

Baseline survey on Development of Democracy

DATA COMPILATION

Assessment on problems and options of democratisation in Indonesia involving 592 expert-informants in 28 cities/regencies and two special regions.



**UNIVERSITAS
GADJAH MADA**



**UNIVERSITY
OF OSLO**

**Supported by The Royal Norwegian Embassy
in Indonesia**

CONTENTS

Baseline survey on Development of Democracy	1
A. The Informants	7
Table A.1. Distribution of Informants	7
Table A.2. Gender composition of informants.....	8
Table A.3. Age composition of informants	8
Table A.4. Gender composition in each city/regency	9
Table A.5. Age composition in each city/regency.....	10
Table A.6. Frontline composition	11
Table A.7. Gender composition in each frontline	11
Table A.8. Age composition in each frontline	12
Table A.9. Frontlines composition in each city/regency.....	13
B. Assessment on Public Issues	15
Table Q1.1. Problems that are accepted as major public issues	15
Table Q1.2. Most important public issues	16
Table Q1.3. Solutions for major issues.....	17
Table Q1.4. Major issues should be subject to public governance.....	18
Table Q1.5. People knowledge on public institutions	19
Table Q1.6-Q1.7. Institutions should handle the problem	20
Table Q1.8. People involved in public debate	21
Table Q1.9. Additional issues needed to invite people to engage in controlling their ‘local’ problems	21
Table Q1.10.	22
Table Q2.1. General assessment on democratic formalized rules and regulations	23
Table Q2.1a. Comparison of General assessment on democratic formalized rules and regulations - 2003, 2007, 2013	23
Table Q2.1b. Frontliners’ assessment on democratic formalized rules and regulations (1#5)	24
Table Q2.2. Quality of the means of democracy (formalized rules and regulations)	29
Table Q2.2a. Comparison of Quality of the means of democracy (formalized rules and regulations) – 2003 and 2013	29
Table Q2.2b. Frontliners’ assessment on Quality of the means of democracy (formalized rules and regulations) (1#5)	30

Table Q2.3. How informal rules and regulations support the formalized means of democracy	35
Table Q2.4. How informal rules and regulations limit or contradict the formalized means of democracy.....	36
D. MAIN ACTORS IN PUBLIC AFFAIRS	37
Table Q3.1a. Current position of influential actors	37
Table Q3.1b. Influential actors' relation to New Order regime	38
Table Q3.1c. Influential actors' scale of business	38
Table Q3.1d. Influential actors' in various position and their relation to the New Order.....	39
Table Q3.2a. The Dominant Actors	40
Table Q3.2b. Dominant actors' relation to the New Order Regime	40
Table Q3.2c. Dominant actors' business ownership.....	41
Table Q3.2d. Current positions of the dominant actors in each frontline (1#2)	42
Table Q3.2e. Dominant actors' in each frontline and their relation to the New Order Regime (1#2)	44
Table Q3.2f. Dominant actors' in each frontline and their business ownership (1#2).....	45
Table Q3.3a. Alternative actors	46
Table Q3.3b. Dominant actors' relation to the New Order Regime	46
Table Q3.3c. Alternative actors' business ownership.....	47
Table Q3.3d. Current positions of the alternative actors in each frontline (1#2)	48
Table Q3.3e. Alternative actors' in each frontline and their relation to the New Order Regime (1#2)	50
Table Q3.3f. Alternative actors' in each frontline and their business ownership (1#2).....	51
E. MAIN ACTORS' RELATION TO THE MEANS OF DEMOCRACY	52
Table Q4.1a. How dominant actors promote the rules and regulations with regard to the Citizens' Rights.....	52
Table Q4.1b. How dominant actors promote the rules and regulations with regard to the Representation.....	53
Table Q4.1c. How dominant actors promote the rules and regulations with regard to Governance	54
Table Q4.1d. How dominant actors promote the rules and regulations with regard to Civil Society	55
Table Q4.2a. How the alternative actors promote the rules and regulations with regard to the Citizens' Rights	56
Table Q4.2b. How the alternative actors promote the rules and regulations with regard to the Representation.....	57

Table Q4.2c. How the alternative actors promote the rules and regulations with regard to Governance	58
Table Q4.2d. How the alternative actors promote the rules and regulations with regard to Civil Society	59
Table Q4.3a. How the dominant actors abuse or avoid the rules and regulations with regard to the Citizens' Rights	60
Table Q4.3b. How the dominant actors abuse or avoid the rules and regulations with regard to the Representation.....	61
Table Q4.3c. How the dominant actors abuse or avoid the rules and regulations with regard to Governance	62
Table Q4.3d. How dominant actors abuse or avoid the rules and regulations with regard to Civil Society	63
Table Q4.4a. How the alternative actors abuse or avoid the rules and regulations with regard to the Citizens' Rights	64
Table Q4.4b. How the alternative actors abuse or avoid the rules and regulations with regard to the Representation.....	65
Table Q4.4c. How the alternative actors abuse or avoid the rules and regulations with regard to the Governance and Civil Society	66
F. ACTORS' CAPACITY	67
Table Q5.1. Methods to involve people.....	67
Table Q5.2. How inclusive the actors are	67
Box Q5.3. Whom are being included by the dominant and alternative actors in the political process?	68
Box Q5.4. In what political, economic, social and cultural sectors of public life do the dominant and alternative actors include other main actors or other people?.....	69
Table Q5.5. How exclusive the actors are.....	70
Box Q5.6. Whom are being excluded by the dominant and alternative actors in the political process?	70
Box Q5.7. In what political, economic, social and cultural sectors of public life do the dominant and alternative actors exclude other main actors or other people?	71
Table Q5.8. Actors' attempt to overcome exclusion	72
Box Q5.9. Who (in addition to the major dominant and alternative actors) are involved in excluding/marginalizing people in your town/district?	73
Box Q5.10.....	74

In what political, economic, social and cultural sectors of public life do they (Q5.9) exclude people?	74
Table Q5.11. Type of rights and policies that needed to claim and develop in order to be included in public and political life	75
Table Q5.12. Prime bases of the main actors	75
Table Q5.12a. Prime bases of the Dominant actors	76
Table Q5.12b. Prime bases of the Alternative actors	77
Table Q5.13. Attempt to become legitimate and authoritative political leader	78
Table Q5.13a. Factors that facilitate the actors to become legitimate and authoritative political leader	78
Table Q5.13b. Factors that prevent the actors to become legitimate and authoritative political leader	79
Table Q5.14. Indicators of successful in using their resources to gain political legitimacy and authority	80
Table Q5.15. Causes of failure in gaining political legitimacy and authority	81
Table Q5.16. Actors' main issue	82
Table Q5.17a. Dominant actors' methods to put issues on political agenda	83
Table Q5.17b. Alternative actors' methods to put issues on political agenda	84
Table Q5.18. How the actors framing the issues	85
Table Q5.19. Indicators of successful in turning their issues into public matters	86
Table Q5.20. Cause of failure in turning issues into public matters	87
Table Q5.21a. Dominant actors' capacity to mobilize and organize support	88
Table Q5.21b. Alternative actors' capacity to mobilize and organize support	88
Table Q5.22. Methods to mobilize people	89
Table Q5.23. Indicators of successful in mobilizing and organizing support	90
Table Q5.24. Causes of failure in mobilizing and organizing support	90
Table Q5.25.	91
Table Q5.26.	91
Q5.27. To what institutions of governance?	92
Q5.28. To what institutions of governance?	92
Table Q5.29. Reasons for opt to specific institutions and mediators	93
Table Q5.30. Indicators of successful in seeking participation and developing representation	94
Table Q5.31. Causes of failure in using channels and mediator institutions	95

Q5.32. Institutions of governance where ordinary people go to solve their problems	96
Q5.33. Mediator that used by ordinary people to go to the institutions of governance	96
Table Q5.32-5.33. How ordinary people solve their problems.....	97
Box Q5.34. Why do ordinary people go to the specific institutions and mediators etc.?	98
G. STRATEGIES (DYNAMICS) OF DEMOCRATISATION	99
Table 6.1.a. Dominant actors' strategies to reach aims	99
Table 6.1.b. Dominant actors' strategies to reach aims (grouped)	100
Table 6.1.c. Alternative actors' strategies to reach aims.....	101
Table 6.2. Major challenges related to democratization that the Dominant and Alternative Actors face when implementing their strategies	102
Table 6.3. Effects of actors' strategies on problems and options of democratization	103

A. The Informants

Table A.1. Distribution of Informants

NO	CITY/REGENCY	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
1	Banda Aceh	20	3.4
2	Medan	23	3.9
3	Batam	20	3.4
4	Bekasi	17	2.9
5	Bandung	19	3.2
6	Pekalongan	25	4.2
7	Surakarta	20	3.4
8	Surabaya	24	4.1
9	Banjarmasin	24	4.1
10	Balikpapan	17	2.9
11	Makassar	22	3.7
12	Manado	25	4.2
13	Ternate	18	3.0
14	Pontianak	17	2.9
15	Kupang	24	4.1
16	Ambon	16	2.7
17	Jayapura	13	2.2
18	Aceh Selatan	18	3.0
19	Kerinci	20	3.4
20	Bengkulu	12	2.0
21	Lampung Selatan	20	3.4
22	Tangerang	20	3.4
23	Batang	20	3.4
24	Sidoarjo	20	3.4
25	Badung	15	2.5
26	KutaiKartanegara	20	3.4
27	Poso	21	3.5
28	Belu	23	3.9
29	DI Yogyakarta	16	2.7
30	DKI Jakarta	23	3.9
TOTAL		592	100.0

Table A.2. Gender composition of informants

NO	GENDER	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
1	Female	130	22.0
2	Male	462	78.0
TOTAL		592	100.0

Table A.3. Age composition of informants

NO	AGE GROUPS	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
1	25 and younger	10	1.7
2	26-30	33	5.6
3	31-35	103	17.4
4	36-40	125	21.1
5	41-45	105	17.7
6	46-50	67	11.3
7	Older than 50	120	20.3
8	Unknown	29	4.9
TOTAL		592	100.0

Table A.4. Gender composition in each city/regency

NO	CITY/REGENCY		GENDER		TOTAL
			FEMALE	MALE	
1	Banda Aceh	f	8	12	20
		%	40.0%	60.0%	100.0%
2	Medan	f	4	19	23
		%	17.4%	82.6%	100.0%
3	Batam	f	5	15	20
		%	25.0%	75.0%	100.0%
4	Bekasi	f	3	14	17
		%	17.6%	82.4%	100.0%
5	Bandung	f	5	14	19
		%	26.3%	73.7%	100.0%
6	Pekalongan	f	11	14	25
		%	44.0%	56.0%	100.0%
7	Surakarta	f	6	14	20
		%	30.0%	70.0%	100.0%
8	Surabaya	f	8	16	24
		%	33.3%	66.7%	100.0%
9	Banjarmasin	f	7	17	24
		%	29.2%	70.8%	100.0%
10	Balikpapan	f	4	13	17
		%	23.5%	76.5%	100.0%
11	Makassar	f	1	21	22
		%	4.5%	95.5%	100.0%
12	Manado	f	4	21	25
		%	16.0%	84.0%	100.0%
13	Ternate	f	3	15	18
		%	16.7%	83.3%	100.0%
14	Pontianak	f	0	17	17
		%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
15	Kupang	f	6	18	24
		%	25.0%	75.0%	100.0%
16	Ambon	f	2	14	16
		%	12.5%	87.5%	100.0%
17	Jayapura	f	5	8	13
		%	38.5%	61.5%	100.0%
18	Aceh Selatan	f	2	16	18
		%	11.1%	88.9%	100.0%
19	Kerinci	f	1	19	20
		%	5.0%	95.0%	100.0%
20	Bengkulu	f	2	10	12
		%	16.7%	83.3%	100.0%
21	Lampung Selatan	f	6	14	20
		%	30.0%	70.0%	100.0%
22	Tangerang	f	1	19	20
		%	5.0%	95.0%	100.0%
23	Batang	f	3	17	20
		%	15.0%	85.0%	100.0%
24	Sidoarjo	f	4	16	20
		%	20.0%	80.0%	100.0%
25	Badung	f	3	12	15
		%	20.0%	80.0%	100.0%
26	Kutai Kartanegara	f	8	12	20
		%	40.0%	60.0%	100.0%
27	Poso	f	3	18	21
		%	14.3%	85.7%	100.0%
28	Belu	f	3	20	23
		%	13.0%	87.0%	100.0%
29	DI Yogyakarta	f	3	13	16
		%	18.8%	81.3%	100.0%
30	DKI Jakarta	f	9	14	23
		%	39.1%	60.9%	100.0%
TOTAL		F	130	462	592
		%	22.0%	78.0%	100.0%

Table A.5. Age composition in each city/regency

NO	CITY/REGENCY		AGE GROUPS								TOTAL
			25 AND YOUNGER	26-30	31-35	36-40	41-45	46-50	OLDER THAN 50	UNKNOWN	
1	Banda Aceh	f	0	2	5	7	3	2	1	0	20
		%	.0%	10.0%	25.0%	35.0%	15.0%	10.0%	5.0%	.0%	100.0%
2	Medan	f	0	0	3	2	6	8	4	0	23
		%	.0%	.0%	13.0%	8.7%	26.1%	34.8%	17.4%	.0%	100.0%
3	Batam	f	1	3	1	2	7	4	2	0	20
		%	5.0%	15.0%	5.0%	10.0%	35.0%	20.0%	10.0%	.0%	100.0%
4	Bekasi	f	0	0	3	4	6	0	2	2	17
		%	.0%	.0%	17.6%	23.5%	35.3%	.0%	11.8%	11.8%	100.0%
5	Bandung	f	0	0	2	3	2	1	7	4	19
		%	.0%	.0%	10.5%	15.8%	10.5%	5.3%	36.8%	21.1%	100.0%
6	Pekalongan	f	3	0	7	4	1	5	4	1	25
		%	12.0%	.0%	28.0%	16.0%	4.0%	20.0%	16.0%	4.0%	100.0%
7	Surakarta	f	0	0	5	4	6	2	3	0	20
		%	.0%	.0%	25.0%	20.0%	30.0%	10.0%	15.0%	.0%	100.0%
8	Surabaya	f	0	2	3	8	3	2	4	2	24
		%	.0%	8.3%	12.5%	33.3%	12.5%	8.3%	16.7%	8.3%	100.0%
9	Banjarmasin	f	0	1	2	2	0	6	13	0	24
		%	.0%	4.2%	8.3%	8.3%	.0%	25.0%	54.2%	.0%	100.0%
10	Balikpapan	f	0	0	3	3	2	0	8	1	17
		%	.0%	.0%	17.6%	17.6%	11.8%	.0%	47.1%	5.9%	100.0%
11	Makassar	f	2	4	3	5	1	4	2	1	22
		%	9.1%	18.2%	13.6%	22.7%	4.5%	18.2%	9.1%	4.5%	100.0%
12	Manado	f	0	1	2	5	7	0	9	1	25
		%	.0%	4.0%	8.0%	20.0%	28.0%	.0%	36.0%	4.0%	100.0%
13	Ternate	f	0	0	6	4	7	1	0	0	18
		%	.0%	.0%	33.3%	22.2%	38.9%	5.6%	.0%	.0%	100.0%
14	Pontianak	f	0	0	3	2	4	3	5	0	17
		%	.0%	.0%	17.6%	11.8%	23.5%	17.6%	29.4%	.0%	100.0%
15	Kupang	f	0	0	7	7	7	0	3	0	24
		%	.0%	.0%	29.2%	29.2%	29.2%	.0%	12.5%	.0%	100.0%
16	Ambon	f	0	0	2	2	3	4	5	0	16
		%	.0%	.0%	12.5%	12.5%	18.8%	25.0%	31.3%	.0%	100.0%
17	Jayapura	f	0	1	4	4	2	0	2	0	13
		%	.0%	7.7%	30.8%	30.8%	15.4%	.0%	15.4%	.0%	100.0%
18	Aceh Selatan	f	2	3	6	2	4	1	0	0	18
		%	11.1%	16.7%	33.3%	11.1%	22.2%	5.6%	.0%	.0%	100.0%
19	Kerinci	f	0	0	2	5	5	2	6	0	20
		%	.0%	.0%	10.0%	25.0%	25.0%	10.0%	30.0%	.0%	100.0%
20	Bengkulu	f	0	2	2	1	3	1	1	2	12
		%	.0%	16.7%	16.7%	8.3%	25.0%	8.3%	8.3%	16.7%	100.0%
21	Lampung Selatan	f	0	0	1	4	7	3	4	1	20
		%	.0%	.0%	5.0%	20.0%	35.0%	15.0%	20.0%	5.0%	100.0%
22	Tangerang	f	0	0	6	8	3	1	1	1	20
		%	.0%	.0%	30.0%	40.0%	15.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	100.0%
23	Batang	f	0	1	2	5	3	2	5	2	20
		%	.0%	5.0%	10.0%	25.0%	15.0%	10.0%	25.0%	10.0%	100.0%
24	Sidoarjo	f	0	1	6	9	2	1	0	1	20
		%	.0%	5.0%	30.0%	45.0%	10.0%	5.0%	.0%	5.0%	100.0%
25	Badung	f	0	1	1	3	2	3	5	0	15
		%	.0%	6.7%	6.7%	20.0%	13.3%	20.0%	33.3%	.0%	100.0%
26	KutaiKartanegara	f	0	2	6	3	1	1	7	0	20
		%	.0%	10.0%	30.0%	15.0%	5.0%	5.0%	35.0%	.0%	100.0%
27	Poso	f	0	1	3	4	3	4	5	1	21
		%	.0%	4.8%	14.3%	19.0%	14.3%	19.0%	23.8%	4.8%	100.0%
28	Belu	f	2	5	0	5	3	2	6	0	23
		%	8.7%	21.7%	.0%	21.7%	13.0%	8.7%	26.1%	.0%	100.0%
29	DI Yogyakarta	f	0	0	2	3	1	3	3	4	16
		%	.0%	.0%	12.5%	18.8%	6.3%	18.8%	18.8%	25.0%	100.0%
30	DKI Jakarta	f	0	3	5	5	1	1	3	5	23
		%	.0%	13.0%	21.7%	21.7%	4.3%	4.3%	13.0%	21.7%	100.0%
TOTAL		f	10	33	103	125	105	67	120	29	592
		%	1.7%	5.6%	17.4%	21.1%	17.7%	11.3%	20.3%	4.9%	100.0%

Table A.6. Frontline composition

NO	FRONTLINE*	NUMBER OF INFORMANTS	PERCENT
1	Education	64	10.8
2	Health	26	4.4
3	Ecology and environment	69	11.7
4	Labor movement	30	5.1
5	Informal sectors	33	5.6
6	Agrarian and Land reform	19	3.2
7	Women and children rights	62	10.5
8	Clan, ethnic, religious inter-relation	66	11.1
9	Media and Social Media	26	4.4
10	Security sector reform	11	1.9
11	Anticorruption	58	9.8
12	Human rights	48	8.1
13	Party and election reform	58	9.8
14	Business sector	22	3.7
TOTAL		592	100.0

* Frontline is movement/arena where the informants (i.e. pro-democratic actors) are active and involve intensively promoting basic principles/values of democracy.

Table A.7. Gender composition in each frontline

NO	FRONTLINES		GENDER		TOTAL
			FEMALE	MALE	
1	Education	f	10	54	64
		%	15.6%	84.4%	100.0%
2	Health	f	6	20	26
		%	23.1%	76.9%	100.0%
3	Ecology and environment	f	8	61	69
		%	11.6%	88.4%	100.0%
4	Labor movement	f	7	23	30
		%	23.3%	76.7%	100.0%
5	Informal sectors	f	6	27	33
		%	18.2%	81.8%	100.0%
6	Agrarian and Land reform	f	4	15	19
		%	21.1%	78.9%	100.0%
7	Women and children rights	f	51	11	62
		%	82.3%	17.7%	100.0%
8	Clan, ethnic, religious inter-relation	f	7	59	66
		%	10.6%	89.4%	100.0%
9	Media and Social Media	f	3	23	26
		%	11.5%	88.5%	100.0%
10	Security sector reform	f	1	10	11
		%	9.1%	90.9%	100.0%
11	Anticorruption	f	4	54	58
		%	6.9%	93.1%	100.0%
12	Human rights	f	9	39	48
		%	18.8%	81.3%	100.0%
13	Party and election reform	f	10	48	58
		%	17.2%	82.8%	100.0%
14	Business sector	F	4	18	22
		%	18.2%	81.8%	100.0%
TOTAL		F	130	462	592
		%	22.0%	78.0%	100.0%

Table A.8. Age composition in each frontline

NO	FRONTLINES		AGE GROUPS								TOTAL
			25 AND YOUNGER	26-30	31-35	36-40	41-45	46-50	OLDER THAN 50	UNKNOWN	
1	Education	f	1	2	12	13	15	3	13	5	64
		%	1.6%	3.1%	18.8%	20.3%	23.4%	4.7%	20.3%	7.8%	100.0%
2	Health	f	0	2	5	5	7	2	3	2	26
		%	0.0%	7.7%	19.2%	19.2%	26.9%	7.7%	11.5%	7.7%	100.0%
3	Ecology and environment	f	1	9	5	17	13	7	13	4	69
		%	1.4%	13.0%	7.2%	24.6%	18.8%	10.1%	18.8%	5.8%	100.0%
4	Labor movement	f	0	0	10	4	5	6	5	0	30
		%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	13.3%	16.7%	20.0%	16.7%	0.0%	100.0%
5	Informal sectors	f	0	2	10	10	3	1	5	2	33
		%	0.0%	6.1%	30.3%	30.3%	9.1%	3.0%	15.2%	6.1%	100.0%
6	Agrarian and Land reform	f	0	0	3	7	5	1	1	2	19
		%	0.0%	0.0%	15.8%	36.8%	26.3%	5.3%	5.3%	10.5%	100.0%
7	Women and children rights	f	0	3	7	13	11	11	16	1	62
		%	0.0%	4.8%	11.3%	21.0%	17.7%	17.7%	25.8%	1.6%	100.0%
8	Clan, ethnic, religious inter-relation	f	1	1	6	12	14	8	23	1	66
		%	1.5%	1.5%	9.1%	18.2%	21.2%	12.1%	34.8%	1.5%	100.0%
9	Media and Social Media	f	2	1	7	3	2	4	6	1	26
		%	7.7%	3.8%	26.9%	11.5%	7.7%	15.4%	23.1%	3.8%	100.0%
10	Security sector reform	f	0	3	1	2	2	1	1	1	11
		%	0.0%	27.3%	9.1%	18.2%	18.2%	9.1%	9.1%	9.1%	100.0%
11	Anticorruption	f	2	4	14	11	8	4	11	4	58
		%	3.4%	6.9%	24.1%	19.0%	13.8%	6.9%	19.0%	6.9%	100.0%
12	Human rights	f	0	3	10	14	9	4	6	2	48
		%	0.0%	6.3%	20.8%	29.2%	18.8%	8.3%	12.5%	4.2%	100.0%
13	Party and election reform	f	1	3	12	11	8	10	12	1	58
		%	1.7%	5.2%	20.7%	19.0%	13.8%	17.2%	20.7%	1.7%	100.0%
14	Business sector	f	2	0	1	3	3	5	5	3	22
		%	9.1%	0.0%	4.5%	13.6%	13.6%	22.7%	22.7%	13.6%	100.0%
TOTAL		f	10	33	103	125	105	67	120	29	592
		%	1.7%	5.6%	17.4%	21.1%	17.7%	11.3%	20.3%	4.9%	100.0%

