

Why does female voters prefer vote buying in local head elections?

Mery Yanti¹, Febrimarani Malinda², Indra Tamsyah³

^{1,2} Department of Sociology, Sriwijaya University

³ Department of International Relation, Sriwijaya University

Received: (1 November 2022)

Revised: (21 April 2023)

Published: (30 April 2023)

Abstract:

This study aims to analyze the determinants of vote buying preferences among female voters in local head elections. We identify eight independent variables (education, income, welfare, happiness, risk-taking attitude, place of residence, age, and marital status) as a predictor of Y. This research used the 5th Indonesian Family Life Survey (IFLS) data, which was collected by Rand Corporation, Ltd., during 2014 – 2015 in 13 (thirteen) provinces in Indonesia. The data were analyzed by logistic regression technique using STATA 15. The results showed that only four independent variables had a statistically significant relationship with Y: education level, risk-taking attitude, income level, and marital status. These four independent variables can explain Y by 2.48% significantly, $X^2(4) = 357.23, p < 0.01$. At the variable level, all variables have a negative relationship with Y, except for marital status (142%) which has the largest contribution to explain Y. The effect of income, risk-taking attitude, and education on Y respectively is 90.62%, 80.90%, 31.11%. The final model of logistic regression produces the characteristics of female voters who tend to choose candidates local head election due to money politics: education below senior high school/equivalent, married, poor, and not willing to take risks. The author recommends all governments at all levels continue the modernization process in all aspects of the social life of Indonesian citizens.

Keywords:

female voter; local head elections; IFLS; local head election; money politics

Introduction

In every general election, citizens are expected to go to the polling station voluntarily and choose election contestants (individuals, political parties, or pairs of candidates) based on trust. Voters will vote candidate that promote their political preferences. However, it is difficult to achieve this situation if the practice of vote buying still exist in every election. Money politics as a part of vote buying practice (Muhtadi 2019) would create a political system that is only controlled by the owners of capital. In the long term, this practice will undermine public confidence in the administration of elections, delegitimize political power, and damage the credibility of civil society to manage political power based on the concept of democracy. At the most

Korespondensi:

Department of Sociology, Jl. Lintas Palembang – Prabumulih, KM. 32, Indralaya, 30652
Email: mery.yanti@fisip.unsri.ac.id

extreme point, it may legitimize the military for taking over the national political leadership.

Votes buying in general elections is a common practice that can be found in Third World countries. Many studies have shown that this practice occurs in Mexico (Vilalta 2010), Thailand (Bowie 2008; Callahan 2005; Callahan and McCargo 1996), Kenya (Kramon 2016), Nicaragua (Gonzalez-Ocantos et al. 2012), Malaysia (Teh 2002; Weiss 2014), Argentina (Brusco, Nazareno, and Stokes 2004), Indonesia (Aspinall et al. 2017; Aspinall and Mada 2016; Fitriyah 2012, 2015), Philippines (Hicken et al., 2019; Nowak & Snyder, 1974), Nigeria (Bratton 2008), and Africa (Lemarchand 1972).

Due to differences in political systems, cultures, economic systems, and population characteristics, the causes and impacts of vote buying on socio-political life in each country are also different. In Indonesia, especially at the individual level, the practice of vote buying can be caused by low levels of income and education (Pradhanawati, Tawakkal, and Garner 2019; Tawakkal et al. 2017), lack of voter access to mass media, internet access, location of residence, low social awareness, social participation, social capital (Putra 2017; Siswanto et al. 2020), cultural values (Adhinata 2019; Yanti and Alamsyah 2018), religion, political efficacy, party identification, and political interests (Muhtadi 2019). In Latin America, as a comparison, voter confidence in the electoral system also influences vote buying (Carreras and İrepoğlu 2013).

Vote buying is a manifestation of dirty politics (Still and Dusi 2020) and commercialisation of electoral processes (Nwagwu et al. 2022). It harms electoral democracy, which is built on a foundation of mutual trust and sincerity, because it tend to subverts democratic development, hinders democratization efforts (Kennedy 2010), trigger political intimidation (Bratton 2008). The spreading of vote buying must be prevented because it undermining democracy. This effort can only be done if we have complete scientific knowledge about vote buying. This research is designed to contribute to building scientific knowledge about the phenomenon of vote buying in Indonesia. The analysis will focus on three independent variables that have not had a place in previous research on vote buying in Indonesia, even at the global level, namely: happiness, welfare, and risk-taking attitudes. The researcher also included several socio-demographic variables (age, gender, education level, location of residence, income level, and access to mass media) as control variables. Specifically, this research aims to analyze the effect of happiness levels, welfare levels, risk-taking attitudes, and socio-demographic variables on the probability of buying and selling votes among female voters in the local head elections.

In Indonesian context, previous studies has shown that female voting participation, implicitly, has been influenced by various factor such as money or gift (Darwin 2017; Putra 2017), woman issues (Mahsun, Elizabeth, and Mufrikhah 2021; Savirani et al. 2021), gender solidarity (Ichsan Kabullah and Fajri 2021), and gender affinity effect (Aspinall, White, and Savirani 2021). Specifically, Irtanto (2015) show that female voter preference has been influence by sociological, psychological, and rational

consideration. All these research does not discuss the influence of vote buying on female voting behavior. We only find one article that investigate vote buying and female voting behavior. This article show that education level, media access (including social media), and social participation has significant effect on vote buying practice among female voters (Siswanto et al. 2020). However, no previous research on female voting behavior investigates the relationship between happiness, welfare, and taking risk attituded as predictor of vote buying among female voters in Indonesia.

