

WHEN DIFFERENT ELECTIONS HAVE DIFFERENT SALIENCIES FOR VOTERS: MOST IMPORTANT AND CONSIDERATION (EVIDENCE FROM INDONESIAN VOTERS)

George Towar Ikkal Tawakkal^{1*}, Irma Fitriana Ulfah², Andi Setiawan³, Andrew D Garner⁴, Thomas R Seitz⁵

^{1*}Lecturer at Governmental Studies Program, Brawijaya University, Malang, Indonesia; ^{2,3}Lecturer at Governmental Studies Program, Brawijaya University, Malang, Indonesia; ^{4,5}Lecturer at School of Politics, Public Affairs, and International Studies, University of Wyoming, Laramie, WY, USA.

Email: ^{1*}george.ikkal@ub.ac.id, ²i.fitriana@ub.ac.id, ³andi.setiawan@ub.ac.id, ⁴agarner1@uwyo.edu, ⁵tseitz@uwyo.edu

Article History: Received on 25th February 2020, Revised on 6th August 2020, Published on 27th August 2020

Abstract

Purpose of the study: Generally, the purpose of this study is to explain the salience of each form of election for voters. To explain that, this study examines which election is perceived as the most important election for voters, and what matters are considered by voters in each election, especially in the most important election and money politics.

Methodology: The data are drawn from a survey of 800 respondents in Central Java during the 2019 Indonesian elections. The survey asked two questions; which election they perceive as the most important election ("what is the most important election for you?"), and what matters they consider when voting for a candidate ("what is your consideration in each election?"). The dataset also includes variables related to money politics.

Main Findings: Voters have different importances and considerations in various forms of elections. More voters see the executive election as the most important than the legislative election in every level of election. More voters consider the program in the legislative elections, while more voters consider the figure of candidates in the executive elections. But in more detail, there are various patterns.

Applications of this study: Referring to the number of elections in Indonesia, this finding can help the government, electoral commission, or activists to develop better strategies for educating citizens. Also, referring to the widespread money politics in Indonesia, this finding can help them to improve participation and reduce money politics in elections, especially at local levels.

Novelty/Originality of this study: Many scholars who talked about the meaning of election or the Importance of election do not explain clearly the possibility of voters having different meanings for different elections, while a voter faces several elections for different positions. This article fills in the literature explanation by discussing the level of elections when understanding the meaning of elections for voters.

Keywords: *Form of Election, Saliencies, Importance, Consideration, Level of the Money Politics, Local Elections.*

INTRODUCTION

The election is one of the basic elements of democracy. Competitive elections will be the selection method that determines democratic legitimacy for the management of the public authority. This shows that the election is different from non-competitive selection methods. The competitive nature inherent in elections will legitimize the representatives to make decisions on behalf of the people. [Wojtasik \(2013\)](#) says the main characteristics of elections in a democratic system are: the uncertainty of election results and the possibility of changing power. It provides an opportunity for citizens to determine who and what policies will be chosen and gain legitimacy from citizens.

Also, the important is that the results of elections cannot be canceled, and cannot be changed by any means other than through the next election. Opposition arises as a result of elections, and its existence is needed to control and provide alternatives for the government. Citing the statement of [Andrew Heywood \(2000: 200\)](#), the usefulness of the reciprocal relationship between citizens and those in power, as well as the elite and the masses, is confirmed through the election. Referring to those concepts, voters should consider them when voting in elections.

The facts are not really like that, at least in literature. However, the ideal concept is practiced differently. According to [Wojtasik \(2013\)](#), often those considerations that should have existed are not fulfilled. This is due to the freedom of choice, which allows voters to choose candidates not based on the ideal assumptions as above but based on anyone who is legally feasible, and based on factors outside the ideal considerations above, such as the level of recognition of candidates, family ties and the possibility of social interaction between them before or during the election. For example in Indonesia, a factor beyond that ideal consideration is money politics ([Tawakkal et al. 2017a; 2017b; Pradhanawati, 2019](#)).

Money politics is an effort to influence others by using material rewards, it can also be interpreted as trading votes in the political process and power, or distributing money to influence the voters ([Kumolo, 2015; Tawakkal et al. 2017c; 2020; 2019](#)). A survey conducted by the Indonesian Institute of Sciences (LIPI) in the 2019 election shows that 40 percent of respondents accept the money in the 2019 election but do not consider it to vote. Meanwhile, another 37 percent claim to accept the money and consider it to vote ([LIPI, 2019](#)).

In addition to the matter of consideration, voters are also likely to experience inconsistencies due to facing many elections for different positions. In Indonesia, each voter faces two categories of elections, namely legislative and executive elections. The legislative elections consist of the DPD election, the DPR RI election, the DPRD Provinsi election, and the DPRD Kabupaten/ Kota election. The DPR RI election is voting for the People's Representative Council (DPR RI). The DPD election is voting for the Regional Representative Council (DPD). The DPRD Provinsi election is voting for the Provincial People's Representative Assembly (DPRD Provinsi). The DPRD Kabupaten/Kota election is voting for the Local People's Representative Assembly (DPRD Kabupaten). The executive elections consist of the presidential election, the governor election, the mayor/regent election, and the village head election. Thus, each voter faces eight elections to elect officials with different powers.

When categorizing based on the level of government, Indonesian has national elections, provincial elections, local elections, and a village election. The national elections consist of the DPD election, the DPR RI election, and the presidential election. The provincial elections consist of the DPRD Provinsi election and the Governor election. The local elections consist of the DPRD Kabupaten election and the Mayor/ regent election. The head village election is the only election at the village level.