Table A.9. Frontlines composition in each city/regency

NO	CITY/REGENCY	FRONTLINES															TOTAL
		Education	Health	Ecology and envi- ronment	Labor movement	Informal sectors	Agrarian and Land reform	Women and children rights	Clan, ethnic, religious inter-relation	Media and Social Media	Security sector reform	Anti-corruption	Human rights	Party and election reform	Business sector		
	KOTA/CITY																
1	Banda Aceh	f	0	1	0	0	0	0	5	5	0	3	3	1	2	0	20
		%	.0%	5.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	25.0%	25.0%	.0%	15.0%	15.0%	5.0%	10.0%	.0%	100.0%
2	Medan	f	0	0	0	3	0	2	4	1	4	0	0	3	6	0	23
		%	.0%	.0%	.0%	13.0%	.0%	8.7%	17.4%	4.3%	17.4%	.0%	.0%	13.0%	26.1%	.0%	100.0%
3	Batam	f	10	4	0	4	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
		%	50.0%	20.0%	.0%	20.0%	.0%	.0%	10.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%
4	Bekasi	f	4	0	0	2	1	0	0	3	0	0	3	1	3	0	17
		%	23.5%	.0%	.0%	11.8%	5.9%	.0%	.0%	17.6%	.0%	.0%	17.6%	5.9%	17.6%	.0%	100.0%
5	Bandung	f	0	0	2	2	2	0	3	0	0	0	7	0	0	3	19
		%	.0%	.0%	10.5%	10.5%	10.5%	.0%	15.8%	.0%	.0%	.0%	36.8%	.0%	.0%	15.8%	100.0%
6	Pekalongan	f	0	0	0	4	1	0	0	5	4	0	0	0	6	5	25
		%	.0%	.0%	.0%	16.0%	4.0%	.0%	.0%	20.0%	16.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	24.0%	20.0%	100.0%
7	Surakarta	f	4	4	0	0	4	0	5	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	20
		%	20.0%	20.0%	.0%	.0%	20.0%	.0%	25.0%	.0%	5.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	10.0%	100.0%
8	Surabaya	f	4	0	4	0	2	1	4	1	3	0	0	5	0	0	24
		%	16.7%	.0%	16.7%	.0%	8.3%	4.2%	16.7%	4.2%	12.5%	.0%	.0%	20.8%	.0%	.0%	100.0%
9	Banjarmasin	f	1	0	3	0	0	0	4	7	5	0	0	0	4	0	24
		%	4.2%	.0%	12.5%	.0%	.0%	.0%	16.7%	29.2%	20.8%	.0%	.0%	.0%	16.7%	.0%	100.0%
10	Balikpapan	f	2	0	5	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	2	2	1	2	17
		%	11.8%	.0%	29.4%	.0%	.0%	5.9%	.0%	5.9%	5.9%	.0%	11.8%	11.8%	5.9%	11.8%	100.0%
11	Makassar	f	2	0	2	0	5	0	0	3	1	0	4	1	3	1	22
		%	9.1%	.0%	9.1%	.0%	22.7%	.0%	.0%	13.6%	4.5%	.0%	18.2%	4.5%	13.6%	4.5%	100.0%
12	Manado	f	4	1	3	0	0	0	1	5	2	0	1	3	3	2	25
		%	16.0%	4.0%	12.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	4.0%	20.0%	8.0%	.0%	4.0%	12.0%	12.0%	8.0%	100.0%
13	Ternate	f	2	0	2	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	3	5	1	0	18
		%	11.1%	.0%	11.1%	.0%	.0%	27.8%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	16.7%	27.8%	5.6%	.0%	100.0%
14	Pontianak	f	5	1	1	0	3	0	1	2	1	0	0	3	0	0	17
		%	29.4%	5.9%	5.9%	.0%	17.6%	.0%	5.9%	11.8%	5.9%	.0%	.0%	17.6%	.0%	.0%	100.0%
15	Kupang	f	0	4	0	0	5	0	0	5	0	0	0	5	5	0	24
		%	.0%	16.7%	.0%	.0%	20.8%	.0%	.0%	20.8%	.0%	.0%	.0%	20.8%	20.8%	.0%	100.0%
16	Ambon	f	0	0	4	0	0	1	3	4	0	0	0	0	4	0	16
		%	.0%	.0%	25.0%	.0%	.0%	6.3%	18.8%	25.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	25.0%	.0%	100.0%
17	Jayapura	f	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	3	0	0	5	0	0	13
		%	7.7%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	30.8%	.0%	23.1%	.0%	.0%	38.5%	.0%	.0%	100.0%

	KABUPATEN/REGENCY																
18	Aceh Selatan	f	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	4	2	6	1	18
		%	.0%	.0%	11.1%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	16.7%	.0%	.0%	22.2%	11.1%	33.3%	5.6%	100.0%
19	Kerinci	f	4	0	2	0	0	2	1	5	0	0	2	2	2	0	20
		%	20.0%	.0%	10.0%	.0%	.0%	10.0%	5.0%	25.0%	.0%	.0%	10.0%	10.0%	10.0%	.0%	100.0%
20	Bengkulu	f	0	1	2	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	2	2	3	0	12
		%	.0%	8.3%	16.7%	.0%	.0%	.0%	8.3%	8.3%	.0%	.0%	16.7%	16.7%	25.0%	.0%	100.0%
21	Lampung Selatan	f	5	0	5	0	0	0	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
		%	25.0%	.0%	25.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	25.0%	25.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%
22	Tangerang	f	6	1	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	5	0	20
		%	30.0%	5.0%	.0%	5.0%	10.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	15.0%	10.0%	25.0%	.0%	100.0%
23	Batang	f	4	5	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	20
		%	20.0%	25.0%	25.0%	25.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	5.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%
24	Sidoarjo	f	0	0	3	5	3	1	3	1	0	0	0	4	0	0	20
		%	.0%	.0%	15.0%	25.0%	15.0%	5.0%	15.0%	5.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	20.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%
25	Badung	f	0	0	5	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	2	15
		%	.0%	.0%	33.3%	26.7%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	26.7%	.0%	.0%	13.3%	100.0%
26	KutaiKartanegara	f	0	0	5	0	0	4	4	0	0	0	5	0	2	0	20
		%	.0%	.0%	25.0%	.0%	.0%	20.0%	20.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	25.0%	.0%	10.0%	.0%	100.0%
27	Poso	f	0	0	4	0	0	0	5	2	0	4	5	1	0	0	21
		%	.0%	.0%	19.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	23.8%	9.5%	.0%	19.0%	23.8%	4.8%	.0%	.0%
28	Belu	f	0	0	5	0	0	0	4	5	0	4	5	0	0	0	23
		%	.0%	.0%	21.7%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	17.4%	21.7%	.0%	17.4%	21.7%	.0%	.0%	.0%
	SPECIAL REGION																
29	DI Yogyakarta	f	2	0	0	0	1	2	3	2	1	0	2	0	2	1	16
		%	12.5%	.0%	.0%	.0%	6.3%	12.5%	18.8%	12.5%	6.3%	.0%	12.5%	.0%	12.5%	6.3%	100.0%
30	DKI Jakarta	f	4	4	5	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	3	23
		%	17.4%	17.4%	21.7%	.0%	17.4%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	13.0%	.0%	.0%	13.0%	100.0%
TOTAL		f	64	26	69	30	33	19	62	66	26	11	58	48	58	22	592
		%	10.8%	4.4%	11.7%	5.1%	5.6%	3.2%	10.5%	11.1%	4.4%	1.9%	9.8%	8.1%	9.8%	3.7%	100.0%

B. Assessment on Public Issues

Q1.1. In your assessment which of the problems that are listed in the table below do people in your town/district think are accepted as major public issues and tasks of the government in the town/district? (Multiple responses allowed)

Table Q1.1. Problems that are accepted as major public issues

NO	PROBLEM	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	PERCENTAGE <i>(based on number of responses)</i>
1	Public services	2750	55.0%
		<i>f</i>	<i>% within public services</i>
1.1.	Education	526	19.1%
1.2.	Health services	519	18.9%
1.3.	Physical security	253	9.2%
1.4.	Welfare and social security	430	15.6%
1.5.	Public transportations	363	13.2%
1.6.	Traffic	335	12.2%
1.7.	Public housing	247	9.0%
1.8.	Other issues related to public services	77	2.8%
2	Mode of economic governance	1405	28.1%
		<i>f</i>	<i>% within modes of economic governance</i>
2.1.	Fishery	188	13.4%
2.2.	Agriculture	226	16.1%
2.3.	Informal sector	369	26.3%
2.4.	Industry	261	18.6%
2.5.	Wages and labour regulations	319	22.7%
2.6.	Other issues related to modes of economic governance	42	3.0%
3	Citizens' rights	689	13.8%
		<i>f</i>	<i>% within citizens' rights</i>
3.1.	Discrimination against minority	251	36.4%
3.2.	Regulations of the rights of children	217	31.5%
3.3.	Religion-based regulations	200	29.0%
3.4.	Other issues related to citizens' rights	21	3.0%
4	Others	156	3.1%
		<i>f</i>	<i>% within others</i>
4.1.	Local (and national) politics, incl. local election issues, regional division	29	18.6%
4.2.	Environmental issues	78	50.0%
4.3.	Performance of government and good governance issues	31	19.9%
4.4.	Problems in society, e.g. drugs, moral issues	16	10.3%
4.5.	Demographic issues, e.g. population growth, jobless	1	0.6%
4.6.	Leadership	1	0.6%
TOTAL OF RESPONSES		5000	100.0%

Q1.2. In your assessment, which problem in the table do local people in your town/district think is the most important issue in the town/district? (Pick one from the list)

Table Q1.2. Most important public issues

NO	PUBLIC ISSUES	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	PERCENTAGE <i>(based on number of responses)</i>
1	Public services	420	70.95%
		<i>f</i>	<i>% within public services</i>
1.1.	Education	161	38.33%
1.2.	Health services	100	23.81%
1.3.	Physical security	17	4.05%
1.4.	Welfare and social security	62	14.76%
1.5.	Public transportation	35	8.33%
1.6.	Traffic	18	4.29%
1.7.	Public housing	4	0.95%
1.8.	Other issues related to public services	23	5.48%
2	Modes of economic governance	87	14.70%
		<i>f</i>	<i>% within modes of economic governance</i>
2.1.	Fishery	7	8.05%
2.2.	Agriculture	17	19.54%
2.3.	Informal sector	19	21.84%
2.4.	Industry	8	9.20%
2.5.	Wages and labor regulations	25	28.74%
2.6.	Other issues related to modes of economic governance	11	12.64%
3	Citizens' rights	27	4.56%
		<i>f</i>	<i>% within citizens' rights</i>
3.1.	Discrimination against minority	9	33.33%
3.2.	Regulations of the rights of children	6	22.22%
3.3.	Religion-based regulations	5	18.52%
3.4.	Others	7	25.93%
4	Others	51	8.61%
		<i>f</i>	<i>% within others</i>
4.1.	Local (and national) politics, incl. local election issues, regional division	7	13.73%
4.2.	Environmental issues	28	54.90%
4.3.	Performance of government and good governance issues	14	27.45%
4.4.	Problems in society, e.g. drugs, moral issues	2	3.92%
4.5.	Demographic issues, e.g. population growth, jobless	0	0.00%
4.6.	Leadership	0	0.00%
5	No answer	7	1.18%
TOTAL		592	100.00%

Q.1.3. In your assessment, what major issues within the policy areas listed below do people in your town/district think that are left outside public politics and public life in the town/district and left to the market, self-help among communities or private solutions? (Multiple responses allowed)

Table Q1.3. Solutions for major issues

NO	MAJOR ISSUES	ALTERNATIVE SOLUTIONS					
		MARKET		SELF-HELP		FAMILY-INDIVIDUAL	
1	Public services	Average	47.8%	Average	26.8%	Average	25.0%
1.1.	Education	388	65.5%	245	41.4%	201	34.0%
1.2.	Health services	393	66.4%	201	34.0%	177	29.9%
1.3.	Physical security	118	19.9%	181	30.6%	164	27.7%
1.4.	Welfare and social security	246	41.6%	164	27.7%	144	24.3%
1.5.	Public transportations	357	60.3%	132	22.3%	148	25.0%
1.6.	Traffic	140	23.6%	86	14.5%	80	13.5%
1.7.	Public housing	376	63.5%	84	14.2%	118	19.9%
1.8.	Other issues related to public services (N=77)	32	41.6%	23	29.9%	20	26.0%
2	Modes of economic governance	Average	47.9%	Average	29.3%	Average	27.5%
2.1.	Fishery	259	43.8%	176	29.7%	183	30.9%
2.2.	Agriculture	224	37.8%	177	29.9%	198	33.4%
2.3.	Informal sector	249	42.1%	248	41.9%	180	30.4%
2.4.	Industry	398	67.2%	107	18.1%	126	21.3%
2.5.	Wages and labor regulations	304	51.4%	151	25.5%	64	10.8%
2.6.	Other issues related to modes of economic governance (N=42)	19	45.2%	13	31.0%	16	38.1%
3	Citizens' rights	Average	10.7%	Average	50.8%	Average	27.8%
3.1.	Discrimination against minority	76	12.8%	338	57.1%	128	21.6%
3.2.	Regulations of the rights of children	69	11.7%	263	44.4%	208	35.1%
3.3.	Religion-based regulations	51	8.6%	319	53.9%	126	21.3%
3.4.	Other issues related to citizens' rights (N=21)	2	9.5%	10	47.6%	7	33.3%
4	Others						
4.1.	Local (and national) politics, incl. local election issues (N=29)	3	10.3%	7	24.1%	5	17.2%
4.2.	Environmental issues (N=78)	25	32.1%	33	42.3%	27	34.6%
4.3.	Performance of government, incl. good governance issues (N=31)	5	16.1%	15	48.4%	4	12.9%
4.4.	Problems in society, e.g. drugs, moral issues (N=16)	2	12.5%	9	56.3%	5	31.3%
4.5.	Demographic issues, e.g. population growth, jobless (N=1)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
4.6.	Leadership (N=1)	1	100.0%	1	100.0%	0	0.0%

Q1.4. In your assessment, what of the major issue areas listed in the Table B below that people say have been left out of public governance do they think should instead be subject to public governance?

Table Q1.4. Major issues should be subject to public governance

NO	MAJOR ISSUES	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	PERCENTAGE (based on number of responses)
1	Public services	2538	50.5%
		<i>f</i>	<i>% within public services</i>
1.1.	Education	401	15.8%
1.2.	Health services	392	15.5%
1.3.	Physical security	334	13.2%
1.4.	Welfare and social security	353	13.9%
1.5.	Public transportations	361	14.2%
1.6.	Traffic	342	13.5%
1.7.	Public housing	310	12.2%
1.8.	Others	45	1.8%
2	Modes of economic governance	1482	29.5%
		<i>F</i>	<i>% within modes of economic governance</i>
2.1.	Fishery	267	18.0%
2.2.	Agriculture	277	18.7%
2.3.	Informal sector	313	21.1%
2.4.	Industry	261	17.6%
2.5.	Wages and labor regulations	336	22.7%
2.6.	Others	28	1.9%
3	Citizens' rights	912	18.2%
		<i>F</i>	<i>% within citizens' rights</i>
3.1.	Discrimination against minority	323	35.4%
3.2.	Regulations of the rights of children	320	35.1%
3.3.	Religion-based regulations	258	28.3%
3.4.	Others	11	1.2%
4	Others	90	1.8%
		<i>F</i>	<i>% within others</i>
4.1.	Local (and national) politics, incl. local election issues, regional division	12	13.3%
4.2.	Environmental issues	51	56.7%
4.3.	Performance of government and good governance issues	16	17.8%
4.4.	Problems in society, e.g. drugs, moral issues	10	11.1%
4.5.	Demographic issues, e.g. population growth, jobless	0	0.00%
4.6.	Leadership	1	1.1%
TOTAL OF RESPONSES		5022	100.00%

Q1.5. In your assessment, do people in your town/district know who and what institutions are supposed to control and manage the problem that they deem to be most important (Q1.2)?

Table Q1.5. People knowledge on public institutions

NO	KNOW INSTITUTIONS OR NOT?	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
1	Yes, they know very well	212	35.9
2	Yes, but they know only partially	311	52.5
3	No, they don't really know much about this	59	10.0
4	No answer	10	1.7
TOTAL		592	100.0

Q1.6. In your assessment, who and what institutions do people in your town/district think should handle the problem you just said that they deem to be most important (Q1.2)?

Q1.7. And how should this be done?

Table Q1.6-Q1.7. Institutions should handle the problem

NO	INSTITUTIONS	F	% WITHIN EACH GROUP	% OF INFORMANTS
1	By the individual	19	3.2%	3.2%
2	By the family	3	0.5%	0.5%
3	On the market	35	5.9%	5.9%
3.1	By paying for help/services	13	37.1%	2.2%
3.2	Cooperation state-market, state-community, community-market	8	22.9%	1.4%
3.3	Support system development, e.g. human resources	3	8.6%	0.5%
3.4	Building foundation (e.g. education foundation)	1	2.9%	0.2%
3.5	No answer	10	28.6%	1.7%
4	By citizens' and people's own organizations	48	8.1%	8.1%
4.1	Getting it done through community organizations	23	47.9%	3.9%
4.2	Getting it done by joint interest/issue organizations	9	18.8%	1.5%
4.3	Getting it done through religious-based organizations	3	6.3%	0.5%
4.4	No answer	13	27.1%	2.2%
5	By state and/or local government	390	65.9%	65.9%
5.1	Getting it done by town/district government	251	64.4%	42.4%
5.2	Getting it done by provincial/ national government	43	11.0%	7.3%
5.3	People power	6	1.5%	1.0%
5.4	Synergy between the government and society	22	5.6%	3.7%
5.5	Through policies	25	6.4%	4.2%
5.6	Government control economic society/business sector	5	1.3%	0.8%
5.7	No answer	38	9.7%	6.4%
6	By state and stakeholder organizations	38	6.4%	6.4%
6.1	By the town/district government and local stakeholder organisations that have been selected at the discretion of the politicians and bureaucrats	10	26.3%	1.7%
6.2	By the provincial/ national government according to the same method of selection as in (6.1)	4	10.5%	0.7%
6.3	By town/district government and local stakeholder organisations in accordance with politically decided but impartial rules and regulations and with the right of the organisations to appoint their representatives	14	36.8%	2.4%
6.4	By the provincial/ national government according to the same method of selection as in (6.3)	3	7.9%	0.5%
6.5	No answer	7	18.4%	1.2%
7	No answer	59	10.0%	10.0%
TOTAL		592	100.0%	100.0%

Q1.8. In your own assessment, who in this town/district discuss actively debate the issue that you just said people deem to be most important (Q1.2)?

Table Q1.8. People involved in public debate

NO	PEOPLE INVOLVED IN PUBLIC DEBATE	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
1	State actors	22	3.7
2	Civil society actors	299	50.5
3	Political society actors	5	.8
4	Economic/Business actors	2	.3
5	State & Civil society actors	128	21.6
6	State & Political society actors	3	.5
7	State & Economic/Business actors	3	.5
8	Civil society & Political society actors	19	3.2
9	Civil society & Economic/Business actors	2	.3
10	Political society & Economic/Business actors	2	.3
11	All actors	69	11.7
12	No answer	38	6.4
TOTAL		592	100

Q1.9. What additional issues do you yourself think are also necessary for people at the local level to engage in, in order to control their 'local' problems?

Table Q1.9. Additional issues needed to invite people to engage in controlling their 'local' problems

NO	ISSUES	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
1	Public services	167	28.2
2	Modes of economic governance	68	11.5
3	Citizen's rights	23	3.9
4	Local and national politics (incl. regional division)	30	5.1
5	Environmental issues	63	10.6
6	Issues related to good/bad governance	83	14.0
7	Issues related to societal problems	64	10.8
8	Leadership	2	0.3
9	Issues related to civil society's roles and support system	4	0.7
10	No answer	89	15.1
TOTAL		592	100

Q1.10. In your assessment, are there any problems in your town/district with regard to who have the right to decide and control public affairs (and to thus be part of the political demos)?

Table Q1.10.

NO	PROBLEMS	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
1	Public services	117	19.8
2	Modes of economic governance	30	5.1
3	Citizen's rights	20	3.4
4	Local and national politics	33	5.6
5	Environmental issues	11	1.9
6	Issues related to good/bad governance	156	26.4
7	Issues related to societal problems	22	3.7
8	Leadership	6	1.0
9	Issues related to civil society's roles and support system	111	18.8
10	Problems related to cultural identity	9	1.5
11	Economic society	4	.7
12	No answer	73	12.3
TOTAL		592	100

C. THE QUALITY OF DEMOCRATIC RULES AND REGULATIONS

Q2.1.What is your general assessment about the situation in your town/district with regard to the following means of democracy? Is it good or fair or bad?

