

Available online at JIS website: <https://jis.undip.ac.id>

Research Article
**Accessibility of Voters with Disabilities
in General Elections**

*Received: 15th September 2021; Revised: 25th October 2021;
Accepted: 25th December 2021; Available online: 26th December 2021*

Fitriyah, Nunik Retno Herawati

Department of Political Science, Faculty of Social and Political Sciences,
Universitas Diponegoro, Jl. Prof. H. Soedarto SH Tembalang, Semarang, 1269, Indonesia

Abstract

Discrimination to voters with disabilities occurs recurrently although many efforts are taken to break such discrimination through regulations. This study intends to specifically describe the accessibility of voters with disabilities in the 2019 election, the obstacles, and recommendation for policy designs to improve the accessibility of voters with disabilities in elections. The simultaneous elections of 2019 which involve the legislative and presidential elections contribute to the complexity of the election, especially for the voters with disabilities. The qualitative research approach applies the analytical descriptive method. The data collection used literature studies on regulations, research results and articles related to disability. Primary data were obtained from interviews and observations (March-April 2019) in the city of Semarang. The data were also collected from documentary studies and online news searches regarding the policies/programs/activities of the General Election Commission (KPU), the General Election Supervisory Agency (Bawaslu) and organizations of disabilities, including using excerpts from their statements. The results of this study conclude that during the 2019 General Election KPU has not been able to remove social barriers to the fulfillment of the rights of disabled voters. The findings show that there is still discrimination for voters with disabilities in the 2019 elections which strengthens the findings of previous researches, although the regulatory aspect is better. The KPU policy of providing polling station (TPS) Akses at all polling stations is actually not effective in meeting their needs based on the types of disability. There are limitations on the budget and the availability to follow the topographic requirements of TPS Akses. As a recommendation, the quality of service needs to be improved by maximizing the accuracy of data for voters with disabilities, using the data as the basis for procurement and distribution of logistics and the establishment of TPS Akses, and as well as institutionalizing the synergy between KPU, local governments, and disabled community organizations/activists.

Keywords: *Voters With Disabilities; Accessibility Elections; Indonesian General Elections; Discrimination; Voter List*

How to Cite: Fitriyah, Herawati, N.R. (2021). Accessibility of Voters with Disabilities in General Elections. *Jurnal Ilmu Sosial*, 20 (2): 209-227 (doi: 10.14710/jis.20.2.2021.209-227), [Online]

Permalink/DOI: <https://doi.org/10.14710/jis.20.2.2021.209-227>

Corresponding Author: fitriyasemarang@yahoo.co.id (Fitriyah)

INTRODUCTION

According to Law no. 8 of 2016, people with disabilities is "anyone who experiences physical, intellectual, mental, and/or sensory limitations for a long time in interacting with the environment, may experience obstacles and difficulties to participate fully and effectively with other citizens based on equal rights." Such condition literally does not eliminate the right to vote in general elections, but there are restrictions and difficulties in political participation in elections for people with disabilities which are answered by accessibility elections.

The results of monitoring access to voters with disabilities at 225 polling stations (TPS) and interviews with 116 voters with disabilities in 5 provinces (DKI Jakarta, Central Java, Aceh, South Sulawesi, and South Kalimantan) by the Voter Education Network for People (JPPR) and The Access Election Network for People with Disabilities (Agenda) in the 2014 presidential election found that more than a third of voters had voting difficulty, only 35% of TPS provided with braille templates, and 30% TPS without accessible roads (JPPR, 2014: 57). This finding illustrates that discrimination to voters with disabilities still exists, even though it has been an efforts to eradicate discrimination by dictating regulations.

In 2016 the Government revised Law no. 4 of 1997 on Handicapped Person by Law No. 8 of 2016 concerning People with Disabilities. Under the new law, people with disabilities have the same rights as general voters without discrimination. Law no. 8 of 2016 guarantees equality and equal opportunity for people with disabilities in political participation, including guarantees of the right to vote in elections (Article 13). Referring to this provision, the state, through KPU, is obliged to fulfill the rights of voters with disabilities to obtain protection and services in elections, or there is an obligation to ensure their accessibility in elections (accessibility elections).

Although the right to vote is a fundamental and universal right, in Indonesia, groups of citizens with mental disorders have been excluded. The exception is in the Election Law no. 12 of 2003. In the subsequent election law, this exception is no longer the norm. The exception is repeated in the Regional Head Election Law no. 1 of 2015 junto Law no. 8 of 2015 which excluded people with mental/memory disorders from the voter list (Pasaribu and Sadikin, 2015: 3), but the norm was canceled based on the Decision of the Constitutional Court (MK) Number 135/PUU-XIII/2015. The law has closed the access as voters for mental disabilities. This type of disability is the inhibition of the function of thought, emotion, behavior, or categorized as voters with mental disorders.

In the 2019 General Election, KPU has a strong legal basis for collecting voter data on all types of people with disabilities, but its implementation is not without challenges. For example, there are still groups of people who openly refuse people with mental disabilities to be registered as voters (nasional.kontan, 2018). Referring to the decision of the Constitutional Court (MK) Number 135/PUU-XIII/2015, people with mental disabilities have the right to be registered as voters as long as they do not suffer from mental disorders permanently and confirmed by professionals. This decision is implicit in the state acknowledgment that people with mental disabilities have legal standing as holders of voting rights, as well as assessing legal capacity from the legal agency aspect, namely the ability to exercise their right to vote (Nursyamsi and Ramadhan, 2020). This description shows the existing potential for discrimination of voters with disabilities by the public.

