JEJAK
Journal of Economics and Policy
http://journal.unnes.ac.id/nju/index.php/jejak

Income Inequality in a Democratic and Social Perspective in Indonesia

Candra Mustika[1], Haryadi[2], Junaidi[3], Zamzami[4]

[1,2,3,4]Economics and Business Faculty, Universitas Jambi, Muaro Jambi

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to determine and analyze the influence of the democracy index, aspects of civil liberties, aspects of political rights, and aspects of democratic institutions, crime rates, access to information from the internet, on inequality in income distribution. The research method used in this study is descriptive quantitative using panel data multiple regression analysis. This study uses panel data with objects from 34 provinces in Indonesia with a research period from 2014 to 2020. Based on the results of panel data regression with a random effects model, it shows that aspects of democracy both in general through the democracy index variable and specifically through the variable aspects of civil liberties, aspects of political rights and aspects of democratic institutions both have a positive and significant effect on income distribution inequality, as well as the variable number of criminal acts has a significant positive effect on income distribution inequality. Meanwhile, access to information has a significant negative effect on income distribution inequality.

Key words : Inequality of income distribution, democracy index, access to information, crime rate

✉ Corresponding author : Haryadi
Address: Jambi - Muara Bulian St., Muaro Jambi, Jambi
E-mail: Candra@unja.ac.id

INTRODUCTION

Income inequality between people is one of the macroeconomic problems that are often faced by various countries. In Indonesia, inequality according to data from the Central Statistics Agency (BPS) from 2017 to 2019 tends to decrease. With the inequality indicator, the Gini index shows that in 2017 it was 0.392 and in 2019 it fell to 0.380. If poverty is associated with inequality, in the view of social democracy (Cheyne, Obrien, & Belgrave 1998) it is injustice and inequality in society that causes poverty. When the focus of attention is only on the economic dimension, but does not pay attention to aspects of social democracy, poverty alleviation will be difficult to run well, because the population or society must have rights and participation in addition to fulfilling a decent standard of living.

According to Sen (1999), poverty and hunger are not only caused by natural disasters, but also dictatorships in a country's political system. Furthermore, according to Winarno, Sen's theory needs special attent-ion for two reasons. First, Sen does not only emphasize development as limited to econo-mic growth, but also prioritizes development as the creation of a wider freedom of space (Winarno, 2011).

Public participation will not appear optimally if there is no access to sufficient information, including from print and electr-onic media information that reaches all lev-els of society, while in a democracy review, these rights are reflected in the Indonesian democracy index, which consists of three aspects, namely aspects civil liberties, aspects of political rights, and aspects of democratic institutions.

Judging from the history of the devel-opment of democracy in Indonesia, which experienced ups and downs starting from the guided democracy of President Sukarno's old order era, and authoritarian democracy in the style of the new order, which during the new order was considered freedom of expre-ssion, and other democratic rights experie-nced difficult times, or were at a breaking point. At the lowest level, after the refor-mation and the collapse of the New Order, the expression of freedom of opinion and democracy began to increase, and can be enjoyed by the people of Indonesia. This is reflected in participation in the general elec-tion, which was attended by many presiden-tial candidates and many political parties.

But now the presidency of Joko Wido-do, which began in 2014, is showing fears of a declining democracy in Indonesia at its low-est point. Twenty-one years after reform, pol-itical researchers Edward Aspinall and Marc-us Mietzner of the Australian National Univ-ersity in Canberra, Australia, said Indonesian democracy is at its lowest point. Democracy in Indonesia decreased by 0.58 points from 2016, to 6.39 in 2017, and 2018 in the Democracy Index issued The Economist Intelligence Unit, (https://fisip.ub.ac.id/?p=9085&lang=id).

In the index, Indonesia is included in the category of imperfect democracy (flawed demo-cracy). This status means that Indonesia holds relatively free and fair elections and respects basic civil liberties, but has several problems such as violations of media freedom, and gover-nance issues. Based on BPS data in 2018, Indo-nesia also experienced a decrease in the civil liberties aspect index by 0.29 points, and in the political rights aspect it decreased by 0.84 poi-nts compared to 2017.

