**Politik Indonesia: Indonesian Political Science Review, 6 (1), April 2021, pp. 53-72**
ISSN 2477-8060 (print), ISSN 2503-4456 (online)
DOI: 10.15294/ipsr.v6i1.22745 

# Similarity Amidst Diversity: Lessons about Women Representation from Pati and Demak

**George Towar Ikbal Tawakkal,** Universitas Brawijaya, Indonesia*
**Alifiulahtin Utaminingsih,** Universitas Brawijaya, Indonesia
**Andrew Douglas Garner,** University of Wyoming, United States
**Wike,** Universitas Brawijaya, Indonesia
**Thomas Richard Seitz,** University of Wyoming, United States
**Fadillah Putra,** Universitas Brawijaya, Indonesia

**Abstract**
While the focus of most research in women's politics has been on the number of legislative seats and explaining the under-representation of women and other marginalized groups, we argue that there also needs to be a greater focus on voters themselves and their attitudes about gender representation in Indonesia. Let's focus on three broad series of questions. First, gender differences in attitudes about women candidates specifically. Second, gender differences in policy priorities. Third, gender differences in attitudes about one specific aspect of Indonesian elections – money politics or what is sometimes referred to as "vote-buying". The data is drawn from a stratified probability sample of citizens in the Demak and Pati regencies in Central Java, Indonesia. There were a total of 800 respondents in the sample, including 55 percent of the sample consisting only of women. The finding has some interesting implications for how to understand gender differences in Indonesian politics. Men and women both respond with the correct "rhetoric" view about the importance of women as candidates and descriptive representation. Still, both genders shift from the "rhetoric" view to the "logic" view about policies that have a more direct impact on their own lives.

**Keywords:**
Gender Representation; Voters' Attitudes; Policy Priorities; Money Politics

## INTRODUCTION

The question of women's participation and representation in democracy is a long-standing focus of scholarly and media commentaries worldwide. This question has been a part of feminism movements since the "second wave" of democratization in the 1960s and into the "third wave" of democratization in the 1970s and 1980s (Randall, 2011). Samuel Huntington famously pointed to the "third wave" of democracy as highly influential among developing countrie including Arab countries, during this time (Gates et al., 2007). As with other countries, such as New Zealand in 1883 or Kazakhstan in 1994, women began demanding greater political rights (e.g., voting) and social equality following transitions to democracy (Mervis et al., 2013). The academic debate about how much

***Correspondence:** Jl. Veteran, Ketawanggede, Kec. Lowokwaru, Kota Malang, Jawa Timur 65145 Indonesia.
**Email:** george.ikbal@ub.ac.id.

Received December 31, 2019; Accepted January 24, 2021; Published April 15, 2021

equality and political representation has been achieved by women worldwide remains robust (see, for example,Michelle-Heath, Schwindt-Bayer & Taylor-Robinson, 2005).

Embedded in this scholarly interest are varying types of political and social representation. Pitkin's (1967) seminal book identifies four types of political representation –formalistic, symbolic, descriptive, and substantive representation (see Kurebwa, 2015 for a full discussion of Pitkin's influential book). However, most academic studies about women's representation in government tend to focus on descriptive versus the substantive representation of women's issues.

Descriptive representation refers to how well government officials resemble their constituents' characteristics and mostly refers to demographic characteristics such as race, gender, nationality, and so forth. The importance of having demographically representative candidates and office-holders derives from the view that they would be more empathetic to disadvantaged groups and promote policies that represent those group interests (Phillips, 1995; Mansbridge, 1999; Beckwith,2007; Karla & Joshi, 2021). Thus, the concept of descriptive representation would promote a more significant number of female candidates and female office-holders to ensure that women's interests and policies are promoted in government.

On the other hand, substantial representation refers to "policy responsiveness or the extent to which representatives enact laws and implement policies that are responsive to the needs or demands of citizens" (Kurebwa, 2015: 53). Substantive representative focuses primarily on citizens' specific policy preferences, regardless of demographic characteristics, as one of the most important representative government components. While women, for example, might have shared policy views, government officials of any gender can conceivably represent those views and enact those policies. Thus, male candidates who actively promote women's policy views (or other demographic groups) can achieve substantive representation for women even if they are not descriptively representative. It should be noted that these two types of representation—descriptive and substantive—are not necessarily mutually exclusive, and most scholars advocate advancing both descriptive and substantive forms of representation.

Considering that women comprise more than half of the world's population, Dahlerup (1998) argues in favor of proportional representation for women in politics and government. Dahlerup argues that female candidates and office-holders are more likely to promote women's policies as a group than men. Such issues include health care, child care, environmental concerns, and social

problems that men are less interested in. This is a view that is also promoted by major pro-democracy groups such as the National Democratic Institute, which believes that without more women in government (e.g., more descriptive representation for women), these issues could be given less attention or even ignored by government officials. The World Bank (2001) has even argued that male politicians are, on average, more corrupt than women politicians. They found a strong relationship between the level of women's political involvement and levels of corruption, with higher women's representation in the government resulting in lower overall levels of corruption in a country.

