

Political Accountability through the Legitimacy of the Regional House of Representatives in Regional Regulations Making

Goinpeace Handerson Tumbel
State Administration Study Program
Universitas Negeri Manado
 Manado, Indonesia
 goinpeacetumbel@unima.ac.id

Recky H. E. Sendouw
State Administration Study Program
Universitas Negeri Manado
 Manado, Indonesia
 reckyhes@yahoo.com

Jetty Erna Hilda Mokat
Public Administration Department
Faculty of Social Science
Universitas Negeri Manado
 Tondano, Indonesia
 jettymokat@unima.ac.id

Abstract— This study aims to describe, analyze and interpret the implementation of political accountability through the Legitimacy of the Regional House of Representatives in Regional Regulations making. Regional Regulation in this study is qualitative research with a case study approach. The results of this study showed that there was no accountability related to legitimacy in making regional regulations by the Regional House of Representatives (DPRD). The procedure in the submission and discussion of the Regional Regulation Draft was not in accordance with the established regulations, the representative system in making regional regulations was not representative, the right of members of the Regional House of Representatives to submit a draft regional regulation was not implemented, and the particular interest as ordered by other parties in making the regional regulations. It shows that political accountability is related to the legitimacy of the Regional House of Representatives in making regional regulations is unaccountable.

Keywords— *Political Accountability, Legitimacy, Regional Regulation, Good Governance*

I. INTRODUCTION

Accountability is a need and an obligation in implementing good governance for every government administrators. It is intended to show the existence of accountability through the process of control for each action in achieving the objectives but also as a process of accountability for actions carried out based on the authority they possess.

Political accountability refers to the nature of recognition of the authority held by political power holders, i.e. the legislative council that sets various regulatory regulations [1]. Thus, accountability reflects the implementation of its legitimacy, refers to the implementation of existing systems and mechanisms, and also related to the implementation of duties and functions based on their position and authority, and the process of implementing cooperative relations with the implementation of duties and responsibilities as a work system based on the delegation of authority which is also based on mutual interests rather than on other interests.

The Regional Regulation (Perda) refers to a Regional regulation issued by the Regional House of Representatives (DPRD), known as the Regional Representative Initiative.

According to Law No. 10 of 2004 concerning the Establishment of Legislation, the Regional Regulation issued by the Regional House of Representatives and by the Government. The authority for the establishment of regional regulations by the Regional House of Representatives has a normative basis as stipulated in Law Number 32 of 2004 concerning Regional Administration [2]; Government Regulation Number 16 of 2010 concerning Guidelines for the Preparation of Regional House of Representative Standing Orders [3]; Minister of Home Affairs Regulation Number 53 of 2011 concerning Regional Legal Products [4], and Regional House of Representatives Regulation of Manado Number 4 of 2010 related to the regulation of the obligation to give moral and political accountability to the public [5].

According to Manan [6], the mechanism in the establishment of a Regional Regulation is the result of a collaboration between the Mayor and the Regional House of Representative and various related parties. Therefore, the procedure for the establishment of the Regional Regulation must be reviewed from several elements of the local government. For this reason, the DPRD has an ethical-political responsibility to build reciprocal relations with the people who had elected them and the party [7]. It is important to contribute to the implementation of the duties and functions of DPRD members who are representatives of the people to fight for policies in the form of regulations to the people's interests-oriented [8].

The implementation of political accountability with the legitimacy of the DPRD in the Regional Regulation making is considered necessary to be continually fought because based on the research data, it has not been fully carried out. These conditions can be observed starting from the process of making and establishing the Regional Legislation Program (Prolegda), which should be implemented every year but in practice, based on primary data and secondary data, it was only found Prolegda in 2012, and in that year, the DPRD of Manado City stipulated 6 (six) Draft of Regional Regulations (Ranperda) known as the DPRD Initiative Ranperda, however, until the end of the DPRD tenure, there were only 2 (two) of them were implemented. It also showed that the establishment and session of the local regulation draft were not well planned. Besides the mechanism for making the Regional Regulation initiative was

not enforced based on applicable regulations, the elements of the community in the DPRD session process on the regional regulation was not involved, and the session on the regional regulation by the DPRD was full of specific interests and was not public interest-oriented. Thus, the making and discussing the process on the regulation draft did not follow the procedures that have been established as it was also not legitimate and not accountable.