There is already a guarantee of equal rights for people with disabilities in the legal system in Indonesia. The guarantees are in the 1945 Constitution, then Law No. 39 of 1999 on Human Rights, Law no. 19 of 2011 concerning the Ratification of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of People with Disabilities, Law no. 8 of 2016 concerning people with Disabilities, Law no. 18 of 2014 concerning Mental Health, and specifically for elections of Law no. 7 of 2017, but at practical it has not fully guaranteed the fulfillment of the rights of voters with disabilities in elections. In fact, the election is a mechanism to choose a leader. Through elections, the people are involved not only in deciding who is believed to be the leader but also in deciding the policy direction for the next five years. Election is a big decision by every voter about his future. Periodic elections become a space for people to carry out control functions for the provision of rewards and punishments. With the election, there is a political contract with the prospective leader, and each voter can cut off the tenure of a bad leader and extend the tenure of a good leader through voting support.

Based on universally applicable democratic election standards, the intended election is the one that contains democratic principles in its implementation. In Indonesia these principles are translated as the principles of direct, free, public, confidential, honest and fair (*luber-jurdil*) elections. The general principle means that there should not be discrimination against all voters. In election, the universal suffrage is recognized (Surbakti et al., 2011). The question is how to translate *luber-jurdil* election to fulfill the rights of voters with disabilities in the 2019 Election. The Article 5 of Law No. 7 of 2017 states that people with disabilities who meet the requirements have the same opportunities as voters, candidates and election organizers. It

means that there is a guarantee of opportunity and equal treatment (non-discrimination) in elections for all roles.

In a national seminar organized by AIPI Semarang Branch (19/3/2019), the chairman of the Indonesian KPU, Arief Budiman, conveyed his commitment to serve disabled voters on the orders of the law. However, what services should be received by people with disabilities? If in previous elections there was still a lack of service, then is this deficiency repeated? The focus of this study is the fulfillment of disability rights as voters, namely how to fulfill the rights of disabled voters to be registered as voters, to obtain socialization and election information, to access voting, to find the obstacles, and to provide recommendation to the policy.

There are four paradigms in public services for people with disabilities, namely the charitable, medical, social, and rights paradigms (Atkinson et al., 2014; Santoso and Apsari, 2017). While the categorization by Salim (2016) in his research includes disability perspectives on medical, social issues, economic issues, and postmodern issues. The charity model views people with disabilities as individuals who are unable to participate fully, need help, and are pitied. The medical model views disability as an obstacle that requires rehabilitation. The social model views disability as a product of a person's interaction with their environment, so social change is needed. The rights model recognizes the rights of people with disabilities, thereby it shifts dependence into empowerment (Atkinson et al., 2014; Santoso and Apsari, 2017). The charitable and medical models have been abandoned, and UNCRPD has shifted the paradigm in attitudes and approaches towards people with disabilities into the rights model. This new paradigm is used as an international standard.

This study uses social and rights models in analyzing accessibility elections. Based on the social model, this study interprets the individual function of disability if there are environmental barriers (disabled). These obstacles exist because there are no accessible facilities. Obstacles are also due to the negative perception of society, considered as a burden for others, or as God's will, a form of karma (Nursyamsi et al., 2015: 19-20). Meanwhile, the rights model emphasizes that there are equal human rights and an advocacy function for people with disabilities. The use of a rights-based social model in this study is to explain the accessibility electoral model. These two models complement each other (Atkinson et al., 2014).

Accessibility is to provide convenience to voters with disabilities for equal opportunities (Article 1 (8) of Law No. 8 of 2016). It is called an accessibility election if every citizen can have rights to vote freely and confidentially, and people with disabilities can fulfill their rights

to vote without any barriers. Democratic elections are the ones that provide convenience for voters, especially ensuring the voters to make political decisions freely and confidentially (Surbakti et al., 2011: 7-8). Voter rights in elections are (1) the right to obtain information; (2) the right to be registered as a voter; and (3) access rights to TPS. These rights apply equally to all voters. The formulation of accessibility elections based on IDEA International (Wall, 2006: 79-80) is an election that ensures the registration process, TPS, and logistics can be accessed by voters with disabilities; the availability of election socialization materials that are friendly to voters with blind and deaf disabilities, and the availability of assistance.

Researches on the fulfillment of the political rights of voters with disabilities have been widely carried out in previous elections (including the presidential and regional elections). In general, the results of those studies found that the accessibility elections had not been met the expectations. The rights of voters with disabilities to participate in elections have not been fully accepted because there are various obstacles (Haryani and Huripah, 2014; Kharma, 2016). The research by Astuti and Suharto (2021) categorizes barriers for people with disabilities on the accessibility dimensions of TPS Akses, accommodation dimensions based on the services of TPS officers, dimensions of availability of materials, machines, and methods, and the dimensions of acceptability of some people. In general, there are similarities in findings with other studies (see JPPR, 2014). Studies in other countries have also found barriers to accessibility of disabled voters (Matsubayashi and Ueda, 2014; Mattila and Papageorgiou, 2017; Virendrakumar et al., 2018). However, the use of social and rights models in analyzing accessibility elections is still limited.