The Inter-Parliamentary Union (2012) has noted a rise in the number of women in legislatures worldwide, reaching approximately 20 percent on average. While still low and far below women's share of the world population, it is the highest number of women legislatures since the 1990s. In the mid-1990s, approximately 10% of legislative seats were held by women (Norris & Krook, 2011), rising to approximately 16% in 2005 (Inter-Parliamentary Union, 2005) and reaching 19.3% in 2010 (Randall, 2011).This was partly the result of regulations that created quotas requiring a minimal threshold of women in the legislature and reforms to the electoral system, political parties, and legislative institutions' development. This increase in women's representation in the legislature is not proportional to their share of the world population. Moreover, while women legislators do often get committee assignments that oversee legislation related to social services, education, housing, and so forth, they are often "sidelined" from more powerful committees that might allow them to advance their policy agenda through the legislature (Michelle-Heath, Schwindt-Bayer & Taylor-Robinson, 2005). Thus, even if women have an increasing percentage of seats in legislatures and are appointed to committees overseeing "women's issues", they are still limited in their ability to pass their legislation and exert control over other policy areas such as foreign policy and economic regulations.

Many of these concerns are also present in Indonesia. Regulations for involving women in elections have been established since Law No. 10 of 2008 on General Elections. This law established a quota system requiring that 30 percent of the legislature must be women for both the "zipper system" and the "serial number rule". With the "zipper system", at least one out of three nominees on the candidate lists must be women. Unfortunately, not all of the parties supported the quota system, with many deciding to follow a majority rule vote in their party's internal regulations.

Moreover, the Constitutional Court would later revoke the "serial number" system, resulting in a parliament where the number of female representatives is still far below 30 percent. According to data from 1999 to

2014 elections, women have yet to reach the 30% target in the Indonesian Parliament. However, women's representation in the DPR has increased slightly, from approximately 9 percent in the 1999 election to approximately 12 percent in 2009. Women's representation in the DPR reached its peak in 2009 at about 18 percent and dropped slightly to about 17 percent in 2019. Thus, the degree of descriptive representation for women in the DPR has increased significantly since 1999, but unfortunately, still falls far short of the 30 percent goal created by Law No. 10 of 2008.

Many scholars argue for greater descriptive representation in the Indonesian legislature, believing that increasing the number of women in the legislature will bolster women's policies. For example, Prihatini (2019) examined which few female candidates won the election, while other scholars (see, for example, Dewi, 2015; Ryan & Wood, 2019) examined differences between men and women in Indonesian politics. Cagna and Rao (2016) highlight that, when the Indonesian legislature voted on the Law on Domestic Violence (No. 23 of 2004), women comprised only about 11 percent of parliament's total seats. However, it should be noted that the Law on Domestic Violence ultimately passed the legislature and is now Indonesian law, which required the support of a large number of male legislators.

Yet this increase in descriptive representation has not yet succeeded in promoting substantive policy outcomes on women's legislature issues. Hillman (2017), for example, demonstrates that the lower number of women legislators is the reason why women councilors in Indonesia have yet to produce pro-women policy outcomes. Until a critical mass of women legislators exists, their ability to produce legislative outcomes is limited. Likewise, Sundari (2016) shows that women legislators in the Indonesian parliament have hindered the ability to produce legislative successes, demonstrating the obstacles in promoting women and other marginalized groups' needs and policy preferences. These studies point to the need for greater descriptive representation in the DPR as a method for obtaining policy outcomes favorable to these groups.

While the focus of most research has been on the number of legislative seats and explaining the under-representation of women and other marginalized groups, we argue that there also needs to be a greater focus on voters themselves and their attitudes about gender representation in Indonesia. Besides structural factors such as systemic or institutional discrimination, another important factor involves voters' prioritizing gender representation by supporting women candidates in elections. After all, candidates are chosen by voters, and thus, the types of candidates desired by voters are crucially important to understanding the under-representation of women in the Indonesian government. Many women legislators have won elections against

male candidates, showing voters will support female candidates in elections. The question remains whether voters look to female candidates specifically to promote women's issues or whether women's issues are secondary in voters' minds to other factors. Do women voters in particular prioritize gender when considering candidates, suggesting that they value descriptive representation? Do women voters believe that male candidates are as capable as women candidates at promoting their policy preferences, which would suggest they prioritize substantive representation?

In the exploratory analysis below, we seek to answer these and other questions about Indonesian citizens' attitudes about gender representation in government. Let's focus on three broad series of questions. First, we analyze gender differences in women candidates' attitudes, including whether Indonesian voters believe that men can promote women's Indonesian government issues.

This series of questions is intended to gauge the support level among men and women regarding both descriptive and substantive representation. Second, we examine whether and to what degree women differ from men in policy priorities across eight different policy domains. This series of questions can indicate whether and to what extent gender-specific differences exist in policy priorities. That would mean the need for more attention to substantive representation for these priorities. Third, we examine gender differences in attitudes about one specific aspect of Indonesian elections – money politics or what is sometimes referred to as "vote-buying".