Thus, a voter can have different considerations when voting in different elections. This article talks about the meaning of elections for voters, including considerations in each level of elections. Some questions will be answered: What is the most important election for voters? What considerations do the voters use when voting in elections? In which election do voters use ideal consideration or others, including money politics? This study is important because of the widespread money politics in Indonesian elections, and scholars must provide a solution to this problem. This study can help the government, electoral commission, or activists, especially in Indonesia, to develop better strategies for educating citizens, to improve participation and reduce money politics in elections, especially at local levels.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Issues and saliences are two factors that influence voters. Many researchers have studied both. Most researchers have seen how the issues become considerations for political parties to choose them as campaign themes ([Klüver and Sagarzazu, 2016](#); [Budge and Farlie, 1983](#); [Petrocik, 1996](#); [Robertson, 1976](#); [Butler and Stokes, 1969](#); [Särilvik and Crewe, 1983](#); [Heath, Jowell, and Curtice, 1985](#); [Clarke et al, 2004](#)). At least, there are three specific studies about that. Some researchers have studied the position of an issue in political debate between parties ([Damore, 2005](#); [Sigelman and Buell, 2004](#)). Other researchers examine the reasons why certain issues arise ([Adams, 1997](#); [Hobolt and de Vries, 2015](#); [Spoon and Klüver, 2014](#)). Other researchers examine the pattern of issues discussed by the party ([Budge and Farlie, 1983](#); [Green-Pedersen, 2007](#); [Van de Wardt et al, 2014](#)). While some researchers have moved to put the salience of issue as an object of research ([Green, 2007](#); [Hutchings, 2003](#); [Whiteley et al, 2005](#)). It means, there is a new cluster in studies, it is the salience of issues.

In the other side, there is a debate about the meaning of "salience" among researchers. Traditionally, it refers to the Importance of an issue, especially for voters. It can also refer to other things, such as the candidate's voter characteristics. Put simply, "salience" refers to the weight attached by individuals to political information, which then determines the individual's tendency to determine political attitudes. The salience approach believes that political parties will highlight certain issues, and exclude other issues, especially in public debates and documents ([Budge, 2015](#)).

Some scientists use "salience" as "prominence", i.e. the extent to which certain information becomes most important in one's mind ([Taylor and Fiske, 1978](#)). The definition is not fully agreed, because "prominence" does not always mean "important". Both are different things, although important information will tend to be something that is "prominence". But at least the definition of "salience" as prominence, still has benefits in certain cases. In some studies, the use of the word is not clearly defined ([Epstein and Segal, 2000](#)), even compiled without model guidelines, and mostly cannot explain variations in the Importance of issues for each voter, or the Importance of the whole issue in the election ([Niemi and Bartels, 1985](#)).

Although there is no clear definition, there is an agreement among scientists to define the salience in political behavior research, as functional variables, such as the use of questions on a questionnaire with the sentence "the most important problem facing the nation". The answer to that question can be interpreted as the meaning of salience. When the respondent answers "infrastructure", it can be interpreted that infrastructure is the most important problem, and the problem is important for the respondent. At the very least, it can be interpreted as a more important problem among other problems. If more people answer "infrastructure", it means that the problem is increasingly worth seeing as a public problem.

The functional definition of salience, in reality, does not solve terminological problems, such as in answering "what is the most important problem". [Wlezien \(2005\)](#) proposes several things to consider when interpreting the "salience" on the "importance", namely On Importance, and Important Problems. Imagine when someone is asked a question as above, and answers "infrastructure". In the form of "On Importance", the answer can be interpreted in various conclusions. The person's answer can be interpreted as an important problem for the whole community, an important problem for their group, a long-term problem that concerns them, or it can be interpreted as a short-term problem that concerns them.

That becomes a problem for researchers to interpret the answers of respondents. In essence, "importance" is interpreted as a joint problem or a public problem that is considered important, or at least not a problem for the person. As with the "Important Problem", interpreted as the significance of a problem for individuals. When someone answers "infrastructure", it can be interpreted as the most important needs expected by that person. There is a principle of personal benefit when someone answers an issue as important. Voters tend to be heterogeneous, both in the number of issues and the type of issues that are considered as more salient by each voter. (RePass, 1971), or that the voters interpret the salience differently for each issue (Belanger and Meguid, 2008), or that an issue has the same degree of salience for all voters, but voters can have different views on political parties (Mauerer et al., 2015).

Theoretically, salience studies can be tracked from Downs's (1957) argument about the spatial model of voting. The argument is improved by Hinich and Ordeshook (1970), Riker and Ordeshook (1973). Spatial models provide a framework for modelling voting choices and for estimating voter responses to policy choices and representation for their voters. In situations with many issues, for example, moral, economic, or foreign policy, the spatial models can be employed to explain more important issues for voters. The spatial voting model believes that voters will vote for parties that they think are closer to their expectations (Ansolabehere and Puy, 2017).

There are relevant studies to the salience. Franklin (2001) proposes an argument related to the relationship of issue salience in a particular election, to voter participation. In his research, Franklin concludes that voters who consider an election as important to him would tend to participate in the election. Adida et al. (2019) talk about voter coordination and the Importance of salience in producing the impact of information in clientelistic democracies.

Some researchers, like Ansolabehere and Puy (2017) and Strijbis, and Leonisio (2012), talk about the dimension of left-right is more salient for voters than the dimension of nationalism. They argue that issues in nationalism are more possible to be divisive than issues in left-right. This explains that voters care more about issues, perhaps not coinciding with issues where the political parties offer more distinctive policies. Lefevere et al. (2017) talk about how political parties have reframed for issues that are salient to the public and the party itself.

