

SAIFUL MUJANI
R. WILLIAM LIDDLE
KUSKRIDHO AMBARDI

VOTING BEHAVIOR IN INDONESIA
SINCE DEMOCRATIZATION

CRITICAL DEMOCRATS

AN
NI

Saiful Mujani, R. William Liddle,
Kuskridho Ambardi,
*Voting Behavior in Indonesia since
Democratization: Critical Democrats*
2017

*Voting Behavior in Indonesia since
Democratization: Critical Democrats*

Saiful Mujani (Syarif Hidayatullah State Islamic University)

R. William Liddle (Ohio State University)

Kuskridho Ambardi (Gadjah Mada University)

Cambridge University Press
(Forthcoming)
2017

Table of Contents

Preface and Acknowledgements	xi
Chapter 1. Introduction: Indonesia and Critical Democracy	1
Chapter 2. The Emergence of Critical Democrats: Support for Democracy and Criticism of its Performance	11
Chapter 3. Participation and Choice	33
Chapter 4. Sociological and Demographic Factors	101
Chapter 5. Rational Voters	195
Chapter 6. Party Identity and Political Leadership	237
Chapter 7. Conclusions	295
Appendix	315
Glossary	321
References	325
Index	335

List of Figures

- 2.1. Democracy is the Best Form of Government for Indonesia (%)
- 2.2. Satisfied or Not Satisfied with the Implementation of Democracy in Indonesia (%)
- 3.1. Voter Turnout (%)
- 3.2. Ever Participated in Campaign Activities before the Parliamentary or Presidential Elections (%)
- 4.1. Regular Fasting and Praying among Indonesian Muslims (%)
- 4.2. Voting According to Income Level (%)
- 5.1. Perception of Present National Economic Condition Compared with Last Year, 1999-2014 (%)
- 6.1. Party ID Trends (Feeling Close to a Particular Party) among Indonesian Voters, 1999-2014 (%)
- 6.2. There is a Preferred National Figure (%)

List of Tables

- 2.1. Descriptive Statistics of Evaluation of Democracy and its Practice (score 1-10) (2006 and 2014b)
- 2.2. Correlations (Pearson's r) of Several Factors with Commitment to Democracy and Democratic Performance (2009a & 2014a)
- 2.3. Regression of Commitment to Democracy (2009a & 2014a)
- 2.4. Democratic Performance Regressions (2009a & 2014a)
- 3.1. Votes Won by Parties in Democratic Elections in Indonesia, 1955, 1999-2014 (%)
- 3.2. Presidential-Vice Presidential Pairs and their Supporting Parties, 2004, 2009, and 2014
- 4.1. Logistic Regression of Voter Turnout in Parliamentary and Presidential Elections
- 4.2. Political Participation Regression
- 4.3. Effect of Religion on Political Choice in Parliamentary Elections 1999-2014 (Change in Predicted Probability)
- 4.4. Effect of Religion on Political Choice in Presidential Elections 2004-2014 (Change in Predicted Probability)
- 4.5. Effect of Ethnic Background on Political Choice in Parliamentary and Presidential Elections 1999-2014 (Change in Predicted Probability)
- 4.6. Effect of Education on Political Choice in Parliamentary and Presidential Elections 1999-2014 (Change in Predicted Probability)
- 5.1. Reasons for Not Voting in Parliamentary and Presidential Elections (%)
- 5.2. Economic Growth, Inflation, and Unemployment, 1996-2014 (%)
- 5.3. Association between Assessment of National Economic Condition

and Voting for Party (%)

- 5.4. Association between National Economic Condition and Voting for President (%)
- 5.5. Political Economy Effect on Partisan and Presidential Choice, 2009 & 2014 (Difference in Predicted Probability)
- 6.1. The Effect of Party Identity on Turnout in Parliamentary and Presidential Elections (Logistic Coefficient B, and Standard Error)
- 6.2. Multivariate Analysis of Political Participation for Parliamentary Elections
- 6.3. Multivariate Analysis of Political Participation in the Presidential Elections
- 6.4. The Effect of Party Identity on Choice of Party and Presidential Candidate, 1999-2009 (Difference in Predicted Probability)
- 6.5. Multivariate Analysis (Regression) of the Effect of Social Identity on Party Identity
- 6.6. Multivariate Analysis (Regression) of Party Identity
- 6.7. The Effect of Leadership Quality on Choice of Party and Presidential Candidates, 1999-2014 (Difference in Predicted Probability)
- 6.8. Regression Analysis of the Effect of Leadership Quality on Party Identity (Regression Coefficient and Standard Error)
- 6.9. Multivariate Analysis of the Effect of Advertising on Affection for Leader (Regression Coefficient with Standard Error)

Preface and Acknowledgements

This book is the product of nearly two decades of research conducted by the authors on Indonesian voting behavior since the restoration of democracy in 1999, after a hiatus of nearly a half century since the last democratic election in 1955. Our primary data come from eight national, individual-level, scientific surveys that we conducted ourselves: the first just after the first democratic parliamentary election in 1999 and the last after the most recent parliamentary and presidential elections in 2014.