The assurance for the fulfillment of the rights of people with disabilities are relevant to be reviewed because they are implemented in the 2019 simultaneous elections which are more complex than the previous elections. Simultaneity makes the 2019 elections even more complex, especially for voters with disabilities. The complexity of the electorate is reflected in the increasing number of elected positions, the electoral system that leads to the selection of candidates and is carried out simultaneously. In addition, different electoral systems are used between the types of positions chosen, so the procedures for voting for ballots are also different. This article is intended to explain the accessibility of voters with disabilities in the 2019 election, the obstacles in obtaining rights, as well as recommending policy designs to improve accessibility voters with disabilities in elections as the novelty in this article.

RESEARCH METHODS

This study uses a qualitative descriptive analytical approach, and the data collection involves literature studies on regulations, research results and articles related to disability. The researchers also conducted field studies to obtain primary data by having interviews and observations. This interview was conducted with research informants who were selected using a purposive technique, and they were voters with visual disabilities and members of the "Relasi" Democracy Volunteers for the 2019 Election for the Semarang City disability voter segment. The method of observation is by being involved in socialization activities by "Relasi" and as voters. Primary data collection is carried out in the period March-April 2019. The data are also from documentary studies and online news searches regarding the policies/programs/activities of KPU, Bawaslu and organizations of people with disabilities, including using excerpts from their statements. The data obtained were analyzed through the process of data reduction, data presentation and drawing conclusions.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Overview of Disabled Voters Accessibility

Voters with disabilities are not homogeneous. Referring to Law No. 8/2016, there are four types of disabilities, namely physical, intellectual, mental, and sensory disabilities. As voters, they have various needs according to the type of disability they have. This heterogeneity raises the need for different treatment according to the specificity of the type of disability (Femec et al., 2017). Therefore, the degree of complexity of the election also varies from this point of view. Voters with disabilities have the right to receive facilities according to their needs to be able to use their political rights properly. We need an election that is accessible to them, for example the availability of TPS Akses. The study of Schur et al. (2017) found difficulties in accessing TPS were higher for voters with disabilities, and this limited access contributed to their low participation. By type, Matsubayashi and Ueda (2014) found voters with cognitive and mobility impairments had the lowest levels of political participation (Matsubayashi and Ueda, 2014)

Guaranteed access as a right for people with disabilities already exists, covering both international and national scopes. On an international scale, the guarantees for the protection of the rights of people with disabilities was stipulated through the United Nations Convention on the Rights of People with Disabilities (UNCRPD) in 2006. The document in Table 1 took effect on March 3, 2012 after 20 countries ratified it, including Indonesia (Pasaribu and Sadikin,

2015:15). Thus, guarantees of protection on a national scale in Indonesia already exist, and have been listed in the constitution.

Table 1: List of ASEAN Countries that Ratified the Convention on the Rights of People with Disabilities

No.	Countries	Sign up	Ratification	Description
1	Brunei Darussalam	18 December 2007	-	Countries that
2	Cambodia	1 October 2007	20 December 2012	ratify this
3	Indonesia	30 March 2007	30 November 2011	convention are
4	Laos	15 January 2008	25 September 2009	obliged to
5	Malaysia	08 April 2008	17 July 2010	promote, protect
6	Myanmar	-	07 December 2011	and ensure the
7	Philippine	25 September 2007	15 April 2008	rights of people
8	Singapore	-	-	with disabilities to
9	Thailand	30 March 2007	29 July 2008	fully take
10	Vietnam	22 October 2007	-	advantages under
11	Timor Leste	-	-	the auspices of the law

Source: Data processed from Pasaribu and Sadikin, 2015:15

The availability of regulations is not enough to protect the rights of voters with disabilities as in mostly African countries which is defined as 54 countries on the African continent, including East, Central, North, South and West Africa (Virendrakumar et al., 2018). As of July 2017, 46 out of 54 African countries (85%) have ratified UNCRPD, the UN international convention on the Rights of People with Disabilities and recognized equality of access in their domestic regulations although the implementation varies, and there are barriers to political participation due to the lack of education and finance; negative social stigma and attitudes; and inaccessible physical infrastructure. The case in the United States also shows the same thing. Matsubayashi and Ueda's (2014) study with samples of 50 states and the District of Columbia found that despite a federal law aimed at removing barriers to vote, the voter turnout gap between people with and without disabilities has not decreased. The adequacy of this regulation is realized if it is accompanied by the alignments of the actors.

People with disabilities who often experience discrimination and unequal treatment have affect their lower political participation in elections (Mattila and Papageorgiou, 2017). Mattila and Papageorgiou study was conducted on three groups of respondents, namely (1) non-disabled; (2) disabled but not discriminated; and (3) people with disabilities and discrimination. The label of people with disabilities shows that Law no. 4 of 1997 is still influenced by the concept of disability based on charity and medical. Based on the charitable and medical point of view, people with disabilities are positioned as objects and mercy. This perspective exists in general people in the world, namely observing with a negative attitude. Cases in European

countries, labeling 'healthy' vs. 'disability' is enough to trigger discriminatory behavior against people with disabilities (Mattila and Papageorgiou, 2017).