Bellucci and Heat (2007) examine voters' perceptions about the salience of elections and social division. Then, Orford et al (2009), which measures the relationship of voter perceptions about the salience of an election, to participation and distance to the polling station. Gorecki (2011) conduct a study related to voter perceptions about the salience of elections and excessive reporting on the level of election participation. Likewise, Dragu and Fan (2016) who examine the salience of elections and the level of party competition in elections.

Talking about the Importance and consideration, when voters see an election is important for them, they tend to use ideal considerations that can be addressed in the function of an election. Various studies examine electoral functions, each of which conveys different typologies according to the approach used by each researcher (Rose and Mossawir 1967; Harrop and Miller 1987; Katz 1997, 2000; Birch 2001; Dye, Schubert, Zeigler 2009; Medvic 2010; Dalton, Farrell, McAllister 2011; Wojtasik 2013). One of them, Wojtasik (2013) mentions seven election functions; voters delegate political representation; voters elect the political elite; voters legitimate authority/ power; voters control authority controller; voters encourage political accountability; formatting political programs; and rearranging public opinion.

The function of delegating political representation allows voters to elect people who, according to their views and values, appear to be the best. As a result of democratic selection, the winners in the election have the legitimacy to decide policies or programs on behalf of the citizen, and the resulting decisions that have the same legitimacy value. Delegation to political representatives, both executive and legislative, from all citizens to several people, is conceptually motivated by several reasons. First, the delegation aims to improve the efficiency of decision making. Second, delegation aims to hand over authority to people who are considered to have better abilities in making policy. Third, increasing the degree of Importance of the policies and increasing their impact on social life.

As an election results, delegating political representation and transferring power of decision-making are based on the argument that voters will vote for the candidate among themselves, who meet the required competency standards (candidate's loyalty, acknowledge, candidate's ability to work together, candidate's integrity, and candidate's ability to reach a compromise). Equally important, people who are winners will not decide programs or policies based on their self-interest but must prioritize the public interest. Not just about delegation, Medvic (2010) states that elections are not only about who will hold certain positions but also who can act on behalf of the citizen. To achieve the idea that elections are about who will represent the people, voters need to consider the following points—first, political guarantees for program implementation. Second, guarantee the availability of authority to implement the program. Third, the availability of competitive candidate or program choices. That is, voters need to ensure that the people they choose have the opportunity to run the program.

Voters are also responsible for ensuring the policies to be taken by the elected officials. VO Key (1966) stated in his work entitled The Responsible Electorate that voters are responsible for determining policy alternatives from some of the policies offered by candidates. Lee et al (2004) convey two possible voter roles in determining policy. First, voters influence the policy choices offered by candidates in elections. In other words, voters influence the level of determination of campaign programs to be offered by candidates. Second, voters choose the policies offered by

candidates. In other words, voters simply choose programs offered by candidates. The difference between the first and second lies in the influencing phase. In the first role, voters become a consideration for candidates to make the program. In the second role, the voter determines the feasibility of the program offered, in the form of selecting the candidate.

[Rose and Mossawir \(1967\)](#) convey six electoral functions for voters. First, elections are an opportunity to carry out leadership succession. Second, elections are an opportunity to control government policy. Third, elections are an opportunity to influence government policy. Fourth, elections are an opportunity to legitimize the government. Fifth, elections are an opportunity to reject the existing government. Sixth, elections are seen as something that has no function, namely when voters do not position elections as something that affects the political system. That is, voters should ideally consider the policy as the Importance of elections. In practice, the ideal considerations must be equal with the Importance of election for voters. Studies on the appeal or Importance of elections for voters show that there is a dynamic that cannot be uninformed, and has come to the attention of various research circles.

The main points of the discussion are, recent studies talk about the object of salience and the effect of salience. The effect of salience refers to how salience influences participation. The object of salience refers to the important. Mostly, the object refers to issues or policies. Scholars have not focused on the form of elections as the object of salience, while voters face some form of elections. It generates questions, such which elections are perceived as the most important election, and what matters are considered by voters in each election. This article will answer the questions.

METHODOLOGY

This article adopts a quantitative analysis, from a survey of 800 Central Java voters during the 2019 elections, with half of the respondents residing in the Pati regency and the other half residing in the Demak regency. The population in the survey is all voters in the regencies, and we use multistage random sampling in choosing respondents. The multistage random sampling is generated by involving district areas in the two regencies, villages, and neighbourhood. In each neighbourhood, we interview twenty respondents randomly. We employ 40 workers to collect data in the regencies, for two weeks during May 2019. With a questionnaire, each worker interviewed 20 respondents.

The survey asks two questions of respondents about which election they view as most important ("what is the most important election for you?") and what factors respondents consider when voting for a candidate ("what is your consideration in voting?"). The dataset also includes variables related to money politics. For this article's purpose, we use SPSS software to analyze the nominal data from the survey, by presenting responses across different forms of elections and relate these responses to the considerations respondents give to factors for each election using cross-tabulations.

RESULTS/FINDINGS

A. The Most Important Election

A discussion of the results in this article begins by presenting survey data on the most important election for voters. Respondents are given a series of answer options about which election they view as the most important. These include elections for the People's Representative Council (DPR RI) election, the Regional Representative Council (DPD) election, the Provincial People's Representative Assembly (DPRD Prov) election, Local People's Representative Assembly (DPRD Kab) election, Presidential election (Pilpres), Governor election (Pilgub), mayor/regent election (Pilbup), and village head election (Pilkades).

Table 1: Which Election is Most Important?

