



CDI Policy Papers on Political Governance

National elections and women candidates in Solomon Islands: Results from the People's Survey

Christine McMurray

ADSRI, ANU¹

Introduction

The Solomon Islands comprises around half a million people from nearly a hundred different language and cultural groups. Around 80% of the population depends mainly on subsistence agriculture and many adults have only a few years of primary schooling. Since attaining independence in 1978, Solomon Islands has been governed by a national parliament based on the Westminster system. There are currently 50 elected members to represent nine provinces and the capital, Honiara. Elected provincial governments are responsible for local government, while at the community level, chiefs and elders still make many of the decisions.

Corruption and poor management have impaired the performance of both national and provincial governments and many people do not have access to basic infrastructure or economic opportunities. In 2007 32% of People's Survey respondents said national government performance in improving services and the economy was not good, and 44% said provincial government's performance was not good (RAMSI, 2007). In 2008 35% said national government was not performing well in providing basic services and 51% said provincial government was not performing well (RAMSI, 2008). In 2009 and 2010 71% and 60% respectively said their MP had not visited their community in the past year (RAMSI, 2009 and 2010).

A striking feature of elected governments in Solomon Islands is the general scarcity of women. Although some community elders are women and women have achieved senior positions in the public service and civil society, very few women have been elected to provincial governments and only one has ever won a seat in the national Parliament. Prior to the 2006 and 2010 national elections, various donors and local organizations made substantial efforts to educate communities in

¹ *Acknowledgments: I would like to thank the Solomon Islands Electoral Commission for access to results from the 2010 election, and Terence Wood for sharing his immensely valuable Solomon Islands Election Database. My profound thanks are also due to several women candidates and numerous members of the Solomon Islands community who related their experiences and expressed their views.*

the concept of democracy, civic rights and the importance of voting independently for the candidates most likely to provide good governance (Alasia, 2008: 119-126; Transparency International, 2010). They also helped to encourage, organise and support women candidates and in the 2010 election women contested 21 of the 50 seats. Despite this, women candidates received only 4% of the vote in the 21 seats they contested. Not a single woman won office or even came close to receiving most votes in the seats they contested. The majority of women candidates were among the least successful (see Annex 1 below).

This paper explores data on Solomon Islanders' perceptions of the role of an elected Member of Parliament (MP), their experience of elections and their perceptions of women as leaders. The data are drawn from the People's Survey (RAMSI, 2007, 2008, 2009 and 2010), which has been conducted annually since 2007 to inform evaluations of The Regional Assistance Mission to the Solomon Islands (RAMSI) and to provide feedback to the Solomon Islands Government and the community. RAMSI comprises army, police and technical advisors and has a mandate to improve and assist in three key areas: economic governance, the machinery of government and law and justice. Activities include advocating and promoting free and fair elections, effective political representation and gender equity (RAMSI, Partnership Framework, 2009).

The People's Survey questionnaire is primarily an opinion survey administered to nationally representative samples of around 4000-5000 people, with approximately equal numbers of men and women aged 18-29 and 30 years and over. Honiara, Guadalcanal, Malaita and Western Province are surveyed every year and the smaller provinces are surveyed in alternate years. Focus group discussions are also conducted with a cross section of the community in rural and urban areas. All questions are asked as face-to-face open questions to avoid influencing respondents. Complete versions of the four reports from which the data in this paper are drawn can be found on the RAMSI website @ <http://www.ramsi.org/solomon-islands/peoples-survey.html>

Perceptions of the role of an MP

In 2007, 2008 and 2009 People's Survey respondents were asked what they considered to be the main job of an MP, with up to three answers permitted. Table 1 shows that in 2007 71% said '*Assist individual people in electorate*', but this declined to 42% in 2009. This substantial decline could partially reflect the education and awareness-raising campaigns mentioned above, although there was no corresponding increase in '*Govern the country /make laws*' or '*National development*'. In each of the three surveys at least 80% of respondents mentioned perceived individual and local issues rather than national concerns as the main responsibilities of an MP.