In contrast to the democratic aspect, when viewed from the social aspect in freedom get information, which comes from the internet, when viewed from the percentage of Indonesian households accessing the internet, shows an increase based on BPS data, namely in 2018 from 66.22%, increasing to 73.75% in 2019, while in other social variables, namely The crime rate, with an indicator of the number of criminal acts in Indonesia, recorded in the BPS sourced from the regional police in Indonesia, shows the number of criminal acts during 2018 was 294,281 cases this figure decreased in 2019 to 269,324 cases.

The phenomenon of data showing a decr-ease in inequality but followed by a decrease in the democracy index and its aspects is in stark contrast to the theory of freedom, Development is freedom, proposed by Amartya Sen (1999). This is the gap between theory and facts in this study so that the results will get novelty. Several previous studies related to this research include: Hariani (2019) uses three variables in deter-mining income inequality, but only one of these three variables is significant. Ananda & Pulung-an (2019) examined inequality with more varia-

bles, namely five variables and only one that was not significant. The variables used are only from macroeconomic indicators, there are no social variables. Mahardiki & Santoso (2013) examined inequality in Indonesia, but the approach was only descriptive and test of difference so that it did not explore the depth of the causes of this inequality. Seranno, et al (2016) examined inequality with an economic approach from the labor side, this study was not optimal in using the determinants of inequality.

Aubron (2015) researched poverty and inequality in rural India, but this research is descriptive in nature so the study is not in-depth. Sumner (2014) researched poverty and inequality in Indonesia, but this research is also descriptive in nature and uses only trend analysis tools so that the depth quantitatively is not optimal. Guiga & Rejeb (2012) examined the relationship between poverty and inequality with a wider object of 52 countries and proved the Kuznets hypothesis. However, the exploration of the relationship between poverty and inequality has not been maximally carried out. Zaman & Shamsuddin (2018) connects poverty and inequality with two quantitative analysis tools, panel data and linear programming, but it is not optimal in seeing the relationship between the two variables. Chukwu (2019) examines poverty and inequality by connecting groups, this study shows a relationship between changes in inequality and poverty between groups, but this relationship has not been clearly identified with quantitative analysis tools. Asra (2000) examines poverty and inequality in Indonesia but has not explored in depth the relationship between the two variables. Adeleye (2020) in her research found a relationship between poverty and inequality, inequality exacerbates the impact of growth

on poverty, so that inequality is considered the main factor that determines poverty.

This approach uses absolute poverty and income inequality variables. Deutsch & colleagues (2020) researched poverty and inequality in the Southeast Asian region, this research is only descriptive so it lacks depth in analyzing the relationship between the two variables.

This research emerges from the difference between the theory of Development is freedom by Amartya Sen and the facts that are happening in Indonesia with the phenomenon showing the democracy index is decreasing but inequality tends to decrease. several previous studies have mostly approached inequality from an economic or social aspect only. This article takes an approach to aspects of democracy and social so that it is updated from previous research.

METHOD

The research method used in this study is descriptive quantitative using panel data multiple regression analysis. The data used in this study is secondary data sourced from BPS. The type of data in this study is panel data, which consists of cross section data, namely 34 provinces in Indonesia and Time series from 2014 to 2020. The analysis tool used is multiple regression panel data, which consists of two 2 panel data regression models. namely as follows:

$$Y_{it} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_{1it} + \beta_2 X_{2it} + \beta_3 X_{3it} + \varepsilon_{it} \quad (1)$$

In this second model, variable X_1, namely the democracy index, is broken down into three more variables, namely variables X_4, X_5, and X_6.

$$Y_{it} = \beta_0 + \beta_2 X_{2it} + \beta_3 X_{3it} + \beta_4 X_{4it} + \beta_5 X_{5it} + \beta_6 X_{6it} + \varepsilon_{it} \quad (2)$$

Where are Y is income inequality; X_1 is democracy index; X_2 is internet access; X_3 is crime rate; X_4 is civil liberties aspect; X_5 is political rights aspect; X_6 is aspects of democratic institutions; i is cross section (34 provinces); t is 2014-2020 research period; β_0 is const-

ant; β1,2,3,4,5,6 is Regression coefficient of each variable; and ε is eror residual.