An undertaking of this magnitude would not have been possible without the robust support, generous contributions, and enthusiastic participation of many others. We would like to begin by thanking Paul Beck and Ned Lebow, whose assistance was critical to the success of our first survey in 1999. At that time, none of us had any experience in conducting public opinion surveys and there were no country experts to whom we could turn, since Indonesia had been a dictatorship for more than three decades.

Paul Beck, at the time chair of the political science department at Ohio State University, helped us in two ways: by giving us a crash course in the basics of political survey research, and by writing compelling letters of support to potential funding agencies, including the National Science Foundation, from which we received a grant of USD 25,000 (#9975671). Match-

ing funds were provided by Ohio State's Mershon Center for International Security Studies, whose director was then Ned Lebow. Ned also provided us with graduate research assistance, office space, and opportunities to present our findings to the Mershon and Ohio State scholarly communities. That assistance has continued to this day, under the leadership of subsequent Mershon directors Richard Herrmann and Craig Jenkins.

In Indonesia our first survey was carried out in collaboration with colleagues at the Political Science Laboratory of the Faculty of Social and Political Sciences at the University of Indonesia in Jakarta. We especially appreciate the leadership at the Laboratory of Valina Singka Subekti, Eep Saefulloh Fatah, and Sri Budi Eko Wardani.

The 2004 and 2009 surveys were conducted by the Lembaga Survei Indonesia (LSI, Indonesian Survey Institute), founded in 2003. We are grateful for the support of our founding researchers: Djunaedi Hadi Sumarto, Heri Akhmadi, Theodore P. Rachmat, Oentoro Surya, and Joko Winoto. Crucial outside funding for LSI, making possible a series of surveys conducted between 2003-2006, was provided by JICA (Japan International Cooperation Agency). We thank in particular Takashi Shiraishi, then at Kyoto University, for his early belief in LSI's promise, and JICA's staff in Jakarta.

We have been blessed by the presence of many skilled researchers at LSI over the years. We are especially grateful to Denny J.A., who was with us until 2005, and to Iman Suhirman, Adam Kamil, Wahyu Prasetyawan, Deni Irvani, Dudi Herlianto, M. Dahlan, Hendro Prasetyo, Burhanuddin Muhtadi, Rizka Halida, Nur Widiyati, and Zezen Zaenal Mutaqin.

For funding and implementation of the 2014 surveys, we thank SaifulMujani Research and Consulting (SMRC), in particular Grace Natalie, Jayadi Hanan, Sirajuddin Abbas, and Ade Armando. Conducting an extensive series of national

surveys at both LSI and SMRC would not have been possible without the hard work of our field coordinators and supervisors in the regions, plus the hundreds of researchers and interviewers from Aceh at the northwest corner of Indonesia to Papua in the southeast, a distance of more than three thousand miles. Though we lack space to list their names, they are the backbone of our enterprise, making possible the collection of data from the far corners of the archipelago, often including reaching respondents in barely accessible sites determined by our random sampling procedures. We are very grateful to them all.

The 2004, 2009, and 2014 surveys also benefited from our collaboration with the Comparative National Elections Project (CNEP), centered at Ohio State and led by Richard Gunther and Paul Beck.

We are grateful to the Indonesian publisher Mizan, which encouraged our work at an early stage and in 2011 published our preliminary analysis, based on Indonesia's first three democratic elections (1999-2009), as *Kuasa Rakyat*.

Two anonymous readers for Cambridge University Press showed us how to better connect our analysis of the Indonesian data to current debates in the scholarly literature on comparative electoral behavior.

Final responsibility for the accuracy and quality of our analysis and interpretation of our data rests of course with the authors. *Semoga berkenan*, we hope the reader is pleased.

Saiful Mujani
R. William Liddle
Kuskridho Ambardi

Chapter 1

Introduction: Indonesia and Critical Democracy

Indonesia's Democratic History

Democratic participation by Indonesian citizens in choosing members of Parliament, provincial and local legislatures, the president and regional executives is still a rare event in modern Indonesian history. The first parliamentary election was held in 1955, about ten years after the proclamation of Indonesian independence, and was judged democratic by observers (Feith 1957). When Parliament was dissolved in 1959 by decree of Indonesia's founding father, President Sukarno, returning the country to its Revolution-era 1945 Constitution, the era of parliamentary democracy was over.

