Authoritarian Legacies in Post-New Order Indonesia:
Evidence from a New Dataset

Sharon Poczter
Charles H. Dyson School of Applied Economics and Management
Cornell University
sharon.poczter@cornell.edu

Thomas B. Pepinsky
Department of Government
Cornell University
pepinsky@cornell.edu

FIRST DRAFT: December 8, 2014
THIS DRAFT: January 22, 2015

Authoritarian Legacies in Post-New Order Indonesia:
Evidence from a New Dataset

Democratization has fundamentally changed the formal institutional structure of Indonesian politics, but a wealth of contemporary research has demonstrated that the informal mechanisms of power and influence have survived the transition. This paper uses a unique, hand-collected dataset of information on Indonesia' political elites over the democratic transition to empirically catalogue the changes and continuities in Indonesian politics since democratization. Our results provide quantitative evidence for substantial change in Indonesia's political economy over the past half century, with the simultaneous rise of capital and decline of military and the state as avenues to political power at the national level. Our evidence also suggests that the origins of this transition pre-date democratization itself.

Introduction

The democratization of Indonesia in 1999 represented a fundamental break in the formal institutional structure of Indonesian politics. However, many scholars of Indonesian politics and political economy have noted not only differences but also *continuities* between New Order and post-New Order politics (see, e.g., Robison and Hadiz 2004; Buehler 2014; Winters 2014). An especially notable aspect of these continuities concerns the backgrounds of Indonesia's political elites: many of the politicians who occupy prominent positions in post-New Order Indonesia either started their political careers under the New Order or rose to political power based on the political or economic connections that they established under the New Order. Yet recent scholarly analyses of the political legacies of the New Order among contemporary Indonesian politicians are inevitably selective, designed to illustrate mechanisms of political continuity rather than to provide systematic overview of the backgrounds of elites in democratic Indonesia.

This paper provides a panoramic, quantitative overview of political change and continuity between New Order and post-New Order Indonesia, relying on a unique dataset on Indonesian politicians active in the post-Soeharto era. We assemble a large, hand-coded dataset on 1,646 political elites, including information on their biographical, educational, professional, and political backgrounds. These remarkably rich data can be used to provide a more systematic descriptive analysis of Indonesia's political elites than is possible from a purely qualitative approach. We demonstrate that our dataset replicates quantitatively what we know from qualitative research to be true about the personal backgrounds of Indonesian politicians in the post-New Order era in terms of demographic characteristics such as place of birth, education, and religion. We then use the data to examine the career backgrounds of politicians across political parties, the demographic and partisan predictors of elites' career backgrounds, and differences in the professional backgrounds of political elites across age cohorts. In particular, we are interested in whether, as was the case prior to regime change, experiences in the private sector, the bureaucracy, and the military continue to serve as conduits to political prominence and/or power.

Our analysis yields three primary findings. First, parties differ substantially in terms of their members' career backgrounds: . For example, elites linked to Golkar, PAN, and Hanura are more likely to have come from the private sector than elites linked to other parties, whereas elites linked to Golkar, PDIP, and the Democrat Party are more likely to have military backgrounds than elites linked to other parties. Second, we find significant correlations also between elites' demographic characteristics and their professional backgrounds. For example, elites with private sector backgrounds are more

likely to have been born in Jakarta, whereas elites with bureaucratic backgrounds are more likely to have been born elsewhere. The third and perhaps most striking finding is that differences across age groups in our data reveal a remarkable rise in elites with private sector backgrounds versus bureaucratic or military backgrounds: younger elites, even those whose careers began under the New Order, are more likely to be drawn from the private sector than from the bureaucracy or the military. We interpret this last finding as evidence of a substantial change in Indonesia's political economy over the past half century. We also conclude that the democratization of Indonesia itself hastened the decline of military- and state-linked elites, even though the rise of the private sector elites can be dated to the late authoritarian period. At the national level, at least, governmental and military careers are no longer the central corridors to political power that they were in the early New Order period.

This paper contains four parts. Following this introduction, the first main section provides brief overviews of Indonesia's democratization and of the theoretical and empirical literatures that focus on Indonesian political elites. In the second section, we describe the data in more detail: we identify our sources and the procedures used to compile the dataset and we establish the face validity of the dataset as a whole. In the third section we present our main results. In the final section we conclude with a discussion of the limitations of this analysis as well as possible avenues for future research.

Literature Review

Indonesia's democratic transition in 1999 brought to an end more than three decades of authoritarian rule under Soeharto's New Order regime. While the final shape

of Indonesian democracy would not be settled until 2004, with the first direct presidential elections, the most significant institutional changes were in place by the elections of 1999 (for more on the evolution of Indonesian democracy from 1999 onwards, see Horowitz 2013). These inaugural post-New Order elections marked the break from the managed political competition of the New Order's regime, during which Golkar was a dominant political organization and its two opposition parties were constrained from exercising any check on Soeharto's authority. From 1999 on, Indonesia emerged as a competitive democracy with dozens of political parties vying for seats. Political decentralization, implemented in 2001, allowed democratic political competition to flourish across hundreds of local jurisdictions as well.

Fifteen years later, Indonesia is a democratic success story. It holds consistently free and fair elections, its military has retreated from actively intervening in politics, and the country has avoided any descent into the chaos of ethnic and/or religious conflict. As Aspinall (2010) and others note, however, this success comes with considerable limitations to the quality of the country's democracy as well as to its economic equality. The problems include, for example: poor horizontal and vertical accountability (Slater 2004), weak rule of law (Horowitz 2013: 233-246), rampant corruption (McLeod 2000; Butt 2011), massive material inequality (Winters 2014), and persistent influence by powerful interests from the New Order era (Robison and Hadiz 2004). This last issue—in particular, the continuity among politicians in the New Order and the post-New Order periods—is the focus of this paper.

Buehler (2007, 2014), Mietzner (2010), and Choi (2014) have provided close analyses of elites in local elections and find that there are many New Order politicians

active in local politics in the post-New Order era. At the national level, as well, there are many prominent politicians with New Order backgrounds. Post-New Order presidents B.J. Habibie, Megawati Sukarnoputri, and Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono all have political roots in the New Order; only Abdurrahman Wahid remained outside of formal politics during the Soeharto regime. The presence of New Order military officers at the highest level of post-New Order politics is especially striking; examples include former President Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono, 2014 presidential runner-up Prabowo Subianto, and Hanura party founder and perennial presidential candidate Wiranto.

Systematic assessments of the *extent* of this persistence, however, are lacking. Only Buehler (2014) has presented a systematic accounting of the backgrounds of post-New Order political elites. As we do, he uses current elected officials' curricula vitae to categorize their professional and political backgrounds. But Buehler focuses on politicians in only one province (South Sulawesi), rather than on politicians nationwide. Our broader approach complements Buehler's and Mietzner's and allows us to probe several key issues that remain unanswered by the previous contemporary literature.

Data Description

Our contribution to the literature is to analyze the background of political elites in post-Soeharto Indonesia in the most comprehensive way possible. We do this by analyzing the curricula vitae (CVs) of a large number of Indonesian politicians active in the post-Soeharto era. CVs are a particularly useful source of information regarding the sociological and economic antecedents of political power, as they identify their subjects' birthplace, education, professional experiences, and political positions held to date. In addition, the data are dynamic by construction, enabling analysis of changes in the

political landscape over time. There are some limitations to the data: for example, some CVs are incomplete, and there is a certain amount of subjectivity in determining who is "important enough" to appear in the dataset (as we outline below). Nevertheless, we are confident that our dataset is the most inclusive source of information currently available on the political and biographical backgrounds of Indonesia's political elites.

There are many challenges to be overcome in assembling information on individuals in this way. Even in advanced industrial democratic countries, accessible data on individual politicians are rare, and accordingly analyses have only recently been undertaken (see, e.g., Carnes 2013; Eggers and Hainmueller 2009, 2014). In emerging democracies with less transparency and more barriers to information with respect to their political processes and politicians, detailed data at the individual level are far more difficult to obtain than in more established democracies (see Fisman et al. 2014; also Carnes and Lupu forthcoming for recent examples).

