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Abstract

Why do people run for elective office? Indeed, it is a central topic in political science that arguably is controversial to reveal, but always appealing since public authority remains in office. This study provides an explorative analysis to investigate local elites’ motives running for local parliament and village offices respectively in Kebumen, Indonesia. In examining individual’s motives, experiences and meanings of candidates are analysed using thematic analysis methods to capture emerging ideas of initial motives, enabling and constraining factors that affect the motives, and how both motives alter. The empirical findings of this study show that “people demand” and “community service” are both socially driven motives which act as a catalyst for the initial motives in candidacy process. In contrast, “monetary incentives” and “personal satisfaction” are both individually driven motives, which in turn replace the initial motives in response to high-cost political competition, that is so-called money politics. This study also captures the emergence of religious motive in the shifting process of the socially driven to the individually driven motives. Eventually, the study affirms that both motives, in combination, constitute a political motive as a desire of power to hold an elective office.
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Introduction
The year 2019 is a year of compelling political competition in Indonesia. In contrast to the previous five-year elections that take place in 2004, 2009, and 2014, this year Indonesia adheres to first concurrent general election during its democratization history. Presidential and parliamentary elections take place on 17th of April across the country, involving 34 provinces, 514 districts, 7,201 sub-districts, and 74,957 villages across Indonesia (Badan Pusat Statistik 2018, 11). Overall, the number of seats to be filled encompasses 1 presidential seat, 575 members of national parliamentary seats, 136 senate seats, 2,207 members of provincial parliamentary seats, and 17,610 members of district parliamentary seats (BBC Indonesia 2019). Note, however, 2019 becomes a paramount traction for politicians at distinct levels and in various areas given that both executive and legislative offices are open contested, regardless social, economic, education, and gender backgrounds, as well as political affiliation of candidates.

In some areas, for instance in Kebumen District, Central Java Province, the general election coincides with ensuing village elections which will be held in 400 out of 449 villages in July and December (Sorot Kebumen 2018). Aside from democratic system that provides ample opportunities for those who have willingness to run for office, as consequences, it successively evokes a vivid debate concerning a question on why people run for elective office. Despite that many studies have tried to explain election phenomena in wide array of focus, such as voter participation (Carreras 2018; Fowler 2013; He 2006), electoral campaign (Allcot and Getzkow 2017; Gregor and Matušková 2014; Russmann 2017), and candidate and party manifestos (Bøggild and Pedersen 2018; Eder et al 2016), yet, arguably, none has really sought to explore individual’s motives to engage in political competition.

Along with fruitful research findings emphasizing that election is a conspicuous characteristic in a democratic system (Mesfin 2008), some argue that election is a prominent mechanism containing particular core functions. In this vein, Berganza (2000) claims that election enables competent and committed individuals to enter the office inclusively, which in turn, helping electorates to ensure elected officials to account for holding public affairs, not least to drive officials to behave appropriately. As a matter of fact, arguably, progressive active participation of individuals running for office, both as nascent and incumbent candidates leads to a critical question, whether they do have
genuine motivations to work with and for people welfare, or, rather they desire to engage in electoral competition for private goals that risk public interests.

Despite that principal political motivations and ambitions may vary due to individuals, office levels, and political makeup, yet, earlier studies focusing on political motivation propose several underlying reasons that lie beneath individual's decision to seek an elective office, such as personal reasons, psychological reasons, opportunistic reasons and altruistic reasons (e.g. Adams & Merill 2013; Borgne & Lockwood 2006; Copeland 1989; Dutton 1975; Fox & Lawless 2004). While Lim (2013) and Luo (2018) situate economic factor as the sole embedded individual's motivation in pursuing office, rather, King (1981) and Yin (2013) suggest psychological commitments of politicians pertaining to altruism characteristic. Further, Maisel and Stone (1997) include interrelated factors that affect nascent contenders to compete against incumbents, namely personal reasons, existing political settings, and candidates’ perceived opportunity of winning. Some scholars also tend to classify political motivation into material, solidary, purposive and asked-to-run incentives, as Parker argues (1972). Finally, some political analysts identify a sense of efficacy of becoming an official and political education aspects as the main elements of political motivation (Fox and Lawless 2005), which are interlinked to personal political base of candidates to act and right time to run, as proposed by Copeland (1989).

1. Objective of Study and Research Questions
The overarching objective of this study is to explore why individuals run for elective office in Kebumen, Central Java, Indonesia. According to this rationale, the guiding research questions of this study are:

   • What motives influence individuals to run for office?
   • What are enabling and constraining factors that shape individuals’ motive, and what are possible relationships of both factors to the motives?
   • Do motives alter when individuals desire to be reelected or to seek a higher office?

2. Delimitations
The catalyst of this study is a long-term interaction between the researcher and local elites in Kebumen District. Most participants are recruited through researcher's social networks by which the researcher has a discrepancy of degree and range of relationship with participants. Moreover, the timeframe of this study takes place in 2019 where general election coincides with village election in Kebumen District, thus this momentum
may create more complex analysis compared to separable elections. Lastly, this study is conducted in Central Java context, thus the empirical findings may not be generalisable with other provinces and potentially other islands in Indonesia.

3. Outline
This paper is divided into eight parts. Part 1 explains research background, objective, research questions, and delimitations. It is followed by Part 2 which discusses related literatures on political motivation and ambition. Having cognizant of lacuna of the prior studies, Part 3 presents theoretical framework development of this study. Further, since this study falls into empirical data, Part 4 deals with methodology of the study, including the use of qualitative research and thematic analysis methods. A brief overview of Indonesian governmental structure, type of offices, characteristics of Kebumen District is discussed in Part 5, while empirical findings and analysis are presented in Part 6 and Part 7 respectively. In the final chapter, this paper provides a summary and ideas for future research.

Related Literature
Many studies have explored the emergence of candidates. As example, research by Canon (2013) shows that experience-seeking amateurs challenge incumbents inasmuch as they desire to gain real political experiences, which in turn, they do not meticulously respond to their electoral arena they compete therein. On the other hand, Bonneau and Kanthak (2018) analyse ads from Hillary Clinton’s campaign for the United States presidency in 2016 which positively augment the political ambition of some Clinton’s women supporters. Almost like-minded, Fox and Lawless (2004) examine candidacy and election in the United States, explaining that support of political actors is imperative for women’ political ambition in seeking an office. Other research by Weelden (2013) focusing on citizen-candidates who run for office, albeit they do not have manifestos before taking office, reveals that constituents’ perception of candidates matters to motivate the less rent-seeking candidates to challenge incumbents. Ultimately, Yin (2013) studies emergence of independent candidates in China to run for People’s Congress, demonstrating that conflicts of interest, social injustice and local officials’ deception in electoral process stimulate many more people to perform in political competition to uphold democracy.

Some studies have also investigated underlying motives of incumbents to maintain their office. For instance, Borgne and Lockwood (2006) study relationship between
incumbent and electorate using a principal-agent model, explaining that incumbents retain holding their office for upcoming election inasmuch as they perceive themselves to have a good performance during their tenure. Meanwhile, Clarke and Donovan (1980) pinpoint self-esteem politicians in the United States, consisting of high-esteem politicians who engaged in political office for public recognition, and low-esteem politicians who seek public office to elicit respectable status and livelihood. Further work, Dutton (1975) delves elected officials’ desire to maintain their electorates to enlarge their likelihood to be reelected, and potentially supporting their promising career opportunities in a higher office. Additionally, Fisman et al. (2014) uses asset disclosures of candidates to examine the Indian state legislatures’ motivation to run for office, confirming that compelling and prospective financial advantages emanating from office motivate experienced officials to remain in office as the incumbent. Moreover, Palmer and Simon (2003) apply political ambition theory to analyse female elected officials who work in the U.S. House of Representatives, which shows that they employ progressive ambitions when deciding to run or be reelected for higher office as the counterpart response to male incumbents.

Many studies have examined hindrance that hinders individuals running for office. Research by Browning and Herbert (1964) focusing on political motivation of local businessmen in the U.S. confirms prior studies that emphasis on private utility-maximizing of actors by which politically active businessmen striving for office when it provides prospects for their economic advantages, not least broader expansions. In separate efforts to stress the importance of women’s representation in politics, research by Bledsoe and Herring (1990) explains that familial responsibilities and personal relationship are most salient consideration for women to run. Relatedly, both Fox et al. (2001) and Huddy and Terkildsen (1993) also suggest that voters’ gender stereotypes and fostered sex-role upbringings are key factors which affect both female candidates and voters to increase the number of female politicians running forwards for various political offices. In a way, research by Krook (2010) reveals that both supply of and demand for female candidates are strongly shaped by structural conditions and gender quotas. Finally, an exploratory work by Maisel and Stone (1997) clearly suggest that having incumbents negatively affect potential nascent candidates to run for office, inasmuch as they may be deterred when fighting robust incumbents in the same electoral affiliation.

Here, it is imperative to provide a comprehensive brief summary which stems from literature review discussed above. As a matter of fact, numerous attempts have been made
to explore political motivations and ambitions that lie behind individual’s decision to run for office. Initially, focusing on the candidacy stage, some initial motives emerge which include experience-seeking, role model of the political elites, more accountable perception from constituents, and political dissatisfaction of candidates. Furthermore, focusing on incumbency stage, economic advantages, self-esteem, settled livelihood, and sense of rivalry all do portray elected politicians to retain or even enlarge their power in office. Relatedly, some enabling and constraining factors are recognizable to shape individual logics either to seek or not to seek an office where discrepancies exist both in democratic and authoritarian systems. Nevertheless, most studies have paid less interest to investigate subjective experiences of individuals’ political motives, both nascent and elected candidates, particularly in Southeast Asia context given that American and European perspectives on political motivations and ambitions are vast studied. In conclusion, there is a need for empirical research by focusing on Indonesian case, more precisely to explore local elites both at local parliament and village levels where so-far are often neglected by political researchers interested in the study of politics of desire.

**Theoretical Framework**

1. **Concept of Political Motivation**

Many contesting notions which strives to define motivation with different emphasis. This generates multifaceted definitions of motivation by which people are influenced to behave or make decisions. Pardee (1990, 2–3) notes that motivation is a driving force within individual that energize and determine the direction of action. However, motivation can be linked to various behaviours and actions to reach specific goals and outcomes (Omorede 2014, 5) and it works when it provides impetus and inspiration to a person doing something (Ryan and Deci 2000, 54). Importantly, motivation can be distinguished as intrinsic and extrinsic. The intrinsic motivation relates to inherent enjoyment and satisfaction that stimulate a person to act independently, whereas the extrinsic motivation is connected to tangible advantages for which a person dependently acts in certain situations (Reinholt 2006, 2; Yo et al 2012, 944).