Table 1 | Perceptions of the main job of an MP

	2007 (%)	2008 (%)	2009 (%)
Assist individual people in electorate	71.3	66.3	41.7
Represent electorate in parliament	30.1	25.7	54.6
Govern the country/ make laws	29.9	17.0	23.2
Get better conditions for constituency	17.7	21.6	40.4
Improve roads, electricity etc in own community	2.0	3.9	4.0
Help the poor, give money	1.7	0.9	0.0
Cynical or negative comment (e.g. 'be corrupt')	1.7	1.4	2.0
Help youth	1.7	0.3	0.4
Listen to the people/ be accountable	1.4	1.3	2.8
National development	0.8	2.4	1.1
Distribute RCDF fairly	0.5	0.6	0.9
Control / keep peace	0.2	0.1	0.1
Create employment	0.1	0.2	0.4
Don't know	6.5	7.0	5.1
Unspecified/ Other	3.0	0.5	0.1
Total number of respondents	5154	4304	5035

NOTE: % = Percentage of respondents mentioning each role in any of up to three responses. Percentages do not sum to 100%.

Experience of elections

Regardless of their perceptions of the role of successful candidates, the way elections are conducted can affect the way people vote. In recent years the Solomon Islands Electoral Commission has made considerable efforts to ensure secret voting at polling booths, including providing screened areas so voters can fill out their ballot papers without being overlooked and single ballot boxes where all folded ballot papers were placed (previously there were separate ballot boxes for each candidate).

In 2009 the People's Survey asked respondents '*Do you believe your vote is secret?*' Respondents who said their vote was not secret were asked '*Who can find out?*' and '*How can they find out?*' The first of these three questions was retained in the 2010 survey, but asked only of people who said they had voted in the 2010 election.

Table 2 shows responses tabulated according to age, province and gender of respondents (with Young Men and Young Women being those aged 18 - 29). In 2009 around 80% of all respondents said they believed their vote was secret, compared with 87% of respondents who actually voted in 2010.

Table 2 | Do you believe your vote is secret? (2009 and 2010)

Province	2009			2010		
	Yes (%)	No (%)	(n)	Yes (%)	No (%)	(n)
Central	79.7	7.6	251	93.0	5.5	273
Choiseul	81.7	4.6	264	-	-	-
Guadalcanal	80.7	1.3	912	88.5	5.4	793
Honiara	63.0	9.4	575	81.4	14.0	527
Honiara Settlements	72.9	1.3	303	89.1	8.6	221
Makira	-	-	-	85.9	10.3	348
Malaita	87.3	2.3	1549	87.2	9.2	1183
Rennell & Bellona	-	-	-	84.7	15.3	98
Temotu	78.6	5.6	215	-	-	-
Western	81.5	5.2	677	87.8	10.9	679
Ysabel	73.0	0.0	289	-	-	-
Respondent type						
Men	92.0	4.1	1307	90.9	5.5	1196
Women	90.7	2.4	1266	89.0	7.0	1120
Young Men	69.2	4.7	1238	82.2	15.9	926
Young Women	66.4	3.4	1224	84.9	10.7	880
Overall percentages	79.8	3.7	5035	87.1	9.3	4122

2009: Don't know/didn't vote = 16%, No answer = 27 cases (0.5%)

2010: Don't know = 3.5%

Tables 3 and 4 show the responses given by the 20% who did not believe their vote was secret. Comments from focus group participants confirmed the view of some respondents that polling booth officials may not always respect confidentiality, but other respondents seemed to believe that their vote was known to certain people even though they had no evidence as to how the information was obtained. Table 4 also shows that almost half of those who thought their vote was not secret could not say how anyone could find out how they voted.