Elections in Indonesia are a five-year event. It has been held since 1955, but it becomes periodical since the New Order Government. Although it is not new, the main stream that has emerged is the phenomenon of accessibility for voters with disabilities (Haryani and Huripah, 2014; Kharma, 2016, Astuti and Suharto, 2021). There is already a legal guarantee for people with disabilities for the right to political participation. The right to vote in elections is a citizen's constitutional right, so it should not be discriminated against on any basis (Susanti, 2016). In a democratic political system, citizens have the right to vote and be elected (Surbakti et al., 2011). The right to vote is considered the most important type of human right, because various other types of human rights can be guaranteed through the use of the right to vote (Surbakti and Supriyanto, 2013: 2).

The quality of the election is determined by the holding of *luber-jurdil* election, which includes the fulfillment of the political rights of voters without any discrimination, which gives exceptions to a certain group of voters. Based on Article 27 paragraph (1) and Article 28 D paragraph (1) of the 1945 Constitution and Law no. 39 of 1999, all citizens are guaranteed to have the same rights in elections, namely the right to vote and be elected. The state also guarantees the accessibility of citizens with special needs in Article 28 H paragraph (2) and Article 28 I paragraph (2) of the 1945 Constitution. Referring to the provisions of the constitution, the election with accessibility is the right of people with disabilities, so its implementation must be accountable (Susanti, 2016). One of the five challenges of *luber-jurdil* elections is “removing legal, administrative, political, economic and social barriers to equal and universal political participation” (Interantional IDEA, 2012). It requires the fulfillment of the principles of integrity of election administrators, namely independence, impartiality, integrity, transparency, efficiency, professionalism, and a mindset of service (Catt et al., 2014: 21).

Accessibility of Voters with Disabilities in the 2019 Election

Being registered in the voter list is a ticket for voters to use their voting rights at TPS. If voters are not registered, they will potentially lose their voting rights (Surbakti et al., 2011). Voter lists in elections are always considered problematic. In the 2014 election, it was found that people with disabilities were unable to use their right to vote because they were not registered on the voter list (Pasaribu and Sadikin, 2015: 2) This can be seen from the number of disabled voters who should be and their reality. The number of people with disabilities based

on data from the Ministry of Health is 3,063,559 and based on data from the Ministry of Social Welfare, it is 3,838,985 people. If it is assumed that there are 3,000,000 people, then about 75% of them, i.e. 2,250,000 million are voters. In reality, the data on voters with disabilities in the 2014 election was only around 1.5 million. There is a difference on the data, so the certainty to be registered as a voter is important. The election law has protected the right of people with disabilities to be registered as voters, and Article 5 of Law no. 7 of 2017 only regulates the requirements for voters, namely Indonesian citizens aged 17 years or have been/already married, not currently losing their right to vote due to court decisions, and registered as voters. This voter requirement is non-discriminatory because it does not give exceptions to voters with disabilities.

The number of voters in the 2019 General Election was 192,828,520. Out of this number, there were 1,247,730 voters with disabilities or 0.65 percent, consisting of 83,182 physical disabled voters, 166,364 blind voters, 249,546 deaf voters, 332,728 mentally retarded voters and 415,910 other disabled voters (<https://opendata.kpu.go.id>). This number is smaller based compared to the actual data. Based on the data from the National Socio-Economic Survey (Susenas) in 2018, the number of people with disabilities was 14.2 percent or equivalent to 30.38 people, while based on the data from the World Health Organization and the World Bank, the number of people with disabilities reached around 15% of world population (Atkinson et al., 2017). The problem of low data accuracy is found in the preparation of voter lists for people with disabilities (JPPR, 2014).

The work of the voter list updating system involves four parties, namely the government, KPU, political parties, and voters (Surbakti et al, 2011). KPU maintains and collects voter data in three types of voter lists, (1) Permanent Voter List (DPT) for residents with the right to vote, (2) Additional Voter List (DBTb) for voters who move to TPS, and (3) Special Voter List (DPK) for voters at TPS who have not been recorded in the DPT. That should be able to reduce the degree of inaccuracy in voter data for people with disabilities. KPU also prepares its officers to ensure that people with disabilities are registered according to the type of disability. KPU Regulation (PKPU) No. 19/2019 which regulates the updating of voter data for the 2019 General Election, in the attachment states the coding for disabled voters: number “1” with physical disability, number “2” with intellectual disability, number “3” with mental disability, and number “4” with sensory disability”. However, this improvement in the administrative realm does not automatically increase the accuracy of voter data for people with disabilities due

to factors in the field. For example, the families refused to register their members with mental disabilities during the data collection (national.kontan, 2018).

Barriers to access to elections for people with disabilities are not only vulnerable citizens from not being registered as voters, but also as voters who are vulnerable to being hampered in using their right to vote. The factors are due to the lack of access to receive socialization and election information and the unavailability of disability-friendly TPS. This is still repeated in the 2019 election, which becomes the finding in this study. KPU literally carries out socialization and simulations of the 2019 General Election to voters with disabilities, but it cannot reach all voters with disabilities. The reach of election socialization by KPU is limited to community representatives (Rita et.al, 2016).

KPU socialization strategy to reach all segments of the electorate is to form Volunteers for Democracy (Relasi), per district/city consisting of 55 people, target groups of 11 voter segments, and a three-month working period. The results of the observation found that the socialization of elections by Relasi to voters with disabilities cannot be maximized. Volunteers in Relasi to the disability segment during election socialization to the group of blind voters were not being equipped with a braille template. In this case, Relasi only can reach community in general and do not reach individual voters. "Relasi work is only to reach community in general", explained by the Chairperson of the Semarang City KPU (www.rmoljateng.com). The group that is more affected by socialization is the blind disability. In general, most of the Relasi work targets this group.

