THE DYNAMIC OF INDONESIAN POLITICAL TRUST IN THE BEGINNING OF REFORM ERA

DINAMIKA KEPERCAYAAN POLITIK INDONESIA DI PARUH AWAL ORDE REFORMASI

Andi Ahmad Yani

Pengajar Universitas Hasanuddin/Leiden University
Jl. Perintis Kemerdekaan KM 10, Tamalanrea, Makassar, Indonesia
E-mail: aayani@unhas.ac.id/a.a.yani@fsw.leidenuniv.nl

Abstrak

Kepercayaan merupakan pondasi utama untuk membangun legitimasi politik dan keberlanjutan sistem demokrasi. Sebagai negara demokrasi yang sedang berkembang, Indonesia menghadapi berbagai tantangan untuk membangun kepercayaan politik pada masa transisi, khususnya pada dekade awal Orde Reformasi. Untuk mengidentifikasi bangunan kepercayaan politik masyarakat Indonesia pada periode tersebut, artikel ini menganalisis kepercayaan politik pada lembaga-lembaga yang mendukung proses demokratisasi pada masa-masa kritis ini. Artikel ini menawarkan dua argumen utama. Pertama, penelitian ini menunjukkan tren kepercayaan masyarakat Indonesia yang cukup tinggi pada lembaga-lembaga demokrasi. Meskipun demikian, sebagian besar responden justru tidak mempercayai partai politik. Kedua, studi ini menganalisis tingkat kepercayaan masyarakat Indonesia dengan mengacu pada teori kepercayaan politik. Teori ini menyatakan bahwa tingkat kepercayaan politik dipengaruhi oleh dua faktor utama. Pertama, adalah faktor dan budaya dan kedua adalah faktor rasionalitas dengan mengacu pada kinerja kelembagaan. Hasilnya, studi ini mendukung asumsi bahwa tingkat kepercayaan politik Indonesia lebih ditentukan oleh prestasi kelembagaan, khususnya demokrasi dan kinerja pembangunan ekonomi.

Kata Kunci: kepercayaan politik, lembaga demokrasi, modal sosial, sistem politik Indonesia.

Abstract

Trust is a fundamental ingredient in legitimacy and sustainability of democratic system. As an emerging democratic country, Indonesia faces various challenges to redevelop political trust in transition period from the Soeharto's military regime. Hence this article examines patterns of political trust in democratic institution in this critical period. It proposes two main arguments. The first, this study indicates a decent trend of Indonesian political trust where most Indonesian people have high confidence in most democratic institutions, except political parties. Second, this study employs theory of political trust which determined by cultural and institutional perspectives to examine Indonesian political trust in democratic institutions. The result then supports the assumption that Indonesian political trust is greatly determined by institutional achievement, particularly democratic and economic development performance.

Keywords: political trust, democratic institutions, social capital, Indonesia's political system.

Introduction

A decade after the military government lost power, Indonesia is becoming more democratic during the Reform era. The United Nation for Development Program (UNDP)[1] reports that Indonesia has been successfully changed from a highly centralized country into one of Asia's most decentralized countries through adequate local and national elections in a period of five years. Moreover, The Asia Foundation (TAF)[2] indicates that Indonesia has been transformed into a more democratic state since the freedom of the press has significantly increased. Government has made serious commitments to transform legal institutions and restructure political institutions to make government more accountable and democratic.[3] Further, TAF cites the Freedom House report which stated that Indonesia was the most free and democratic country in Southeast Asia in 2007.[4]

However, as an emerging democratic country, Indonesia faces various challenges that may reduce the quality of democratization. The biggest challenge is the possibility of social conflict, which can occur for many reasons. As a country that has diverse ethnic and religious groups, Indonesia is prone to horizontal conflicts that may arise due to the government's failure to break down conflicts completely. The military government had previously controlled conflicts with a power approach that did not resolve the root of problem but rather created a time bomb that would explode in the future. The bomb then exploded just right after Suharto stepped down in several areas in Indonesia. Ethno-religious conflicts occurred mainly in Poso, Province of Central Sulawesi, Maluku and North Maluku during 1999 through 2002. Other political conflicts, such as the rebellions in Aceh and Papua, have been occurred ongoing since 1960s but were not solved completely. These separatist conflicts significantly increased in the beginning of the Reform period. Although most social and political conflicts have stopped right now, that does not mean that such conflicts will not arise again. All the conflict groups are still in the process of reconciliation and there is a possibility of conflict being fueled by the certain evil interests aimed to undermine peaceful interests. In addition, the political institutions have a critical role in managing conflict since they tend to utilize ethnic and religious identities in political mobilizations and political bargaining in those conflict areas.[5] Accordingly, political parties as one of the principal factors of democracy are expected to be actively involved in maintaining peace in the society.

Based on above discussion, it shows that the Indonesian reform government might achieve a decent degree of democratic society in terms of basic elements of democracy, such as political rights and civil liberties. The reform regime, however, has not yet accomplished an adequate level of social capital, the other side of the coin of democracy. Social capital refers to relationships among individuals within groups or networks, reciprocal norms and trustworthiness that encourage positive emotions and mutually beneficial collective action.[6] Social capital and democracy have an interconnected relationship in which social capital initially endorses democratic values while there is also positive feedback of democracy to generate social capital in a particular society.[7] In sum, all Indonesian social and political institutions should be actively

---

[1] United Nation Development Program. 2010. *"Assessment of development results; Evaluation of UNDP contribution in Indonesia". Executive summary,* New York: UNDP Evaluation Office. Accessed on 15 April 2012.

[2] The Asia Foundation (2007) "Elections and good governance in Indonesia" *http://asiafoundation.org/resources/pdfs/IDelectionseng.pdf.* Accessed on 15 April 2012.

[3] *Ibid.*

[4] *Ibid.*

[5] Wilson, C., *Ethno-religious Violence in Indonesia; From soil to God,* (New York: Routledge, 2008); Bertrand, J., *Nationalism and Ethnic Conflict in Indonesia,* (Cambdrige: Cambridge University Press, 2004).