1. Notion of Good Governance

The notion of good governance cannot be separated from the concept of governance. Therefore the State Administration Agency (LAN) as explained by Sadjijono, states that governance is the process of implementing state power in carrying out the provision of public good and service [9]. Since 1998, Indonesia has been collaborating with the United Nations Development Program (UNDP), which is a program to further empower governance and apply the principles of good governance. To support the continuous implementation of the duties and functions of government administration, it requires the implementation of the principles of good governance according to UNDP as restated by Mardiasmo, namely participation, rule of law, transparency, responsiveness, consensus orientation, equity, effectiveness and efficiency, accountability, strategic vision [10]. The principles of good governance then become a pattern or paradigm for every government, including the local government, which is to run its governance duties must involve existing stakeholders, i.e. the government, the community, and the private sector. On that basis, Sedarmayanti also argues that the principle of good governance contains objective and rational values when it is applied properly, to become a benchmark or indicator and characteristics / of good governance [11].

Good governance leads to an attempt to rebuild and improve government management processes to make the performance becomes better. The pattern and style of government must be restored and developed using the concept of good governance as stated by Stoker in the five proposals of good governance as follows: 1) governance refers to the complex set of institutions and actors that are drawn from but also beyond government; 2) governance recognizes the blurring of boundaries and responsibilities for tackling social and economic issues; 3) governance identifies the power dependence involved in the relationship between institutions involved in collective action; 4) governance is about autonomous self-governing networks of actors; 5) governance recognizes the capacity not thing done which does not rest on the power of government to command or use its authority. It sees government as able to use new tools and techniques to steer and guide [12].

The actors in implementing good governance according to Indradi include 3 (three) domains, namely: 1) state (state or government); 2) private sector / market (private sector or business / market); and 3) civil society [13].

2. The Concept of Political Accountability

Before discussing political accountability, we need to understand the grand theory of accountability that includes political accountability. Accountability seen from the aspect of

the terminology shows that there is control over action in achieving its goals and obligations to provide accountability for the actions taken. The media of accountability in its concept is not limited to accountability reports, but also includes the conventional practices of the mandate to obtain information both directly, or indirectly orally or in writing, both the success or failure of the implementation of the mission of the agency concerned [14].

According to Schacter, accountability has two dimensions, namely: vertical and horizontal. Vertically, accountability is how the state is responsible for its duties to citizens, while horizontally, the state is responsible for its responsibility for its institutional accountability [15]. According to O'Donnell, the vertical dimension refers to the power relations between the state and its citizens, while the horizontal dimension refers to institutional oversight, examination, and balance [16]. Accountability can be strengthened through the demands of civil society, in this case civil society actors can influence horizontal accountability in two ways: First, directly by supporting the establishment and empowerment of institutional checks and balances, and Secondly, indirectly by strengthening the vertical accountability institutions that support it, such as election democracy, and independent media [17].

Meanwhile, according to David Hulme and Mark Turner [18], accountability is a complex concept and has several instruments to measure it, namely the existence of indicators as follows: 1) the legitimacy of decision-makers, namely the legitimacy of decision-making officials; 2) moral conduct, namely the existence of adequate morals; 3) responsiveness, that is sensitivity to developing conditions and aspirations; 4) openness, namely openness to information and participation; 5) optimal responsiveness utilization, namely efforts to utilize resources optimally; 6) improving efficacy and effectiveness, i.e. increasing efficiency and effectiveness.

Sheila Elwood, claims that accountability can be divided into several types of models, namely: 1) accountability for probity and legality; 2) process accountability; 3) program accountability; 4) policy accountability. Thus, public officials in implementing their duties and responsibilities must be accountable according to the laws and regulations, ensure procedural processes, have a good program to achieve and optimal results and have accountability that is truly transparent and accountable [3].