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid DPD election	4	.5	.5	.5
DPR RI election	59	7.4	7.4	7.9
DPRD Prov election	8	1.0	1.0	8.9
DPRD Kab election	43	5.4	5.4	14.3
Presidential election	107	13.4	13.4	27.6
Governor election	10	1.3	1.3	28.9
Regent election	45	5.6	5.6	34.5
Village head election	524	65.5	65.5	100.0
Total	800	100.0	100.0	

Table 1 presents the frequencies for the "most important election" question. The most notable result is a large majority of respondents indicated that the village head election is the most important for them (65.5%). The second most common response is the Presidential election (13.4%), followed by the DPR RI election (7.4%). None of the other elections are chosen as most important by more than 6% of respondents, with three elections (DPD, DPDR Provinsi, and Governor) receiving at or less than 1%. Thus, respondents in these two regencies of Central Java overwhelmingly view the local elections as more important to them than higher-level elections such as the presidential and the governor elections. After combining responses into the legislative versus the executive elections, the overwhelming majority of respondents (85.5%) view the executive elections as the most important than the legislative elections (approximately 14.5%).

B. What Considerations in Voting

What considerations are used by voters to select candidates? Respondents are given several options – the figure of the candidate, the political party, money politics, the candidate's policy program, their supporters, the candidate's religion, the candidate's level of education, whether the respondents follow other people when voting, and the candidate's advertisement. There is also an "other" option available to respondents. We analyze responses to this question across the different forms or types of elections.

Table 2: Considerations in Each Election

	DPD Election	DPR RI Election	DPRD Provinsi Election	DPRD Kabupaten Election	Presidential Election	Governor Election	Regent Election	Village Head Election
Valid Figure	20.9%	13.9%	12.8%	18.9%	55.6%	44.3%	42.4%	48.6%
Party	7.1%	20.5%	19.3%	15.6%	2.6%	1.4%	-	-
Money	-	1.3%	12.0%	15.8%	-	7.6%	10.1%	7.9%
Program	32.8%	31.4%	32.8%	32.8%	33.8%	36.3%	33.0%	30.6%
Supporter	2.6%	-	1.3%	-	-	1.1%	-	-
Religion	5.3%	9.1%	7.9%	8.0%	6.6%	5.4%	5.4%	4.0%
Education	1.4%	5.1%	1.4%	2.8%	1.4%	1.4%	1.4%	1.4%
Following Others	26.4%	14.8%	10.3%	5.0%	-	1.4%	5.1%	-
Advertisement	1.4%	1.4%	1.3%	-	-	-	1.4%	1.1%
Others	2.3%	1.3%	1.3%	1.3%	-	-	-	5.1%
No Answer	-	1.4%	-	-	-	1.3%	1.3%	1.3%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table 2 presents the results for what considerations are used by voters to select candidates. Notable is the absence of any respondent saying that they consider money offered by candidates when voting for candidates in the DPD elections. The most common response is the candidate's program (32.8%). Turning to the DPR RI elections, the candidate's program remains the most common consideration used by citizens when selecting candidates, while money politics is considered in the DPR RI elections, the percentage of respondents citing the money was very small (1.3%). Like the DPR RI elections, the candidate's program is the most common consideration (32.8%) in the DPRD Provinsi election. But here, the figure of candidate and money politics are chosen as a close third and fourth with about 12% of respondents choosing each as a consideration. Turning to DPRD Kabupaten elections, the candidate's program is, once again, the most frequently cited consideration, the responses across the other options are more spread out than for the previous elections analyzed. Notably, money politics is the second most frequently cited consideration for selecting candidates.

The responses for presidential elections differ considerably from the legislative elections analyzed above. The first major difference is fewer considerations were cited as factors for selecting presidential candidates, with no respondents considering the candidate's advertisement, following other people, the candidate's supporter, or money politics. The second major difference is the role of candidate characteristics (figure of the candidate) in selecting presidential candidates, with the majority of respondents citing the figure of candidates (55.6%) as the most important consideration.

As with the presidential election, the results for the regent election is similar to the results for governor elections, with candidate personality (figure of candidates) cited by 42.4% of respondents and the candidate's program cited by 33% of respondents. Money politics is also cited as a consideration in the recent elections (10.1%). Finally, the table shows similar results for the village head election, with the candidate's figure is cited by 48.6% of respondents and the candidate's program is the second most cited consideration (30.6%), followed by 7.9% of respondents citing money as a consideration when selecting candidates in the village head election.

One interesting and notable conclusion from these findings is that candidate characteristics and personality play a much stronger role in the executive elections than in the legislative ones. Only in the DPD elections, the candidate's figure is cited by more than 20% of respondents in the legislative elections while the candidate's figure is cited by greater than 40% of respondents for all of the executive elections.

C. Considerations in The Most Important Election

The data above shows that more respondents consider the village head elections to be the most important form of election, and respondents have varying considerations in each form of election. In this session, we look at what considerations when they vote in their most important elections. We employ cross-tabulation between the most important election variable and the consideration variable in each form of election.

Table 3: The Most Important Election and The Considerations

		Considerations in The Most Important Elections									Total	
		Figure	Part y	Mone y	Progr am	Religi on	Edu c	Followi ng Others	Adver ts	Other s	No Answ er	
Most Importa nt	DPD election	50.0%			50.0%							100.0 %
	DPR RI election	32.2%	16.9 %		15.3%	18.6%		16.9%				100.0 %
	DPRD Prov election		37.5 %		50.0%			12.5%				100.0 %
	DPRD Kab election	58.1%	2.3%	4.7	30.2%	2.3%	2.3 %					100.0 %
	Presidential election	70.1%			28.0%	1.9%						100.0 %
	Governor election	100.0 %										100.0 %
	Regent election	35.6%		4.4%	11.1%		2.2 %	46,7%				100.0 %
	Village head election	39.7%		9.5%	36.3%	5.5%	1.7 %		1.7%	3.6%	1.9%	100.0 %

The respondents who see the DPD election as the most important election is equally divided into the candidate's figure and the candidate's program. In the DPR RI election, more respondents who see the DPR RI election as the most important election consider the candidate's figure (32.2%) when they select candidates in the DPR RI election. In the DPRD Provinsi election, more respondents who see the DPRD Provinsi election as the most important election consider the program (50.0%). In the DPRD Kabupaten election, more respondents consider the figure of the candidates.