Our data were compiled using three different datasets. Due to limitations in the format in which the data could be provided, it was necessary to hand-enter all of the data in each dataset. The entirety of each entry was double-keyed by a separate person to ensure uniformity of the input process. A third person examined and resolved discrepancies.

The primary source of data is Tokoh Indonesia's *Encyclopedia of Prominent Indonesians*.[1] The *Encyclopedia of Prominent Indonesians* is the most comprehensive online database of profiles of Indonesia leaders, with more than 600 profiles updated regularly. Tokoh Indonesia is a not-for-profit media information firm managed by a staff

---

[1] http://www.tokohindonesia.com

of politically minded journalists and founded with the mission to "create greater transparency"[2] between the media and political sectors. The firm is financed exclusively by donations. Tokoh Indonesia began collecting historical data in 2000, with data being published exclusively online since 2002, the *Encyclopedia of Prominent Indonesians* includes information regarding the country's formal and informal leaders, politicians, businessmen, experts, and other professionals. Each profile includes the individual's curriculum vitae, a photograph, names of spouses and children, political affiliation, and other personal information. The personal information may vary slightly from person to person, including information regarding non-professional service to charities or non-profits, and memberships to professional clubs. Tokoh Indonesia describes the standard procedure for adding a profile to the encyclopedia as follows: Drawing from his or her experiences in journalism and knowledge of politics, an editor or other staff member proposes the addition of someone believed to be of sufficient political interest in contemporary Indonesia. Once an addition has been agreed upon by the entire staff, Tokoh Indonesia begins the information-aggregation process by contacting the primary source via telephone and arranging an interview to take place either in person or, if necessary, by phone. If the primary source is unavailable, Tokoh Indonesia attempts to arrange an interview with one or more members of the source's family. If neither the primary source nor his or her family is available, then Tokoh Indonesia turns to secondary sources to collect the information for the profile; these secondary sources include the Ministry of Social Affairs, the Department of State, and Indonesian newspapers and magazines such as *Kompas*, *Republika*, *Suara Pembaruan*, *Media*

---

[2] Translated from Bahasa Indonesia by a research assistant, Edwin Thong, after interviewing the editor-in-chief from Tokoh Indonesia via phone.

Indonesia, *Indopos*, *Tempo*, *Gatra*, and *Berita Indonesial*. In cases where primary sources are available, secondary sources are also used to verify information provided by primary sources. Any additional or conflicting information from secondary sources is verified with the primary source or his or her family through the review of document copies or by phone or text in these cases. If the secondary information cannot be verified by the primary source, the additional information is not included in the encyclopedia. Tokoh Indonesia maintains open communication with the profiled individuals and their families in case any information must be added or updated on the website, and the firm maintains that there have been very few complaints against the company in terms of the validity of any data in its publication.

Based on the information in Tokoh Indonesia's online encyclopedia, we hand-entered the information from each profile into our own datasets, as data could not be scraped accurately. The data entered included year of birth, place of birth, education, political positions held, private sector positions held, affiliations to organizations, and political party. Next, we verified the information from the main dataset using additional data provided by an independent Indonesian political consulting firm, PT Reformasi Info Sastra (PT Ris). One of the leading political risk consulting firms in Indonesia, PT Ris specializes in the analysis of investment conditions, providing clients with strategic consulting, customized research, and syndicated reports. The company's book *Who's Who in the Yudhoyono Era* provides detailed factual and analytical assessments of more than 140 Indonesian officials, policy-makers, and politicians, including the entire cabinet, security officials, the leaders of major state institutions, senior civil servants, political party chairs, parliamentary faction heads, and major state enterprise directors. The book

supplies extensive background information on these people as well, but for our purposes we used only the basic facts provided, namely what would appear on their curricula vitae.

Almost all of the politicians in *Who's Who in the Yudhoyono Era* also appear in Tokoh Indonesia's encyclopedia. Discrepancies between individual profiles were minor. Our third source of data was the CVs of all of the members of the People's Consultative Assembly (DPR) and House of Regional Representatives (DPD) from 2004 and 2009. Members of the DPR and DPD are asked to provide a CV to the government, which in turn, via a private source, provided copies to us.

Finally, we augmented the existing data in an important way by developing a classification scheme that coded every career position held by every individual in our dataset. This enabled us to see how individuals with various demographic or career backgrounds enter politics. It also enabled us to characterize the extent of overlap between various career types among the elites in our dataset, because it allowed us to record whether individuals have had multiple careers. Based on a close reading of the data and our familiarity with Indonesian politics, we generated twenty-two separate career codes.[3] Our dataset contains 5,858 distinct careers, and we were able to assign career codes to 5,417 (92.5%) of them. This allowed us to code 6,712 positions held by the 1,646 individuals in our dataset. For a summary of that coding exercise, see Table 1. *** Table 1 here ***

---

[3] Careers appear in our dataset as two variables: *CareerTitle* ("comissioner," "regent," "finance minister," etc.) and *CareerInstitution* ("bakrie brother enterprises," "mining," "ppp," etc.). The combination of these two variables generates the 5,858 "career tokens." We assigned career tokens to our twenty-two career types without knowing anything else about the individual reporting each career. This ensures that we cannot have unconsciously adjusted our coding choices based on our familiarity with a particular individual.

Our dataset has particularly rich information on elites who are members of parliament or who hold other leadership positions. We also have extensive coverage of individuals with private sector business backgrounds.

Validity

It would be reasonable to question the validity of such a large dataset constructed from three separate sources. Two primary concerns came to our own minds: One, could the data contained in the curricula vitae be systematically biased in any way, as a result of being either incomplete or deliberately misreported? Two, do the data have "face validity," i.e., do they replicate, to a reassuring degree, features that we would expect our research subjects (i.e., the post-New Order political class) to have? We address these questions below in turn.

Indeed, some CVs are "more complete" than others, suggesting variation among individuals as to what and how much of their professional and personal backgrounds they chose to disclose. This is only problematic for our purposes, however, if entire classes of individuals systematically under- or overreported on their backgrounds. For example: if all or several former military officials who went on to serve in parliament were unwilling and therefore failed to list all of their prior positions, this would compromise our inferences. Although we consider such deliberate misreporting or withholding of information to be unlikely, we cannot rule it out. More likely, in our opinion, is non-systematic misreporting by individuals owing merely to a lack of attention in fulfilling the task. This would not systematically bias our inferences, but it does suggest that we should precede our analysis with an assessment of our sample's face validity.

In this context, the face validity of a dataset refers to whether the dataset as a whole approximates what we would expect to find in a large sample of Indonesian political elites. If, for example, a majority of the elites in our dataset had been identified as Christian, or as having completed only low levels of education, it would suggest that the dataset does not accurately reflect the reality we expected it to. On the other hand, if our dataset "looks like" what we expecct based on our substantive knowledge of Indonesian politics, then we are more confident that it captures the Indonesian elites we wish it to capture. To assess our dataset's validity, then, we look first at some basic demographic information on gender, religious affiliation, and education, reported in Table 2.

*** Table 2 here ***

Here we see that in terms of demographic characteristics our sample is substantially representative of Indonesian political life as a whole. Most Indonesian political elites are male, Muslim, and have completed higher levels of education than the country's general population.[4] Contrary, however, to what we might expect from this data, only 7.1% of our respondents reported having a military educational background. This percentage probably understates the actual number of military figures in our sample, because our sample seeks to capture the "highest level of education" for each individual and for some military figures the highest level of education is not a military degree.

---

[4]The 2010 census shows that 7.53% of Indonesians over the age of 15 had completed a post-secondary degree (data from http://sp2010.bps.go.id/index.php [accessed December 2, 2014]), a far smaller number than the 87.5% figure from our data.

In Table 3 we list the birthplaces reported by at least six individuals in our data. (It would not have been practical to list every single birthplace, as the individuals in our sample reported several hundred unique places of birth.)

*** Table 3 here ***

These results, too, are broadly reflective of what we would expect from an average sample of Indonesian elites. By far the most common birthplace is Jakarta, followed by other major cities on Java and then other major cities elsewhere in Indonesia. Interestingly, among those in our dataset who were born overseas, the most common locations reported were London (six individuals), Amsterdam (four individuals), and Madison, Wisconsin, USA (three individuals).