Money politics is often seen as a corrupt practice that undermines democratic elections and thus relates to the very functioning of democratic governance. Beyond simply the number of female candidates in elections (e.g., descriptive representation), in other words, there may be important gender differences in how candidates relate to voters during an election. This concept does not fit neatly into the notion of substantive representation, which usually focuses on specific policies desired by women. However, money politics does involve how candidates interact with and communicate with voters during the election.Therefore, exploring attitudes about this practice can help highlight gender differences in views about elections themselves.

Regarding money politics, we would note that money politics is a very strong factor in Indonesian elections and is a widespread practice worldwide. Scholars have examined the practice of money politics, especially the role of brokers or intermediaries who help distribute the money across Indonesia (see, for example, Vel, 2005; Simandjuntak, 2012; Aspinall & Sukmajati, 2016; Tawakkal et al., 2020; Asmawi et al., 2021). Another recent scholarship has focused on citizens' attitudes and opinions about the practice of money politics (Tawakkal & Garner,

2017). While most of this scholarship has overlooked the role of women or gender differences, one notable exception is Rohman (2016), who found that some candidates hire women as brokers because they are viewed as more trustworthy. Therefore, it is important to understand what differences exist in how women view the practice of money politics and its role in representative democracy.

In the sections below, we present an exploratory statistical analysis of these three broad sets of questions. We would like to emphasize that we are not testing specific theories or hypotheses, but rather investigating whether and to what extent gender differences in attitudes toward descriptive and substantive representation exist in Indonesian elections. The next section explains our survey data and methods, including how we measured our independent and dependent variables. The next section then presents severallogistic, ordered logistic, and multinomial logistic regression models. In the final section, we summarize the conclusions and consider implications for understanding gender representation in Indonesian politics and implications for future research.

In the sections below, we present an exploratory statistical analysis of these three broad sets of questions. We would like to emphasize that we are not testing specific theories or hypotheses, but rather investigating whether and to what extent gender differences in attitudes toward descriptive and substantive representation exist in Indonesian elections. The next section explains our survey data and methods, including how we measured our independent and dependent variables. The next section then presents severallogistic, ordered logistic, and multinomial logistic regression models. In the final section, we summarize the conclusions and consider implications for understanding gender representation in Indonesian politics and implications for future research.

## RESEARCH METHOD

The data is drawn from a stratified probability sample of citizens in the Demak and Pati regencies in Central Java, Indonesia. Central Java is one of the largest provinces in Indonesia and focuses on extensive research on the practice of "vote-buying", especially in the Pati regency (Tawakkal et al., 2017; Tawakkal et al., 2017; Aspinall & Sukmajati, 2016). There are a total of 800 respondents in the sample, including 55 percent of the sample consisting entirely of women. The sample contains a large majority of Muslim citizens (approximately 89 percent), with a smaller population of Christians (approximately 7 percent), Buddhists, and Hindus (approximately 1 percent each).

The analysis below examines three sets of dependent variables related to attitudes about female candidates' importance and female issues being represented in campaigns, which policy issue is the most important, and attitudes

about vote-buying. For the importance of female candidates, we analyze four dependent variables. The first asked respondents how important it is for there to be female candidates running for office. The variable is a four-point scale that includes "Not Very Important", "Not Important", "Important", "Very Important". The second asks respondents whether they believe that men will represent women's issues in the legislature. It is also a four-point scale that includes "Do not believe at all", "Do not believe", "Believe", and "Very much believe".

Because these are ordinal variables, we used ordered logistic regression analysis. The other two questions related to women candidates' importance ask respondents whether they are aware of candidates who talk about women's issues and whether they voted for a woman candidate in the previous election. Therefore, we used logistic regression to analyze these two dependent variables.

The second topic examined in the analysis below asks respondents about which policy issue is most important. There were nine response options – "free or affordable education", "protecting the environment", "economic development", "infrastructure development", "jobs", "higher wages", "the cost of living" including things like food, "helping small businesses", and "public safety". This variable is categorical and therefore, we used multinomial logistic regression to analyze the results.

Finally, the third set of questions asked respondents about their attitudes regarding vote-buying or offers of money by candidates to citizens. There was a total of four dependent variables related to this topic. First, citizens were asked how corrupt they found vote-buying – "not at all corrupt", "corrupt", or "very corrupt". This dependent variable is ordinal, and therefore, ordered logistic regression was used. Two additional variables asked respondents whether they were offered money during the campaign and, if they were, should they vote for the candidate who offered it? Both questions were dichotomous—"yes" or "no"—and thus, we used logistic regression to analyze the results. Finally, respondents were asked what the money offered by candidates meant to them. Response options included "buying their vote", "transportation costs", "candidate virtue", "party" or "carnival" (pesta), and "bribery". This dependent variable, like the most important policy issue question, is categorical, so we analyzed the results using multinomial logistic regression.

The main explanatory variable is a dummy variable coded 1 if the respondent is female and 0 if the respondent is male. In addition to gender, our analysis also controlled for income, education, and age. Income and education are measured as 7-point scales, while age is measured as a 6-point scale. For three control variables, the scale goes from lowest to highest.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The results below are divided into the three broad topics discussed in the previous section. These questions are designed to tap into citizens' attitudes about both descriptive and substantive representation.