Motivation is strongly inherent with needs, so that tracing individual needs can help to identify the motives. Demonstrably, every individual has own needs that generate heterogeneous motives and can alter in connection with circumstances and time. Nonetheless, two leading theories are highly dominant to explain the relationships between needs and motivation, namely Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs theory which
derives from psychology field and McClelland’s Achievement Motivation theory which stems from economic field. Both theories attempt to reveal underlying root-factors that lie behind individual’s motivation, and allegedly individual’s motivation is needs-driven. In a nutshell, motivation and need are mutually inseparable given that need becomes antecedent of motivation, while motivation is the ensuing consequence of need that manifested through a catena of actions.

Maslow classifies a bottom-up pyramid of five staple basic human needs (1943, 372–383) as follows:

- **Physiological Needs.** These are most fundamental needs of individuals to survive as human beings and located at the lowest level of the pyramid, including water, food, clothes, sleep and sex. Maslow contends that ensuing needs become secondary unless the physiological needs are fulfilled.
- **Security Needs.** These refer to desires for safety and security, such as life protection, health insurance, environmental safety, and financial stability.
- **Social Needs.** These are higher needs beyond security needs which comprise family affection, friendship, love relationship and social belonging.
- **Esteem Needs.** These relate to acceptance, appreciation, and recognition of others that are sought after three prior needs have been accomplished.
- **Self–Actualizing Needs.** These are the highest level of needs, but less primary than earlier needs, and connected to self-awareness and self-confidence to realize own potential at the expense of others’ perception.

In contrast to Maslow situating motivation as hierarchical and gradual processes, McClelland identifies three interrelated needs concerning behavioural consequences (Andersen 2018, 2) which each need may have different degrees upon individual preference and action as explained below:

- **Need for Achievement.** This refers to a desire to do something difficult or something better in order to elicit successful achievement both in realizing own interest or addressing certain problems in competition nuance (James 1991, 1–4).
- **Need for Affiliation.** This involves a desire to interact with other people without conflicts, and includes developing, maintaining, and restoring both personal and social relationships (Moore et al 2010, 26).
- **Need for Power.** This relates to a desire to influence and create an impact over people, both through personal and institutional power by which power-
motivated individuals forthrightly make use their authority and improve their reputation (Jha 2010, 382–383).

Building on Maslow's and McClelland's theories, individual’s needs can be classified as individual-driven and social-driven. The individual-driven involves a person as the independent actor who determines type of outcomes and ways to achieve them based on his/her preference and control that most fruitful for him/her personally. Some needs belong to individual-driven are physiological, security, esteem, self-actualization and power in which these needs are most likely profitable to the person as an individual. In contrast, the social-driven involves a person as the dependent actor in the community, so that he/she requires other people to identify and elicit his/her needs, as well as entailing him/her to compromise with the needs of others. Hence, social belonging or affiliation is put as the social-driven because these needs are more likely worthwhile to many people rather than individual’s own needs per se. Nonetheless, it is difficult to capture and measure the tendency of needs of the individuals in real life because it is often intangible, immeasurable, and relatively subjective.

Since I discuss motivation with emphasizes on individual as the point of interest, in this paper I tend to borrow some ideas from New Institutionalism approach, particularly Rational-Choice and Sociological strands, to link the individual’s motivation with institutions. Theoretically speaking, Institutionalism is a theoretical perspective in political science interested in the ways in which political behaviours and outcomes are understood by studying the rules and practices, as well as the ways by which individuals relate to them (Lowndes and Robert 2013). The basic assumption of this approach is that in order to understand how and why individuals are capable to act, either consciously or unconsciously, we need to study the patterns of rules that affect them both enabling and constraining. Nilsson (2018, 2) divides institutions as formal aspects that can be depicted as “how things should be done” and informal aspects that relate to “how things are done”. Hence, more specifically, New Institutionalism is a broad approach of Institutionalism that concerns itself, not just with the impact of institutions upon individuals, but also with the interaction between institutions and individuals (Marsh and Stoker 2010, 71).

The Rational Choice Institutionalism (RCI) which derived its roots from economic and organizational theory understands that institutions are “the rule of the game” comprising rules and incentives which are contested (Breuning and Ishiyama 2018), and individuals calculate the best preference consciously to pursue their interest within communities
(Lowndes and Robert 2013). Moreover, the Sociological Institutionalism (SI) emphasizes that individuals are driven by rules of appropriate or exemplary behaviour, in which rules are followed because they are seen as natural, rightful, expected, and legitimate to fulfil individuals’ obligation in regard to their roles in a community (March and Olsen 2006, 3). In sum, from the RCI perspective, individual’s motivation is more independent, assuming that individual is self-interested, purposeful and cognizant. Rather, from the SI perspective, individual’s motivation is more dependent, perceiving that individual is obedient, self-less, and loyal to the rules taken for granted.

As a conceptual starting point, I define political motivation as “established motives that drive the behaviour and decision of individuals to control communities.”

By employing the term “established motives”, I wish to emphasize that motivation is a cornerstone of actions which are produced and reproduced by individuals in response to their needs in specific contexts. Further, with the term “drive”, I mean it is imperative that motivation provides individuals an implicit guiding force in order to fulfil their needs or desires through interrelated actions. Eventually, by using the term “communities”, I assert that motivation is perceived to be existent, despite it is difficult to observe, along with individuals’ recurring patterns of behaviour, personality, knowledge and capability in public arena which enable people to appraise.

2. Type of Political Motives

Drawing on theories of political motivation as discussed above, I propose four principal motives of an individual to run for public office by classifying them into individual-driven and social-driven (see figure 1 for the theoretical framework of this study). I include monetary incentives and personal satisfaction as the individual-driven motives by which individual is assumed to be more independent to shape and realize his/her motives. In contrast, I include community service and people demand as the social-driven motives by which individual is assumed to be more dependent to shape and realize his/her motives.

2.1. Monetary Incentives

This is a prevalent and ubiquitous motive which is at the expense of altruism or voluntarism logics. A political candidate is perceived as the economic actor who seeks an office for material advantages (Berganza 2000, 165) and highly interested to pursue personal payments (Parker 1972, 269) through policy-making and public service works (Müller 2007, 287–288). Therefore, when in office, an elected official significantly
acquires an increase of annual income which may derive from formal financial returns (Fisman et al. 2014, 808–809) and potentially political rents. Among many things, many officials wish to remain in office for some reasons, such as to maintain and expand their economic utility as the central focus (Browning and Herbert 1964, 89–90) or due to a misfit and boredom of the previous job (Parker 1972, 271). However, some individuals become so passionate in office given that they tend to posit the office as livelihood (Clarke and Donovan 1980, 549–550) with fixed salaries and potential allowances.

2.2. Personal Satisfaction

This is a motive which is supported by candidate’s readiness to engage in electoral competition. Typically, the individuals who have enough resources, such as money, capacity, and time, are more inclined to run compared to resource-deprived individuals (Fox and Lawless 2005, 645). Moreover, some elected officials also have rivalry reason to be reelected inasmuch as they are challenged by their contenders thus in order to secure their position or to pursue a higher office, they spend sums of their funds to win the competition (Copeland 1989, 550–552). Relatedly, sense of prestige and identification (Parker 1972, 269), as well as individual subjective perception of office to provide invaluable benefits (Copeland 1989, 553), they all do influence individual incumbent to remain in office. By the same token, many incumbents experience upset when they are defeated (Dutton 1975, 519) given that office provides ample opportunities to improve their knowledge and ability in governing public matters during their tenure (Borgne and Lockwood 2006, 41–43). In addition, a desire to obtain public recognition through performing leadership skills on electoral competition also becomes personal reason of self-confident individuals (Clarke and Donovan 1980, 549–550) by which they make use the office as personal enjoyment. While successful politician activates important impulse as a role model for amateur politician (Bonneau and Kanthak 2018, 15), many amateur politicians seek office to gain real political experience (Canon 2013, 1137–1138) thus their satisfaction more relies on the process to challenge incumbent.

2.3. Community Service

This connects to contribution and dedication to help communities through the office as formal means. Individuals, both who intend to be nascent and incumbent politician, posit politics authentically as a psychological call for contribution and commitment to achieve public goals (King 1981, 250–251), which in turn, they identify themselves as an activist with dominant altruistic spirit to make or change better policy for people. Note that social
and law injustice in communities (Yin 2013, 267–268) may urge dedicated individuals to enshrine themselves by taking over the office from unworthy incumbent to realize public interests. In this vein, when in office, they attempt to consider diverse interests when making decisions (Lim 2013, 1361) by prioritizing policy outcome (Callander 2008, 690–691) profitable for most people.

2.4. People Demand

This relates to a group of people where individual is involved with intense interaction and becomes an important part of the group, which directly requests the individual to run for office. Since the group is inherently meaningful for individual life, the individual is heavily unable to reject the request (Parker 1972, 270). Beside the group containing strong political elites who support the individual with adequate resources (Fox and Lawless 2004, 275) to run in adulthood period, family political upbringing through intimate parents’ socialization for their children also positively affects initial individual’s motivation in childhood period to obtain an office in the future (Fox and Lawless 2005, 646).

3. Enablers and Hindrances to Run

In this study, I also propose five factors that can be either enabler or hindrance for individuals to run for office, that vary according to the circumstances of individuals to grow up as a political actor, and the office to be pursued (see figure 1 for the complete theoretical framework of this study).

3.1. Demographic Aspects

Where individual comes from, lives in, and competes in are of central importance that relates to demographic aspects involving gender (Fox et al 2001), age (Musarurwa 2018), religion (Bradberry 2016), education (Berinsky and Lenz 2011) and race/ethnicity (Fairdosi and Rogowski 2015). Basically, these illuminate individual’s imagination regarding voter participation, electoral arena, and majority-minority configuration in communities. Indeed, demography does not rely tightly only on numeric size, but also the power of groups containing diverse substantial interests and resources respectively. One the one hand, demographic aspects can become an enabler when individual is a member of the majority groups which their interests intersect with the office. Thus, he/she will be potentially elected as the insider in the electoral arena. Rather, on the other hand, it can also become a hindrance when individual is a member of the minority groups bringing less popular interests of majority groups. Thus, as the outsider, the individual will be
scantily elected where the electoral arena is ruled by the majority groups. In sum, assuming, there is always a possibility for the individual who derives from the minority groups to run as the candidate for some cases, such as 1) an absence of political candidate from majority groups; 2) the increase of public trust to minority groups; 3) majority and minority group consensus to uphold political representation in public office.

