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**ABSTRACT**

This research was conducted to examine how gender influences the risk taking of Indonesian people and other factors that can influence it. Gender equality which is currently often echoed in fact is still clashing with the construction of a patriarchal Indonesian culture so that research is needed to prove the actual data. This study uses secondary data sourced from the 5th edition of Indonesia Family Life Survey (IFLS). This study uses quantitative methods with multiple linear regression analysis techniques with the help of R Studio statistical analysis software version 3.5.2. Respondents used in this study amounted to 7,344 people consisting of 3,728 men and 3,616 women. The results of this study indicate that gender is considered quite influential in risk taking with no striking differences between men and women. Even so, gender does not necessarily become a major factor in risk taking but there are other factors that can affect a person's age.
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1. **INTRODUCTION**

              Indonesia is one of the countries famous for its patriarchal culture. This patriarchal culture is very lasting in the life of the Indonesian people and is found in various aspects and scope, such as economics, education, politics, to law. According to Alfian Rokhmansyah (in Sakina, 2015) patriarchy is derived from the word patriarchate, meaning the structure that places the role of men as the sole, central, and everything. Using a patriarchal system that dominates the culture of society causes gender inequality and inequality which affects up to various aspects of human activities including risk taking.

Gender is one of the most frequently discussed parts. The reason why gender is often discussed is because in social life between men and women today it is still often distinguished. So that the concept of gender equality that has been echoed by social activists has not yet fully borne fruit. Currently, men are still regarded as someone who should be in a higher position among women. This is because in Indonesian culture which still adheres to a patriarchal system, men are considered to have a role as the main control in society while women have little influence or can be said to have no rights in the general areas of society (Sakina, 2015). In fact, in fact, men and women have the same rights and opportunities in all fields. So it is interesting to discuss about how much gender influences between men and women on risk taking .

The concept of gender itself is also interpreted as a trait inherent in men and women socially and culturally constructed. The qualities themselves are interchangeable. Changes in the characteristics of the traits can occur from time to time and from one place to another. These differences occur because of many things, including being formed, socialized, strengthened, even constructed socially or culturally through religious or state teachings. Gender is one of the factors in taking risks carried out by individuals because there is a general belief that men should take greater risks than women, where women generally behave more risk-averse than men. This is in accordance with research conducted by Jayathilake (2013) which shows the results that men and women have different behaviors in dealing with risks. P enelitian previously shown that decision-making men and women equal or se appeal . Similar research has also been done before in Indonesia related to the influence of gender and education level on auditor risk taking. In that study explained that there is no significant effect between the two with risk taking. This is because there are other factors that influence the auditor's risk taking process apart from gender factors (In Wirosari, 2010).

Basically there are enough studies that have examined gender and its relation to decision making and risk taking, but there are some differences in results between studies. In addition, if seen from the scope there has been no research that discusses the relationship and influence of gender in taking risks in a broader scope, namely the Indonesian region, previous studies only focused on the scope of certain groups. It's interesting when in the context of gender that still needs a lot of struggle for feminism to get gender equality in all aspects can not be separated in any aspect. So the study in this research needs to be done to find out and test the existing theories related to it.

1. **RESEARCH METHOD**

This research uses quantitative methods. using descriptive quantitative research methods with the Secondary Data Analysis (ADS) approach or commonly called *Secondary Data Analysis* . According to Martono (2014) this secondary quantitative data method utilizes data that is already available from various institutions and makes the data obtained as a primary data source. This research takes place in the State of Indonesia, where the object of study is the risk taking data of the Indonesian people taken from the Indonesia Family Life Survey (IFLS) Issue 5. Based on the provisions and criteria in accordance with this study, the number of respondents is 7,344 people with 3,728 details male and 3,616 female. The data analysis in this study uses descriptive data analysis and regression analysis.

1. **RESULT AND DISSCUSSION**

The number of respondents in general in IFLS 5 there were 36,385 respondents. Divided among others as many as 17,560 male respondents and 18,825 female respondents. The data was obtained from processed IFLS 5 data from IIIA book with specific gender questions on COV5. The question of whether the respondent is male or female is symbolized by number 1 as male and number 3 as female respondent.

