

Voter Education and the Fight Against Money Politics: Implementing Voter Education in the 2024 Indonesian Election

**George Towar Ikbal Tawakkal¹, Andrew D Garner², Thomas R Seitz², Andi
Setiawan¹, Irma Fitriana Ulfah¹**

¹Universitas Brawijaya, Indonesia

²University of Wyoming, USA

(Email: george.ikbal@ub.ac.id)

Received: 11 April 2025; Revised: 20 April 2025; Accepted: 20 Mei 2025

Abstract

One of the persistent challenges in safeguarding democratic elections across many countries is the widespread practice of money politics, which primarily targets voters and undermines the core principles of democratic participation. While voter education is widely recognized as a crucial tool for promoting democratic integrity, existing literature offers limited analysis of its effectiveness in addressing money politics. This study seeks to fill that gap by examining the challenges faced in implementing voter education programs, focusing on their role in combating money politics. Adopting a mixed-methods approach, this research combines a systematic literature review, drawing exclusively from peer-reviewed domestic and international journals, with fieldwork conducted during Indonesia's 2024 simultaneous elections in two regencies. Despite reports of rising money politics in the 2024 elections, various voter education initiatives were also deployed. However, the persistence of vote buying suggests these efforts have had a limited impact. Based on interview data and document analysis, the study identifies four primary obstacles to effective voter education: limited outreach and accessibility, inadequate and unengaging educational materials, a shortage of qualified facilitators, and a lack of contextual relevance for the target audience. These findings underscore an urgent need to redesign voter education strategies to be more inclusive, participatory, and tailored to local contexts. This research contributes to the growing discourse on electoral integrity by offering actionable insights for policymakers, electoral bodies, and civil society organizations working to strengthen democracy through informed and empowered voter participation.

Keywords:

implemented; money politics; organized; voter education.

Introduction

Voter education intersects with various political concepts, such as democracy and elections. This connection is rooted in the ongoing debate about the relationship between elections and democratization. Elections have become widely regarded as a fundamental prerequisite for democracy in both academic and policy circles. Rooted in the belief that democracy is "government by the people, for the people," many scholars and policymakers equate democracy with the conduct of free and fair elections (e.g., Dahl, 1971; Elklit & Svensson, 1997). However, critics argue that this view represents a minimalist and overly basic understanding of democracy, although Collier and Levitsky (1997) note the diversity in interpretations of democracy.

In practice, democratic elections face numerous challenges, including non-institutional ones. While politicians may not directly coerce voters, they often influence them in

unjustifiable ways. This form of influence is frequently cited as money politics. Also known as vote-buying, money politics is regarded as a form of electoral fraud in many countries, even historically in England during the 19th century (Lehoucq, 2003). In Asia, money politics remains a significant issue in various political systems. Rigger (2002) refers to a survey where over two-thirds of voters and politicians in Taiwan believed that candidates distributed assistance or cash on election day. Hellmann (2014) also notes that money politics is prevalent in elections across several Asian nations, including Thailand and Indonesia.

Indonesia is particularly scrutinized for its money politics practices. In the 2024 simultaneous elections, multiple parties reported incidents of money politics. For example, the Bawaslu RI report documented 130 cases of money politics (Metrotvnews, 2024). A survey by Indikator Politik (Detiknews, 2025) revealed a rise in tolerance for money politics compared to the 2019 election. In 2019, about 42 percent of respondents considered money politics to be normal; this figure increased to 60-70 percent in 2024. Furthermore, survey data showed that 35 percent of respondents made their voting decisions based on money in the 2024 election, compared to 28 percent in 2019. These statistics reflect the growing influence of money politics in the 2024 election and underscore the challenges facing democratization efforts in Indonesia.

The challenges faced by democratic elections in various countries, including the rise of money politics, have drawn significant concern from scholars. Patrick (2008) emphasized the importance of a robust election framework, identifying several key elements for ensuring a democratic election, one of which is voter education. According to Patrick, elections cannot be considered truly democratic unless voters are equipped with the knowledge to distinguish between candidates and make informed decisions at the polls. Voters must also be aware of when, where, and how to register, as well as when, where, and how to cast their vote.

In Indonesia, a framework for voter education was established for the 2024 elections. This is reflected in the hierarchy of legislation, where the term "election education" appears in Law Number 7 of 2017 on General Elections. In line with this, the KPU issued General Election Commission Regulation No. 9 of 2022, which further clarifies the concept of voter education. Beyond this regulation, the General Election Supervisory Body (Bawaslu) also introduced other regulations, such as Regulation No. 2 of 2023 on Participatory Supervision, which introduces the concept of "participatory supervision education." Several activities have been carried out to promote voter education and participation (Info Publik Pemilu, 2024; Prasetyo et al., 2023; Adnan et al., 2023; Nasiwan, 2018).

