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Abstrak
The This study highlights the problem of differences in attitudes at the coalition party level in responding to the discourse of filling the remaining term of office of the Deputy Regent of Ende for the 2018-2023 period. This difference in attitude has led to divisions within the coalition parties, which are converging on two opposite poles, namely Golkar on the one hand and PDIP, Nasdem, Democrats, PKB, PKS, and KPPI on the other. In a long period from 2019 to the end of 2021, differences in attitudes have caught the public’s attention, especially the people of the Ende Regency. This study uses a descriptive qualitative method that aims to examine the motives behind the differences in the political attitudes of the coalition parties in determining the candidate for Deputy Regent of Ende and how the settlement mechanism is. The results of this study indicate that there are different interest motives from each pole of the coalition party. The pole of the Golkar party translates the position of Deputy Regent of Ende as a position that must be filled by its cadres, which is based on the rationality of political ethics. On the other hand, the six coalition parties also interpret the position of Deputy Regent of Ende as a shared right, which can be filled by all coalition party cadres. Meanwhile, the mechanism for resolving the polemic of differences in attitudes between the two coalition parties is carried out through a voting mechanism and a punishment/penalty mechanism. These two mechanisms are said to be strategies to discipline the behavior of political party elites who tend to maintain their political power and interests.
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INTRODUCTION

The 2018 Pilkada led the incumbent candidate pair Marselinus Y.W. Petu and H. Djafar H. Acmad (Package MJ) were re-elected as Regent and Deputy Regent of Ende for the 2018-2024 period. Package MJ won 61.90% of the vote while the other candidate pair, namely Drs. Don Bosco Wangge M.Si who was paired with Drs. Haji Munawar H. Achmad (WM Package) only reached 38.10% of the vote. In his nomination, the MJ Package was supported by seven coalitions of political parties namely Golkar, PDIP, NasDem, Democrats, PKB, PKS and PKPI. Two of the seven political parties, namely Golkar and PDIP, are the main supporting parties for the MJ Package. In general, the number of seats in the coalition of parties carrying the MJ Package reached 21 seats (80%) in the Ende Regency DPRD in 2014-2019. In detail, the number of seats for the seven political parties includes PKB with 3 seats, PDIP with 4 seats, Golkar with 4 seats, NasDem with 4 seats, PKS with 2 seats, Democrats with 3 seats and PKPI with 1 seat.

However, less than a month after taking office, in May 2019-Regent Marselinus Y.W. Petu died, so Deputy Regent H. Djafar H. Acmad was inaugurated as Regent on September 8, 2019. After H. Djafar H. Acmad was sworn in as Regent of Ende, the position of Deputy Regent of Ende experienced a vacancy. In the end, filling the vacancy for the Deputy Regent became an issue of discussion, especially at the level of the coalition party carrying the MJ Package.

Juridically, the mechanism and requirements for filling the vacant position of the Deputy Regent are regulated by Law Number 10 of 2016 concerning the Election of Governors, Regents, and Mayors. Article 176 paragraphs 1 and 2 states that in the event that the deputy regional head resigns due to death, his own request, or is dismissed, filling the vacancy for the deputy regional head is carried out through an election mechanism by the DPRD based on a
Proposal from a political party or a coalition of supporting political parties. Political parties or coalitions of political parties that carry 2 (two) names of candidates for deputy regional head to the DPRRD through the regional head to be elected in the plenary meeting of the DPRD.

Referring to the law, the process to fill the vacant seat of the Deputy Regent of Ende goes through three stages. The first stage at the joint level of the coalition parties that carried the Marsel-Djafar victory (Package MJ) at the 2018 Regional Head Election, which consisted of the Golkar, PDIP, Democrat, PKB, PKS, NasDem, and PKPI parties. The coalition parties then propose two (2) names of candidates for Deputy Regent of Ende to the Regent of Ende. The second stage at the government level, after the Regent of Ende received the proposal of two (2) names of candidates for Deputy Regent from a coalition of parties to be submitted to the DPRD Ende Regency. Next is the third stage, at the level of the Ende Regency DPRD. Two (2) names of candidates for Deputy Regent are chosen by the election committee in the DPRD, the results of which are then submitted back to the Regent to be submitted to the Minister of Home Affairs in order to process the legality of the SK and the inauguration.