With Table 4 we complete our face-validity analysis by looking at the partisan affiliations of the individuals in our dataset, breaking them down by whether or not they have been members of the DPR at any point in their career.

*** Table 4 here ***

Once again our results are reassuring: most of the individuals who are not members of the DPR do not record a partisan affiliation, while most of those who are in the DPR do. Golkar, Democrat Party, and PDIP members are those most common among DPR members, reflecting the fact that most of the individuals in our dataset are members of the 2004 and 2009 sessions. Those members of the DPR without any partisan affiliation are those who served prior to democratization and comprise only a small portion of our sample.

We conclude from this preliminary analysis that our results are indeed "face valid," in the sense that they do reproduce qualitative features of Indonesian political

elites as a category. This evidence is not dispositive that the data are an unbiased and representative sample of Indonesia's political elites, but it does suggest that a close quantitative analysis of our data will yield informative patterns in the backgrounds of Indonesia's elite politicians.

Analysis

Our analysis begins by examining differences across parties. We ask two questions: One, which parties attract politicians with private sector experience? And two, which parties attract politicians with military experience?

In Table 5 we show the number of individuals in each dataset affiliated with each party along with whether or not their CVs include at least one instance of private sector employment.

*** Table 5 here ***

The data show that most party-linked individuals in our dataset actually do not have private sector experience. Among the minority that do, there are party-specific differences. Elites linked to PDIP, PD, and PKB, for example, are less likely to have private sector backgrounds than those linked to Gerindra, Golkar, Hanura, and PAN. This difference reflects Golkar's reputation as a business-friendly party in the post-Soeharto era, and suggests that Hanura and Gerindra draw from a similar base of business-minded elites.[5] The relative abundance of elites linked to PAN and who have private sector experience reflects the party's social base in Muhammadiyah, a relatively affluent, middle-class, modernist Muslim constituency.

---

[5] Both Hanura and Gerindra were founded by retired generals (Wiranto and Prabowo Subianto, respectively) who were close—albeit in different ways—to former president Soeharto.

13

In Table 6 we repeat this exercise for individuals with a military background.

*** Table 6 ***

Based on our data, party-linked political elites in our dataset are much less likely to have a military background than a private sector background. In fact, in our dataset, most parties have no members linked to the military. Consistent with the observations of Rüland and M.-G. Manea (2013: 139), the parties with the highest percentage of elites with military backgrounds are Golkar, PDIP, Democrat, and Gerindra (although Gerindra's score of 6.2% simply reflects one individual, its founder Prabowo Subianto).).[6] The case of Golkar as an authoritarian holdover party is also not hard to understand. Several plausible interpretations can account for the comparatively high numbers of military figures affiliated with PDIP and Democrat Party. As these groups are the two most successful national parties in the post-Soeharto period aside from Golkar, it is possible that retired generals may be seeking political power through the strongest political vehicles available. It could also be that powerful parties ally with former generals in order to forestall conflicts between military and civilian governments. Our quantitative data alone cannot adjudicate among these theories, but they do draw attention to the lingering effects of the politicization of the military under Soeharto.

Multivariate Analysis

These cross-tabs suggest only a fraction of what we can learn from our dataset about Indonesian political elites. To probe further, we exploit the detailed data that we

---

[6] Table 6 codes Hanura as being a party where no elites in our dataset have military backgrounds. This is puzzling, given that former General Wiranto is its founder. However in our source Wiranto is coded as a member of Golkar, rather than Hanura, as his CV dates from before the founding of Hanura. This explains the aberration.

have extracted from the CVs in a multivariate framework. For the moment, we set aside questions of partisanship, and examine how gender, educational type and attainment, place of birth (i.e., Jakarta versus elsewhere), and age relate to career outcomes. Our three broadly conceived outcomes of interest are: private sector experience, bureaucratic experience, and government experience.

To estimate the predictive power of these background factors on career outcomes, we estimate a series of logistic regressions with a binary career indicator as a dependent variable (*PRIVATE SECTOR, BUREAUCRAT*, and *GOVERNMENT*[7]) and the following independent variables: *MILITARY, BACHELOR'S, GRADUATE, FEMALE, MUSLIM, BIRTH: JAKARTA*, and *AGE*. The first three independent variables are binary variables indicating whether individuals with military education, a bachelor's degree, or a post-graduate degree are more likely *relative to individuals with non-military education at the high school level or lower* to have private sector experience. *FEMALE* and *MUSLIM* are binary variables used to test the relevance of gender and Islam, while *BIRTH: JAKARTA* is an indicator equal to one if the politician was born in Jakarta. Finally, *AGE* captures differences by age (defined as 2014 minus year of birth); in our baseline models we include age with a linear functional form, and explore nonlinear functional forms later in our cohort analysis.

To analyze the antecedents for career backgrounds, we use a range of empirical specifications. First, we test the antecedents separately in a bivariate logistic regression, where the dependent variable is equal to one if an individual has a particular career background; otherwise it is equal to zero. Next, we test a more parsimonious model

---

[7] *GOVERNMENT* captures general government experience, including bureaucrats as well as respondents having a career experience as an ambassador, executive, minister, and/or in the public sector (see Table 1).

including each independent variable. We then add a series of dummy variables for the elite's political party, independently and then jointly, to investigate how changing the conditioning set of political affiliation affects the relationships we uncover. We do this for each career outcome classification: private sector experience, bureaucratic experience, and government experience.

We start by presenting our results for the personal attributes that predict private sector career experience. These attributes appear in Table 7 and Table 8. We are interested in whether demographics (gender, religion, age, and birthplace), education (military, graduate, etc.), and political party affiliation are related to having a private sector background.

*** Table 7 here ***

*** Table 8 here ***

The results suggest that educational attainment, individually or in the joint model, does not predict having a private sector background. Model 8 of Table 8 indicates that women are less likely than men to have a private sector background, and the precision of this estimate increases when we control for party affiliation. In the bivariate model, Muslims are more likely to have private sector backgrounds (Model 5 in Table 7), but this result disappears in the multivariate results. And finally, both elites born in Jakarta and younger elites are more likely to have private sector backgrounds, a result that is stable across all specifications.

The results when controlling for party (individually and jointly) are also instructive. Net of other determinants, Golkar-linked elites are more likely than other elites to have private sector backgrounds. The same is true of PAN-linked elites. PKS-

16

linked elites are less likely to have private sector backgrounds. Results for other parties are either fragile or inconclusive. Therefore the multivariate results confirm our results based on Table 5 concerning Golkar and PAN, which suggested that these parties are more likely than others to have members with private sector backgrounds. However, the multivariate analysis also reveals that PKS-linked elites are *less* likely than elites linked to other parties to have private sector backgrounds, something that our preliminary analysis in Table 5 did not capture.

We turn next to our results for elites with bureaucratic backgrounds, as shown in Table 9 and Table 10.

*** Table 9 here ***

*** Table 10 here ***

We find suggestive evidence that gender, religion, and education predict bureaucratic employment histories in the bivariate models, but the parsimonious model (Model 8 in Table 9) shows that the most robust predictors of bureaucratic employment are age and having been born in Jakarta. Interestingly, the relationships for these two predictors are exactly the opposite of what we uncovered in the analysis of elites with private sector backgrounds: *older* members of the dataset born *outside* of Jakarta are the ones most likely to have bureaucratic experience. We return to the question of age in our analysis below, but we also note here that the findings about elites born outside of Jakarta being more likely to have bureaucratic backgrounds are consistent with recent research on the importance of the local state as a key source of political power in the regions (see, e.g., van Klinken 2014).

Our results for party affiliation and bureaucratic employment history (Table 10) are interesting. When a party variable is significant, it is always *negative*: party affiliation predicts a lower probability of having a bureaucratic background. However, it is important to remember that these party variables compare elites with party affiliations to all other elites, including those without partisan affiliations. As a result, they must be interpreted as the partial correlation between party affiliation and bureaucratic employment history relative to all other elites, approximately half of whom have no party affiliation. When we restrict the analysis to only those elites with party affiliations, we do not find a significant correlation between affiliation and bureaucratic employment history, either individually or jointly.[8] Net of other predictors, party affiliation does not predict bureaucratic experience among the elites in our sample.