Figure 1 . Graph of risk taking respondents viewed from gender



Table 1. Distribution of respondents frequency of risk taking for men and women

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Code** | **Gender** | **total**  | **Percentage**  |
| **1** | Male | 3728 | 50.76% |
| **3** | Female | 3616 | 49.24% |
|  | **Total**  | 7344 |   |

Based on the data above, it can be seen that there are 7,344 people who are the focus of this study with details of 3728 respondents with male gender and 3,616 respondents with female gender spread throughout Indonesia. Of these 7,344 people, they were given a research question. In this code, they were asked if they were guaranteed to get 800 thousand per month and in the second choice they would be guaranteed to get Rp. 1.6 million per month or Rp. 800 thousand per month, each with an opportunity same. In the SI code 03 the question is given if it is guaranteed to get 800 thousand per month and in the second option is guaranteed to get Rp. 1.6 million per month or Rp. 400 thousand per month, each with the same opportunity . the SI code 0 5 is   given a question in the form of a guarantee to get Rp. 1.6 million per month or Rp. 200 thousand per month, and the first choice is Rp. 800 thousand per month each with the same opportunity. In the SI code 11 is given a question in the form of a guarantee to get Rp. 4 million per month or the second option is Rp. 4 million or Rp. 2 million per month each with the same opportunity. And the Si 13 code is asked if it is guaranteed to get Rp. 4 million per month or on the second option or Rp. 12 million or Rp. 0 each with the same opportunity. The five codes are related to one another so that all respondents are asked to answer all questions. The results of this study in terms of the risk-taking process seen based on gender of men and women are as follows:

Table 2 . Frequency distribution of risk taking respondents

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No** | **Code** | **Answer Choice** | **Number of respondents** | **Percentage** |
| **Total** | **Male** | **Female** | **Male** | **Female** |
| 1. | SI 01 | Option 1 | 1157 people | 465 people | 692 people | 12.47% | 19.14% |
| Option 2 | 6177 people | 3262 people | 2915 people | 87.50% | 80.61% |
| 2 | SI 03 | Option 1 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Option 2 | 7344 people | 3728 people | 3616 people | 100% | 100% |
| 3 | SI 05 | Option 1 | 3201 people | 1413 people | 1788 people | 37.90% | 49.45% |
| Option 2 | 4137 people  | 2313 people | 1824 people | 62.04% | 50.55% |
| 4 | SI 11 | Option 1 | 6599 people | 3367 people | 3232 people | 90.32% | 89.38% |
| Option 2 | 734 people | 357 people | 377 people  | 9.58% | 10.42% |
| 5 | SI 13 | Option 1 | 6103 people | 2928 people | 3175 people | 78.54% | 87.80% |
| Option 2 | 1225 people | 795 people | 430 people | 11.53% | 11.89% |

            Based on the above details, it can be seen that between men and women both do have differences in risk taking. This can be seen from the number of male respondents who prefer a higher risk when compared to women. However, this does not rule out the possibility that women also have the same right to choose a higher risk when compared to men. This can be proven by data showing that men and women do not have far-reaching differences in numbers. In the codes SI 01, SI 03, SI 05, and SI 13 show that the number of male respondents who choose a higher risk is higher when compared to women. However, the SI11 code shows that in the second choice with the question of the possibility to get Rp 4 million or Rp 2 million per month each with the same opportunity the results show that there are 734 respondents with details of 357 men and 377 women person. Whereas in the first choice, given a guarantee to get Rp. 4 million per month , there were quite a lot of respondents who chose this option, namely 6599 people with details of 3367 men and 3232 people.

              In this study, there are control variables that are used to explain phenomena more optimally, then the results of the analysis using control variables will also have higher statistical *power (power)* . In this study, the control variables are age and marital status *.* Responder specifications used in this study were started with respondents who were at least 21 years old. This is done because the age of 21 years is considered to be mature enough in decision making so that risk taking is far more valid in data processing. Marital status is one of the control variables in this study because researchers want to know whether marital status factors have an influence on the risk-taking process undertaken by the community.