To select the best panel data model, three tests were carried out, namely the Chou test, Hausman test and LM test.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

To get the best panel data model from the three panel data models, namely common effect, fixed effect and random effect, three types of tests were carried out,namely chou test, Hausman test, and Lagragge Multiplier test.

Table 1. Chou test result (Model 1, Model 2)

Effects Test	Statistics		df		Prob.	
	Model I	Model II	Model I	Model II	Model I	Model II
Cross-section F	36.334700	34.316115	(33,201)	(33,199)	0.0000	0.0000
Cross-section Chi-square	461.947247	452.367876	33	33	0.0000	0.0000

Source: Eviews 9.0

Based on the results of Chou's test in table above, it can be seen that the probability value of model 1 and model 2 are close to zero, small from the alpha significance of 1% (0.01), so it can be concluded that the selected model is the Fixed effect model.

Table 2. Hausman test result (Model 1, Model 2)

Test Summary	Chi-Sq. Statistics		Chi-Sq. df		Prob.	
	Model I	Model II	Model I	Model II	Model I	Model II
Cross-section F	3.501710	5.522369	3	5	0.3205	0.3555

Source: Eviews 9.0

Based on the results of the Hausman test in table above, it can be seen that the probability value of model 1 and model 2 are large from an alpha significance of 1% (0.01) so that it can be concluded that the chosen model is the Random effect model.

Table 3. Lagrange test result (Model 1, Model 2)

	Hypothesis Test					
	Cross-section		time		Both	
	Model I	Model II	Model I	Model II	Model I	Model II
Breusch-Pagan	469.2858	445.6963	1.630571	1.062242	470.9164	446.7586
	(0.0000)	(0.0000)	(0.2016)	(0.3027)	(0.0000)	(0.0000)

Source: Eviews 9.0

Based on the results of the Lagrange multiplier test, the Breusch Pagan value both of model 1 and model 2 are close to zero or less than 1% alpha, so it can be concluded that the best model of model 1 and model 2 are Random effect model.

Table 4. Random Effect Model Regression Results (Model 1)

Variable	Coefficient	Std. Error	t-Statistics	Prob.
C	0.164429	0.015532	10.58647	0.0000
IDI	0.002820	0.000194	14.51634	0.0000
AI	-0.000696	9.12E-05	-7.636813	0.0000
TK	9.64E-07	3.52E-07	2.738457	0.0066

Source: Data processed, eviews 9.0

Democracy index variable (IDI). The t-count value is 14.5 with a probability close to zero, small from alpha 1%, it can be concluded that the democracy index variable has a significant effect on the level of inequality in income distribution with a positive or unidirectional relationship.

Variable access to information from the internet (AI). The t-count value is 7.63 with a probability close to zero, small from alpha 1%, it can be concluded that the variable access to information from the internet has a significant effect on the level of inequality in income distribution with a negative or opposite direction.

Variable number of criminal acts (TK). The t-count value is 2.73 with a probability of approaching zero, small from alpha 1%, it can be concluded that the variable access to information has a significant effect on the level of inequality in the income distribution with a positive or unidirectional relationship.

Based on the calculated F, which is 78.1 with a probability close to zero, meaning that the significance is at alpha 1%, it is concluded that the variables of the democracy index, access to information from the internet and the number of criminal acts have a significant effect on the level of inequality in income distribution.

The value of the coefficient of determination based on the results of the panel data regression of the first random effect model is 0.49, meaning that 49 % of the change in the level of inequality in income distribution is determined by the democracy index variable, access to information and the number of criminal acts in the model, while the remaining 66% is determined by other variables is outside the model.