Many researchers have focused on the implementation of state programs, including those managed by central state institutions (e.g., Listiani et al., 2022; Sopiansyah et al., 2021) and those overseen by regional state institutions (e.g., Idrus, 2023; Fuadi, 2023; Hastuti et al., 2021; Nofriadi, 2021; Nuarida, 2021). One notable area of study within program implementation is the voter education program. Various studies conducted in different countries have examined the impact of voter education, yielding two primary findings. First, voter education enhances the technical ability to vote. Educating voters improves their experience by making the voting process easier and ensuring that votes are counted (Merivaki & Suttman-Lea, 2022; Suttman-Lea & Merivaki, 2022). This increase in technical knowledge positively influences voter confidence, as voters feel more assured about the process and outcome (Hall et al., 2009; Atkeson & Saunders, 2007). A well-established culture of voter education can lead to a more positive experience, which in turn boosts confidence in the accuracy of the election results.

Second, voter education fosters greater election transparency. It encourages election administrators to improve the transparency of the electoral process, thereby creating an information ecosystem where voters are more likely to trust and rely on official sources of

election information (Kim & Lee, 2012; Malhotra et al., 2012). Suttman-Lea and Merivaki (2022) argue that such educational efforts help protect voters from misinformation or disinformation, especially regarding the vote-counting process, and can reduce doubts related to election irregularities or fraud. These two findings are reflected in a range of research outcomes. For instance, voter education has been shown to increase voter registration and turnout (Merivaki & Suttman-Lea, 2022; Mann & Bryant, 2020) and reduce the number of spoiled or invalid ballots (Suttman-Lea & Merivaki, 2022). When voter education provides clear guidance on how to complete various processes—such as registering to vote, voting early in person, or voting by mail, it not only motivates individuals to participate but also makes them more politically informed (Shineman, 2016). This evidence indicates that voter education can help produce a more informed electorate, enhancing transparency and fostering positive assessments of the election process, including trust in the vote count.

Additionally, research on voter trust suggests that voter education can enhance trust by creating a closer connection between voters and election officials. For example, Atkeson and Saunders (2007) argue that public service announcements and other forms of voter education help bridge the gap between voters and election administrators, which can result in increased voter turnout. Similarly, Alvarez, Hall, and Llewellyn (2008) contend that the negative effects of electronic voting technology on voter confidence can be mitigated through educational campaigns focused on the operation, security, and accuracy of electronic voting systems. However, these arguments have not been thoroughly developed theoretically nor tested directly with observable measures of the voter education efforts conducted by election officials. Despite these insights, there remains a significant gap in the literature regarding the direct impact of voter education on combating specific challenges like money politics, particularly in the context of Indonesia. This gap highlights the need for more focused research that connects the role of voter education with the effectiveness of elections in the face of practices like money politics and other forms of electoral fraud.

The studies mentioned before suggest that research on the impact of voter education has primarily focused on increasing voter participation. However, there is limited research on how voter education influences the fight against money politics. This gap is likely due to the complex measures needed to assess its effectiveness. One notable attempt to evaluate the impact of voter education on mitigating money politics comes from Schaffer (2007). In his study of Thailand and the Philippines, Scheffer found that efforts to reduce money politics through voter education were largely ineffective. He attributed this failure to a class-based conflict, specifically the moral and ethical divide between the upper class and lower-class individuals engaged in criminal activities related to money politics.

This class-based tension likely stems from the efforts of the emerging middle class to establish its own political culture. The meaning of money politics differs across various segments of society, and these differences are influenced by factors such as class, religion, ethnicity, and education. Scheffer argues that voter education cannot succeed unless it is attuned to the different interpretations of money politics. His research suggests that the failure of voter education in combating money politics is largely rooted in the societal context, particularly class dynamics. However, this raises further questions about the role of implementation factors in voter education. Could weaknesses in how voter education is implemented be contributing to its ineffectiveness in addressing money politics? These questions point to the need for additional research to explore the broader factors influencing the success or failure of voter education programs in combating money politics.

Voter education is typically a structured and planned activity aimed at informing the electorate. The content of voter education covers several key areas. First, it provides

information about the election process, which includes details such as the date, time, and location of the election, the type of election, required voter identification, voting procedures, the appearance of the ballot paper, prohibited activities, and the basics of vote counting. The goal of this foundational education is to ensure that voters have a clear understanding of the electoral process, thus encouraging participation and helping the system run smoothly. The second focus of voter education is on understanding the electoral system itself. This level of education provides more in-depth knowledge, enabling voters, candidates, and election officials to engage more effectively in the electoral process by grasping the broader framework and mechanisms of the election system.