*The importance of female candidates*

We look at responses to four questions about the importance of female candidates in elections. The two questions about the importance of having women candidates and whether the respondent voted for a woman candidate are intended to measure descriptive representation attitudes. If citizens do not believe that having women candidates is important or are unwilling to vote for women candidates, descriptive representation becomes more difficult to achieve. The two other questions about whether respondents believe men can represent women's issues and whether they are aware of candidates talking about women's issues are intended to measure attitudes about substantive representation. For example, if women are less likely to believe that men can represent their interests, it would suggest that descriptive representation is more important because women do not believe that substantive representation is as likely with men.

**Table 1**. Ordered Logistic and Logistic Regression Results for Attitudes about Women Candidates and Women Issues in Politics

| | Importance of Woman Candidate | Men will Represent Women's Issue in Parliament | Are there Candidates Who Talk about Women's Issues | Did You Vote for a Woman Candidate in the Last Election? |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Woman | -0.192 | -0.428*** | 0.493** | -0.274 |
| | (0.168) | (0.163) | (0.218) | (0.180) |
| Income | -0.428*** | -0.514*** | 0.167* | -0.279*** |
| | (0.069) | (0.073) | (0.085) | (0.075) |
| Education | 0.580*** | 0.187*** | 0.200*** | 0.364*** |
| | (0.056) | (0.054) | (0.067) | (0.060) |
| Age | 0.024 | 0.040 | 0.140 | -0.028 |
| | (0.070) | (0.066) | (0.089) | (0.076) |
| Threshold 1 | -2.519*** | -4.386*** | | |
| | (0.371) | (0.422) | | |
| Threshold 2 | -0.331 | -0.910*** | | |
| | (0.338) | (0.338) | | |
| Threshold 3 | 2.196*** | 0.989*** | | |
| | (0.347) | (0.343) | | |
| Constant | | | -2.999*** | -0.479 |
| | | | (0.439) | (0.366) |
| N = | 596 | 596 | 596 | 596 |
| Log-likelihood | -629.40 | -645.66 | -285.83 | -380.30 |
| Pseudo R-square | 0.1157 | 0.0531 | 0.0269 | 0.0764 |

Note: Cell entries are unstandardized ordered logistic regression coefficients for the first two columns and unstandardized logistic regression coefficients for the second two columns. Standard errors in parentheses: *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1.

significant at greater than the 0.10 significance level across all four models. Most of the coefficients are significant at greater than the 0.01 significance level. By contrast, the age coefficient is not statistically significant for any of the four models. The main variable of interest, however, is gender and the results are largely mixed. For example, women are not more likely than men to say that female candidates are important having women candidates

**Table 2**. Multinomial Logistic Regression Results for Most Important Policy

| | Education | Environ-ment | Economic Develop-ment | Infra-structure | Jobs | Higher Wages | Cost of Living | Small Business es |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Women | -0.469 | -5.46 | -0.866** | -1.218*** | -3.419*** | -0.11 | 0.062 | 32.146 |
| | -0.401 | -3,632.19 | -0.36 | -0.457 | -0.482 | -0.516 | -0.417 | -3,456.15 |
| Income | -0.289* | -29.539 | -1.046*** | 0.159 | -1.370*** | -1.045*** | -1.002*** | -18.138 |
| | -0.156 | -3,135.92 | -0.157 | -0.184 | -0.19 | -0.233 | -0.181 | -1,887.52 |
| Education | -0.052 | 3.641 | -0.183* | -0.252* | -0.606*** | -0.614*** | -0.578*** | 0.055 |
| | -0.123 | -1,772.54 | -0.11 | -0.141 | -0.135 | -0.158 | -0.129 | -0.292 |
| Age | -0.555*** | -18.947 | -0.164 | 0.065 | -1.220*** | -0.540*** | -0.293* | 0.422 |
| | -0.174 | -2,934.29 | -0.143 | -0.194 | -0.202 | -0.206 | -0.166 | -0.393 |
| Constant | -0.115 | 106.993 | 5.625*** | -5.845*** | 9.473*** | 0.229 | 1.658 | -16.336 |
| | -1.166 | -18,208.09 | -1.064 | -1.523 | -1.373 | -1.495 | -1.219 | -2,895.21 |
| N = | 576 | | | | | | | |
| Log-likelihood | -824.58 | | | | | | | |
| Pseudo R-square | 0.2762 | | | | | | | |

**Note**: Cell entries are unstandardized multinomial logistic regression coefficients with "Public Safety" left as the baseline category. Standard errors in parentheses; *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1.

Regarding whether men will represent women's interests in the legislature (second column), women are less likely to believe they will than men. The coefficient is statistically significant at greater than the 0.01 significance level. In contrast, women are more likely to say that there are candidates who talk about women's issues in campaigns (third column) than are men. The coefficient is statistically significant at greater than the 0.01 significance level. Finally, women are not more likely than men to say that they voted for a woman's issue in the last election (last column). While the coefficient for women is negative, the coefficient is not statistically significant at traditional significance levels.