Table Q2.1. General assessment on democratic formalized rules and regulations

NO	RULES AND REGULATIONS	GOOD	FAIR	BAD	NO ANSWER
		(% of informants)			
A	CITIZENSHIP	29.0	42.0	25.8	3.2
1	Equal citizenship	34.3	45.3	17.9	2.5
2	Rule of law	27.7	42.9	25.2	4.2
3	Equal justice	22.3	36.0	38.5	3.2
4	Universal human rights	31.8	43.8	21.6	2.9
B	REPRESENTATION	25.5	41.7	28.8	4.0
5	Democratic political representation	27.4	35.5	33.3	3.9
6	Citizen participation	20.8	43.8	32.3	3.2
7	Institutionalized channels for interest- and issue-based representation	24.0	47.0	24.8	4.2
8	Local democracy	28.9	43.2	23.8	4.1
9	Democratic control of instruments of coercion	26.7	39.0	29.9	4.4
C	GOVERNANCE	19.4	41.7	35.1	3.7
10	Transparent, impartial and accountable governance	19.8	39.9	37.5	2.9
11	Government's independence to make decisions and implement them	19.1	43.6	32.8	4.6
D	CIVIL SOCIETY	52.0	33.4	10.6	3.9
12	Freedom of and equal chances to access to public discourses	49.0	34.5	12.2	4.4
13	Democratic citizen's self-organizing	55.1	32.4	9.1	3.4
AVERAGE		29.7	40.5	26.1	3.7

Table Q2.1a. Comparison of General assessment on democratic formalized rules and regulations - 2003, 2007, 2013

NO	CLUSTER OF RULES AND REGULATIONS	Years					
		2003		2007		2013	
		Good	Bad	Good	Bad	Good	Bad
1	Citizenship, law and rights	36	63	55	44	71	26
2	Representation	36	62	57	42	67	29
3	Governance	23	76	53	45	61	35
4	Democratically oriented civil society and direct participation	45	55	62	38	85	11
AVERAGE		35	64	57	42	70	26

Table Q2.1b. Frontliners' assessment on democratic formalized rules and regulations (1#5)

NO	RULES AND REGULATIONS	FRONTLINE: EDUCATION				FRONTLINE: HEALTH				FRONTLINE: ECOLOGY AND ENVIRONMENT			
		GOOD	FAIR	BAD	NO ANSWER	GOOD	FAIR	BAD	NO ANSWER	GOOD	FAIR	BAD	NO ANSWER
		(% of informants, N=64)				(% of informants, N=26)				(% of informants, N=69)			
A	CITIZENSHIP	38.3%	36.3%	21.1%	4.3%	31.7%	47.1%	19.2%	1.9%	25.0%	40.6%	28.6%	5.8%
1	Equal citizenship	50.0%	34.4%	12.5%	3.1%	34.6%	53.8%	11.5%	0.0%	26.1%	44.9%	23.2%	5.8%
2	Rule of law	34.4%	37.5%	21.9%	6.3%	42.3%	34.6%	19.2%	3.8%	20.3%	43.5%	30.4%	5.8%
3	Equal justice	28.1%	34.4%	31.3%	6.3%	23.1%	42.3%	34.6%	0.0%	29.0%	24.6%	40.6%	5.8%
4	Universal human rights	40.6%	39.1%	18.8%	1.6%	26.9%	57.7%	11.5%	3.8%	24.6%	49.3%	20.3%	5.8%
B	REPRESENTATION	26.9%	44.7%	22.8%	5.6%	29.2%	50.0%	18.5%	2.3%	24.1%	38.0%	31.6%	6.4%
5	Democratic political representation	21.9%	40.6%	31.3%	6.3%	26.9%	38.5%	30.8%	3.8%	23.2%	34.8%	34.8%	7.2%
6	Citizen participation	28.1%	43.8%	21.9%	6.3%	30.8%	53.8%	15.4%	0.0%	17.4%	42.0%	36.2%	4.3%
7	Institutionalized channels for interest- and issue-based representation	25.0%	46.9%	21.9%	6.3%	26.9%	69.2%	3.8%	0.0%	27.5%	36.2%	30.4%	5.8%
8	Local democracy	29.7%	43.8%	21.9%	4.7%	26.9%	53.8%	15.4%	3.8%	29.0%	44.9%	18.8%	7.2%
9	Democratic control of instruments of coercion	29.7%	48.4%	17.2%	4.7%	34.6%	34.6%	26.9%	3.8%	23.2%	31.9%	37.7%	7.2%
C	GOVERNANCE	21.9%	39.8%	32.0%	6.3%	19.2%	59.6%	17.3%	3.8%	19.6%	41.3%	34.8%	4.3%
10	Transparent, impartial and accountable governance	23.4%	40.6%	31.3%	4.7%	19.2%	61.5%	15.4%	3.8%	20.3%	39.1%	37.7%	2.9%
11	Government's independence to make decisions and implement them	20.3%	39.1%	32.8%	7.8%	19.2%	57.7%	19.2%	3.8%	18.8%	43.5%	31.9%	5.8%
D	CIVIL SOCIETY	52.3%	27.3%	16.4%	3.9%	61.5%	32.7%	1.9%	3.8%	51.4%	32.6%	10.9%	5.1%
12	Freedom of and equal chances to access to public discourses	45.3%	31.3%	20.3%	3.1%	61.5%	34.6%	0.0%	3.8%	46.4%	34.8%	13.0%	5.8%
13	Democratic citizen's self-organizing	59.4%	23.4%	12.5%	4.7%	61.5%	30.8%	3.8%	3.8%	56.5%	30.4%	8.7%	4.3%
AVERAGE		33.5%	38.7%	22.7%	5.0%	33.4%	47.9%	16.0%	2.7%	27.9%	38.5%	28.0%	5.7%

(continue to next page)

Table Q2.1b. Frontliners' assessment on democratic formalized rules and regulations (2#5)

NO	RULES AND REGULATIONS	FRONTLINE: LABOR MOVEMENT				FRONTLINE: INFORMAL SECTORS				FRONTLINE: AGRARIAN AND LAND REFORM			
		GOOD	FAIR	BAD	NO ANSWER	GOOD	FAIR	BAD	NO ANSWER	GOOD	FAIR	BAD	NO ANSWER
		<i>(% of informants, N=30)</i>				<i>(% of informants, N=33)</i>				<i>(% of informants, N=19)</i>			
A	CITIZENSHIP	22.5%	39.2%	36.7%	1.7%	13.6%	49.2%	34.1%	3.0%	30.3%	44.7%	22.4%	2.6%
1	Equal citizenship	26.7%	46.7%	23.3%	3.3%	15.2%	60.6%	24.2%	0.0%	36.8%	47.4%	15.8%	0.0%
2	Rule of law	16.7%	50.0%	30.0%	3.3%	12.1%	42.4%	39.4%	6.1%	36.8%	42.1%	21.1%	0.0%
3	Equal justice	16.7%	20.0%	63.3%	0.0%	9.1%	42.4%	45.5%	3.0%	26.3%	36.8%	31.6%	5.3%
4	Universal human rights	30.0%	40.0%	30.0%	0.0%	18.2%	51.5%	27.3%	3.0%	21.1%	52.6%	21.1%	5.3%
B	REPRESENTATION	23.3%	42.7%	29.3%	4.7%	15.2%	45.5%	35.8%	3.6%	20.0%	51.6%	26.3%	2.1%
5	Democratic political representation	16.7%	40.0%	43.3%	0.0%	21.2%	39.4%	33.3%	6.1%	31.6%	47.4%	21.1%	0.0%
6	Citizen participation	20.0%	40.0%	36.7%	3.3%	3.0%	45.5%	48.5%	3.0%	5.3%	57.9%	36.8%	0.0%
7	Institutionalized channels for interest- and issue-based representation	20.0%	50.0%	23.3%	6.7%	9.1%	42.4%	45.5%	3.0%	10.5%	73.7%	15.8%	0.0%
8	Local democracy	26.7%	46.7%	20.0%	6.7%	15.2%	60.6%	21.2%	3.0%	26.3%	31.6%	36.8%	5.3%
9	Democratic control of instruments of coercion	33.3%	36.7%	23.3%	6.7%	27.3%	39.4%	30.3%	3.0%	26.3%	47.4%	21.1%	5.3%
C	GOVERNANCE	18.3%	26.7%	53.3%	1.7%	16.7%	47.0%	33.3%	3.0%	10.5%	44.7%	42.1%	2.6%
10	Transparent, impartial and accountable governance	20.0%	26.7%	53.3%	0.0%	21.2%	39.4%	36.4%	3.0%	10.5%	42.1%	42.1%	5.3%
11	Government's independence to make decisions and implement them	16.7%	26.7%	53.3%	3.3%	12.1%	54.5%	30.3%	3.0%	10.5%	47.4%	42.1%	0.0%
D	CIVIL SOCIETY	51.7%	30.0%	16.7%	1.7%	48.5%	42.4%	6.1%	3.0%	36.8%	39.5%	21.1%	2.6%
12	Freedom of and equal chances to access to public discourses	46.7%	33.3%	20.0%	0.0%	45.5%	48.5%	3.0%	3.0%	31.6%	47.4%	15.8%	5.3%
13	Democratic citizen's self-organizing	56.7%	26.7%	13.3%	3.3%	51.5%	36.4%	9.1%	3.0%	42.1%	31.6%	26.3%	0.0%
AVERAGE		26.7%	37.2%	33.3%	2.8%	20.0%	46.4%	30.3%	3.3%	24.3%	46.6%	26.7%	2.4%

(continue to next page)

Table Q2.1b. Frontliners' assessment on democratic formalized rules and regulations (3#5)

NO	RULES AND REGULATIONS	FRONTLINE: WOMEN AND CHILDREN RIGHTS				FRONTLINE CLAN, ETHNIC, RELIGIOUS INTER-RELATION				FRONTLINE: MEDIA AND SOCIAL MEDIA			
		GOOD	FAIR	BAD	NO ANSWER	GOOD	FAIR	BAD	NO ANSWER	GOOD	FAIR	BAD	NO ANSWER
		<i>(% of informants, N=62)</i>				<i>(% of informants, N=66)</i>				<i>(% of informants, N=26)</i>			
A	CITIZENSHIP	31.5%	42.3%	25.4%	0.8%	34.5%	43.9%	18.9%	2.7%	30.8%	40.4%	26.0%	2.9%
1	Equal citizenship	32.3%	51.6%	16.1%	0.0%	40.9%	42.4%	13.6%	3.0%	42.3%	30.8%	23.1%	3.8%
2	Rule of law	30.6%	45.2%	22.6%	1.6%	33.3%	42.4%	21.2%	3.0%	34.6%	46.2%	19.2%	0.0%
3	Equal justice	27.4%	27.4%	43.5%	1.6%	27.3%	47.0%	24.2%	1.5%	19.2%	34.6%	42.3%	3.8%
4	Universal human rights	35.5%	45.2%	19.4%	0.0%	36.4%	43.9%	16.7%	3.0%	26.9%	50.0%	19.2%	3.8%
B	REPRESENTATION	30.3%	37.7%	29.7%	2.3%	30.3%	34.8%	30.0%	4.8%	19.2%	46.2%	33.1%	1.5%
5	Democratic political representation	33.9%	27.4%	37.1%	1.6%	39.4%	33.3%	24.2%	3.0%	15.4%	34.6%	46.2%	3.8%
6	Citizen participation	32.3%	41.9%	24.2%	1.6%	25.8%	25.8%	43.9%	4.5%	15.4%	42.3%	38.5%	3.8%
7	Institutionalized channels for interest- and issue-based representation	27.4%	45.2%	22.6%	4.8%	27.3%	40.9%	25.8%	6.1%	23.1%	50.0%	26.9%	0.0%
8	Local democracy	29.0%	38.7%	29.0%	3.2%	33.3%	36.4%	25.8%	4.5%	23.1%	53.8%	23.1%	0.0%
9	Democratic control of instruments of coercion	29.0%	35.5%	35.5%	0.0%	25.8%	37.9%	30.3%	6.1%	19.2%	50.0%	30.8%	0.0%
C	GOVERNANCE	27.4%	41.1%	27.4%	4.0%	24.2%	42.4%	29.5%	3.8%	23.1%	36.5%	38.5%	1.9%
10	Transparent, impartial and accountable governance	21.0%	51.6%	27.4%	0.0%	27.3%	36.4%	33.3%	3.0%	30.8%	30.8%	34.6%	3.8%
11	Government's independence to make decisions and implement them	33.9%	30.6%	27.4%	8.1%	21.2%	48.5%	25.8%	4.5%	15.4%	42.3%	42.3%	0.0%
D	CIVIL SOCIETY	62.9%	25.0%	7.3%	4.8%	52.3%	34.1%	7.6%	6.1%	67.3%	19.2%	13.5%	0.0%
12	Freedom of and equal chances to access to public discourses	62.9%	24.2%	6.5%	6.5%	51.5%	31.8%	9.1%	7.6%	53.8%	23.1%	23.1%	0.0%
13	Democratic citizen's self-organizing	62.9%	25.8%	8.1%	3.2%	53.0%	36.4%	6.1%	4.5%	80.8%	15.4%	3.8%	0.0%
AVERAGE		35.2%	37.7%	24.6%	2.5%	34.0%	38.7%	23.1%	4.2%	30.8%	38.8%	28.7%	1.8%

(continue to next page)

Table Q2.1b. Frontliners' assessment on democratic formalized rules and regulations (4#5)

NO	RULES AND REGULATIONS	FRONTLINE: SECURITY SECTOR REFORM				FRONTLINE ANTI-CORRUPTION MOVEMENT				FRONTLINE: HUMAN RIGHTS MOVEMENT			
		GOOD	FAIR	BAD	NO ANSWER	GOOD	FAIR	BAD	NO ANSWER	GOOD	FAIR	BAD	NO ANSWER
		(% of informants, N=11)				(% of informants, N=58)				(% of informants, N=26)			
A	CITIZENSHIP	25.0%	34.1%	40.9%	0.0%	27.2%	43.1%	26.7%	3.0%	21.4%	35.9%	41.7%	1.0%
1	Equal citizenship	45.5%	27.3%	27.3%	0.0%	32.8%	46.6%	19.0%	1.7%	27.1%	41.7%	31.3%	0.0%
2	Rule of law	18.2%	36.4%	45.5%	0.0%	24.1%	43.1%	29.3%	3.4%	25.0%	39.6%	33.3%	2.1%
3	Equal justice	9.1%	27.3%	63.6%	0.0%	19.0%	39.7%	39.7%	1.7%	12.5%	33.3%	52.1%	2.1%
4	Universal human rights	27.3%	45.5%	27.3%	0.0%	32.8%	43.1%	19.0%	5.2%	20.8%	29.2%	50.0%	0.0%
B	REPRESENTATION	25.5%	36.4%	36.4%	1.8%	27.2%	36.6%	31.0%	5.2%	15.8%	45.8%	36.3%	2.1%
5	Democratic political representation	27.3%	18.2%	45.5%	9.1%	29.3%	29.3%	36.2%	5.2%	16.7%	37.5%	43.8%	2.1%
6	Citizen participation	9.1%	63.6%	27.3%	0.0%	22.4%	39.7%	32.8%	5.2%	8.3%	56.3%	35.4%	0.0%
7	Institutionalized channels for interest- and issue-based representation	9.1%	54.5%	36.4%	0.0%	24.1%	43.1%	27.6%	5.2%	22.9%	50.0%	25.0%	2.1%
8	Local democracy	36.4%	36.4%	27.3%	0.0%	36.2%	34.5%	25.9%	3.4%	14.6%	47.9%	35.4%	2.1%
9	Democratic control of instruments of coercion	45.5%	9.1%	45.5%	0.0%	24.1%	36.2%	32.8%	6.9%	16.7%	37.5%	41.7%	4.2%
C	GOVERNANCE	22.7%	22.7%	54.5%	0.0%	15.5%	36.2%	45.7%	2.6%	13.5%	37.5%	47.9%	1.0%
10	Transparent, impartial and accountable governance	27.3%	18.2%	54.5%	0.0%	12.1%	34.5%	51.7%	1.7%	14.6%	29.2%	54.2%	2.1%
11	Government's independence to make decisions and implement them	18.2%	27.3%	54.5%	0.0%	19.0%	37.9%	39.7%	3.4%	12.5%	45.8%	41.7%	0.0%
D	CIVIL SOCIETY	36.4%	54.5%	9.1%	0.0%	44.8%	37.9%	14.7%	2.6%	50.0%	35.4%	13.5%	1.0%
12	Freedom of and equal chances to access to public discourses	27.3%	63.6%	9.1%	0.0%	43.1%	36.2%	19.0%	1.7%	45.8%	33.3%	18.8%	2.1%
13	Democratic citizen's self-organizing	45.5%	45.5%	9.1%	0.0%	46.6%	39.7%	10.3%	3.4%	54.2%	37.5%	8.3%	0.0%
AVERAGE		26.6%	36.4%	36.4%	0.7%	28.1%	38.7%	29.4%	3.7%	22.4%	39.9%	36.2%	1.4%

(continue to next page)

Table Q2.1b. Frontliners' assessment on democratic formalized rules and regulations (5#5)

NO	RULES AND REGULATIONS	FRONTLINE: PARTY AND ELECTION REFORM				FRONTLINE BUSINESS SECTOR			
		GOOD	FAIR	BAD	NO ANSWER	GOOD	FAIR	BAD	NO ANSWER
		<i>(% of informants, N=58)</i>				<i>(% of informants, N=22)</i>			
A	CITIZENSHIP	28.0%	46.6%	19.4%	6.0%	43.2%	44.3%	8.0%	4.5%
1	Equal citizenship	29.3%	53.4%	12.1%	5.2%	54.5%	40.9%	0.0%	4.5%
2	Rule of law	24.1%	48.3%	19.0%	8.6%	40.9%	45.5%	4.5%	9.1%
3	Equal justice	22.4%	41.4%	31.0%	5.2%	18.2%	59.1%	18.2%	4.5%
4	Universal human rights	36.2%	43.1%	15.5%	5.2%	59.1%	31.8%	9.1%	0.0%
B	REPRESENTATION	29.3%	43.8%	23.1%	3.8%	31.8%	47.3%	19.1%	1.8%
5	Democratic political representation	31.0%	39.7%	27.6%	1.7%	45.5%	36.4%	13.6%	4.5%
6	Citizen participation	20.7%	50.0%	25.9%	3.4%	27.3%	45.5%	27.3%	0.0%
7	Institutionalized channels for interest- and issue-based representation	27.6%	48.3%	19.0%	5.2%	27.3%	50.0%	22.7%	0.0%
8	Local democracy	37.9%	39.7%	19.0%	3.4%	31.8%	50.0%	13.6%	4.5%
9	Democratic control of instruments of coercion	29.3%	41.4%	24.1%	5.2%	27.3%	54.5%	18.2%	0.0%
C	GOVERNANCE	10.3%	52.6%	31.0%	6.0%	29.5%	47.7%	18.2%	4.5%
10	Transparent, impartial and accountable governance	10.3%	46.6%	37.9%	5.2%	27.3%	50.0%	18.2%	4.5%
11	Government's independence to make decisions and implement them	10.3%	58.6%	24.1%	6.9%	31.8%	45.5%	18.2%	4.5%
D	CIVIL SOCIETY	45.7%	42.2%	6.0%	6.0%	59.1%	29.5%	4.5%	6.8%
12	Freedom of and equal chances to access to public discourses	48.3%	41.4%	3.4%	6.9%	59.1%	27.3%	4.5%	9.1%
13	Democratic citizen's self-organizing	43.1%	43.1%	8.6%	5.2%	59.1%	31.8%	4.5%	4.5%
AVERAGE		28.5%	45.8%	20.6%	5.2%	39.2%	43.7%	13.3%	3.8%

Q2.2. In your assessment, has the quality of the means of democracy (rules and regulations) improved or worsened or remained the same since the first *Pemilukada* (direct elections of local executives) during 2008/2009 in your town/district?

Table Q2.2. Quality of the means of democracy (formalized rules and regulations)

NO	RULES AND REGULATIONS	IMPROVED	WORSENER	NOT CHANGED	NO ANSWER
		(% of informants)			
A	CITIZENSHIP	33.4	14.6	48.0	4.0
1	Equal citizenship	38.5	12.7	44.9	3.9
2	Rule of law	33.4	14.2	47.1	5.2
3	Equal justice	27.2	16.7	52.4	3.7
4	Universal human rights	34.6	14.7	47.5	3.2
B	REPRESENTATION	32.5	15.1	47.5	4.9
5	Democratic political representation	28.9	21.3	45.3	4.6
6	Citizen participation	31.8	14.4	50.2	3.7
7	Institutionalized channels for interest- and issue-based representation	35.8	11.5	47.3	5.4
8	Local democracy	34.0	14.0	46.8	5.2
9	Democratic control of instruments of coercion	32.3	14.2	48.0	5.6
C	GOVERNANCE	27.8	17.1	50.4	4.6
10	Transparent, impartial and accountable governance	29.7	16.9	49.7	3.7
11	Government's independence to make decisions and implement them	25.8	17.4	51.2	5.6
D	CIVIL SOCIETY	54.1	7.5	34.3	4.1
12	Freedom of and equal chances to access to public discourses	51.9	6.6	37.2	4.4
13	Democratic citizen's self-organizing	56.3	8.4	31.4	3.9
AVERAGE		35.4	14.1	46.1	4.5

Table Q2.2a. Comparison of Quality of the means of democracy (formalized rules and regulations) – 2003 and 2013

NO	CLUSTER OF RULES AND REGULATIONS	Years					
		2003			2013		
		Improved	Worsened	Not changed	Improved	Worsened	Not changed
1	Citizenship, law and rights	34	17	48	33	15	48
2	Representation	33	22	49	33	15	48
3	Governance	23	76	0	28	17	50
4	Democratically oriented civil society and direct participation	45	55	0	54	8	34
AVERAGE		34	42	24	35	14	46

Table Q2.2b. Frontliners' assessment on Quality of the means of democracy (formalized rules and regulations) (1#5)

NO	RULES AND REGULATIONS	FRONTLINE: EDUCATION				FRONTLINE: HEALTH				FRONTLINE: ECOLOGY AND ENVIRONMENT			
		IMPROVED	WORSENE	NOT CHANGED	NO ANSWER	IMPROVED	WORSENE	NOT CHANGED	NO ANSWER	IMPROVED	WORSENE	NOT CHANGED	NO ANSWER
		(% of informants, N=64)				(% of informants, N=26)				(% of informants, N=69)			
A	CITIZENSHIP	41.4%	10.5%	43.4%	4.7%	51.0%	10.6%	35.6%	2.9%	23.9%	14.9%	53.3%	8.0%
1	Equal citizenship	48.4%	6.3%	40.6%	4.7%	57.7%	7.7%	34.6%	0.0%	27.5%	11.6%	53.6%	7.2%
2	Rule of law	39.1%	6.3%	48.4%	6.3%	57.7%	7.7%	30.8%	3.8%	20.3%	17.4%	53.6%	8.7%
3	Equal justice	34.4%	17.2%	42.2%	6.3%	38.5%	19.2%	42.3%	0.0%	24.6%	14.5%	52.2%	8.7%
4	Universal human rights	43.8%	12.5%	42.2%	1.6%	50.0%	7.7%	34.6%	7.7%	23.2%	15.9%	53.6%	7.2%
B	REPRESENTATION	35.9%	13.8%	42.5%	7.8%	47.7%	13.1%	34.6%	4.6%	25.5%	18.8%	48.4%	7.2%
5	Democratic political representation	31.3%	20.3%	42.2%	6.3%	26.9%	26.9%	42.3%	3.8%	20.3%	26.1%	44.9%	8.7%
6	Citizen participation	35.9%	9.4%	48.4%	6.3%	57.7%	7.7%	30.8%	3.8%	24.6%	18.8%	50.7%	5.8%
7	Institutionalized channels for interest- and issue-based representation	37.5%	17.2%	35.9%	9.4%	61.5%	7.7%	26.9%	3.8%	33.3%	15.9%	44.9%	5.8%
8	Local democracy	39.1%	14.1%	40.6%	6.3%	50.0%	15.4%	30.8%	3.8%	30.4%	14.5%	46.4%	8.7%
9	Democratic control of instruments of coercion	35.9%	7.8%	45.3%	10.9%	42.3%	7.7%	42.3%	7.7%	18.8%	18.8%	55.1%	7.2%
C	GOVERNANCE	31.3%	19.5%	42.2%	7.0%	51.9%	0.0%	42.3%	5.8%	25.4%	20.3%	50.0%	4.3%
10	Transparent, impartial and accountable governance	34.4%	20.3%	40.6%	4.7%	50.0%	0.0%	42.3%	7.7%	27.5%	18.8%	50.7%	2.9%
11	Government's independence to make decisions and implement them	28.1%	18.8%	43.8%	9.4%	53.8%	0.0%	42.3%	3.8%	23.2%	21.7%	49.3%	5.8%
D	CIVIL SOCIETY	50.0%	10.9%	35.2%	3.9%	73.1%	1.9%	19.2%	5.8%	54.3%	8.7%	31.9%	5.1%
12	Freedom of and equal chances to access to public discourses	45.3%	9.4%	42.2%	3.1%	69.2%	0.0%	26.9%	3.8%	49.3%	8.7%	36.2%	5.8%
13	Democratic citizen's self-organizing	54.7%	12.5%	28.1%	4.7%	76.9%	3.8%	11.5%	7.7%	59.4%	8.7%	27.5%	4.3%
AVERAGE		39.1%	13.2%	41.6%	6.1%	53.3%	8.6%	33.7%	4.4%	29.4%	16.3%	47.6%	6.7%