The third component addresses the importance of exercising the right to vote. Voter participation is influenced by various demographic and socioeconomic factors such as age, gender, economic status, geographic location (urban or rural), occupation, and educational background (Merrifield, 2003). Research by Ghosh (2006) also highlights that voter turnout is affected by the diversity of the demographic and socioeconomic composition of voters within an electoral regency. Aldrich (1993) argued that political behavior is largely shaped by individual preferences, further suggesting that understanding these preferences is crucial to encouraging voter participation. Finally, voter education includes informing citizens about their roles, responsibilities, and rights within the electoral system. Educators can motivate voters by emphasizing how individual participation helps shape a representative government and holds elected officials accountable. By understanding their roles, voters are more likely to engage in the democratic process, ensuring the integrity and legitimacy of the election system.

In the context of money politics, effective voter education becomes particularly important. When voters are informed and engaged, they are better equipped to recognize and resist undue influence, such as money politics or other corrupt practices. However, voter education must be sensitive to the social and political dynamics of money politics to be effective in combating it. Education on the importance of exercising the right to vote, as well as on the roles and responsibilities of voters, can serve as powerful tools in addressing money politics. Voter education can equip individuals with the knowledge necessary to recognize that money politics undermines the integrity of their rights, roles, and responsibilities, ultimately harming the quality of democratic elections. Through effective voter education, individuals should gain the understanding and confidence to resist the influence of money politics.

Several key pieces of knowledge can help persuade voters to act against money politics. First, every vote counts. In systems that use proportional representation, every vote contributes to shaping the overall representation of candidates chosen by the electorate (National Democratic Institute (NDI), 1999). Regardless of the numbers involved, voters must understand that each vote holds weight in securing their rightful voice in the political system, directly influencing the legitimacy of elected parties or representatives. Second, each person's vote is confidential. The NDI (1999) emphasizes the importance of protecting voters from intimidation and the fear of political or personal repercussions. In environments where such threats are present, voters need to be assured that their votes remain private and secure. It is crucial to communicate and, where possible, demonstrate the guarantees of vote confidentiality. However, secrecy can be perceived differently in various cultural contexts—while it can be seen as a safeguard in many societies, it might also raise suspicion in communities that place high value on transparency and collective decision-making. In some societies, secrecy might even be seen as unfeasible due to administrative issues or prevailing cultural beliefs. Therefore, voter education must also address these perceptions and ensure that voters understand the vital role of confidentiality in safeguarding their electoral choices.

As discussed earlier, elections are a critical yet complex component of democracy, facing numerous challenges, including the prevalence of money politics. Voter education, however, is seen as an essential framework for fostering more democratic elections, free from fraudulent practices. Evaluating the effectiveness of voter education, however, is a complex task. Despite various initiatives being implemented, the literature review reveals a lack of comprehensive studies specifically assessing its impact on addressing money politics. In Indonesia, although reports indicate a rise in money politics during the 2024 elections, efforts have been made to implement voter education as a countermeasure. This suggests that voter education has been ineffective in addressing the issue. Given this context, this article seeks to address a fundamental question: What obstacles hinder the effective implementation of voter education?

Method

To address the research questions, this article employs a combination of literature review and field research. The literature review focuses on previous studies published in scientific journals that examine the dynamics of voter education and money politics, particularly in Indonesia. Only peer-reviewed journals, both domestic and international, were selected to ensure the scientific credibility of the information, avoiding news articles and opinion pieces.

Field research was conducted through a series of interviews and document collection. Interviews were held with 40 informants, including election organizers, party officials, community organizations, community leaders, voters, and campaign teams. Voters and campaign teams were prioritized as informants due to their central role in the electoral process. Previous studies, such as Maharani (2023), emphasize the significant role of campaign teams in elections. Document collection involved gathering reports on the implementation of voter education at the Regency KPU and participatory supervision education at the Regency Bawaslu. The data obtained were systematically analyzed and verified through both source triangulation and method/technique triangulation.

The research was carried out in Pati Regency and Malang Regency, chosen for several methodological reasons. First, these two regencies represent the characteristics of Central and East Javanese societies, providing insights into a dominant region in Indonesian elections. While this study does not claim to represent all of Indonesia, it offers valuable context for Javanese society. Second, Pati and Malang represent the people of the north and south coasts of Java, respectively, further diversifying the scope. Third, research on money politics in these areas has been widely conducted, making them rich sources of relevant data. Numerous studies have explored how money politics operates in these regions, including the role of intermediary networks.