Because coefficients in ordered and logistic regression models are difficult to interpret, we converted the coefficients into predicted percentages for the two models. The woman coefficients were statistically significant (men represent women's issues and candidates who talk

about women's indicated that they believe or strongly believe that men will represent women's issues compared to about 50 percent of women who said "believe" or "strongly believe".

This difference is statistically significant. As indicated above, the actual differences appear modest. Moreover, approximately 16 percent stated that there were candidates who talked about women's issues compared to approximately 23 percent of women. Again, the difference is statistically significant, but the substantive difference (approximately 7% difference between men and women) appears to be minor.

*Most Important Policy Issue*

This section examines whether gender differences exist in which issues respondents list as the most important government policy to address. The analysis can indicate whether certain "women's issues" or policy priorities are shared among women. If there are identifiable policies that women prioritize more than men, then the government should pay greater attention to providing substantive representation by adequately representing these issues when creating policy. On the other hand, if women and men have approximately the same policy priorities, substantive representation becomes slightly less of a concern for the government, at least related to gender.

Table 2 provides the multinomial logistic regression results for the "most important policy" question. Multinomial logistic regression requires leaving one of the categories as the baseline and this model leaves "public safety" as the baseline.

The coefficients indicate whether the respondents were more or less likely to respond to that category versus the baseline. Thus, the first column indicates that women are less likely than men to choose "education" compared to "public safety", although the coefficient is not statistically significant. Looking across the columns, only three of the women coefficients are statistically significant. Women are less likely than men to cite "economic development", "infrastructure development", and "jobs" compared to men than they are to select the baseline category ("public safety"). Two of these coefficients (infrastructure and jobs) are significant at greater than the 0.01 significance level, while the third ("economic development") is significant at greater than the 0.05 significance level. In addition, women are more likely to select "public safety" than men, which is statistically significant.

In order to interpret the substantive differences between men and women on these policy issues, the coefficients were

converted into predicted percentages across all nine policy areas for both men and women.

**Table 3**. Predicted Percentages for Most Important Policy, by Gender

| | Men | Women |
|---|---|---|
| Public Safety | 6.90% | 17.10% |
| Education | 11.01% | 16.85% |
| Environment | N/A | N/A |
| Economic Development | 29.76% | 30.62% |
| Infrastructure | 5.48% | 3.97% |
| Jobs | 35.26% | 2.82% |
| Higher Wages | 3.17% | 6.95 |
| Cost of Living | 8.35% | 21.72% |
| Small Businesses | N/A | N/A |

**Note**: Cell entries are predicted percentages with all other control variables held at their mean. Bolded percentages are statistically significant at greater than the 0.10 significance level. "N/A" indicates that not enough respondents chose these.

**Table 4**. Ordered Logistic and Logistic Regression Results on Attitudes about Vote-Buying

| | How Corrupt is Vote Buying? | Offered Money during Election | Should Vote for Candidate Offering Money |
|---|---|---|---|
| Women | -1.114***<br>(0.186) | 0.472**<br>(0.205) | -0.360*<br>(0.200) |
| Income | -0.078<br>(0.076) | -0.477***<br>(0.081) | -0.085<br>(0.083) |
| Education | 0.328***<br>(0.059) | 0.014<br>(0.062) | -0.022<br>(0.059) |
| Age | 0.067<br>(0.078) | 0.037<br>(0.085) | |
| Threshold 1 | -2.347***<br>(0.413) | | |
| Threshold 2 | -0.167<br>(0.392) | | -0.689**<br>(0.312) |
| Constant | | 1.849***<br>(0.406) | |
| N = | 596 | 593 | 594 |
| Log-Likelihood | -456.05 | -318.35 | -331.63 |
| Pseudo R-Square | 0.0814 | 0.0737 | 0.0055 |

**Note**: Cell entries are unstandardized ordered logistic regression coefficients for the first column columns and unstandardized logistic regression coefficients for the second two columns. Standard errors in parentheses; *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1.

Table 3 provides these results with statistically significant differences in bold text. As the table indicates, while approximately 7 percent of men chose "public safety" as the most important policy, over 17 percent of women chose that policy. The differences between men and women who decided on "economic

development" and "infrastructure", respectively, were relatively small. The only other issue where we found large substantive gender differences was for the issue of jobs, where only about 3 percent of women chose that as the most important category compared to over 35 percent of men. While these results are interesting, they do not appear to conform to the traditional conceptions of women caring more about "women's issues" compared to men. For example, there were no statistically significant differences between men and women in education. The substantive difference (11 percent for men compared to about 17 percent for women) is much smaller.

**Table 5**. Predicted Percentages for Men and Women on Three Attitudes about Vote-Buying

| | Men | Women |
|---|---|---|
| How Corrupt is Vote Buying? | | |
| - Not at all Corrupt | 3.40% | 9.70% |
| - Somewhat Corrupt | 20.37% | 39.02% |
| - Very Corrupt | 76.22% | 51.27% |
| Were You Offered Money During the Election? | 71.17% | 79.82% |
| Should You Vote for Candidate Offering Money? | 27.93% | 21.28% |

Differences on other issues, such as jobs and public safety, are less significant.Even when it comes to public safety, the substantive difference between men and women is only about 10 percent. In conclusion, while there are interesting differences between men and women on the most important policy questions, these differences are mostly modest. They do not conform to traditional conceptions about "women's issues".