(continue to next page)

Table Q2.2b. Frontliners' assessment on Quality of the means of democracy (formalized rules and regulations) (2#5)

NO	RULES AND REGULATIONS	FRONTLINE: LABOR MOVEMENT				FRONTLINE: INFORMAL SECTORS				FRONTLINE: AGRARIAN AND LAND REFORM			
		IMPROVED	WORSENE	NOT CHANGED	NO ANSWER	IMPROVED	WORSENE	NOT CHANGED	NO ANSWER	IMPROVED	WORSENE	NOT CHANGED	NO ANSWER
		(% of informants, N=30)				(% of informants, N=33)				(% of informants, N=19)			
A	CITIZENSHIP	30.0%	14.2%	55.8%	0.0%	31.1%	18.2%	48.5%	2.3%	34.2%	18.4%	46.1%	1.3%
1	Equal citizenship	33.3%	3.3%	63.3%	0.0%	42.4%	12.1%	45.5%	0.0%	47.4%	21.1%	31.6%	0.0%
2	Rule of law	30.0%	16.7%	53.3%	0.0%	21.2%	24.2%	48.5%	6.1%	47.4%	10.5%	42.1%	0.0%
3	Equal justice	16.7%	23.3%	60.0%	0.0%	24.2%	21.2%	51.5%	3.0%	15.8%	26.3%	57.9%	0.0%
4	Universal human rights	40.0%	13.3%	46.7%	0.0%	36.4%	15.2%	48.5%	0.0%	26.3%	15.8%	52.6%	5.3%
B	REPRESENTATION	28.7%	16.0%	51.3%	4.0%	32.1%	17.6%	49.1%	1.2%	33.7%	12.6%	51.6%	2.1%
5	Democratic political representation	6.7%	36.7%	56.7%	0.0%	27.3%	21.2%	48.5%	3.0%	42.1%	21.1%	36.8%	0.0%
6	Citizen participation	30.0%	13.3%	56.7%	0.0%	18.2%	18.2%	63.6%	0.0%	36.8%	15.8%	47.4%	0.0%
7	Institutionalized channels for interest- and issue-based representation	40.0%	6.7%	43.3%	10.0%	33.3%	15.2%	48.5%	3.0%	31.6%	5.3%	63.2%	0.0%
8	Local democracy	33.3%	10.0%	50.0%	6.7%	30.3%	12.1%	57.6%	0.0%	26.3%	5.3%	63.2%	5.3%
9	Democratic control of instruments of coercion	33.3%	13.3%	50.0%	3.3%	51.5%	21.2%	27.3%	0.0%	31.6%	15.8%	47.4%	5.3%
C	GOVERNANCE	23.3%	18.3%	56.7%	1.7%	33.3%	18.2%	48.5%	0.0%	34.2%	18.4%	42.1%	5.3%
10	Transparent, impartial and accountable governance	30.0%	16.7%	53.3%	0.0%	39.4%	12.1%	48.5%	0.0%	31.6%	10.5%	52.6%	5.3%
11	Government's independence to make decisions and implement them	16.7%	20.0%	60.0%	3.3%	27.3%	24.2%	48.5%	0.0%	36.8%	26.3%	31.6%	5.3%
D	CIVIL SOCIETY	58.3%	5.0%	35.0%	1.7%	60.6%	10.6%	27.3%	1.5%	47.4%	7.9%	39.5%	5.3%
12	Freedom of and equal chances to access to public discourses	50.0%	10.0%	40.0%	0.0%	66.7%	3.0%	27.3%	3.0%	42.1%	10.5%	42.1%	5.3%
13	Democratic citizen's self-organizing	66.7%	0.0%	30.0%	3.3%	54.5%	18.2%	27.3%	0.0%	52.6%	5.3%	36.8%	5.3%
AVERAGE		32.8%	14.1%	51.0%	2.1%	36.4%	16.8%	45.5%	1.4%	36.0%	14.6%	46.6%	2.8%

(continue to next page)

Table Q2.2b. Frontliners' assessment on Quality of the means of democracy (formalized rules and regulations) (3#5)

NO	RULES AND REGULATIONS	FRONTLINE: WOMEN AND CHILDREN RIGHTS				FRONTLINE CLAN, ETHNIC, RELIGIOUS INTER-RELATION				FRONTLINE: MEDIA AND SOCIAL MEDIA			
		IMPROVED	WORSENE	NOT CHANGED	NO ANSWER	IMPROVED	WORSENE	NOT CHANGED	NO ANSWER	IMPROVED	WORSENE	NOT CHANGED	NO ANSWER
		(% of informants, N=62)				(% of informants, N=66)				(% of informants, N=26)			
A	CITIZENSHIP	44.0%	13.7%	41.5%	0.8%	29.5%	15.2%	51.1%	4.2%	35.6%	10.6%	52.9%	1.0%
1	Equal citizenship	48.4%	9.7%	41.9%	0.0%	30.3%	22.7%	42.4%	4.5%	46.2%	11.5%	38.5%	3.8%
2	Rule of law	48.4%	14.5%	35.5%	1.6%	33.3%	13.6%	48.5%	4.5%	42.3%	11.5%	46.2%	0.0%
3	Equal justice	37.1%	16.1%	45.2%	1.6%	22.7%	10.6%	63.6%	3.0%	19.2%	7.7%	73.1%	0.0%
4	Universal human rights	41.9%	14.5%	43.5%	0.0%	31.8%	13.6%	50.0%	4.5%	34.6%	11.5%	53.8%	0.0%
B	REPRESENTATION	41.9%	14.5%	40.3%	3.2%	27.6%	12.1%	53.6%	6.7%	22.3%	17.7%	58.5%	1.5%
5	Democratic political representation	40.3%	17.7%	40.3%	1.6%	25.8%	13.6%	56.1%	4.5%	15.4%	30.8%	50.0%	3.8%
6	Citizen participation	50.0%	12.9%	33.9%	3.2%	22.7%	12.1%	59.1%	6.1%	23.1%	7.7%	65.4%	3.8%
7	Institutionalized channels for interest- and issue-based representation	45.2%	6.5%	41.9%	6.5%	31.8%	9.1%	50.0%	9.1%	23.1%	15.4%	61.5%	0.0%
8	Local democracy	38.7%	16.1%	41.9%	3.2%	28.8%	12.1%	53.0%	6.1%	19.2%	23.1%	57.7%	0.0%
9	Democratic control of instruments of coercion	35.5%	19.4%	43.5%	1.6%	28.8%	13.6%	50.0%	7.6%	30.8%	11.5%	57.7%	0.0%
C	GOVERNANCE	36.3%	16.9%	41.9%	4.8%	22.0%	12.9%	59.1%	6.1%	28.8%	11.5%	55.8%	3.8%
10	Transparent, impartial and accountable governance	40.3%	14.5%	43.5%	1.6%	27.3%	12.1%	56.1%	4.5%	26.9%	11.5%	53.8%	7.7%
11	Government's independence to make decisions and implement them	32.3%	19.4%	40.3%	8.1%	16.7%	13.6%	62.1%	7.6%	30.8%	11.5%	57.7%	0.0%
D	CIVIL SOCIETY	61.3%	4.0%	29.8%	4.8%	48.5%	6.1%	38.6%	6.8%	51.9%	9.6%	38.5%	0.0%
12	Freedom of and equal chances to access to public discourses	62.9%	1.6%	29.0%	6.5%	51.5%	3.0%	36.4%	9.1%	42.3%	19.2%	38.5%	0.0%
13	Democratic citizen's self-organizing	59.7%	6.5%	30.6%	3.2%	45.5%	9.1%	40.9%	4.5%	61.5%	0.0%	38.5%	0.0%
AVERAGE		44.7%	13.0%	39.3%	3.0%	30.5%	12.2%	51.4%	5.8%	32.0%	13.3%	53.3%	1.5%

(continue to next page)

Table Q2.2b. Frontliners' assessment on Quality of the means of democracy (formalized rules and regulations) (4#5)

NO	RULES AND REGULATIONS	FRONTLINE: SECURITY SECTOR REFORM				FRONTLINE ANTI-CORRUPTION MOVEMENT				FRONTLINE: HUMAN RIGHTS MOVEMENT			
		IMPROVED	WORSENER	NOT CHANGED	NO ANSWER	IMPROVED	WORSENER	NOT CHANGED	NO ANSWER	IMPROVED	WORSENER	NOT CHANGED	NO ANSWER
		(% of informants, N=11)				(% of informants, N=58)				(% of informants, N=26)			
A	CITIZENSHIP	29.5%	34.1%	36.4%	0.0%	28.9%	20.3%	44.4%	6.5%	20.3%	17.7%	60.9%	1.0%
1	Equal citizenship	36.4%	27.3%	36.4%	0.0%	32.8%	17.2%	44.8%	5.2%	22.9%	20.8%	56.3%	0.0%
2	Rule of law	27.3%	36.4%	36.4%	0.0%	27.6%	22.4%	41.4%	8.6%	25.0%	14.6%	58.3%	2.1%
3	Equal justice	18.2%	36.4%	45.5%	0.0%	29.3%	22.4%	41.4%	6.9%	12.5%	12.5%	72.9%	2.1%
4	Universal human rights	36.4%	36.4%	27.3%	0.0%	25.9%	19.0%	50.0%	5.2%	20.8%	22.9%	56.3%	0.0%
B	REPRESENTATION	34.5%	23.6%	40.0%	1.8%	29.7%	20.3%	43.1%	6.9%	22.1%	12.5%	62.9%	2.5%
5	Democratic political representation	27.3%	27.3%	36.4%	9.1%	31.0%	27.6%	32.8%	8.6%	22.9%	12.5%	62.5%	2.1%
6	Citizen participation	27.3%	18.2%	54.5%	0.0%	25.9%	22.4%	46.6%	5.2%	22.9%	16.7%	60.4%	0.0%
7	Institutionalized channels for interest- and issue-based representation	18.2%	18.2%	63.6%	0.0%	27.6%	15.5%	50.0%	6.9%	29.2%	6.3%	62.5%	2.1%
8	Local democracy	36.4%	27.3%	36.4%	0.0%	39.7%	17.2%	37.9%	5.2%	16.7%	12.5%	64.6%	6.3%
9	Democratic control of instruments of coercion	63.6%	27.3%	9.1%	0.0%	24.1%	19.0%	48.3%	8.6%	18.8%	14.6%	64.6%	2.1%
C	GOVERNANCE	27.3%	36.4%	36.4%	0.0%	19.0%	23.3%	50.9%	6.9%	14.6%	16.7%	67.7%	1.0%
10	Transparent, impartial and accountable governance	27.3%	45.5%	27.3%	0.0%	20.7%	27.6%	46.6%	5.2%	16.7%	18.8%	62.5%	2.1%
11	Government's independence to make decisions and implement them	27.3%	27.3%	45.5%	0.0%	17.2%	19.0%	55.2%	8.6%	12.5%	14.6%	72.9%	0.0%
D	CIVIL SOCIETY	31.8%	4.5%	63.6%	0.0%	44.8%	9.5%	40.5%	5.2%	45.8%	10.4%	42.7%	1.0%
12	Freedom of and equal chances to access to public discourses	36.4%	0.0%	63.6%	0.0%	41.4%	12.1%	43.1%	3.4%	37.5%	8.3%	52.1%	2.1%
13	Democratic citizen's self-organizing	27.3%	9.1%	63.6%	0.0%	48.3%	6.9%	37.9%	6.9%	54.2%	12.5%	33.3%	0.0%
AVERAGE		31.5%	25.9%	42.0%	0.7%	30.1%	19.1%	44.3%	6.5%	24.0%	14.4%	59.9%	1.6%

(continue to next page)

Table Q2.2b. Frontliners' assessment on Quality of the means of democracy (formalized rules and regulations) (5#5)

NO	RULES AND REGULATIONS	FRONTLINE: PARTY AND ELECTION REFORM				FRONTLINE BUSINESS SECTOR			
		IMPROVED	WORSENER	NOT CHANGED	NO ANSWER	IMPROVED	WORSENER	NOT CHANGED	NO ANSWER
		(% of informants, N=58)				(% of informants, N=22)			
A	CITIZENSHIP	35.3%	10.8%	46.6%	7.3%	44.3%	5.7%	43.2%	6.8%
1	Equal citizenship	41.4%	8.6%	41.4%	8.6%	45.5%	0.0%	40.9%	13.6%
2	Rule of law	29.3%	8.6%	50.0%	12.1%	36.4%	4.5%	54.5%	4.5%
3	Equal justice	34.5%	17.2%	44.8%	3.4%	36.4%	9.1%	50.0%	4.5%
4	Universal human rights	36.2%	8.6%	50.0%	5.2%	59.1%	9.1%	27.3%	4.5%
B	REPRESENTATION	42.8%	11.0%	41.0%	5.2%	34.5%	11.8%	50.9%	2.7%
5	Democratic political representation	39.7%	17.2%	39.7%	3.4%	45.5%	13.6%	36.4%	4.5%
6	Citizen participation	37.9%	12.1%	44.8%	5.2%	36.4%	13.6%	50.0%	0.0%
7	Institutionalized channels for interest- and issue-based representation	46.6%	6.9%	43.1%	3.4%	27.3%	18.2%	54.5%	0.0%
8	Local democracy	46.6%	12.1%	34.5%	6.9%	31.8%	9.1%	54.5%	4.5%
9	Democratic control of instruments of coercion	43.1%	6.9%	43.1%	6.9%	31.8%	4.5%	59.1%	4.5%
C	GOVERNANCE	29.3%	14.7%	50.9%	5.2%	29.5%	18.2%	45.5%	6.8%
10	Transparent, impartial and accountable governance	27.6%	17.2%	50.0%	5.2%	22.7%	13.6%	59.1%	4.5%
11	Government's independence to make decisions and implement them	31.0%	12.1%	51.7%	5.2%	36.4%	22.7%	31.8%	9.1%
D	CIVIL SOCIETY	63.8%	6.9%	24.1%	5.2%	59.1%	2.3%	34.1%	4.5%
12	Freedom of and equal chances to access to public discourses	67.2%	1.7%	25.9%	5.2%	54.5%	4.5%	36.4%	4.5%
13	Democratic citizen's self-organizing	60.3%	12.1%	22.4%	5.2%	63.6%	0.0%	31.8%	4.5%
AVERAGE		41.6%	10.9%	41.6%	5.8%	40.6%	9.4%	45.1%	4.9%

Q2.3. In your assessment, what informal rules and regulations support the formal means of democracy?

Table Q2.3. How informal rules and regulations support the formalized means of democracy

NO	RULES AND REGULATIONS	INFORMALITY SUPPORTS FORMALIZED MEANS OF DEMOCRACY			
		Values	Organization	Mechanism	Uncategorized
A	CITIZENSHIP	29.4%	12.4%	39.9%	18.4%
1	Equal citizenship	33.9%	11.2%	36.2%	18.8%
2	Rule of law	24.9%	11.0%	39.1%	24.9%
3	Equal justice	25.0%	16.0%	43.5%	15.4%
4	Universal human rights	33.7%	11.2%	40.6%	14.4%
B	REPRESENTATION	12.9%	20.2%	44.4%	22.5%
5	Democratic political representation	12.2%	10.0%	32.8%	45.0%
6	Rights based citizen participation in public governance	10.9%	18.3%	51.3%	19.5%
7	Institutionalized channels for interest and issue-based representation in public governance	7.6%	40.2%	33.5%	18.7%
8	Local democracy	14.3%	11.9%	55.2%	18.6%
9	Democratic control of instruments of coercion	19.3%	20.5%	49.2%	11.0%
C	GOVERNANCE	18.6%	18.6%	50.4%	12.4%
10	Transparent, impartial and accountable governance	14.6%	18.0%	55.7%	11.8%
11	Government's independence to make decisions and implement them	22.7%	19.3%	45.0%	13.0%
D	CIVIL SOCIETY	16.9%	22.5%	51.8%	8.9%
12	Freedom of and equal chances to access to public discourses	20.2%	11.3%	60.2%	8.3%
13	Democratic citizens' self-organizing	13.5%	33.7%	43.4%	9.4%

Q2.4. In your assessment, what informal rules and regulations limit or contradict the formal means of democracy?

Table Q2.4. How informal rules and regulations limit or contradict the formalized means of democracy

NO	RULES AND REGULATIONS	INFORMALITY CONTRADICTS FORMAL MEANS OF DEMOCRACY			
		Values	Organization	Mechanism	Uncategorized
A	CITIZENSHIP	32.2%	9.8%	46.7%	11.4%
1	Equal citizenship	41.0%	9.2%	40.7%	9.2%
2	Rule of law	28.8%	9.0%	50.5%	11.8%
3	Equal justice	25.6%	13.2%	48.3%	12.8%
4	Universal human rights	33.3%	7.7%	47.3%	11.7%
B	REPRESENTATION	29.4%	12.7%	42.9%	16.1%
5	Democratic political representation	38.2%	4.1%	30.7%	27.0%
6	Rights based citizen participation in public governance	32.7%	10.2%	36.2%	20.9%
7	Institutionalized channels for interest and issue-based representation in public governance	28.0%	18.0%	42.9%	11.2%
8	Local democracy	29.7%	10.4%	50.5%	9.4%
9	Democratic control of instruments of coercion	18.4%	20.9%	54.4%	11.9%
C	GOVERNANCE	21.8%	14.6%	53.1%	10.4%
10	Transparent, impartial and accountable governance	20.4%	11.4%	59.2%	9.0%
11	Government's independence to make decisions and implement them	23.2%	17.8%	47.0%	11.9%
D	CIVIL SOCIETY	31.3%	15.2%	44.1%	9.4%
12	Freedom of and equal chances to access to public discourses	28.8%	12.4%	48.0%	10.7%
13	Democratic citizens' self-organizing	33.7%	18.0%	40.1%	8.1%

D. MAIN ACTORS IN PUBLIC AFFAIRS

Q3.1. Who are the main influential actors – individual or collective – in the discussion about public issues in your town/district? (Please mention 2-4 actors in each arena mentioned in Table F)

Table Q3.1a. Current position of influential actors

NO	CURRENT POSITION	STATE AND GOVERNMENT		POLITICAL SOCIETY		BUSINESS LIFE		CIVIL SOCIETY		ALL INFLUENTIAL ACTORS	
		F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
1	Member of national/local parliament	254	16.0%	376	27.4%	38	3.2%	19	1.2%	687	11.8%
2	Party leader/prominent figure	66	4.1%	452	32.9%	63	5.3%	33	2.0%	614	10.6%
3	Public official	718	45.1%	79	5.7%	23	1.9%	10	0.6%	830	14.3%
4	Bureaucrat	292	18.4%	11	0.8%	7	0.6%	14	0.8%	324	5.6%
5	State's auxiliary body/Commissioner	18	1.1%	6	0.4%	1	0.1%	31	1.9%	56	1.0%
6	Businessman/Entrepreneur	2	0.1%	20	1.5%	802	67.6%	21	1.3%	845	14.6%
7	CSO activist	21	1.3%	42	3.1%	21	1.8%	870	52.8%	954	16.4%
8	Public figure/Adat leader/Ethnic group leader	34	2.1%	172	12.5%	142	12.0%	264	16.0%	611	10.5%
9	Religious leader	8	0.5%	50	3.6%	6	0.5%	130	7.9%	194	3.3%
10	Military/Police officer	65	4.1%	2	0.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	67	1.2%
11	Militia	0	0.0%	1	0.1%	0	0.0%	6	0.4%	7	0.1%
12	Professional, Academician	34	2.1%	70	5.1%	36	3.0%	169	10.3%	309	5.3%
13	Unknown	79	5.0%	93	6.8%	49	4.1%	81	4.9%	303	5.2%
TOTAL		1591	100.0%	1374	100.0%	1188	100.0%	1648	100.0%	5801	100.0%

Table Q3.1b. Influential actors' relation to New Order regime

NO	RELATION TO THE NEW ORDER	STATE AND GOVERNMENT		POLITICAL SOCIETY		BUSINESS LIFE		CIVIL SOCIETY		ALL INFLUENTIAL ACTORS	
		F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
1	Old elite / Have relation to New Order regime	325	20.4%	191	13.9%	196	16.5%	29	1.8%	741	12.8%
2	New elite / Do not have relation to the New Order regime	595	37.4%	559	40.7%	358	30.1%	647	39.3%	2160	37.2%
3	Unknown	671	42.2%	624	45.4%	634	53.4%	972	59.0%	2900	50.0%
TOTAL		1591	100.0%	1374	100.0%	1188	100.0%	1648	100.0%	5801	100.0%

Table Q3.1c. Influential actors' scale of business

NO	SCALE OF BUSINESS	STATE AND GOVERNMENT		POLITICAL SOCIETY		BUSINESS LIFE		CIVIL SOCIETY		ALL INFLUENTIAL ACTORS	
		F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
1	Large scale (Big/Medium-National/Big-Local enterprises)	415	26.1%	241	17.5%	753	63.4%	83	5.0%	1492	25.7%
2	Medium/Small scale (Medium/Small-Local business)	81	5.1%	64	4.7%	40	3.4%	37	2.2%	222	3.8%
3	Do not have own business	542	34.1%	524	38.1%	28	2.4%	651	39.5%	1745	30.1%
4	Unknown	553	34.8%	545	39.7%	367	30.9%	877	53.2%	2342	40.4%
TOTAL		1591	100.0%	1374	100.0%	1188	100.0%	1648	100.0%	5801	100.0%