Table 3 | Who can find out how an individual votes? (2009)

	Male (%)	Female (%)	All (%)	(n)
Polling booth officer	37.6	37.4	37.5	81
Chiefs, politicians, other big men	13.6	9.9	12	26
Public community	10.4	12.1	11.1	24
Relatives /supporters	11.2	6.6	9.3	20
Tell them myself	2.4	4.4	3.2	7
Candidate knows	3.2	3.3	3.2	7
Don't know	19.2	26.4	22.2	48

No answer = 3 cases (2%)

Table 4 | How can someone find out how an individual votes? (2009)

	Male (%)	Female (%)	All (%)	(n)
Check lists/numbers by names	16.8	21.6	18.8	40
No privacy	12.8	12.5	12.7	27
Polling booth officer	14.4	6.8	11.3	24
MP through handouts	6.4	4.5	5.6	12
Other /undefined	5.6	1.1	3.8	8
Computers	0.8	2.3	1.4	3
Don't know	38.4	47.7	42.3	90

No answer = 11 cases (5%)

In 2010 respondents were asked 'How did you chose who to vote for in this year's national election?' with multiple responses permitted. Table 5 shows that 83% said they decided themselves, while 18% said their family told them how to vote and smaller percentages mentioned other factors. As some of the multiple responses appeared contradictory, it seems this question was ambiguous and not a good indicator of the factors influencing voting behaviour. This topic will be explored with more specific questions in future People's Surveys.

Table 5 | How did you chose who to vote for in this year's national election? (2010)

	Male (%)	Female (%)	All (%)	(n)
I decide who to vote for	85.3	81.0	83.2	3442.0
Family told me who to vote for	17.4	19.4	18.4	761.0
Candidate's qualifications*	4.9	1.8	3.4	140.0
Thought candidate would help /has helped community	3.1	3.3	3.2	133.0
People gave me money to vote for them	3.2	2.8	3.0	125.0
Chief or big man tell me who to vote for	2.9	2.0	2.5	102.0

People gave me gifts to vote for them	2.1	1.7	1.9	79.0
Political party /campaign policy /need change	2.4	0.7	1.6	67.0
Voted for wantok /friend /neighbour	1.5	1.2	1.4	56.0
People threatened me if I didn't vote for them	0.2	0.3	0.3	11.0
Other not specified	1.2	0.5	0.9	36.0
Don't know	0.0	0.1	0.0	2.0

Perceptions of women candidates

In each year of the Survey respondents have been asked 'Should there be women MPs in Parliament'? Table 6 shows that, every year, more than 85% of respondents said there should be women in Parliament. Young Men and Young Women were a little more likely to hold this view than Men and Women. There was no consistent pattern across provinces, with a difference of only around 12% between the province with most support (Ysabel) and least (Malaita).

Table 6| Should there be women MPs in Parliament? (2007, 2008, 2009, 2010)

Province	2007 Yes (%)	2008 Yes (%)	2009 Yes (%)	2010 Yes (%)
Central	89.7	-	94.8	83.8
Choiseul	87.2	-	85.2	-
Guadalcanal	81.3	87.7	83.6	89.6
Honiara	90.9	93.3	98.1	90.9
Honiara Settlements	-	-	93.7	93.2
Makira	84.3	93.3	-	82.1
Malaita	79.1	78.0	73.2	76.7
Rennell & Bellona	-	95.0	-	79.6
Temotu	88.9	-	87.0	-
Western	80.1	88.5	90.7	91.2
Ysabel	91.4	-	96.5	-
Respondent type				
Men	76.7	81.4	81.9	79.6
Women	77.5	90.5	85.9	85.8
Young Men	82.2	83.2	86.8	84.2
Young Women	82.9	88.1	86.0	92.2
Overall percentages	89.2	85.8	85.1	85.3
Total Respondents	5154	4304	5035	4921

In 2007, 2008 and 2009 respondents were asked 'Would you vote for a good woman candidate?'² Table 7 shows that responses to this question were also consistently positive. Again, respondents in Malaita were a little less likely to say they would support a woman candidate, with the percentage declining markedly over the three years. But even in that province support remained well above 70%.

In 2010 respondents were asked if they thought there should be reserved seats for women. The concept of reserved seats has been canvassed by 'Vois Blong Mere'³ and the National Council of Women for several years. It now seems to have been accepted in principal by the current government, but there has not been much public discussion of the form it might take. Table 8 shows that almost 85% of surveyed respondents supported the concept of reserved seats for women.