The analysis begins by presenting the programs implemented by election organizers, followed by an evaluation based on the key components discussed in the literature review. The conclusion summarizes the main findings, highlights the novelty of the research, and provides both scientific and practical recommendations.

Results and Discussion

Based on the recap of the SOSWATIF activities conducted by the Pati Regency Bawaslu, it was found that 21 SOSWATIFs were implemented between 2022 and 2024. In 2022, two socialization activities were held targeting people with disabilities and youth. In 2023, a total of 10 socializations were organized, reaching various groups including people with disabilities, students, youth, and local residents. In 2024, nine more socializations took place, again focusing on youth and local communities. The Pati Regency Bawaslu has carried out a range of socialization and participatory supervision programs aimed at raising public awareness and

promoting involvement in election oversight. These activities have engaged groups such as people with disabilities, youth, community organizations, and other local communities, reflecting the Bawaslu's efforts to expand its outreach across different social groups.

Additionally, several villages have been designated as "Supervision Villages" and "Anti-Money Politics (APU) Villages," as part of a local strategy to combat money politics. This initiative demonstrates Bawaslu's commitment to grassroots engagement. However, for these efforts to be more effective, the socialization programs should be tailored to meet the specific needs of each group. This includes enhancing activities for younger generations, people with disabilities, and religious organizations, all of which play significant roles in Pati's social fabric.

While the range of activities is extensive and covers diverse groups, an evaluation is necessary to ensure that the anti-money politics message is being effectively communicated and understood across all societal levels. The data indicates that while the Pati Regency Bawaslu has made efforts to engage various groups—such as people with disabilities, community organizations, and youth—the participatory supervision programs have not fully reached all key segments of society that are essential in preventing money politics. Notably, groups such as new voters, young voters, female voters, and religious communities are still underrepresented in these initiatives. A deeper analysis is needed to ensure that these crucial segments are properly targeted in future efforts.

First-time and young voters, for instance, are particularly vulnerable to money politics due to their limited understanding of the importance of fair and transparent elections. Although there are some programs involving students and youth organizations, the frequency and scale of these activities appear insufficient compared to the large potential of the young voter segment in Pati. It is crucial to involve more schools and youth organizations in socialization efforts about money politics. Young voters are often more susceptible to being influenced by material promises from candidates or their campaign teams. By providing intensive and educational socialization tailored to first-time voters and young people, we can foster a generation that values integrity in general elections.

Female voters, another significant but underrepresented group in Bawaslu's programs, also need more attention. As influential members of their communities, women can play a strategic role in spreading awareness about the dangers of money politics. Targeted activities, such as discussions at PKK meetings or Majelis Taklim gatherings, can offer a more personal and relevant form of socialization for women in Pati. These programs could take the form of small group discussions or workshops, reaching women from various backgrounds and empowering them to become agents of change in their communities.

Additionally, religious groups, which hold significant sway in shaping public opinion, are not widely represented in Bawaslu's program data. Religious leaders and community figures are highly respected and often serve as role models. Involving them in socialization and monitoring efforts would make the anti-money politics message more easily accepted and spread within the community. Socialization initiatives in places of worship or collaborations with religious organizations can effectively extend the reach of money politics supervision while reinforcing a moral commitment to conducting honest elections.

Beyond voter segments, it is essential to target the direct actors involved in money politics, such as candidate pairs, campaign teams, and community elites who often facilitate these practices, like through "dawn attacks." Socializing the negative consequences of money politics for a healthy democracy should also include candidates and their teams. By inviting political actors to socialization programs, we can deepen their understanding of the legal and moral implications of engaging in such practices. For example, Bawaslu could hold meetings

with candidates and their teams before the campaign period, clearly outlining the regulations and sanctions related to money politics.

Moreover, community elites, such as village leaders and local officials, who frequently serve as intermediaries for money politics, should also be included in socialization programs. These programs should aim to raise awareness among these figures about the long-term social and economic repercussions of money politics on their communities.

In conclusion, the relevance of Bawaslu's programs needs to be enhanced. While the current activities show positive efforts, they have not fully reached all critical segments involved in preventing money politics. A more specific and targeted socialization strategy is necessary to effectively engage key voter segments and directly address political actors who are most susceptible to engaging in money politics. These programs must be designed to be more inclusive and comprehensive, ensuring that the values of clean and integrity-based elections are instilled across all levels of society.