Table Q3.1d. Influential actors' in various position and their relation to the New Order

NO	ACTOR'S CURRENT POSITION	RELATION TO THE NEW ORDER REGIME		
		OLD ELITE	NEW ELITE	UNKNOWN
1	Member of national/local parliament	12.4%	46.1%	41.5%
2	Party leader/prominent figure	22.0%	42.2%	35.8%
3	Public official	31.6%	51.1%	17.3%
4	Bureaucrat	7.1%	33.6%	59.3%
5	State's auxiliary body/Commissioner	1.8%	67.9%	30.4%
6	Businessman/Entrepreneur	20.0%	20.5%	59.5%
7	CSO activist	1.3%	41.1%	57.7%
8	Public figure/Adat leader/Ethnic group leader	6.7%	34.6%	58.7%
9	Religious leader	0.5%	43.8%	55.7%
10	Military/Police officer	2.4%	30.1%	67.5%
11	Militia	20.0%	0.0%	80.0%
12	Professional, Academician	1.7%	40.4%	57.9%
13	Unknown	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
TOTAL		13.2%	37.3%	49.5%

Q3.2. Who among the influential actors (Q3.1) are the most dominant actors (irrespective of whether they foster democracy or not) when it comes to public affairs in your town/district? (Please mention two actors)

Table Q3.2a. The Dominant Actors

NO	CURRENT POSITION OF DOMINANT ACTORS	F	%
1	Member of national/local parliament	160	14.0%
2	Party leader/prominent figure	84	7.3%
3	Public official	562	49.2%
4	Bureaucrat	60	5.2%
5	State's auxiliary body/Commissioner	5	0.4%
6	Businessman/Entrepreneur	73	6.4%
7	CSO activist	41	3.6%
8	Public figure/Adat leader/Ethnic group leader	48	4.2%
9	Religious leader	21	1.8%
10	Military/Police officer	15	1.3%
11	Militia, Preman	1	0.1%
12	Professional, Academician	28	2.4%
13	Unknown	45	3.9%
TOTAL		1143	100.0%

Table Q3.2b. Dominant actors' relation to the New Order Regime

NO	DOMINANT ACTOR'S CURRENT POSITION	RELATION TO THE NEW ORDER REGIME		
		OLD ELITE	NEW ELITE	UNKNOWN
1	Member of national/local parliament	6.9%	63.1%	30.0%
2	Party leader/prominent figure	36.9%	46.4%	16.7%
3	Public official	33.3%	49.6%	17.1%
4	Bureaucrat	15.0%	40.0%	45.0%
5	State's auxiliary body/Commissioner	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%
6	Businessman/Entrepreneur	26.0%	11.0%	63.0%
7	CSO activist	0.0%	65.9%	34.1%
8	Public figure/Adat leader/Ethnic group leader	18.8%	37.5%	43.8%
9	Religious leader	4.8%	28.6%	66.7%
10	Military/Police officer	38.5%	30.8%	30.8%
11	Militia	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
12	Professional, Academician	3.6%	60.7%	35.7%
13	Unknown	6.7%	15.6%	77.8%
TOTAL		24.4%	46.8%	28.8%

Table Q3.2c. Dominant actors' business ownership

NO	DOMINANT ACTORS' CURRENT POSITION	SCALE OF BUSINESS			
		LARGE SCALE	MEDIUM-SMALL BUSINESS	HAVE NOT OWN BUSINESS	UNKNOWN
1	Member of national/local parliament	23.1%	1.9%	51.3%	23.8%
2	Party leader/prominent figure	38.1%	3.6%	38.1%	20.2%
3	Public official	48.6%	7.8%	29.4%	14.2%
4	Bureaucrat	20.0%	1.7%	40.0%	38.3%
5	State's auxiliary body/Commissioner	0.0%	0.0%	80.0%	20.0%
6	Businessman/Entrepreneur	83.6%	0.0%	4.1%	12.3%
7	CSO activist	0.0%	0.0%	63.4%	36.6%
8	Public figure/Adat leader/Ethnic group leader	27.1%	6.3%	25.0%	41.7%
9	Religious leader	14.3%	14.3%	19.0%	52.4%
10	Military/Police officer	7.7%	0.0%	61.5%	30.8%
11	Militia, Preman	0.0%	0.0%	66.7%	33.3%
12	Professional, Academician	17.9%	3.6%	53.6%	25.0%
13	Unknown	8.9%	0.0%	11.1%	80.0%
TOTAL		38.6%	5.1%	33.4%	22.9%

Table Q3.2d. Current positions of the dominant actors in each frontline (1#2)

NO	CURRENT POSITION	FRONTLINE: EDUCATION		FRONTLINE: HEALTH		FRONTLINE: ECOLOGY AND ENVIRONMENT		FRONTLINE: LABOR MOVEMENT		FRONTLINE: INFORMAL SECTORS		FRONTLINE: AGRARIAN AND LAND REFORM		FRONTLINE: WOMEN AND CHILDREN RIGHTS	
		f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
1	Member of national/local parliament	16	12.9%	7	13.7%	16	12.1%	8	13.3%	6	9.7%	4	10.8%	15	12.7%
2	Party leader/prominent figure	8	6.5%	3	5.9%	11	3.2%	6	10.0%	2	3.2%	3	8.1%	11	9.3%
3	Public official	63	50.8%	27	52.9%	63	51.6%	30	50.0%	32	51.6%	15	40.5%	59	50.0%
4	Bureaucrat	4	3.2%	6	11.8%	7	9.7%	3	5.0%	6	9.7%	2	5.4%	11	9.3%
5	State's auxiliary body/Commissioner	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
6	Businessman/Entrepreneur	6	4.8%	2	3.9%	9	9.7%	6	10.0%	6	9.7%	5	13.5%	4	3.4%
7	CSO activist	3	2.4%	1	2.0%	9	1.6%	2	3.3%	1	1.6%	1	2.7%	3	2.5%
8	Public figure/Adat leader/Ethnic group leader	7	5.6%	4	7.8%	1	4.8%	1	1.7%	3	4.8%	3	8.1%	5	4.2%
9	Religious leader	4	3.2%	0	0.0%	2	3.2%	1	1.7%	2	3.2%	1	2.7%	2	1.7%
10	Military/Police officer	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	2.7%	1	0.8%
11	Militia	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
12	Professional, Academician	7	5.6%	0	0.0%	4	3.2%	0	0.0%	2	3.2%	1	2.7%	1	0.8%
13	Unknown	6	4.8%	1	2.0%	6	3.2%	3	5.0%	2	3.2%	1	2.7%	6	5.1%
TOTAL		124	100.0%	51	100.0%	132	100.0%	60	100.0%	62	100.0%	37	100.0%	118	100.0%

(continue to next page)

Table Q3.2d. Current positions of the dominant actors in each frontline (2#2)

NO	CURRENT POSITION	FRONTLINE: CLAN, ETHNIC, RELIGIOUS INTER-RELATION		FRONTLINE: MEDIA AND SOCIAL MEDIA		FRONTLINE: SECURITY SECTOR REFORM		FRONTLINE: ANTI- CORRUPTION MOVEMENT		FRONTLINE: HUMAN RIGHTS MOVEMENT		FRONTLINE: PARTY AND ELECTION REFORM		FRONTLINE: BUSINESS SECTOR	
		f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
1	Member of national/local parliament	22	16.9%	8	15.4%	3	15.8%	17	16.2%	10	10.8%	20	17.2%	8	18.2%
2	Party leader/prominent figure	12	9.2%	3	5.8%	1	5.3%	9	8.6%	5	5.4%	8	6.9%	2	4.5%
3	Public official	63	48.5%	23	44.2%	11	57.9%	48	45.7%	49	52.7%	54	46.6%	25	56.8%
4	Bureaucrat	7	5.4%	2	3.8%	2	10.5%	3	2.9%	4	4.3%	3	2.6%	0	0.0%
5	State's auxiliary body/Commissioner	0	0.0%	2	3.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	1.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
6	Businessman/Entrepreneur	5	3.8%	6	11.5%	0	0.0%	7	6.7%	9	9.7%	7	6.0%	1	2.3%
7	CSO activist	2	1.5%	2	3.8%	0	0.0%	6	5.7%	3	3.2%	6	5.2%	2	4.5%
8	Public figure/Adat leader/Ethnic group leader	6	4.6%	1	1.9%	1	5.3%	5	4.8%	2	2.2%	8	6.9%	1	2.3%
9	Religious leader	1	0.8%	1	1.9%	0	0.0%	1	1.0%	3	3.2%	1	0.9%	2	4.5%
10	Military/Police officer	3	2.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	1.9%	3	3.2%	3	2.6%	0	0.0%
11	Militia	0	0.0%	1	1.9%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
12	Professional, Academician	2	1.5%	2	3.8%	1	5.3%	3	2.9%	2	2.2%	3	2.6%	0	0.0%
13	Unknown	7	5.4%	1	1.9%	0	0.0%	4	3.8%	2	2.2%	3	2.6%	3	6.8%
TOTAL		130	100.0%	52	100.0%	19	100.0%	105	100.0%	93	100.0%	116	100.0%	44	100.0%

Table Q3.2e. Dominant actors' in each frontline and their relation to the New Order Regime (1#2)

NO	RELATION TO THE NEW ORDER REGIME	FRONTLINE: EDUCATION		FRONTLINE: HEALTH		FRONTLINE: ECOLOGY AND ENVIRONMENT		FRONTLINE: LABOR MOVEMENT		FRONTLINE: INFORMAL SECTORS		FRONTLINE: AGRARIAN AND LAND REFORM		FRONTLINE: WOMEN AND CHILDREN RIGHTS	
		f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
1	Old elites	28	22.6%	7	13.7%	25	22.6%	13	21.7%	14	22.6%	5	13.5%	31	26.3%
2	New elites	56	45.2%	31	60.8%	70	61.3%	24	40.0%	38	61.3%	10	27.0%	51	43.2%
3	Unknown	40	32.3%	13	25.5%	37	16.1%	23	38.3%	10	16.1%	22	59.5%	36	30.5%
TOTAL		124	100.0%	51	100.0%	132	100.0%	60	100.0%	62	100.0%	37	100.0%	118	100.0%

(continue to below)

Table Q3.2e. Dominant actors' in each frontline and their relation to the New Order Regime (2#2)

NO	RELATION TO THE NEW ORDER REGIME	FRONTLINE: CLAN, ETHNIC, RELIGIOUS INTER-RELATION		FRONTLINE: MEDIA AND SOCIAL MEDIA		FRONTLINE: SECURITY SECTOR REFORM		FRONTLINE: ANTI-CORRUPTION MOVEMENT		FRONTLINE: HUMAN RIGHTS MOVEMENT		FRONTLINE: PARTY AND ELECTION REFORM		FRONTLINE: BUSINESS SECTOR	
		f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
1	Old elites	44	33.8%	17	32.7%	6	31.6%	24	22.9%	16	17.2%	37	31.9%	12	27.3%
2	New elites	58	44.6%	19	36.5%	7	36.8%	46	43.8%	48	51.6%	55	47.4%	22	50.0%
3	Unknown	28	21.5%	16	30.8%	6	31.6%	35	33.3%	29	31.2%	24	20.7%	10	22.7%
TOTAL		130	100.0%	52	100.0%	19	100.0%	105	100.0%	93	100.0%	116	100.0%	44	100.0%

Table Q3.2f. Dominant actors' in each frontline and their business ownership (1#2)

NO	RELATION TO THE NEW ORDER REGIME	FRONTLINE: EDUCATION		FRONTLINE: HEALTH		FRONTLINE: ECOLOGY AND ENVIRONMENT		FRONTLINE: LABOR MOVEMENT		FRONTLINE: INFORMAL SECTORS		FRONTLINE: AGRARIAN AND LAND REFORM		FRONTLINE: WOMEN AND CHILDREN RIGHTS	
		f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
1	Large scale	59	47.6%	19	37.3%	46	46.8%	35	58.3%	29	46.8%	10	27.0%	35	29.7%
2	Medium/Small scale	3	2.4%	4	7.8%	8	3.2%	2	3.3%	2	3.2%	0	0.0%	10	8.5%
3	Have not own business	32	25.8%	23	45.1%	41	37.1%	13	21.7%	23	37.1%	9	24.3%	36	30.5%
4	Unknown	30	24.2%	5	9.8%	37	12.9%	10	16.7%	8	12.9%	18	48.6%	37	31.4%
TOTAL		124	100.0%	51	100.0%	132	100.0%	60	100.0%	62	100.0%	37	100.0%	118	100.0%

(continue to below)

Table Q3.2f. Dominant actors' in each frontline and their business ownership (2#2)

NO	RELATION TO THE NEW ORDER REGIME	FRONTLINE: CLAN, ETHNIC, RELIGIOUS INTER-RELATION		FRONTLINE: MEDIA AND SOCIAL MEDIA		FRONTLINE: SECURITY SECTOR REFORM		FRONTLINE: ANTI-CORRUPTION MOVEMENT		FRONTLINE: HUMAN RIGHTS MOVEMENT		FRONTLINE: PARTY AND ELECTION REFORM		FRONTLINE: BUSINESS SECTOR	
		f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
1	Old elites	43	33.1%	20	38.5%	10	52.6%	42	40.0%	28	30.1%	49	42.2%	16	36.4%
2	New elites	8	6.2%	0	0.0%	6	31.6%	5	4.8%	6	6.5%	3	2.6%	1	2.3%
3	Have not own business	54	41.5%	25	48.1%	3	15.8%	33	31.4%	28	30.1%	46	39.7%	16	36.4%
4	Unknown	25	19.2%	7	13.5%	0	0.0%	25	23.8%	31	33.3%	18	15.5%	11	25.0%
TOTAL		130	100.0%	52	100.0%	19	100.0%	105	100.0%	93	100.0%	116	100.0%	44	100.0%

Q3.3. Who among the influential actors (Q3.1) are the most important sub-ordinated (alternative actors) in favor of change and more popular control of public affairs in your town/district? (Please mention two actors)

Table Q3.3a. Alternative actors

NO	CURRENT POSITION OF ALTERNATIVE ACTORS	F	%
1	Member of national/local parliament	79	7.3%
2	Party leader/prominent figure	66	6.1%
3	Public official	21	1.9%
4	Bureaucrat	18	1.7%
5	State's auxiliary body/Commissioner	35	3.2%
6	Businessman/Entrepreneur	43	4.0%
7	CSO activist	394	36.5%
8	Public figure/Adat leader/Ethnic group leader	92	8.5%
9	Religious leader	78	7.2%
10	Military/Police officer	2	0.2%
11	Militia, Preman	1	0.1%
12	Professional, Academician	126	11.7%
13	Unknown	124	11.5%
TOTAL		1079	100.0%

Table Q3.3b. Dominant actors' relation to the New Order Regime

NO	ALTERNATIVE ACTOR'S CURRENT POSITION	RELATION TO THE NEW ORDER REGIME		
		OLD ELITE	NEW ELITE	UNKNOWN
1	Member of national/local parliament	12.7%	59.5%	27.8%
2	Party leader/prominent figure	10.6%	57.6%	31.8%
3	Public official	14.3%	76.2%	9.5%
4	Bureaucrat	5.6%	72.2%	22.2%
5	State's auxiliary body/Commissioner	0.0%	91.4%	8.6%
6	Businessman/Entrepreneur	14.0%	18.6%	67.4%
7	CSO activist	0.8%	68.3%	31.0%
8	Public figure/Adat leader/Ethnic group leader	4.3%	48.9%	46.7%
9	Religious leader	0.0%	62.8%	37.2%
10	Military/Police officer	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
11	Militia	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
12	Professional, Academician	1.6%	57.1%	41.3%
13	Unknown	0.8%	5.6%	93.5%
TOTAL		3.6%	55.2%	41.1%

Table Q3.3c. Alternative actors' business ownership

NO	ALTERNATIVE ACTORS' CURRENT POSITION	SCALE OF BUSINESS			
		LARGE SCALE	MEDIUM-SMALL BUSINESS	HAVE NOT OWN BUSINESS	UNKNOWN
1	Member of national/local parliament	32.9%	8.9%	39.2%	19.0%
2	Party leader/prominent figure	28.8%	7.6%	37.9%	25.8%
3	Public official	19.0%	14.3%	57.1%	9.5%
4	Bureaucrat	0.0%	22.2%	61.1%	16.7%
5	State's auxiliary body/Commissioner	2.9%	0.0%	88.6%	8.6%
6	Businessman/Entrepreneur	79.1%	0.0%	2.3%	18.6%
7	CSO activist	1.8%	1.5%	61.7%	35.0%
8	Public figure/Adat leader/Ethnic group leader	20.7%	3.3%	39.1%	37.0%
9	Religious leader	10.3%	1.3%	76.9%	11.5%
10	Military/Police officer	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%	50.0%
11	Militia, Preman	13.1%	1.6%	39.3%	45.9%
12	Professional, Academician	10.9%	5.5%	21.1%	62.5%
13	Unknown	11.1%	2.6%	44.3%	42.0%
TOTAL		13.6%	4.0%	44.8%	37.5%

Table Q3.3d. Current positions of the alternative actors in each frontline (1#2)

NO	CURRENT POSITION	FRONTLINE: EDUCATION		FRONTLINE: HEALTH		FRONTLINE: ECOLOGY AND ENVIRONMENT		FRONTLINE: LABOR MOVEMENT		FRONTLINE: INFORMAL SECTORS		FRONTLINE: AGRARIAN AND LAND REFORM		FRONTLINE: WOMEN AND CHILDREN RIGHTS	
		f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
1	Member of national/local parliament	16	12.9%	5	9.8%	12	9.1%	3	5.0%	2	3.2%	1	2.7%	11	9.3%
2	Party leader/prominent figure	6	4.8%	3	5.9%	4	8.1%	5	8.3%	5	8.1%	4	10.8%	10	8.5%
3	Public official	3	2.4%	0	0.0%	3	1.6%	1	1.7%	1	1.6%	0	0.0%	5	4.2%
4	Bureaucrat	2	1.6%	0	0.0%	1	0.0%	1	1.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.8%
5	State's auxiliary body/Commissioner	4	3.2%	3	5.9%	1	1.6%	2	3.3%	1	1.6%	2	5.4%	3	2.5%
6	Businessman/Entrepreneur	10	8.1%	1	2.0%	4	3.2%	5	8.3%	2	3.2%	1	2.7%	2	1.7%
7	CSO activist	35	28.2%	24	47.1%	48	58.1%	19	31.7%	36	58.1%	7	18.9%	41	34.7%
8	Public figure/Adat leader/Ethnic group leader	8	6.5%	3	5.9%	11	6.5%	9	15.0%	4	6.5%	0	0.0%	5	4.2%
9	Religious leader	4	3.2%	2	3.9%	5	0.0%	2	3.3%	0	0.0%	1	2.7%	7	5.9%
10	Military/Police officer	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
11	Militia	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.8%
12	Professional, Academician	13	10.5%	4	7.8%	16	8.1%	2	3.3%	5	8.1%	9	24.3%	12	10.2%
13	Unknown	17	13.7%	3	5.9%	17	9.7%	8	13.3%	6	9.7%	3	8.1%	13	11.0%
TOTAL		118	95.2%	48	94.1%	122	100.0%	57	95.0%	62	100.0%	28	75.7%	111	94.1%

(continue to next page)

Table Q3.3d. Current positions of the alternative actors in each frontline (2#2)

NO	CURRENT POSITION	FRONTLINE: CLAN, ETHNIC, RELIGIOUS INTER-RELATION		FRONTLINE: MEDIA AND SOCIAL MEDIA		FRONTLINE: SECURITY SECTOR REFORM		FRONTLINE: ANTI- CORRUPTION MOVEMENT		FRONTLINE: HUMAN RIGHTS MOVEMENT		FRONTLINE: PARTY AND ELECTION REFORM		FRONTLINE: BUSINESS SECTOR	
		f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
1	Member of national/local parliament	6	4.6%	4	7.7%	0	0.0%	3	2.9%	6	6.5%	9	7.8%	1	2.3%
2	Party leader/prominent figure	5	3.8%	4	7.7%	1	5.3%	4	3.8%	4	4.3%	9	7.8%	2	4.5%
3	Public official	1	0.8%	1	1.9%	0	0.0%	2	1.9%	0	0.0%	2	1.7%	2	4.5%
4	Bureaucrat	5	3.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	2.9%	3	3.2%	0	0.0%	2	4.5%
5	State's auxiliary body/Commissioner	5	3.8%	4	7.7%	0	0.0%	2	1.9%	2	2.2%	6	5.2%	0	0.0%
6	Businessman/Entrepreneur	9	6.9%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	4	3.8%	2	2.2%	1	0.9%	2	4.5%
7	CSO activist	30	23.1%	16	30.8%	9	47.4%	42	40.0%	41	44.1%	37	31.9%	9	20.5%
8	Public figure/Adat leader/Ethnic group leader	12	9.2%	4	7.7%	0	0.0%	14	13.3%	7	7.5%	12	10.3%	3	6.8%
9	Religious leader	19	14.6%	7	13.5%	2	10.5%	8	7.6%	5	5.4%	5	4.3%	11	25.0%
10	Military/Police officer	2	1.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
11	Militia	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
12	Professional, Academician	18	13.8%	5	9.6%	1	5.3%	10	9.5%	11	11.8%	16	13.8%	4	9.1%
13	Unknown	12	9.2%	5	9.6%	3	15.8%	10	9.5%	10	10.8%	14	12.1%	3	6.8%
TOTAL		124	95.4%	50	96.2%	16	84.2%	102	97.1%	91	97.8%	111	95.7%	39	88.6%

Table Q3.3e. Alternative actors' in each frontline and their relation to the New Order Regime (1#2)

NO	RELATION TO THE NEW ORDER REGIME	FRONTLINE: EDUCATION		FRONTLINE: HEALTH		FRONTLINE: ECOLOGY AND ENVIRONMENT		FRONTLINE: LABOR MOVEMENT		FRONTLINE: INFORMAL SECTORS		FRONTLINE: AGRARIAN AND LAND REFORM		FRONTLINE: WOMEN AND CHILDREN RIGHTS	
		f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
1	Old elites	6	4.8%	1	2.0%	2	3.2%	1	1.7%	2	3.2%	1	2.7%	6	5.1%
2	New elites	55	44.4%	31	60.8%	65	67.7%	26	43.3%	42	67.7%	11	29.7%	62	52.5%
3	Unknown	57	46.0%	16	31.4%	55	29.0%	30	50.0%	18	29.0%	16	43.2%	43	36.4%
TOTAL		118	95.2%	48	94.1%	122	100.0%	57	95.0%	62	100.0%	28	75.7%	111	94.1%

(continue to below)

Table Q3.3e. Alternative actors' in each frontline and their relation to the New Order Regime (2#2)