              This study uses regression analysis techniques with risk taking as the dependent variable (y) and gender as the independent variable (x) and age and marital status as control variables. In the results of this regression analysis there are 5 regressions conducted with the same variable, it's just that risk taking as the dependent variable is what makes it different because of different codes in one variable. The results of multiple linear regression analysis can be seen as follows:

Table 3 . Regression Results 1

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Estimate** | **Std. Error** | **T value** | **Pr (> | t |)** | **Sig.** |
| **(Intercept)** | 1.892253 | 0.017171 | 110,204 | <2e-16 | \*\*\* |
| **Woman** | -0.046392 | 0.010227 | -4,536  | 5.81e-06 | \*\*\* |
| **Usiabaru1** | 0.003962 | 0.004314 | 0.919 | 0.35837 |   |
| **Mar.** | -0.026908 | 0.017440 | -1,543 | 0.12291 |   |
| **Div** | -0.070839 | 0.038253 | -1,852 | 0.06409 | . |
| **Sep** | -0.166409 | 0.075480 | -2,205 | 0.02751 | \* |
| **Wid** | -0.085329 | 0.031352 | -2,722 | 0.00651 | \*\* |

Significance Code: 0 '\*\*\*' 0.001 '\*\*' 0.01 '\*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 '' 1

Residual standard error: 0.4282 on 7335 degrees of freedom (2 observations deleted due to missingness) Multiple R-squared: 0.005515, Adjusted R-squared: 0.004702 F-statistics: 6.78 on 6 and 7335 DF, p-value: 3.505e-07

Table 4. Regression Results 2

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Estimate** | **Std. Error** | **T value** | **Pr (> | t |)** | **Sig.** |
| **(Intercept)** | 2,000e + 00 | 5.522e-16 | 3,622e + 15 | <2e-16 | \*\*\* |
| **Woman** | 3,402e-16 | 3,289e-16 | 1.034e + 00 | 0301 |   |
| **Usiabaru1** | 7.437e-17 | 1,387e-16 | 5,360e-01 | 0.592 |   |
| **Mar.** | -3,342e-16 | 5,609e-16 | -5,960e-01 | 0.551 |   |
| **Div** | -2.109e-16 | 1,230e-15 | -1.710e-01 | 0864 |   |
| **Sep** | -2.304e-16 | 2,427e-15 | -9,500e-02 | 0.924 |   |
| **Wid** | -4,141e-16 | 1,008e-15 | -4.110e-01 | 0.681 |   |

Significance Code: 0 '\*\*\*' 0.001 '\*\*' 0.01 '\*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 '' 1

Residual standard error: 1.377e-14 on 7335 degrees of freedom (2 observations deleted due to missingness) Multiple R-squared: 0.4999, Adjusted R-squared: 0.4995 F-statistics: 1222 on 6 and 77335 DF, p-value: < 2.2e-16

Table 5 . Regression Results 3

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Estimate** | **Std. Error** | **T value** | **Pr (> | t |)** | **Sig.** |
| **(Intercept)** | 1.56850 | 0.02106 | 74,488 | <2e-16 | \*\*\* |
| **Woman** | -0.11809 | 0.01254 | -9,416 | <2e-16 | \*\*\* |
| **Usiabaru1** | 0.01459 | 0.00529 | 2,759 | 0.05082 | \*\*\* |
| **Mar.** | 0.01990 | 0.02139 | 0.930 | 0.35227 |   |
| **Div** | 0.06576 | 0.04691 | 1,402 | 0.16102 | . |
| **Sep** | 0.20461 | 0.09256 | 2,210 | 0.02710 | \* |
| **Wid** | 0.06595 | 0.03845 | 1,715 | 0.08634 | . |

Significance Code: 0 '\*\*\*' 0.001 '\*\*' 0.01 '\*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 '' 1

Residual standard error: 0.5251 on 7335 degrees of freedom (2 observations deleted due to missingness) Multiple R-squared: 0.0357, Adjusted R-squared: 0.01372

F-statistics: 18.01 on 6 and 7335 DF, p-value: <2.2e-16

Table 6 . Regression Results 4

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Estimate** | **Std. Error** | **T value** | **Pr (> | t |)** | **Sig.** |
| **(Intercept)** | 1.077928 | 0.016085 | 67,015 | <2e-16 | \*\*\* |
| **Woman** | 0.013876 | 0.009580 | 1,448 | 0.14754 |   |
| **Usiabaru1** | 0.012984 | 0.004041 | 3,213 | 0.00132 | \*\* |
| **Mar.** | -0.008922 | 0.016338 | -0,546 | 0.58503 |   |
| **Div** | 0.036407 | 0.035835 | 1,016 | 0.30967 |   |
| **Sep** | -0.095327 | 0.070708 | -1,348 | 0.17765 |   |
| **Wid** | 0.001257 | 0.029370 | 0.043 | 0.96587 |   |