From the evaluation results presented above, several obstacles and challenges in the implementation of voter education become apparent. First, the limited reach of voter education is a significant issue. Voter education does not effectively reach all regions, particularly rural areas. Many voters in these regions are more susceptible to money politics because they lack a comprehensive understanding of their rights and the importance of making informed voting decisions.

Several factors contribute to this limited reach, especially in rural areas. One of the main challenges is the restricted access to information, both in terms of technology and infrastructure. The lack of a stable internet network and the vastness of rural areas make it difficult to effectively distribute information via online platforms. Additionally, many rural areas have limited access to formal and non-formal education facilities, which makes it harder to reach voters through educational programs. The absence of voter learning or training centers in rural communities' further hampers efforts to educate these voters.

Another contributing factor is the budget constraints and resource limitations faced by government bodies or election organizers. Uneven allocation of funds often leads to prioritizing urban areas, making it harder to extend voter education efforts to more remote, rural regions. Moreover, some rural voters may not fully recognize the importance of voter education or may lack motivation to participate in such programs. Cultural factors, reliance on local figures, and a strong adherence to traditional practices can also influence their willingness to engage with voter education initiatives.

In terms of outreach methods, voter education is often conducted through mass media or digital platforms, which may not be effective in isolated areas. To better reach rural voters, educational methods should be adapted to local characteristics, including social customs, media preferences, and language differences.

The second challenge lies in the limited material available for voter education, particularly when it comes to addressing money politics. Despite research, such as studies by Pradhanawati et al. (2019) and Tawakkal et al. (2017), showing how money politics affects voters, education programs have not sufficiently incorporated these issues into their materials. Voter education tends to focus primarily on the technical aspects of elections, such as how to vote, understanding the electoral process, and learning about candidates and political parties.

One reason for this is that voter education often centers on the procedural aspects of elections, aiming to ensure that voters know how to properly exercise their voting rights. Money politics, however, is typically viewed as a more complex issue linked to political ethics rather than election mechanics. As such, it is often not prioritized in voter education content. Moreover, money politics is a sensitive and controversial topic. Many individuals, including

election organizers, politicians, and community members, may be reluctant to openly discuss money politics. In some political cultures, particularly in less developed or local areas, money politics is seen as an established practice, making it a challenging and delicate subject to address. Election educators may avoid discussing it for fear of making the conversation too political or offending certain groups. Consequently, this crucial issue is often sidelined or considered too sensitive to include in voter education programs.

Another contributing factor is a lack of understanding among voters, particularly in rural areas or among those with lower levels of education. Many may not fully grasp the negative consequences of money politics on the quality of democracy. Voter education programs often focus on more basic information, such as how to correctly exercise the right to vote. As a result, money politics is frequently left out of the curriculum, either because it is seen as less relevant or because it is considered a topic that doesn't need to be directly addressed. However, the lack of understanding about the dangers of money politics makes voters more susceptible to such practices. While many recognize that money politics harms the integrity of elections, there is no consistent, systematic policy to incorporate it into voter education. Programs are usually run by the KPU or other institutions with limited resources, which often prioritize more immediate or easily accessible materials. Educating the public about money politics requires a deeper, more thorough approach, which takes time and resources, something often overlooked due to budget constraints.

In areas with a traditional political culture or a strong patronage system, money politics may be seen as an accepted, everyday practice. Voters in these areas may not view money politics as harmful because they focus more on the immediate benefits, they receive rather than the long-term impact on the political system. This limited understanding of the damage caused by money politics results in it not being treated as a top priority in voter education, despite its central role in undermining the integrity of elections.

A third challenge is the limited availability of resources. Even in voter education programs that address money politics, there is often a lack of involvement from those with specialized knowledge in the field (see Table 1). Money politics is a complex issue that intersects with political ethics, campaign practices, corruption, and socio-economic problems. Few experts focus solely on money politics, and most sources for voter education concentrate on the election process, election techniques, or general political participation, which are easier for the public to understand. Experts in the specific area of money politics often come from specialized fields, such as anti-corruption, criminal law, or political science, and are not typically involved in direct voter education efforts.