*Attitudes about Vote-Buying*

As discussed above, the practice of money politics involves how candidates interact with voters during an election, including through the use of campaign intermediaries often referred to as "brokers". While not related to descriptive representation, if money is a consideration in how citizens vote, it could reduce the impact of policy issues in an election, thus undermining substantive representation. Below, we examine gender differences in attitudes about how corrupt respondents view the practice if they were offered money.during the election and whether citizens feel a "norm of reciprocity" to vote for candidates offering money.

Table 4 provides the ordered and logistic regression results on three

dependent variables related to attitudes about vote-buying.

The first column of results uses ordered logistic regression to analyze how corrupt respondents think vote-buying is, while the last two columns provide logistic regression results for whether they were offered money and whether they should vote for the candidate offering the money. The women's coefficient is statistically significant at greater than the 0.10 significance level for all three models, but the coefficient's direction differs. First, women are less likely than men to view vote-buying as corrupt and the coefficient is significant at greater than the 0.01 level. Yet, women are more likely than men to indicate that they were offered money during the election. Finally, and interestingly, women were less likely than men to indicate that they should vote for the candidate who offers it if they were offered money. As before, these coefficients were converted to predicted percentages to determine the size of these differences between men and women regarding attitudes about vote-buying.

Table 5 provides these results. First, the differences between men and women regarding how corrupt vote-buying is are fairly substantial. Whereas over 76 percent of men say that vote-buying is "very corrupt", only about 51 percent of women indicate that. Far more women indicated that vote-buying is either "not at all" or "somewhat" corrupt than men. Moving to the other two attitudes regarding vote-buying, about 80 percent of women said they were offered money compared to about 71 percent of men. In contrast, about 21 percent of women said they should vote for the candidate offering money, compared to about 28 percent of men. While these differences are statistically significant, they are far smaller than those associated with how corrupt they believe voting-buying is.

**Table 6**. Multinomial Logistic Regression Results for Attitudes about the Meaning of Money Offered by Candidates

| | Buying Vote | Transportation Costs | Candidate Virtue | Party |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Women | -0.342 | -0.383 | -0.357 | 0.518 |
| | (0.284) | (0.296) | (0.277) | (0.496) |
| Income | 0.115 | -0.213 | -0.143 | 0.083 |
| | (0.111) | (0.130) | (0.118) | (0.204) |
| Education | -0.002 | -0.334*** | -0.342*** | -0.545*** |
| | (0.091) | (0.098) | (0.091) | (0.156) |
| Age | -0.018 | -0.168 | -0.158 | -0.336 |
| | (0.118) | (0.130) | (0.120) | (0.206) |
| Constant | 0.515 | 2.519*** | 2.745*** | 0.679 |
| | (0.573) | (0.653) | (0.602) | (1.066) |

| | |
|---|---|
| N = | 575 |
| Log-Likelihood | -816.02 |
| Pseudo R-square | 0.0345 |

**Note**: Cell entries are unstandardized multinomial logistic regression coefficients for the meaning of money offered by candidates with "bribery" left as the baseline. Standard errors in parentheses: *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1.

determine the size of these differences between men and women regarding attitudes about vote-buying. Table 5 provides these results. First, the differences between men and women regarding how corrupt vote-buying is are fairly substantial. Whereas over 76 percent of men say that vote-buying is "very corrupt", only about 51 percent of women indicate that. Far more women indicated that vote-buying is either "not at all" or "somewhat" corrupt than men. Moving to the other two attitudes regarding vote-buying, about 80 percent of women said they were offered money compared to about 71 percent of men. In contrast, about 21 percent of women said they should vote for the candidate offering money, compared to about 28 percent of men. While these differences are statistically significant, they are far smaller than those associated with how corrupt they believe voting-buying is.

Finally, Table 6 provides the multinomial logistic regression results for attitudes about the meaning of candidates' money. Of note is that none of the women's coefficients are statistically significant at traditional significance levels. Interestingly, neither are the coefficients for income and age. The only variable that appears to explain differences in attitudes about money's meaning is education, which is not surprising considering past research on vote-buying attitudes (author citation).

As discussed above, coefficients in a multinomial logistic regression analysis indicate the variable's effect compared to the baseline category ("bribery" in this model). Thus, those with higher levels of education are far less likely to say that the money represents transportation costs, candidate virtue, or contributions to the election "party" (e.g., pesta) than the baseline category, which is "bribery". Again, this is consistent with previous research on vote-buying attitudes, which shows that citizens with higher formal education levels tend to view vote-buying as generally more corrupt and unacceptable. Related to this, the education coefficient in the "Buying Vote" column is not statistically significant, indicating that those with higher education were more likely to say that the money by candidates was for bribery or buying their vote than it was for transportation costs, candidate virtue, or the election party.

Overall, then, there are some notable differences between men and women in some aspects of vote-buying.