Jabbara and Dwivedi developed five types of accountability, they are: 1) administrative/organizational accountability; 2) legal accountability; 3) political accountability; 4) professional accountability; dan 5) moral accountability [1].

Based on Jabbara and Dwivedi's idea, to observe political accountability, it is necessary to refer to 2 (two) indicators, namely: 1) participation; and 2) recognition of authority.

3. Public Participation in Regional Regulations Making

The reform era of Indonesia in 1998 has brought very significant changes in the administration of the regional government in Indonesia from centralistic to decentralized. In the perspective of decentralization, there are 4 objectives to be achieved, namely: empowering the community, fostering community initiative and creativity, increasing community participation, and developing the role and function of DPRD

[19]. Logically, participation has a positive influence on performance/achievement of results and satisfaction, that is, the more using the voice of interest or who understand each other the problem, the more performance or achievement and satisfaction increased [20]. Participation is also important to build public trust [21]. The objectives of public participation are very diverse, covering a variety of information, accountability, legitimacy, education, community empowerment, and various real powers [22].

According to Bryant, political participation can be divided into two areas. First, horizontal participation that involves the community collectively to influence policy decisions. Second, the vertical arena that occurs when community members develop certain relationships with elite groups and officials who benefit both parties [8]. In its development, the development of the concept of participation not only includes the planning and implementation process but also includes participation in receiving benefits. There is a possibility that the community will not benefit from the contributions they make. Furthermore, participation in planning, implementing, and obtaining benefits, Griesgraber & Gunter [23] states, "mechanism for enabling affected people to share in the creation of a project or program, beginning with identification all the way through to implementation and evaluation". They added another aspect, namely evaluation by interpreting participation as a mechanism involving the community in a program from the identification stage to implementation and evaluation. Thus, the concept of participation becomes very broad encompassing from planning, implementation, evaluation, to the acceptance of benefits.

4. Basis of Policy in Regional Regulations (Perda) Making

Basically, every public policy in the form of laws and regulations that will be formed in the unitary state of the Republic of Indonesia should be based on the Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia as the source of all sources of law as stipulated in Law Number 10 of 2004 concerning Formation of Regulations Legislation which was later amended by Law Number 12 of 2011 [24].

In addition to the policy base, the formation of regional regulations by the DPRD is also based on several regulations, namely: Government Regulation Number 16 of 2010 concerning Guidelines for the Preparation of DPRD Regulations [3]; Regulation of the Minister of Home Affairs Number 53 of 2011 concerning Regional Legal Products [4]; and Manado City DPRD Regulation No. 4 of 2010 concerning the Standing Orders of the Manado City DPRD [5].

The various regulations regulate the process of the procedures for the formation of regional regulations including those from the DPRD which are often known as Regional Regulation initiatives.

II. METHODOLOGY

This study was conducted in Manado, North Sulawesi Province, aimed to analyze and explain the implementation of political accountability through the legitimacy of the Regional House of Representatives of the Manado in the Regional Regulation making. This type of study is qualitative with a case study approach. Sources of data include primary and secondary data. Primary data sources were obtained from informants

(DPRD Chairpersons, Board Leaders, Faction Leaders, DPRD Members, Observers, DPRD Secretaries, Heads of DPRD Minutes and Trials, Head of Regional Government Legal Division, Staff of Minutes and Trials, Observer, NGOs, Journalists and other community leaders carried out through interviews and observations and for secondary data obtained from documents in the form of written materials such as Regional Regulations, Decrees on Prolegda relating to the focus of the research. Researchers are the main instrument because the data collection process was carried out with a triangulation process during the research the data analysis technique was also carried out from the beginning using Milles and Huberman's interactive model analysis [25].