Based on the results of the first regression model using random effects, the model obtained the following regression equation:

$$KT = 0.164428518674 + 0.00281982900065*IDI - 0.000696108480472*AI + 9.64164247886e\text{-}07*TP + eit \qquad (3)$$

The constant value of 0.164 indicates that if the independent variables are the index of democracy, access to information and the number of criminal acts in the zero position, the level of inequality in income distribution is 0.164. The regression coefficient value of the democracy index is 0.0028, it shows that if there is an increase in the democracy index by one percent, it will increase the level of inequality in income distribution by 0.0028%.

The regression coefficient value for Access to information is -0.00069. It shows that if there is an increase in the percentage of the population who enjoys internet access by one percent, the level of inequality in income distribution will decrease by 0.00069%. The regression coefficient value for the number of criminal acts is 0.00000096, it shows that if there is an increase in the number of criminal acts by 1 case per year, it will increase the level of inequality by 0.0000009 or if there is an increase in the number of criminal acts by 1000 cases, it will cause an increase in the level of inequality in income distribution by 0.00096.

Based on Table 5, variable aspects of civil liberties (AKS) t-count value is 7.35 with a probability close to zero, small from alpha 1%, it can be concluded that the variable aspect of civil liberties has a significant effect on the level of inequality in income distribution with a positive or unidirectional relationship.

Variable aspects of political rights (AHP). The t-count value is 5.26 with a probability close to zero, small from alpha 1%, it can be concluded that the variable aspect of civil liberties has a significant effect on the level of inequality in income distribution with a positive or unidirectional relationship.

Table 5. Random Effect Model Regression Results (Model 1)

Variable	Coefficient	Std. Error	t-Statistics	Prob.
C	0.165005	0.015481	10.65854	0.0000
AKS	0.001183	0.000161	7.356318	0.0000
AHP	0.000932	0.000177	5.265120	0.0000
ALD	0.000640	0.000139	4.610891	0.0000
AI	-0.000686	9.15E-05	-7.502879	0.0000
TK	9.31E-07	3.54E-07	2.632117	0.0091
Weighted Statistics				
R-squared	0.506423	Mean dependent var		0.059465
Adjusted R-squared	0.495785	SD dependent var		0.023755
SE of regression	0.016868	Sum squared resid		0.066012
F-statistics	47.60761	Durbin-Watson stat		1.389948
Prob(F-statistic)	0.000000			

Source: Data processed, eviews 9.0

Variable aspects of democratic institutions. The t-count value is 4.61 with a probability close to zero, small from alpha 1%, it can be concluded that the variable aspect of civil liberties has a significant effect on the level of inequality in income distribution with a positive or unidirectional relationship.

Variable access to information from the internet. The t-count value is 7.5 with a probability close to zero, small from alpha 1%, it can be concluded that the variable access to information from the internet has a significant effect on the level of inequality in income distribution with a negative or opposite direction.

Variable number of criminal acts. The t-count value is 2.63 with a probability of 0.0091 which is small from alpha 1%, it can be concluded that the variable access to information has a significant effect on the inequality level with a positive or unidirectional relationship.

Based on the calculated F value, which is 47.6 with a probability close to zero, meaning that the significance is at alpha 1%, it is concluded together that the variables Aspects of civil liberties, aspects of political rights, aspects of democratic institutions, access to information from the internet and the number of criminal acts have an effect significant to the level of inequality of income distribution.

The value of the coefficient of determination based on the results of the panel data regression of the first random effect model is 0.49, meaning that 49% of the change in the level of inequality in income distribution is determined by the variables of aspects of civil liberties, aspects of political rights, aspects of democratic institutions, access to information and the number of criminal acts in the model. while the remaining 50% is determined by other variables outside the model.