Table 7 | Would respondent vote for a good woman candidate? (2007, 2008, 2009)

Province	2007 Yes (%)	2008 Yes (%)	2009 Yes (%)
Central	93.2	-	95.6
Choiseul	90.7	-	85.6
Guadalcanal	92.1	90.3	84.2
Honiara	94.1	95.8	96.3
Honiara Settlements	-	-	94.1
Makira	92.2	95.2	-
Malaita	84.6	78.4	72.1
Rennell & Bellona	-	86.7	-
Temotu	93.3	-	94.0
Western	95.7	95.2	92.9
Ysabel	96.1	-	97.6
Respondent type			
Men	86.0	80.3	81.1
Women	91.7	91.9	86.0
Young Men	89.7	88.0	88.1
Young Women	92.1	90.3	86.8
Overall percentages	89.8	87.5	85.5
Total Respondents	<i>5154</i>	<i>4304</i>	<i>5035</i>

² Initially the inclusion of the word 'good' was questioned by some who reviewed the draft questionnaire, but the research team considered it essential to ensure respondents gave the matter serious consideration.

³ 'Vois Blong Mere' (literally 'the voice of women') is a non-government organisation that promotes active participation of women in development, primarily by sharing information. Its activities include radio broadcasts, training and workshops (<http://www.voisblongmere.org.sb>).

Table 8 | Do you think there should be special seats reserved for women MPs?

Province	Yes (%)	No (%)	Don't Know	
			(%)	(n)
Central	69.1	15.6	15.2	243
Guadalcanal	91.7	4.4	3.9	798
Honiara	77.9	17.1	5.0	625
Honiara Settlements	88.1	8.4	3.4	261
Makira	82.6	9.1	8.3	362
Malaita	84.0	9.3	6.7	1077
Rennell & Bellona	64.6	30.5	4.9	82
Western	89.8	8.9	1.4	734
Respondent type				
Men	72.2	20.8	7.0	1046
Women	93.2	2.8	4.0	1072
Young Men	80.1	13.9	6.0	967
Young Women	91.5	3.9	4.6	1097
Overall percentages	84.5	10.2	5.4	4182

In 2008 and 2009 respondents were asked to suggest up to three reasons why male candidates receive more votes than women. Like all other questions in the People's Survey, this question was always asked as an open question. Table 9 shows the percentages mentioning a particular reason as their first, second or third answer. There was considerable consistency between genders and between the two years, even though different districts were surveyed. In both years the reason mentioned most often by both men and women was *'It's the custom or culture that men are the leaders'*, followed by *'Male candidates bribe voters'*.

The wide variety and small percentages for the remaining responses, some of which contradict others, suggest that the question elicited sincere answers and that people were well aware that women candidates face many problems. One surprising finding was *'Husbands/men tell wives/women how to vote'* was mentioned only infrequently.

Table 9 | Why do male candidates always get more votes than female candidates? (2008 and 2009)

	2008		2009	
	Male (%)	Female (%)	Male (%)	Female (%)
It's the custom/ culture that men are the leaders	36.7	29.3	44.9	33.4
Male candidates bribe voters	27.5	22.4	40.8	37.9
Men make false promises /con voters /are dishonest	11.9	5.3	11.3	9.8
Men stronger /work better /relate to community	10.0	8.5	11.4	7.8
People look down on women/ women are not respected	9.0	9.2	9.8	10.6
Men are cleverer/ more educated than women	6.5	9.0	7.2	9.0
Favouritism /nepotism /men favour men	4.8	5.4	1.9	3.9
Women not suited to /capable of power /governing	4.5	4.2	4.4	4.5
Women lack confidence /are not good speakers	4.1	3.5	8.2	6.1
Men have connections /control more money	3.6	2.3	3.4	2.7
Men hungry for power /want to keep the power	3.3	2.3	0.6	0.8
People don't trust women /women lie /are not popular	3.5	1.8	7.0	5.3
People think only men can do good work /be MPs	2.9	3.3	3.7	3.9
Obligations to <i>wantoks</i>	2.6	1.5	1.7	1.3
Female candidates are not capable /capabilities not known	2.1	2.1	3.7	3.9
More men in the population /more male voters	1.3	1.8	0.2	0.8
Women too busy with children /family /gender roles	1.0	1.3	2.4	1.0
Intimidation/ threats/ aggression	0.6	0.7	1.1	1.6
Husbands /men tell wives /women how to vote	0.6	0.7	0.7	0.8
Women disunited /jealous of women /don't campaign well	0.5	3.6	7.2	6.4
Men better at managing money	0.5	0.5	0.7	0.2
The Bible says men are superior /should be head /lead	0.3	0.6	1.0	0.1