3.2. Leadership Capacity

Leadership capacity can be obtained from formal education backgrounds and organizational experiences. Despite that education does not create specific skills of how to seek or hold the office concretely, education can supply various skills that may be applicable in civic engagement and political competition (Carnes and Lupu 2015, 37), such as communication, problem-solving, teamwork and forth. By the same token, formally educated individuals allegedly perceive themselves or are perceived by the communities as an astute and knowledgeable who are eligible to address complex issues. However, indeed, running for office requires robust and practical skills that tightly relate to long-lasting leadership characters fostered outside schools, namely organizational activities. While formal education offers much more cognitive skills, social organization fosters individual leadership characters through many more practical skills to manage people and govern collective interests. Regardless of the sources, either education accomplishments or organizational experiences, the leadership capacity itself consists of the sense of duty, service, and responsibility (Saveth 1988, 379) that enable individuals to channel that capacity through office means. In brief, assumed, individuals who do not have leadership capacity are inclined to be constrained to run unless they desire to become an experience-seeker who posit the office as the place of trials.

3.3. Financial Resource

Running for office is tremendously money-consuming, particularly for nascent politicians who want to be a contender against incumbent who is already well-known with incumbency advantage in electoral arena. Therefore, for nascent politicians, greater efforts to promote themselves and campaign their manifestos to heterogeneous constituents are imperative things, which entail money as inevitable financial resources to raise and familiarize themselves in a constituency. Meanwhile, both financial resource and chance of success have positive associations, meaning that the more money individuals spend, the better chance they are recognized and elected (Kenig and Atmor 2019, 9) by the voters who have been approached during campaigning.
process. Yet, for incumbents, the money-spending is higher and successively be increased when they are being threatened by stronger contender (Squire 1995, 900). Accordingly, financial resource, both originating from public funding and self-funding, is the enabler for whom financially guaranteed, and the contrary is a hindrance for whom financially indigent.

3.4. Social Networks

Elective office always requires electoral votes as much as possible, thus that is prevalent for individuals to utilize their social networks in communities, such as kinship, friendship, cultural ties and voluntary affiliations. These social networks are not just a place of socialization for individuals, but rather effective social capital that provides a potential political means by which individuals gain trust, support, loyalty, and early fundraising to evoke their political motives. Since social networks are long-term built and relatively stable over external change, these offer prospect for individuals to run for office by utilizing family reputation (Cruz et al 2017), ancestral lineage (Balian and Gasparyan 2017), organizational engagement (Lake and Huckfeldt 1998), and social network sites (Utz 2009). A wide range of social networks creates the individual’s sense of ownership and proximity, which in turn, facilitating them to join the contest supposing that social bond between individuals and their supporters is well-established. In a similar vein but negatively, the limited and weaker social networks may diminish individual's motives and possibilities in candidacy process, given that individuals emerge initially from close and condensed social networks nominating them to pursue the office.

3.5. Political Makeup

Incumbency effects significantly affect individuals to enter arena. From challengers’ perspective, incumbents have more experiences and familiarities within their constituency (Druckman et al 2017), thus they obtain loyalty based on their satisfied office performance (Luo 2018). Consequently, the challengers may be deterred by the incumbents (Maisel and Stone 1997), unless they are politically experienced and well-funded (Holbrook and Weinschenk 2014). The emergence of high-quality challengers posing popular name recognition, political experience, and resource support (Kazee 1983) may also hinder incumbents when candidacy is strongly dependent on voter preferences. Linked to incumbency effects, term limits also shape political space for individuals to engage in political competition (Daniel and Lott Jr 1997) and simultaneously reduce the chances of eligible incumbents to be reelected (Lazarus 2006).
Methodology

1. Qualitative Research

In this study, qualitative research is used inasmuch as it enables a researcher to understand phenomena by using researcher’s perspectives. Epistemologically, I posit this study as constructivist which facilitates the researcher to construct meanings and interpretation based on the object being studied, and reality during research process rejects the idea of value-free assumptions. Basically, qualitative research does not need quantitative assumptions to proceed and analyse data, thus consequently entails the researcher to familiarize and assimilate with the object of study in order to obtain scientific analysis. Further, qualitative research provides a wide space for the researcher to develop analytical thinking based on social realities instead of mathematical or statistical methods. Importantly, qualitative research involves subjectivity and standpoint of the researcher as crucial aspects. In practice, the researcher may be situated in circumstances that relatively detached or value-free, thus it is the role of the researcher to determine in which part or to what extent that the data profitable for the researcher.

According to Creswell (2014), there are at least five leading approaches in qualitative research, namely narrative, phenomenological, grounded theory, ethnography and case study. Compared to other approaches, case study is used extensively and becomes dominant method in social sciences. While there is no single explanation to define case
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study method, Crowe et al (2011, 1) consider it as a research approach to explore and generate an in-depth and multifaceted understanding of phenomena in a natural context. Moreover, Gerring (2004, 342) suggests that case study is an intensive study of a single unit for the purpose of understanding a larger class of (similar) units. In this vein, Creswell (2014) refers the unit as a program, activity, process, or one or more individuals, whereas Yin (2004, 17) contends it as individuals, organizations, processes, programs, neighbourhoods, institutions, and events.

Case study method is relevant to this study inasmuch as essentially it focuses on answering “how” and “why” questions in actual and contemporary events (Yin 2009, 10–11). In addition, case study is more useful when conclusions of a study are “descriptive rather than causal”, when a study more emphasizes on “comparability” rather than “representativeness”, when a study accentuates “causal mechanisms” rather than “causal effects”, when a study is “exploratory” rather than “confirmatory”, and when “useful variance” of a study is available for only a single unit or a small number of units (Gerring 2004, 352). Relatedly, Baxter and Jack (2008, 449–551) classify case study into single and multiple case studies, which single case study only allows researcher to understand one unique or critical case, while multiple case study examines several cases to understand the similarities and differences between cases.

2. Research Design
This is an explanatory qualitative study for the purpose of exploring and capturing principal driving forces that shape and facilitate individuals’ motives to run for elective public office in Kebumen District, Central Java Province, Indonesia. More specifically, this study is designed to investigate experiences and meanings of local elites in connection with their political motivation to become public official either in village or local legislature offices through elections. The multiple case study is opted given that the type and level of contested offices, as well as the period and election system, vary. In brief, the unit of analysis of this study is individual political motives for becoming an elective official, both as incumbent and amateur in 2019 in two separable offices. It is reasonable to state that 2019 becomes promising timeframe given that general election containing local legislative election takes place in unison with village elections. Thus, it generates greater political escalation in the locus of study. Hence, this infrequently momentum can help the researcher to explore individuals’ motives both in maintaining or seeking public office in Kebumen District.
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Concerning with generalizability, it is reasonable that this study applies analytical generalization. It reexamines established concepts and theories to develop new conceptual and theoretical understandings (Smith 2018, 141) drawn from empirical findings (Carminati 2018, 2099) related to political motivation. Accordingly, the theoretical model developed and examined in this study can be replicated and applied across cases of offices and politicians in Indonesia despite its empirical results may be distinct based on locus and contexts of study. Analytical generalization is analogous to multiple case study, by which a case of individual’s motives running for village office and a case of individual’s motives running for local legislative office can predict either similar empirical findings (a literal replication), or contrasting results but for anticipatable reasons (theoretical replication) (Yin 2009, 54).

3. Operationalization of Theory

In order to approach the unit of analysis to collect data through in-depth interviews, the theoretical framework developed in this study needs to be operationalised. It breaks the theoretical model down to deal with practicalities to fit the locus of study by providing, and to some extent, clarifying concepts and definitions as presented earlier in the theoretical framework part.

3.1. Run for Office

“Run for Office” refers to a catena of motives manifested through individual’s behaviours, decisions, and actions to nominate or to be nominated himself/herself as a candidate in elections process in Kebumen District.

In this study, office means an elective public office in Kebumen District, either in village or local legislature levels, where elected individuals become public official who holds the office for certain term limits. In relation to a public official in village office, he/she is formally called as village head (in Bahasa: Kepala Desa) who officially has six years of tenure and can be reelected for maximum 3 tenures. In addition, a public official in local legislature office is called as the local legislature member (in Bahasa: Anggota Dewan Perwakilan Rakyat Daerah/Anggota DPRD), who officially he/she serves office for five years of tenure and can be reelected for many tenures. The major distinction of candidacy of both offices is the need for political party recognized and legalized officially by the General Election Commission of the Republic of Indonesia (in Bahasa: Komisi Pemilihan Umum Republik Indonesia/KPU RI). For village head candidate, there is no need for a political party to engage in village elections, and the
candidate is not formally a member of any political parties, despite he/she is informally a sympathizer or supporter of a political party. Rather, for local legislature member candidates, the political party is imperative to support a person as the candidate, and typically he/she is a registered member of political party located at district level.

Most importantly, this study prefers to use “local elite” to name an individual who desires to run for office rather than “local politician”. It is reasonable to consider that “local elite” can broadly refer to individual who economically, socially, or culturally is influential among people, regardless he/she is an amateur or incumbent candidate and either he/she is a member of political party or not. In contrast, “local politician” narrowly refers to individual who is a member of political party, thus in other words, every individual who formally belongs to the political party can be named as a politician regardless economically, socially, or culturally he/she is the dominant figure within communities.

3.2. Political Motive

Political motive is a primary reason or reasons that lie behind individual’s behaviours, decisions, and actions to seek, hold, and survive the office through election in Kebumen District. It can be classified as monetary incentives, personal satisfaction, community service, and people demand. Note, however, monetary incentives and personal satisfaction belong to individual-driven motives by which individual is more independent to shape and realize his/her motives. In contrast, community service and people demand belong to social-driven motives by which individual is relatively more dependent to shape and realize his/her motives. Hence, to identify the motives, we can analyse both tacit and expressed statements, explanations, and confirmations from individuals during in-depth interviews. In practice, we categorize the motives as follows:

- **Monetary Incentives:** when individual states that he/she primarily relies on fixed incomes, extra perks, and even he/she posits the office as his/her staple livelihood over other jobs.