In classical voter behavior literature, sex or gender is one of the social identities that could influence voter preference. However, in classical literature, female voter preference is limited to the perception of female voters on the political participation of females as a voter in the political process, especially in general elections. This study also stresses how education level and residential have influenced female voter perception (Campbell et al. 1960). Now, female voting behavior is not only about participation rate or gender gap (Shorrocks 2016, 2018), but also related to various theme such as gender streotype (Bauer 2015; De Geus et al. 2021; Dolan 2010), female political representation (Caul 1999, 2001; Krook 2010; Reynolds 1999), gender affinity effect (Aspinall et al. 2021; Badas and Stauffer 2019).

In various countries, for example Malawi (Kao, Lust, and Rakner 2022), Turkey (Kaba 2022), sub-Saharan Africa and Latin America (Gallego, Guardado, and Wantchekon 2023), Indonesia (Allen 2015; Aspinall and Berenschot 2019), Philippines (Hicken et al. 2019), Malaysia (Weiss 2014), vote buying praxis also influence female voter behavior. Vote buying is one of clientelism manifestion in electoral process (Nichter 2014). Clientelism refers to a personal relationship between two people (dyadic) that have several attributed: patron-client, reciprocal, hierarchical, continuous, and which is formed with the aim of gaining political support, especially gaining voters' votes in elections (Hicken 2011). In patron-client relationship, individuals with higher socio-economic status (*patrons*) use their influence or resources to provide protection or benefits, or both, to individuals with lower socio-economic status (*clients*). At the same time, the client reciprocally provides support, assistance, service to the patron (Scott 1972).

According to the modernization approach, vote buying is a manifestation of political relations in traditional societies. Traditional society, said Scott (1972), is a society that puts forward primordial sentiments (e.g., religion, ethnicity, language) as the basis for building social organization and social conflict. Traditional societies have an extractive economy, low specialization and technological innovation, narrow markets, and do not have an expansive character. The social structure of traditional society has low internal solidarity, political power is not well organized so that it loses autonomy to control resources. Based on its cultural orientation, traditional societies tend to see social order as a given (Eisenstadt and Roniger 1980). On the other hand, modern society is a society that already has class consciousness which is built on the

basis of rationality, secularism, individualism, modern capitalism, and industrialization (Scott 1972; Valade 2015).

Because vote buying is a practice of traditional community, traditional society must be transformed into a modern society. In the political sector, the modernization process includes the rationalization of power, differentiation of political functions, mass participation, and capacity strengthening coupled with economic development to facilitate structural and cultural changes that strengthen individual autonomy and democracy (Schmidt 2015). In this process, the function of education becomes very important to equip citizens with the values, knowledge, and skills needed by the modern society system. Many previous empirical researches have shown that higher education is negatively associated with the practice of vote buying (Pradhanawati et al. 2019, 2019). Starting from this narrative, *this study expects that the higher the education level of female voters, the lower the tendency to have vote buying as political preference* (Hypothesis 1/H1).

If referring to the modernization project in Indonesia which began in the colonial era, the modernization process carried out through the Ethical Policy gave birth to a new social class with socio-economic status, income level, and new social awareness among the Indonesian population at that time (Ricklefs 1981). In other words, education allows a person to get a higher level of income and creates new demands for the status quo. Not surprisingly, then, the influence of income level seems to be in line with the level of education. In other words, economically poor voters are more likely to sell their votes than those who are not poor (Brusco et al. 2004). This narrative is the basis for the researcher to formulate the second hypothesis (H2): *income level is negatively associated with the vote buying preference among female voters in local elections in Indonesia*.

The goal of modernization is the welfare and happiness of citizens. Welfare refers to a situation where material needs are met. His opposite is poverty (Spicker 2000). While happiness is a situation that describes the life of a person who is in a pleasant situation and in harmony with his wishes (Veenhoven 2015). Achievement of welfare and happiness at a certain level indicates a process of modernization. This means that the more prosperous and happy citizens are, the less likely it is to have vote buying as political preference. However, the contribution of happiness to electoral political participation is still under debate. Akhmetkarimov (2008) showed that subjective perceptions of living conditions (*happiness*) had no effect on election results. Dolan et al., (2008) concluded that happiness affects a person's intention to vote, but has no effect on election results. On the other hand, Ward (2020) recent research shows that happiness is a very strong predictor of election outcome.

Of course, that research did not come from the election process which was colored by money politics like in Indonesia. Somewhat like the situation in Indonesia are countries in Latin America. In Latin America, Weitz-Shapiro & Winters (2011) showed a positive correlation between voting and happiness. But happiness is the

cause of choosing, not the effect of choosing. That is, the happier a person is, the more likely he is to vote. The findings of Weitz-Shapiro & Winters (2011) become the basis for researchers to formulate the 3rd and 4th hypotheses as follows: (a) *the level of voter welfare is negatively associated with the practice of buying and selling votes* (H3); (b) *the level of happiness has a negative relationship with the practice of buying and selling votes* (H4).