The guarantee for blind voters to vote in secret has also not been fully accepted. The voter list has recorded the number of voters with disabilities and the type of disability, but it has not been maximized for the procurement and distribution needs of election logistics that are on target, so they are efficient and effective. The number of voters with visual impairment is 166,364 people, but KPU provides braille templates as many as 810,329 TPS in Indonesia, KPU policy "one TPS one braille template". There was a waste because not every TPS had voters with visual disabilities. Meanwhile, KPU only provides braille templates for Regional Representative Council (DPD) and presidential election ballots, while braille templates for House of People Representative (DPR) and District People Representative Council (DPRD) election ballots are not available. The reason for the KPU is due to budget constraints (politik.rmol, 2019). The KPU's policy is to optimize the model for assisting for blind voters as regulated in Articles 356 and 364 of Law no. 7 of 2017. As a voter assistant is a member of

Voting Organization Group (KPPS) or a person appointed by the voter, generally a family member. KPU provides a Model C3 form that must be filled out by a voter assistant.

This study found that there were informants who remained comfortable and chose assistance from family members, because it will be difficult to use a braille template¹. This voter attitude reinforces the need for voters with visual impairments to receive special voter education according to their needs, namely skills in using braille templates through election simulations. The assistantship model makes voters with disabilities depend on other parties, which should be empowerment as the spirit of Law No. 8/2016. Further, the confidentiality of voters with visual disabilities is not safe. More educated informants want braille templates to be provided for all types of elections. There are concerns that assistance is vulnerable to abuse². The use of braille templates literally ensures the secrecy of voters' choices for people with visual impairments. The braille template can affect the degree of participation of voters with disability. The highest percentage is in the presidential election (77.43%), and the next rank is the DPD election (74.59%). In both types of elections, KPU provides a braille template for blind voters, therefore it makes them easier to use their right to vote. For the election for members of the DPR and DPRD, voter participation is around 72% (www.kpu.go.id, 2019)

The budget constraint to purchase braille templates for all types of election ballots should be possible if the procurement is based on data on the number of blind voters, not TPS. Thus, braille templates are only provided if there are voters who are blind at TPS. Backup tools are for anticipation if there are DPTb and DPK blind voters are stored in PPS (village level organizers) to make it easily accessible. The number of PPS in the 2019 Election is 83,404 units, so KPU only needs to provide 249,768 sets of braille templates. If there are five types of ballots, the need for braille templates is 1,248,840 units. The number is smaller than the number of braille templates for the 2019 DPD and Presidential Elections of 1,619,000 units.

The general policy pattern is also about the establishment of TPS access, even though not all TPS have voters with people with disabilities. Apart from being ineffective and inefficient, non-compliance with TPS access standards is a finding of supervision by Bawaslu. In the 2019 Election, Bawaslu found that there were around 2,366 TPS that were difficult to reach for voters with disabilities, and around 20,834 TPS did not provide braille template tools (CNN Indonesia,

¹ My son will help me, in the previous election I was also with my son , it is easier than "using a tool" (interview of blind voter, female, 50 years old, 29 March 2019)

² My friends and I are worried if the intended ballot will be different, we are still in doubt" (interview with blind voter, the committee of blind community, male, 30 years old, 29 March 2019)

2019). These Findings have an impact on the KPU professional assessment and election integrity.

Table 2. Accessibility Election Findings in the 2019 Election by Type of Voter Disability

No	Type of Disability	Election Accessibility	Finding
1	Physical	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. TPS does not stand on land that is rocky, sandy, hilly, surrounded by ditches/moats, or has stairs 2. TPS equipment must be arranged so that there is sufficient distance for wheelchair users to move freely in the TPS 3. There is service guideline by KPPS 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Accessible TPS location depends on land availability. It is limited at urban areas 2. No wheelchair available. Physical disability voting services by activists and government 3. The service guideline is in the KPPS manual
2	Visual	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There is a ballot tool available 2. There is a KPPS officer who helps to the voting booth and helps install the template 3. KPPS officers keep voters' choices confidential. 4. There are service guidelines by KPPS 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Braille templates are limited to the Presidential and DPD elections 2. Voters prefer assistance by family members 3. The service guideline is in the KPPS manual
3	Hearing	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There are special waiting chairs for voters with hearing disability 2. There are service guidelines by KPPS 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Guidelines for the layout of voter seats at TPS do not regulate special seats for deaf disabled voters 2. The service guideline is in the KPPS manual
4	Mental intellectual	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There is assistantship from KPPS officers 2. There are service guidelines by KPPS 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Assistance by family members 2. The service guideline is not in the KPPS manual
5	All disability	Rights for political education	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The reach of voter education is limited to communities /organizations, not directly to individuals 2. Outreach to the visually impaired is not equipped with a braille template

