, R., Sachs, J. D., Neve, J. De, Huang, H., & Wang, S. (2020). *World happiness report*. Sustainable Development Solution Network.
- Letki, N. (2018). Trust in newly democratic regimes. In Eric M Uslaner (Ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Social and Political Trust*. Oxford University Press.
- Lewicki, R. J. (2006). Trust, Trust Development, and Trust Repair. In M. Deutsch, P. T. Coleman, & E. C. Marcus (Eds.), *The Handbook of Conflict Resolution* (2nd ed., p. 94).
- LIPI. (2012, October 13). LIPI: Cuma 23 persen Rakyat Yang Tertarik Politik. *LIPI*. <http://lipi.go.id/berita/single/LIPI-Cuma-23-persen-Rakyat-Yang-Tertarik-Politik/6919>
- Margono, S. (2003). *Membentuk Pola Perilaku Manusia Pembangunan* (1st ed.). IPB Press.
- Marijan, K. (2010). *Sistem Politik Indonesia: Konsolidasi Demokrasi Pasca-Orde Baru*. Penerbit Kencana.

- Martey, E., Etwire, P. M., Wiredu, A. N., & Dogbe, W. (2014). Factors Influencing Willingness To Participate In Multi-Stakeholder Platform By Smallholder Farmers In Northern Ghana: Implication For Research And Development. *Agricultural and Food Economics*, 2(1), 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40100-014-0011-4>
- Mas'ood, M., & MacAndrews, C. (2000). *Perbandingan Sistem Politik*. Gadjah Mada University Press.
- Maslow, A. H. (1987). *Motivation and personality*. Harper & Row, Publishers, Inc.
- Merdeka.com. (2018). *Survei chandra politika: Kepercayaan politik terhadap parpol masih rendah*. <https://www.merdeka.com/politik/survei-charta-politika-kepercayaan-publik-terhadap-parpol-masih-rendah.html>
- Mishler, W., & Rose, R. (2001). What are the origins of political trust? Testing institutional and cultural theories in post-communist societies. *Comparative and General Pharmacology*, 34(1), 30–62.
- Myers, C. D., Gordon, H. G., Kim, H. M., Rowe, Z., & Goold, S. D. (2020). Does Group Deliberation Mobilize? The Effect of Public Deliberation on Willingness to Participate in Politics. *Political Behavior*, 42(2), 557–580. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11109-018-9507-z>
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2018). Survey ekonomi OECD Indonesia 2018. In *OECD Economic Survey: Indonesia OECD 2018*. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781107415324.004>
- Pamungkas, C. P. (2018). Politik Kekerabatan Di Pilkada: Studi Kasus Terpilihnya Pasangan Calon Hj. Sri Hartini S.E – Hj. Sri Mulyani Pada Pilkada Kabupaten Klaten Tahun 2015. *Journal of Politic and Government Studies*, 7(3), 221–230.
- Pedersen, N. J. L. L., Ahlström-Vij, K., & Kappel, K. (2014). Rational trust. *Synthese*, 191(9), 1953–1955.
- Purwaningsih, T. (2013). *Politik Kekerabatan Dalam Politik Lokal Di Sulawesi Selatan Pada Era Reformasi (Studi Tentang Rekrutmen Politik Pada Partai Golkar, Partai Amanat Nasional Dan Partai Demokrat Sulawesi Selatan Tahun 2009)*. Universitas Muhammadiyah Yogyakarta.
- Purwaningsih, T. (2015). Politik Kekerabatan dan Kualitas Kandidat di Sulawesi Selatan. *Jurnal Politik*, 1(1), 97–123. <https://doi.org/10.7454/jp.v1i1.10>
- Rinjani, F., & Hasan, E. (2016). Kepercayaan politik pada pilar demokrasi: Suatu analisis terhadap independensi JSI kota Banda Aceh dalam penyelenggaraan survei pra pilkada 2017. *Jurnal Ilmiah Mahasiswa FISIP Unsyiah*, 1(4), 1–17. <http://www.jim.unsyiah.ac.id/FISIP/article/view/1415>
- Rompf, S. A. (2012). *Trust and Rationality: An Integrative Framework for Trust Research*. Springer.
- Saraswati, R. (2011). Calon Perseorangan : Pergeseran Paradigma Kekuasaan Dalam Pemilukada. *Masalah-Masalah Hukum*, 40(2), 196–201. <https://doi.org/10.14710/mmh.40.2.2011.196-201>
- Sugiyono. (2007). *Statistik Untuk Penelitian*. Alfabeta.
- Surbakti, R. (2010). *Memahami ilmu politik*. Grasindo.
- sutrisno, cucu. (2017). Partisipasi Warga Negara Dalam Pilkada. *Jurnal Pancasila Dan Kewarganegaraan*, 2(2), 36–48. <https://doi.org/10.24269/v2.n2.2017.36-48>

- Undang-undang No. 2 tahun 2008 tentang Partai Politik, Pub. L. No. 2, Lembaran Negara Republik Indonesia (2008).
- Van Der Meer, T. W. (2018). Economic performance and political trust. In E. M Uslaner (Ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Social and Political Trust*. Oxford University Press.
- Vornanen, V., Sivula, A., Liu, Y., & Takala, J. (2018). Mutual Trust: Joint Performance of an Operations Strategy Implementation— Securing the Value Chain by Preparedness. In B. Kozuch, S. J. Magala, & J. Paliszkiwicz (Eds.), *Managing Public Trust*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Wahyudi, H., Fernando, T., Ahmad, A., Khairani, A., Fatimah, Aung, Ivan muhammad, & Milla, M. N. (2013). Peran kepercayaan politik dan kepuasan demokrasi terhadap partisipasi politik mahasiswa. *Jurnal Psikologi UIN Sultan Syarif Kasim Riau*, 9(2), 94–99.
- Wijaya, J. H., Achmad, Z., & Permatasari, I. A. (2019). Implementasi Sistem E-voting Untuk Meningkatkan Kualitas Demokrasi di Indonesia. *Jurnal Pemerintahan Dan Kebijakan (JPK)*, 1(1), 51–59.
- World Justice Project. (2020). Rule of Law Index 2020. In *The World Justice Project* (Issue June). World Justice Project. <http://www.oecd.org/mena/governance/45447873.pdf>
- Yuningsih, A. (2014). Komunikasi, kepemimpinan dan politik kekerabatan dalam perspektif birokrasi ideal. In *Seminar Besar Nasional Komunikasi*. Universitas Mercubuana.