[6] Bourdieu, P., Forms of Capital, in Richardson, J. G. (Eds.). *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education.* (New York: Greenwood, 1983); Coleman, J. S.,"Social Capital in the Creation of Human Capital". *American Journal of Sociology*, 1998, 94 (supp.), p. S95-S120; Putnam, R. D., *Bowling Alone: the Collapse and Revival of American Community*. (New York: Simon and Schuster Paperbacks, 2000); Paxton, P., "Social Capital and Democracy: an Interdependent Relationship"*, American Sociological Review*, 2002, 67 (2), p. 254-277.

[7] Paxton, P., "Social Capital and Democracy: an Interdependent Relationship"*, American Sociological Review*, 2002, 67 (2), p. 272.

involved in promoting social capital in line with improving the quality of democracy. Otherwise, the current democratic system will turn around and become an oligarchy or even revert back to an authoritarian system.

Trust is one of the core social capital values which directly determine democratic attitudes and political interests.[8] Moreover, public trust in democratic institutions implies principal condition to guarantee a democratic regime and to reduce resistance to the regime.[9] In order to assess a pattern of political trust in the Reform era, this paper aims to examine determinants of Indonesian political trust in democratic institutions. Therefore, this paper proposes the following research question: "to *what extent do Indonesian people trust in democratic institutions, and what is the core determinant – cultural or institutional factors – of their trustworthiness?*". The first section briefly explains more about the Indonesian democratization process in the Reform era. The second section explores theoretical framework of political trust and will be followed by methods of study sections. Further, result study will be examined in two main sections: first, the pattern of Indonesian political trust; and second, determinants of Indonesian political trust in cultural and institutional approaches. The last section assesses both two determinants of political trust.

Theoretical Framework of Political Trust

Trust is a fundamental ingredient in legitimacy and sustainability of the democratic system. Trust becomes very critical especially in an emerging democratic country, as is the case of Indonesia. Fukuyama (1995) defines trust as "the expectation that arises within a community of regular, honest, cooperative behavior, based on communally shared norms, on the part of other members of that community".[10] Fukuyama (1995) then observes trust as cultural value which is based on a "preexisting community of shared moral norms and values".[11] In addition, cultural trust is divided into two types: particularized trust and generalized trust.[12] Particularized trust commonly occurs in a distrust community where a person only trusts members of the same family, clan or group and it tends to jeopardize consolidation of democracy. The other type is generalized trust that a person extends trust to strangers, especially people who are different from his/herself. The last kind of trust is a key variable of social capital and demands effective social cohesion through a reciprocal social network.

Another perspective of trust is rational choice that emphasizes adequate reason to trust somebody or to be trusted.[13] The rational choice initially concerns interests and judgments that may generate or decrease the level of trust. In the field of psychology, this type of trust refers to cognitive trust, which is influenced by sufficient information and experience that drive one to trust someone or not.[14] Another type of trust in psychology is known as affective trust, which arises from mutual understanding and shared value among truster and trusted. The affective trust correlates with cultural trust which was previously discussed. Both cognitive and affective trusts are interconnected; both

---

[8] Bourne, P. A., "Modelling Political Trust in a Developing Country*, Research Journal of Social Sciences,* 2010, 2 (2), p. 84-98.

[9] Askvik, S. et al., "Citizens' Trust in Public and Political Institutions in Nepal", *International Political Science Review*, 2011, 32 (4), p. 417-437.

[10] Fukuyama, F., *Trust: The Social Virtues and the Creation of Prosperity* (New York: Free Press, 1995), p. 26.

[11] *Ibid*., p. 336.

[12] Warren, M. E. (Eds.). *Democracy and Trust,* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999); Uslaner, E. M.*"Trust and Corruption. Global Corruption Report Transparency International".* a paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Society for the Advancement of Socio-Economics, What counts? Calculation, representation, Association*,* Budapest, Hungary, June 30-July 2, 2005.

[13] Warren, M. E. (Eds.). *Democracy and Trust,* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), p. 329.

[14] Warren, M.E. (Eds.). *Democracy and Trust,* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999); Grimmelikhuijsen, S., *Transparency and Trust; an Experimental Study of Online Disclosure and Trust in Government,* a PhD Dissertation in Utrecht School of Governance, (Netherlands: Universiteit Utrecht, 2012).

are shaped by the human's way of feeling and thinking.[15]

These two basic concepts of trust have been assessed in the political trust approach which is the purpose of this paper. Political trust implies citizens' expectation and evaluation in political institutions and political leadership to implement democratic values.[16] Hence, the dynamic of Indonesians' political trust is very crucial in the reform regime's era because the level of citizens' confidence on democratic institutions determines democratic consolidation, legitimacy, and stability of a political system.

Generally, there are two theoretical approaches in examining the political trust concept, namely the cultural approach and the institutional approach.[17] The cultural approach conceives of the relationship between trust and cultural norms and beliefs of people that have commonly been shared through socialization in early life.[18] Social and culture identities commonly shape cultural trust since people tend to be confident in interaction and cooperation with people who have a commonly shared identity, such as social class, religion, region, political and interest group and so on. Accordingly, this cultural norm affects peoples' perception and expectation in a particular political leader and institutions that seems to reflect certain groups' identities or values.[19] Moreover, a study of Christensen and Lægreid (2005)[20] supports this approach that indicates that political trust is determined by socio-demographic indicators like age, education and occupation. As result, culturalists demand that cultural trust can generate public support to democratic government, public acknowledgment of democratic values and level of public involvement in political spheres.[21]

Conversely, trust in institutional perspective is formed upon the concept of rational choice that perceives performance evaluation of political institutions as the principal determinant in level of trust.[22] In other words, institutionalists regard political trust as the capability of political institutions to perform as well as citizens' expectations, referring to democratic values as such. Some scholars indicate that a government's performance refers to economic outcomes in general.[23] Other studies observe political institutions' achievement is measured by quality of democracy, civil services satisfaction, ensuring civil liberties, corruption eradication, and rule of

[15] Grimmelikhuijsen, S., *Transparency and Trust; an Experimental Study of Online Disclosure and Trust in Government,* a PhD Dissertation in Utrecht School of Governance, (Netherlands: Universiteit Utrecht, 2012).