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Political Accountability through the Legitimacy of Regional Representatives in Regional Regulations Making

Based on the problem and focus of research on the implementation of political accountability in relation to the legitimacy of the Regional House of Representatives in Regional Regulations making, especially those from the DPRD (Regional Initiative), the operational theory used was the theory of Hulme and Turner which formulates the main indicators which include: 1) legitimacy of decision makers; 2) moral conduct; 3) responsiveness; 4) openness; 5) optimal resources utilization; 6) improving efficiency and effectiveness. Furthermore, the indicators examined were related to the legitimacy of decision maker indicators, namely the existence of recognition or validity in the making and discussion as well as the stipulation of Perda originating from the DPRD. The process of implementing accountability for the main indicators by Hulme and Turner subdivides into 7 (seven) sub-indicators, namely: a) constitutions, the exercise of the authority to make regional regulations by the DPRD in accordance with the provisions of the prevailing laws and regulations; b) electoral systems for governments and decisions-making bodies, which are related to the systems and mechanisms used in the submission and discussion and stipulation of regional regulations carried out by the DPRD together with the executive; c) bureaucratic systems of representation, namely the implementation of a representative system in the making of regional regulations in the DPRD; d) royal prerogative, which is related to the special rights attached to the DPRD in this case the right to submit a Regional Regulation (Ranperda); e) legislation, which is related to the duties and functions of the DPRD as a legislator; f) letters of appointment, i.e. there is cooperation in the discussion of the Regional Regulation Draft, both the DPRD and the executive; and g) formal delegation of authority, i.e. formal delegation of authority in the implementation of deliberative regional regulation deliberations; h) standing orders, i.e. the presence of particular interests by the DPRD as entrusted matters or orders from certain parties [21].

a) Constitutions, namely the exercise of the authority to make regional regulations by the DPRD according to the provisions of the prevailing laws and regulations.

The political accountability of the DPRD in exercising authority over its tasks and functions in making a Regional Regulation has a normative basis. It means that the political work of the representative institution is a subject of some provisions of existing legislation. However, based on research findings on this indicator, the process of implementing political accountability in the drafting of a Local Regulation initiative had not been carried out as the authority it has under the applicable provisions or it can be said that it was not accountable, for example, the authority to submit Prolegda proposals from the DPRD, and the rights of members to submit Ranperda has never been exercised. Other findings were related to the process and procedure for discussion of the Regional Regulation, especially at the first stage of discussion. Where the activity starts immediately by allowing the Mayor, not the leader of the Special Committee or the Commission to submit an explanation of the DPRD's Regional Regulation draft initiative, was not following the regulated mechanism. Some of the findings were not based on Article 2, Article 3, Article 10 paragraph (a) and Article 81, Article 82 of Government Regulation Number 16 of 2010 as well as Manado City DPRD Regulation Number 04 of 2010 concerning DPRD's Standing Orders. The process did not only eliminate and obscure the existing authority, but it also ignored the conceptual substance of the regional regulation itself, which was philosophically born of the DPRD's efforts to articulate various people's aspirations [7]. It was more because 80% of DPRD members did not understand the duties and functions of DPRD. This condition has implications for the number of members who are not serious and do not care about the task and authority to form a Perda. It was also not in line with what was regulated in Article 42 of Law Number 32 2004 concerning the Duties and Authorities of DPRD and the rights of members in submitting the Regional Regulation; Article 82 PP Number 16 of 2010 and Manado City DPRD Regulation Number 4 of 2010. Compliance with and compliance with statutory provisions is also an embodiment of accountability based on the authority possessed. Therefore, according to Elwood, the area of accountability needs to realize the attitude of compliance with other laws and regulations [26]. For this reason, the DPRD must consistently carry out its duties and functions based on the provisions of the regulations (constitution) that apply as part of the realization of the authority it possesses.

b) Electoral systems for government and decision-making bodies, which are related to the systems and mechanisms used in the submission and discussion and stipulation of regional regulations carried out by the DPRD together with the executive.