More male than female candidates	0.4	0.5	0.8	0.4
Women don't know how to do MP's work	0.3	0.4	2.6	3.0
Men and women don't discuss voting	0.2	0.1	0.0	0.1
Not enough women candidates / assistance for women	-	-	2.0	1.6
Voters not well educated/ not informed/ many women don't vote	-	-	0.6	0.7
Workers at voting centres are corrupt /some people vote twice	-	-	0.5	0.1
Weakness in party system			0.1	0.0
Don't know	16.1	29.8	14.1	20.6
Unspecified /not a proper answer	1.6	0.6	0.6	1.3
Total number of respondents	2170	2134	2545	2490

NOTE: % = Percentage of respondents mentioning each reason as one of up to three responses.

In 2010 two different questions were asked: 'Do you think women make good leaders?' and (for those who said yes) 'What makes women good leaders?' Although 'leaders' encompasses community leaders and senior public servants as well as parliamentarians, Table 10 shows similar percentages to Table 6 'Should there be women in Parliament?'

Table 10 | Do women make good leaders? (2010)

Province	Yes (%)	No (%)	Don't Know	
			(%)	(n)
Central	81.1	11.7	7.2	291
Guadalcanal	87.4	7.6	4.9	892
Honiara	87.4	10.3	2.3	691
Honiara Settlements	90.4	6.8	2.9	280
Makira	75.8	12.5	11.6	447
Malaita	75.1	19.3	5.5	1412
Rennell & Bellona	85.4	14.6	0	103
Western	93.3	5.4	1.2	808
Respondent type				
Men	79.3	17.5	3.2	1317
Women	85	7.3	7.7	1253
Young Men	81.9	15.1	2.9	1157
Young Women	88.4	6.9	4.7	1197
Overall percentages	83.6	11.8	4.7	4924

Table 11 suggests that women leaders are valued most for their perceived honesty, focus on education, health and family and good communication skills.

Mention of communication skills is interesting given that many respondents perceived women as less effective candidates than men (Table 9).

Table 11 | What makes women good leaders? (2010)

	Male (%)	Female (%)	All	
			(%)	(n)
Honest way of doing things	73.1	66.4	65.6	2671
Stronger focus on education /health /family	44.2	32.6	40.3	1640
Good communicators	28.2	44	36.3	1479
More inclusive decision makers	18.4	18.6	20.5	835
More equitable distributors of funds	20.9	17.9	17.9	728
More respected	18.4	13.6	16.6	675
Considerate /concerned /care for people and resources /listen	3.2	7	6.4	259
Clever /wise /well educated /good managers /experience	2.4	2.7	2.6	104
Easier to approach /involved in community activities /patient	1.5	1.7	1.9	76
More action than words /no promises / truthful /committed	0.3	0.7	0.6	23
No alcohol abuse /good Christians/ religious	0.1	0.6	0.5	22
Understand or respect culture /others	0.4	0.3	0.3	11
Other not specified	2.4	2.2	1.8	75
Nothing	0	0.1	0.1	3
Don't know	1.1	2.6	1.9	76

Note: Based on up to three responses per respondent.