Significance Code: 0 '\*\*\*' 0.00 1 '\*\*' 0.01 '\*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 '' 1

Residual standard error: 0.4011 on 7335 degrees of freedom (2 observations deleted due to missingness) Multiple R-squared: 0.002679, Adjusted R-squared: 0.001864 F-statistics: 3,284 on 6 and 7335 DF, p-value: 0.003151

Table 7 . Regression Results 5

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Estimate** | **Std. Error** | **T value** | **Pr (> | t |)** | **Sig.** |
| **(Intercept)** | 1,253179 | 0.019574 | 64,024 | <2e-16 | \*\*\* |
| **Woman** | -0.080678 | 0.011658 | -6,921 | 4.88e-12 | \*\*\* |
| **Usiabaru1** | 0.013245 | 0.004918 | 2,693 | 0.007089 | \*\* |
| **Mar.** | -0.074579 | 0.019881 | -3,751 | 0,000177 | \*\*\* |
| **Div** | -0.059632 | 0.043607 | -1367 | 0.171514 | . |
| **Sep** | -0.060309 | 0.086044 | -0,701 | 0.483386 |   |
| **Wid** | -0.035655 | 0.035740 | -0.998 | 0.318491 |   |

Significance Code: 0 '\*\*\*' 0.001 '\*\*' 0.01 '\*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 '' 1

Residual standard error: 0.4881 on 7335 degrees of freedom (2 observations deleted due to missingness) Multiple R-squared: 0.01007, Adjusted R-squared: 0.009265 F-statistics: 12.44 on 6 and 7335 DF, p-value: 5.363e-14

              Based on the results of descriptive data and regression analysis that has been carried out on these five risk-taking codes, it can be seen that Based on the results of the descriptive data analysis that has been done it can be seen that between men and women do not have significant differences. Basically, the views of most people, men generally take greater risks compared to women. However, not necessarily women tend to avoid risk. In accordance with existing data shows that women who choose to take and face greater risks are not small in number. In this case the number of women who choose a greater risk is proportional to the number of men with a percentage ratio that is not too far away. Described in the graph and table above it can be seen that the ratio is 1% - 12%. Even in the SI03 code between men and women answered with the same choice, namely in the second choice with higher risk taking. It can also be seen that in the SI11 and SI13 codes the majority of respondents both male and female prefer the first choice with lower risk. This shows that men do not always choose choices with a higher risk, but in some choices men actually choose a lower risk choice and are comparable to choices chosen by women, so it can be concluded that the comparison between men and women are quite balanced in taking risks.

              The results of this research have been assessed in accordance with the results of research conducted by Wendy (in Wirosari, 2010) which shows that there is no difference in risk behavior between men and women because risk behavior factors are not only influenced by gender factors, but there are still many Other factors that can influence, include experience and characteristics of the surrounding environment. In another research conducted by Wirosari (2010) shows that gender is not the only factor that can influence auditor risk behavior, but there are still many other factors that can be considered, such as competency, experience, time pressure, audit fees. The results of this research have shown that of the 5 codes there are 2 codes that are considered to have no significant effect and there are 3 codes that are considered to be quite influential even though the level of significance is judged to be unfavorable. it means that basically in certain contexts gender shows its influence on risk taking and in other contexts gender cannot significantly influence risk taking. This shows that there are many other factors that can significantly influence risk taking.

              Based on the regression results it is also explained that age or age as a control variable is considered to have a significant effect on risk taking. This is shown from the 5 risk taking codes, there are 4 codes that show that age affects risk taking significantly. This is consistent with the results of research conducted by Wirosari (2010) which explains that age has a significant influence on risk behavior, especially on auditor behavior. The effect is positive, which the older the respondent's age, the greater the possibility of taking a big enough risk. This also shows that marital status as a control variable in the study is considered not to significantly influence risk taking. This is indicated by only a few that can influence it.

1. **CONCLUSIONS**

              Gender influences the risk taking of the Indonesian people with other factors that can influence including one of them is the age of the respondent. the results of the influence of gender itself indicate that there is no difference between male and female gender . The absence of differences between men and women can be used as a reference by the wider community that there is a need for gender equality in various sectors given that there is still no uniform understanding of gender equality in society. Gender men and women do not necessarily become a major assessment in the process of defining certain parties, especially in the public domain so it needs to be reexamined other factors which can be used as an assessment.
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