The legitimacy of accountability is also related to the systems and mechanisms carried out in the formation of regional regulations by the DPRD. Correspondingly, Elwood

said that the accountability process is also related to the procedures used in carrying out the tasks whether it is good enough [3]. From the research data, it was found that step by step in the process of making the Regional Regulation Initiative of the Manado City DPRD unprocedural or the process was not based on existing provisions. Because the DPRD does not have a planning proposal for Prolegda, the DPRD only waits for the Prolegda proposal from the government, which in the end the proposal submitted by the government is partially requested by the DPRD through the Baleg and is made as a proposal from the DPRD. Then the process of submitting Ranperda proposals from DPRD so far none has been proposed by DPRD members, also by commissions or joint commissions so that the submission mechanism process is not carried out because everything is submitted to the Balegda and the plenary meeting is carried out directly on the agenda for ratification of the Ranperda proposal as a DPRD initiative. More internal discussion of the DPRD before it is submitted to the Mayor. Also, the Ranperda submission is not equipped with an academic paper. The trial process at the First Level Discussion stage also occurred unprocedural, in which the Draft Discussion on the initiative that provided preliminary explanations at the Paripurana meeting was not from the Special Committee or the Chair of the Commission but directly from the Mayor. It should not have happened because the one explaining the Regional Regulation draft was the leaders of the Special Committee or the Chairman of the Commission because the Regional Regulation came from the DPRD, not from the Government. The findings were not in accordance with the mechanism stipulated in Article 82 of Government Regulation Number 16 of 2010, that the submission of the Regional Regulation can be submitted by members of the DPRD, the Commission or a combination of commissions, and the Regional Legislation Body (Balegda) in writing, attached with the academic text to the DPRD leaders. Then the leaders of the DPRD asked Balegda to conduct a study. Furthermore, the results of the study by the DPRD leadership conveyed it to all members 7 (seven) days before entering the DPRD plenary meeting to discuss and decide whether the draft regulation could be approved or rejected. And if the draft regulation is accepted, the DPRD leaders will submit it by a letter to the Mayor. Then, the next step is to start the discussion process of the DPRD Initiative Draft Regional Legislation carried out through 2 (two) levels of discussion in the plenary meeting, namely the first level of discussion and the second level of discussion. At the first level discussion the Ranperda originating from the DPRD (Ranperda Initiative) activities begin with an explanation from the Commission or the Special Committee after that the opportunity is given to the Mayor to provide an opinion on the Ranperda from the DPRD followed by a response and/or response from each faction to the Mayor's opinion. Included in discussions in commission meetings, joint commissions, or special committees (Special Committee) conducted together with the Mayor of Manado or the official appointed to represent him. Then after that enter

the second level of discussion with a series of activities, including decision making in the plenary session which was preceded by the submission of the report of the head of the commission / joint committee leader, a special committee containing the results of the discussion process, opinion of the faction and the results of the discussion that had been passed before as referred to in the discussion at the first level of discussion, after that proceed with requests for approval from members verbally by the leadership of the plenary meeting, and then concludes with a final opinion from the Mayor of Manado.

Accountability is an activity to provide an explanation and justification for the actions (ways) done in using power and take corrective action when an error occurs [15]. Therefore, the DPRD must pay attention to the processes and mechanisms as well as normative foundations in carrying out its duties and functions.

c) Bureaucratic systems of representation, namely the implementation of a representative system in the regional regulations making in the DPRD.

According to Manan [6], the mechanism for the formulation of a Regional Regulation is the result of the collaboration between the Mayor and the Regional Legislative Council and various related parties, therefore, the procedure for the preparation of the Regional Regulation must be reviewed from several elements of the regional government. However, the research findings in the process of making regional regulations have stages that involve elements of the community as representatives to be asked for information and opinions, but some do not involve the community in the discussion. For example, the community was only involved in the process before entering into the discussion of the draft regional regulation to only be asked for information, data or information relating to the material of the regional regulation not being involved in the discussion process of the regional regulation. The practice carried out by the Manado City DPRD is not in line with what is regulated in Law Number 10 of 2004 concerning Formation of Laws and Regulation of the Minister of Home Affairs Number 53 of 2011 concerning Regional Legal Products community participation is a must or the community has the rights to be involved in the process of law-making. Therefore, the DPRD has an obligation to involve the community in the discussion of the Regional Regulation. The forms of community involvement can be through recess, hearings, socialization, and seminars conducted by the DPRD.