Discussion

The People's Survey data show community perceptions of elections and women candidates that appear to be at variance with the usual outcomes of Solomon Islands elections. In particular, it seems that the majority of respondents believe that elections are confidential, support the concept of women as leaders and parliamentarians, say they would vote for a good woman candidate and support the concept of reserved seats for women. Focus group discussions confirmed a common view that women candidates would probably perform better than male candidates because of their stronger focus on the family and living conditions (RAMSI, 2009).

When the 2007 People's Survey results were released in Solomon Islands, the high percentages saying they believe there should be women in Parliament and they would vote for a woman candidate were greeted with surprise. At that time, the chaos that followed the 2006 election and the failure of all 25 women candidates to win office in that election were still very much in mind. Some politicians taunted that these findings proved that the People's Survey (which was not popular with the government of the day because of other topics

covered) was invalid. The consistency of answers in subsequent Surveys and the undeniable plausibility of other findings⁴ have shown clearly that this inconsistency was not caused by any limitation of the Surveys. Rather, the findings point to the need for further in-depth research to determine exactly why election outcomes do not reflect these views and why women candidates are poorly supported.

In particular there is a need for further in-depth investigation as to what exactly people perceive as the role of an MP and what benefits they expect to gain when they vote for a candidate. More detailed investigation is also needed of how bribery and vote buying affect election results. According to some focus group participants, bribery and vote buying was rife in 2010 and possibly even more widespread than in previous years (RAMSI, 2010). People's Survey data also indicate that vote buying is often resented or regarded with cynicism, votes are often bought cheaply and many parliamentarians are perceived as not honouring their promises. It is therefore somewhat surprising that vote buying still seems to be such an effective strategy for candidates. Other key questions that need to be explored include what exactly discourages voters from voting for women when so many believe that there should be women in Parliament, how this outcome is related to individual and community perceptions of the role of an MP, and what exactly determines voters' final decisions at the polling booth.

⁴ Whenever People's Survey questions have been repeated in successive years the percentages have generally varied by only a few per cent or as would be predicted from known interventions or other events.

References

Alasia, S. (2008) 'Rainbows across the mountains: the first post-RAMSI general election', Chapter 5 in S.Dinnen and S.Firth (eds) *Politics and State Building in Solomon Islands*. Canberra: The ANU E-Press, pp 119-147.

RAMSI (2007, 2008, 2009, 2010) *Peoples Survey* <http://www.ramsi.org/solomon-islands/peoples-survey.html>

RAMSI (2009) SIG RAMSI Partnership Framework (Unpublished document)

Transparency International (2010)

http://www.transparency.org/regional_pages/asia_pacific/about/pacific/solomon_islands