Table 1. The Participatory Supervision Education Program by the Pati Regency Bawaslu

No	Program	Date		Venue		Speaker
1	Socialization of participatory oversight with disability groups	30	March 2022	Hangout Tlogowungu District	Café,	Staff of the Social Affairs Office, Pati Regency
2	Socialization of participatory electoral oversight	04	November 2022	Pati Hotel		Achwan, S.Pd.I, M.H
3	Enhancing the role of civil society organizations in the 2024 election oversight	30	March 2023	New Merdeka Hotel, Pati Regency		Yusuf Hasyim, <u>S.Ag., M.Si.</u>
4	Strengthening youth engagement in electoral and election monitoring	22	September 2023	New Merdeka Hotel, Pati Regency		Dr. Sukarjo Waluyo, S.S., M.Hum

5	Facilitating the enhancement of electoral literacy	23 May 2023	Meeting Room, Pati Regency Election Supervisory Board (Bawaslu)	Ahmadi, S.Sos.,S.H.,M.H.
6	The role of youth in electoral and election monitoring	4 February 2024	New Merdeka Hotel, Pati Regency	Dafid Alifianto, S.IP, M.Sos.

Lastly, the participants in voter education programs are often not directly relevant to the issue of money politics. Many of the participants in these programs are not the key players involved in perpetuating money politics. According to studies by Tawakkal et al. (2017, 2020) and Aspinall (2014), community leaders and other influential figures in the money politics network have not been targeted by these educational efforts. These figures, who are often central to the spread of money politics, should be key targets of voter education. Successfully involving such figures in voter education could help break the cycle of money politics. Identifying and targeting the key individuals and networks that perpetuate money politics is crucial for addressing this issue effectively.

There are several reasons why voter education programs often do not target actors involved in money politics as participants. One key factor is that voter education organizers may not adequately map out or identify the key players in money politics. As a result, they lack sufficient information about these actors and their roles in the electoral process. Additionally, election organizers may be concerned about the potential impact of involving money politics actors in these educational programs. Money politics undermines the integrity and fairness of elections, and one of the primary goals of voter education is to increase public awareness about the importance of participating in elections based on candidates' visions, missions, and policies, rather than material incentives.

Including money politics actors in voter education could dilute the message that elections should be conducted honestly, fairly, and in accordance with democratic values. If such actors are involved, it may create the impression that money politics is a legitimate part of the democratic process, when in fact it is an unethical practice that should be eradicated and met with legal consequences. Therefore, these actors are not suitable participants, as they may influence the message of voter education with perspectives that contradict its core objectives. Money politics actors often use financial incentives or other rewards to sway voters, which directly undermines the democratic principles of freedom and equality in voting. If they are included in voter education, there is a risk that they will justify or reinforce these unethical practices, either explicitly or implicitly.

Rather than promoting education that upholds political ethics and election integrity, money politics actors could share how they manipulate votes through illegitimate means, which would undermine the goal of encouraging voters to make informed decisions based on rational considerations, not monetary enticements. The purpose of voter education is to foster more responsible and educated voter behavior, making it counterproductive to involve money politics actors. Their participation could introduce harmful ideas or practices that erode the democratic system. Even well-informed participants could be influenced by a narrative that legitimizes money politics, ultimately reducing the effectiveness of the education itself.

Moreover, money politics actors, especially those with political influence or authority, may exert undue influence on voter education participants. They may use the platform to promote money politics or recruit voters by offering material incentives. This would clearly undermine the goal of voter education, which is to build an informed and responsible electorate that recognizes the importance of clean, money-free elections.

Conclusion

This study directly addresses the effectiveness of voter education in combating money politics during the 2024 simultaneous elections and finds that it remains inadequate due to limited outreach, insufficient educational materials, a lack of qualified resource persons, and weak relevance to target audiences. These challenges indicate that voter education, as currently implemented, has not yet functioned as an effective deterrent to money politics. By shifting the focus from voter education's traditional link to participation toward its potential role in curbing electoral malpractice, this research contributes new insights to the field. However, the study's scope, limited to two regencies and lacking observational data, restricts its generalizability across Indonesia. Future research should adopt a broader, multi-regional approach and incorporate field-based methods to assess better the contextual factors affecting voter education outcomes. To improve program effectiveness, future initiatives should target vulnerable groups involved in money politics, increase outreach to new and young voters, empower women through community engagement, collaborate with religious leaders, integrate technology in anti-money politics messaging, and implement systematic monitoring and evaluation frameworks.