Griesgraber & Gunter said that the involvement of community representatives can go through a process of planning, implementation, evaluation until the receiving of benefits [23]. According to Wang and Wart [21], participation is also important to build public trust. Legitimacy in the drafting of the Regional Regulation Initiative is important as a form of implementing the DPRD's political accountability [1]. It is intended so that the product of Perda is truly oriented to the public, and also gets legitimacy from the public.

d) Royal prerogative, which is related to the privileges inherent in the DPRD, in this case, the right to propose the Regional Regulation Draft (initiative rights)

Since the issuance of Law Number 32 of 2004 concerning the Regional Administration, there has been a very fundamental change in the authority to make a Regional Regulation. Where in the law stipulates that the DPRD has the authority and rights to form a law. Because of this, one of the functions of the DPRD is the legislative function, which is the function of forming a local regulation. The provisions also stated that the rights of DPRD members in proposing local regulations. However, the data showed that the use of these rights has never been used by members of the Regional Legislative Council of Manado City. It is mostly due to the leadership of the DPRD along with the members' inconsistency, and even many members who did not know and understood the privilege.

The DPRD should not necessarily reflect and display that kind of appearance, because it is not in line with the provisions as regulated in Article 10 paragraph (a) of Government Regulation No. 16 of 2010, members of the DPRD have the rights to propose a Regional Regulation. Legitimacy for accountability also includes obligations the holder of the mandate (agent) to provide responsibility, to present, report and disclose all activities that are his responsibility to the party that gives the mandate (principal) who has the right and authority to ask for accountability [10]. Accountability holds individuals and organizations accountable for performance that is measured as objectively as possible [14].

For the realization of accountability, accountability itself can be strengthened through the demands of civil society for civil society can influence horizontal accountability in two ways: First, by directly supporting the establishment and empowerment of institutional checks and balances, and Secondly, by indirectly strengthening institutions vertical accountability that supports it, such as electoral democracy and independent media [17].

e) Legislation, which is related to the duties and functions of the DPRD as a legislator.

Political accountability of DPRD as a political institution that has ethical-political responsibility obligations to the public [2]. One indicator is the extent to which this institution struggles for the interests of the people who elect it through the establishment of various Regulations that are discussed together with the executive (government) which leads to programs supported by budgets that are technically operational will be carried out by the ranks of government under the control of the Mayor as To the Region.

Research data shows that the Manado City DPRD in the 2009-2014 period only gave birth to 2 (two) initiative regulations out of 6 (six) planned regulations in 2012. Both of these regulations are Regulation No. 5 of 2012 concerning Procedures for Forming Regional Regulations and Perda No. 11 of 2012 concerning Layout Placement of Billboards. It is

more due to the fact that there are no concessionaires and the seriousness of the DPRD to implement the stipulated Prolegda and the indifference of most members of the Manado City DPRD. For this reason, the DPRD must consistently and seriously place the institution as a formulation kitchen, but also as an institution that is wealthy of regulations that are oriented towards the welfare of the people and as a form of responsibility for carrying out the activities provided responsibly.

f) Letters of appointment, i.e. there is cooperation in the discussion of the Regional Regulation Draft, both the DPRD and the executive.

The implementation of the duties and functions of the DPRD in articulating and aggregating community interests is normatively inherent to the position and authority both institutionally and personally. As regulated in Law No. 32 of 2004 along with other derivative provisions. Whereas the Regional Regulation was discussed together with the DPRD and the Regional Head (Mayor). Then the DPRD approves and the Mayor decides. The cooperation was carried out from the process of drafting and discussing Proleda to the discussion, approval, and enactment of Perda. Therefore, the DPRD must have synergy in carrying out its duties and functions as stated by Manan [6], that the making of a Regional Regulation is the result of cooperation between the Mayor and the DPRD and various other local government elements. It's just that the research findings, that the implementation of the partnership is often not consistently carried out, especially starting from the submission of the Prolegda to the discussion of the Regional Regulation that there is no good planning where the discussion schedule is not facilitated and mediated by the DPRD caused the DPRD to be very minimal in the Regional Regulations, especially the Initiative Regulations. Time limitation is a classic reason that emerges from the DPRD, although there is also little research data that points to the cause because of the dynamic and varied interests in the DPRD, resulting in a conflict of interest in each of the Ranperda's material. The DPRD should have an ethical-political responsibility to build reciprocal relations with the people who elect them and their parties [7] to remember their political deals with the public.