Still, most of those differences are either statistically insignificant at traditional significance levels or the differences are substantively small. The largest gender difference appears to be related to attitudes about how corrupt they view the practice of vote-buying, with women being far less likely to view it as corrupt than were men.

**Discussion**

We would note that our study uses a probability sample from the Pati and Demak regencies, which is not representative of all of Java, let alone Indonesia's entire nation. We believe our results provide interesting insight and lessons from these two regencies, but we do not attempt to generalize attitudes about gender representation beyond these two regencies. Indonesia is a large and extremely diverse country, and therefore, it is likely that attitudes regarding gender representation vary across the different provinces and islands in Indonesia. We believe this is likely to be especially true in the area of attitudes about money politics. Gender differences in attitudes about money politics have not received significant scholarly attention, so it is unclear whether our findings would generalize beyond these two regencies. Examining attitudes about descriptive and substantive representation in other regions and islands in Indonesia would seem to be a very fruitful avenue for future research.

These findings also have some interesting implications for how we understand gender differences in Indonesian politics. Blair's (2012) essay distinguishes between "rhetoric" and "logic" in terms of having "a different objective of argument and argumentation", where the goal of rhetoric is persuasion while the goal of logic is concerned with the "product" or outcome (p. 162). For example, men and women both respond with the correct "rhetoric" view, using Blair's term, about women's importance and descriptive representation. Still, women are not more likely than men to support female candidates in the last election. And while interesting gender differences exist on the most important policy question, these differences are rather modest and do not conform to traditional conceptions about "women's issues". This suggests that gender differences in policies reflect more of the "logic" view that Blair discusses as both genders shift from the "rhetoric" view to the "logic" view when they are asked about policies that have a more direct impact on their own lives. Women, for example, might leave the "rhetoric" view when asked about money politics, viewing the practice as more acceptable and being more likely to be offered

money (though, again, these differences were small).

## CONCLUSION

This manuscript has explored attitudes among Indonesian citizens in the Pati and Demak regencies about descriptive and substantive representation related to gender. These include gender differences in attitudes about women's roles and the promotion of women's issues, which policy issues are most important, and opinions about "money politics" in Indonesian elections. Our findings show that, at least in Demak and Pati's two regencies, men and women both view women candidates as important and are equally likely to vote for women candidates, indicating support for descriptive representation in elections and, by extension, government. However, women were significantly less likely to believe that men would represent their interests in parliament, suggesting that they are skeptical about whether substantive representatives can achieve their policy preferences, highlighting the importance of descriptive representation again.

Moreover, women were more likely to see candidates in the election talking about women's issues than men. Perhaps most interesting is that we did not find evidence that men and women substantially differ in their policy priorities, at least not in the way postulated by popular media accounts and typical discussions about what constitutes "women's issues". While we did find some statistically significant differences on some issues (but not most of them), the size of those differences was rather modest. This further suggests the importance of descriptive representation given the lack of clearly identifiable gender differences in policy priorities typical when discussing substantive representation. Perhaps most interesting were gender differences inperceptions of "money politics", especially in how corrupt citizens view the practice. Women were much less likely to view the practice as corrupt, a statistically significant finding and substantially large. Women were also slightly more likely to be offered money and less likely to vote for the candidate offering the money (e.g., more likely to "vote their conscience") than men, but the substantive effect was rather small. Finally, we did not find any significant differences between men and women in how they viewed candidates' money.

Whereas past studies have focused primarily on explaining the percentage of women in legislative bodies or their representation on various committees (see, for example, Michelle-Heath, Schwindt-Bayer & Taylor-Robinson, 2005), our study focuses directly on citizen attitudes about the topic of representation. Having greater

representation of women in government positions and greater representation of "women's issues" in policy-making is obviously the ultimate goal. But achieving this goal requires that women run for public office and campaign in elections for public support. It is extremely difficult to achieve the goal of greater gender representation in government if women candidates face a public that does not value (or is actively hostile to) the concepts of descriptive and substantive representation. Thus, one of the contributions we seek to make with this study is to understand public opinion and the electoral conditions that women candidates face in the two regencies of Demak and Pati. We believe that our findings raise important questions about public support for descriptive versus substantive representation and citizen attitudes about women's representation in the election that future research should explore.

**REFERENCES**

Asmawati, A., Tawakkal, G. T. I., & Muadi, S. (2021). Religion, Political Contestation and Democracy: Kiai's Role as Vote Broker in Madurese Local Political Battle. Buletin Al-Turas, 27(1), 37-54.

Aspinall, E., & Sukmajati, M. (Eds.). (2016). Electoral dynamics in Indonesia: Money politics, patronage and clientelism at the grassroots. NUS Press. Google Scholar

Beckwith, K. (2007). Numbers and newness: The descriptive and substantive representation of women. Canadian Journal of Political Science, 40(1), 27-49.