However, in the process and stages of filling the vacant seat for the Deputy Regent of Ende, there have been differences in attitudes since the first stage between the coalition parties. This difference in attitude has led to divisions within the coalition parties, which are converging on two opposite poles, namely Golkar on the one hand and PDIP, Nasdem, Democrats, PKB, PKS, KPPI on the other. The poles of the Golkar party carry the names of two cadres, namely Herman Yosef Wadhi and dr. Dominic Mere. Meanwhile, the poles of the other six parties (PDIP, Democrat, PKB, PKS, NasDem, and PKPI) carry one name, namely Erikos Emanuel Rede from the Nasdem party, as a candidate for Deputy Regent. So that the total names of the candidates for deputy regent of Ende from the two poles of the coalition of coalition parties are three names, which of course exceeds the provisions of the law which requires a minimum of two names for the proposed coalition of parties. Differences in attitudes that cause divisions within the coalition party indicate a conflict within the coalition.

The conflict that was packaged in the form of differences in political attitudes between the two poles of a coalition of parties took place over a long period of time from 2019 to 2021 and quite caught the attention of the public, especially the people of Ende Regency. Mass media coverage was also carried out. Various opinions and public opinion stated that the difference in attitudes of the two poles of the coalition party coalition was the root of the problem of the protracted process of determining the candidate for Deputy Regent of Ende. So, Ende's public expectations are related to the importance of the deputy regional head being held hostage by the coalition party's conflict of interest.

Relying on the description above, this article examines the motives behind the conflict that are packaged in the form of differences in the political attitudes of the coalition parties in determining the candidate for Deputy Regent of Ende and how the resolution mechanism is. By correcting the topic, this article has an important meaning, especially in assessing the behavior of political party elites, as well as the position of political parties in front of the public.

**Coalition Theory**

Coalition is a practice that often occurs in everyday life, which is formed by individuals, groups or organizations, aiming to work together, coordinate collective agreements and determine their actions to achieve their common interests. The practice of coalitions is based on common values, interests, and goals and allows members to combine their resources to be stronger than when they were each acting alone. Coalitions are formed both in formal and informal contexts, in the short and long term, in the public or private sphere or even a combination of both, depending on the interests and in the context in which these interests are fought for (Leftwich & Wheeler, in Tamma & Nadir, 2015: 257-258).
In a political context, Elinor Ostrom defines that coalition is one of the main political mechanisms to address the problem of widespread collective action that defines most of the challenges or problems and is also the core of politics and political science concerns (Ostrom, 1997: 17). Thus, Brad Spangle defines the formulation of a political coalition as an alliance or partnership of political groups to achieve common goals or to engage in collective activities (Spangle, 2003: 18). Thus, it can be said that political coalitions are the culmination of various political forces to face a problem or challenge together and agreed upon common interests.

However, in the practice of coalitions, Michelangelo Vercesi's study explains that various political parties in a coalition will face two problems, namely: (a) forming and maintaining agreements with coalition partners, while (b) satisfying actual and potential voters (Vercesi, 2016:171). Muller and Storm (in Ambardi 2009:14) describe the dilemma of political parties in making decisions. Political party leaders often have to choose between conflicting goals, whether to remain committed to ideological policies or gain office. When the leader of a political party chooses the first option, there is a possibility of losing the second option, and vice versa (Muller and Storm, in Ambardi 2009:14).

Conflict in Coalition

Conflict usually occurs when two or more humans or human groups are absorbed into different dynamics and sometimes clash with each other in different dimensions, due to the need for limited resources, differences in status, goals, interests, or culture. Wahyudi (2021, 17) provides an understanding of social conflict as conflict, dispute, and hostility between parties caused by the failure of the accommodation process for a series of ideological differences, values, norms, other ideas, and interests in social life (Wahyudi, 2021, 17).

In the context of coalitions, according to Lili Romly, the tendency for conflict between political parties is caused by differences in the political interests of party elites in choosing coalitions. The differences that arise between coalition parties make the coalition balance precarious and make coalition relations uncertain, and allow conflicts and divisions to occur (Romly, 2017: 97-98). Furthermore, according to Stevenson, conflicts in political party coalitions arise because the choice of coalition formation tends to be incidental (adhoccocaltion) whose agreements are usually not made in a formal context (Stevenson in Tamma & Nadir, 2015: 261).

Adhoccocaltion coalitions are formed by an agreement between parties related to a certain agenda and generally do not last for a very long period of time. Usually this type of coalition is greatly influenced by differences in perspective, the level of adherence to coalition agreements and a limited agenda that is fought for. This coalition will survive as long as there are common views and agreement among members to continue together regarding the agenda being championed. Togetherness is generally only stated in a charter of agreement in which the binding force tends to be attached to the common interest of the members on a particular issue. This coalition ends immediately when there are differences of opinion or the interests to be fought for have been achieved (Tattersal in Tamma & Nadir, 2015: 261).