Finally, we examine our results for elites with general government backgrounds. As noted above, this encompasses bureaucrats as well as ambassadors, government ministers, public sector employees, as well as those working with the executive branch.

*** Table 11 here ***

*** Table 12 here ***

As with bureaucratic employment, age is a strong predictor of general government employment as well: the older elites in our dataset are much more likely to have government employment experience. Place of birth, however, is not a significant predictor of government employment experience. Rather, in both the bivariate and the parsimonious models with parties, our results show that Muslims are more likely than non-Muslims to have government employment experience, and that women are less likely

---

[8] These results are available from the authors upon request.

than men to have government employment experience. As it does with bureaucratic

employment, party affiliation predicts a lower likelihood of having government

employment experience. When we restrict the analysis, as previously, to only those elites

with some party affiliation, we find that elites with affiliations to Partai Bulan Bintang

and Partai Kebangkitan Bangsa are more likely than elites with other affiliations to have

histories in government employment.[9] This result is somewhat surprising, but it must be

considered along with the caveat that the formerly statistically significant results for

MUSLIM lose significance in this model. This suggests that these two parties—one

(PBB) an Islamist party, and the other (PKB) representing a traditional Muslim

constituency—reflect the same effect that we attributed to Islam in our main results.

Multiple Employment Histories

In the previous section, we analyzed the demographic and partisan predictors of

elites' career experience in the private sector, bureaucracy, or government. But this

analysis does not consider the possibility of overlap among those employment categories.

A unique advantage of our data is that they allow us to examine the extent to which elites

move in and out of different professions. This is particularly important given the close

links in Indonesia among the military, the business sector, and the state, both under the

New Order and after democratization (for an early acknowledgment of this point, see

Robison 1978). Rather than classify elites into a single category of officer, bureaucrat, or

businessperson, our coding of individual career histories reflects the richer complexity of

individuals' professional histories. This gives us a window onto the cross-permeation of

---

[9] These results are available from the authors upon request.

the state, private sector, and the military, as well as how this interplay is reflected in the country's most prominent political elites.

In Table 13 we cross-tabulate different types of employment in order to show, for example, what percentage of elites with private sector employment histories also have bureaucratic or government employment histories.

*** Table 13 here ***

The first two cross-tabs demonstrate how many elites have both a private sector and a bureaucratic (Panel A) or general government (Panel B) background. In both cases we find considerable overlap, but also that it is not disproportionate: elites with private sector backgrounds are no more likely to have bureaucratic or government backgrounds than elites without private sector backgrounds. This finding is inconsistent with an interpretation of Indonesian politics in which service of the state provides an entry point into the private sector as a means of accumulating wealth. While we have no doubt that this is true in individual cases, it appears that it is not consistent with the experiences of a majority of the elites in our sample.

In Panel C we examine the links between the private sector and military experience alone. We find that elites with private sector experience are less likely than those without private sector experience to have military experience. In fact, only four percent of elites within our sample have both military and private sector backgrounds, relative to fourteen percent of elites who have military but no private sector background. This difference is highly statistically significant. It is yet more evidence against an interpretation of Indonesian politics in which military experience would seem to be an entry point into the private sector (at least according to our sample). We emphasize here

20

that these results *do not* imply that retired Indonesian military officers do not enter private business, only that such patterns are not characteristic of the most prominent national elites in our sample. Indeed, we suspect that the presence of retired military officers in private sector careers is particularly notable in the regions—outside of Jakarta—and among less prominent non-commissioned officers (see Global Security 2014), although our data do not allow us to demonstrate this.

In Panels D and E, we complete this exercise by investigating the association between having a military background and experience within the bureaucracy or government more generally. Here, we do find evidence that elites with military backgrounds are more likely than non-military elites to have bureaucratic or government experiences, and these differences are highly statistically significant. These positive findings are consistent with interpretations of Indonesian politics—especially politics under the New Order—in which the military served as an entry point to positions of authority within the state, even if neither military nor governmental service had increased the likelihood of private sector employment among political elites.

The Changing Face of Indonesia's Political Elites

Our final substantive analysis examines differences in elite backgrounds by age. This analysis brings us back to the question of change and continuity in Indonesian politics after democratization. Our dataset is designed to reflect contemporary politics, and to capture contemporary elites, however it also contains information on a number of older political elites, many of whom have died. We can use this information to examine differences in elites' backgrounds across age cohorts (i.e., actual ages for those still alive and the ages implied by year of birth for those who have died). For example, the "rise of

capital"—to borrow Robison's (1986) terminology—might imply a shift away from

political elites from the state sector and the military in favor of those from the private

sector. If democratization leads to a broadening of the career backgrounds of Indonesian

politics, then we should expect to find that younger political elites are less likely to have

military or bureaucratic backgrounds than would older elites who entered politics at the

height of the New Order. By examining the backgrounds of elites belonging to different

age cohorts, we can more effectively chart the changing nature of Indonesian politics.

We analyze the changing nature of Indonesian politics by estimating a

parsimonious model—equivalent to Model 8 in Table 7 and Table 9—to show the

probability that an elite has a background in the private sector, in the government or

bureaucracy, and in the military as a function of age. To capture the potential non-linear

relationship between age and professional background, we augment that specification by

adding both quadratic and cubic polynominals for age in each model.[10] Rather than

interpret regression coefficients, we calculate the predicted probability of each individual

between the ages of 40 and 90 (as of 2014) having each type of professional background,

and then plot the resulting curves along with the 95% confidence regions around each

prediction. The results of this exercise are shown in Figure 1.

*** Figure 1 here ***

This figure demonstrates clearly (and dramatically) the changing face of Indonesia's

political elite. The older elites in our data tend to have government or military

backgrounds, whereas virtually none of the younger elites do. Instead, these younger

elites are much more likely to have a private sector background. This holds for both the

---

[10] Higher order polynomials do not appreciably improve model fit, nor do they change any of our
substantive conclusions.

entire sample (Panel A) and for analyses that include only elites with affiliations to major political parties (Panel B).

We must be careful in interpreting these results, and mindful of what we can learn about historical changes from data that focus largely—although not exclusively—on contemporary political elites. We cannot rule out, for example, the possibility that a dataset compiled in the 1970s would have included more comprehensive information about private sector elites that did not have government, bureaucratic, or military backgrounds. Our data *do*, however, include a number of elites from decades prior to the current one, and we have impressive coverage of ones who had risen to prominence under the New Order and were still alive between 2004 and 2009. The fact that our dataset does not include many older private sector elites is consistent with our interpretation that the core political economy of Indonesia has changed, from one in which political elites come predominantly from the state, bureaucracy, and military to one in which they come from the private sector. A lack of coverage of pre-2004 elites with private sector backgrounds could have produced our findings only if elites with private sector backgrounds were more likely to have died young than elites without private sector backgrounds (in which case they probably wouldn't have been included in our data anyway).

Interpreting the decline of younger elites with military backgrounds requires taking into account the career trajectories of Indonesian military officers. Unlike under the New Order, a successful military career today entails that an officer be able to enter politics only after retirement, at the minimum age of sixty. But the requirement that officers retire from "operational duty" before standing for office (see Sebastian and

Iisgindarsah 2013: 34) is itself one of the achievements of military reform after democratization. We also note that the abolishment of military representation in the DPR is a primary factor in the decline of military-linked political elites. Our analysis confirms that these legal and constitutional changes are indeed shaping the composition of Indonesia's political elite, even if many older, retired military officers whose careers were made under the New Order continue to enter politics post-retirement.

Finally, we emphasize that these results are not necessarily (or exclusively) evidence of the effect of *democratization* on the composition of Indonesia's political elite. They could also (or alternatively) reflect developments in national politics that date to the late New Order period. In the last decade of Soeharto's rule, analysts detected a shift in the constellation of elites surrounding Soeharto, who sidelined potential opponents within the Indonesian military while nurturing Muslim groups, Chinese and indigenous business allies, and his own family (see Winters 1996: 184-190; Robison and Hadiz: 58-60; Pepinsky 2009: 46-61). It is likely, then, that the decline of military and state backgrounds and the rise of private sector backgrounds among Indonesia's political elites date at least in part to Soeharto's own evolving strategy of regime preservation. Our analysis based on age alone cannot distinguish between changes that occurred in the late Soeharto era and those that date from the early democratic era.