Based on the results of the second regression model using the Random effect model, the following regression equation is obtained:

KT = 0.165 + 0.00118*AKS + 0.000931*AHP+ 0.000639*ALD - 0.000686*AI+ 9.307498182 74e-07*TP +eit   (4)

The constant value of 0.165 indicates that if the independent variables are aspects of civil liberties, aspects of political rights, aspects of democratic institutions, access to information, and the number of criminal acts in the zero position, the inequality level is 0.165. The regression coefficient value for the civil liberties aspect is 0.0011, indicating that if there is an increase in the civil liberties index by one perc-

ent, it will increase the level of inequality in income distribution by 0.0011.

The regression coefficient value of the political rights aspect of 0.0009 shows that if there is an increase in the political rights index by one percent, it will increase the level of inequality in the distribution of income by 0.0009. The value of the regression coefficient for the aspect of democratic institutions is 0.00063, indicating that if there is an increase in the civil liberties index by one percent, it will increase the level of inequality in the distribution of income by 0.00063.

The regression coefficient value for Access to information is -0.00068, indicating that if there is an increase in the percentage of the population who enjoys internet access by one percent, the level of inequality in income distribution will decrease by 0.00068. The regression coefficient value for the number of criminal acts is 0.0000093, indicating that if there is an increase in the number of criminal acts by 1 case per year, it will increase the level of inequality in income distribution by 0.0000006 or if there is an increase in the number of criminal acts by 1000 cases, it will cause an increase in the level of inequality in income distribution by 0,0006.

In both regression models, the results show that the coefficient of determination is not greater than fifty percent (50%), this indicates that the variable used in this study is not an economic variable whose influence and transmission are closer to inequality.

Based on the results of the regressions that have been carried out on the first, and second, models, the results are almost the same, namely between the influence of democratic and social aspects on the level of the level of inequality in income distribution, good aspects of democracy in general as reflected by the index variable. democracy and specifically the aspects of civil liberties, aspects of political rights and aspects of democ-

ratic institutions show the same positive and significant effect on income inequality.

If you look at the direction of the influence of the democracy variable, the result is a significant positive, meaning that if the indicators for the democratic aspect increase, the inequality level will be also increases, and vice versa if the aspect of democracy decreases, the relative poverty level also decreases. This result is in stark contrast to the concept of freedom proposed by Sen (1999), it can be explained that if the poverty referred to by Sen is absolute poverty then it can happen in a country, and this has been empirically proven by research by Olofin et al. 2015) in Nigeria, namely the result of democracy being recorded as reducing poverty with statistically significant results, but if what is meant is relative poverty Based on the results of this study, the cent theory cannot be applied to cases that occurred in Indonesia.

This result can also be explained, among others, according to several views, namely according to Firmansyah (2012), the democratic movement increases public participation and gender equality, but does not automatically affect the portion of private ownership and market mechanisms. In a number of countries, democracy even leads to the totality of support for market mechanisms which are suspected to be the main cause of income inequality, countries with the largest democracies such as the United States and Europe actually face the problem of inequality and injustice, while income inequality is the cause of relative poverty. Another opinion expressed by Hidayat (2010), said that China, whose economy is advanced, does not imitate western countries such as the United States and Europe, which are famous for their advanced democracy, the democratic process in China uses its own method that does not open up broad political freedoms..

This is of course different as has been stated by the theory of development is freedom by Sen (1999), in China the state remains solidly in control of all fields including politics, but in

the economic field, the state encourages people to be more active in trying and developing the creative economy. And this has been proven in the last three decades that China has been able to reduce the number of poor people to 400 million people (Hidayat 2010).

In China or China, the strengthening of traditional values in state management is a reflection of the theory of conservatism inherent in the teachings of Confucianism. The theory of conservatism is a different principle from democracy which tends to prioritize freedom conservatism emphasizes the value of prevailing traditions or traditional values, habits of mind, ways of life rather than a political doctrine. This view began to emerge after the emergence of the French revolution in the 18th century by Richard Hooker, which emphasized reduction in politics in order to create a balance of interests towards harmony. social and common good. However, it was only when Burke's (1997) pole-mic emerged - Reflections on the Revolution in France - that conservatism had the most influential channel of its views.