NO	RELATION TO THE NEW ORDER REGIME	FRONTLINE: CLAN, ETHNIC, RELIGIOUS INTER-RELATION		FRONTLINE: MEDIA AND SOCIAL MEDIA		FRONTLINE: SECURITY SECTOR REFORM		FRONTLINE: ANTI-CORRUPTION MOVEMENT		FRONTLINE: HUMAN RIGHTS MOVEMENT		FRONTLINE: PARTY AND ELECTION REFORM		FRONTLINE: BUSINESS SECTOR	
		f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
1	Old elites	8	6.2%	2	3.8%	0	0.0%	3	2.9%	4	4.3%	3	2.6%	0	0.0%
2	New elites	76	58.5%	24	46.2%	13	68.4%	51	48.6%	57	61.3%	64	55.2%	19	43.2%
3	Unknown	40	30.8%	24	46.2%	3	15.8%	48	45.7%	30	32.3%	44	37.9%	20	45.5%
TOTAL		124	95.4%	50	96.2%	16	84.2%	102	97.1%	91	97.8%	111	95.7%	39	88.6%

Table Q3.3f. Alternative actors' in each frontline and their business ownership (1#2)

NO	RELATION TO THE NEW ORDER REGIME	FRONTLINE: EDUCATION		FRONTLINE: HEALTH		FRONTLINE: ECOLOGY AND ENVIRONMENT		FRONTLINE: LABOR MOVEMENT		FRONTLINE: INFORMAL SECTORS		FRONTLINE: AGRARIAN AND LAND REFORM		FRONTLINE: WOMEN AND CHILDREN RIGHTS	
		f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
1	Large scale	27	21.8%	10	19.6%	12	8.1%	10	16.7%	5	8.1%	4	10.8%	10	8.5%
2	Medium/Small scale	5	4.0%	0	0.0%	4	3.2%	4	6.7%	2	3.2%	0	0.0%	3	2.5%
3	Have not own business	37	29.8%	20	39.2%	51	46.8%	20	33.3%	29	46.8%	5	13.5%	58	49.2%
4	Unknown	49	39.5%	18	35.3%	55	41.9%	23	38.3%	26	41.9%	19	51.4%	40	33.9%
TOTAL		118	95.2%	48	94.1%	122	100.0%	57	95.0%	62	100.0%	28	75.7%	111	94.1%

(continue to below)

Table Q3.3f. Alternative actors' in each frontline and their business ownership (2#2)

NO	RELATION TO THE NEW ORDER REGIME	FRONTLINE: CLAN, ETHNIC, RELIGIOUS INTER-RELATION		FRONTLINE: MEDIA AND SOCIAL MEDIA		FRONTLINE: SECURITY SECTOR REFORM		FRONTLINE: ANTI-CORRUPTION MOVEMENT		FRONTLINE: HUMAN RIGHTS MOVEMENT		FRONTLINE: PARTY AND ELECTION REFORM		FRONTLINE: BUSINESS SECTOR	
		f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
1	Old elites	14	10.8%	10	19.2%	1	5.3%	13	12.4%	7	7.5%	14	12.1%	3	6.8%
2	New elites	6	4.6%	2	3.8%	0	0.0%	2	1.9%	5	5.4%	2	1.7%	2	4.5%
3	Have not own business	71	54.6%	24	46.2%	13	68.4%	49	46.7%	42	45.2%	62	53.4%	24	54.5%
4	Unknown	33	25.4%	14	26.9%	2	10.5%	38	36.2%	37	39.8%	33	28.4%	10	22.7%
TOTAL		124	95.4%	50	96.2%	16	84.2%	102	97.1%	91	97.8%	111	95.7%	39	88.6%

E. MAIN ACTORS' RELATION TO THE MEANS OF DEMOCRACY

Q4.1. In your assessment, how do the dominant actors (Q3.2) promote the rules and regulations that are supposed to promote democracy to thus foster the issues that they give priority to (Q3.4)?

Table Q4.1a. How dominant actors promote the rules and regulations with regard to the Citizens' Rights

NO	DOMINANT ACTORS	EQUAL CITIZENSHIP			RULE OF LAW			EQUAL TO JUSTICE			UNIVERSAL HUMAN RIGHTS		
		Frequently promote	Rarely promote	No answer	Frequently promote	Rarely promote	No answer	Frequently promote	Rarely promote	No answer	Frequently promote	Rarely promote	No answer
1	Member of national/local parliament	66.9%	29.4%	3.8%	50.0%	45.0%	5.0%	56.9%	39.4%	3.8%	48.8%	46.3%	5.0%
2	Party leader/prominent figure	50.0%	50.0%	0.0%	29.8%	67.9%	2.4%	31.0%	65.5%	3.6%	35.7%	59.5%	4.8%
3	Public official	62.6%	35.8%	1.6%	49.1%	47.5%	3.4%	50.4%	45.7%	3.9%	49.5%	47.0%	3.6%
4	Bureaucrat	61.7%	36.7%	1.7%	45.0%	51.7%	3.3%	41.7%	55.0%	3.3%	40.0%	55.0%	5.0%
5	State's auxiliary body/Commissioner	60.0%	40.0%	0.0%	60.0%	40.0%	0.0%	60.0%	40.0%	0.0%	40.0%	60.0%	0.0%
6	Businessman/Entrepreneur	28.8%	68.5%	2.7%	26.0%	72.6%	1.4%	19.2%	75.3%	5.5%	21.9%	68.5%	9.6%
7	CSO activist	65.9%	26.8%	7.3%	70.7%	24.4%	4.9%	53.7%	26.8%	19.5%	56.1%	29.3%	14.6%
8	Public figure/Adat leader/Ethnic group leader	60.4%	37.5%	2.1%	35.4%	60.4%	4.2%	45.8%	45.8%	8.3%	45.8%	47.9%	6.3%
9	Religious leader	76.2%	19.0%	4.8%	33.3%	52.4%	14.3%	33.3%	42.9%	23.8%	33.3%	42.9%	23.8%
10	Military/Police officer	53.3%	46.7%	0.0%	53.3%	46.7%	0.0%	73.3%	26.7%	0.0%	40.0%	60.0%	0.0%
11	Militia, Preman	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%
12	Professional, Academician	78.6%	17.9%	3.6%	64.3%	25.0%	10.7%	64.3%	28.6%	7.1%	46.4%	46.4%	7.1%
13	Unknown	68.9%	24.4%	6.7%	57.8%	35.6%	6.7%	57.8%	28.9%	13.3%	55.6%	31.1%	13.3%
ALL DOMINANT ACTORS		60.8%	36.8%	2.4%	46.8%	49.3%	3.9%	47.9%	46.6%	5.4%	45.8%	48.6%	5.6%

Table Q4.1b. How dominant actors promote the rules and regulations with regard to the Representation

NO	DOMINANT ACTORS	DEMOCRATIC POLITICAL REPRESENTATION			CITIZEN PARTICIPATION IN PUBLIC GOVERNANCE			INSTITUTIONALIZED CHANNELS FOR INTEREST- AND ISSUE-BASED REPRESENTATION IN PUBLIC GOVERNANCE			LOCAL DEMOCRACY			DEMOCRATIC CONTROL OF INSTRUMENTS OF COERCION		
		Frequently promote	Rarely promote	No answer	Frequently promote	Rarely promote	No answer	Frequently promote	Rarely promote	No answer	Frequently promote	Rarely promote	No answer	Frequently promote	Rarely promote	No answer
1	Member of national/local parliament	65.6%	31.3%	3.1%	60.0%	36.9%	3.1%	58.8%	39.4%	1.9%	57.5%	38.1%	4.4%	51.3%	46.3%	2.5%
2	Party leader/prominent figure	46.4%	50.0%	3.6%	39.3%	56.0%	4.8%	35.7%	57.1%	7.1%	44.0%	50.0%	6.0%	29.8%	65.5%	4.8%
3	Public official	54.8%	40.9%	4.3%	54.3%	42.0%	3.7%	48.6%	47.5%	3.9%	48.2%	47.5%	4.3%	48.2%	47.5%	4.3%
4	Bureaucrat	36.7%	56.7%	6.7%	51.7%	41.7%	6.7%	43.3%	50.0%	6.7%	33.3%	60.0%	6.7%	30.0%	63.3%	6.7%
5	State's auxiliary body/Commissioner	40.0%	60.0%	0.0%	40.0%	60.0%	0.0%	40.0%	60.0%	0.0%	40.0%	60.0%	0.0%	40.0%	60.0%	0.0%
6	Businessman/Entrepreneur	21.9%	69.9%	8.2%	26.0%	69.9%	4.1%	28.8%	64.4%	6.8%	21.9%	64.4%	13.7%	16.4%	71.2%	12.3%
7	CSO activist	51.2%	34.1%	14.6%	61.0%	26.8%	12.2%	53.7%	29.3%	17.1%	51.2%	34.1%	14.6%	41.5%	43.9%	14.6%
8	Public figure/Adat leader/Ethnic group leader	39.6%	52.1%	8.3%	47.9%	45.8%	6.3%	35.4%	56.3%	8.3%	33.3%	60.4%	6.3%	37.5%	54.2%	8.3%
9	Religious leader	38.1%	38.1%	23.8%	38.1%	38.1%	23.8%	33.3%	42.9%	23.8%	47.6%	23.8%	28.6%	42.9%	33.3%	23.8%
10	Military/Police officer	20.0%	80.0%	0.0%	46.7%	53.3%	0.0%	20.0%	80.0%	0.0%	40.0%	60.0%	0.0%	53.3%	46.7%	0.0%
11	Militia, Preman	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%
12	Professional, Academician	60.7%	28.6%	10.7%	64.3%	28.6%	7.1%	50.0%	39.3%	10.7%	53.6%	39.3%	7.1%	57.1%	35.7%	7.1%
13	Unknown	53.3%	35.6%	11.1%	51.1%	40.0%	8.9%	46.7%	44.4%	8.9%	60.0%	28.9%	11.1%	53.3%	35.6%	11.1%
	ALL DOMINANT ACTORS	51.1%	43.2%	5.7%	51.6%	43.5%	4.9%	46.4%	48.1%	5.5%	46.6%	47.1%	6.3%	43.9%	50.2%	5.9%

Table Q4.1c. How dominant actors promote the rules and regulations with regard to Governance

NO	DOMINANT ACTORS	TRANSPARENT, IMPARTIAL AND ACCOUNTABLE GOVERNANCE			GOVERNMENT'S INDEPENDENCE TO MAKE DECISIONS AND IMPLEMENT THEM		
		Frequently promote	Rarely promote	No answer	Frequently promote	Rarely promote	No answer
1	Member of national/local parliament	50.6%	46.3%	3.1%	44.4%	52.5%	3.1%
2	Party leader/ prominent figure	38.1%	57.1%	4.8%	25.0%	70.2%	4.8%
3	Public official	53.2%	43.8%	3.0%	42.7%	54.1%	3.2%
4	Bureaucrat	41.7%	50.0%	8.3%	36.7%	58.3%	5.0%
5	State's auxiliary body/ Commissioner	40.0%	60.0%	0.0%	20.0%	80.0%	0.0%
6	Businessman/ Entrepreneur	17.8%	75.3%	6.8%	23.3%	71.2%	5.5%
7	CSO activist	58.5%	24.4%	17.1%	51.2%	34.1%	14.6%
8	Public figure/Adat leader/Ethnic group leader	45.8%	45.8%	8.3%	43.8%	47.9%	8.3%
9	Religious leader	33.3%	42.9%	23.8%	19.0%	57.1%	23.8%
10	Military/Police officer	20.0%	80.0%	0.0%	33.3%	66.7%	0.0%
11	Militia, Preman	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%
12	Professional, Academician	53.6%	35.7%	10.7%	50.0%	42.9%	7.1%
13	Unknown	60.0%	31.1%	8.9%	40.0%	51.1%	8.9%
ALL DOMINANT ACTORS		48.1%	46.7%	5.2%	39.8%	55.4%	4.8%

Table Q4.1d. How dominant actors promote the rules and regulations with regard to Civil Society

NO	DOMINANT ACTORS	FREEDOM OF AND EQUAL CHANCES TO ACCESS TO PUBLIC DISCOURSES			DEMOCRATIC CITIZENS' SELF-ORGANIZING		
		Frequently promote	Rarely promote	No answer	Frequently promote	Rarely promote	No answer
1	Member of national/local parliament	44.4%	52.5%	3.1%	53.8%	42.5%	3.8%
2	Party leader/ prominent figure	25.0%	70.2%	4.8%	44.0%	50.0%	6.0%
3	Public official	42.7%	54.1%	3.2%	56.8%	39.9%	3.4%
4	Bureaucrat	36.7%	58.3%	5.0%	41.7%	53.3%	5.0%
5	State's auxiliary body/ Commissioner	20.0%	80.0%	0.0%	40.0%	60.0%	0.0%
6	Businessman/ Entrepreneur	23.3%	71.2%	5.5%	21.9%	69.9%	8.2%
7	CSO activist	51.2%	34.1%	14.6%	58.5%	24.4%	17.1%
8	Public figure/Adat leader/Ethnic group leader	43.8%	47.9%	8.3%	56.3%	37.5%	6.3%
9	Religious leader	19.0%	57.1%	23.8%	38.1%	38.1%	23.8%
10	Military/Police officer	33.3%	66.7%	0.0%	33.3%	66.7%	0.0%
11	Militia, Preman	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%
12	Professional, Academician	50.0%	42.9%	7.1%	60.7%	28.6%	10.7%
13	Unknown	40.0%	51.1%	8.9%	55.6%	33.3%	11.1%
ALL DOMINANT ACTORS		39.8%	55.4%	4.8%	51.7%	42.9%	5.4%

Q4.2. In your assessment, how do the alternative actors (Q3.3) promote the rules and regulations that are supposed to promote democracy to thus foster the issues that they give priority to (Q3.5)?

Table Q4.2a. How the alternative actors promote the rules and regulations with regard to the Citizens' Rights

NO	ALTERNATIVE ACTORS	EQUAL CITIZENSHIP			RULE OF LAW			EQUAL TO JUSTICE			UNIVERSAL HUMAN RIGHTS		
		Frequently promote	Rarely promote	No answer	Frequently promote	Rarely promote	No answer	Frequently promote	Rarely promote	No answer	Frequently promote	Rarely promote	No answer
1	Member of national/local parliament	70.9%	26.6%	2.5%	50.6%	41.8%	7.6%	55.7%	35.4%	8.9%	51.9%	39.2%	8.9%
2	Party leader/prominent figure	65.2%	31.8%	3.0%	65.2%	30.3%	4.5%	63.6%	31.8%	4.5%	57.6%	37.9%	4.5%
3	Public official	47.6%	47.6%	4.8%	23.8%	61.9%	14.3%	47.6%	38.1%	14.3%	42.9%	47.6%	9.5%
4	Bureaucrat	61.1%	38.9%	0.0%	55.6%	44.4%	0.0%	66.7%	33.3%	0.0%	50.0%	50.0%	0.0%
5	State's auxiliary body/Commissioner	85.7%	14.3%	0.0%	85.7%	14.3%	0.0%	74.3%	25.7%	0.0%	74.3%	25.7%	0.0%
6	Businessman/Entrepreneur	41.9%	48.8%	9.3%	37.2%	51.2%	11.6%	46.5%	44.2%	9.3%	34.9%	55.8%	9.3%
7	CSO activist	81.5%	15.7%	2.8%	73.6%	22.8%	3.6%	76.9%	19.8%	3.3%	75.1%	21.6%	3.3%
8	Public figure/Adat leader/Ethnic group leader	66.3%	30.4%	3.3%	57.6%	38.0%	4.3%	68.5%	26.1%	5.4%	64.1%	31.5%	4.3%
9	Religious leader	59.0%	37.2%	3.8%	42.3%	53.8%	3.8%	55.1%	42.3%	2.6%	48.7%	48.7%	2.6%
10	Military/Police officer	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%
11	Militia, Preman	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%
12	Professional, Academician	80.2%	11.9%	7.9%	71.4%	22.2%	6.3%	78.6%	13.5%	7.9%	76.2%	15.9%	7.9%
13	Unknown	66.1%	25.0%	8.9%	56.5%	33.9%	9.7%	65.3%	25.0%	9.7%	62.9%	27.4%	9.7%
ALL ALTERNATIVE ACTORS		72.2%	23.4%	4.4%	63.0%	31.6%	5.4%	68.9%	25.7%	5.5%	65.3%	29.4%	5.3%

Table Q4.2b. How the alternative actors promote the rules and regulations with regard to the Representation

NO	ALTERNATIVE ACTORS	DEMOCRATIC POLITICAL REPRESENTATION			CITIZEN PARTICIPATION IN PUBLIC GOVERNANCE			INSTITUTIONALIZED CHANNELS FOR INTEREST- AND ISSUE-BASED REPRESENTATION IN PUBLIC GOVERNANCE			LOCAL DEMOCRACY			DEMOCRATIC CONTROL OF INSTRUMENTS OF COERCION		
		Frequently promote	Rarely promote	No answer	Frequently promote	Rarely promote	No answer	Frequently promote	Rarely promote	No answer	Frequently promote	Rarely promote	No answer	Frequently promote	Rarely promote	No answer
1	Member of national/local parliament	60.8%	30.4%	8.9%	57.0%	34.2%	8.9%	41.8%	46.8%	11.4%	49.4%	41.8%	8.9%	40.5%	51.9%	7.6%
2	Party leader/prominent figure	63.6%	30.3%	6.1%	59.1%	34.8%	6.1%	50.0%	42.4%	7.6%	65.2%	30.3%	4.5%	53.0%	40.9%	6.1%
3	Public official	38.1%	47.6%	14.3%	33.3%	57.1%	9.5%	42.9%	42.9%	14.3%	38.1%	47.6%	14.3%	28.6%	61.9%	9.5%
4	Bureaucrat	50.0%	44.4%	5.6%	61.1%	33.3%	5.6%	72.2%	22.2%	5.6%	50.0%	44.4%	5.6%	55.6%	38.9%	5.6%
5	State's auxiliary body/Commissioner	74.3%	25.7%	0.0%	74.3%	25.7%	0.0%	77.1%	22.9%	0.0%	60.0%	40.0%	0.0%	62.9%	37.1%	0.0%
6	Businessman/Entrepreneur	34.9%	53.5%	11.6%	37.2%	46.5%	16.3%	41.9%	41.9%	16.3%	27.9%	55.8%	16.3%	34.9%	53.5%	11.6%
7	CSO activist	58.9%	36.5%	4.6%	76.4%	20.1%	3.6%	69.3%	26.4%	4.3%	64.2%	31.5%	4.3%	62.7%	32.7%	4.6%
8	Public figure/Adat leader/Ethnic group leader	53.3%	38.0%	8.7%	64.1%	28.3%	7.6%	54.3%	37.0%	8.7%	45.7%	44.6%	9.8%	43.5%	46.7%	9.8%
9	Religious leader	34.6%	59.0%	6.4%	43.6%	50.0%	6.4%	37.2%	57.7%	5.1%	39.7%	55.1%	5.1%	48.7%	46.2%	5.1%
10	Military/Police officer	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%
11	Militia, Preman	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%
12	Professional, Academician	69.0%	22.2%	8.7%	73.8%	20.6%	5.6%	63.5%	29.4%	7.1%	62.7%	27.8%	9.5%	64.3%	26.2%	9.5%
13	Unknown	56.5%	32.3%	11.3%	55.6%	33.1%	11.3%	49.2%	38.7%	12.1%	45.2%	42.7%	12.1%	47.6%	38.7%	13.7%
	ALL ALTERNATIVE ACTORS	56.8%	36.1%	7.0%	64.9%	28.8%	6.3%	58.0%	34.8%	7.2%	55.0%	37.8%	7.2%	54.2%	38.6%	7.2%

Table Q4.2c. How the alternative actors promote the rules and regulations with regard to Governance

NO	ALTERNATIVE ACTORS	TRANSPARENT, IMPARTIAL AND ACCOUNTABLE GOVERNANCE			GOVERNMENT'S INDEPENDENCE TO MAKE DECISIONS AND IMPLEMENT THEM		
		Frequently promote	Rarely promote	No answer	Frequently promote	Rarely promote	No answer
1	Member of national/local parliament	53.2%	38.0%	8.9%	32.9%	57.0%	10.1%
2	Party leader/ prominent figure	65.2%	30.3%	4.5%	43.9%	50.0%	6.1%
3	Public official	47.6%	38.1%	14.3%	28.6%	61.9%	9.5%
4	Bureaucrat	55.6%	38.9%	5.6%	50.0%	44.4%	5.6%
5	State's auxiliary body/ Commissioner	80.0%	20.0%	0.0%	65.7%	34.3%	0.0%
6	Businessman/ Entrepreneur	25.6%	60.5%	14.0%	30.2%	53.5%	16.3%
7	CSO activist	72.8%	23.6%	3.6%	58.4%	36.8%	4.8%
8	Public figure/Adat leader/Ethnic group leader	59.8%	30.4%	9.8%	45.7%	45.7%	8.7%
9	Religious leader	37.2%	57.7%	5.1%	35.9%	59.0%	5.1%
10	Military/Police officer	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%
11	Militia, Preman	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%
12	Professional, Academician	73.0%	17.5%	9.5%	60.3%	29.4%	10.3%
13	Unknown	50.8%	35.5%	13.7%	41.9%	41.9%	16.1%
ALL ALTERNATIVE ACTORS		62.1%	30.9%	7.0%	49.5%	42.5%	8.0%

Table Q4.2d. How the alternative actors promote the rules and regulations with regard to Civil Society

NO	ALTERNATIVE ACTORS	FREEDOM OF AND EQUAL CHANCES TO ACCESS TO PUBLIC DISCOURSES			DEMOCRATIC CITIZENS' SELF-ORGANIZING		
		Frequently promote	Rarely promote	No answer	Frequently promote	Rarely promote	No answer
1	Member of national/local parliament	46.8%	46.8%	6.3%	57.0%	35.4%	7.6%
2	Party leader/ prominent figure	54.5%	40.9%	4.5%	56.1%	39.4%	4.5%
3	Public official	52.4%	33.3%	14.3%	57.1%	28.6%	14.3%
4	Bureaucrat	66.7%	22.2%	11.1%	50.0%	38.9%	11.1%
5	State's auxiliary body/ Commissioner	80.0%	20.0%	0.0%	71.4%	28.6%	0.0%
6	Businessman/ Entrepreneur	32.6%	53.5%	14.0%	25.6%	58.1%	16.3%
7	CSO activist	68.8%	26.4%	4.8%	70.1%	26.4%	3.6%
8	Public figure/Adat leader/Ethnic group leader	53.3%	37.0%	9.8%	60.9%	29.3%	9.8%
9	Religious leader	43.6%	51.3%	5.1%	46.2%	48.7%	5.1%
10	Military/Police officer	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%
11	Militia, Preman	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%
12	Professional, Academician	66.7%	23.0%	10.3%	67.5%	23.0%	9.5%
13	Unknown	50.0%	36.3%	13.7%	61.3%	27.4%	11.3%
ALL ALTERNATIVE ACTORS		59.1%	33.4%	7.5%	61.9%	31.2%	6.9%

Q4.3. In your assessment, how do the dominant actors (Q3.2) abuse or avoid the rules and regulations that are supposed to promote democracy to thus foster the issues that they give priority to (Q3.4)?