The tendency for conflict in coalitions is a necessity, because according to Lili Romly, political parties today are bound by political pragmatism driven by a high desire for power (Romly, 2017: 98). Therefore, conflicts in coalitions need to be minimized, with the choice of a coalition model of the type of support coalitions. This type of coalition is made in a mutual agreement as the direction of the coalition. In addition, this coalition shows a high intensity of communication among its members. Coalition members regularly hold meetings to maintain commitment and adherence to coalition goals (Tattersal in Tamma & Nadir, 2015: 261).

RESEARCH METHODE

The method used in this research is descriptive qualitative. Descriptive type through qualitative according to Sugiyono (2011: 24) that to understand complex social phenomena can only be described by qualitative research, by conducting interviews with
certain social groups, which are based on post-positivism philosophy which does not accept only one truth, which is generally used to examine an object under natural conditions, (the opposite is experiment). In testing the validity or truth of facts, it is done by triangulation (testing it by doing several combined methods). Then the analysis of qualitative data is usually inductive/qualitative and the results emphasize meaning rather than generalization.

In getting the final conclusion, the researcher will follow the scientific steps offered by Sugiyono above, starting from determining informants, interviewing and documenting techniques to analyzing and discussing them. Therefore, the final conclusion about the motives for the differences in the political attitudes of the coalition parties in determining the candidate for Deputy Regent of Ende is the result of interpretation (meaning) of the processed research data. Then to test the truth of the data, triangulation will be carried out or test the truth between the data from interviews and data obtained from observations, namely observations of the political dynamics that occur.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Motives for the Differences in Attitudes of the Coalition Parties

Filling the vacancy for the Deputy Regent of Ende became a public discussion and in particular by political elites in the coalition of parties supporting the MJ Package, after the death of Regent Marselinus Y.W. Petu in May 2019. Within the Golkar party, the discourse on filling the vacancy for the Deputy Regent of Ende was officially discussed at the Regional Deliberation (Musda) which took place in July 2019. The Musda recommended four Golkar Party cadres as candidates for Deputy Regent of Ende, including: Herman Yosef Wadhi, Megi Siga sare, Lori Gadi Djou and Mathilda Gaudusia Ilmoe. However, in January 2020, the Golkar party internally held discussions to reduce the number of candidates for Deputy Regent from four to one.

Finally, at the 2020 Golkar Party Regional Deliberation (Musda) (23 February 2020), the internal Golkar party agreed to recommend Herman Yosef Wadhi as a candidate for Deputy Regent of Ende. This recommendation is based on the collective decision of Golkar cadres that Herman Yosef Wadhi is a figure who has long raised Regency Golkar. However, along the way, the Golkar party added to the formation of candidates for Deputy Regent, so that it became two people, namely Herman Yosef Wadhi and Dominikus Minggu Mere. This change in formation was ratified in the decision of the Golkar DPP. Finally, on September 10, 2020, the Golkar Party DPP issued Decree No. B-387 GOLKAR/IX/2020 which approved the two names.

The internal Golkar party seems to want to launch its political strategy so that the two names for the candidate for Deputy Regent of Ende can be accommodated by a combination of other coalitions. The strategy of the Golkar party is based on the concept of “political fatsun” or “political ethics”, that is, the Golkar party as the main supporting party for the MJ Package and the late Regent Marselinus Y.W. Petu was a Golkar party cadre and chairman of the Golkar Ende DPD II at that time. On that basis, according to the Golkar party, the position of Deputy Regent of Ende is actually filled by Golkar party cadres, so the option to propose two names is a strategic choice. The internal Golkar party finally decided on the two names for the candidate for Deputy Regent of Ende, based on SK Number B-387 GOLKAR/IX/2020, in the hope that other coalition coalitions could accommodate them.

However, the other six parties namely PDIP, Nasdem, Democrat, PKB, PKS, KPPI actually rejected (disagreed with) the Golkar party’s proposal. Based on the narrative of the elite six coalition parties that the Golkar Party’s efforts to get the coalition to choose one of the two names of deputy regent candidates who are both Golkar cadres, is an attempt to deny the existence of the coalition carrying the MJ Package in the 2018 regional elections. For them, all parties have the same right to nominate candidates for Deputy Regent, because the six coalition parties also contributed to the victory of the MJ Package
in the 2018 Pilkada. As a form of rejection of Golkar, the six coalition parties proposed one of the Nasdem party cadres, Erikos Emanuel Rede, as a candidate for Deputy Regent of Ende.