As described above, modernization is built on the foundations of rationality, secularism, and individualism which gave birth to modern humans who can understand various natural and social phenomena based on scientific knowledge that has developed since the Enlightenment. Using their scientific knowledge, modern humans can explore the universe and various social processes that occur in society. At this point, modernization gave birth to people who dare to take risks. In the context of this research, both candidates and voters know that vote buying is full of risks action. From the candidate's point of view, voting for ballots is confidential, so the possibility of voters betraying is very high. From the voters' point of view, the practice of vote buying is illegal so there is a risk of being imprisoned. This situation illustrates that the practice of vote buying is an arena full of various risks. Only those with a risk-taking attitude can interact in this arena. This situation became the basis for the researcher to formulate the 5th hypothesis: *the attitude of risk taking is positively associated with the practice of vote buying preference among female voters in the local elections* (H5).

This study also includes the variables of residence, age, and marital status of female voters which have also been identified by previous researchers as factors that influence the practice of vote buying among voters (Hicken, 2007). Starting from this description, the researcher formulates the 6th, 7th, and 8th hypotheses as follows: (a) *rural area are positively associated with the vote buying preference* (H6); (b) *old female voters have a positive association with the vote buying preference* (H7); (c) *married female voters are positively associated with the vote buying preference* (H8).

Methods

This study uses a quantitative approach. The research data comes from a longitudinal survey, the 5th Indonesian Family Life Survey (IFLS) in 2015, organized by the RAND Corporation and the Survey Meter. IFLS 5 is a continuation of the activities of IFLS 1 (1993), IFLS 2 (1997), IFLS 3 (2000) and IFLS 4 (2007). IFLS 5 involved 16,204 households and 50,418 individuals spread across 13 provinces: four provinces in Sumatra (North Sumatra, West Sumatra, South Sumatra, and Lampung), five provinces in Java (DKI Jakarta, West Java, Central Java, DI Yogyakarta, East Java), four provinces representing other islands (Bali, West Nusa Tenggara, South Kalimantan, and South Sulawesi). The research sample was selected using a stratified random sampling technique referring to the 1993 SUSENAS sampling frame (Strauss, Witoelar, and Sikoki 2016). The provinces in Java and Sumatra Island receive a larger allocation of respondents compared to other islands in Indonesia because they have a larger population. However, the IFLS 5 sample has not accommodated the population in

several new provinces, such as Gorontalo Province, North Maluku Province, and North Kalimantan Province. The only province that was created as a sample province was West Papua Province. Even so, the distribution of this sample indicates that the IFLS 5 data is quite representative to describe the condition of Indonesia.

Respondent of IFLS 5 has diverse education level, ranging from kindergarten to doctoral program (S3). However, most respondents had elementary school education (9,846 respondents or 30.29%), senior high school (5,321 respondents or 16.37%), junior high school (5,094 respondents or 15.67%), vocational high school (4,531 respondents or 13.94%), undergraduate degree (3,183 respondents or 9.79%), diploma 1/2/3 (1,223 respondents or 3.76%), and Islamic junior high school/*madrasah tsanawiyah* (1,097 respondents or 3.37%).

The average age of the respondents was 42.18 years with a standard deviation of 15.32 and a variance of 234.96. This means that IFLS 5 respondents are in their productive age and the age data of respondents do not deviate too much from the average value. The lowest age for IFLS 5 respondents is 15 years, while the highest age is 103 years. The average monthly income of respondents reached IDR10 million, and the highest income reached IDR100 million with a standard deviation or standard deviation of IDR15 million.

Most IFLS 5 respondents are married (83.30%). Unmarried respondents reached 7.97%. The rest are respondents who are separated (0.30%), divorced (1.54%), and widowed/ widowed (6.89%). The separated category refers to married couples who are still married but do not live together due to various factors, such as migrant workers seasonal workers, or husband/wife work in different cities, and other factors.

Since the dependent variable (Y) is binary (1 and 0), this study used binary logistic regression (Hosmer, Lemeshow, and Sturdivant 2013). The estimation of logistic regression model parameters used the method of maximum likelihood. Bivariate statistical analysis used Pearson correlation (nominal variable). The regression model goes through a series of tests: the likelihood ratio test, the Wald test, and the goodness fit of the model using the Hosmer-Lemeshow method, and the logit model coefficient interpreted using the odds ratio (OR). The summary of variables of this study are shown in Table 1.

Table 1. Research variable

Variable	Operationalization
<i>Dependent variable</i>	
Vote buying preference among female voters (Y)	Vote buying preference among female voters (Y) was extracted from option (i) "gift/transport money", the question (PM26): "what factors do you consider in electing a regent/mayor" that has two possible answers: Yes (1) and No (3). Respondent's answer was recoded into binary

	variable: 1 = vote buying preference (recoded from Yes/1); 0 = other (recoded from No/3).
<i>Independent variable</i>	
Education level	1 = > senior high school; 0 = < other
Income level	1 = rich; 0 = other
Welfare level	1 = welfare; 0 = other
Level of happiness	1 = happy; 0 = other
Taking risk attituded	Taking risk attituded was extracted from the question (SI01) as follow: "Suppose you are offered two ways to earn some money. With option 1, you are guaranteed Rp800 thousand per month. With option 2, you have an equal chance of either the same income, Rp800 thousand per month, or, if you are lucky, Rp 1.6 million per month, which is more. Which option will you choose?". This question has three possible questions: (1) Rp800 thousand per month; (2) Rp1.6 million or Rp 800 thousand per month; and (8) Don't know". We dropped respondent that choose 8 and recoded answer 1 as 0 (other) and 2 as 1 (dare to taking risk).
Residence location	1 = rural area; 0 = other
Age	1 = >40 years old/old; 0 = <40 years old/young
Marital status	1 = married; 0 = other