Annex 1 | Votes received by winners and women candidates, 2010 election

Province/ no. of constituencies	Constituency name	Candidate		Votes received		Rank in constituency
		Name	Gender	Number	%	
Central (2)	Nggela	Mark Roboliu Kemakeza	M	1966	24.4	1/12
		Catherine Ann Pule	F	74	0.9	9/12
	Russells/Savo	Dickson Mua Panakitasi	M	1840	42.5	1/5
		No women candidate				
Choiseul (3)	East Choiseul	Manasseh Damukana Sogavare	M	1913	71.8	1/4
		No women candidate				
	North West Choiseul	Connelly Sadakabatu	M	1408	30.0	1/6
		Sylvia Nowak Anderson	F	113	2.4	6/6
	South Choiseul	Elizah Doro Muala	M	635	17.5	1/13
	No women candidate					
Guadalcanal (8)	Central Guadalcanal	Peter Shanel Agovaka	M	2526	55.2	1/2
		No women candidate				
	East Central Guadalcanal	Joseph Onika	M	1133	24.8	1/11
		No women candidate				
	East Guadalcanal	Bradley Tovosia	M	1630	43.0	1/9
		No women candidate				
	North East Guadalcanal	Derek Sikua	M	2535	57.0	1/6
		No women candidate				
	North Guadalcanal	Martin Sopage	M	1489	31.2	1/12
		Greenta Vienna Tome	F	231	4.8	7/12
	North West Guadalcanal	Horst Heinz Bodo Dettke	M	2228	41.3	1/14
		Hilda Padavera Kii	F	117	2.2	7/14
	South Guadalcanal	David Day Pacha	M	1941	50.1	1/14
Betty Lirma Gigisi		F	5	0.1	1/14	
West Guadalcanal	Moses Garu	M	1006	23.2	1/11	
	No women candidate					
Honiara (3)	Central Honiara	John Moffat Fugui	M	1240	14.9	1/23
		Delmah Lavina Nori	F	136	1.6	1/23
	East Honiara	Douglas Ete	M	3178	38.6	1/12
		Catherine Adifaka	F	146	1.8	9/12
	West Honiara	Namson Tran	M	4499	56.6	1/6
	Catherine Sheardown Atanikakia	F	516	6.5	4/6	
Isabel (3)	Gao/Bugotu	Samuel Manetoali	M	2479	66.7	1/7
		Rhoda Sikilabu	F	564	15.2	2/7
	Hogranof/Kia/Havulei	Selwyn Riumana	M	1461	35.2	1/10
		Jane Magata Tozaka	F	447	10.8	4/10
	Maringe/Kokota	Varian Lonamei	M	1385	32.5	1/10
	Rachel Theotahigna	F	41	1.0	8/10	
Makira/Ulawa (4)	Central Makira	Hypolite Taremae	M	1360	33.8	1/16
		Nesta Marahora	F	121	3.0	10/16
	East Makira	Alfred Ghoro	M	1480	22.9	1/14
		No women candidate				
	Ulawa/Ugi	James Tora	M	641	26.0	1/14
		No women candidate				
West Makira	Dick Ha'amori	M	871	18.5	1/15	
	No women candidate					
Malaita (14)	Aoke/Langalanga	Mathew Cooper Wale	M	1681	36.7	1/6
		Judy Kwatena Fionala Barty	F	63	1.4	5/6
	Baegu/Asifola	Toswel Kaua	M	1037	22.6	1/14
		No women candidate				
	Central Kwar'ae	Jackson Fiulaua	M	2936	43.7	1/11
		Rose Anilabata	F	121	1.8	7/11
	East Are' Are	Andrew Hanaria Keniasina	M	1000	21.7	1/8
		No women candidate				
	East Kwaio	Stanley Festus Sofu	M	3973	67.9	1/4
		No women candidate				
East Malaita	Manasseh Maelanga	M	2845	71.1	1/7	
	No women candidate					

Annex 1 continued

Province/ no. of constituencies	Constituency name	Candidate		Votes received		Rank in constituency
		Name	Gender	Number	%	
Malaita (14) (cont.)	Fataleka	Steve William Abana	M	1954	34.2	1/10
		Jeniffer Fugui	F	216	3.8	7/10
	Lau/Mbaelelea	Walter Folotalu	M	2370	25.8	1/11
		No women candidate				
	Malaita Outer Islands	Martin Kealoe	M	739	45.2	1/7
		No women candidate				
	North Malaita	Jimmy Lusibaea	M	3091	49.6	1/9
		No women candidate				
	Small Malaita	Rick Houenipwela	M	1677	24.6	1/14
		No women candidate				
	West Are' Are	John Maneniaru	M	1281	32.3	1/10
		No women candidate				
	West Kwaio	Peter Tom	M	1550	34.8	1/13
		No women candidate				
West Kwara'ae	Shemuel Sam Iduri	M	1451	18.4	1/18	
	No women candidate					
Rennell and Bellona (1)	Rennell/Bellona	Seth Gukuna	M	882	47.5	1/8
No women candidate						
Temotu (3)	Temotu Nende	Commins Aston Mewa	M	1467	29.8	1/8
		No women candidate				
	Temotu Pele	Martin Teddy Magga	M	897	30.8	1/13
		No women candidate				
Temotu Vatud	Clay Forau Soalaoi	M	602	25.3	1/18	
	No women candidate					
Western (9)	Gizo/Kolombangara	Gordon Darcy Lilo	M	1942	39.6	1/14
		No women candidate				
	Marovo	Snyder Rini	M	2520	37.2	1/12
		Hellen Saera Hilli	F	215	3.2	9/12
	North New Georgia	Job Dudley Tausinga	M	1419	73.9	1/3
		Nuatali Tongarutu	F	36	1.9	3/3
	North Vella Lavella	Milner Tozaka	M	1225	45.0	1/6
		Gwen Abana Jitukalo	F	12	0.4	6/6
	Ranongga/Simbo	Charles Sigoto	M	1485	38.4	1/5
		Elizabeth Tamugula Pearson	F	254	6.6	4/5
	Shortland	Steve Laore	M	1073	49.3	1/7
		No women candidate				
	South New Georgia/ Rendova	Danny Philip	M	1579	39.1	1/8
		Nairy Alamu	F	98	2.4	7/8
		Doreen Linga	F	28	0.7	8/8
	South Vella Lavella	Lional Alex	M	997	26.3	1/6
No women candidate						
West New Georgia/ Vona Vona	Silas Kerry Vaqara Tausinga	M	1487	27.5	1/12	
	Gloria Sibisobere	F	594	11.0	4/12	
	Selina Boso	F	211	3.9	6/12	