In order to distinguish, as best we can, changes originating toward the end of the New Order from post-New Order changes, we identify the elites in our data according to whether their first reported career—of any type—began before or after 1998. Cross-tabulations of New Order/post-New Order elites by private sector, bureaucratic, military, or other backgrounds appear in Table 14.

*** Table 14 here ***

These four cross-tabs demonstrate that elites whose careers began after 1998 are less likely to have a military, bureaucratic, government, *or* private sector background. Clearly, democratization has resulted in fewer political elites with military and/or state backgrounds. There is also evidence, however, that the rise of the private sector as a source of military elites (as seen in Figure 1) must have begun prior to democratization. In other words, the rise of private sector elites is at least partially a legacy of changes to Indonesia's political economy that date to the New Order period.

Conclusion

This paper began with the question of change versus continuity in Indonesian politics after the New Order. Using a unique, hand-coded dataset, we have examined career background and demographic profiles of a large number of prominent Indonesian political elites. The differences we uncover in career backgrounds by partisan affiliation, as well as the demographic predictors of elites' career histories, reflect the new complexity of contemporary Indonesian politics at the national level. At the same time, the fact that factors as basic as birthplace (i.e., in Jakarta or elsewhere) predict career histories so well reflects a clear legacy from New Order Indonesia, in which the local state was a key avenue to political power in the regions—whereas among Jakarta-born elites, the private sector dominates. We also find evidence of a dramatic change in the career backgrounds of politicians across age groups. This shift in the composition of Indonesia's political elite away from the military and the state and towards private sector business represents a fundamental change in Indonesia's political economy at the national level. Even if many political elites in contemporary Indonesia still have bureaucratic or

25

military backgrounds, our data demonstrate a meaningful shift towards private sector backgrounds among younger political elites coming to prominence in the post-New Order era.

In this section, we conclude with a discussion of some of the most important limitations of our approach, and suggest avenues for future research.

Our analysis in this paper focuses on change and continuity in Indonesian politics as captured through the types of individuals who rise to national prominence. Naturally, there are many other dimensions through which to examine the legacies of authoritarian politics on emerging democracies. These include legacies of structural power, inequality, bureaucratic decay, patterns of popular mobilization, and many others. Moreover, as others have argued, the decline of the state and military as routes to political power in Indonesia does not in any way imply that the military and the bureaucracy are no longer politically relevant (see, e.g., Rosser et al. 2005 on "politico-bureaucrats" and Mietzner 2013: 103-106 on the military). Our findings about partisan differences in career histories and the changing composition of political elites must be interpreted alongside the broader legacies of institutions, inequality, and mobilization, among other contexts. Indeed, our finding that the rise of political elites with private sector backgrounds dates to the late New Order period shows how important it is to take into account informal changes in the social bases of authoritarian politics (Pepinsky 2014) alongside the discrete changes in regime type that accompany democratization.

We also emphasize that we do not have a complete model of the process through which elites enter into our dataset. While we are confident in the face validity of our data, we acknowledge that our findings do not generalize to all Indonesian political elites as a

26

class (with the exception that our results do encompass all sitting parliamentarians from 2009). This limitation also prevents us from making stronger claims about the effects of birthplace, gender, religion, and other influences on career outcomes, which is why, throughout this paper, we have been careful to describe our findings as predictive ones about the elites in our dataset, rather than as estimates of causal effects. Future work following the leads of Eggers and Hainmueller (2009, 2013) and Fisman et al. (2014) may be able to use our data and/or expand on our approach in order to gain causal leverage on key theoretical issues. It is also worth noting that there are exciting new sources of data pertaining to more recent legislative elections in Indonesia—including both winners and losers in legislative elections—being made available through sources such as PemiluAPI.[11]

Finally, our analysis is limited in that it covers national political elites rather than provincial or local political elites. We expect that the patterns we uncover at the national level may not emerge in regional analyses. In particular, we suspect that local bureaucrats and local military elites will be far more prominent among contemporary political elites. More analyses such as those by Buehler (2007), Mietzner (2010), and Choi (2014) are critical for understanding just what legacies the local authoritarian state in Indonesia has had on local politics. Such analyses will profit by borrowing from our methodological approach, in particular by focusing on individuals' multiple-career histories and by examining age effects alongside other demographic and political factors that may explain the prominence of certain local elites.

---

[11] See http://pemiluapi.org/ [accessed December 2, 2014].

References

Buehler, Michael. 2007. Local elite reconfiguration in post-New Order Indonesia: the 2005 election of district government heads in South Sulawesi. *Review of Indonesian and Malaysian Affairs* 41(1), 119–47.

---. 2014. Elite competition and changing state-society relations: Shari'a policymaking in Indonesia. In Michele Ford and Thomas B. Pepinsky. Eds. *Beyond Oligarchy* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press), 157-75.

Butt, Simon. 2011. *Corruption and Law in Indonesia*. London: Routledge.

Carnes, Nicholas. 2013. *White-Collar Government: The Hidden Role of Class in Economic Policy Making*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Carnes, Nicholas, and Noam Lupu. forthcoming. "Rethinking the Comparative Perspective on Class and Representation: Evidence from Latin America." *American Journal of Political Science*.

Choi, Nankyung. 2014. "Local Political Elites in Indonesia: 'Risers' and 'Holdovers.'" *Sojourn* 29(2), 364-407.

Eggers, Andrew C., and Jens Hainmueller. 2009. MPs for Sale? Returns to Office in Postwar British Politics. *American Political Science Review* 103(4), 513-533.

---. 2014. Political Capital: Corporate Connections and Stock Investments in the U.S. Congress, 2004-2008. *Quarterly Journal of Political Science* 9, 169-202.

Fisman, Raymond, Florian Schulz, and Vikrant Vig. 2014. The Private Returns to Public Office. *Journal of Political Economy* 122(4), 806-862.

Global Security. 2014. "Indonesia - Military Personnel." Available at http://www.globalsecurity.org/military/world/indonesia/personnel.htm [accessed December 2, 2014].

Horowitz, Donald L. 2013. *Constitutional Change and Democracy in Indonesia*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

McLeod, Ross H. 2000. "Soeharto's Indonesia: A Better Class of Corruption." *Agenda* 7(2), 99-112.

Mietzner, Marcus. 2010. "Indonesia's Direct Elections: Empowering the Electorate or Entrenching the New Order Oligarchy?" in *Soeharto's New Order and its Legacy: Essays in honour of Harold Crouch*. Edited by Edward Aspinall and Greg Fealy. ANU E Press.

---. 2013. "Veto Player No More? The Declining Political Influence of the Military in Postauthoritarian Indonesia." In *Democracy and Islam in Indonesia*. Edited by Mirjam Künkler and Alfred Stepan. New York: Columbia University Press. 89-108.

Pepinsky, Thomas B. 2009. *Economic Crises and the Breakdown of Authoritarian Regimes: Indonesia and Malaysia in Comparative Perspective*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

---. 2014. "The Institutional Turn in Comparative Authoritarianism." *British Journal of Political Science* 44(3), 631-653.

Robison, Richard. 1978. "Toward a Class Analysis of the Indonesian Military Bureaucratic State." *Indonesia* 25, 17-39.

---. 1986. *Indonesia: The Rise of Capital*. Sydney: Allen & Unwin Pty Ltd.

Robison, Richard, and Vedi R. Hadiz. 2004. *Reorganizing Power in Indonesia: The Politics of Oligarchy in an Age of Markets*. London: RoutledgeCurzon.

Rosser, Andrew, Kurnya Roesad, and Donni Edwin. 2005. "Indonesia: the Politics of Inclusion." *Journal of Contemporary Asia* 35(1), 53-77.

Rüland, Jürgen, and Maria-Gabriela Manea. 2013. "The Legislature and Military Reform in Indonesia." *The Politics of Military Reform: Experiences from Indonesia and Nigeria*. Edited by Jürgen Rüland, Maria-Gabriela Manea, and Hans Born. New York: Springer, 29-56.