Setting

Indonesia is the largest archipelagic country in the world because it has 17,508 islands with a total area of 1,904,569 km². Astronomically, Indonesia is located between 60°04'30" north latitude and 110°00'36" south latitude and between 940°58'21" to 141°01'10" east longitude. The Indonesian archipelago is located between the continents of Asia and the continents of Australia and is flanked by the Pacific Ocean and the Indian Ocean. In 2020, the total population of Indonesia is 270 million people and spread over 32 provinces or 309 regencies/cities or 4,242 sub-districts, or 46,747 villages/urban village. The population growth rate reached 1.25%. Of this total population, the number of poor people in 2020 reach 26.4 million people or 9.8%. Indonesia has a Human Development Index (HDI) score of 71.9 percent. The labor force participation rate is 67.8% and the open unemployment rate is 7.1% (BPS, 2021).

On December 8, 2020, the number of voters in Indonesia reached 100,359,152 people. Male voters reached 50,164,426, while female voters reached 50,194,726 voters (KPU RI 2021). There are 30,300 female voters more than male voters. Because this

difference is not too big, male voters and female voters both have the same big chance to influence the election results. The problem is, the large number of female voters must deal with a small number of female political candidates, both in the legislative and regional head elections. In the 2019 general election, there were 3,194 female candidates or had fulfilled the 30% quota for female candidates as stipulated in the election law. This number increased by 50% from the 2014 General Election of 2,467 people. Of this number, the elected female candidates reached 162 people (5.07%). This figure is down 0.24% percent when compared to the 2014 General Election which placed 131 (5.31%) female politicians in the legislature (Saputra 2019). In the 2020 Local Head Election, there are 1,432 candidates competing in Indonesia. Of this total, the proportion of female candidates reached 159 (11%).

Even though all political parties have complied with the provisions regarding the representation of women in the list of permanent candidates and open access for women candidates to compete in the local head elections, the electability rate of women candidates in Indonesia is still low. This phenomenon is influenced by very complex and multi-dimensional factors. In the context of this study, the subjective well-being perception factor, which is represented by the happiness variable and the welfare variable, is important because Indonesia has just detached from the 1998 Economic Crisis and starting adopted multi-party system in the 1999 General Election.

The 2014-2015 period was also marked by a change in the political regime in Indonesia from President Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono to President Joko Widodo who won the 2014 Presidential Election paired with Jusuf Kalla. When IFLS 5 fieldwork for data collection was carried out in 2014, economic growth has slow down due to 2014 as a political year that make policy coordination more problematic (Armstrong and Rahardja 2014). Although Jokowi has a strong commitment to increasing economic growth and the quality of life of citizens, these two agendas are not easy to implement due to various economic and political factors (Aswicahyono and Hill 2014). Jokowi must cover three development sectors that President Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono tends to ignore, namely: economic reform, infrastructure investment, and eradicating corruption (Howes and Davies 2014).

Bivariate and multivariate analysis

Bivariate analysis was carried out using cross tabulation technique. At this stage, following the suggestion of Hosmer et al., (2013), only independent variables having $p < 0.25$ will be included in the multivariate analysis. The result of bivariate analysis shows that among eight independent variables identified as contributors to Y, only five independent variables can be included in the multivariate analysis. The five independent variables are: education level, risk-taking attitude, marital status, income level, and location of residence. The other three variables: the level of welfare, age, and the level of happiness, cannot be included in the multivariate analysis because they have a $p > 0.25$. The independent variables will be entered into the logistic regression

formula according to the order of their calculated X^2 scores. The independent variable that has the most X^2 score will be included first, followed by the independent variable that has the X^2 score in the second position, third position, and so on until it is finished.

The final logistic regression model produced by this study contains four independent variables: education level, risk-taking attitude, income level, and marital status. The final model did not include location of residence because it did not significantly affect Y. These four independent variables were able to significantly explain Y by 2.48%, $X^2(4) = 357.23$, $p < 0.01$. At the variable level, all variables have a negative relationship with Y, except for marital status (142%) which has the largest contribution to explain Y. The effect of income, risk-taking attitude, and education on Y respectively is 90.62%, 80.90%, 31.11%.

This final logistic regression model produces the characteristics of female voters who tend to choose local head election candidates due to money politics: educated < senior high school/ equivalent, married, poor, and not willing to take risks. The summary of the final logistic regression model is shown in Table 5. The results of the goodness-of-fit test using the Hosmer-Lemeshow test show that the final model is in line with the field data, $p > 0.10$. This is indicated by $X^2(21.03)$ which is smaller than X^2 table (38.89) at a significance level of 0.05 and a degree of freedom of 26.