- **Personal Satisfaction:** when individual states that he/she primarily situates the office as way to acquire people’s recognition, or to defeat his/her personally enemy, or to experience a real public business, or to accomplish a prestige as an influential figure in communities.
• **Community Service:** when individual states that he/she primarily utilizes the office as a place for both, dedicating himself/herself and helping communities by creating or changing public policy that increases community development.

• **People Demand:** when individual states that he/she primarily is requested by his/her family or special person or networks to hold the office given that he/she is perceived as qualified and capable, and the requester guarantees to support him/her to winning the office.

### 3.3. Enabler and Hindrance

The enabler is a matter of things which can establish and substantiate individual’s political motives, whereas in contrast hindrance can diminish and subjugate his/her political motives as a candidate in the electoral arena. Both enablers and hindrances can be identified concretely through individual’s subjective views and experiences as follows:

• **Demographic Aspects:** when enabler or hindrance involve gender, age, educational level, religion, employment and domicile status of individual as candidate competing in a specific electoral arena where whether he/she becomes a minority within the electorates.

• **Leadership Capacity:** when enabler or hindrance relate to individual’s personal leadership skills and capabilities, proven from his/her experiences in managing organizations or communities, thus individuals can be labelled either as experienced candidate or inexperienced candidate.

• **Financial Resource:** when enabler or hindrance rely on money to fund his/her electoral competition, including setting up the core-team, recruiting supporters, campaigning his/her profile and programs, visiting potential voters and forth. This leads to group individuals as wealthy candidate and destitute candidate.

• **Social Networks:** when enabler or hindrance relate to his/her kinship, peers, organizational involvements, and other social groups. These segregates individuals as candidate with extensive supporting social or candidate with minor social support, which in turn affect their integrity and popularity within society.

• **Political Makeup:** when enabler or hindrance hinge on external issues, such as whether an existing incumbent is credible and reputable, whether emerging contender is prominent and preferable, whether voters’ political behaviour is rational and fair, and whether a contested office is prospective and lucrative for candidate.
4. Data Collection
Collecting data is a vital aspect to provide rich and detailed research information into the topic. Essentially, there are two main types of data collection as described by Lewis and Nicholls (2014): naturally occurring data and generated data. Data which exist independently of the research, basically found in texts (recorded conversations, media coverage, policy documents, internet and forth), and relatively effortless to obtain, called as naturally occurring data. On the other hand, data which intendedly created through a research process and mainly generated from an interaction between researcher and participant (interview or group discussions) is called as generated data (Lewis and Nicholls in Ritchie et al. 2014, 54).

This study employs generated data collection to obtain participants’ own experiences and views. In this vein, generated data enables participants to tell their own experiences in real context and provide an extensive picture of phenomenon captured in the research (Lewis and Nicholls in Ritchie et al. 2014, 55). In addition, generated data situates researcher as a primary instrument having an important role (Atieno 2009, 14) to develop own interpretations, as well as to give participants opportunity to develop their own meanings (Lewis and Nicholls in Ritchie et al. 2014, 55) during data collection and analysis.

In-depth individual interview is chosen for this study inasmuch as it is adept to get a reflexive understanding from participants with more spaces and personal freedom to discuss various information. Importantly, approaching participants as an individual will strengthen data collected given that information may be highly sensitive or private, but still have adequacy and efficacy to support the topic of being studied. Further, the Whatsapp video call is used as medium to carry out in-depth individual interviews given that the time and distance barriers between researcher and participants to undergo physical meeting. I argue that live interview process using internet is similar as well as the face-to-face meeting.

This study employs purposive sampling to choose participants. Given this, I explore rich and relevant information from participants related to the research questions, and the participants are chosen according to specific information, such as lived experiences, perspectives, and practices. Moreover, I apply heterogeneous sampling technique with the following criteria: 1) participants are affiliated to a political party (for local legislative office) or independent (for village head); 2) may work as nascent or incumbent local elite;
3) have been or will be running for office, either for local legislature or village offices in Kebumen District in 2019.

Overall, two groups of participants comprising seven local elites are determined to provide diverse power dynamics and political characteristics of different offices, as explained below:

- Four individuals at the village level are recruited by considering both littoral and hilly areas in several sub-districts. Note that according to the political system, village election does not involve political party, thus individuals run independently with the support of their autonomous interim team.
- Three individuals running for local parliamentary office are recruited by considering both the different political parties in various local electoral areas and gender representation.

5. Data Analysis

Thematic analysis is used as a tool for analyzing data. Thematic analysis is gradual procedures to identify, analyse, and report patterns or themes within the data (Braun and Clarke 2006, 79; Kito and Ueno 2016, 24). Historically, thematic analysis term evoked about 40 years ago referring to a method for analysing qualitative data that relies on interpretative forms to identify emerged recurrent themes or patterns in data (Clarke et al in Smith 2015, 222).

Thematic analysis is compatible with my epistemological position in qualitative research as social constructivist given that thematic analysis is a method rather than a methodology (Marvasti 2004, 5; Ritchie et al. in Ritchie et al 2014, 12; Clarke et al in Smith 2015, 223). Moreover, it can be used to analyse most types of qualitative data, chiefly individual interviews, and researcher does not just report the subjective experiences and meanings of participants, but also examine socio-cultural contexts that lie behind individual’s behaviours and interpretations (Braun and Clarke 2006, 85). Note, however, data derived from interviews are analysed using an inductive thematic analysis procedure (Braun and Clarke 2016, 87–93; Clarke, Braun, and Hayfield in Smith 2015, 231–243).

6. Practical Considerations and Ethical Aspects

In-depth interviews are conducted individually by the researcher and scheduled for roughly 40–60 minutes in duration. All interviews consider the willingness of participants, different time zones between Sweden and Indonesia, and the voluntary
participation of participants, which exempt researcher to provide any forms of money-giving as acknowledgement of contribution. By using semi-structured interview guide, during interviews process researcher gives some questions to participants regarding demographic information, political motives, enablers and hindrances as local elite seeking the office. However, researcher also allows participants to discuss any issues most relevant to them and to clarify prior given information. Consequently, for data collection purpose, all interviews are recorded using recording software installed on laptop and transcribing process is carried out immediately as appropriate after the interviews completed.

However, to mitigate potential bias derived from my interpretative works, I elaborate ethical consideration proposed by Webster et al. (in Ritchie et al. 2014: 87 – 106) as follows:

- To ensure that participants voluntarily participate in the audio-recorded interviews, they are explained about the purpose of the study, methods used, their participation in on-going research and how their data will be stored and treated. They also have right to refuse the participation for any reason if they intend to, or not to share any information they perceive as secret.

- To protect participants' personal information, chiefly sensitive sequences, both anonymity and confidentiality are considered. Anonymity means that participants are permitted to use aliases during interview process and/or in the research report when needed, while confidentiality means that their personal information will not be shared with the public unless they give approbation.

- To subjugate any risks that may risk the researcher and participants, I utilize my social network as an activist since 2009 and as an independent political observer since 2016 onwards. Being cognizant of it, I also attempt to give broad opportunity to participants to provide feedback before the research report is published to avert any complaints from them.

**Background: Kebumen, Indonesia**

1. Indonesian Governmental Structure

Indonesia is the largest archipelago country in the world located in between Asia and Australia continents and on a crossroad between the Pacific and the Indian oceans. This strategic geographical position leads Indonesia as a highly diverse country culturally, socially, economically, and politically in Southeast Asia, not least in Asia. Historically, after
has been colonized by the Spanish, Portugal, Netherlands, British and Japan for various periods, it has proclaimed its independence from Netherlands’ colonization in 1945.

Most importantly, Indonesia is the fourth largest populous country in the world which has around 269.136.421 million people (Population Pyramid 2019) and becomes the world’s largest populated Muslim country with about 84% of the overall population (World Atlas 2019). With big population, Indonesia also becomes Southeast Asia’s largest economy (Indonesia Investments 2019) and third world’s largest democratic country.

Constitutionally, Indonesia is a sovereign unitary state which adheres regional autonomy. It means that the highest governmental system remains in the central government, whereas the regional governments undertake delegated public affairs from the central government as well as undergoing administrative functions. Administratively, to date Indonesia is divided into 34 provinces, from which 4 provinces are stipulated as special regions, namely Aceh (Law No. 11/2006 on the Governing of Aceh), Jakarta (Law No. 29/2007 on the Governing of Jakarta as Capital of Republic of Indonesia), Yogyakarta (Law No. 13/2012 on the Privilege of Yogyakarta Province) and Papua (Law No. 21/2001 on the Papuan Special Autonomy). These special regions have certain privileges and asymmetric authority compared to other provinces as specifically stipulated by the national laws pertaining to regulating these regions under “The 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia” (In Bahasa: Undang-Undang Dasar Republik Indonesia Tahun 1945/UUD 1945).

Furthermore, on the one hand, the form of the government of Indonesia is a constitutional republic situating its people as the highest sovereignty bearer in the country, by which they submit the mandate of power to the government exerted to the president through the general elections. On the other hand, the system of the government is a presidential system entailing the president as both the head of the state and head of the government. As the head of government, the president has legitimated power to run the executive business of the country, and prerogative right to designate the working ministries within the cabinet. Consequently, to anticipate the abuse of power emanating from the great authority posed by the government, the parliament acts the legislative function to balance the government’s power by making national laws, checking and approving government’s spending, and scrutinizing the work of government.

The Indonesian parliament comprises two chambers, namely the House of Representatives (in Bahasa: Dewan Perwakilan Rakyat Republik Indonesia/DPR RI) and
Dewan Perwakilan Daerah Republik Indonesia (DPD RI). Both the members of DPR RI and DPD RI are elected by the people through general elections held by the General Election Commission (in Bahasa: Komisi Pemilihan Umum Republik Indonesia (KPU RI). While running for DPR RI as a candidate requires a political party, the candidate of DPD RI runs individually inasmuch as the members of DPR RI represent the electoral areas, whereas the members of DPD RI represent the provinces. However, both DPR RI and DPD RI base their work at national level, which in turns, constitutionally, they are an integral part of the People’s Consultative Assembly, respectively (in Bahasa: Majelis Permusyawaratan Rakyat Republik Indonesia (MPR RI). The MPR RI is a high state institution which mainly obliged to discharge and inaugurate the president and vice president according to the constitution, and when necessary it is authorized to amend and stipulate the state constitutions (Law No. 17/2014 on the MPR, DPR, DPD, and DPRD).