Sebastian, Leonard C., and Iisgindarsah. 2013. "Taking Stock of Military Reform in Indonesia." in *The Politics of Military Reform: Experiences from Indonesia and Nigeria*. Edited by Jürgen Rüland, Maria-Gabriela Manea, and Hans Born. New York: Springer, 29-56.

Slater, Dan. 2004. Indonesia's Accountability Trap: Party Cartels and Presidential Power after Democratic Transition. *Indonesia* 78, 61-92

van Klinken, Gerry. 2014. *The Making of Middle Indonesia: Middle Classes in Kupang Town, 1930s-1980s*. Leiden: Brill.

Winters, Jeffrey A. *Power in Motion: Capital Mobility and the Indonesian State*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

---. 2014. Oligarchy and Democracy in Indonesia. *Indonesia* 96, 11-33.

Table 1: Career Types and Frequencies

Career Type	No.	Percent
Ambassador	61	0.9
Bureaucrat	550	8.2
Celebrity	18	0.3
Civil society	349	5.2
Cooperative	20	0.3
Education	612	9.1
Executive	22	0.3
Independence	21	0.3
International	62	0.9
Law	163	2.4
Local government	401	6.0
Media	137	2.0
Medical	37	0.6
Military	806	12.0
Minister	299	4.5
Parliament	1380	20.6
Party	260	3.9
Private sector	1271	18.9
Public sector	83	1.2
Rebel	1	<0.1
Religious	132	2.0
Sports	27	0.4
Total	6712	100

Table 2: Demographic Profiles

Gender	No.	%
Male	1,306	79.30%
Female	210	12.80%
Not Recorded	130	7.90%
Total	1,646	100.00%

Religion	No.	%
Muslim	1,275	77.50%
Christian	150	9.10%
Not Recorded	136	8.30%
Protestant	34	2.10%
Catholic	31	1.90%
Hindu	17	1.00%
Buddhist	3	0.20%
Total	1,646	100.00%

Education Level and Type	No.	%
Not Recorded	94	5.70%
Less than Bachelor's	159	9.70%
Military	117	7.10%
Bachelor's Degree	662	40.20%
Postgraduate	614	37.30%
Total	1,646	100.00%

Table 3: Place of Birth

Place	No.	%	Place	No.	%
Jakarta	195	11.80%	Garut	7	0.40%
Bandung	53	3.20%	Kediri	7	0.40%
Yogyakarta	49	3.00%	Madiun	7	0.40%
Surakarta	38	2.30%	Probolinggo	7	0.40%
Surabaya	35	2.10%	Purworejo	7	0.40%
Makassar	34	2.10%	Sukabumi	7	0.40%
Medan	26	1.60%	Bali	6	0.40%
Palembang	24	1.50%	Flores	6	0.40%
Padang	21	1.30%	Jayapura	6	0.40%
Cirebon	18	1.10%	Klaten	6	0.40%
Malang	17	1.00%	Kuningan	6	0.40%
Bogor	16	1.00%	Kupang	6	0.40%
Jombang	16	1.00%	Nganjuk	6	0.40%
Manado	16	1.00%	Palangkaraya	6	0.40%
Semarang	15	0.90%	Pandeglang	6	0.40%
Tasikmalaya	15	0.90%	Samarinda	6	0.40%
Banjarmasin	14	0.90%	Siantar	6	0.40%
Gorontalo	14	0.90%	Tegal	6	0.40%
Serang	13	0.80%	Tenggarong	6	0.40%
Pekanbaru	12	0.70%	Bandar Lampung	5	0.30%
Magelang	10	0.60%	Banten	5	0.30%
Pati	10	0.60%	Banyuwangi	5	0.30%
Pematang Siantar	10	0.60%	Blitar	5	0.30%
Singaraja	10	0.60%	Depok	5	0.30%
Banda Aceh	9	0.50%	Fakfak	5	0.30%
Pekalongan	9	0.50%	Jepara	5	0.30%
Tangerang	9	0.50%	Lahat	5	0.30%
Ambon	8	0.50%	Manokwari	5	0.30%
Bekasi	8	0.50%	Pare Pare	5	0.30%
Jambi	8	0.50%	Purwokerto	5	0.30%
Mataram	8	0.50%	Salatiga	5	0.30%
Palu	8	0.50%	Sofifi	5	0.30%
Bone	7	0.40%	Sumenep	5	0.30%
Bukittinggi	7	0.40%	Tanjungkarang	5	0.30%
Denpasar	7	0.40%	Temanggung	5	0.30%
Overseas	22	1.30%	Other	655	39.80%
Total	1,646	100%			

Table 4: Party or Affiliation by DPR Membership

Party or Affiliation		DPR	Total	Total %
	Yes	*No*		
Gerindra	13	3	16	1.00%
Golkar	127	57	184	11.20%
Hanura	10	1	11	0.70%
PAN	48	12	60	3.60%
PBB	2	4	6	0.40%
PBR	1	2	3	0.20%
PD	143	43	186	11.30%
PDIP	100	25	125	7.60%
PDS	2	1	3	0.20%
PKB	32	16	48	2.90%
PKS	59	15	74	4.50%
PPP	43	19	62	3.80%
Military/Police	2	30	32	1.90%
Non-Affiliated	11	80	91	5.50%
Not Recorded	21	706	727	44.20%
Other Party	6	12	18	1.10%
Total	620	1,026	1,646	100.0%

Table 5: Private Sector Experience by Party

Party	Private Sector Experience				Total
	No	*Yes*	*% No*	*% Yes*	
Gerindra	8	8	50.0%	50.0%	16
Golkar	98	86	53.3%	46.7%	184
Hanura	4	7	36.4%	63.6%	11
Military/Police	28	4	87.5%	12.5%	32
Non-Affiliated	72	19	79.1%	20.9%	91
Not Recorded	560	167	77.0%	23.0%	727
Other Party	13	5	72.2%	27.8%	18
PAN	33	27	55.0%	45.0%	60
PBB	6	0	100.0%	0.0%	6
PBR	2	1	66.7%	33.3%	3
PD	116	70	62.4%	37.6%	186
PDIP	78	47	62.4%	37.6%	125
PDS	2	1	66.7%	33.3%	3
PKB	32	16	66.7%	33.3%	48
PKS	59	15	79.7%	20.3%	74
PPP	41	21	66.1%	33.9%	62
Total	1,152	494	70.0%	30.0%	1,646

Table 6: Military Experience by Party

Party	Military Experience				Total
	No	*Yes*	*% No*	*% Yes*	
Gerindra	15	1	93.8%	6.2%	16
Golkar	177	7	96.2%	3.8%	184
Hanura	11	0	100.0%	0.0%	11
Military/Police	0	32	0.0%	100.0%	32
Non-Affiliated	82	9	90.1%	9.9%	91
Not Recorded	620	107	85.3%	14.7%	727
Other Party	15	3	83.3%	16.7%	18
PAN	59	1	98.3%	1.7%	60
PBB	6	0	100.0%	0.0%	6
PBR	3	0	100.0%	0.0%	3
PD	173	13	93.0%	7.0%	186
PDIP	118	7	94.4%	5.6%	125
PDS	3	0	100.0%	0.0%	3
PKB	47	1	97.9%	2.1%	48
PKS	73	1	98.6%	1.4%	74
PPP	62	0	100.0%	0.0%	62
Total	1,464	182	88.9%	11.1%	1,646

Table 7: Correlates of Private Sector Employment

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
MILITARY	-0.140							-0.024
	(0.215)							(0.264)
BACHELORS		0.108						0.225
		(0.109)						(0.174)
GRADUATE			0.058					0.190
			(0.111)					(0.175)
FEMALE				-0.192				-0.404*
				(0.163)				(0.171)
MUSLIM					0.482***			-0.189
					(0.138)			(0.152)
BIRTH: JAKARTA						0.846***		0.599***
						(0.155)		(0.163)
AGE							-0.023***	-0.024***
							(0.004)	(0.004)
Constant	-0.837***	-0.891***	-0.869***	-0.701***	-1.229***	-0.959***	0.636*	0.654
	(0.056)	(0.070)	(0.068)	(0.059)	(0.124)	(0.059)	(0.260)	(0.343)
N	1646	1646	1646	1516	1646	1646	1516	1491

Standard errors in parentheses. * $p<0.05$, ** $p<0.01$, *** $p<0.001$.