Source: data analysis result, 2019

The KPPS Guidebook for Voting and Counting Votes in the 2019 Election (2019: 17) has regulated TPS which guarantees all types of voters with disabilities to be used as a reference for the establishment of TPS and to regulate services for voters with disabilities during voting, but there is no standard for voters with mental disabilities. This study also still found TPS that did not meet the standards of TPS Akses. In reality, it was customary for TPS to be set up in the same location, therefore the findings are repeated violations in every election. In urban areas, there is limited land that topographically meets the requirements for TPS Akses, for instance, most of the sub-districts in Semarang City are in urban areas. It is not easy to find spacious vacant land. The establishment of TPS mostly makes use of privately owned buildings,

which have narrow entrances and use stairs. The design of this TPS adapts to the availability of land/buildings that are not always accessible for people with disabilities. It will be different if KPU has set up selective TPS Akses based on disability voter data in Table 2. For TPS that have voters with disabilities, they are given special treatment according to the needs of the type of disability of the voters, including the required additional budget such as the availability of topography and equipment and special services. For voters with physical disabilities, wheelchairs are provided along with officers who operate them, including picking them up from home to TPS and vice versa. In the case of voters with hearing impairments, TPS provide special waiting chairs. For voters with visual disabilities, a set of braille templates is available for all types of elections. KPPS at TPS Akses are also given special technical guidance training (Bimtek), so they have an inclusive perspective to provide full service. KPU can involve organizations/activists of the disabled community. However, the fulfillment of the rights of voters with disabilities in the 2019 elections is still a problem. This finding is similar to the 2014 general election and previous elections. The quality of service varies between regions, depending on the partisanship of the local KPU. The Provincial KPU of Yogyakarta and the KPU of Sleman Regency in the 2009 General Election were able to provide braille templates for all types of ballots, but in the 2014 General Elections, they were no longer available (Jogja.Antaraneews, 2014). Yogyakarta City Election Commission (KPU) in the 2014 Election not only provided braille templates for all types of ballots, but also provided a Permanent Candidate List (DCT) and braille 2014 Election information leaflets (Halalia, 2017). The service innovation uses Local government budget (APBD), and it means that there is local government participation. This innovation is also not generally applicable in all regions, and its sustainability depends on the KPU members. In fact, the tenure of KPU members is limited, and there is a change every five years. It is potential to be replaced by new people with different perspectives on disability.

The good quality of service is also due to the participation of disabled community organizations/activists. In the 2019 elections in Yogyakarta, four organizations for people with disabilities, Samasetara, Center for Improving Qualified Activity in Life of People with Disabilities (CIQAL), Difabike, and the Harapan Nusantara Organization (Ohana Indonesia), formed the Accessibility Movement for Democracy (Gandem). This institution provides pick-up services for voters with disabilities (VoA Indonesia, 2019). In the city of Semarang, disabled activist, Noviana Dibyantari, succeeded in opening access for physical disabled voters. He asked for the help of the Deputy Mayor of Semarang to facilitate the pick-up service through

the sub-district head. This pick-up service is not provided by KPU as the statement of a member of the Central Java KPU, Ikhwan, "Because the active ones will get the right to vote. Because, it is impossible for us to pick up to houses of people with disabilities, considering the number of our limited officers" (Kumparan, 2019). Further, the Semarang City visual disability organization / activist, Disabled Community Indonesia (DFCI) and the Indonesian Blind Association (Pertuni), have also succeeded in mobilizing the participation of their members to 100 percent (Suara Merdeka, 2019).

CONCLUSION

Election discrimination against voters with disabilities is still repeated in the 2019 Election. The KPU policy of providing TPS Akses model at all polling stations (TPS) is actually not effective. First, from a budget perspective, there are limitations because the needs of people with disabilities is generally applied at all TPS. Second, especially in urban areas, there is limited land that topographically meets the requirements for TPS Akses. Third, the fulfillment of the rights of people with disabilities that is better or above the average is still sporadic, not yet institutionalized. Its existence depends on the partisanship of KPU, the activity of disabled community organizations/activists and the support of responsive local governments.

This study concludes that during the 2019 General Election, KPU has not been able to remove social barriers to the fulfillment of the rights of disabled voters. The strengthening of regulations (Law No. 8 of 2016 and Law No. 7 of 2017) has not guaranteed equal rights at the implementation level. One of the keys of weaknesses is that information on the number of voters and types of disability in the voter list has not been maximized as a service basis.

This study recommends that voter data can be used as the basis for electoral services for voters with disabilities. For this reason, the accuracy of voter data for people with disabilities must be guaranteed, and there must be respective efforts to improve the accuracy of voter data. In addition, synergies with the government and disabled community organizations/activists need to be institutionalized, so it generally applies and sustainable. In several cases the involvement of local governments and disabled community organizations/activists has proven to be able to provide better services to voters with disabilities.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Appreciation to Priyatno Harsasto for his involvement in this research through interesting discussions