[16] Catterberg, G. and A. Moreno. *"*the Individual Bases of Political Trust; Trends in New and Established Democracies. *International Journal of Public Opinion Research*, 2005, 18 (1): 31 –48; Mishler, W. and Rose, R. "What are the Origins of Political Trust?; Testing Institutional and Cultural Theories in Post-communist Societies", *Comparative Political Studies,* 2001, *34 (1): 30-62;* Blind, P. K. *"Building Trust in Government in the Twenty-First Century; Review of Literature and Emerging Issues"*. A paper presented in the 7th Global Forum on Reinventing Government and Building Trust in Government, Vienna, Austria, 26-29 June 2007; Wong, T. K., Wan P. and Hsiao, H. M., "The Bases of Political Trust in Six Sosian Societies: Institutional and Cultural Explanations Compared*", International Political Science Review,* 2011, 32 (3): 263–281; Grimmelikhuijsen, S., *Transparency and Trust; an Experimental Study of Online Disclosure and Trust in Government,* a PhD Dissertation in Utrecht School of Governance, (Netherlands: Universiteit Utrecht, 2012).

[17] Mishler, W. and Rose, R. "What are the Origins of Political Trust?; Testing Institutional and Cultural Theories in Post-communist Societies", *Comparative Political Studies,* 2001, *34 (1): 30-62;* Mishler, W., "What are the Political Consequences of Trust?; a Test of Cultural and Institutional Theories in Russia", *Comparative Political Studies,* 2005, *38 (9): 1050-1078;* Askvik, S. et al., "Citizens' Trust in Public and Political Institutions in Nepal", *International Political Science Review*, 2011, 32 (4): 417–437; Wong, T. K., et al., "The Bases of Political Trust in Six Sosian Societies: Institutional and Cultural Explanations Compared", *International Political Science Review,* 2011, 32 (3): 263–281.

[18] Mishler, W. and Rose, R. "What are the Origins of Political

Trust?; Testing Institutional and Cultural Theories in Post-communist Societies", *Comparative Political Studies,* 2001, *34 (1): 31.*

[19] Askvik, S. et al., "Citizens' Trust in Public and Political Institutions in Nepal", *International Political Science Review*, 2011, 32 (4): 419.

[20] Wong, T. K., et al., "The Bases of Political Trust in Six Sosian Societies: Institutional and Cultural Explanations Compared", *International Political Science Review,* 2011, 32 (3): 266.

[21] Mishler, W., "What are the Political Consequences of Trust?; a Test of Cultural and Institutional Theories in Russia", *Comparative Political Studies,* 2005, *38 (9): 1052-1053.*

[22] Mishler, W. and Rose, R. "What are the Origins of Political Trust?; Testing Institutional and Cultural Theories in Post-communist Societies", *Comparative Political Studies,* 2001, *34 (1): 30-62;* Wong, T. K., et al., "The Bases of Political Trust in Six Sosian Societies: Institutional and Cultural Explanations Compared", *International Political Science Review,* 2011, 32 (3): 263-281.

[23] *Ibid*.

law improvement.[24] Institutionalists believe that political trust that emanates from performance quality will effectively remain at a high level of public trust and strengthen democratic regimes[25].

There are some studies that explore these two facets of political trust in several Asian states. Wong et. al (2011)[26] analyzed both trust approaches in six Asian countries: China, Hong Kong, Singapore, Taiwan, South Korea, and Japan. This study indicates that institutional performance mainly determines political trust rather than the cultural approach. However, the culturalists mainly occur in less globalized country with strong traditional norms due to a long history like China, South Korea, and Japan. On the contrary, the traditionalists are lacking in highly globalized city-states, such as Hong Kong and Singapore.[27]

Another study of the trust concept was conducted by Askvik et.al (2011)[28] in Nepal, as another emerging democratic country. Similar with the previous study, this study also found that the performance-based (institutional) approach strongly shapes public trust in political institutions compared to identity-based (cultural) perspective. This result explains a great change of political development to Nepal as a new democratic state, since previously they had

political structures strongly dependent on ethnic and religion identities.

Based on the above theoretical and researches discussions, it generally observes that the institutional approach and cultural approach essentially construct political trust in democratic institutions. Following previous studies in Asian and developing democracy states, this study then expects that Indonesian political trust is essentially influenced by the institutionalists rather than the culturalists as well.

The Method of Examining Political Trust

This paper uses the second phase of the Asian Barometer Survey conducted in November 2006. The study covered 80 regencies based on population proportion in three major study areas: Western Indonesia, Central Indonesia, and Eastern Indonesia. The data used in this paper is part of the Asian Barometer second wave survey conducted during 2005-2008 in thirteen countries and regions in East Asia, namely the Philippines, Taiwan, Thailand, Mongolia, Singapore, Japan, South Korea, Vietnam, Malaysia, Hong Kong, Cambodia, China and Indonesia.[29]

In order to examine the dynamic of Indonesian political trust in the beginning of reform era, we select "political trust in democratic institutions" as dependent variable. This paper formulates democratic institutions as the following organizations: President; The Court; Political Parties; Parliament; National Government; Local Government; Non-Governmental Organizations; Newspaper; and Police. The degree of citizens' confidence on these institutions is elaborated in the next section.

In addition, this study has two independent variables based on two approaches of political trust as already discussed in previous sections, which are "cultural/self-identity approach" and "institution/performance based perspective". Firstly, this study examines similar cultural perspective variables with previous researches conducted in developing democratic countries,

[24] Mishler, W. and Rose, R. "What are the Origins of Political Trust?; Testing Institutional and Cultural Theories in Post-communist Societies", *Comparative Political Studies,* 2001, *34 (1): 30-62;* Wong, T. K., et al., "The Bases of Political Trust in Six Sosian Societies: Institutional and Cultural Explanations Compared", *International Political Science Review,* 2011, 32 (3): 263-281; Askvik, S. et al., "Citizens' Trust in Public and Political Institutions in Nepal", *International Political Science Review*, 2011, 32 (4): 417-437.