Table 2. Summary of multivariate analysis

Independent variable (X)	Dependent variable
	Vote buying preferences (Y)
Level of education	-1.167*** (0.0984)
Taking risk attitude	-0.212*** (0.0562)
Level of income	-0.0985* (0.0570)
Marital status	0.354** (0.158)
Constant	-0.277* (0.166)
Observations	5,367

Standard errors in parentheses

*** $p < 0.01$, ** $p < 0.05$, * $p < 0.1$

Level of education has a negative relationship with Y. Because it contains two categories (1 = >senior high school/ equivalent and 0 = other), the higher the female

voters education level, the lower the probability of female voter to choose local head election candidate due to vote buying preference. This finding became the basis for the researcher to accept hypothesis 1 (H1). This finding also strengthens previous research which showed a negative relationship between education level and vote buying (Pradhanawati et al. 2019; Tawakkal et al. 2017). This finding also confirms the important role of formal educational institutions as a mechanism for transferring values, knowledge, and skills needed by voters to become rational voters.

Risk-taking attitude also has a negative *Y* relationship. Because it contains two categories (1 = dare to take risks and 0 = other), it means that female voter who dare to take risks tend to have 80.27% probability for not choosing a candidate due to vote buying preference. This finding is the basis for the researcher to reject Hypothesis 5 (H5): *the attitude of risk taking is positively associated with the practice of vote buying preference among female voters in the local elections.*

This finding is very interesting to discuss. Because, at first, the researcher suspected that because the practice of money politics is an arena full of risks, both for candidates and for voters, only voters who dare to take risks tend to be influenced by money politics. However, the findings of this research refute this hypothesis. Even though the practice of vote buying in the local head election is a risk behaviour, female voters who are willing to take risks are less likely to vote for candidates due to vote buying preference. According to the researcher's interpretation, the attitude of taking risk is part of the attributes of modern voter rationality. Risk-taking female voters know that the practice of money politics is a risky act. Although they dare to take risks, they do not dare to take the risk of accepting money politics because their rationality is not enough to convince them to accept money politics. It is possible that female voters know that money politics is irrational because the risks (e.g., imprisonment) received are not commensurate with the benefits received (e.g., increased daily liquidity).

The implication is that the voters involved in the practice of money politics are female voters who do not dare to take risks. This situation was created because the practice of money politics as a risky arena only exists on paper. Law enforcement is not carried out optimally so that it does not cause a deterrent effect for the parties involved in the practice of money politics. On the other hand, political practice occurs on a massive scale so that it is considered a part of contemporary political culture. Because money politics is considered a new normal in the era of direct regional head elections, election organizers, contestants, and voters alike consider the practice of money politics as an inseparable part of the electoral democratic process at the regional level.

Income level has a negative relationship with *Y*. Since it consists of two categories (1 = rich and 0 = poor), wealthy female voters tend to have an 89.68 percent chance of not choosing local head elections candidates due to vote buying preference. This finding is the basis for the researcher to accept the second hypothesis (H2): *income level is negatively associated with the vote buying preference among female voters in local elections in Indonesia.* This finding corroborates the findings of Brusco et al.,

(2004) in Argentina which shows that economically poor voters are more likely to sell their votes than those who are not poor.

Marital status has a significant positive relationship with Y. Since it consists of two categories (1 = married and 0 = not married), married female voters have a 114% chance of choosing a candidate due to money politics. This finding became the basis for the researcher to accept the 8th hypothesis (H8): *married female voters are positively associated with the vote buying preference*. Marital status is a variable that cannot be manipulated. Since married women are more influenced by money politics than unmarried women, it is impossible for the government to change the status of the marriage. What can be done is to intervene in income level which acts as a cofounder or modification effect for marital status and is more likely to be manipulated. This means that if the income level of married women voters improves, then the chances of them being influenced by money politics will decrease.

The final logistic regression model produced by this study did not include location of residence, welfare level, age, and happiness level because it did not significantly affect Y. This finding became the basis for researchers to reject H3, H4, H6 and H7. The researcher's findings regarding age and location of residence reject the arguments of previous researchers who confirmed both variables as contributors to money politics (Hicken, 2007). Meanwhile, the researchers' findings on happiness reject the arguments of Weitz-Shapiro & Winters (2011) and Ward (2020) which indicate a statistical relationship between happiness and electoral participation. At the same time, although the dynamics and quality of electoral democracy are different, the findings of this study strengthen the arguments of Akhmetkarimov (2008) and Dolan et al., (2008) regarding the absence of a statistical relationship between happiness and electoral participation.

Although it was successful in showing empirically the statistical relationship of several independent variables with Y, the researcher realized that the data used by the researcher was outdated. If calculated from 2021, this research data is already six years old when calculated when the IFLS data was released by Rand Corporations, Ltd., in 2015. Because local politics in Indonesia is very dynamic, at least it has the potential to change every five years, the results of this study cannot become the basis for policy making to reduce the practices of money politics in local elections in Indonesia. However, the results of this study can still be used as a basis for academic debate among researchers who have an interest in voter behaviour in Indonesia. To the best of the researcher's knowledge, voter behaviour researchers in Indonesia have not paid special attention to the contribution of subjective well-being as a predictor to voter behaviour and election outcomes.