Table Q4.3a. How the dominant actors abuse or avoid the rules and regulations with regard to the Citizens' Rights

NO	DOMINANT ACTORS	EQUAL CITIZENSHIP			RULE OF LAW			EQUAL TO JUSTICE			UNIVERSAL HUMAN RIGHTS		
		Frequently abuse	Rarely abuse	No answer	Frequently abuse	Rarely abuse	No answer	Frequently abuse	Rarely abuse	No answer	Frequently abuse	Rarely abuse	No answer
1	Member of national/local parliament	30.0%	66.3%	3.8%	26.9%	67.5%	5.6%	25.6%	68.8%	5.6%	23.1%	71.9%	5.0%
2	Party leader/prominent figure	47.6%	48.8%	3.6%	39.3%	52.4%	8.3%	45.2%	46.4%	8.3%	41.7%	51.2%	7.1%
3	Public official	38.3%	57.7%	4.1%	29.9%	64.8%	5.3%	35.2%	58.9%	5.9%	29.9%	64.6%	5.5%
4	Bureaucrat	33.3%	55.0%	11.7%	25.0%	63.3%	11.7%	25.0%	65.0%	10.0%	16.7%	71.7%	11.7%
5	State's auxiliary body/Commissioner	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%
6	Businessman/Entrepreneur	47.9%	46.6%	5.5%	41.1%	50.7%	8.2%	43.8%	45.2%	11.0%	41.1%	47.9%	11.0%
7	CSO activist	9.8%	78.0%	12.2%	0.0%	85.4%	14.6%	9.8%	82.9%	7.3%	12.2%	80.5%	7.3%
8	Public figure/Adat leader/Ethnic group leader	31.3%	58.3%	10.4%	20.8%	70.8%	8.3%	29.2%	64.6%	6.3%	16.7%	75.0%	8.3%
9	Religious leader	23.8%	57.1%	19.0%	19.0%	61.9%	19.0%	19.0%	61.9%	19.0%	9.5%	71.4%	19.0%
10	Military/Police officer	40.0%	60.0%	0.0%	40.0%	60.0%	0.0%	40.0%	60.0%	0.0%	66.7%	33.3%	0.0%
11	Militia, Preman	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
12	Professional, Academician	39.3%	57.1%	3.6%	28.6%	60.7%	10.7%	28.6%	60.7%	10.7%	21.4%	64.3%	14.3%
13	Unknown	37.8%	53.3%	8.9%	26.7%	62.2%	11.1%	42.2%	51.1%	6.7%	31.1%	57.8%	11.1%
ALL DOMINANT ACTORS		36.5%	58.1%	5.4%	28.9%	64.0%	7.1%	33.2%	59.8%	6.9%	28.5%	64.5%	7.0%

Table Q4.3b. How the dominant actors abuse or avoid the rules and regulations with regard to the Representation

NO	DOMINANT ACTORS	DEMOCRATIC POLITICAL REPRESENTATION			CITIZEN PARTICIPATION IN PUBLIC GOVERNANCE			INSTITUTIONALIZED CHANNELS FOR INTEREST- AND ISSUE-BASED REPRESENTATION IN PUBLIC GOVERNANCE			LOCAL DEMOCRACY			DEMOCRATIC CONTROL OF INSTRUMENTS OF COERCION		
		Frequently abuse	Rarely abuse	No answer	Frequently abuse	Rarely abuse	No answer	Frequently abuse	Rarely abuse	No answer	Frequently abuse	Rarely abuse	No answer	Frequently abuse	Rarely abuse	No answer
1	Member of national/local parliament	34.4%	61.9%	3.8%	30.6%	65.6%	3.8%	25.6%	70.0%	4.4%	21.9%	72.5%	5.6%	30.0%	65.6%	4.4%
2	Party leader/prominent figure	45.2%	46.4%	8.3%	44.0%	47.6%	8.3%	31.0%	60.7%	8.3%	31.0%	61.9%	7.1%	40.5%	52.4%	7.1%
3	Public official	35.6%	58.5%	5.9%	34.3%	60.0%	5.7%	28.5%	65.7%	5.9%	24.9%	67.8%	7.3%	30.6%	64.1%	5.3%
4	Bureaucrat	13.3%	75.0%	11.7%	26.7%	61.7%	11.7%	18.3%	71.7%	10.0%	16.7%	70.0%	13.3%	16.7%	71.7%	11.7%
5	State's auxiliary body/Commissioner	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%
6	Businessman/Entrepreneur	41.1%	46.6%	12.3%	35.6%	54.8%	9.6%	31.5%	57.5%	11.0%	26.0%	60.3%	13.7%	37.0%	53.4%	9.6%
7	CSO activist	4.9%	85.4%	9.8%	4.9%	85.4%	9.8%	0.0%	90.2%	9.8%	9.8%	80.5%	9.8%	9.8%	78.0%	12.2%
8	Public figure/Adat leader/Ethnic group leader	31.3%	58.3%	10.4%	25.0%	64.6%	10.4%	27.1%	62.5%	10.4%	22.9%	66.7%	10.4%	25.0%	66.7%	8.3%
9	Religious leader	19.0%	66.7%	14.3%	19.0%	66.7%	14.3%	9.5%	76.2%	14.3%	4.8%	81.0%	14.3%	14.3%	71.4%	14.3%
10	Military/Police officer	46.7%	53.3%	0.0%	20.0%	80.0%	0.0%	46.7%	53.3%	0.0%	46.7%	53.3%	0.0%	60.0%	40.0%	0.0%
11	Militia, Preman	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
12	Professional, Academician	25.0%	64.3%	10.7%	17.9%	75.0%	7.1%	21.4%	67.9%	10.7%	21.4%	64.3%	14.3%	28.6%	64.3%	7.1%
13	Unknown	31.1%	57.8%	11.1%	31.1%	57.8%	11.1%	37.8%	51.1%	11.1%	31.1%	57.8%	11.1%	28.9%	57.8%	13.3%
	ALL DOMINANT ACTORS	33.3%	59.5%	7.2%	31.7%	61.5%	6.8%	26.9%	66.1%	7.1%	24.0%	67.7%	8.3%	29.8%	63.4%	6.7%

Table Q4.3c. How the dominant actors abuse or avoid the rules and regulations with regard to Governance

NO	DOMINANT ACTORS	TRANSPARENT, IMPARTIAL AND ACCOUNTABLE GOVERNANCE			GOVERNMENT'S INDEPENDENCE TO MAKE DECISIONS AND IMPLEMENT THEM		
		Frequently abuse	Rarely abuse	No answer	Frequently abuse	Rarely abuse	No answer
1	Member of national/local parliament	30.0%	65.0%	5.0%	29.4%	66.9%	3.8%
2	Party leader/ prominent figure	48.8%	45.2%	6.0%	41.7%	51.2%	7.1%
3	Public official	40.0%	54.6%	5.3%	37.7%	57.3%	5.0%
4	Bureaucrat	35.0%	55.0%	10.0%	23.3%	65.0%	11.7%
5	State's auxiliary body/ Commissioner	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%
6	Businessman/ Entrepreneur	35.6%	56.2%	8.2%	39.7%	52.1%	8.2%
7	CSO activist	7.3%	82.9%	9.8%	0.0%	87.8%	12.2%
8	Public figure/Adat leader/Ethnic group leader	29.2%	62.5%	8.3%	29.2%	62.5%	8.3%
9	Religious leader	19.0%	66.7%	14.3%	23.8%	61.9%	14.3%
10	Military/Police officer	66.7%	33.3%	0.0%	40.0%	60.0%	0.0%
11	Militia, Preman	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
12	Professional, Academician	25.0%	67.9%	7.1%	21.4%	71.4%	7.1%
13	Unknown	26.7%	64.4%	8.9%	31.1%	60.0%	8.9%
ALL DOMINANT ACTORS		36.0%	57.7%	6.3%	33.5%	60.3%	6.2%

Table Q4.3d. How dominant actors abuse or avoid the rules and regulations with regard to Civil Society

NO	DOMINANT ACTORS	FREEDOM OF AND EQUAL CHANCES TO ACCESS TO PUBLIC DISCOURSES			DEMOCRATIC CITIZENS' SELF-ORGANIZING		
		Frequently abuse	Rarely abuse	No answer	Frequently abuse	Rarely abuse	No answer
1	Member of national/local parliament	20.6%	76.3%	3.1%	18.8%	77.5%	3.8%
2	Party leader/ prominent figure	28.6%	64.3%	7.1%	28.6%	65.5%	6.0%
3	Public official	19.6%	74.7%	5.7%	19.8%	74.6%	5.7%
4	Bureaucrat	18.3%	68.3%	13.3%	16.7%	70.0%	13.3%
5	State's auxiliary body/ Commissioner	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%
6	Businessman/ Entrepreneur	32.9%	58.9%	8.2%	31.5%	63.0%	5.5%
7	CSO activist	0.0%	90.2%	9.8%	2.4%	87.8%	9.8%
8	Public figure/Adat leader/Ethnic group leader	16.7%	75.0%	8.3%	16.7%	75.0%	8.3%
9	Religious leader	19.0%	61.9%	19.0%	9.5%	76.2%	14.3%
10	Military/Police officer	46.7%	53.3%	0.0%	40.0%	60.0%	0.0%
11	Militia, Preman	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
12	Professional, Academician	17.9%	71.4%	10.7%	14.3%	71.4%	14.3%
13	Unknown	24.4%	66.7%	8.9%	20.0%	71.1%	8.9%
ALL DOMINANT ACTORS		20.8%	72.5%	6.6%	20.0%	73.5%	6.5%

Q4.4. In your assessment, how do the alternative actors (Q3.3) abuse or avoid the rules and regulations that are supposed to promote democracy to thus foster the issues that they give priority to (Q3.5)?

Table Q4.4a. How the alternative actors abuse or avoid the rules and regulations with regard to the Citizens' Rights

NO	ALTERNATIVE ACTORS	EQUAL CITIZENSHIP			RULE OF LAW			EQUAL TO JUSTICE			UNIVERSAL HUMAN RIGHTS		
		Frequently abuse	Rarely abuse	No answer	Frequently abuse	Rarely abuse	No answer	Frequently abuse	Rarely abuse	No answer	Frequently abuse	Rarely abuse	No answer
1	Member of national/local parliament	7.6%	88.6%	3.8%	2.5%	91.1%	6.3%	3.8%	88.6%	7.6%	3.8%	88.6%	7.6%
2	Party leader/prominent figure	15.2%	78.8%	6.1%	9.1%	86.4%	4.5%	12.1%	81.8%	6.1%	9.1%	86.4%	4.5%
3	Public official	14.3%	76.2%	9.5%	14.3%	76.2%	9.5%	4.8%	85.7%	9.5%	14.3%	76.2%	9.5%
4	Bureaucrat	16.7%	83.3%	0.0%	11.1%	83.3%	5.6%	11.1%	83.3%	5.6%	11.1%	83.3%	5.6%
5	State's auxiliary body/Commissioner	5.7%	94.3%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%
6	Businessman/Entrepreneur	11.6%	74.4%	14.0%	4.7%	83.7%	11.6%	9.3%	79.1%	11.6%	2.3%	86.0%	11.6%
7	CSO activist	10.9%	87.1%	2.0%	6.1%	90.4%	3.6%	6.3%	90.4%	3.3%	4.8%	92.1%	3.0%
8	Public figure/Adat leader/Ethnic group leader	12.0%	79.3%	8.7%	6.5%	83.7%	9.8%	9.8%	79.3%	10.9%	7.6%	82.6%	9.8%
9	Religious leader	5.1%	92.3%	2.6%	5.1%	93.6%	1.3%	5.1%	92.3%	2.6%	3.8%	94.9%	1.3%
10	Military/Police officer	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%
11	Militia, Preman	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%
12	Professional, Academician	5.6%	85.7%	8.7%	6.3%	84.1%	9.5%	4.8%	86.5%	8.7%	5.6%	86.5%	7.9%
13	Unknown	8.9%	85.5%	5.6%	7.3%	86.3%	6.5%	11.3%	83.1%	5.6%	5.6%	87.9%	6.5%
ALL ALTERNATIVE ACTORS		9.7%	85.5%	4.7%	6.1%	88.3%	5.6%	7.0%	87.3%	5.7%	5.4%	89.3%	5.3%

Table Q4.4b. How the alternative actors abuse or avoid the rules and regulations with regard to the Representation

NO	ALTERNATIVE ACTORS	DEMOCRATIC POLITICAL REPRESENTATION			CITIZEN PARTICIPATION IN PUBLIC GOVERNANCE			INSTITUTIONALIZED CHANNELS FOR INTEREST- AND ISSUE-BASED REPRESENTATION IN PUBLIC GOVERNANCE			LOCAL DEMOCRACY			DEMOCRATIC CONTROL OF INSTRUMENTS OF COERCION		
		Frequently abuse	Rarely abuse	No answer	Frequently abuse	Rarely abuse	No answer	Frequently abuse	Rarely abuse	No answer	Frequently abuse	Rarely abuse	No answer	Frequently abuse	Rarely abuse	No answer
1	Member of national/local parliament	11.4%	81.0%	7.6%	5.1%	87.3%	7.6%	2.5%	89.9%	7.6%	3.8%	88.6%	7.6%	2.5%	89.9%	7.6%
2	Party leader/prominent figure	19.7%	75.8%	4.5%	18.2%	77.3%	4.5%	12.1%	83.3%	4.5%	10.6%	84.8%	4.5%	13.6%	81.8%	4.5%
3	Public official	19.0%	76.2%	4.8%	14.3%	76.2%	9.5%	23.8%	66.7%	9.5%	9.5%	85.7%	4.8%	9.5%	85.7%	4.8%
4	Bureaucrat	5.6%	88.9%	5.6%	11.1%	83.3%	5.6%	5.6%	88.9%	5.6%	5.6%	88.9%	5.6%	16.7%	77.8%	5.6%
5	State's auxiliary body/Commissioner	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	2.9%	97.1%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%
6	Businessman/Entrepreneur	14.0%	74.4%	11.6%	14.0%	76.7%	9.3%	16.3%	74.4%	9.3%	9.3%	79.1%	11.6%	16.3%	76.7%	7.0%
7	CSO activist	9.4%	87.3%	3.3%	5.8%	91.1%	3.0%	6.6%	90.1%	3.3%	5.1%	91.6%	3.3%	5.1%	91.9%	3.0%
8	Public figure/Adat leader/Ethnic group leader	5.4%	83.7%	10.9%	8.7%	80.4%	10.9%	10.9%	79.3%	9.8%	5.4%	83.7%	10.9%	5.4%	87.0%	7.6%
9	Religious leader	10.3%	88.5%	1.3%	2.6%	96.2%	1.3%	3.8%	94.9%	1.3%	5.1%	93.6%	1.3%	2.6%	96.2%	1.3%
10	Military/Police officer	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%
11	Militia, Preman	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%
12	Professional, Academician	7.1%	84.1%	8.7%	5.6%	86.5%	7.9%	5.6%	85.7%	8.7%	6.3%	84.1%	9.5%	4.0%	87.3%	8.7%
13	Unknown	12.9%	79.8%	7.3%	8.1%	84.7%	7.3%	8.1%	85.5%	6.5%	4.8%	87.1%	8.1%	7.3%	86.3%	6.5%
	ALL ALTERNATIVE ACTORS	10.0%	84.4%	5.6%	7.1%	87.5%	5.4%	7.4%	87.2%	5.4%	5.6%	88.7%	5.7%	5.9%	89.2%	4.9%

Table Q4.4c. How the alternative actors abuse or avoid the rules and regulations with regard to the Governance and Civil Society

NO	ALTERNATIVE ACTORS	RULES AND REGULATIONS WITH REGARD TO THE GOVERNANCE						CIVIL SOCIETY		
		TRANSPARENT, IMPARTIAL AND ACCOUNTABLE GOVERNANCE			GOVERNMENT'S INDEPENDENCE TO MAKE DECISIONS AND IMPLEMENT THEM			FREEDOM OF AND EQUAL CHANCES TO ACCESS TO PUBLIC DISCOURSES		
		Frequently abuse	Rarely abuse	No answer	Frequently abuse	Rarely abuse	No answer	Frequently abuse	Rarely abuse	No answer
1	Member of national/local parliament	10.1%	81.0%	8.9%	11.4%	81.0%	7.6%	3.8%	88.6%	7.6%
2	Party leader/prominent figure	16.7%	78.8%	4.5%	19.7%	75.8%	4.5%	9.1%	86.4%	4.5%
3	Public official	23.8%	71.4%	4.8%	23.8%	71.4%	4.8%	14.3%	81.0%	4.8%
4	Bureaucrat	11.1%	83.3%	5.6%	22.2%	72.2%	5.6%	16.7%	77.8%	5.6%
5	State's auxiliary body/Commissioner	5.7%	94.3%	0.0%	2.9%	97.1%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%
6	Businessman/Entrepreneur	9.3%	83.7%	7.0%	16.3%	76.7%	7.0%	4.7%	88.4%	7.0%
7	CSO activist	6.6%	90.4%	3.0%	5.8%	90.9%	3.3%	3.8%	92.1%	4.1%
8	Public figure/Adat leader/Ethnic group leader	4.3%	87.0%	8.7%	9.8%	81.5%	8.7%	6.5%	84.8%	8.7%
9	Religious leader	5.1%	93.6%	1.3%	3.8%	94.9%	1.3%	2.6%	96.2%	1.3%
10	Military/Police officer	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%
11	Militia, Preman	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%
12	Professional, Academician	7.1%	84.1%	8.7%	3.2%	88.1%	8.7%	4.0%	88.9%	7.1%
13	Unknown	6.5%	87.1%	6.5%	8.1%	85.5%	6.5%	6.5%	87.1%	6.5%
ALL ALTERNATIVE ACTORS		7.7%	87.2%	5.1%	8.2%	86.7%	5.1%	4.9%	89.9%	5.2%

F. ACTORS' CAPACITY

Q5.1. In your assessment, what methods are used to involve people in the political process in your town/district?

Table Q5.1. Methods to involve people

NO	METHODS TO INVOLVE PEOPLE	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
1	Politics	498	39.4%
2	Economy	361	28.6%
3	Social and culture	405	32.0%
TOTAL RESPONSES		1264	100.0%

Q5.2. Do any of the dominant and alternative actors whom you mentioned in Part 3 include other main actors or other people?

Table Q5.2. How inclusive the actors are

NO	ACTORS	INCLUSIVE TO OTHERS	
		<i>f</i>	%*
1	Dominant actors	884	77.3%
2	Alternative actors	868	80.4%

* Percentage based on number of actors. (Dominant actors = 1143; Alternative actors=1079)

Q5.3. Whom are being included by the dominant and alternative actors in the political process?**Box Q5.3. Whom are being included by the dominant and alternative actors in the political process?**

Dominant and alternative actors tend to inclusive to various actors. However, there are different patterns of inclusion between dominant and alternative actors. For the dominant actors there are four patterns: first, the dominant actors most widely predominant inclusion community. That is, the dominant actors open channels so that peoples have access to it. Second, the others actors like (1) businessmen or capital owners, (2) the people who became into his circle (include succes team, advisory, internal bases, and his family), (3) bureaucracy (include SKPD-SKPD dan government), (4) the military actors, (5) legislators, (6) professional (like academisc, rector) which is often called by dominant actors, include the parties (Demokrat, PDIP, and Golkar). Third, in the civil society domain the names who called of dominant actors is; (1) traditional leaders, rate, clan, and religious like Kesultanan Ternate, Owners of the Pondok Pesantren, Tionghoa Community, Majelis Adat Aceh, (2) NGO and popular movement organisations like LSM, NGO activist, or Buruh Tani. But the number of mentoins from NGO domain is not significant. Mention more for (3) youth organtisations usually called OKP. Although very minor, in this domain designation satgas and militia organisations like Pemuda Pancasila also mentions. Fourth, inclusion against associations who concern in the specific issues like Lapindo's victim, and supporting privilege. Although rarely mentions, this actors called as victim incluion from dominant actors.

Different with dominant actors, the alternative actors are more inclusive to community. Second, frequently mentioned is media, NGO, CSO, dan popular movement dan businessmen (including foreign donors). Third, peoples who became in alternative circles, and then pilgrims, member of CSO, networking, and followers. Fourth, the next variation is called bureucrate, government, public official, legislators, party politic, military, and academics. Fifth, altirnative actors also inclusion actors who have focus to spesific issues like pro- contra- regional division (pemekaran) and Lapindo's victim.

Q5.4. In what political, economic, social and cultural sectors of public life do the dominant and alternative actors include other main actors or other people? *(Please provide examples!)*

Box Q5.4. In what political, economic, social and cultural sectors of public life do the dominant and alternative actors include other main actors or other people?

Dominant actors and alternative actors have similar patterns to inclusion another sector. In generally, some informants called like economic, social, culture, and politic sectors. But there are some informant explain specific sectors. First, things relating too governance like transparency, against corruption movement, budgeting, capacity building, bureaucracy, participation (involvement in the political process), regulation, programming related vision and mission of regent or mayor. Second, basic service related with citizenship right like education, licensing, property and flats, quarante of equality (including gender and child), and quarante of security, religious sector, clan, and ethnic. Fourth, things about economic development like agrarian, labor, agriculture, informal sectors. Fifth, governance areas like development study, enviromental, physical development, infrastructure, facilities and infrastructure. Sixth, specific things about interest sector from the actors (especially inclusion of the dominant actors) like imaging, project transactions, politic recruitment, relationship between party politic. Little that distinguishes between dominant patterns and alternative patterns is emergence "advocay" and "coersive actions" in the alternative actors list.

Q5.5. Do any of the dominant and alternative actors whom you mentioned in Part 3 exclude other main actors or other people?

Table Q5.5. How exclusive the actors are

NO	ACTORS	EXCLUSIVE TO OTHERS	
		f	%*
1	Dominant actors	495	43.3%
2	Alternative actors	242	22.4%

* Percentage based on number of actors. (Dominant actors = 1143; Alternative actors=1079)

Q5.6. Whom are being excluded by the dominant and alternative actors in the political process?

Box Q5.6. Whom are being excluded by the dominant and alternative actors in the political process?