g) Formal delegation of authority, i.e. formal delegation of authority in the implementation of deliberative regional regulation deliberations;

DPRD institutions whose members are elected and gain political legitimacy from the people are given a mandate as people's representatives with the authority they have. Jabbara and Dwivedi [1], stated that the authority is an authority that comes from the people who have chosen to carry out the task of regulating, setting priorities and distributing resources. These political authorities must be accounted for in carrying out their duties and functions as forming legislators. To carry out its position and authority, the DPRD forms and has a number of House's equipment such as the Commission,

Balegda, Faction, Banmus, Honorary Board and each has its duties and authorities, such as the Commission and Regional Regulations relating to the formation of regional regulations, especially regional initiatives. Ranperda's initiative can be submitted besides members also by the Commission and Balegda. But in reality, this is not done optimally. So far, the draft has been proposed and prepared by the Balegda. It is due to the fact that most DPRD members were not committed, undisciplined and inconsistent with the authority of their duties and obligations, as stipulated in Manado City DPRD Regulation No. 04 of 2010 concerning the Standing Orders of the Manado City DPRD.

h) Standing orders, i.e. the presence of certain interests by the DPRD as entrusted items or orders from certain parties.

The content of certain interests always colors every discussion of the Ranperda by the Manado City DPRD, because every Regional Regulation initiative contains personal interests, factions, et cetera. There were many stages of debate that were sometimes difficult to avoid because they have become characteristics of the DPRD as a means of political struggle. Another finding is that the making of the Manado City DPRD Regulation is not consistent with what has been stipulated in Prolegda, this is more due to the tug of war on interests. In the DPRD there was also the name "Team 9" which was very influential in influencing decision making or can be said to be actors in the decision-making scenario. One of the causes of the lack of initiative by the DPRD products was its initiative, because of the dynamic and polarizing interests that are often reflected in these institutions.

IV. CONCLUSION

The implementation of political accountability in relation to the legitimacy of DPRD of Manado City in making Regional Regulations has not been accountable either related to procedures in the submission and discussion of the Regional Regulation in the DPRD, the process of making the initiative's Regional Regulations, the representative system in making the Regional Regulations, and also no involvement of society, both in the planning process and in the process of drafting and discussing the regional regulation. Besides, the use of special privileges, especially in the exercise of the right to submit a Ranperda has not been used and carried out by members of the Manado City DPRD, the Commission or the combined Commission was more due to the fact that most members of the Manado City DPRD did not understand their duties and functions.

The form of cooperation in the making and discussion of the Ranperda initiative was not fully carried out by the Manado City DPRD, because the DPRD did not prepare the concept both in the Prolegda concept or for the Ranperda draft through Balegda. The Prolegda and Ranperda concept of the DPRD initiative was originally a concept proposed by the executive, which was then taken and made as a Prolegda and/or Ranperda by the Manado City DPRD. Thus, the members and even the

Commission as one of the DPRD's Completeness tools are less than optimal in proposing the Ranperda initiative.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The author would like to express his very great appreciation to the heads of Social Science Faculty UNIMA for approving the plan to conduct this study and for providing the funding for the completion of this study.