The researcher is also aware that there are many independent variables that have the potential to affect Y, both at the individual level (e.g., type of employment), family level (e.g., number of family members), and community level (e.g., access to the internet), but were not included in the logistic regression model. We ignore these variables to avoid multicollinearity and social phenomenon is very complex to

explain by one empirical research. We leave out a few variables for other researchers to contribute to the debate about female voting behaviour in Indonesia.

Conclusion

Of the eight independent variables that are expected to influence the vote buying preferences of female voters in local head election, only four independent variables (education level, risk-taking attituded, income level, and marital status) have a statistical relationship significantly with Y. These four independent variables were able to significantly explain Y by 2.48%, $X^2(4) = 357.23, p < 0.01$. At the variable level, all variables have a negative relationship with Y, except for X_8 (142%) which has the largest contribution to explain Y. The effect of income level, taking risk attituded, and education level on Y respectively is 90.62%, 80.90%, 31.11%. This final logistic regression model produces the characteristics of female voters who tend to choose local head election candidates due to vote buying preference: educated <senior high school/ equivalent, married, poor, and not willing to take risks. This empirical finding stresses that modernization variable, especially education, welfare, and taking-risk, affects vote buying. This finding is a message for the policymaker to continue the modernization project in Indonesia. Explicitly, this study recommends the central government and local governments (provincial/ district/ city) to increase access to education (formal, informal, and non-formal) for female voters at all levels of education, both general education (managed by the Ministry of Education, Culture, Research, and Technology) and religious education (managed by the Ministry of Religion of the Republic of Indonesia). Furthermore, this research encourages the government (central/ provincial/ district/ city) to prioritize the female population as a beneficiary of various economic empowerment programs funded by the public budget (APBN or Central Government Budget, and APBD or Regional Government Budget).

Acknowledgement

Many thank to RAND Corporation who give access IFLS data to author freely. We also thank you for the journal reviewer who give valuable comments.

Funding

This research is fully funded by the Rector of Sriwijaya University based on decree number: 0007/UN9/SK/LP2M.PT/2021, 27 April 2021

References

- Adhinata, B. (2019). Vote Buying Dan Perilaku Pemilih Pemula: Kasus Pemilihan Gubernur Bali 2018 Di Tabanan. *Politika: Jurnal Ilmu Politik* 10(2):163–78. doi: 10.14710/politika.10.2.2019.163-178.

- Akhmetkarimov, B. (2008). Revisiting the Profile of the American Voter in the Context of Declining Turnout. *Alternatives: Truskish Journal of International Relations* 7(2):III-33.
- Allen, N. W. (2015). Clientelism and the Personal Vote in Indonesia. *Electoral Studies* 37:73-85. doi: 10.1016/j.electstud.2014.10.005.
- Armstrong, Shiro, and Rahardja. (2014). Survey of Recent Developments. *Bulletin of Indonesian Economic Studies* 50(1):3-28. doi: 10.1080/00074918.2014.896235.
- Aspinall, Edward, and Berenschot. (2019). *Democracy for Sale: Elections, Clientelism, and the State in Indonesia*. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press.
- Aspinall, E., et al.. (2019). *Electoral Dynamics in the Philippines: Money Politics, Patronage and Clientelism at the Grassroots*. NUS Press Pte Ltd.
- Aspinall, Edward, and Sukmajati. (2016). *Electoral Dynamics in Indonesia: Money Politics, Patronage, and Clientelism at the Grassroots*. Singaore: NUS Press.
- Aspinall, E., et al. (2017). Vote Buying in Indonesia: Candidate Strategies, Market Logic and Effectiveness. *Journal of East Asian Studies* 17(1):1-27. doi: 10.1017/jea.2016.31.
- Aspinall, E., et al. (2021). Women's Political Representation in Indonesia: Who Wins and How? *Journal of Current Southeast Asian Affairs* 40(1):3-27. doi: 10.1177/1868103421989720.
- Aswicahyono, Haryo, and Hill, H. (2014). Survey of Recent Developments. *Bulletin of Indonesian Economic Studies* 50(3):319-46. doi: 10.1080/00074918.2014.980374.
- Badan Pusat Statistik (BPS). 2021. *Statistik Indonesia 2021*. BPS Statistic Indonesia.
- Badas, Alex, and Stauffer. (2019). Voting for Women in Nonpartisan and Partisan Elections. *Electoral Studies* 57:245-55. doi: 10.1016/j.electstud.2018.10.004.
- Bauer, N. M. (2015). Emotional, Sensitive, and Unfit for Office? Gender Stereotype Activation and Support Female Candidates: Emotional, Sensitive, and Unfit for Office? *Political Psychology* 36(6):691-708. doi: 10.1111/pops.12186.
- Bowie, K. A. (2008). Vote Buying and Village Outrage in an Election in Northern Thailand: Recent Legal Reforms in Historical Context. *Journal of Asian Studies* 67(2):469-511. doi: 10.1017/S0021911808000673.
- Bratton, M. (2008). Vote Buying and Violence in Nigerian Election Campaigns. *Electoral Studies* 27(4):621-32. doi: 10.1016/j.electstud.2008.04.013.
- Brusco, et al.. (2004). Vote Buying in Argentina. *Latin American Research Review* 39(2):66-88. doi: 10.1353/lar.2004.0022.
- Callahan, W. A. (2005). The Discourse of Vote Buying and Political Reform in Thailand. *Pacific Affairs* 78(1):95-113.
- Callahan, W. A., and Duncan McCargo. (1996). Vote-Buying in Thailand's Northeast: The July 1995 General Election. *Asian Survey* 36(4):376-92.
- Campbell, et al.(1960). *The American Voter*. Illinois, USA: Chicago University Press.
- Carreras, M., et al. (2013). Trust in Elections, Vote Buying, and Turnout in Latin America. *Electoral Studies* 32(4):609-19. doi: 10.1016/j.electstud.2013.07.012.
- Caul, M. (1999). Women's Representation in Parliament: The Role of Political Parties. *Party Politics* 5(1):79-98. doi: 10.1177/1354068899005001005.