References

- Adnan, I. M., Habib, R., & Ridha, M. R. (2023). Penguatan peran organisasi masyarakat dalam pengawasan pemilu partisipatif pada Badan Pengawas Pemilu Kabupaten Indragiri Hilir. *Jurnal Karya Abdi*, 4(1), 1-9. <https://doi.org/10.32520/karyaabdi.v4i1.2439>.
- Alvarez, R. M., Hall, T. E., & Llewellyn, M. H. (2008). Are Americans confident their ballots are counted? *The Journal of Politics*, 70(3), 754-766. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022381608080730>.
- Aspinall, E. (2014). When brokers betray: Clientelism, social networks, and electoral politics in Indonesia. *Critical Asian Studies*, 46(4), 545-570. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14672715.2014.960706>.
- Atkeson, L. R., & Saunders, K. L. (2007). The effect of election administration on voter confidence: A local matter?. *PS: Political Science & Politics*, 40(4), 655-660. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096507071041>.
- Collier, D., & Levitsky, S. (1997). Democracy with adjectives: Conceptual innovation in comparative research. *World Politics*, 49, 430 - 451. <https://doi.org/10.1353/wp.1997.0009>.
- Dahl, R. (1971). *Ployarchy: participation and opposition*. Yale University press: New Haven.
- Detiknews. (2025). Burhanuddin Muhtadi: Toleransi politik uang meningkat setelah pemilu 2019. <https://news.detik.com/berita/d-7737923/burhanuddin-muhtadi-toleransi-politik-uang-meningkat-setelah-pemilu-2019>.
- Elklit, J., & Svensson, P. (1997). The rise of election monitoring: What makes elections free and fair? *Journal of Democracy*, 8(3), 32 - 46. <http://doi.org/10.1353/jod.1997.0041>.
- Fuadi, B. (2023). Implementasi kebijakan publik persentuhan antarbudaya dalam tata ruang perkotaan di Gresik. *JIAPI: Jurnal Ilmu Administrasi Dan Pemerintahan Indonesia*, 4(1), 1-12. <https://doi.org/10.33830/jiapi.v4i1.111>.
- Ghosh, S. (2006). *Strategic interaction among local governments: a spatial analysis of spillover of public goods*. Clark University.

- Hastuti, B. D. ., Anwar, F. ., & Titi, T. D. (2021). Implementasi kebijakan pengelolaan sampah di Kabupaten Bengkulu Selatan. *JIAPI: Jurnal Ilmu Administrasi Dan Pemerintahan Indonesia*, 2(2), 92-101. <https://doi.org/10.33830/jiapi.v2i2.70>.
- Hall, T. E., Quin Monson, J., & Patterson, K. D. (2009). The human dimension of elections: How poll workers shape public confidence in elections. *Political Research Quarterly*, 62(3), 507-522. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1065912908324870>.
- Hellmann, O. (2014). Electoral reform in Asia: Institutional engineering against 'money politics'. *Japanese Journal of Political Science*, 15(2), 275-298. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1468109914000073>.
- Idrus, I. A. (2023). Implementasi pelayanan berbasis digitalisasi government pada Aplikasi Alpukat Betawi di Kecamatan Penjaringan Jakarta Utara . *JIAPI: Jurnal Ilmu Administrasi Dan Pemerintahan Indonesia*, 4(1), 27-35. <https://doi.org/10.33830/jiapi.v4i1.116>
- Info Publik Pemilu 2024. (2024). <https://pemilu2024.kpu.go.id/>
- Kim, S., & Lee, J. (2012). E-participation, transparency, and trust in local government. *Public administration review*, 72(6), 819-828. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6210.2012.02593.x>.
- Lehoucq, F. (2003). Electoral fraud: Causes, types, and consequences. *Annual review of political science*, 6(1), 233-256. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.polisci.6.121901.085655>.
- Listiani, R., Pebriyanti, A., Fawwaz, M., & Istanti, N. D. (2022). Analisis implementasi kebijakan program jaminan kesehatan nasional: A systematic review. *Jurnal Kesehatan Tambusai*, 3(4), 645-652. <https://doi.org/10.31004/jkt.v3i4.9248>.
- Maharani, R. (2023). Marketing politik dan politisi perempuan: (Analisis kemenangan Ra. Anita Noeringhati sebagai petahana DPRD Sumatera Selatan). *JIAPI: Jurnal Ilmu Administrasi Dan Pemerintahan Indonesia*, 4(2), 94-104. <https://doi.org/10.33830/jiapi.v4i2.134>.
- Malhotra, N., Michelson, M. R., & Valenzuela, A. A. (2012). Emails from official sources can increase turnout. *Quarterly Journal of Political Science*, 7(3), 321-332. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1561/100.00011073>.
- Mann, C. B., & Bryant, L. A. (2020). If you ask, they will come (to register and vote): Field experiments with state election agencies on encouraging voter registration. *Electoral Studies*, 63, 102021. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.electstud.2019.02.012>.
- Metrotvnews. (2024). Bawaslu RI Ungkap Ada 130 Kasus politik uang pilkada 2024 di seluruh Indonesia. <https://www.metrotvnews.com/read/KYVCDLBq-bawaslu-ri-ungkap-ada-130-kasus-politik-uang-pilkada-2024-di-seluruh-indonesia>
- Merivaki, T., & Suttman-Lea, M. (2023). Can electoral management bodies expand the pool of registered voters? Examining the effects of face-to-face, remote, traditional, and social media outreach. *Policy Studies*, 44(3), 377-407. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01442872.2022.2044020>.
- Merrifield, J.D. (2003). School choice fallacies in the US. 8th IEA Discussion Paper Institute of Economic Affairs, 23 Juni 2003. <https://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4350632>.
- Nasiwan, N. (2010). Prospek pendidikan politik di era reformasi. *Humanika: Kajian Ilmiah Mata Kuliah Umum*, 10(1).