Table 8: Correlates of Private Sector Employment (Parties)

Panel A

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
GOLKAR	0.818*** (0.159)									
PDIP		0.370 (0.193)								
DEMOCRAT			0.388* (0.162)							
PKS				-0.545 (0.294)						
PAN					0.673* (0.265)					
PKB						0.158 (0.311)				
PPP							0.185 (0.274)			
PBR								0.154 (1.226)		
PBB									0.000 (.)	
PDS										0.154 (1.226)
Constant	-0.949*** (0.058)	-0.877*** (0.056)	-0.893*** (0.058)	-0.825*** (0.055)	-0.874*** (0.055)	-0.851*** (0.055)	-0.854*** (0.055)	-0.847*** (0.054)	-0.841*** (0.054)	-0.847* (0.054)
N	1646	1646	1646	1646	1646	1646	1646	1646	1640	1646

Panel B

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
MILITARY	0.003	-0.025	-0.026	-0.004	-0.040	-0.023	-0.023	-0.022	-0.030	-0.024
	(0.265)	(0.264)	(0.264)	(0.265)	(0.264)	(0.264)	(0.264)	(0.264)	(0.264)	(0.264)
BACHELORS	0.261	0.224	0.223	0.242	0.207	0.225	0.225	0.226	0.224	0.225
	(0.175)	(0.174)	(0.174)	(0.174)	(0.174)	(0.174)	(0.174)	(0.174)	(0.174)	(0.174)
GRADUATE	0.218	0.188	0.184	0.185	0.176	0.190	0.190	0.190	0.188	0.189
	(0.176)	(0.175)	(0.175)	(0.176)	(0.175)	(0.175)	(0.175)	(0.175)	(0.175)	(0.175)
FEMALE	-0.393*	-0.402*	-0.418*	-0.464**	-0.399*	-0.404*	-0.405*	-0.404*	-0.410*	-0.404*
	(0.171)	(0.171)	(0.172)	(0.172)	(0.171)	(0.171)	(0.171)	(0.171)	(0.171)	(0.171)
MUSLIM	-0.200	-0.182	-0.187	-0.152	-0.201	-0.189	-0.186	-0.189	-0.183	-0.188
	(0.153)	(0.153)	(0.152)	(0.153)	(0.153)	(0.153)	(0.153)	(0.152)	(0.152)	(0.153)
BIRTH: JAKARTA	0.602***	0.595***	0.588***	0.630***	0.611***	0.599***	0.600***	0.600***	0.593***	0.599**
	(0.164)	(0.164)	(0.164)	(0.164)	(0.164)	(0.163)	(0.163)	(0.163)	(0.163)	(0.163)
AGE	-0.023***	-0.024***	-0.024***	-0.027***	-0.023***	-0.024***	-0.024***	-0.024***	-0.024***	-0.024*
	(0.005)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.005)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)
GOLKAR	0.681***									
	(0.163)									
PDIP		0.104								
		(0.198)								
DEMOCRAT			0.135							
			(0.169)							
PKS				-1.004***						
				(0.304)						
PAN					0.439					
					(0.272)					
PKB						0.008				
						(0.321)				

PPP							-0.070 (0.285)			
PBR								-0.103 (1.230)		
PBB									0.000 (.)	
PDS										0.075 (1.234)
Constant	0.495 (0.348)	0.630 (0.346)	0.619 (0.346)	0.823* (0.348)	0.613 (0.344)	0.654 (0.344)	0.659 (0.343)	0.654 (0.343)	0.665 (0.343)	0.654 (0.343)
N	1491	1491	1491	1491	1491	1491	1491	1491	1486	1491

Standard errors in parentheses. * p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001.

Table 9: Correlates of Bureaucratic Employment

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
MILITARY	-0.137 (0.278)							-0.284 (0.338)
BACHELORS		0.230 (0.138)						0.013 (0.205)
GRADUATE			-0.347* (0.148)					-0.410 (0.216)
FEMALE				-0.775** (0.251)				-0.413 (0.262)
MUSLIM					0.787*** (0.199)			0.346 (0.212)
BIRTH: JAKARTA						-0.700** (0.264)		-0.761** (0.294)
AGE							0.051*** (0.005)	0.049*** (0.005)
Constant	-1.706*** (0.071)	-1.812*** (0.092)	-1.596*** (0.083)	-1.532*** (0.072)	-2.360*** (0.185)	-1.649*** (0.071)	-4.842*** (0.350)	-4.752*** (0.440)
N	1646	1646	1646	1516	1646	1646	1491	1491

Standard errors in parentheses. * p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001.

Table 10: Correlates of Bureaucratic Employment (Parties)

Panel A

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
GOLKAR	-0.627* (0.264)									
PDIP		-1.533*** (0.462)								
DEMOCRAT			-0.640* (0.264)							
PKS				-0.738 (0.432)						
PAN					-0.949 (0.522)					
PKB						-1.014 (0.600)				
PPP							-1.722* (0.722)			
PBR								0.000 (.)		
PBB									0.106 (1.098)	
PDS										0.000 (.)
Constant	-1.658*** (0.071)	-1.645*** (0.070)	-1.656*** (0.071)	-1.689*** (0.070)	-1.690*** (0.069)	-1.694*** (0.069)	-1.679*** (0.069)	-1.713*** (0.069)	-1.716*** (0.069)	-1.713* (0.069)
N	1646	1646	1646	1646	1646	1646	1646	1643	1646	1643

Panel B

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
MILITARY	-0.310	-0.279	-0.278	-0.271	-0.269	-0.290	-0.285	-0.275	-0.283	-0.284
	(0.339)	(0.339)	(0.338)	(0.338)	(0.338)	(0.338)	(0.339)	(0.338)	(0.338)	(0.338)
BACHELORS	-0.011	0.029	0.016	0.019	0.030	0.015	0.017	0.016	0.013	0.015
	(0.206)	(0.206)	(0.206)	(0.206)	(0.206)	(0.206)	(0.206)	(0.205)	(0.205)	(0.205)
GRADUATE	-0.434*	-0.398	-0.405	-0.408	-0.392	-0.411	-0.411	-0.410	-0.410	-0.406
	(0.217)	(0.216)	(0.216)	(0.216)	(0.216)	(0.216)	(0.216)	(0.216)	(0.216)	(0.216)
FEMALE	-0.426	-0.426	-0.391	-0.426	-0.421	-0.412	-0.431	-0.416	-0.411	-0.413
	(0.263)	(0.263)	(0.263)	(0.262)	(0.262)	(0.262)	(0.262)	(0.262)	(0.262)	(0.262)
MUSLIM	0.362	0.305	0.345	0.357	0.354	0.362	0.380	0.348	0.345	0.340
	(0.213)	(0.214)	(0.213)	(0.213)	(0.212)	(0.213)	(0.213)	(0.212)	(0.213)	(0.213)
BIRTH: JAKARTA	-0.762**	-0.719*	-0.741*	-0.759**	-0.776**	-0.769**	-0.746*	-0.754*	-0.759**	-0.763*
	(0.294)	(0.295)	(0.294)	(0.294)	(0.294)	(0.294)	(0.294)	(0.294)	(0.294)	(0.294)
AGE	0.048***	0.047***	0.048***	0.048***	0.048***	0.048***	0.048***	0.049***	0.049***	0.049*'
	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)
GOLKAR	-0.661*									
	(0.278)									
PDIP		-1.329**								
		(0.468)								
DEMOCRAT			-0.347							
			(0.274)							
PKS				-0.346						
				(0.444)						
PAN					-0.703					
					(0.531)					
PKB						-0.755				
						(0.613)				

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
PPP							-1.579* (0.729)			
PBR								0.000 (.)		
PBB									0.321 (1.133)	
PDS										0.000 (.)
Constant	-4.605*** (0.442)	-4.563*** (0.443)	-4.672*** (0.443)	-4.704*** (0.443)	-4.697*** (0.440)	-4.709*** (0.441)	-4.685*** (0.440)	-4.749*** (0.440)	-4.756*** (0.440)	-4.745* (0.440)
N	1491	1491	1491	1491	1491	1491	1491	1488	1491	1488

Standard errors in parentheses. * $p<0.05$, ** $p<0.01$, *** $p<0.001$.