The hierarchical government of Indonesia, upholding the local autonomy and decentralization, consists of four levels under the central government, namely province or regional level which is led by governor, district level which is led by regent for regency and mayor for city area, sub-district level which is led by sub-district head, and lastly village level which is led by village head (See Appendix 3 for the summary of Indonesian governmental structure and type of office). Note, however, the type of authority of the sub-district is administrative and coordinative only in supporting the interconnection between the district and village levels, thus it has no autonomy and the head is appointed by the regent or mayor. Most importantly, a governor, regent, mayor, and village head are elected by the people through elections, and aside from exercising delegated hierarchical matters from the higher levels of authority, each level of local governments has the autonomy to holding local governmental affairs. The main authority of local heads is to enact executive function of local governments according to the national laws, with the exceptions of defence, security, justice, foreign affairs, monetary and fiscal which become the absolute authority of the central government. By the same token, the executive power is distributed from the central government to the lower government, but the central government remains greater and more authoritative power. In other words, the authority of governor is greater than the regent/mayor and the authority of regent/mayor is higher than village head given that the top-down distribution of power juxtaposes with the distribution of budget. Accordingly, the greater authority of the office means the more
budgets available supplied by the central government despite that the local governments have authority to generate the local government’s incomes through local taxation, retribution, and the local owned enterprises (in Bahasa: Badan Usaha Milik Daerah).

Furthermore, the province and district/city levels are equipped by the local parliament (in Bahasa: Dewan Perwakilan Rakyat Daerah/DPRD) respectively, to enact the local democratization and autonomy. The main duty of DPRD is to undertake legislative function as carried out by DPR RI, but the domain is at the local level and the scope of authority is different, such as to make local regulations which must not contravene the national laws and higher regulations, to discharge and inaugurate governor/regent/mayor, to check and approve the local government’s budget, and to oversee the work of local government (See Appendix 4 to find out the authority and right of Local Parliament’s Member). The members of DPRD are elected through the election, usually, it is simultaneously with national general elections held by KPU RI, and can only run for office when officially nominated by national political parties which have official branches at the local level (See Appendix 5 to find out the complete list of political parties in Kebumen District).

Village is a unique, distinctive, and smallest-most level in the governmental structure in Indonesia. Historically, the village has been established by the people, organizing people’s interests, proving its long-lasting existence before Indonesia as a nation-state was built up. Becoming the antecedent of this modern country, the government of Indonesia maintain its origin, nature, and privilege in the constitutional frame of the unitary state of Indonesia. Therefore, both as the social unitary of people and as the formal body of the governmental system in the grassroots, the village has also a local autonomy to execute its governmental business comprising executive and legislative bodies. The executive body of the village government is led by the village head who is elected through the village election (in Bahasa: Pemilihan Kepala Desa/Pilkades), while the legislative body is run by the Village Consultative Board (in Bahasa: Badan Permusyawaratan Desa/BPD). The members of BPD cannot be situated and treated as DPRD or even DPR RI, given that they are elected through traditional deliberative mechanisms held by the people of the village by upholding the principle of representativeness and local wisdom rather than a common election. Since the village head is politically given a direct mandate to run the office through the election (See Appendix 4 to find out the authority and right of village head), the executive power is
reasonably more dominant compared to the BPD which formally plays as the representative body of the village people to balance the village government’s authority, such as involved in the discussion and approval of the village regulations proposed by the village head, and to accommodate and articulate the people aspiration intended to the village government.

2. Kebumen District Characteristics
Kebumen is one of 35 districts in Central Java Province, located at 7° 27’ – 7° 50’ South latitude and 109° 22’ – 109° 50’ East longitude, which has 1281,12 km² of the total land area (Kebumen Regency in Figures 2018, 1–2). Geographically, Kebumen area consists of lowland in the southern part and both mountains and hills in the northern part, which administratively is divided into 26 sub-districts, 449 villages, and 11 administrative villages in the municipality area (in Bahasa: Kelurahan). Kebumen becomes a strategic area in southern Java Island which links the West Java and East Java Province (Kebumen Local Regulation’s Appendix No. 1 Year 2010, 25), bounded by Banjarnegara and Wonosobo District to the North, Purworejo District to the East, Indian Ocean to the South, and Banyumas and Cilacap District to the West.

Image 1. Kebumen District Location in Indonesian Map


Inhabited by 1,362,524 people (Department of Population and Civil Registration of Kebumen Regency 2019), the highest executive office of the local government is led by
a regent and vice supported by 12,079 civil servants (Kebumen Regency in Figures 2018, 20) working in various governmental sectors. Moreover, the people are politically represented by 50 members of the local parliament (Local Parliament Office of Kebumen Regency 2019) which comprises eight political fractions in working with four commissions and several committees in the office. Since the tenure of the members of local parliament ends in 2019, the contestation for the next tenure takes place in 17th of April 2019 which coincides with the general election, participated by 523 candidates (Kebumen Ekspress 2018) and 1,072,708 registered voters (Regional Election Commission of Kebumen Regency 2018).

As a matter of fact, 7 local electoral areas become a competitive political arena for 15 national parties (See Appendix 5: List of Political Parties in Kebumen District) operated in Kebumen (Regional Election Commission of Kebumen Regency 2018). In turn, the local parliament office understandably becomes a highly contested office in Kebumen, given that a single candidate, both nascent and incumbent must defeat roughly 10 candidates to sit in the office for the next 5-year tenure. Likewise, but in the distinct level of office, a 6-year cycle of village head election takes places concurrently in Kebumen which is divided into two periods, namely in June 2019 in 348 villages and in November 2019 in 52 villages (Local Parliament Office of Kebumen Regency 2019). In contrast to the local parliament office, the village office has many more seats in total, lesser number of competing candidates, and more localized dynamic of the turnout, so that creating the village head election as a vibrant political competition for the villagers on the one hand, and less attractive and less competitive political competition for the candidates who are the member of political party on the other hand.

Typically, a majority of the candidates are more enthusiastic to run for the local parliament office rather than the village office given that the scope of authority and offered resources are more promising for the elected officials, whilst indeed, the complexity and possibility to win the election are more challenging. However, the village office remains noteworthy as it has been given specific autonomy by the central government through the National Law No. 6/2014 concerning on Village, which in turn, it situates the village as relatively more independent from the higher offices and enables a village head as the leading actor in developing the village with the people (See appendix 2 for the summary of differences between the local parliament and village office in Kebumen District in term of elected official’s authorities and rights).
Empirical Findings

1. People Demand and Support as the Main Catalyst of Motive

Competing in political arena as a politician is reasonably linked to the constituency where individual acquires people support, either in the form of sympathy or concretely the votes in a polling station when election occurs. Yet, to be an experienced politician, a person needs to undergo a candidacy process which emanates from communities where he/she initially develops his/her motives and to where the public office he/she perceives as the proper place to channeling his/her motives therein. However, most political candidates build up the initial motives when “people demand” directly encourages them to run as the candidate, so that the first initiative is derived from a group of people, which in turn they become a core energetic supporter for the candidate. As an impetus of motives, the people demand can be manifested as a request, recommendation, promotion, suggestion, persuasion, assignment, or nomination which strongly evokes the person to transform him/herself to be a potential candidate who brings a solid support from the majority of people who pressures him/her to run for office. The people demand is ubiquitous in generating a nascent politician, as Muslimah (50 years old) tells her life journey to become a village head candidate in 2007 back then:

“... I have never imagined to have a passion to be a village head. Never! But, in 2007 there was a group of village activists who gathered in the Coordinator of Krajan 01 Neighborhood Association’s house. They have had deliberation to discuss the new village candidate since the candidate was only one person at the time. I was not there with them. Then, one member as the representative of the group came to my house explaining that the group had decided to select me as the village head candidate. At the same day, I and my husband were picked up by the representative to attend the deliberation meeting and to answer the group request whether I agreed or not. After had enough consideration, finally I accepted to run ...

The candidacy process, indeed, cannot be excluded from the role of supporters consisting of the leading figures in the communities who have influences to drive the people’s life, notably the candidates themselves. In other words, the supporters are extraordinary people who are personally special to the candidates, thus candidates listen to them attentively, and consequently respect and obey their views and decisions. Most importantly, supporters can be religious leaders, local public figures, peers, elders, former public officials, neighbors, family, volunteers, and potential constituents. The means of supporters to ask candidates to stand for them by running for office are categorized as 1) direct demand by which the supporters suggest or persuade the candidates as it is, and 2) indirect demand by which supporters satirize the candidates to run.

30 – Why People Run for Elective Office?
Broadly speaking, to be able to be defined as a supporter, a person does not support the candidate verbally per se, rather he/she should have mutual understandings and concerns with the candidate to jointly dedicate themselves in developing their communities. Relatedly, candidate and supporters basically have congruent ideas on how to define the collective problems, including the better solutions toward the better future. Accordingly, the supporters presume that the candidate is a capable, proper, and trusted among the people to hold the office in dealing with public matters, which in turn, it situates the candidate as a needed and desired person to lead the development process within the communities. When the candidate approves their supporters’ request, several forms of support can be given by the supporters to fully ensure the candidate to win the office as noted by Paimin, who is running for village office this 2019: “Yes, the important thing is blessing. Exactly! Automatically, regarding the financial resources, we provide them collectively. But the most salient is approbation, blessing, and spirit.”

While many candidates are asked by people to run, the people demand can tacitly appear in some circumstances where the absence of candidates exist in the competition, thus it evokes the initial motives of some people to consciously run as candidate after subjectively interpreting that the absence means that the call for them to be a part of salvaging the office sustainability. The absence of the candidates encompasses 1) less of the potential candidates interested in office; 2) vacuum of the populist candidates; and 3) need for fulfilling minimum quota of the candidates. This case is experienced by Sarlan who runs for the third tenure of the village office due to many of potential local elites do not have adequate interest in holding the office, thus imposing him to rerun as the incumbent candidate despite that he wishes other people can replace his position. He tells that:

“...almost every sub-village asks me to run again. And then, my people who actually have the competency, until now, none who wants to run. I don’t know. We didn't find other candidates, I mean to replace me for this office. So, maybe I feel like imposed or victimized because I run again. That’s difficult. Personally, I am fine to surrender my position to the next official. Never mind! But the fact, there is none to register ...”

The initial motive of the candidates is stronger when the candidates obtain the acceptance from their family, both in the forms of permit and blessing, by which the candidates can convince their external supporters that they are ready to run by bringing a panoply. The role of the candidates’ family is understandably predominant, given that all the decisions taken by the candidates will affect their family, either positively or
negatively. Therefore, the family will be the last stronghold of the candidates when in case they lose the political competition. Therefore, after discussing and making familial decision, the candidates can continue to work with their core team in establishing the networks of constituency by collecting the data of the promising voters, campaigning the manifestos, and visiting the constituents by door to door.