In the Presidential election, more respondents who see the presidential election as the most important election consider the candidate's figure (70.1%). In the Governor election, all respondents who see the Governor election as the most important election only considers the figure of the candidate (100.0%). In the Regent election, more respondent who sees the Regent election as the most important election consider following other persons (46.7%). In the village head election, more respondents who see village head election as the most important election consider the figure of a candidate (39.7%).

DISCUSSION

More respondents see executive elections as most important than legislative elections. It shows that not only issues, policies, and conditions (see [Ansolabeher and Puy, 2017](#); [Dragu and Fan, 2016](#); [Strijbis and Leonisio, 2012](#); [Gorecki, 2011](#); [Orford et al, 2009](#); [Bellucci and Heat, 2007](#)), the form of elections become variable that generates different saliency for voters. In more detail, the Governor election is a form of election in which the least respondents see it as the most important election in the executive election, while the DPD election is in the legislative election. By categorizing the territories, more respondents see the executive election as most important than the legislative election in local government. More respondents see the executive election as most important than the legislative election in the provincial government. More respondents see the executive election as most important than the legislative election in the national government. Respondents are more interested in executive elections.

In the other sides, respondents have varying considerations when they vote in each form of election, in the most important election for them or not. It shows how they consider, especially, ideal consideration (program or policy) and money politics. In the DPD election, the candidate's program is the most common consideration for selecting candidates in the DPD election, and no respondent considers money in the DPD election. In the DPR RI election, the candidate's program is the most common consideration used by the respondents when they vote in the DPR RI election, and small respondents consider money politics. In the DPRD Provinsi election, the candidate's program is the most consideration used by the respondent when they vote in the DPRD Provinsi election, and small respondents consider money politics. In the DPRD Kabupaten election, the candidate's program is the most common consideration for selecting candidates in the DPRD Provinsi election, and small respondents consider money politics. Thus, more respondents consider the candidate's program in the legislative elections.

Different from the legislative elections, more respondents consider the figure of the candidates in the presidential election, and no voter considers money politics. In the Governor election, the candidate's figure is the most common consideration for selecting candidates in the Governor election, and small respondents consider money politics. In the Regent election, the candidate's figure is the most common consideration used by the respondent when they vote in the Regent election, and small respondents consider money politics. In the village head election, the candidate's figure is the



most common consideration used by the respondent when they vote in the village head election, and small respondents consider money politics. Thus, more respondents consider the figure of candidates in the executive elections.

Referring to many scholars (like [VO Key, 1966](#); [Lee et al., 2004](#); [Rose and Mossawir, 1967](#)), more respondents vote for an ideal reason, such as program or policy. Although respondents consider money in some elections, that is small, only in the DPD election and the Presidential election where no voters consider money. The difference might be caused by different situations. We have no question about whether the respondents accept the money or not. It makes sense if the respondents do not accept the money then do not consider the money. It looks to present different data to the LIPI survey that 40.0% of voters consider money in voting ([LIPI, 2019](#)), while in our survey, they do not present the numbers. The different percentages might be caused by the structure of the question and answer. We gave some answers to respondents, not only considering money or not considering money. It makes us have more diverse answers and more diverse percentages.

Based on interpretation from literature (like [VO Key, 1966](#); [Lee et al., 2004](#); [Rose and Mossawir, 1967](#)), we know that ideally, voters have to consider the candidate's program or policy. Voters should consider the program or policy for elections which they consider as the most important election, but our survey shows different variations. The respondents who see the DPD election as the most important election are equally divided into the candidate's figure and candidate's program. The more respondents who see the DPR RI election as the most important election consider the figure of the candidate. This result is different from the consideration of the total respondents that more respondents consider the candidate's program in the DPR RI election.

More respondents who see the DPRD Provinsi election as the most important election consider the candidate's program, and no respondent considers money when they vote in the DPRD Provinsi election. This result is similar to the consideration of the total respondents that more respondents consider the program in the DPR RI election but different in considering money. Only small respondents who consider money, but no respondents who see the DPR RI election as the most important consider money politics. More respondents who see the DPRD Kabupaten election as the most important election consider the figure of the candidates, and small respondents who consider money when they vote in the DPRD Kabupaten election. This result is different from the consideration of the total respondents that more respondents consider the program in the DPRD Kabupaten election.

Different data are shown in the executive election. More respondents who see the presidential election as the most important election consider the figure of the candidates. This result is similar to the consideration in the total respondents that more respondents consider the candidate's figure in the Presidential election. In the Governor election, more respondents who see the Governor election as the most important election only consider the figure of candidates. This result is similar to the consideration in the total respondents that more respondents consider in the Governor election. In the Regent election, more respondents who see the Regent election as the most important election consider following other persons, and the only small respondents who consider the candidate's program when they vote in the Regent election. This result is different from the consideration in the total respondents that more respondents consider the candidate's figure in the Regent election. In the village head election, more respondents who see village head election as the most important election consider the candidate's figure when they vote in the village head election. This result is similar to the consideration in the total respondents that more respondents consider the candidate's figure in the village head election.