Table 11: Correlates of Government Employment

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
MILITARY	-0.196						-0.211
	(0.233)						(0.294)
BACHELORS		0.160					0.104
		(0.116)					(0.184)
GRADUATE			-0.171				-0.154
			(0.120)				(0.188)
FEMALE				-0.799***			-0.429*
				(0.202)			(0.216)
MUSLIM					0.962***		0.568**
					(0.167)		(0.186)
BIRTH: JAKARTA						-0.300	-0.223
						(0.189)	(0.208)
AGE						0.064***	0.064***
						(0.005)	(0.005)
Constant	-1.106***	-1.186***	-1.058***	-0.917***	-1.906***	-1.087***	-5.013***	-5.372***
	(0.059)	(0.075)	(0.071)	(0.061)	(0.155)	(0.060)	(0.330)	(0.419)
N	1646	1646	1646	1516	1646	1646	1491	1491

Standard errors in parentheses. * $p<0.05$, ** $p<0.01$, *** $p<0.001$.

Table 12: Correlates of Government Employment (Parties)

Panel A

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
GOLKAR	-0.290 (0.194)									
PDIP		-1.188*** (0.309)								
DEMOCRAT			-0.721*** (0.217)							
PKS				-0.889* (0.360)						
PAN					-0.931* (0.406)					
PKB						-0.221 (0.360)				
PPP							-0.970* (0.405)			
PBR								0.000 (.)		
PBB									1.125 (0.819)	
PDS										0.000 (.)
Constant	-1.090*** (0.060)	-1.054*** (0.059)	-1.052*** (0.060)	-1.088*** (0.058)	-1.094*** (0.058)	-1.114*** (0.058)	-1.092*** (0.058)	-1.117*** (0.057)	-1.125*** (0.057)	-1.117* (0.057)
N	1646	1646	1646	1646	1646	1646	1646	1643	1646	1643

Panel B

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
MILITARY	-0.224	-0.208	-0.202	-0.195	-0.196	-0.210	-0.208	-0.193	-0.202	-0.211
	(0.295)	(0.296)	(0.294)	(0.295)	(0.295)	(0.294)	(0.295)	(0.295)	(0.294)	(0.294)
BACHELORS	0.092	0.121	0.109	0.112	0.122	0.103	0.107	0.107	0.107	0.106
	(0.185)	(0.185)	(0.185)	(0.184)	(0.184)	(0.184)	(0.185)	(0.184)	(0.184)	(0.184)
GRADUATE	-0.166	-0.140	-0.146	-0.152	-0.136	-0.154	-0.154	-0.154	-0.153	-0.149
	(0.189)	(0.189)	(0.189)	(0.188)	(0.188)	(0.188)	(0.189)	(0.188)	(0.188)	(0.188)
FEMALE	-0.436*	-0.447*	-0.396	-0.447*	-0.436*	-0.429*	-0.444*	-0.433*	-0.420	-0.429*
	(0.216)	(0.217)	(0.217)	(0.216)	(0.216)	(0.216)	(0.217)	(0.216)	(0.216)	(0.216)
MUSLIM	0.575**	0.538**	0.566**	0.581**	0.576**	0.564**	0.592**	0.571**	0.560**	0.562**
	(0.186)	(0.187)	(0.186)	(0.186)	(0.186)	(0.186)	(0.186)	(0.186)	(0.186)	(0.186)
BIRTH: JAKARTA	-0.223	-0.182	-0.193	-0.221	-0.240	-0.221	-0.210	-0.214	-0.215	-0.226
	(0.208)	(0.209)	(0.209)	(0.208)	(0.208)	(0.208)	(0.208)	(0.208)	(0.208)	(0.208)
AGE	0.063***	0.062***	0.063***	0.063***	0.063***	0.064***	0.063***	0.064***	0.064***	0.064**
	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)
GOLKAR	-0.289									
	(0.206)									
PDIP		-1.024**								
		(0.319)								
DEMOCRAT			-0.466*							
			(0.229)							
PKS				-0.454						
				(0.373)						
PAN					-0.662					
					(0.419)					
PKB						0.143				
						(0.385)				

46

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
PPP							-0.867* (0.420)			
PBR								0.000 (.)		
PBB									1.606 (0.942)	
PDS										0.000 (.)
Constant	-5.302*** (0.421)	-5.217*** (0.422)	-5.265*** (0.421)	-5.299*** (0.422)	-5.317*** (0.419)	-5.384*** (0.420)	-5.326*** (0.419)	-5.372*** (0.419)	-5.396*** (0.420)	-5.367* (0.419)
N	1491	1491	1491	1491	1491	1491	1491	1488	1491	1488

Standard errors in parentheses. * $p<0.05$, ** $p<0.01$, *** $p<0.001$.

Table 13: Cross-Tabs

Panel A

		Bureaucratic Experience				**Total**
		No	*Yes*	*% No*	*% Yes*	
Private Sector Experience	*No*	970	182	84.2%	15.8%	1,152
	Yes	425	69	86.0%	14.0%	494
	Total	1,395	251	84.8%	15.2%	1,646

Pearson chi2(1) = 0.8969 Pr = 0.344

Panel B

		Government Experience				**Total**
		No	*Yes*	*% No*	*% Yes*	
Private Sector Experience	*No*	862	290	74.8%	25.2%	1,152
	Yes	379	115	76.7%	23.3%	494
	Total	1,241	405	75.4%	24.6%	1,646

Pearson chi2(1) = 0.6687 Pr = 0.413

Panel C

		Military Experience				**Total**
		No	*Yes*	*% No*	*% Yes*	
Private Sector Experience	*No*	990	162	85.9%	14.1%	1,152
	Yes	474	20	96.0%	4.0%	494
	Total	1,464	182	88.9%	11.1%	1,646

Pearson chi2(1) = 35.2537 Pr = 0.000

Panel D

		Bureaucratic Experience				**Total**
		No	Yes	% No	% Yes	
	No	1,275	189	87.1%	12.9%	1,464
Military Experience	Yes	120	62	65.9%	34.1%	182
	Total	1,395	251	84.8%	15.2%	1,646

Pearson chi2(1) = 56.0616 Pr = 0.000

Panel E

		Government Experience				**Total**
		No	Yes	% No	% Yes	
	No	1,143	321	78.1%	21.9%	1,464
Military Experience	Yes	98	84	53.8%	46.2%	182
	Total	1,241	405	75.4%	24.6%	1,646

Pearson chi2(1) = 51.2197 Pr = 0.000

Table 14: Career Histories, Pre- and Post-New Order

Panel A

		First Career under New Order?				Total
		No	*Yes*	*% No*	*% Yes*	
Private Sector Experience	*No*	505	438	53.6%	46.4%	943
	Yes	182	252	41.9%	58.1%	434
	Total	687	690	49.9%	50.1%	1,377

Pearson chi2(1) = 16.0442 Pr = 0.000

Panel B

		First Career under New Order?				Total
		No	*Yes*	*% No*	*% Yes*	
Bureaucratic Experience	*No*	629	510	55.2%	44.8%	1,139
	Yes	58	180	24.4%	75.6%	238
	Total	687	690	49.9%	50.1%	1,377

Pearson chi2(1) = 74.9645 Pr = 0.000

Panel C

		First Career under New Order?				Total
		No	*Yes*	*% No*	*% Yes*	
Government Experience	*No*	589	399	59.6%	40.4%	988
	Yes	98	291	25.2%	74.8%	389
	Total	687	690	49.9%	50.1%	1,377

Pearson chi2(1) = 132.2883 Pr = 0.000

Panel D

		First Career under New Order?				Total
		No	*Yes*	*% No*	*% Yes*	
	No	656	551	54.3%	45.7%	1,464
Military Experience	*Yes*	31	139	18.2%	81.8%	182
	Total	687	690	49.9%	50.1%	1,646

Pearson chi2(1) = 77.7398 Pr = 0.000

Figure 1: Employment Histories by Age

Panel A
Full Sample

Panel B
Party Members

Private Sector — — — Bureaucrat
············ Government —·—·— Military