2. Disadvantaged Development as the Amplifier of Motive
People demand, chiefly asked by people, in this study is a common motive that imposes the candidates to run, from which the candidates consequently reflect on their capability in tackling public issues to personally justify themselves as the right person who is able to comply with the people expectation. Above all, the people demand motive can transfigure to be community service motive as long as the candidates perceives that what experienced by the people is what actually experienced by themselves. Therefore, they decide to run is not just to satisfy their supporters as it is, rather they have a sense of responsibility to address the collective problems. By the same token, the candidates find confidence as the helper, inasmuch as previously they have enacted the active observation on the development process by individually observing the work of the local government, visiting their communities, participating in several social activities, and interacting directly with both the civil servants and marginalized communities. Hence, typically, the candidates understand the lack of the development outcomes and impact between what should be done by the government and what are acquired by the communities. In turn, it encourages the candidates to accumulate the developmental problems of the local government as the result of dissatisfaction upon the local government’s performance. Most the candidates reveal that the government needs for improvements to deal with the less-functioned agencies, the less of public facilities, unplanned government’s programs, and unresponsive public officials to articulate and accommodate inputs emanating from the aggrieved people in the remote areas. For example, Anam who is running for village office as the youngest candidate, considers the unfair politics of the village budgeting, particularly for the young people, which eventually compels him to run:

“... budgeting is important, because so-far the young people didn’t elicit it properly. There is no budget allocation. The politics of budgeting is very less so-far, because the power is governed privately. So, the village planning of mid-term development didn't run well. That is my observation. I want the village budget can be used wisely and transparently, so the young people can actualize themselves more ...”
The transparency of the work of local government is extensively of the importance of the candidates who basically have community service motives. They believe that the government transparency is so far under-considered in which the corruption may be maintained through a political dynasty by which the office is governed at the expense of the public participation and scrutiny, as Paimin observes his village office:

“... in my village office, its government can be understood as a dynasty. So, only those who are a part of that family. When the government is the dynasty, everything can be deviated, and it will be easily covered because it is one family. That’s it. I want the government becomes transparent by leveraging the active participation of the villagers to control the use of the government budget.”

Analogous to the village office, some candidates running for local parliament office reinforce their motives after they realize that the office is governed by the incapable officials. Therefore, they desire to improve the office performance by becoming the insider, since becoming the outsider who delivers the keen critics is meaningless and often useless. A disappointment to the current members of the local parliament is expressed by Maryatun who is running for the local parliament office for her first attempt as follows:

“... the members of the local parliament are unintendedly labelled as poor. They seem to accentuate their lifestyle. Many things should be done by them apart from conducting the work trip to the other districts. For instance, to be beholden to the constituents. They are the representative of their people, so they must listen to their constituents' aspiration instead of taking a walk during their work trip. I am concerned with the current members of the local parliament. Most of them prone to sit nicely and enjoy the work trip without attempting to stand for their people. When I had the public hearing with them, apparently, they acted very indifferently. What did they do?"

In the similar vein, Bambang who is running as the local parliament candidate for his third attempt asserts that:

“... the members of the local parliament are not intelligent enough, don't have positive progress. They just come, sit down, and then assent the majority, even receive the perks if any. They don't perform a good example to their followers, difficult to be in touch, and the people aspiration is displaced. They are hopeless…”

Regardless of what kind of the candidates’ perception on the ruling public officials, both the candidates running for village and local parliament office comprehend that the collective problem is an uneven development. It is caused by the non-populist programs of the government to elevate the quality of community life, to provide the expedient housing for the poorest groups, to supply the broader employment, and to eliminate the poverty. The root-cause of these major problems remains in the work of the government.
where the public business is addressed, which encompasses 1) “out of tune” of public policies between the regency and village governments; 2) the excessive intervention of the executive office at the expense of the legislative office in formulating local policies; 3) the inferior role of the legislative office in creating workable local regulations and in scrutinizing the budgeting and implementation of the government programs; 4) unresponsive government action to transform the people policy inputs into the populist outputs; 5) the government’s reluctance to seriously realize its accountability and transparency through an active and meaningful people participation. Accordingly, the initial motive remains as the people demand motive per se when the candidates do not have a sensitivity of the collective development problems. Rather, it becomes the community service motive when the candidates connect the people demand to their concerns to make a better developmental change.

3. **Run for Better Change**
   The community service posits the candidates as an agent of change who adequately collate a plenty of collective problems within communities, which in turn, they formulate the political agendas neatly for the better change through their will power to run for office. Given that the candidates are the political product of the people demand, regardless they do have community service motive authentically, both motives are socially-driven imposing candidates to build up their mission to refine the current contravening policies, and simultaneously to propose their plans in order to provide the alternative policy proposals. Here, the candidates perceive that they are the integral part of the communities, thus their personal hope sinks into the public issues, or in other words, the people interests are at the heart of what candidates concern with and stand for. Hence, it cannot clearly be differentiated between candidates’ own autonomy and the people pressure, since both are coalesced into the community service platform which is represented by the candidates’ motive to help their people politically. Consequently, the community service motive evolves as the robust motive for the nascent politicians given that their sense of ownership upon their people reaches the peak of their awareness as the member of communities. It encourages the candidates to be more helpful and meaningful for their people, thus the sense of responsibility becomes inevitable for them. Given this, the candidates situate their candidacy as an honorable mandate, collective life struggle, and great duty to wholeheartedly serve their people. Paimin points out:
"... in my life, I want to be more beneficial to my people. That is a noble mandate for me that should be truly carried out. When some people ask me or recommend me, I think it is a great mandate. I have the responsibility to help my people. I know what should be done by the government. I think, I should run because this is a must ..."

In parallel to Paimin, Anam highlights that:

"... basically, I want to dedicate myself for my village. I mean, I can give something that can contribute to the village. At least, my knowledge can be applied to the smallest communities. I want this knowledge to be meaningful for many more people. I concern with the expediency aspect. As long I can give the expediency to the wider communities, I will do that ...

Pertaining to the candidates’ agenda when they are successfully elected as the public official, it can be divided into two strands of agenda, namely 1) government reforms and 2) community-based programs. The beginning consists of improving the government transparency and accountability, increasing the public participation in the agenda-setting and policy formulation process to subjugate corruption, making the public services more effectively and efficiently through the professional civil servants, and mainstreaming the budget allocation for productive government programs to fight for poverty. Rather, the rest consists of infrastructures development for farmers and fishermen, economic empowerment for women, and leadership and life skills training for young people to be able to create creative jobs.

For the village government transparency and accountability, as the incumbent village head candidate, Muslimah considers that:

"... I conducted school of budgeting and village on every Saturday, attended by 20 until 25 people to learn about how to mutually govern the village office. They come from plural backgrounds, such as village officers, village activists, village religious figures, and others. I invited them to help mastering their insights about their village, not least the village office ...

Similarly, Paimin states that:

"... There is the village budget, both derived from the central and regency governments. I think, the village government should display the budget infographics, so that the people know how much money posed by the village government annually and what for it is. By doing this, the people may monitor the government program implementation. It is the best way. I believe that when people cannot control what the government does, it will potentially cause unintended risks. But, when people can openly control their government, I believe that the government will be carefully using their budget ...

For the local parliament office, Bambang underlines that:

"... the most important is how we can transform the people interests to the development programs. By becoming the member of the local parliament, we can strive to end the poverty, to help the farmers in selling their rice with good price, and to aid the poorest groups. We can
propose the program inputs to the executive office on behalf of our people, our constituents. For me, the social welfare is the most salient …”

Damayanti, who is running for her first attempt as the female local parliament candidate affirms that:

“… the development should be by and for people. We should map the sub-districts potentials to consider their relevant needs. For instance, the potentials in Mirit Sub-District are rice and salt, while in Padureso Sub-District are fisheries, farming, herbs and spices. Then, we can make a priority scale to create the programs in communities which are suitable for the specific context of needs and fit the government budget …”

Most candidates argue that they are committed to taking the people interests into account, which indicates that they care about their people and are obliged to put the collective matters as the basis of the imperative struggle. Relatedly, on behalf of the greater collective business, they base their willingness to run for office on a religious motive, by which they believe that their decision to run for office is not only to fulfil the people demand or to realize the community service, but also as the way of worship to the God Almighty. They believe that what they stand for and work with is a destiny, involving them to earn rewards and punishments in the day of judgement in association with their struggle to achieve a virtuous collective struggle. Given the sincere intention of the candidates, they rely on the God about their process, either winning or losing the desired office. This also magnifies the candidates’ motive to run, given that their initial motives are already fortified by the religious motive, entailing them to be a humble person when winning the competition and not to be blamed by their supporters when losing out. Sarlan strongly underlines that:

“… in principle, we return to our life. We are doing our worship, right? But this worship is for and within the communities. Our life focus is not just to pursue a worldly, but we want to strive for (hereafter), we want to exercise the worship in communities, to improve our village …”

4. Candidate’s View on Office: Alteration of Motives?
Most candidates posit the office as a central point of the future change, which becomes the concrete target they are supposed to accomplish, both in the meanings of the office as a tangible place and the office as a formal power to realize their initial motives. At this point, when candidates determine the office as unnegotiable, their social-driven motives gradually alter to be individual-driven since their personal interest impedes their given people mandate. In other words, the personal interest subtly leads them to activate their political ambition, which in turn makes them adhere their pragmatic attempt in order
to maintain their self-esteem, and to prove their bold leadership capacity as they already promise to enter the office. To some extent, an ambition is required through the passionate and hard-working actions of the candidates to awaken the optimism and spirit of their supporters and constituents in winning the office. Yet, in contrast, the ambition makes the candidates to bargain their self-advantages rather than the collective problems and solutions as the more significant commodity to their campaign. Therefore, in the campaigning process, instead of optimizing public anxiety to attract the public sympathy and empathy to more concretely cast their vote, the candidates are inclined to market their own capacity, such as showing that they have astonishing academic records, are clean for any corruption scandals, have the good understandings on democracy, and are experienced in organizational activities. As the results, the candidates are conceived to leave their people interest, and consequently, their candidacy is a story of their own struggle, not the collective struggle as designed previously.