- Caul, M. (2001). Political Parties and the Adoption of Candidate Gender Quotas: A Cross-National Analysis. *The Journal of Politics* 63(4):1214–29. doi: 10.1111/0022-3816.00107.
- Darwin, R.L. (2017). The Power of Female Brokers: Local Elections in North Aceh. *Contemporary Southeast Asia* 39(3):532–51.
- De Geus, R. A., et all. (2021). Do Voters Judge the Performance of Female and Male Politicians Differently? Experimental Evidence from the United States and Australia. *Political Research Quarterly* 74(2):302–16. doi: 10.1177/1065912920906193.
- Dolan, K. (2010). The Impact of Gender Stereotyped Evaluations on Support for Women Candidates. *Political Behavior* 32(1):69–88. doi: 10.1007/s11109-009-9090-4.
- Dolan, P., and Nattavudh, P. (2008). *Electing Happiness: Does Happiness Affect Voting and Do Elections Affect Happiness?* 2008/30. York, UK.
- Eisenstadt, S. N., and Louis Roniger. (1980). Patron—Client Relations as a Model of Structuring Social Exchange. *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 22(1):42–77. doi: 10.1017/S0010417500009154.
- Fitriyah. (2012). Fenomena Politik Uang Dalam Pilkada. *Politika: Jurnal Ilmu Politik* 3(1). doi: 10.14710/politika.3.1.2012.5-14.
- Fitriyah. (2015). Cara Kerja Politik Uang (Studi Kasus Pilkada Dan Pilkadaes Di Kabupaten Pati). *Politika: Jurnal Ilmu Politik* 6(2):101–11. doi: 10.14710/politika.6.2.2015.101-111.
- Gallego, J., et all. (2023). Do Gifts Buy Votes? Evidence from Sub-Saharan Africa and Latin America. *World Development* 162:106125. doi: 10.1016/j.worlddev.2022.106125.
- Gonzalez, O.E., et all. (2012). Vote Buying and Social Desirability Bias: Experimental Evidence from Nicaragua. *American Journal of Political Science* 56(1):202–17. doi: 10.1111/j.1540-5907.2011.00540.x.
- Hicken, A. (2011). Clientelism. *Annual Review of Political Science* 14(1):289–310. doi: 10.1146/annurev.polisci.031908.220508.
- Hicken, A. D. (2007). How Do Rules and Institutions Encourage Vote Buying. Pp. 47- in *Elections for Sale: The causes and consequences of vote buying*, edited by F. C. Schaffer. Colorado, USA: Lynne Rienner Publisher, Inc.
- Hosmer., et all. (2013). *Applied Logistic Regression*. Massachusetts, USA: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Howes, S., and Robin, S. (2014). Survey of Recent Developments. *Bulletin of Indonesian Economic Studies* 50(2):157–83. doi: 10.1080/00074918.2014.938403.
- Kabullah, M.I., and Fajri. (2021). Neo-Ibuism in Indonesian Politics: Election Campaigns of Wives of Regional Heads in West Sumatra in 2019. *Journal of Current Southeast Asian Affairs* 40(1):136–55. doi: 10.1177/1868103421989069.
- Irtanto. (2015). Perilaku Politik Pemilih Perempuan Di Kota Mojokerto Pada Pemilu 2014. *Jurnal Penelitian Komunikasi* 18(2):115–28. doi: 10.20422/jpk.v18i2.41.
- Kaba, M. (2022). Who Buys Vote-Buying? How, How Much, and at What Cost? *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization* 193:98–124. doi: 10.1016/j.jebo.2021.11.004.