Under the 1945 Constitution, the formal governmental system combined elements of parliamentarism and presidentialism. In this mixed system, sovereign authority was held by a People's Consultative Assembly (MPR, Majelis Permusyawaratan Rakyat). The president as head of state and government was selected by and responsible to the Assembly. After dissolving parliamentary democracy, President Sukarno labelled the mixed governmental system Guided Democracy,

Chapter 2

The Emergence of Critical Democrats: Support for Democracy and Criticism of its Performance

In modern democracies, the citizenry determines who will rule via elections. They are the final arbiters of the competition to determine which of the contestants acquires authority over them. Indeed, their voice is important not only in determining who rules, but also in determining whether the selection process is conducted in a democratic fashion or not, freely and fairly or not. Their judgment provides the democratic legitimation of parliamentary and presidential elections.

In the Indonesian case, many domestic observers have paid insufficient attention to this aspect of democratic politics, as discussed in the previous chapter. They have failed to evaluate just how democratic Indonesian elections have been in the eyes of the voters themselves. Accordingly, this chapter will present the voters' judgments on the elections that have already been conducted. In our surveys, citizens were asked to evaluate the degree of democraticness of the parliamentary or presidential election in which they had just participated.

Chapter 3

Participation and Choice

In comparative electoral behavior studies, two basic connected components receive the most attention: political participation and political choice. Participation is related to voters' involvement in choosing candidates or parties and other related forms of participation, especially the act of voting itself. Choice is connected to the candidates or parties that are chosen.¹ This chapter examines both of these components. They represent the dependent variables that will be explored in the subsequent chapters as in other voting behavior studies.

Political Participation

In this study, political participation is limited to two dimensions: voting and activities connected to election campaigning. More specifically, activities connected to campaigning are limited to attendance at rallies or open gatherings held

¹For the relevant theoretical literature see Verba and Nie (1972); Verba, Nye, and Kim (1978); Kaase and Marsh (1979); Parry, Moyser, and Day (1992); McDonough, Shin, and Moises (1998); Verba, Schlozman, and Brady (1995); Brady (1999).

Chapter 4

Sociological and Demographic Factors

In the sociological model, the prime movers of participation and political choice are differences in gender, age, ethnicity or regional residence, religion and level of piety, and social class as measured by urban versus rural residence, level of education, income, and type of employment. Indonesian scholars and politicians have paid most attention to religion, ethnicity, and social class, all of which have been considered prime movers (Samadhi and Warouw 2009; Aspinall and Mietzner 2010; Hadiz 2010; Winters 2011).

Examination of voters in these terms may also help us locate sociologically Norris's (1999, 2011) critical citizens in the Indonesian case. Of particular potential interest, perhaps, is the comparison between Indonesia and other Muslim-majority countries in an era in which there are few democracies in those countries. For these reasons, we open our analysis with consideration of these factors.

Religion and Religiosity

Religion and Participation

Many studies show that religion, in older democracies such as the United States and newer ones in Asia and Latin America, influences citizens to become involved in their re-

Chapter 5

Rational Voters

The previous chapter has shown that sociological factors are not a sufficient explanation for Indonesian voters' behavior. Religious, ethnic, and social class differences have not much changed in recent years, in contrast to the rapid changes experienced in support for parties and candidates in parliamentary and presidential elections. This chapter explores the extent to which voter rationality helps us explain these changes. Does the decline in participation that we have observed reflect the increasing rationality of the Indonesian voter? In other words, is it true that if elections represent collective goods and do not provide personal incentives citizens will tend not to vote? Further, do the changes in relative party strengths in Parliament and also in the presidency reflect voters' rational decisions to reward and punish the parties and candidates?

Political Participation

In Chapter 3, we discovered that the level of participation in voting in parliamentary elections declined significantly, from 93% (1999) to 84% (2004) and 71% (2009), although it slightly increased to 75% in 2014. In the direct presidential elections, it declined from 80% in the 2004 first round to 76.5% in the second round, 73% in the 2009 single round, and

Chapter 7

Conclusion: Critical Democrats as Rational Voters

Indonesia is one of the world's newest democracies, its people having overthrown the three decades-long Suharto-led New Order dictatorship in 1998. Since that time, four democratic elections have been held at the national level, in 1999 (for Parliament), 2004, 2009 and 2014 (for Parliament and president). These elections, examined through public opinion surveys, have provided the basis for our evaluation of the current state and future prospects of the Indonesian democratic project.

Critical Democrats

Indonesian voters, as reported in our surveys, consider the 1999 and subsequent elections to have been conducted freely and fairly. Moreover, they have a strong commitment to democracy as the best system for their country even though they recognize that it is not perfect. This strong positive commitment is closely connected in turn to perceptions of how democracy is implemented. The higher the perception of democratic performance, the stronger the citizen's commitment to democracy; conversely, if democratic performance is perceived to be low, the commitment declines.

Appendix

Data, Method, and Model

Data and Method

This book is based largely on data from several national surveys of voters conducted by the authors several days after parliamentary and presidential elections in 1999, 2004, 2009, and 2014. There was one survey in 1999 (after the parliamentary election, the sole election that year), three in 2004 (after the parliamentary and each round of the presidential election) two in 2009 and in 2014 (after the parliamentary and the single round presidential election).

In 2014, the surveys were conducted by Saiful Mujani Research and Consulting (SMRC), in 2004 and 2009 by LSI (Lembaga Survei Indonesia, Indonesian Survey Institute, lsi.or.id). In 1999, the survey team, consisting of scholars from the University of Indonesia, was led by R. William Liddle and Saiful Mujani, then both at Ohio State University. The 1999 survey was funded by the National Science Foundation (Grant #9975671) and the Mershon Center at Ohio State University. The 2004 surveys were made possible by a grant from the Japan International Cooperation Agency. The 2009 surveys were funded by the LSI foundation, while the 2014 surveys were the corporate social responsibility of SMRC.

References

- Abramowitz, Alan J., and Kyle L. Saunders. (2006). Exploring the Basis of Partisanship in the American Electorate: Social Identity vs. Ideology. *Political Research Quarterly*, 59(2), 175-187.
- Achen, Christopher H. (2002). Parental Socialization and Rational Party Identification. *Political Behavior*, 24(2), 151-70.
- Allsop, Dee, and Herbert F. Weisberg. (1988). Measuring Change in Party Identification in an Election Campaign. *American Journal of Political Science*, 32(4), 996-1017.
- Almond, Gabriel A. and Sidney Verba. (1963). *The Civic Culture: Political Attitudes and Democracy in Five Nations*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Anderson, Benedict R. (1996). Elections and Participation in Three Southeast Asian Countries. In *The Politics of Elections in Southeast Asia*. R.H. Taylor, ed. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Asian Barometer www.asianbarometer.org
- Aspinall, Edward. (2005). *Opposing Suharto: Compromise, Resistance, and Regime Change in Indonesia*, Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Aspinall, Edward and Marcus Mietzner, eds. (2010). *Problems of Democratisation in Indonesia: Elections, Institutions and Society*, Singapore: Institute of Southeast Asian Studies Press.
- Azwar, Rully Chairul. (2008). *Politik Komunikasi Partai Golkar di Tiga Era: Dari Partai Hegemonik ke Partai Berorientasi "Pasar,"* Jakarta: The Indonesian Institute and Grasindo.
- Badan Pusat Statistik (Central Statistical Body) bps.go.id
- Badan Pusat Statistik. (2010). *Penduduk Indonesia Hasil Sensus Penduduk 2010*. Nomor Katalog: 2102001 (diolah)
- Barnes, Samuel H., Peter McDonough, and Antonio Lopez Pina. (1985). The Development of Partisanship in New Democracies: The Case of Indonesia. *American Journal of Political Science*, 29(4), 695-720.
- Barnes, Samuel H., M. Kent Jennings, Ronald Inglehart, and

Indonesian voters, as reported in our surveys, consider the 1999 and subsequent elections to have been conducted freely and fairly. Moreover, they have a strong commitment to democracy as the best system for their country even though they recognize that it is not perfect. This strong positive commitment is closely connected in turn to perceptions of how democracy is implemented. The higher the perception of democratic performance, the stronger the citizen's commitment to democracy; conversely, if democratic performance is perceived to be low, the commitment declines.

While most citizens feel satisfied with how democracy is being implemented, the better-educated tend to be negative in their evaluations of democratic performance. They have a commitment to democratic values, and that commitment is accompanied by demands for better implementation of democracy. They are critical democrats, "critical citizens" or "dissatisfied democrats" in the terminology of Pippa Norris (1999, 2011). Quoting Norris: "This group aspires to democracy as their ideal form of government, yet at the same time they remain deeply sceptical when evaluating how it is being implemented in their own country" (2011, 5). Because Indonesians are more educated, we predict that citizens' commitment to democracy will become greater, but so will their dissatisfaction.



Voting behavior in
Indonesia...

PE
SA