REFERENCES

- [1] O. P. Dwivedi and J. G. Jabbara, 'Public service accountability: A comparative perspective'. Hartford: Kumarian Press, 1989.
- [2] R. Indonesia, 'Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia Nomor 32 Tahun 2004 Tentang Pemerintahan Daerah', *Jakarta RI*, 2004.
- [3] P. P. R. I. Nomor, 'Tahun 2010 Tentang Pedoman Penyusunan Peraturan Dewan Perwakilan Rakyat Daerah Tentang Tata Tertib Dewan Perwakilan Rakyat Daerah'. Jakarta: Peraturan Pemerintah Republik Indonesia, 16AD.
- [4] MENTERI DALAM NEGERI REPUBLIK INDONESIA, *PERATURAN MENTERI DALAM NEGERI REPUBLIK INDONESIA NOMOR 53 TAHUN 2011 TENTANG PEMBENTUKAN PRODUK HUKUM DAERAH*. Indonesia, 2011.
- [5] DPRD Kota Manado, *Peraturan DPRD Kota Manado Nomor 04 Tahun 2010 tentang Tata Tertib DPRD Kota Manado*. Indonesia, 2010.
- [6] B. Manan, *Menyongsong fajar otonomi daerah*. Pusat Studi Hukum, Fakultas Hukum, Universitas Islam Indonesia, 2001.
- [7] S. Salang, M. Djadjiono, I. M. L. Wiratma, and T. A. Legowo, 'Menghindari Jeratan Hukum bagi Anggota Dewan'. Jakarta: PT. Penebar Swadaya, 2009.
- [8] Efriza and S. Rozi, *Parlemen Indonesia: geliat volksraad hingga DPD: menembus lorong waktu doeloe, kini, dan nanti*. Alfabeta, 2010.
- [9] H. Sadjijono, 'Bab-bab Pokok Hukum Administrasi Negara', *Yogyakarta Laksbang Press.*, 2008.
- [10] A. Mardiasmo, 'Otonomi dan Manajemen Keuangan Daerah: Good Governance', *Democr. Local Gov. Financ. Manag.*, 2002.
- [11] G. G. Sedarmayanti, 'Dalam Rangka Otonomi Daerah', *Mandar Maju, Bandung*, 2003.
- [12] G. Stoker, 'Governance as theory: five propositions', *Int. Soc. Sci. J.*, vol. 50, no. 155, pp. 17–28, 1998.
- [13] S. Sjamsuddin, 'Etika birokrasi dan akuntabilitas sektor publik', *Malang yayasan CV. SOFA Mandiridan Indones. Print Malang*, 2007.
- [14] H. C. Tangkau, 'Akuntabilitas Penyelenggara Pemerintahan', 2011.
- [15] M. Schacter, *When accountability fails: a framework for diagnosis and action*. Institute on Governance, 2000.
- [16] G. A. O'Donnell and LP3ES., *Transisi menuju demokrasi: rangkaian kemungkinan dan ketidakpastian*. Institute for Social and Economic Research, Education and Information, 1993.
- [17] J. Fox, 'Civil society and political accountability: propositions for discussion', *St. Cruz, Univ. Calif.*, 2000.
- [18] M. Turner and D. Hulme, *Governance, administration and development: Making the state work*. Macmillan International Higher Education, 1997.
- [19] M. R. K. Muluk, *Mengugat partisipasi publik dalam pemerintahan daerah: sebuah kajian administrasi publik dengan pendekatan berpikir sistem*. Kerjasama antara Lembaga Penerbitan & Dokumentasi, FIA, UNIBRAW dengan ..., 2007.
- [20] Y. T. Keban, 'Enam Dimensi Strategis Administrasi Publik: Konsep, Teori, dan Isu, Edisi Kedua', *Cetakan Pertama. Yogyakarta Penerbit Gaya Media*, 2008.
- [21] X. Wang and M. Wan Wart, 'When public participation in administration leads to trust: An empirical assessment of managers' perceptions', *Public Adm. Rev.*, vol. 67, no. 2, pp. 265–278, 2007.
- [22] K. A. Graham and S. D. Phillips, 'Making public participation more effective: Issues for local government', *Citiz. Engagem. Lessons Particip. from local Gov.*, pp. 1–24, 1998.
- [23] J. M. Griesgraber and B. G. Gunter, 'Development: New paradigms and principles for the twenty-first century', 1996.
- [24] U.-U. Nomor, 'tahun 2011 tentang Pembentukan Peraturan Perundang-undangan', *Lembaran Negara Nomor*, vol. 82, 12AD.
- [25] A. M. H. Miles, Matthew B., *Analisis Data Kualitatif. Terjemahan Tjetjep Rohendi Rohidi*. Jakarta: Universitas Indonesia, 1992.
- [26] J. W. Ellwood, 'CHAPTER Prospects for the Study of 11 the Governance of Public Organizations and Policies', *Gov. Perform. New Perspect.*, p. 319, 2000.