The survey also presents interesting data. There is an increase in the number of respondents who consider money in lower elections, except in the village head election. For example in legislative elections. Small respondents consider money in the national legislative election, even no respondents consider money in the DPD election. At the provincial level, the number of respondents is increasing to 12.0% in the DPRD Provinsi election, then increasing to 15.8% in the DPRD Kabupaten election. Similar to the legislative elections, the survey presents that no respondent considered money in the presidential election. At the provincial level, the number of respondents is increasing to 7.6% in the Governor election, then increasing to 10.1% in the Regent election. The village head election is unique. In this case, the number is decreasing to 7.9% in the village head election. Not only that, by doing cross-tabulation we know that no respondents consider money politics for their most important election, except for the DPRD Kabupaten election, the Regent election, and the Village head election. The first two are elections at the local level, while the village head election is at the lowest level, lower than the local level. No respondent who sees national or provincial elections as the most important election considers money politics for their most important election, but not for local and village elections. It means elections at the local level have more respondents who consider money politics.

In general, this finding shows another side of what is presented by previous literature. When some literature explain issues on the political debate during an election ([Damore, 2005](#); [Sigelman and Buell, 2004](#)), why an issue arises ([Adams, 1997](#); [Hobolt and de Vries, 2015](#); [Spoon and Klüver, 2014](#)), the pattern of issues in a campaign ([Budge and Farlie, 1983](#); [Green-Pedersen, 2007](#); [Van de Wardt et al., 2014](#)), all is about how the salience of issue which can be considered by voters, this article shows another side that the salience of election forms can be considered by voters. Now, researchers have more complicated factors for identifying factors that can influence voters, not only the political party, identity, or economic, but also the form of elections, such as the level of election and what office will be elected.



CONCLUSION

The short conclusion from the discussion is voters have different importances and considerations in various forms of elections. More voters see the executive elections as the most important than the legislative election in every level of election. More voters consider the candidate's program in the legislative elections, while more voters consider the figure of candidates in the executive elections. But in more detail, it presents differences and similarities. More voters who see the DPR RI election as the most important election consider the figure of the candidates. More voters who see the DPRD Kabupaten election as the most important election consider the figure of the candidates, and small respondents who consider money when they vote in the DPRD Kabupaten election. More voters who see the Regent election as the most important election consider following other persons, the only small respondents who consider the candidate's program when they vote in the Regent election. The results are different from the consideration in the total respondents that more respondents consider other things in those elections. The interesting thing is no voters who consider money politics for their most important elections, except for the DPRD Kabupaten election, the Regent election, and the Village head election. It confirms the data that elections at the local level have more voters who consider money politics. Thus, voters have different considerations for the most important elections and the level of election. More voters consider money politics only in the low level of elections and avoid to consider money politics in the most important election.

LIMITATION AND STUDY FORWARD

The conclusion left some questions. If there is a difference in considerations in the most important election and considerations in total respondents, who is more contribute to the differences? For example, more respondents who see the DPRD Kabupaten election as the most important election consider the figure of a candidate and small respondents who consider money when they vote in the DPRD Kabupaten election. This result is different from the consideration in the total respondents that more respondents consider the candidate's program in the DPRD Kabupaten election. So who is more contribute to consider the candidate's program for selecting candidates in the DPRD Kabupaten election?. Another question is, why do voters consider money politics more in local elections, and less in the national and provincial election? If the answer is because of distance or number of voters, why do voters consider money politics less in the village head election than in local election? This article can not answer the questions. Advanced researches are needed to answer the questions.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This study is supported by a grant of Faculty of Social and Political Sciences, Brawijaya University, Malang, Indonesia.

AUTHORS CONTRIBUTION

Irma Fitriana is a member of the project who contributes to designing the proposal and the financial report. In this article, she contributes to a literature review.

Andi Setiawan is a member of the project who contributes to collecting data and coordinating the survey workers. In this article, he contributes to building the background of article questions.

Andrew Garner is a member of the project who contributes to designing the proposal and analyzing statistical data. In this article, he provides statistical tables and builds an argument.

Thomas Seitz is a member of the project who contributes to designing the proposal. In this article, he contributes to building an argument and literature review.

REFERENCES

1. Adams, Greg D. (1997). Abortion: Evidence of an Issue Evolution. *American Journal of Political Science*, 41(3), 718–737. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2111673>
2. Adida, C., Gottlieb, J., Kramon, E., & McClendon, G. (2019). When Does Information Influence Voters? The Joint Importance of Salience and Coordination. *Comparative Political Studies*, online first, 1-41. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0010414019879945>
3. Ansolabehere, S., & Puy, M.S. (2017). Measuring issue-salience in voters' preferences, *Electoral Studies*, 51, 103-114. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.electstud.2017.09.008>
4. Bélanger, Éric., & Meguid, Bonnie M. (2008). Issue Salience, Issue Ownership and Issue-Based Vote Choice, *Electoral Studies*, 27(3), 477-491. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.electstud.2008.01.001>
5. Bellucci, Paolo., & Oliver Heath. (2007). *The Political Salience of Social Cleavages in Italy, 1963-2006*. Occasional Paper No. 18/2007. Siena, Italy: Center for the Study of Political Change. <https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/4912/6b0ed6d47de52cd82348a22707c91f9a475a.pdf>
6. Birch S. (2001). "Elections". in P.B. Clarke, J. Foweraker (Eds.) *Encyclopedia of Democratic Thought*, New York: Routledge. <https://www.amazon.com/Encyclopedia-Democratic-Thought-Barry-Clarke/dp/0415862728>
7. Budge, I. (2015). Issue Emphases, Saliency Theory and Issue Ownership: A Historical and Conceptual Analysis. *West European Politics*, 38(4), 761–777. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01402382.2015.1039374>