[25] Mishler, W., "What are the Political Consequences of Trust?; a Test of Cultural and Institutional Theories in Russia", *Comparative Political Studies,* 2005, *38 (9): 1054.*

[26] Wong, T. K., et al., "The Bases of Political Trust in Six Sosian Societies: Institutional and Cultural Explanations Compared", *International Political Science Review,* 2011, 32 (3): 263-281.

[27] Wong, T. K., et al., "The Bases of Political Trust in Six Sosian Societies: Institutional and Cultural Explanations Compared", *International Political Science Review,* 2011, 32 (3): 276.

[28] Askvik, S. et al., "Citizens' Trust in Public and Political Institutions in Nepal", *International Political Science Review*, 2011, 32 (4): 417-437.

[29] Asian Barometer. 2006. *The 2006 Asian barometer survey; Wave 2,* Project home page, retrievable from: http://www.asianbarometer.org/.

especially study of Askvik et.al (2011)[30] in Nepal. The cultural perspective is mainly determined by three variables, namely: demography and education; religion and religiosity; and social status and region. The second independent variable refers to the institutional approach which is examined by three variables, namely public service performance; democratic development performance; and economic development performance.[31]

Discussion: Patterns of Political Trust in Indonesian Democratic Institutions

Before we examine major determinants of Indonesia' political trust – whether cultural or institutional factors -, let us start with exploring degree of citizens' confidence on democratic institutions. It is widely known that Indonesia is the third largest democratic country in the world after India and the United States in terms of the number of voters. Major challenges exist to maintaining a decent level of political trust in the Indonesian democratic system as a new democratic regime. As noted before, Indonesian political development has increased significantly since the Reform era was started. Although there were uncertain political situations in the beginning of the Reform period, further in the second period, the political development has improved well.

There are two great political changes in the Reform period compared to all previous Indonesian regimes. The first is the president and vice president were voted directly by the people of Indonesia in the 2004 Election. In the past, the presidents and the vice-presidents were elected by People's Consultative Assembly (*Majelis Permusyawaratan Rakyat*) as the National Parliament. Although this was the

first time conducted, the 2004 Presidential and Vice-President Election run was safe, fair and democratic.[32] This positive change significantly influenced the level of people's confidence in the presidency as seen in Table 1 where trust in the President is the highest level of trust compared to other institutions. In addition, seventy-six percent of Indonesian citizens also greatly confide in the National Government, which means the Susilo Bambang Yudoyono's (SBY) administration gains great political support. The high level of public confidence in the national government has mainly been a result of the process by which the president selects state ministers from multiple groups. The ministers are not only politicians but are also selected from among professionals and scholars in a balanced number. Moreover, these ministers also represent different ethnic, believes and regions in Indonesia. In public administration perspective, this policy refers to the representative bureaucracy concept of Kingsley (1944)[33] and Krislov (1974)[34] that democratizes public bureaucracy through recruiting officials and pointing high public leaders based on social representation, such as ethnic, religion and gender.[35]

---

[30] Askvik, S. et al., "Citizens' Trust in Public and Political Institutions in Nepal", *International Political Science Review*, 2011, 32 (4): 417-437.

[31] See Mishler, W. and Rose, R. "What are the Origins of Political Trust?; Testing Institutional and Cultural Theories in Post-communist Societies", *Comparative Political Studies,* 2001, *34 (1): 30-62;* Wong, T. K., et al., "The Bases of Political Trust in Six Sosian Societies: Institutional and Cultural Explanations Compared"*, International Political Science Review,* 2011, 32 (3): 263-281; Askvik, S. et al., "Citizens' Trust in Public and Political Institutions in Nepal", *International Political Science Review*, 2011, 32 (4): 417-437.

[32] United Nation Development Program. 2010. "*Assessment of development results; Evaluation of UNDP contribution in Indonesia". Executive summary,* New York: UNDP Evaluation Office. http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/ADR/ADR_Reports/Indonesia/ExecSum-Indonesia-eng.pdf, accessed on 15 April 2012; The Asia Foundation (2007) "Elections and good governance in Indonesia"*, http://asiafoundation.org/resources/pdfs/IDelectionseng.pdf*, accessed on 15 April 2012.

[33] Kingsley, J. D. *Representative Bureaucracy: An Interpretation of the British Civil Services*,(Ohio: Antioch Press, 1944).

[34] Krislov, S. *Representative Bureaucracy*, (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1974).

[35] Farazmand, A., Bureaucracy and Democracy: a Theoretical Analysis, *Public Organization Review*, 2010, 10, p. 256.

Table 1. Public Trust in Democracy Institutions (Percentage)

Trust in	"Non Trust at all" and "Not Very Much Trust"	"Quite a Lot of Trust" and "A Great Deal of Trust"
President	23,9	76
National Government	31,8	68,1
Local government	24,7	75,2
Political Parties	55,7	44,2
Parliament	38,8	61,1
Police	35,3	64,6
Courts	43,6	56,3
NGOs	30,3	69,6
Newspapers	32	67,9

Source : The 2006 Asian Barometer Survey, Wave 2[36]

This trend of public trust in local government levels also demonstrates a high degree of confidence (75,2%) as noted in Table 1. This fact reflects positive local political development of Indonesia throughout the archipelago. Hence this survey was conducted in 80 regions/districts which represent three different areas of Indonesia, namely western, central and eastern region, the result perhaps indicates a common pattern in local governments.[37] This positive condition may be influenced by the second extensive political change in Indonesia which is direct election for local public leaders - governor and mayor – since 2004. The new members of the National House of Representatives (*Dewan Perwakilan Rakyat)* amended the Law Number 22, 1999 regarding regional autonomy became the new Law number 32, 2004 regarding regional government which rules direct local election for the first time in the history of Indonesia. In sum, these circumstances, both at the direct national and local election level, support the concept that the level of political trust in the democratic systems is determined by political citizen engagement, particularly in electing their public leaders.[38]

Conversely, Indonesian citizens have weak confidence in political parties. Table 1 presents that 55,7% respondents have a low level of trust in them. This data represents a global trend in the most democratic countries, not only in new democracies but also in developed democracies.[39] In the Indonesian case, this trend may be caused by the lack of capacity of political parties in managing their institutions and constituents. People have a high expectation in political parties, especially in new political parties, to transform old authoritarian political system to a more democratic system. In fact, unfortunately, most political parties in Indonesia are not well managed to strengthen their reciprocal relationship with society, in terms of identifying addressing the needs of the people in an appropriate way. In addition, political parties are hardly able in ensuring internal democracy since the role of party leadership tends to be more personal and likely acts as a central authority of parties. As a net result, party leaders tend to utilize political parties as personal or factional instruments to gain power. These conditions are reflections of weak political institutionalization which commonly occur in emerging democracies.[40]

---

[36] N = 1389 (minimum) to 1563 (maximum). The question asked was: I am going to name a number of institutions. For each one, please tell me how much trust do you have in them? Is it a great deal of trust, quite a lot of trust, not very much trust, or none at all? "Do not understand the question", "Can not choose" and "Decline to answer" are defined as missing and are excluded.

[37] Asian Barometer. 2006. *The 2006 Asian barometer survey; Wave 2,* Project home page, retrievable from: http://www.asianbarometer.org/. Accessed on 10 April 2012.

[38] Uslaner, E. M., "Democracy and Social Capital", i*n* M. E.

Warren (eds) *Democracy and Trust*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999); Putnam, R. D., *Bowling Alone: the Collapse and Revival of American Community*, (New York: Simon and Schuster Paperbacks, 2000); Mishler, W., "What are the Political Consequences of Trust?; a Test of Cultural and Institutional Theories in Russia", *Comparative Political Studies,* 2005, *38 (9): 1050-1078.*

[39] Putnam, R. D., *Bowling Alone: the Collapse and Revival of American Community*, (New York: Simon and Schuster Paperbacks, 2000); Mishler, W. and Rose, R. "What are the Origins of Political Trust?; Testing Institutional and Cultural Theories in Post-communist Societies", *Comparative Political Studies,* 2001, *34 (1): 30-62;* Mishler, W., "What are the Political Consequences of Trust?; a Test of Cultural and Institutional Theories in Russia", *Comparative Political Studies, 2005, 38 (9): 1050-1078;* Wong, T. K., et al., "The Bases of Political Trust in Six Sosian Societies: Institutional and Cultural Explanations Compared"*, International Political Science Review,* 2011, 32 (3): 263-281; Askvik, S. et al., "Citizens' Trust in Public and Political Institutions in Nepal", *International Political Science Review*, 2011, 32 (4): 417-437; Cariño, L. V., "Building trust in government in Southeast Asia". A paper presented in the 7th Gglobal Forum on Rinventing Government and Building Trust in Government, Vienna, Austria, 26-29 June 2007.

[40] Mainwaring, Scott. 1998. *Rethinking Party Systems Theory in the Third Wave of Democratization; The importance of party system institutionalization*. A working paper #260 - October 1998, The Hellen Kellogg Institute for International Studies.

Interestingly, a low level of trust in political parties does not significantly influences the degree of public confidence in parliament. Table 1 shows that 61,1% of respondents trust in the legislative institutions. This data is surprising, but it may refer to two different explanations. First, trust in parliament in some instances is higher in new democracies, and even in authoritarian regimes. This does not mean that people truly confide the legislative institution but respondents merely expect a higher value on that institution for what it should do instead for what it was doing.[41] Another reason is people may trust parliament in terms of institutional perspective. Since the parliament, especially the national parliament has made some policies to transform Indonesia's political structure to be more democratic. In other words, respondents assess the parliament in general as a high institution rather than as an institution which consist of political parties that they tend to distrust.

Following justice organizations, there have been many reformations in the police and the court institutions during the Reform era. In the military government, the police organization was part of military institutions. Since in the Reform era, the police institution has been transformed from militaristic system towards a civilian system and more concerns on its principal role as protector and community servant.[42] The police organization has also become more independent, accountable and decentralized.[43] In addition, the court institutions also have been changed significantly through establishing special bodies, like the Judicial Commission, the Anti-Corruption Court, and the Human Rights Court,

to ensure the judicial reform program.[44] The Indonesian court reforms also have been changed in strengthening the independence of the court, reducing corruption, collusion, and nepotism, and encouraging a mutual relationship between the courts and other democratic institutions, such as the media and civil society organizations.[45] All of these reform programs in justice organizations may affect people's slightly high degree of trust in both justice organizations as seen in Table 1.

Lastly, the NGOs and the press (newspaper) are the non-state organizations that have a critical role in encouraging Indonesian reform movement since in 1998. Therefore, it is not surprising to see that respondents confide in these two organizations. The number of media outlets (newspaper, TV, radios, magazines) increases significantly during the Reform period because the new Regime does not control the media like what happened in the days of the military government. This condition also occurred in NGO policy where the military government had controlled the civil society organizations and arrested most NGO activists. Further, since the end of the military government, the numbers of international aids have increased to support civil society organizations to ensure democratic development in Indonesia. As result, Indonesian NGOs and media have been successfully encouraged democracy building through influencing public policies in protecting human rights and empowering citizens.[46]

In sum, this study argues that political transformation in the beginning of Reform era has greatly contributed to a strong political trust in Indonesian democratic institutions, except to political parties.

http://kellogg.nd.edu/publications/workingpapers/WPS/260. pdf accessed on 18 April 2012; Randall, V. and Svaasan, L., "Party Institutionalization in New Democracies, *Party Politics,* 2002, 8 (1): 5-29.

[41] Catterberg, G. and A. Moreno. "the Individual Bases of Political Trust; Trends in New and Established Democracies. *International Journal of Public Opinion Research*, 2005, 18 (1): 35

[42] Rahmawati, A. and Najib, A., "Police Reform from Below: Examples from Indonesia's Transition to Democracy, a chapter in *Democracy, conflict and Human Security*, (Stockholm: International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance, 2006): 61.

[43] *Ibid.*

[44] Assegaf, R. S., "Judicial reform in Indonesia; 1998-2006", in Sakumoto N. and H. Juwana. (eds.). *Reforming laws and institutions in Indonesia: an Assessment,* (Ciba: Institute of Developing Economies/Japan External Trade Organization, 2007).

[45] *Ibid.*

[46] Ibrahim, R., *A Long Journey to a Civil society; Civil Society Index Report for the Republic of Indonesia*, (Jakarta: Indonesia Australia Partnership and Yappika/Indonesian Civil Society Alliance for Democracy, 2006), p. 8.

1. Determinant of Indonesian Political Trust

Cultural Approach

This section examines the level of political trust which is influenced by the similarity of identity in certain social groups. The Table 2 shows correlation between three different sources of self-identity based trust and Indonesian democracy institutions, which is examined by regression analysis method.

The first model examines demography and education variables that show to what extent age, gender and educational attainment induce political trust in democratic institutions. As seen in Table 2, the model can only explain 2,3% of the variation in political trust. In terms of correlation in individual variables, only gender has positive significant impact and conversely the education variable has a negative relationship with political trust. It means that Indonesian female tends to believe in democracy institutions and on other hand, educational attainment does not affect political trust at all. The age variable also may influence trust but is not significant.

The variables of religion and religiosity are examined in the second model to explore the impact degree of religion (non-Muslim) and level of worship in political trust. Although the total explained variance in this group is limited (3%) but it slightly higher than the first group. This fact shows that religion variables play a more critical role than gender - even education variables in political trust. In addition, the data indicates people who claim to be more religious have a more significant impact in political trust rather than people who claim to be less religious. This data supports phenomena of political parties that represent religions or factions in certain religion. Yet, the correlation is very small.

The third model tests the identity variable of region (rural) and social status that may affect political trust. The result appears that these two variables only explain 2% of the variation in trust. Table 2 also demonstrates that region (rural) has a significant correlation and, in contrary, social class does not affect level of trust at all. The region data explains that people who live in rural areas tend to have more confidence in

Table 2. Source of Political Trust in Cultural Approach

	Demography and education	Religion and religiosity	Social status and region	Combined model
Age	.012 (.014)			.005 (.014)***
Gender (female)	.090 (.024)***			.094 (.025)***
Educational attainment	-.096 (.024)***			-.073 (.027)**
Religion (Non Muslim)		.094 (.038)*		.108 (.042)***
Religiosity		.113 (.019)***		.112 (.020)**
Social status			-.025 (.023)	-.017 (.025)
Region (rural)			.122 (.023)***	.94 (.025)***
Constant	2.726 (.052)	2.299 (.060)	2.628 (.039)	2.302 (.086)

Notes: * p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001

Cell values are unstandardized coefficients with standard errors in the brackets.

democratic institutions rather than those living in urban areas. This fact indicates social cohesion which is commonly high in rural areas and may contribute to level of trust in public institutions.

All three of these models are analyzed in a combined model through one regression equation. However, the result shows that all seven variables of the cultural approach only explain 6,7% of variation in political trust. Table 2 demonstrates that most variables are statistically significant except for the social status variable. In demography and education groups, age and gender (female) variables become very significant in this combined model. This indicates that age become more important in political trust when it is combined with religion, religiosity, and region variables. In addition, significant level of religion increases in the combined model. Yet, education and social status do not influence a certain level of trust.

In brief, this data indicates that the correlation of the cultural approach on political trust in democratic institutions is lower than 10 %. Although some variables do have impact, in general they are very low.

Institutional Approach

The next determinant of political trust analyzed in this paper is the performance-based perspective that consists of three main sources: public services, political development and economic improvement. Employing the regression method, this section examines those indicators as shown in Table 3.

Public satisfaction in public services is a pivotal element in government performance that affects political trust.[47] In this first model, as noted earlier, public service performance is explored in three sectors, namely education, health and securities. Unfortunately, this model only explains 3.8% of variance of political trust. Whereas police services and health services have a significant impact in quality of public trust, value of education services does not. As seen in Table 3, the securities service has a more significant affect than the health services.

[47] Askvik, S. et al., "Citizens' Trust in Public and Political Institutions in Nepal", *International Political Science Review*, 2011, 32 (4): 417-437.

The quick response of the Indonesian Police institution in tackling terrorist attacks at the time when this survey was conducted may affect the level of public trust in it at that time. However, this correlation lacks an impact in political trust.

The next indicator of institutional perspective is political development that expects to greatly impact the degree of political trust. This model explores three variables of political improvement, satisfaction of democracy and democracy suitability. In Table 3, it appears that the model demonstrates a very high impact compared to other variables, explaining 19,9% of the variation in political trust. All individual variables have a statistically significant impact on political trust in democratic institutions. This data indicates Indonesian people are satisfied with political improvement during the Reform era and this condition influences high confidence in democratic institutions.

The third model concerns people's assessment in current economic condition and economic improvement during the Reform period. Both coefficient variables affirm significant statistic and they explain about 6.3% in the amount of political trust variance. The model also shows that it has slightly high correlation with political trust compared to the public service performance. The last model in Table 3 shows a regression equation result in all variables together. This combined model explains 21.3% of the variation in political trust in democratic organizations. In other words, the variance of trust slightly increases for an additional 1.4%. Although its value is quite higher than democratic development model, it has the highest value from all other models. In Table 3, it appears that most individual variables are statistically significant except education service, which shows no correlation at all. Furthermore, as shown in Table 3, three variables of democratic development have the highest values of significance. This implies that these three indicators have more pivotal impact in political trust in democratic development compared to other determinants.

In general, the institutional approach within quality of public service, democracy development, and economic improvement variables indicates high correlation with political

Table 3. Source of Political Trust in Institutional Approach

	Public service performance	Democracy development performance	Economic development performance	Combined model
Education service	.016 (.022)			-.029 (.022)
Health service	.066 (.025)**			.067 (.026)*
Police service	.088 (.020)***			.054 (.021)**
Political improvement		.166 (.015)***		.116 (0.18)***
Satisfaction with Democracy		.150 (.019)***		.139 (.023)***
Acceptability of democracy		.52 (.019)**		.052 (.018)**
Current economic condition			.079 (.011)***	.034 (.015)*
Economic improvement			.047 (.011)***	.044 (.013)**
Constant	2.195 (.078)	1.780 (.056)	2.300 (.038)	1.494 (.097)
R²	.038	.197	.063	.213
N	1203	1283	1592	994

Notes: * p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001

Cell values are unstandardized coefficients with standard errors in the brackets.

trust in democratic institutions. The Table 3 also demonstrates that democracy development plays an essential role in the level of public trust rather than other determinants.

2. Determinants of Indonesian Political Trust (Cultural and Institutional Approaches)

In this last section, all determinants in two approaches are combined and examined in one regression equation. The result shows that all variables explain 27% of Indonesian political trust variance which are higher at about 5% from the institutional perspective model.

Table 4. Combined Source of Cultural and Institutional Approaches in Political Trust

	Combined model
Education service	-.034 (.023)
Health service	.045 (.027)
Police service	.084 (.022)***
Political improvement	.035 (.019)*
Satisfaction with Democracy	.128 (.023)***
Acceptability of democracy	.106 (.069)***
Current economic condition	.029 (.016)*
Economic improvement	.057 (.014)***
Age	-.008 (.016)
Gender (female)	.108 (.027)***
Educational attainment	-.060 (.029)*
Religion (Non Muslim)	.101 (.043)*
Religiosity	.091 (022)***
Social status	-.047 (.028)*
Region (rural)	.075 (.028)**
Constant	1.275 (.128)
R²	.27
N	858

Notes: * p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001

Cell values are unstandardized coefficients with standard errors in the brackets.

There are ten individual variables that have statistical significance. Three of them are determined by all variables in three main groups, namely: democratic development, economic improvement, and religion and religiosity. The rest of them are some variables which represent other determinants, like police service, age, gender and region variables. This data indicates that Indonesian political trust is mainly influenced by democracy and economic performance and, more interestingly, religion and level of religiosity.

Conclusion

Trust is a basic element of social capital that influences democratic development, especially in new democratic regimes, through remaining legitimacy and political stability.[48] The Indonesia's transformation process - from the authoritarian military regime towards a democratic system – was accompanied by various social conflicts that tend to jeopardize citizens' trust in governance institutions. Hence, this study examines pattern and determinants of political trust in democratic organizations to understand a progress of political development process in the beginning of the Reform period.

The data from the 2006 Asian Barometer survey indicates a decent trend of Indonesian political trust where most Indonesian people have high confidence in most democratic institutions, except in political parties. Although low trust in political parties commonly occurs both in developed and emerging countries,

however, the political party is a critical element of democracy and directly influences democratic consolidation in new regimes. Therefore, this study then strongly suggests internal reform in Indonesian political parties in order to strengthen political institutionalization, more specifically in recruitment and training programs.

In the second step, this study employs the theory of political trust determined by cultural and institutional perspectives to examine Indonesian political trust in democratic institutions. The result then supports the assumption that Indonesian political trust is greatly determined by institutional achievement, particularly democratic and economic development performance. In the third step, when all determinants are combined, political and economic developments still have high impact in the level of trust. However, to some extent, religion and level of worship also tend to affect a level of political trust in democracy institutions. These data show that Indonesian people are likely to have political confidence based on rational (cognitive) trust rather than affective trust. Nevertheless, the religious factors still have an influence even on a very limited level. Possible influence of religious values, however, may change at the moment. The result of 2009 and 2014 Elections show that electoral votes of the religious parties have not increased significantly compared to the nationalist political parties. However, this phenomenon should be followed by more empirical studies.

Accordingly, further studies of political trust issues in Indonesia as an emerging democracy have to be continually conducted. The further studies may examine trend changes of the level of Indonesian political trust in democracy systems in the two decades of the Reform period with a longitudinal study. Moreover, more empirical studies can also be conducted to explore causal patterns among social capital, political religion, and political institutionalization.

Finally, this study has limitations as a desk research in using the 2006 data of the Asian Barometer survey, which may show different levels of political trust than those in more current conditions, due to changing national and local political dynamics and international influences. Moreover, trust is very subjective and mainly

---

[48] Bourne, P. A., "Modelling Political Trust in a Developing Country, *Research Journal of Social Sciences*, 2010, 2 (2): 84-98; Askvik, S. et al., "Citizens' Trust in Public and Political Institutions in Nepal", *International Political Science Review*, 2011, 32 (4): 417-437; Warren, M. E. (eds.) *Democracy and Trust*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999); Uslaner, Eric. M. "Democracy and Social Capital", *in* M. E. Warren (eds) *Democracy and Trust*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999); Catterberg, G. and A. Moreno. "the Individual Bases of Political Trust; Trends in New and Established Democracies. *International Journal of Public Opinion Research*, 2005, 18 (1): 35; Mishler, W. and Rose, R. "What are the Origins of Political Trust?; Testing Institutional and Cultural Theories in Post-communist Societies", *Comparative Political Studies*, 2001, *34 (1): 30-62;* Blind, Peride K. 2007. "Building Trust in Government in the Twenty-First Century; Review of Literature and Emerging Issues". A paper presented in the 7th Global Forum on Reinventing Government and Building Trust in Government, Vienna, Austria, 26-29 June 2007.

influenced by information that respondents receive. Some bias may occur especially in subjective questions, such as economic improvement and political change.

Lastly, this study employs the 2006 data of the Asian Barometer survey in order to explore early period of the Reform era as a base line data for Indonesian political trust study in the future. We believe that the pattern and degree of Indonesia's political trust is different in the current condition. Therefore, study of Indonesia political trust based on more recent data is necessary to clearly understand the progress of Indonesia's political development after more than a decade of the Reform regime.