As a matter of fact, the office is a central of the public policy making which comprises both the formal authority and monetary incentives for the elected officials. Some candidates imply the office as the place of a dedication situating monetary incentives as not important at all, albeit some consider that the monetary incentives are prevalent as the compensation for their work in taking public matters into account. However, the candidates' view on office related to the offered monetary incentives is bifurcated into two strands, namely 1) those who are committed to distribute their personal income and allowance to their people; and 2) those who argue that the financial incomes is the reward for them to support their roles and responsibilities as the public official. For the first strand, Paimin states:

"… to ambitiously pursue the office, it is not my desire, even less to obtain money. To be honest, I am more comfortable to work for the agricultural business, not for the office. Even, I promise that I am committed to not earn my incomes or perks when I am elected as the village head. I want to use them to fund the social programs. I will not take them. It is not for money or position. It is not …"

In contrast, for the second strand, Bambang speaks:

"… obviously, the personal gain exists because the daily needs are covered. (I) obtain allowances, obtain regular incomes, that is it. Then, by obtaining the incomes, we can save some for the party, to maintain the constituency. But, the important thing here actually is that it is just compensation, the compensation for our struggle so that we acquire rewards …"
While some candidates alter their motives to monetary incentives in response to their rationality in facing side-offers of the office, intriguingly, some who embolden to try preserving their community service cannot tacitly hide their personal reasons of becoming public official. Albeit they do not stick on the monetary incentives, they alter their community-service motive to be a self-satisfaction as the compensation of their work. They feel so satisfied when they can be helpful and meaningful as the public official who can look for affirmative solutions, deliver their people inputs to the relevant key stakeholders, and generate the greater impact to their people in the form of public polices and local regulations. By the same token, both candidates who have monetary incentives and personal satisfaction can be juxtaposed as the individually driven since they do not realize the people interests by intact, rather, their own interest is jumbled up with the public business. Maryatun asserts that:

"... of course. At least I can help them. That is a satisfaction which is invaluable and cannot be counted by rupiah (money) as much as it can be. To me, I feel satisfied, be satisfied to help them, to accommodate their aspiration, to follow up their proposals, to allocate the budget for their needs. That’s it. As long my recommendation can be channelled to and accommodated by the government, for me it is a satisfaction, I don’t demand anything! ..."

Nevertheless, it is reasonable to consider that the self-satisfaction remains dominant given that some candidates have the organizational experiences which positively contribute to their leadership preparedness to participate in the political competition. Involved as the board member of students association, the board member of certain village organizations, the board member of certain political party, and employed in the private organization can strengthen the candidates’ motive to work with people in dealing with the public issues, either to actualize their own practical knowledge or to funnel their organizational embedded pleasure at the broader and more strategic context. Note, however, the likelihood of organizationally experienced candidates is relatively higher to have the self-satisfaction motive than those who run for office with a void of the organizational experiences. Typically, the organizationally experienced candidates leverage their social networks and demographic advantages to build up and maintain their popularity before running for office, whereas the organizationally unexperienced candidates are most likely to opt a shortcut by substituting their financial resources to the contrived popularity for the political electoral purpose.
5. **Competitive Political Make Up: No Money, No Office!**

As the elective office provides the highly authoritative roles and responsibilities, as well as embedded incomes and facilities, it is reasonable to argue that the office requires the highly political costs to spend for. Theoretically speaking, despite that the office is open-contested in the democratic system through the election, the recent facts show that the financial resources of the candidates to fund their campaign and hire their working teams are decisive for any candidates, regardless whether they are the incumbent or amateur, whether they are the part of majority group, whether they have robust social networks, and whether they are the experienced candidate posing the promising leadership skills. The financial resources become inevitable when the candidates are officially registered as the running candidate, in which they are identified by their voters as the rich person who can disseminate a political charity in the form of money politics. Running for office in the electoral area where the voters are culturally money-oriented, it entails the candidates to spend over their money to bribe their voters given that without leveraging some money to their voters, they are most likely to be not elected. Note, however, a caucus imposes the candidates to keep forward for pursuing the office with tenuous rationality, that is to pass their financial limits in order to obtain votes as much as they should.

At this point, the candidates may forfeit their self-control, including their recent motives due to the competitive political makeup posit the candidates to mess their motives. In sum, it is foreseeable that four discussed motives alter to be a political motive in which both individually and socially driven motives are jumbled up with the different degrees, respectively. The candidates only have one vestige choice in facing the burdening high-cost politics, that is to continue their candidacy to salvage their self-reputation in the communities, without any guarantee to win the election. Hence, the money politics become a severe political realm for all candidates given that the rivalry is about the financial campaign instead of the programs campaign. Bambang points out:

“... the most challenge is money politics. Now, the experienced candidates who already dedicated to their party for 30 years are defeated by the new candidates who have higher capital. I really hate money politics. In 2014, I ran for office against my colleague who was running as the incumbent. No money, I loose. If there was no money politics, probably I won in 2014. I don’t agree with money politics. It breaks the votes.”

More specifically, Damayanti adds on her valued experiences that:

“... here, the money politics overlaps among candidates. Most candidates carry out money politics. Despite that we are popular, but without the money politics, there is no vote for us.”

---
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For instance, in area A there is a candidate who bribes the voters with 50 thousand rupiahs, and then his/her competitor gives the voters 100 thousand rupiahs. As a result, the candidates make illegal bargaining with the voters. It is not educative at all. Until when will we end this case? When? …"

A lugubrious note of the political makeup, on the one hand, leads the optimistic and committed candidates who strive for ending the money politics through their forthright campaign to finally be deterred to win. And on the other hand, it shapes the successful candidates who spent their financial resources over by exercising money politics to potentially be selfish, greedy, and corrupt officials in order to return their political capital when in office.

Discussion

1. **What motives influence individuals to run for office?**

This study clearly shows that four identified, people demand, community service, monetary incentives and personal satisfaction, are important to understand why individuals run for elective office. However, based on the findings, it is also reasonable to add an additional aspect, namely religious motive, which is an important component of the community service motive. The religious motive situates the people interest beyond the candidates’ self-interest, even it is most salient than both the people and candidates’ interests themselves. It situates the God as the owner of destiny who controls to whom the office is given to, which entails the candidates to surrender the political process to the God, including the worst risk that may occur.

As earlier discussed, the initial motive of the candidates can be depicted as the life journey when the collective problems impose the people to reflect on the root-causes, and indeed the desired to look for solutions. This leads a cognizant group of the people to look for the right actor eligible to help them, since that the actor is perceived as an astute, capable, and loyal to them in order to stand for them by using political means. Given this, the willed actor is requested by the people to run for office with the social incapability to refuse, inasmuch as the actor is the part of the communities. It means that to reject the people request may generate the social sanction that risks the actor. Therefore, the willingness of the actor to accept the group request as the candidate is inevitable, which in turn it emerges the people demand as the catalyst of motive. The findings confirm the earlier studies which posit the supporters (Fox and Lawless 2004), constituents’ perception (Weelden 2013), and the importance of supporting group to the candidates (Parker 1972) as the staple mutual elements that form the people demand motive.
Departing from people demand, the candidates strengthen their sense of obligation within the communities to accommodate and articulate the collective problems to build up their sense of ownership of the people. Relatedly, they comprehend themselves as a savior posing an altruistic spirit in addressing the current disadvantaged development, not least to bring the broader accessible promising public policies to the wider groups through the office. In other words, the candidates convince that the greater impact can be achieved by dedicating themselves in office, in which they have authorized roles and responsibilities to initiate and follow up the public matters. Accordingly, the community services motive works as the amplifier of the people demand motive, which also supports the earlier studies by King (1981) and (Yin 2013) which explain the altruism characteristics that lie beneath the individuals’ robust commitment to run for office.

Broadly speaking, aside from providing the embedded public authority, the office also offers incomes and perks for the elected officials who work for the public business. This study shows that the candidates are bifurcated in response to their consistency and fortitude on the importance of the monetary incentives. Some perceive that monetary incentives are habitual to compensate their professional work (Browning and Herbert 1964; Parker 1972; Clarke and Donovan 1980; Berganza 2000). In contrast, the rest considers that the monetary incentives are not of the importance, and they attempt to maintain their community service regardless of how much money and what kind of public facilities they may deserve. Instead of becoming a community service worker in the office, they are more likely to elicit personal satisfaction to compensate their contribution (Clarke and Donovan 1980; Copeland 1989; Palmer and Simon 2003; Canon 2013), from which it cannot be justified that the candidates’ personal satisfaction means the public satisfaction. Note, however, one the one hand, the monetary incentives and personal satisfaction are categorized as the individually driven motives, but on the other hand, both can be distinguished as a single motive with the importance of money as the subjective differentiator.

2. **What are enabling and constraining factors that shape individuals’ motive, and what are possible relationships of both factors to the motives?**

This study identifies five factors as both enabling and constraining factors, namely, demographic aspects, leadership capacity, financial resources, social networks, and political makeup. Albeit the extent of influence of these factors varies according to how
the candidates define them as enabler and hindrance respectively, this study finds that as many as candidates can take these factors in control, they may have higher likelihood to be demanded by the people or rather by own initiative to run for office. These factors contribute to the explanation of the variation among the candidacy process of the candidate in this study. However, this study clearly shows that the people demand remains determinant regardless of the candidates begin their precondition of the candidacy by posing one or all these factors.

The demographic aspects positively become the enabler when the candidates are the member of the majority groups in the communities which can be based on gender, age, economic status, and occupation, respectively. For instance, a female is more prone to be requested as the candidate, given majority of the inhabitants is female, as extensively studied earlier by Huddy and Terkildsen (1993) and Fox et al (2001). Similarly, a youth can potentially be recommended by the youth group to run for office given that the young people are the dominant population of the communities, which also can be applied to the economic status and occupation in the same token.

The leadership capacity which stems from the organizational experiences does enable the candidates to run, inasmuch as they personally see themselves and are seen by the people as the capable and responsible person. Experienced in managing organizations and governing social activities also sheds some light to the people to recommend the candidates, and for the candidates themselves, it reinforces their desire and conviction to run for office, as explored by Dutton (1975) and Palmer and Simon (2003) focusing on the elected officials with progressive office ambition. Moreover, the financial resources enact as the hindrance for those who are incapable to fund their campaign and hire their core team by using their own capital, except the office does not require complicated campaign due to the less of applicants. In addition, the social networks significantly enable the candidates to obtain the people demand motive and to evoke their community service motive, given that they are arguably well-known in the communities before entering the candidacy process. By having the good track records in interacting with and standing for people, the candidates are more likely to employ their social networks as an initial asset that can be leveraged when the political competition is going on.