The process of exclusion of dominant and alternative actors is not too many, generally inclusion do to community. The pattern of dominant actors is; first, exclusion to his political opponents both individually, party politic (opposition or another party- Golkar, Demokrat), and people who have different political orientation. Second, exclusion doing to civil society like CSO, NGO and media, or spesificly called Fitra, labor community, CSO, "Pasir Besi" support for Kulonprogo case, democracy activist, agrarian activist, youth organisations. Third, government actors like bureucratic opposition, legislator, and stakeholder. Fourth, exclusion for business sectors like forestry business, and his business rivals, also traditional business sector. Fifth, individual or minority groups who have base clan, rate, religion, custom, and gender like LGBT, Tionghoa, ordinary women, traditional leaders, religious leaders, and church. Although just minority, group movement security vandals also discuss between the actors. In the alternative actors, the pattern of exclusion almost same with dominant actors. Added exclusion to budgetting mafia, radical military, another groups who have diffrent advocacy models, and exclusion to spesific policy. Nevertheless in alternative sectors there are some informant join exclusion community with any variants.

Q5.7. In what political, economic, social and cultural sectors of public life do the dominant and alternative actors exclude other main actors or other people? *(Please provide examples!)*

Box Q5.7. In what political, economic, social and cultural sectors of public life do the dominant and alternative actors exclude other main actors or other people?

Nor dominant and alternative actors have same Exclusion sectors. Although from variations in terms of diversity of the sectors exclusion more done dominant actors. In generally dominant actors and alternative actors called public sectors, economic, social, and culture as exclusion sectors. But specifically dominant and alternative actors explain became; first, the issue of participation- the extent to which the public is involved in decision making. Participation including words like hearing, information access, and the openness public information. Second, internal problem of government like human resources capacity, governance, mutation positions. Third, things about governance including budgeting, transparency, regulations and policy, also cooperation. Fourth, things related basic needs and citizenship, also about public service like security, militarism/thuggery/violence, agrarian, wage, unemployment, trafficking, gender, relation inter clan, religion, and human rights. Fifth, things about areas and economic development like infrastructure, environmental, regional assets, tourism, and investment. Sixth, related with actor interest, for example exclusion another actors who have different program, exclusion active NGO (alternative actors answer). Seventh, specific things like Lapindo, feature, and iron sands problem in Kulonprogo.

Q5.8. What do the dominant and alternative actors do to overcome exclusion?**Table Q5.8. Actors' attempt to overcome exclusion**

NO	ATTEMPT TO OVERCOME EXCLUSION	DOMINANT ACTORS		ALTERNATIVE ACTORS	
		f	%	F	%
1	Using patronage	61	5.34%	24	2.22%
2	Using money	26	2.27%	11	1.02%
3	Using media/information/discourses	87	7.61%	193	17.89%
4	Using democratic organization and institutions	55	4.81%	49	4.54%
5	Using coercion/intimidation	17	1.49%	5	0.46%
6	Using propaganda/campaign	68	5.95%	45	4.17%
7	Persuasive action	278	24.32%	167	15.48%
8	Using authority	75	6.56%	9	0.83%
9	To open access for public/To involve people	76	6.65%	52	4.82%
10	Building political image	22	1.92%	5	0.46%
11	Mass action/Network	32	2.80%	169	15.66%
12	Doing advocacy, real program	18	1.57%	45	4.17%
13	Others	29	2.54%	18	1.67%
14	Doing nothing	74	6.47%	20	1.85%
15	Unknown	225	19.69%	267	24.75%
TOTAL		1143	100.00%	1079	100.00%

Q5.9. In your assessment, who else (in addition to the major dominant and alternative actors) are involved in excluding/marginalizing people in your town/district? (You may indicate more than one option)

Box Q5.9. Who (in addition to the major dominant and alternative actors) are involved in excluding/marginalizing people in your town/district?

Other actors who did exclusion outside dominant and alternative actors are divided into three domains. First, the political arena which includes legislators like a parliament, the executive actors like a public officials such as the governor and mayor, commissioners such as the KPU and Bawaslu, members of political parties such as PDI-P, Golkar, PKS, Democrats, and the Aceh Party, a group of NGOs and organizations such as trade unions, HTI, FPI, ethnic and religious-based organizations, including NGOs also considered as opposition.

Second, the business sphere mention a name of local actors. Some of them are a big / well known companies names in the national level as Danar Hadi, Tommy Winata Group, Jusuf Kalla Group, Great Sedayu Group, Sahid Group, Clairvoyant Kingdom, Alfamart, Indomaret group, and Pertamina. On the other, also mention such as APINDO business associations, Chamber of Commerce, and Gapensi. In addition to professional associations based job-profession, ethnic-based groups such as migrant associations, unions ethnicity, and Chinese groups.

Thirdly, the people does exclusion in socio-cultural sector is who have influence, and if classified as derived from religious organizations like a Kyai, Muhammadiyah, Sinode groups, Department of Islamic Law, FBR, HTI and FPI. On the other that such as academics groups, campus movement BEM Bandung Raya, and ethnic-based groups such as the Kraton (Palace)

Q5.10. In what political, economic, social and cultural sectors of public life do they (Q5.9) exclude people? (Please provide examples!)

Box Q5.10.

In what political, economic, social and cultural sectors of public life do they (Q5.9) exclude people?

Exclusion in politics sector is related with the first , governance such as public services performance, money-politics, policy-regulation, transparency, independency and bureaucracy. Secondly, related to practical politics such as political dynasties, parties, competition-groups opposition. Third, related to citizenship right such as religion ideology, disabilities, gender, land acquisition, ethnic minorities.

Exclusion in economic business sector is related with the first, labor right such as wages, social security, outsourcing, unilateral dismissal, leave entitlements. Secondly, related to conflict with society because of land acquisition, custom/cultural problems, community involvement in business decisions that their affect and ribbish management. Third, related to competition of bussines such as internal project local goverment (indpendence), nepotisme-project doing by their family network (child) / family member of public official, exclusion business who didn't participate in this organization that controlled by certain groups.

Exclusion in socio-cultural sector mostly struggling in religion affairs, caused by ideology (khilfiyah, syiah), differences of organization (HTI, FPI) and differences respected public figure. On the other hand, exclusion also related in discrimination ethnic and custom.

Q5.11. What kind of favors, rights and policies, do you think that those who are excluded or marginalized in your town/district need to claim and develop in order to be included in public and political life?

Table Q5.11. Type of rights and policies that needed to claim and develop in order to be included in public and political life

NO	RIGHTS AND POLICIES	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
1	Special favors and preferential treatments	201	34.0
2	Rights for all	355	60.0
3	No answer	36	6.0
TOTAL		592	100.0

Q5.12. What are the prime bases for the capacity of the dominant and alternative actors that you have identified in Part 3? (Pick the most two important prime bases for each actor, then rank them)

Table Q5.12. Prime bases of the main actors

NO	PRIME BASES OF MAIN ACTORS	DOMINANT ACTORS			ALTERNATIVE ACTORS		
		Rank 1*	Rank 2*	Total responses**	Rank 1*	Rank 2*	Total responses**
1	Economic resources	520	143	663	164	52	216
		45.5%	12.5%	31.7%	15.2%	4.8%	10.8%
2	Good contact	363	398	761	567	316	883
		31.8%	34.8%	36.4%	52.5%	29.3%	44.3%
3	Knowledge	95	263	358	270	501	771
		8.3%	23.0%	17.1%	25.0%	46.4%	38.7%
4	Coercive	102	208	310	30	93	123
		8.9%	18.2%	14.8%	2.8%	8.6%	6.2%

* Percentage based on number of actors. (Dominant actors = 1143; Alternative actors=1079)

* Rank 1 column reflects the most important resources; Percentages in rank columns based on number of actors (dominant actors = 1143, alternative actors= 1079).

** Total responses column reflects the most popular resources among others; Percentages based on number of responses.

Table Q5.12a. Prime bases of the Dominant actors

NO	DOMINANT ACTORS	ECONOMIC RESOURCES			GOOD CONTACT			KNOWLEDGE			COERCIVE POWER		
		Rank 1	Rank 2	Cum	Rank 1	Rank 2	Cum	Rank 1	Rank 2	Cum	Rank 1	Rank 2	Cum
1	Member of national/ local parliament	36.9%	13.8%	28.3%	40.0%	29.4%	38.8%	6.3%	23.8%	16.8%	10.6%	18.1%	16.1%
2	Party leader/ prominent figure	44.0%	7.1%	30.1%	28.6%	35.7%	37.8%	7.1%	19.0%	15.4%	6.0%	22.6%	16.8%
3	Public official	51.1%	15.5%	36.0%	32.0%	37.5%	37.6%	4.8%	19.2%	13.0%	6.9%	17.8%	13.4%
4	Bureaucrat	36.7%	8.3%	25.2%	25.0%	26.7%	29.0%	20.0%	25.0%	25.2%	11.7%	25.0%	20.6%
5	State's auxiliary body/Commissioner	0.0%	20.0%	16.7%	20.0%	20.0%	33.3%	20.0%	20.0%	33.3%	20.0%	0.0%	16.7%
6	Businessman/ Entrepreneur	84.9%	6.8%	46.9%	1.4%	39.7%	21.0%	4.1%	15.1%	9.8%	8.2%	35.6%	22.4%
7	CSO activist	17.1%	2.4%	10.5%	53.7%	26.8%	43.4%	22.0%	43.9%	35.5%	4.9%	14.6%	10.5%
8	Public figure/Adat leader/Ethnic group leader	29.2%	6.3%	18.7%	43.8%	31.3%	39.6%	12.5%	39.6%	27.5%	14.6%	12.5%	14.3%
9	Religious leader	33.3%	0.0%	18.4%	47.6%	38.1%	47.4%	14.3%	42.9%	31.6%	4.8%	0.0%	2.6%
10	Military/ Police officer	20.0%	20.0%	20.0%	6.7%	26.7%	16.7%	20.0%	33.3%	26.7%	53.3%	20.0%	36.7%
11	Militia, Preman	0.0%	100.0%	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	50.0%
12	Professional, Academician	28.6%	7.1%	20.4%	28.6%	42.9%	40.8%	28.6%	32.1%	34.7%	3.6%	3.6%	4.1%
13	Unknown	31.1%	15.6%	25.6%	35.6%	31.1%	36.6%	15.6%	31.1%	25.6%	15.6%	6.7%	12.2%
ALL DOMINANT ACTORS		45.5%	12.5%	31.7%	31.8%	34.8%	36.4%	8.3%	23.0%	17.1%	8.9%	18.2%	14.8%

Table Q5.12b. Prime bases of the Alternative actors

NO	ALTERNATIVE ACTORS	ECONOMIC RESOURCES			GOOD CONTACT			KNOWLEDGE			COERCIVE POWER		
		Rank 1	Rank 2	Cum	Rank 1	Rank 2	Cum	Rank 1	Rank 2	Cum	Rank 1	Rank 2	Cum
1	Member of national/ local parliament	27.8%	7.6%	18.4%	53.2%	30.4%	43.4%	16.5%	39.2%	28.9%	1.3%	16.5%	9.2%
2	Party leader/ prominent figure	31.8%	6.1%	20.3%	47.0%	33.3%	43.1%	18.2%	36.4%	29.3%	1.5%	12.1%	7.3%
3	Public official	28.6%	9.5%	22.9%	47.6%	28.6%	45.7%	9.5%	33.3%	25.7%	4.8%	4.8%	5.7%
4	Bureaucrat	11.1%	16.7%	14.3%	55.6%	22.2%	40.0%	16.7%	50.0%	34.3%	16.7%	5.6%	11.4%
5	State's auxiliary body/Commissioner	2.9%	5.7%	4.3%	68.6%	22.9%	46.4%	22.9%	68.6%	46.4%	2.9%	2.9%	2.9%
6	Businessman/ Entrepreneur	53.5%	11.6%	37.8%	20.9%	34.9%	32.4%	9.3%	25.6%	20.3%	7.0%	9.3%	9.5%
7	CSO activist	6.6%	3.6%	5.5%	57.9%	27.2%	46.3%	28.9%	48.7%	42.3%	2.5%	8.1%	5.8%
8	Public figure/Adat leader/Ethnic group leader	16.3%	4.3%	12.0%	47.8%	21.7%	40.5%	20.7%	45.7%	38.6%	4.3%	10.9%	8.9%
9	Religious leader	14.1%	3.8%	9.2%	73.1%	16.7%	46.1%	10.3%	70.5%	41.4%	1.3%	5.1%	3.3%
10	Military/ Police officer	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	50.0%	0.0%	100.0%	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
11	Militia, Preman	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	50.0%	0.0%	100.0%	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
12	Professional, Academician	6.3%	3.2%	5.1%	34.1%	50.0%	45.1%	53.2%	31.7%	45.5%	1.6%	6.3%	4.3%
13	Unknown	23.4%	4.0%	14.7%	53.2%	27.4%	43.3%	16.1%	50.8%	35.9%	2.4%	8.9%	6.1%
ALL ALTERNATIVE ACTORS		15.2%	4.8%	10.8%	52.5%	29.3%	44.3%	25.0%	46.4%	38.7%	2.8%	8.6%	6.2%

Q5.13. Is it easy or difficult to become a legitimate and authoritative political leader?**Table Q5.13. Attempt to become legitimate and authoritative political leader**

NO	ATTEMPT TO BECOME LEGITIMATE AND AUTHORITATIVE LEADER	DOMINANT ACTORS		ALTERNATIVE ACTORS	
		FREQUENCY	PERCENT	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
1	Easy <i>(details in Table Q5.13a)</i>	831	72.7%	401	37.0%
2	Difficult <i>(details in Table Q5.13b)</i>	294	25.7%	656	60.9%
3	Unknown	18	1.6%	22	2.1%
TOTAL		1143	100.0%	1079	100.0%

Table Q5.13a. Factors that facilitate the actors to become legitimate and authoritative political leader

NO	FACTORS	DOMINANT ACTORS		ALTERNATIVE ACTORS	
		<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
1	Active and participate in democratic organizations	60	7.2%	26	6.5%
2	Professional background, works, job	30	3.6%	9	2.2%
3	Have good capacity, knowledge, expertise	48	5.8%	40	10.0%
4	Have good understanding on social and political context	33	4.0%	36	9.0%
5	Good personality	13	1.6%	6	1.5%
6	Have similar ideology with constituent	2	0.2%	6	1.5%
7	Getting support from mass bases	56	6.7%	58	14.5%
8	Have authority	120	14.4%	27	6.7%
9	Good network and contacts	42	5.1%	29	7.2%
10	In-group of patronage, oligarchy, political dynasty	29	3.5%	2	0.5%
11	Winning political competition	32	3.9%	4	1.0%
12	Good image, track record, popularity	36	4.3%	41	10.2%
13	Long experiences	44	5.3%	19	4.7%
14	Big capital, economic resources, rich	166	20.0%	16	4.0%
15	Getting trust from society	31	3.7%	18	4.5%
16	Factors related to clan, ethnic, religion	13	1.6%	4	1.0%
17	Have coercive power	7	0.8%	3	0.7%
18	Media exposed	7	0.8%	13	3.2%
19	Leadership capacity	20	2.4%	7	1.7%
20	Others	15	1.8%	5	1.2%
21	Unknown	27	3.2%	32	8.0%
TOTAL		831	100.0%	401	100.0%

Table Q5.13b. Factors that prevent the actors to become legitimate and authoritative political leader

NO	FACTORS	DOMINANT ACTORS		ALTERNATIVE ACTORS	
		<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
1	Lack of support from organization/party/institution	14	4.8%	45	6.9%
2	Professional background not supportive	22	7.5%	31	4.7%
3	Lack of capacity/expertise, limited knowledge	15	5.1%	62	9.5%
4	Do not have strong mass bases	24	8.2%	73	11.1%
5	Limited/Lack of authority	6	2.0%	51	7.8%
6	Do not have network and contacts	4	1.4%	41	6.3%
7	Lack of economic resources	9	3.1%	84	12.8%
8	Not getting support from society; People apathy	29	9.9%	14	2.1%
9	Minority group (ethnic, religion, clan)	14	4.8%	15	2.3%
10	Political competition too hard	27	9.2%	19	2.9%
11	Fragmented, segmented society	15	5.1%	6	0.9%
12	Do not interest to politics	10	3.4%	44	6.7%
13	Negative image, bad track record	35	11.9%	29	4.4%
14	Blocked by patronage, oligarchy, and political dynasty	15	5.1%	4	0.6%
15	Suffer from political pressures	5	1.7%	15	2.3%
16	Do not have enough experiences	2	0.7%	8	1.2%
17	Do not have charisma	2	0.7%	12	1.8%
18	Tend to use coercive power	5	1.7%	8	1.2%
19	Lack of media coverage, not able to influence public debate	1	0.3%	11	1.7%
20	Others	19	6.5%	32	4.9%
21	Unknown	21	7.1%	52	7.9%
TOTAL		294	100.0%	656	100.0%

Q5.14. How successful are the dominant actors and sub-ordinated/alternative actors in using their economic, social, cultural and coercive resources to gain political legitimacy and authority, i.e. to gain political power?

Table Q5.14. Indicators of successful in using their resources to gain political legitimacy and authority

NO	INDICATORS OF SUCCESSFUL	DOMINANT ACTORS		ALTERNATIVE ACTORS	
		F	%	F	%
1	Honest, clean and trustworthy	17	1.5%	29	2.7%
2	Policies are implemented	138	12.1%	49	4.5%
3	Democratic, aspiring, fair, enlightened	19	1.7%	39	3.6%
4	Efficient	24	2.1%	12	1.1%
5	Pro people, populist	29	2.5%	42	3.9%
6	Accumulating wealth/money/resources	113	9.9%	39	3.6%
7	Become popular (in media)	40	3.5%	54	5.0%
8	Strong and powerful	303	26.5%	132	12.2%
9	Skillful, have knowledge/expertise	26	2.3%	84	7.8%
10	Building patronage and oligarchy	29	2.5%	9	0.8%
11	Re-elected in political competition	56	4.9%	7	0.6%
12	Gain strong support from the people	109	9.5%	89	8.2%
13	Have strong network	31	2.7%	100	9.3%
14	Create political stability	20	1.7%	9	0.8%
15	Coercive	20	1.7%	9	0.8%
16	Become national figure	8	0.7%	20	1.9%
17	Have close relation to the government	29	2.5%	40	3.7%
18	Able to do advocacy, organizing and mobilization	23	2.0%	83	7.7%
19	Develop leadership, charismatic	16	1.4%	66	6.1%
20	Others	27	2.4%	52	4.8%
21	Unknown	66	5.8%	115	10.7%
TOTAL		1143	100.0%	1079	100.0%

Q5.15. In their attempts to use their resources to gain political legitimacy and authority, when do the actors fail?

Table Q5.15. Causes of failure in gaining political legitimacy and authority

NO	CAUSES OF FAILURE IN GAINING POLITICAL LEGITIMACY AND AUTHORITY	DOMINANT ACTORS		ALTERNATIVE ACTORS	
		F	%	F	%
1	Democratic institutions, regulations and channels are weak	69	6.0%	41	3.8%
2	Lack of support from bureaucracy	38	3.3%	38	3.5%
3	Lack of capacity, actors are not capable, no vision	125	10.9%	95	8.8%
4	Character of society (communalism, intolerant, etc.)	67	5.9%	96	8.9%
5	Lack of support from local elites	13	1.1%	44	4.1%
6	Not legitimized	98	8.6%	48	4.4%
7	Using coercion	36	3.1%	96	8.9%
8	Lack of money/budget and support system	66	5.8%	97	9.0%
9	Corruption	21	1.8%	13	1.2%
10	Ineffective policies	27	2.4%	20	1.9%
11	Lack of knowledge, expertise, information	39	3.4%	21	1.9%
12	Un-authoritative to make decision	10	0.9%	47	4.4%
13	Alternative movements are still limited	9	0.8%	20	1.9%
14	Law enforcement still poor	6	0.5%	23	2.1%
15	Not able to compete	68	5.9%	34	3.2%
16	Limited network	27	2.4%	94	8.7%
17	Too tight political competition, also within parties	103	9.0%	6	0.6%
18	Dynamic of local politics	41	3.6%	25	2.3%
19	Uncategorized	39	3.4%	46	4.3%
20	Others	18	1.6%	81	7.5%
21	There is no challenges	119	10.4%	94	8.7%
22	Unknown	104	9.1%	41	3.8%
TOTAL		1143	100.0%	1079	100.0%

Q5.16. What are the issues that the dominant and alternative actors give priority to?

Table Q5.16. Actors' main issue

NO	DESCRIPTION	DOMINANT ACTORS		ALTERNATIVE ACTORS	
		RESPONSE	PERCENT	RESPONSE	PERCENT
1	Issues related to moral and ethics	37	3.2%	45	4.2%
2	Issues related to welfare	450	39.4%	346	32.1%
3	Issues related to governance	123	10.8%	151	14.0%
4	Issues related democracy, human rights and pluralism	114	10.0%	230	21.3%
5	Issue related to development, infrastructure	71	6.2%	17	1.6%
6	Various issues (combined)	148	12.9%	131	12.1%
7	Others	106	9.3%	72	6.7%
8	Unknown	94	8.2%	87	8.1%
TOTAL RESPONSES		1143	100,0%	1079	100,0%

Q5.17. What are these dominant actors' and alternative actors' methods to put those issues on the political agenda? (Pick three methods that are most important for each actor, and rank them)

Table Q5.17a. Dominant actors' methods to put issues on political agenda

NO	METHODS TO PUT ISSUES ON POLITICAL AGENDA	RANK 1*		RANK 2		RANK 3		CUMULATIVE RESPONSES**	
		<i>f</i>	%***	<i>f</i>	%***	<i>f</i>	%***	<i>f</i>	%****
1	Be active in a party and thus put the issue on the agenda	647	56.9%	80	7.0%	44	3.9%	771	24.8%
2	Be active in an interest organization and bring the issue to	211	18.6%	458	40.3%	150	13.2%	819	26.3%
3	Build TV/radio stations	20	1.8%	48	4.2%	71	6.2%	139	4.5%
4	Writing articles in media, press briefing	57	5.0%	119	10.5%	110	9.7%	286	9.2%
5	Offering support	117	10.3%	273	24.0%	362	31.8%	752	24.1%
6	Petition	11	1.0%	32	2.8%	44	3.9%	87	2.8%
7	Demonstration, Mass action	7	0.6%	16	1.4%	54	4.7%	77	2.5%
8	Working with academicians, university, research institutions	3	0.3%	1	0.1%	12	1.1%	16	0.5%
9	Direct contact to community to get support, "sosialisasi"	17	1.5%	12	1.1%	34	3.0%	63	2.0%
10	Using bureaucracy, regulations	14	1.2%	10	0.9%	24	2.1%	48	1.5%
11	Using business network, economic resources to influence	0	0.0%	1	0.1%	18	1.6%	19	0.6%
12	Others	4	0.4%	11	1.0%	22	1.9%	37	1.2%
TOTAL RESPONSES								3114	100.0%

* Rank 1 column reflects the most important method among others

** Cumulative responses column reflects the most popular method among others

*** Percentages based on number of dominant actors (N=1143)

**** Percentages based on number of responses

Table Q5.17b. