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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 labeled the mixed governmental system Guided Democracy, but it was in fact a form of authoritarianism. During Guided Democracy, there were no elections.

President Sukarno was removed from power in 1966 by Army General Suharto, whose authoritarian New Order government ruled for the following thirty-two years. A second parliamentary election was held in 1971. Elections were then held quinquennially under Suharto’s New Order regime until 1997, but did not fulfill basic democratic conditions (Anderson 1996; Liddle 1996a, 1996b). They were instead a mechanism
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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 Chapter 1. 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.

Before describing the results of our exit polls and postelection surveys, we will offer an analysis of the depth of citizens' commitments to the value of democracy in general, and of how they judge the practice of democracy thus far. Understanding the degree of popular commitment and evaluation of democratic performance at the macro level is important, because in the final analysis elections have meaning only in the context of democratic legitimation by the citizenry itself.
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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. 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 by a party, parliamentary or presidential candidate in 1999, 2004, 2009, and 2014. In addition, for the 2009 and 2014 elections, we included a number of items connected to campaigning, that is, assisting and financially supporting a party and persuading others to choose a party or candidate. Other forms that are considered unconventional are not included, not because we consider them unimportant, but because this

\footnote{For the relevant theoretical literature, see Verba and Nie (1972); Verba, Nie, and Kim (1978); Kaase and Marsh (1979); Party, Moyser, and Day (1992); McDonough, Shin, and Moses (1998); Verba, Schlozman, and Brady (1995); Brady (1999).

\footnote{See the Appendix for variables and indicators.}
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' (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 religious communities in ways that are not political, including societal organizations like churches, religious study groups, and charitable foundations. Further, citizens who are active in the socioreligious sphere tend to be active in the nonreligious sphere. They
Chapter 4 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 percent (1999) to 84 percent (2004) and 71 percent (2009), although it slightly increased to 73 percent in 2014. In the direct presidential elections, it declined from 80 percent in the 2004 first round to 76.5 percent in the second round, 73 percent in the 2009 single round, and 71 percent in the 2014 single round. These declines are significant. Do they indicate that the voters are increasingly rational as expected by rational voter theorists?

In rational voter theory, human beings are actors who calculate the costs and benefits of their personal or individual actions (Downs 1957;
In previous chapters we have learned that Indonesian voters are at base critical, open to many political choices, including deciding not to vote. Choosing not to vote has indeed become increasingly popular. In addition, every election has produced a new party with a sizeable number of seats in Parliament, plus a different party with the most seats. In the 1999 election PDIP won the most votes. In 2004 it was Golkar, followed by Partai Demokrat in 2009. In 2014, PDIP once again won the most seats. The pattern is one of increasing instability and fragmentation. In 1999, five parties won a significant number of seats. In 2004 there were seven, in 2009 nine, and finally, in 2014, ten. All of this indicates that Indonesian voters are open to alternatives, and critical toward the existing parties.

Much voting behavior literature argues that psychological factors increase participation and stabilize partisan choice. Does the decline in participation and the instability of partisan choice mean that psychological factors are not important in the Indonesian case?

Psychological factors have been taken seriously in voting behavior research at least since the publication of The American Voter by scholars at the University of Michigan (Campbell, Converse, Miller, and Stokes 1960). Even though the psychological model was introduced long ago and has continued to develop as an important approach ever since, it is relatively new in Indonesia. During Indonesia’s first democratic period in the 1950s, the model was too new and Indonesian political science still embryonic. In the late 1950s Indonesia ceased to be a democracy.1

1 During the nondemocratic New Order period, the model was tested in seminal studies of electoral behavior in doctoral theses by Alan Gallar, “The Japanese Voter” (1992) and Andi Alfian Mallarangeng, “The Indonesian Voter” (1998).
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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 corporation social responsibility of SMRC.

In all our surveys the population and unit of analysis consist of Indonesian citizens with the right to vote, which according to law is all citizens aged 17 or older or who are married. The sample size for each of the surveys differs, depending on our experiences in the field and available financial resources. In the 1999 survey the total sample was 2,488 respondents, while in the subsequent surveys the size was 1,200. The samples from populations of more than 100 million voters were chosen
“This concise but richly documented book, analyzing fifteen years of national elections and voter surveys since the transition to democracy in the late 1990s, will likely be regarded for some time to come as the definitive account of why Indonesians vote the way they do and what it means for democracy . . . . This is an important book not just for Indonesian studies but for comparative studies in democratic development.”

Larry Diamond, Stanford University

“Mujani, Liddle, and Ambardi constitute a dream team for making sense of voting behavior in Indonesia, and their book delivers a magnificent contribution to our understanding of political behavior and opinion in the world’s third largest democracy . . . . Voting Behavior in Indonesia Since Democratization not only offers insights into how to improve the quality of democracy in Indonesia; it also informs how democrats the world over might more skillfully meet the challenges posed by the rise of populist and technocratic challenges to open politics.”

M. Steven Fish, University of California, Berkeley

“Voting Behavior in Indonesia Since Democratization amasses a truly impressive body of original public opinion data to understand the factors that shape voting behavior in democratic Indonesia. The result is the most comprehensive analysis of mass political behavior in one of the world’s most important countries. It is essential reading for Indonesianists interested in electoral politics, and for comparativists seeking to understand the practice of politics in new democracies.”

Thomas Pepinsky, Cornell University
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