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Anonyms. 2019. Interview of blind voter on Semarang City KPU, Semarang.
- Atkinson, V., A. Azelton, K. Fogg. (2014). Akses Setara: Cara Melibatkan orang-orang dengan disabilitas dalam Proses Pemilu dan Politik. Jakarta: International Foundation for Electoral System (IFES) and National Democratic Institute (NDI) [Online]. Retrieved from https://ifes.org/sites/default/files/equal_access_manual_bahasa_indonesian.pdf [Accessed April 15, 2021]
- Atkinson, V., R. Aaberg., & S. Darnolf. (2017). Disability Rights and Election Observation: Increasing Access to the Political Process. *Nordic Journal of Human Rights*, 35(4): 375-391 (doi:10.1080/18918131.2017.1400348), [Online]
- Astuti, D., & Suharto, D. G. (2021). Aksesibilitas Penyandang Disabilitas dalam Pemilu 2019 di Kabupaten Sleman. *Public Inspiration: Jurnal Administrasi Publik*, 6(1): 29-41 (doi: 10.22225/pi.6.1.2021.29-41), [Online]
- Biro Teknis dan Hupmas KPU. (2019). Panduan KPPS Pemungutan dan Penghitungan Suara Pemilu Tahun 2019. Sekretariat Jenderal KPU
- Catt, H., A. Ellis, M. Maley, A. Wall, & P. Wolf. (2014). Electoral Management Design: Revised Edition. Stockholm: International IDEA. [Online]. Retrieved from <https://www.idea.int/es/publications/catalogue/electoral-management-design-revised-edition> [Accessed April 15, 2021]
- Femec, L., L. Kiš-Glavaš, & V. Mašić. (2017). Voting Opportunities For People With Disabilities. *Hrvatska revija za rehabilitacijska istraživanja*. 53: 1-14.
- Halalia, M.R. (2017). “Pemenuhan Hak Politik Penyandang Disabilitas Sesuai dengan Undang-Undang Nomor 8 Tahun 2016 tentang Penyandang Disabilitas oleh Komisi Pemilihan Umum (KPU) Kota Yogyakarta”. *Supremasi Hukum*, 6(2): 1-24 [Online]. Retrieved from <http://ejournal.uin-suka.ac.id/syariah/Supremasi/article/view/2016> [Accessed April 15, 2021]
- Haryani, A. dan E. Huripah. (2014). Partisipasi Politik Penyandang Disabilitas Netra Dalam Pemilihan Umum Tahun 2014 di Panti Sosial Bina Netra “Wyata Guna” Bandung. *Jurnal Agregasi*, 2(1): 89-104

- IDEA, I. (2012). Pendalaman Demokrasi: Strategi untuk Meningkatkan Integritas Pemilihan Umum di Seluruh Dunia. Stockholm: International IDEA [Online]. Retrieved from <https://www.idea.int/sites/default/files/publications/pendalaman-demokrasi.pdf> [Accessed April 15, 2021]
- JPPR. (2014). Presidential Elections in Indonesia: Monitoring Results from Aceh, Jakarta, Central Java, South Kalimantan and South Sulawesi. Jakarta: JPPR [Online]. Retrieved from https://www.ifes.org/sites/default/files/indonesia_election_access_monitoring_report_2014.pdf [Accessed April 15, 2021]
- Kharima, N. (2016). Problematika Penyandang Disabilitas dalam Pemilu Studi Kasus Pemilu Legislatif Tahun 2014 di Jakarta. *Jurnal Ilmu Kesejahteraan Sosial*, 5(1), 34-44 (doi: 10.15408/empati.v5i1.9775), [Online]
- Matsubayashi, T. dan M. Ueda. (2014). Disability and Voting. *Disability and Health Journal*, 7(3) (doi: 10.1016/j.dhjo.2014.03.001), [Online]
- Mattila, M., & Papageorgiou, A. (2016). Disability, perceived discrimination and political participation. *International Political Science Review*, 38(5), 505–519 (doi:10.1177/0192512116655813), [Online]
- Nursyamsi, F., E.D. Arifianti, M. F. Aziz, P. Bilqish, & A. Marutama. (2015). Kerangka Hukum Disabilitas di Indonesia : Menuju Indonesia Ramah Disabilitas, Jakarta: Pusat Studi Hukum dan Kebijakan Indonesia (PSHK) [Online]. Retrieved from <https://www.pshk.or.id/wp-content/uploads/2016/01> [Accessed April 15, 2021]
- Nursyamsi, F. dan M.N. Ramadhan. (2015). Analisa Yuridis Pencalonan Penyandang Disabilitas Sebagai Anggota DPR RI oleh Partai Politik. *Jurnal Pemilu dan Demokrasi*. # 11, 41-82 [Online]. Retrieved from perludem.org > plugins > includes > download [Accessed April 15, 2021]
- Nursyamsi, F. dan M.N. Ramadhan. (2020). Pelindungan Hak Pilih Penyandang Disabilitas Mental Dalam Pendekatan Rangkaian Proses Pasca Putusan Mahkamah Konstitusi Nomor 135/PUU-VIII/2015. *Jurnal Adhyasta Pemilu*. 3(1) 2: 17-39
- Pasaribu, K. dan U. H. Sadikin. (2015). Akses Bagi Semua Yang Berhak Pembukaan Akses Memilih Dan Dipilih Dalam Pemilu Bagi Penyandang Disabilitas. Jakarta: Yayasan Perludem [Online]. Retrieved from perludem.org > plugins > includes > download [Accessed April 15, 2021]