In Indonesia, the democratic climate began to grow very large after the reform, marked by the fall of the New Order regime under the leadership of President Suharto, political freedom which during the New Order was very limited began to grow after the reform era with the emergence of various kinds of political parties, social institutions and the emergence of various desires. people to become members of parliament and regional heads and the emergence of more than one presidential candidate, the method of selecting people's representatives at the regional and central levels as well as the election of the president and regional heads were also carried out directly.

Meanwhile when compared to the economic situation of Indonesia and developed democracies such as the United States, the conditions are very different, in terms of economic resources, the level of education and income between Indonesia and the United States is very far, America with its economy is very developed, and its population is better educated, of course. Even though we are very ready to practice democracy as freely as possible, but in Indonesia with an economic situation that is not as prosperous as America, with many people who have not enjoyed education up to university or college level, and many people still live with poverty, and the level of inequality. income inequality between residents, causing the practice of democratic freedom after the reform era which is very massive and ineffective and very inefficient. After the collapse of the new order became a very contradictory thing, the wave of freedom of expression and in politics increased but did not correlate with the increase in the ability and knowledge of the people in using their rights appropriately and according to the rule of law.

The cost of carrying out a general election is large, starting from the presidential election, the people's representative council (DPR) both at the center and the regions while the economic life is not yet good and equitable, causing some people to not have a good preference in determining their choice in every general election, this is sometimes it is vulnerable to create a money politics system that is used by certain individuals who run as members of parliament or regional heads, by using money politics to buy votes from low-skill voters, economically, and educationally and think more pragmatically.

This is what makes it vulnerable to corruption, because the contestants who are elected using money politics and supported by their investors of course want to take advantage of their position, when elected to return their capital or investment that has been out in the election process, this can be seen by the rise of corruption cases. carried out by members of the council and regional heads who are acted upon by the

corruption eradication agency, namely the corruption eradication commission.

Samego (2012) said that there are three weaknesses in implementing democracy in Indo-nesia. In this country, there is still a feudali-stic political culture and communalism, our democracy also leads to majority authoritaria-nism, and the last weakness of our democracy is the absence of ideology from political part-ies.

In another view, the paradox theory of liberal democracy by Mouffe (2000), states that "on the one hand the democratic tradit-ion has values in the form of equality, identity between the governed and the governed, and the sovereignty of the people; but on the oth-er hand, the liberal tradition carries values and is constitutive of the rule of law, the defe-nse of human rights and respect for indivi-dual freedoms. This has resulted in democr-acy being only used by a handful of people who have the capital and resources that lead to economic liberalization so that it will lead to inequality.

Mouffe through radical democracy, is an idea that emerged after the birth of his opinion on the paradoxical theory of liberal democracy, which states that there are parad-oxes in democracy, namely first, falling into the curse of good and bad morals, for liberal democracy when responding to illiberal issu-es, intolerance, religious and racial sentime-nts, and xenophobia, secondly, liberal democ-racy departs from equality (politics) but crea-tes inequality (economics), and the three tea-chings on consensus in liberal democracy are uniform and anti-pluralism because politics is interpreted solely rationally.

Radical democracy rejects the consen-sus mechanism of the liberal democracy ver-sion and replaces it with the concept of disen-sus. Liberal democracy is considered to have eliminated many voices in the concept of co-nsensus in an oppressive way, in the form of state decisions that apply as something bin-ding. The paradox arises because democracy bridges two opposing aspects, namely indivi-dual freedom (freedom of expression) and the principle of equality (equal dignity). Accor-ding to Mouffe, the tension between the two is impossible to bridge and is the driving spirit of the democratic movement.

In addition to democratic variables, other variables such as access to information or the percentage of people who have access to infor-mation from the internet, the results show a significant negative effect on the relative poverty level and income distribution inequality, mean-ing that if people are more free to access the internet or get information, the relative poverty level and inequality will increase. This is in accordance with the theory put forward by Sen (1999) regarding the third and fourth instrumen-tal aspects of freedom, namely the guarantee of social freedom and the guarantee of freedom of openness.