- Kao, K., et al. (2022). Vote-Buying, Anti-Corruption Campaigns, and Identity in African Elections. *World Development* 160:106064. doi: 10.1016/j.worlddev.2022.106064.
- KPU RI. (2021). "Daftar Pemilih Tetap (DPT)."
- Kramon, E. (2016). Where Is Vote Buying Effective? Evidence from a List Experiment in Kenya. *Electoral Studies* 44:397–408. doi: 10.1016/j.electstud.2016.09.006.
- Krook, M. L. (2010). Studying Political Representation: A Comparative-Gendered Approach. *Perspectives on Politics* 8(1):233–40. doi: 10.1017/S1537592709992817.
- Lemarchand, R. (1972). Political Clientelism and Ethnicity in Tropical Africa: Competing Solidarities in Nation-Building. *American Political Science Review* 66(1):68–90. doi: 10.2307/1959279.
- Mahsun., et al. (2021). Female Candidates, Islamic Women's Organisations, and Clientelism in the 2019 Indonesian Elections. *Journal of Current Southeast Asian Affairs* 40(1):73–92. doi: 10.1177/1868103420988729.
- Muhtadi, B. (2019). *Vote Buying in Indonesia: The Mechanics of Electoral Bribery*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Nichter, S. (2014). Conceptualizing Vote Buying. *Electoral Studies* 35:315–27. doi: 10.1016/j.electstud.2014.02.008.
- Nowak, T. C., and Kay A. S. (1974). Clientelist Politics in the Philippines: Integration or Instability? *American Political Science Review* 68(3):1147–70. doi: 10.2307/1959153.
- Pradhanawati, A., and Garner. (2019). "Voting Their Conscience: Poverty, Education, Social Pressure and Vote Buying in Indonesia. *Journal of East Asian Studies* 19(1):19–38. doi: 10.1017/jea.2018.27.
- Putra, H. (2017). Determinants of Vote Buying in Local Head Election in Indonesia. *Jurnal Bina Praja* 9(2):205–18. doi: 10.21787/jbp.09.2017.205-218.
- Reynolds, A. (1999). Women in the Legislatures and Executives of the World: Knocking at the Highest Glass Ceiling. *World Politics* 51(4):547–72. doi: 10.1017/S0043887100009254.
- Ricklefs, M. C. (1981). *A History of Modern Indonesia: C. 1300 to Present*. The Macmillan Press, Ltd.
- Saputra, F. L. A. (2019). "Partisipasi Politik Perempuan Naik." *Www.Kompas.Com*, November 11.
- Savirani, A., et al. (2021). Floating Liberals: Female Politicians, Progressive Politics, and PSI in the 2019 Indonesian Election. *Journal of Current Southeast Asian Affairs* 40(1):116–35. doi: 10.1177/1868103421989084.
- Schmidt, G. (2015). Modernization. Pp. 697–99 in *International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences*. Elsevier.
- Scott, J.C. (1972). Patron-Client Politics and Political Change in Southeast Asia. *American Political Science Review* 66(1):91–113. doi: 10.2307/1959280.
- Shorrocks R. (2016). Modernisation and Government Socialisation: Considering Explanations for Gender Differences in Cohort Trends in British Voting Behaviour. *Electoral Studies* 42:237–48. doi: 10.1016/j.electstud.2016.03.004.

- Shorrocks, R. 2018. "Cohort Change in Political Gender Gaps in Europe and Canada: The Role of Modernization." *Politics & Society* 00(0):1–41. doi: 10.1177/0032329217751688.
- Siswanto, J., et all. 2020. "Media Access, Collective Efficacy, and Vote Buying among Female Voters during Local Leader Elections in Indonesia." *International Journal of Scientific & Technology Research* 09(01):3221–27.
- Spicker, P. (2000). *The Welfare State: A General Theory*. SAGE Publication.
- Strauss, J., Witoelar, F., and Sikoki, S. (2016). *The Fifth Wave of the Indonesia Family Life Survey: Overview and Field Report (IFLS 5)*. 1143/1-NIA/NICHD. California, USA: RAND Corporation. doi: 10.7249/WR1143.1.
- Tawakkal, G.T.I., et all. (2017). Consistency and Vote Buying: Income, Education, and Attitudes about Vote Buying in Indonesia. *Journal of East Asian Studies* 17(3):313–29. doi: 10.1017/jea.2017.15.
- Teh, Y. K. (2002). Money Politics in Malaysia. *Journal of Contemporary Asia* 32(3):338–45. doi: 10.1080/00472330280000231.
- Valade, B. (2015). Modernity. Pp. 682–86 in *International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences*. Elsevier.
- Veenhoven, R. (2015). Happiness: History of the Concept. Pp. 521–25 in *International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences*. Elsevier.
- Vilalta, C. (2010). Vote-Buying Crime Reports in Mexico: Magnitude and Correlates. *Crime, Law and Social Change* 54(5):325–37. doi: 10.1007/s10611-010-9260-7.
- Ward, G. (2020). Happiness and Voting: Evidence from Four Decades of Elections in Europe. *American Journal of Political Science* 64(3):504–18. doi: 10.1111/ajps.12492.
- Weiss, M. L. (2014). *Electoral Dynamics in Malaysia: Findings from the Grassroots*. edited by M. L. Weiss. Strategic Information and Research Development Centre.
- Weitz, S. R., and Matthew S. Winters. (2011). The Link between Voting and Life Satisfaction in Latin America. *Latin American Politics and Society* 53(4):101–26. doi: 10.1111/j.1548-2456.2011.00135.x.
- Yanti, M., and Alamsyah. (2018). How Are They Elected? Vote Buying And General Election In Ogan Ilir District, South Sumatera Province. *ARISTO* 6(2):354–72. doi: 10.24269/ars.v6i2.1029.

About the authors

Mery Yanti is a senior lecturer at Department of Sociology, Faculty of Political and Social Science, Sriwijaya University, Palembang, Indonesia.

Febrimarani Malinda is a junior lecturer at Department of Sociology, Faculty of Political and Social Science, Sriwijaya University, Palembang, Indonesia.

Indra Tamsyah is a junior lecturer at Department of International Relation, Faculty of Political and Social Science, Sriwijaya University, Palembang, Indonesia.