- Rita, M. D., Y. Nurmalisa, H. Yanzi. (2016). Peranan KPU dalam Sosialisasi Pemilukada Kepada Penyandang Disabilitas di Kota Bandar Lampung [Online] dalam [https://media.neliti.com > media > publications > 24892](https://media.neliti.com/media/publications/24892), [Accessed April 15, 2021]
- Salim, I. (2016). Perspektif Disabilitas dalam Pemilu 2014 dan Kontribusi Gerakan Difabel Indonesia bagi Terbangunnya Pemilu Inklusif di Indonesia. *The Politics: Jurnal Magister Ilmu Politik Universitas Hasanuddin*, 1(2): 127-156 (doi: 10.31947/politics.v1i2.141), [Online]
- Santoso, M. B. dan N. A. Apsari. (2017). Pergeseran Paradigma Dalam Disabilitas. *Intermestic: Intermestic Journal of International Studies* 1(2): 166-76 (doi: 10.24198/intermestic.v1n2.6), [Online]
- Schur, L., M. Ameri, & M. Adya. (2017). Disability, Voter Turnout, and Polling Place Accessibility, *Social Science Quarterly*, 98(5): 1374-1390 (doi: 10.1111/ssqu.12373), [Online]
- Surbakti, R., D. Supriyanto, & H. Asy'ari. (2011). Meningkatkan Akurasi Daftar Pemilih: Mengatur Kembali Sistem Pemilih Pemutahiran Daftar. Jakarta: Kemitraan bagi Pembaruan Tata Pemerintahan [Online]. Retrieved from <https://media.neliti.com/media/publications/45200-ID-meningkatkan-akurasi-daftar-pemilih-mengatur-kembali-sistem-pemilih-pemutahiran.pdf> [Accessed April 15, 2021]
- Surbakti, R. & D. Supriyanto. (2013). Partisipasi Warga Masyarakat Dalam Proses Penyelenggaraan Pemilihan Umum. Jakarta: Kemitraan bagi Pembaruan Tata Pemerintahan [Online]. Retrieved from <https://media.neliti.com/media/publications/45203-ID-partisipasi-warga-masyarakat-dalam-proses-penyelenggaraan-pemilihan-umum.pdf> [Accessed April 15, 2021]
- Susanti, B. (2016). Hak Memilih untuk Warga Negara Penyandang Disabilitas Intelektual dan Mental [Online]. Retrieved from <https://pshk.or.id/blog-id/hak-memilih-untuk-warga-negara-penyandang-disabilitas-intelektual-dan-mental/> [Accessed April 15, 2021]
- Virendrakumar, Bhavisha dan Emma Jolley, Eric Badu and Elena Schmidt. (2018). Disability inclusive elections in Africa: a systematic review of published and unpublished literature. *Disability & Society*, 2018 33(4): 509–538 (doi:10.1080/09687599.2018.1431108), [Online]

- Wall, A., A. Ellis, A. Ayoub, C. W. Dundas, J. Rukambe, & S. Staino. (2006). *Desain Penyelenggaraan Pemilu: Buku Pedoman Internasional IDEA* (terj. Perludem). Jakarta: Internasional IDEA [Online]. Retrieved from <https://www.idea.int/sites/default/files/publications/desain-penyelenggaraan-pemilu.pdf> [Accessed April 15, 2021]
- cnnindonesia.com. (2018). KPU Sebut Pemilih Penyandang Disabilitas Capai 1,2 Juta Orang [Online]. Retrieved from <https://www.cnnindonesia.com/nasional/20181216001650-32-353978/kpu-sebut-pemilih-penyandang-disabilitas-capai-12-juta-orang> [Accessed March 2, 2019]
- cnnindonesia.com. (2019). Pemilu 2019 Bawaslu Sebut 2366 TPS Tak ramah Disabilitas [Online]. Retrieved from <https://www.cnnindonesia.com/nasional/20190417220635-32-387446/pemilu-2019-bawaslu-sebut-2366-tps-tak-ramah-disabilitas> [Accessed April 24, 2019]
- jogja.antaranews.com. (2014), 21: 18. KPU Diminta Sediakan seluruh Template Surat Suara. [Online]. Retrieved from <https://jogja.antaranews.com/berita/321125/kpu-diminta-sediakan-seluruh-template-surat-suara> [Accessed April 25, 2019]
- kumparan.com. (2019). KPU Jateng Siapkan 115 Ribu Lembar Braille untuk Pemilih Difabel [Online]. Retrieved from <https://kumparan.com/@kumparannews/kpu-jateng-siapkan-115-ribu-lembar-braille-untuk-pemilih-difabel-155171260020899089> [Accessed April 25, 2019]
- nasional.kontan.co.id. (2018). KPU temui kendala dalam mendata pemilih penyandang disabilitas mental [Online]. Retrieved from <https://nasional.kontan.co.id/news/kpu-temui-kendala-dalam-mendata-pemilih-penyandang-disabilitas-mental> [Accessed March 2, 2019]
- politik.rmol.id. (2019) Kurang Anggaran, Template Braille Pemilu DPR RI Dan DPRD Tak Disiapkan KPU [Online]. Retrieved from <https://politik.rmol.id/read/2019/02/14/378631/kurang-anggaran> [Accessed March 2, 2019]
- rmoljateng.com. (2019). KPU Kota Semarang Rekrut Relawan Demokrasi Pemilu 2019 [Online]. Retrieved from <http://www.rmoljateng.com/read/2019/01/12/15886/KPU-Kota-Semarang-Rekrut-Relawan-Demokrasi-Pemilu-2019> [Accessed March 2, 2019]

suaramerdeka.com. (2019). Secercah Asa Pemilu Bagi Difabel [Online]. Retrieved from <https://www.suaramerdeka.com/news/baca/181527/secercah-asa-pemilu-bagi-difabel> [Accessed April 25, 2019]

voaindonesia.com. (2019). Pemilu 2019 Belum Ramah Bagi Difabel [Online]. Retrieved from <https://www.voaindonesia.com/a/pemilu-2019-belum-ramah-bagi-difabel/4885841.html> [Accessed April 25, 2019]