Internet access is very important in deve-loping people's abilities, both knowledge and skills because there is a lot of information that can be obtained from the internet, so that with more and more people who can access the inter-net, they get information in increasing their ability to innovate and be creative, in an effort to increase productivity to increase income, and this of course will reduce the relative poverty level if people's income is more evenly distrib-uted.

The concept of development is freedom from Sen (1999) requires a guarantee of freedom of openness, this openness requires the freedom of the community to obtain information and ac-cess information, obtain information, with incr-easing public references in choosing good leade-rs will produce better policy makers.

In addition, according to Sen (1999) one aspect of freedom is security guarantees, devel-opment can take place if people are free from fear or get security guarantees, based on the results of this study this is confirmed by the results of security indicators through the large

number of reports of criminal acts that have a significant positive effect. relative poverty level, meaning that the more crime rates that occur will lead to an increase in relative poverty, con-versely if the crime rate decreases it will cause a decrease in the relative poverty level, thus guaranteeing a sense of security plays a very important role in helping to reduce the relati-ve poverty level, if people feel As reflected in the low crime rate, the relative poverty level can be reduced to a lower level.

Security which is reflected in the crime rate is an aspect that is born from the social dynamics of society. Economic conditions, difficulty finding work will lead to high levels of unemployment and crime. If the security aspect in terms of crime can be reduced, the public peace in carrying out economic activities will be conducive so that with the economy running well, it can reduce inequality or income inequality so that relative poverty can decrease. Overall, indeed, when compared to democratic and social variables with economic variables, there will be differences, seve-ral journals contained in this dissertation show that statistically economic variables have a greater influence than the influence of democratic variables and social variables in this study, this is because the variables of inequality of income distribution theoretically and empirically as well as the transmission of their influence are directly determined by economic variables, while the democracy variable is a variable that is not directly involved in determining poverty and inequality, and social variables in this study are also not entirely capable of determining poverty and inequality represent indicators or social dimensions that affect inequality.

CONCLUSION

The results showed that the aspects of democracy both in general through the democracy index variable, and specifically thro-ugh the variable aspects of civil liberties, aspects of political rights and aspects of democratic institutions both had a positive and significant effect on inequality in income distribution, as well as the variable number of criminal acts had an effect. significant positive on the inequality of income distribution. Meanwhile, access to information has a significant negative effect on income distribution inequality.

Policies in reducing inequality to continue and use development strategies that are just and inclusive of all Indonesian people. An appropriate policy breakthrough is needed to reduce the negative effects of the overly broad democratization process, so that the democratization process in Indonesia does not have an impact on increasing economic liberalism, oligarchic politics, and money politics, which can have an impact on the increasing level of inequality in Indonesia. By improving the general election system in accordance with the conditions of society in Indonesia, and using an effective ITE law that can reduce conflict, control freedom. And another strategy is to improve people's living standards and access to internet information and guarantee security so that people's preferences in choosing and exercising their political rights can run effectively and efficiently.

REFERENCES

Adeleye, B. N., Gershon, O., Ogundipe, A., Owolabi, O., Ogunrinola, I., & Adediran, O. (2020). Comparative investigation of the growth-poverty-inequality trilemma in Sub-Saharan Africa and Latin American and Caribbean Countries. *Heliyon, 6*(12

Ananda, C. F., & Pulungan, A. M. (2019). Determinant of Income Inequality in Indonesia: Case Study 33 Provinces in 2011-2016. *Journal of Applied Business and Eco-*

nomics, 21(September 2018), 198–208. https://doi.org/10.20472/iac.2018.044.004

Asra, A. (2000). Poverty and inequality in Indonesia: Estimates, decomposition and key issues. *Journal of the Asia Pacific Economy, 5*(1–2), 91–111. https://doi.org/10.1080/13547860008540785

Aubron, C., Lehoux, H., & Lucas, C. (2015). Poverty and inequality in rural India: Reflections based on two agrarian system analyzes in the state of Gujarat. *EchoGéo, 32*(17). https://doi.org/10.4000/echogeo.14300

BPS. (2020). Development of Several Main Socio-Economic Indicators of Indonesia. Central Bureau of Statistics.