8. Budge, I., & Farlie, D. (1983). *Explaining and Predicting Elections: Issue Effects and Party Strategies in Twenty-Three Democracies*. London: Allen & Unwin. <https://www.worldcat.org/title/explaining-and-predicting-elections-issue-effects-and-party-strategies-in-twenty-three-democracies/oclc/905556115>
9. Butler, David., & Stokes, Donald E. (1969). *Political change in Britain*. London: Macmillan. <https://www.palgrave.com/gp/book/9781349001408>
10. Clarke, Harold D., Sanders, David., Stewart, Marianne C., & Whiteley, Paul. (2004). *Political choice in Britain*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/019924488X.001.0001>
11. Dalton, R.J., Farrell, D.M., & McAllister, I. (2011). The Dynamics of Political Representation. In M. Rosema, B. Denters, K. Aarts (Eds.), *How Democracy Works: Political Representation and Policy Congruence in Modern Societies*. Amsterdam University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9789048513369-003>
12. Damore, David F. (2005). Issue Convergence in Presidential Campaigns, *Political Behavior*, 27(1), 71–97. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11109-005-3077-6>
13. Downs, Anthony. (1957). *An Economic Theory of Democracy*. Harper and Row. <https://www.amazon.com/Economic-Theory-Democracy-Anthony-Downs/dp/0060417501>
14. Dragu, T. C. and Fan, X. , 2016-08-31 "Issue Saliency and Electoral Campaigns". *Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association Annual Meeting, TBA, Philadelphia, PA* <Not Available>. 2017-01-24 from http://citation.allacademic.com/meta/p1116722_index.html.
15. Dye, T.R., Schubert, L., & Zeigler, H. (2009). *The Irony of Democracy: An Uncommon Introduction to American Politics*, Cengage Learning. <https://www.cengage.com/c/the-irony-of-democracy-an-uncommon-introduction-to-american-politics-17e-schubert/9781285870281/PF/>
16. Epstein, L., & Segal, J. (2000). Measuring Issue Saliency. *American Journal of Political Science*, 44(1), 66-83. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2669293>
17. Franklin, Mark N. (2001). Electoral Participation. In Richard G. Niemi and Herbert F. Weisberg (Eds.). *Controversies in Voting Behavior*, 4th. CQ Press. <https://us.sagepub.com/en-us/nam/controversies-in-voting-behavior/book236590>
18. Górecki, Maciej A. (2011). Electoral Saliency and Vote Overreporting: Another Look at the Problem of Validity in Voter Turnout Studies. *International Journal of Public Opinion Research*, 23(4), 544–557. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ijpor/edr023>
19. Green, Jane. (2007). When parties and voters agree: Valence issues and party competition. *Political Studies* 55(3) :629-655. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9248.2007.00671.x>
20. Green-Pedersen, Christoffer., & Mortensen, Peter B. (2010). Who Sets the Agenda and Who Responds to It in the Danish Parliament? A New Model of Issue Competition and Agenda-Setting. *European Journal of Political Research*, 49(2), 257–281. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ejpr.2010.49.issue-2>
21. Harrop, M., & Miller, W.L. (1987). *Elections and Voters: A Comparative Introduction*. Macmillan. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-349-18912-0>
22. Heath, Anthony., Jowell, Roger., & Curtice, John. (2001). *The rise of New Labour*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/0199245118.001.0001>
23. Heywood, A. (2000). *Key Concepts in Politics*. Palgrave. <https://amazon.com/Key-Concepts-Politics-Palgrave/dp/0312233817>
24. Hinich, Melvin J., & Peter, C. Ordeshook. (1970). Plurality Maximization Vs. Vote Maximization: A Spatial Analysis With Variable Participation. *American Political Science Review* 64: 772-791. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1953462>
25. Hobolt, Sara B., & De Vries, Catherine E. (2015). Issue Entrepreneurship and Multiparty Competition. *Comparative Political Studies*, 48(9), 1159–1185. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0010414015575030>
26. Hutchings, Vincent L. (2003). *Public opinion and democratic accountability: How citizens learn about politics*. Princeton: Princeton University Press. <https://press.princeton.edu/books/paperback/9780691123790/public-opinion-and-democratic-accountability>
27. Katz, R.S. (1997). *Democracy and Elections*. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780195044294.001.0001>
28. Katz, R.S. (2000), Function of Elections. In R. Rose (Ed.), *International encyclopedia of elections*. CQ Press.
29. Key, O.V. (1966), *The Responsible Electorate: Rationality of Presidential Voting 1936–1960*. The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press. <https://doi.org/10.4159/harvard.9780674497764>
30. Klüver, Heike., & Sagarzazu, Iñaki. (2016). Setting the Agenda or Responding to Voters? Political Parties, Voters and Issue Attention. *West European Politics*, 39(2), 380-398. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01402382.2015.1101295>
31. Kumolo, Tjahjo. (2015). *Politik Hukum Pilkada Serentak*. PT Mizan Publika. <https://www.bukukita.com/Hukum-dan-Undang-undang/Sosial-Politik/139178-Politik-Hukum-Pilkada-Serentak.html>
32. Lembaga Ilmu Pengetahuan Indonesia. (2019). *Pemilu Serentak 2019; Partisipasi dan Persepsi*. LIPI, Jakarta.
33. Lee, D. S., Moretti, E., & Butler, M. J. (2004). Do Voters Affect or Elect Policies? Evidence from the U. S. House. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 119(3), 807–859. <https://doi.org/10.1162/0033553041502153>