The difference in attitude between the two poles of the coalition party coalition is because the two poles of the coalition party have different opinions and aspirations when translating the position of Deputy Regent of Ende. The pole of the Golkar party translates the position of Deputy Regent of Ende as a position that must be filled by its cadres, which is based on reasons of ethical rationality or political futsun. On the other hand, the six coalition parties interpret the position of Deputy Regent of Ende as a shared right, which can be filled by all coalition party cadres.

**Dynamics of Settling Differences in Attitudes in Determining Candidates for Deputy Regent of Ende**

In response to the polemic that has garnered much public attention, in the end, throughout March 2021, the coalition of parties held a meeting, even though the Golkar party was present in every meeting agenda and maintained its option that the two names for the candidate for Deputy Regent of Ende were entirely from Golkar. However, the six coalition parties carried out political maneuvers by designing the process flow for the meeting to determine the candidates for Deputy Regent with a voting mechanism. Politically, in the analogy of war, for example, by maneuvering the number of troops and weapons that are capable of winning the battle. Until then the coalition voting finally chose one of the two names proposed by the Golkar party pole (Dominggus Minggu Mere), who then together with Erikos Emanuel Rede (six parties proposed) as the candidate for Deputy Regent of Ende.

The Golkar Party is still resistant to its political options. Returning to the war analogy, the defensive maneuvers of the Golkar party were shown by a walk out attitude in a meeting with the coalition, on March 13, 2021. The coalition also launched an attack tactic, by "dropping" the name of the candidate for Deputy Regent proposed by the Golkar party (Dominggus Minggu Mere). So the coalition forum decided to recruit another additional candidate outside the Golkar party, who would be compared to Erikos Emanuel Rede (six parties proposed). Finally, Golkar's attitude softened. This is because the tactic of attacking the six coalition parties, by "aborting" the Golkar party's proposal, is read as a form of punishment/penalty against the political resistance of the Golkar party.

The Golkar Party is in a dilemma situation. As Muller and Storm (in Ambardi 2009:14) describe the dilemma situation of political parties in making decisions. Political party leaders often have to choose between conflicting goals, whether to remain committed to the original choice and its ideology or to abandon the choice. The first choice can lead to the loss of the second choice and vice versa. In this dilemmatic situation, party leaders and political parties may change their behavior (Muller and Storm, in Ambardi 2009:14).

The Golkar Party eventually changed its attitude. If you remain resistant to the initial decisions and attitudes, it can cause the party's obsession to be lost to fill the Deputy Regent's position or vice versa. Until then, in early July 2021, the candidate proposed by the Golkar Party (Herman Yoshep Wadhi) stated that he had withdrawn from the exchange for the nomination of Deputy Regent. With the resignation of Herman Yoshep Wadhi, the seven coalition parties agreed on Dominggus Minggu Mere (Golkar's proposal) and Erikos Emanuel Rede (six parties' proposal) as candidates for Deputy Regent of Ende, which was marked by the signing of the minutes of agreement and a letter of recommendation to the DPRD through the Regent of Ende. The agreement ended all polemics that occurred at the level of the coalition party coalition.
CONCLUSION

Reflecting on the findings of the research, it can be concluded that the motive behind the difference in attitudes at the joint coalition party level is because the two poles of the coalition party have different reasoning. These differences dragged the two poles of the coalition party into a conflict of interest, when each pole of the coalition party pushed its cadres to become candidates for deputy regent of Ende. Political obsession to occupy the position of Deputy Regent of Ende, then made party elites launch political tactics and tactics to defend their respective interests. Conflicts of interest, which are packaged in the form of differences in attitudes, are resolved through a voting mechanism and a punishment/punishment mechanism. Both mechanisms are used to discipline the behavior of political party elites who tend to maintain their political power and interests.

In addition, the findings of this study embody the fact that coalition party elites misunderstand the meaning of coalition as an alliance or partnership of political groups to achieve common goals or to engage in collective activities. Although differences in attitudes in politics are a necessity, the tendency of coalition parties is still trapped in political pragmatism driven by obsession and the will to power. This can be read through the substance of the differences in attitudes which tend to only focus on the figures of party cadres, not on the strategic essence of the position of the Deputy Regional Head in carrying out government and community development tasks in Ende Regency.
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