BPS. (2021). Development of Several Main Socio-Economic Indicators of Indonesia. Central Bureau of Statistics.

Burke. E. (1997). *Reflections on the Revolution in France*, Hackett Publishing Company, Inc. October 1997: ISBN 0-87220-020-5

Chukwu, J. O. (2019). Poverty Impact of Variations in Within-group and Between-group Inequality in Nigeria: New Estimates Using Two Household Survey Data. *Social Indicators Research, 141*(2), 539–549. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-018-1844-0

Deutsch, J., Silber, J., Wan, G., & Zhao, M. (2020). Asset indexes and the measurement of poverty, inequality and welfare in Southeast Asia. Journal of Asian Economics, 70. https://e-resources.perpusnas.go.id:2111/10.1016/j.asiec0.2020.101220

FISIP Brawijaya University. (2019). The Decline of Democracy in Jokowi's Administration: Turn on the Danger Signshttps://fisip.ub.ac.id/?p=9085&lang=id.

Firmansyah. (2012). Democracy, Poverty, and "Inequality". Accessed via: https://amp.kompas.com/nasional/read/2012/10/30/11200060/~Nasional?page=all#page2

Guiga, H., & Rejeb, J. Ben. (2012). Poverty, growth and inequality in developing countries. *International Journal of Economics and Financial Issues, 2*(4), 470–479.

Hariani, E. (2019). Analysis of Factors Affecting Income Inequality in 38 Regencies/ Cities of East Java in 2012-2015. *The International Journal of Applied Business (TIJAB), 3*(1), 13–23. https://ejournal.unai.ac.id/index.php/TIJAB

Heywood, A. (2017). Political ideologies: An introduction. Macmillan International Higher Education.

Hidayat, K. (2010). Demokrasi Model China. https://internasional.kompas.com/read/2010/02/13/05120239/Democracy.Model.China ?page=all

Mahardiki, D., & Santoso, R. P. (2013). Analysis of Changes in Income Inequality and Economic Growth Between Provinces in Indonesia 2006-2011. *TRACK: Journal of Economics And Policy, 6*(2). https://doi.org/10.15294/jejak.v6i2.3888

Mouffe, C. (2000). *The Democratic Paradox*. London: Verso

Mouffe, C. (2013). *Agonistics: Thinking The Word Politically*. London: Verso

Mouffe, C. (2018). Demonising populism won't work-Europe needs a progressive populist alternative. LSE European Politics and Policy (EUROPP) Blog.

Sen, A. (1980). Equality of what?. *The Tanner lecture on human values, 1*, 197-220.

Sen, A. (1981). Poverty and famines: An essay on entitlement and deprivation (clarendon, oxford).

Sen, A. (1985). The moral standing of the market. *Social philosophy and policy, 2*(2), 1-19.

Sen, A. (1995). A Sociological Approach to The Meaurement of Poverty: A Reply to Professor Peter Townsend. Oxford Economic Papers, 37, 669–676.

Sen, A. (1992). *Inequality reexamined*. Oxford University Press.

Sen, A. (1999). *Commodities and capabilities.* OUP Catalog.

Sen, A. (1999). Development as Freedom (New York: Anchor). South Indian ICT Clusters, 227.

Serrano, P. J. G., Simarro, R. M-., & Buendía, L. (2016). The Impact of the 2008/9 Crisis on Inequality and Poverty in Southern Europe: The Case of Spain. *Journal of Australian Political Economy*, December.

Winarno, B. (2011). *Contemporary Global Issues.* CAPS.

Zaman, K., & Shamsuddin, S. (2018). Linear and Non-linear Relationships Between Growth, Inequality, and Poverty in a Panel of Latin America and the Caribbean Countries: A New Evidence of Pro-poor Growth. *Social Indicators Research, 136*(2), 595–619. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-017-1581-9