34. Lefevere, J., Sevenans, J., Walgrave, S., & Lesschaeve, C. (2017). Reframing by parties : The effect of issue salience and ownership. *Party Politics*, 25: 4, 1-14. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1354068817736755>
35. Mauerer, Ingrid, Paul W. Thurner and Marc Debus (2015) Under wick conditions do parties attract voters' reactions to issues? Party-varying issue voting in German elections 1987-2009. *West European Politics* 38: 1251-1273. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01402382.2015.1026562>
36. Medvic, S.K. (2010). *Campaigns and Elections: Players and Processes*. Cengage Learning. <https://www.amazon.com/Campaigns-Elections-Processes-Stephen-Medvic/dp/1138058432>
37. Niemi, R., & Bartels, L. (1985). New Measures of Issue Salience: An Evaluation. *The Journal of Politics*, 47(4), 1212-1220. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2130815>
38. Orford, S., Rallings, C., Thrasher, M., & Borisyuk, G. (2009). Electoral Salience and the Costs of Voting at National, Sub-National and Supra-National Elections in the UK: A Case Study of Brent, UK. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 34(2), 195-214. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-5661.2008.00335.x>
39. Petrocik, John R., Benoit, William L., & Hansen, Glenn J. (2003). Issue Ownership and Presidential Campaigning, 1952–2000. *Political Science Quarterly*, 118(4), 599–626. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1538-165X.2003.tb00407.x>
40. Pradhanawati, Ari., Tawakkal, George Towar Ikb., & Garner, Andrew D. (2018). Voting Their Conscience: Poverty, Education, Social Pressure and Vote Buying in Indonesia. *Journal of East Asian Studies*. 19(1). 1-20. <http://doi.org/10.1017/jea.2018.27>
41. RePass, D. (1929). Issue Salience and Party Choice. *American Political Science Review*, 65(2), 389-400. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1954456>
42. Riker, William H., & Peter C. Ordeshook. (1973). *An Introduction To Positive Political Theory*. Prentice-Hall. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1958429>
43. Robertson, David. (1976). *Theory of Party Competition*. New York: John Wiley and Sons. <https://www.amazon.com/Theory-Party-Competition-David-Robertson/dp/0471727377>
44. Rose, R., & Mossawir, H. (1967), Voting and Elections: A Functional Analysis. *Political Studies*, 15(2). <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9248.1967.tb01843.x>
45. Särilvik, Bo., & Crewe, Ivor. (1983). *Decade of dealignment*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://www.cambridge.org/id/academic/subjects/politics-international-relations/comparative-politics/decade-dealignment-conservative-victory-1979-and-electoral-trends-1970s?format=PB&isbn=9780521136938>
46. Sigelman, Lee., & Buell, Emmett H. (2004). Avoidance or Engagement? Issue Convergence in U.S. Presidential Campaigns, 1960–2000. *American Journal of Political Science*, 48(4), 650–661. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0092-5853.2004.00093.x>
47. Spoon, Jae-Jae., & Klüver, Heike. (2015). Voter Polarization and Party Responsiveness: Why Parties Emphasize Divided Issues, but Remain Silent on Unified Issues. *European Journal of Political Research*, 54(2), 343–362. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ejpr.2015.54.issue-2>
48. Strijbis, O., & Leonisio, R. (2012). Political Cleavages in the Basque Country: Meaning and Salience. *Regional & Federal Studies*, 22(5), 595–611. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13597566.2012.734502>
49. Tawakkal, George Towar Ikb., Kistanto, Nurdien Harry., Asy'ari, Hasyim., Pradhanawati, Ari., & Garner, Andrew D. (2017) Why Brokers Don't Betray: Social Status and Brokerage Activity in Central Java. *Asian Affairs: An American Review*, 44(2), 52-68. <http://doi.org/10.1080/00927678.2017.1307641>
50. Tawakkal, George Towar Ikb., Suhardono, Wisnu., Garner, Andrew D., & Seitz, Thomas. (2017). Consistency and Vote Buying: Income, Education, and Attitudes about Vote Buying in Indonesia. *Journal of East Asian Studies*, 17(3), 313-329. <http://doi.org/10.1017/jea.2017.15>
51. Tawakkal, George Towar Ikb., & Garner, Andrew D. (2017). Unopposed but Not Uncontested: Brokers and "Vote Buying" in the 2017 Pati District Election. *Contemporary Southeast Asia*. 39. 491-510. <http://doi.org/10.1355/cs39-3e>.
52. Tawakkal, George Towar Ikb., Damayanti, Ratnaningsih., Subekti, Tia., Alfian, Faqih., & Garner, Andrew D. (2020). Social networks and brokerage behavior in Indonesian elections: Evidence from Central Java. *Asian Affairs: An American Review*, 47(3), 226-243. <http://doi.org/10.1080/00927678.2020.1765473>
53. Taylor, Shelley E., & Fiske, Susan T. (1978). Salience, Attention, and Attribution: Top of the Head Phenomena. In L. Berkowitz., *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, Vol. 2. Academic Press, 249-288. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2601\(08\)60009-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2601(08)60009-X)
54. Van de Wardt, Marc., De Vries, Catherine E., & Hobolt, Sara B. (2014). Exploiting the Cracks: Wedge Issues in Multiparty Competition. *Journal of Politics*, 76(4), 986–999. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022381614000565>
55. Whiteley, Paul., Stewart, Marianne C., Sanders, David., & Clarke, Harold D. (2005). The issue agenda and voting in 2005. In Pippa Norris & Christopher Wlezien (Eds.), *Britain votes 2005* (pp. 146-161). Oxford: Oxford University Press. <https://global.oup.com/academic/product/britain-votes-2005-9780198569404?cc=us&lang=en&>.
56. Wlezien, Christopher. (2005). On the Salience of Political Issues: The Problem with 'Most Important Problem. *Electoral Studies*, 24, 555-579. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.electstud.2005.01.009>
57. Wojtasik, Waldemar. (2013). Functions of Elections in Democratic Systems. *Political Preferences*, 4, 25-38.