- National Democratic Institute (1999). The role of electoral management bodies in supporting voter education: Lessons learned and challenges, national democratic institute for international affairs, Mexico City. https://www.ndi.org/sites/default/files/19_elect_mgmt99_5.pdf.
- Nofriadi, D. (2021). Analisis implementasi pengelolaan barang milik daerah pada dinas pekerjaan umum dan penataan ruang kabupaten merangin. *JIAPI: Jurnal Ilmu Administrasi Dan Pemerintahan Indonesia*, 2(1), 50-56. <https://doi.org/10.33830/jiapi.v2i1.39>.
- Nuarida, N. (2021). Analisis implementasi kebijakan peningkatan kualitas terhadap permukiman kumuh (studi kasus di Kecamatan Tungkal Ilir Kabupaten Tanjung Jabung Barat). *JIAPI: Jurnal Ilmu Administrasi Dan Pemerintahan Indonesia*, 2(2), 111-119. <https://doi.org/10.33830/jiapi.v2i2.55>.
- Patrick, M. (2008). *Promoting legal frameworks for democratic elections*. National Democratic Institute for International Affairs. <https://www.ndi.org/sites/default/files/Legal%20Frameworks%20Guide%20Sections%201-3%20-%20EN.pdf>.
- Pradhanawati, A., Tawakkal, G. T. I., & Garner, A. D. (2019). Voting their conscience: Poverty, education, social pressure and vote buying in Indonesia. *Journal of East Asian Studies*, 19(1), 19-38. <https://doi.org/10.1017/jea.2018.27>.
- Prasetyo, N., Asrinaldi, A., & Zetra, A. (2022). Model partisipasi politik masyarakat Sumatera Barat Dalam Pilpres Tahun 2019. *Integritas: Jurnal Antikorupsi*, 8(2), 259-268. <https://doi.org/10.32697/integritas.v8i2.852>.
- Rigger, S. (2002, August). Weighing a shadow: toward a technique for estimating the effects of vote-buying in Taiwan. In *International Conference Trading Political Rights: The Comparative Politics of Vote Buying*, Boston: MIT press.
- Schaffer, F.C. (2007). How effective is voter education?. In F. C. Schaffer (ed.), *Elections for Sale: The Causes and Consequences of Vote Buying*. Boulder, CO: Rienner Publishers.
- Shineman, V. A. (2018). If you mobilize them, they will become informed: Experimental evidence that information acquisition is endogenous to costs and incentives to participate. *British Journal of Political Science*, 48(1), 189-211. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0007123416000168>.
- Sopiansyah, D., Masruroh, S., Zaqiah, Q. Y., & Erihadiana, M. (2022). Konsep dan implementasi kurikulum MBKM (merdeka belajar kampus merdeka). *Reslaj: Religion Education Social Laa Roiba Journal*, 4(1), 34-41. <https://doi.org/10.47467/reslaj.v4i1.458>.
- Suttmann-Lea, M., & Merivaki, T. (2023). The impact of voter education on voter confidence: Evidence from the 2020 US presidential election. *Election Law Journal: Rules, Politics, and Policy*, 22(2), 145-165. <https://doi.org/10.1089/elj.2022.0055>.
- Tawakkal, G. T. I., Damayanti, R., Subekti, T., Alfian, F., & Garner, A. D. (2020). Social networks and brokerage behavior in Indonesian elections: Evidence from Central Java. *Asian Affairs: An American Review*, 47(4), 227-244. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00927678.2020.1765473>.
- Tawakkal, G. T. I., Suhardono, W., Garner, A. D., & Seitz, T. (2017). Consistency and vote buying: income, education, and attitudes about vote buying in Indonesia. *Journal of East Asian Studies*, 17(3), 313-329. <https://doi.org/10.1017/jea.2017.15>.