Blair, J. A. (2012). Rhetoric, dialectic, and logic as related to argument. Philosophy & Rhetoric, 45(2), 148-164. Crossref | Google Scholar

Cagna, P., & Rao, N. (2016). Feminist mobilisation for policy change on violence against women: insights from Asia. Gender & Development, 24(2), 277-290. Crossref | Google Scholar

Dahlerup, D. (1998). Using quotas to increase women's political representation. In Karam, Azza (ed). Women in Parliament: Beyond Numbers. Stockholm: The International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance. Google Scholar

Dewi, K. H. (2015). Indonesian Women and Local Politics: Islam, Gender and Networks in Post-Suharto Indonesia. Singapore: NUS Press. Google Scholar

Gates, S., Hegre, H., Jones, M. P., & Strand, H. (2007). Democratic Waves? Global Patterns of Democratization, 1800-2000.

Mimeograph: Centre for the Study of Civil War, PRIO. Google Scholar

Hillman, B. (2017). Increasing women's parliamentary representation in Asia and the Pacific: The Indonesian experience. Asia & the Pacific Policy Studies, 4(1), 38-49. Crossref | Google Scholar

Inter-Parliamentary Union. (2012). Taking the lead in Making Parliaments more Gender Attuned (7th meeting of Women speakers of Parliament, New Delhi, 3-4 October). Inter-Parliamentary Union. Retrieved from http://archive.ipu.org/english/stories/story20121003.htm.

Kalra, S., & Joshi, D.K. (2020). Gender and parliamentary representation in India: The case of violence against women and children. Women's Studies International Forum, 82,1-10

Kurebwa, J. (2015). A review of Hanna Pitkin's (1967) conception of women's political representation. International Journal of Scientific and Research Publications, 5(11), 50-60. Google Scholar

Mansbridge, J. (1999). Should blacks represent blacks and women represent women? A contingent" yes". The Journal of politics, 61(3), 628-657. Crossref | Google Scholar

Mervis, Z., Box, M. P., Pleasant, M., Eve, N., Florence, M., & Caroline, M. (2013). The relationship between democracy and women participation in politics. Journal of Public Administration and Governance, 3(1), 168-176. Google Scholar

Michelle-Heath, R., Schwindt-Bayer, L. A., & Taylor-Robinson, M. M. (2005). Women on the sidelines: Women's representation on committees in Latin American legislatures.
American Journal of Political Science, 49(2), 420-436. Crossref | Google Scholar

Norris, P., & Krook, M. L. (2011). Gender equality in elected office: A six-step action plan. Google Scholar

Phillips, A. (1995). The politics of presence. Clarendon Press. Google Scholar

Pitkin, H. F. (1967). The concept of representation (Vol. 75). University of California Press. Google Scholar

Prihatini, E. S. (2019). Women who win in Indonesia: The impact of age, experience, and list position. In Women's Studies International Forum (Vol. 72, pp. 40-46). Pergamon. Crossref | Google Scholar

Randall, V. (2011). Gender and Democracy. Briefing Paper (IDCR-BP-08/11). Institute for Democracy & Conflict Resolution. Google Scholar

Rohman, N. (2016). Pati, Central Java: Targets, Techniques and Meanings of Vote Buying. Electoral Dynamics in Indonesia, 233-48. Google Scholar

Ryan, R., & Woods, R. (2019). Women's Political Empowerment: Lessons for Subnational Levels of Government–Nepal, Pakistan, Rwanda, and Indonesia. In Civic Engagement and Politics: Concepts, Methodologies, Tools, and Applications (pp. 1237-1257). IGI Global. Crossref | Google Scholar

Simandjuntak, D. (2012). Gifts and promises: Patronage democracy in a decentralised Indonesia. European Journal of East Asian Studies, 11(1), 99-126. Crossref | Google Scholar

Sundari, E. K. (2016). Perempuan di Parlemen Berjuang di Tengah Keraguan. Jurnal Penelitian Politik, 8(1), 45-51. Google Scholar

Tawakkal, G. T. I., Damayanti, R., Subekti, T., Alfian, F., & Garner, A. D. (2020). Social Networks and Brokerage Behavior in Indonesian Elections: Evidence from Central Java. Asian Affairs: An American Review, 47(4), 227-244.

Tawakkal, G. T. I., & Garner, A. D. (2017). Unopposed but not Uncontested: Brokers and" Vote Buying" in the 2017 Pati District Election. Contemporary Southeast Asia, 491-510. Crossref | Google Scholar

Tawakkal, G. T. I., Kistanto, N. H., Asy'ari, H., Pradhanawati, A., & Garner, A. D. (2017). Why Brokers Don't Betray: Social Status and Brokerage Activity in Central Java. Asian Affairs: An American Review, 44(2), 52-68. Crossref | Google Scholar

Tawakkal, G. T. I., Suhardono, W., Garner, A. D., & Seitz, T. (2017). Consistency and vote buying: income, education, and attitudes about vote buying in Indonesia. Journal of East Asian Studies, 17(3), 313-329. Crossref | Google Scholar

Vel, J. (2005). Pilkada in East Sumba: an old rivalry in a new democratic setting. Indonesia, (80), 81-107. Google Scholar

World Bank. (2001). Engendering Development through Gender Equality in Rights, Resources and Voice. Oxford: University Press. Retrieved from https://documents.worldbank.org/en/publication/documents-

reports/documentdetail/512911468327401785/engendering-development-through-gender-equality-in-rights-resources-and-voice.