Finally, the political makeup, chiefly money politics phenomenon, becomes the most hindrance for all candidates regardless of they are demographically dominant, highly experienced in leadership, financially prepared, and congested in social networks. The
money politics mess the candidates’ motives and negatively generate the severe and uncertain political competition. This study reveals that the candidates’ money buys the votes, yet, the money is futile to guarantee the candidates’ vote results. The presence of the incumbent which may demotivate nascent candidates as earlier studied by Maisel and Stone (1997) does not emerge, yet, this study confirms the study by Kazee (1983) which explains the emergence of the popular, experienced, and well-funded challengers.

3. **Do motives alter when individuals desire to be reelected or to seek a higher office?**

This study shows that the motives alter before the candidates are elected as the public official. Initially, the motives are the socially driven comprising the people demand and community service. Yet, when the candidates perceive that the office as an imperative target to obtain, the motives alter to be individually driven comprising twofold motives, namely the monetary incentives and personal satisfaction motives.

The findings of this study also show that the alteration of motives works when the candidates desire to rerun for the office, either in the same or higher office, regardless of whether they are elected in the prior elections. Ahead of the candidacy process, either as the incumbent or contender, the candidates who previously have altered the motives to be individually driven, they restart and rebuild their socially driven motives, which allegedly it creates a recurring pattern of motives. I argue that the motive containing both the socially and individually driven, which emerges in every election process, is a political motive. The political motive itself is a pragmatic motive relevant to answer the desire for power in the quest for elective public office, which also strengthens the findings of the previous studies (Copeland 1989; Maisel and Stone 1997; Fox and Lawless 2005) that show the complex interrelated factors, such as political setting, sense of efficacy of becoming official, opportunity of winning and right time to run. Eventually, the candidates may have multiple motives with the distinct degrees and variations which both interact and counteract, as well as are produced and reproduced.

**Concluding Remarks**

Why do people run for office? On the basis of the data presented here exploring the local elites in two different types of office in Kebumen District, the answer is they desire to realize their political motive. Most candidates establish their initial motive that is to adhere to the people demand, which in turn, it evokes their sense of ownership and responsibility upon their communities to tackle the collective problems by undertaking the community service. Both people demand and community service motives are
classified as socially driven motives, by which the candidates’ motives are catalyzed and fostered through the social needs to generate the political leader who is supposed to stand for the people interests by holding the office. The emergence of the religious motive is unpredictable, but it is reasonable to conclude that the theoretical framework of this study is surprisingly evident, given that it captures a derivative motive stems from the socially driven motives.

Furthermore, when the candidates comprehend the office as a mandatory to achieve, this study clearly shows that their motives alter to be the monetary incentives motive for those who perceive it as the compensation of their work as the public official, and to be the personal satisfaction motive for those who perceive that incomes cannot substitute their work contribution to take the public matters into account. Most importantly, both motives are classified as the individually driven motives, by which the candidates realistically allow their personal interests to fall into the public interests. However, this study also reveals that demographic aspects, leadership capacity, and social networks are obviously the enablers for the candidates to run, whereas, in contrast, financial resources and high-cost politics are the most hindrances for the candidates to win the office without being plunged into the misery of money-politics system in the grassroots.

As the explorative study, the central conclusion of this study strongly speaks that the political motive is embedded in the candidates attempt to pursue the office. It consists of both socially driven and individually driven motives, in which these motives interact and counteract each other to drive candidates’ thoughts and behaviors in the different political contexts, namely precondition of candidacy, candidacy, tenure as elected, and next candidacy as both the incumbent and former contender. The findings of this study contribute to the development of the study of political motivation, not least the politics of desire. Note, however, the future studies should, firstly, examine the theoretical framework of this study by including the religious motive to re-examine the present motives, and secondly, to measure the degree of both the socially and individually-driven motives by using the quantitative methods to investigate the candidates’ political motive.
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**Appendix 1: Interview Guide**

**A. Demography Information**
1. Complete Name: ........
2. Gender (Male/Female)
3. Age Group (Youth (20 – 30)/Adult (Above 30))
4. Highest Education Level (Elementary School/Junior High School/Senior High School/Bachelor/Master/PhD)
   - Previous Occupation Before in Office (Farmer/ Fisherman/Social Worker (Non-Governmental Organization)/Private Worker (Private Organization)/Civil Servant (Governmental Organization)/Businessman)
5. Type of Candidate (Nascent (Run for the first time or Never Elected Before)/Incumbent (Run for the next tenure))
6. Monthly Income in Indonesian Rupiah (Low Income (Below 3 million)/Middle Income (Between 3 – 5 million)/High Income (Above 5 million))

**B. Questions related to political motives**
1. Would you tell me your life journey from the very beginning until finally you decide to become political candidate, please?
2. Has anyone recommended you or influenced you to run for office?
3. What are your initial motives to become elected official? Can you rank these motives, please?
4. According to these motives, which motive do you think the most important for you? And why is it important?
5. Do you wish to run again, either in the same office or higher office? And why it become a better decision for you?
6. After elected, what are the most advantages of becoming public official?

**C. Questions related to enablers and hindrances to run for office**
1. Would you describe yourself as political candidate, such as strength and weakness, please?
2. Have you been involved in social, professional, or political organization before you are elected as official? Can you describe your experience and roles chronologically, please?
3. Would you like to share your considerations before you convincingly make decision to engage in political competition?
4. Can you prioritize your considerations, and which one do you think the most salient for you?
5. In your opinion, do you autonomously take decision to run for office or does someone else intervene your decision?
Appendix 2: List of Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Type of Candidate</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Type of Office</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Paimin</td>
<td>Nascent</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Muslimah</td>
<td>Incumbent</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Sarlan</td>
<td>Incumbent</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Anam Lutfi</td>
<td>Nascent</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Bambang Tri Saktiono</td>
<td>Nascent</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Local House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Maryatun</td>
<td>Nascent</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Local House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Damayanti Prabasari</td>
<td>Nascent</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Local House</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix 3: Summary of Indonesian Governmental Structure and Type of Office

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Office</th>
<th>Type of Office and Candidate</th>
<th>Tenure</th>
<th>Election Holder</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Executive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Government</td>
<td>President (Party Candidacy)</td>
<td>5 years</td>
<td>KPU RI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DPR RI (Party Candidacy)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DPD RI (Individual Candidacy)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Province</td>
<td>Governor (Party or Individual Candidacy)</td>
<td>5 years</td>
<td>Local Office of KPU RI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DPRD of Province (Party Candidacy)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District</td>
<td>Regent/Mayor (Party or Individual Candidacy)</td>
<td>5 years</td>
<td>Local Office of KPU RI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DPRD of Regency/City (Party Candidacy)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-District</td>
<td>Sub-District Head (Appointed)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village</td>
<td>Village Head (Individual Candidacy)</td>
<td>6 years</td>
<td>Village Interim Election Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BPD (Individual Candidacy)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 4: Differences of Authority and Right between Member of Local Parliament and Village Head

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authority</th>
<th>Member of Local Parliament (National Law No. 17/2014, Article 366 Paragraph 1 and Article 372)</th>
<th>Village Head (National Law No. 6/2014, Article 26 Paragraph 2 and 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authority</td>
<td>• Participating in creating local regulations with regent;</td>
<td>• Leading the work of village government;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Discussing and approving the proposal of local government budget proposed by the regent;</td>
<td>• Inaugurate and discharge village government officers;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Scrutinizing the work of local government in implementing local regulations and spending local government budget;</td>
<td>• Managing village finance and asset;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Expressing opinion and consideration, as well as assigning approval to the proposal of international cooperation agreement, cooperation with other district, and/or third party affecting the local people and district interests;</td>
<td>• Stipulating village regulation;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Asking responsibility memorandum to the government in term of government's performance;</td>
<td>• Stipulating village government budget;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Ensuring the compliance of the government obligation to according the provisions of legislation.</td>
<td>• Fostering social life of the village people;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right</td>
<td>• Proposing draft local government regulation;</td>
<td>• Fostering peace and order of the village people;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Proposing question; expressing suggestion and opinion;</td>
<td>• Fostering and increasing the economy of village towards productivity and prosperity for the village people;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Appointing and be appointed;</td>
<td>• Developing village income resources;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Self-defense;</td>
<td>• Proposing and acquiring a partial distribution of state asset to improve the prosperity of village people;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Self-immunity;</td>
<td>• Improving social and cultural life of village people;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Participating in orientation and capacity building;</td>
<td>• Utilizing appropriate technology;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Acquiring office protocol, administrative, and monetary incentives.</td>
<td>• Coordinating participatory process of village development;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Representing the village legally in the court according the provisions of legislation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right</td>
<td>• Proposing organizational structure and work procedure of the village government;</td>
<td>• Proposing organizational structure and work procedure of the village government;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Proposing and stipulating draft village regulation;</td>
<td>• Acquiring fixed monthly income, allowance, other legitimate oncomes, including health insurance;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Acquiring legal protection upon the implemented policy;</td>
<td>• Acquiring legal protection upon the implemented policy;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Imparting duty mandate to the village government officers.</td>
<td>• Imparting duty mandate to the village government officers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 5: List of Political Parties in Kebumen District
1. PKB (Partai Kebangkitan Bangsa/National Awakening Party)
2. Gerindra (Partai Gerakan Indonesia Raya/the Great Indonesia Movement Party)
3. PDIP (Partai Demokrasi Indonesia Perjuangan/Indonesian Democratic Party Struggle)
4. Golkar (Partai Golongan Karya/the Functional Group Party)
5. Nasdem (Partai Nasional Demokrat/National Democrats Party)
6. Garuda (Partai Gerakan Perubahan Indonesia/the Change Indonesia Movement Party)
7. Berkarya (Partai Berkarya/the Working Party)
8. PKS (Partai Keadilan Sejahtera/the Justice and Prosperity Party)
9. Perindo (Partai Persatuan Indonesia/Indonesian Unity Party)
10. PPP (Partai Persatuan Pembangunan/the United Development Party)
11. PSI (Partai Solidaritas Indonesia/Indonesian Solidarity Party)
12. PAN (Partai Amanat National/National Mandate Party)
13. Hanura (Partai Hati Nurani Rakyat/the People’s Conscience Party)
14. Demokrat (Partai Demokrat/Democrats Party), and
15. PBB (Partai Bulan Bintang/the Star and Crescent Party).