SUMMARY STATISTICS:

Total number of votes cast	=	232,983
Total votes received by women candidates	=	4359
Overall percentage of votes received by women candidates	=	1.9%
Total votes cast in the 21 electorates contested by women	=	109,154
Women candidates share of votes in electorates contested by women	=	4.0%

About the Author

Christine McMurray | Adjunct Associate Professor, The Australian Demographic & Social Research Institute (ADSRI), ANU

Christine's work has included extensive research in Solomon Islands over many years in areas including voter behaviour, attitudes and perceptions on key issues such as economy, access to basic services, law and justice etc. This work has also included research on political representation and civic awareness including voter's attitudes towards women standing for parliament.

About the Centre for Democratic Institutions

CDI was established in 1998 to assist in the development and strengthening of democratic institutions in developing countries. Its mission is to *harness Australian and international best practice in support of developing countries' needs for democratic governance.*

CDI's work combines technical assistance and capacity building programs, networking, and interpersonal and knowledge exchange, including the dissemination of CDI's original research on democracy and its institutions.

Its focus countries comprise Indonesia and East Timor in South East Asia and Papua New Guinea, Fiji, Solomon Islands and Vanuatu in Melanesia.

CDI Policy Paper Series on Political Governance

http://www.cdi.anu.edu.au/research/PPS_Home.htm

Series Editors / Stephen Sherlock, Grant Harrison, Luke Hambly

17

2011/01 | Christine McMurray
National Elections & Women Candidates in Solomon Islands: Results from the People's Survey

2010/02 | Norm Kelly
Electoral Democracy in Post-Conflict Melanesia: The 2010 Bougainville and Solomon Islands Elections

2010/01 | Ben Hillman
Political Parties and Post-Conflict Transition: The Results and Implications of the 2009 Parliamentary Elections in Aceh

2009/01 | Stephen Sherlock
Indonesia's 2009 Elections: The New Electoral System and the Competing Parties

2008/01 | Benjamin Reilly, Per Nordlund and Edward Newman
Political Parties in Conflict-Prone Societies: Encouraging Inclusive Politics and Democratic Development.

2007/02 | Joseph Ketan
The Use and Abuse of Electoral Development Funds and their Impact on Electoral Politics and Governance in Papua New Guinea

2007/01 | Stephen Sherlock
The Indonesian Parliament after Two Elections: What has Really Changed?

2006/02 | Wahidah Zein Br Siregar
Political Parties, Electoral System and Women's Representation in the 2004-2009 Indonesian Parliaments

2006/01 | Stephen Sherlock
Indonesia's Regional Representative Assembly: Democracy, Representation and the Regions. A report on the Dewan Perwakilan Daerah (DPD)



Centre for Democratic Institutions
Australian National University
Canberra ACT 0200
AUSTRALIA

Phone: 61 2 6125 0605
Fax: 61 2 6125 9726
Email: cdi@anu.edu.au
Website: www.cdi.anu.edu.au