Acknowledgement

References

Books

Assegaf, Rifqi S. 2007. "Judicial reform in Indonesia; 1998-2006", in Sakumoto N. and H. Juwana. (Eds.). *Reforming laws and institutions in Indonesia: an Assessment*. Ciba: Institute of Developing Economies (IDE) / Japan External Trade Organization (JETRO).

Bakti, Ikrar N. 2004. "The transition to Democracy in Indonesia; Some Outstanding Problems", in J. Rolfe. (Eds.). *The Asia-Pacific; a Region Transition*. Hawai'i: Asia-Pacific Center of Securities Studies.

Bertrand, Jacques. 2004. *Nationalism and Ethnic Conflict in Indonesia*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1983. "Forms of Capital, in Richardson, J. G. (eds.). *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education*. New York: Greenwood.

Diamond, Larry. 1997. "Introduction: In Search of Consolidation", in Diamond L., Plattner, M. F., Chu, Y. and Tien. H. *Consolidating the Third Wave Democracies; Regional Challenges*. Maryland: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Fukuyama, Francis. 1995. *Trust: The Social Virtues and the Creation of Prosperity*. New York: Free Press.

Ibrahim, Rustam. 2006. *A Long Journey to a Civil society; Civil Society Index Report for the Republic of Indonesia*. Jakarta: Indonesia Australia Partnership and Yappika (Indonesian Civil Society Alliance for Democracy).

Putnam, Robert. D. 1993. *Making Democracy Work: Civic Traditions in Modern Italy*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Putnam, Robert D. 2000. *Bowling Alone: the Collapse and Revival of American Community*. New York: Simon and Schuster Paperbacks

Uslaner, Eric. M. 1999. "Democracy and Social Capital", in M. E. Warren (eds) *Democracy and Trust*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wilson, Chris. 2008. *Ethno-religious Violence in Indonesia: From Soil to God*. London: Routledge.

Warren, Mark E. (eds.) 1999. *Democracy and Trust*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Journals

Askvik, Steiner et al., 2011. "Citizens' Trust in Public and Political Institutions in Nepal". *International Political Science Review*. 32 (4): 417–437.

Bourne, Paul A. 2010. "Modelling Political Trust in a Developing Country. *Research Journal of Social Sciences*. 2 (2): 84-98.

Catterberg, G. and A. Moreno. 2005. "the Individual Bases of Political Trust; Trends in New and Established Democracies. *International Journal of Public Opinion Research*.18 (1): 31 –48.

Coleman, James S. 1988. "Social Capital in the Creation of Human Capital". *American Journal of Sociology*. 94 (supp.): S95-S120.

Dalton, Russel J. 2005. "The Social Transformation of Trust in Government". *International Review of Sociology.* 15 (1): 133-154.

Farazmand, Ali. 2010. Bureaucracy and Democracy: a Theoretical Analysis. *Public Organization Review*. 10: 245–258.

Mishler, William and Rose, R. 2001. "What are the Origins of Political Trust?; Testing Institutional and Cultural Theories in Post-communist Societies". *Comparative Political Studies. 34 (1): 30-62.*

Mishler, William. 2005. "What are the Political Consequences of Trust?; a Test of Cultural and Institutional Theories in Russia". *Comparative Political Studies. 38 (9): 1050-1078.*

Paxton, Pamela. 2002. Social Capital and Democracy: an Interdependent Relationship. *American Sociological Review*. 67 (2): 254-277.

Randall, V. and Svaasan, L. 2002. "Party Institutionalization in New Democracies. *Party Politics,* 8 (1): 5–29.

Wong, T. K., Wan P. and Hsiao, H. M. 2011. "The Bases of Political Trust in Six Sosian Societies: Institutional and Cultural Explanations Compared". *International Political Science Review.* 32 (3): 263–281.

Papers/Dissertation

Blind, Peride K. 2007. *"*Building Trust in Government in the Twenty-First Century; Review of Literature and Emerging Issues". A paper presented in the 7th Global Forum on Reinventing Government and Building Trust in Government, Vienna, Austria, 26-29 June 2007.

Cariño, Ledivina V. 2007. "Building trust in government in Southeast Asia". A paper presented in the 7th Global Forum on Reinventing Government and Building Trust in Government, Vienna, Austria, 26-29 June 2007.

Rahmawati, Arifah and Najib, Azca. 2006. "Police Reform from Below: Examples from Indonesia's Transition to Democracy, a chapter in *Democracy, conflict and Human Security*, International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance, Stockholm. Sweden.

Uslaner, Eric. M. 2005. "Trust and Corruption. Global Corruption Report Transparency International". A paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Society for the Advancement of Socio-Economics, "*What counts? Calculation, representation, Association,*" Budapest, Hungary, June 30-July 2, 2005.

Grimmelikhuijsen, Stephan. 2012. *Transparency and Trust; an Experimental Study of Online Disclosure and Trust in Government.* A PhD Dissertation in Utrecht School of Governance, Universiteit Utrecht, Netherlands.

Websites

Asian Barometer. 2006. *The 2006 Asian barometer survey; Wave 2,* Project home page, retrievable from: http://www.asianbarometer.org/. Accessed on 10 April 2012

Mainwaring, Scott. 1998. *Rethinking Party Systems Theory in the Third Wave of Democratization; The importance of party system institutionalization.* A working paper #260 - October 1998, The Hellen Kellogg Institute for International Studies. http://kellogg.nd.edu/publications/ workingpapers/WPS/260.pdf . Accessed on 18 April 2012

The Asia Foundation (2007) "Elections and good governance in Indonesia"*, http://asiafoundation.org/resources/pdfs/IDelectionseng.pdf.* Accessed on 15 April 2012

United Nation Development Program. 2010. "*Assessment of development results; Evaluation of UNDP contribution in Indonesia". Executive summary,* New York: UNDP Evaluation Office

http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/ ADR/ADR_Reports/Indonesia/ExecSum-Indonesia-eng.pdf. Accessed on 15 April 2012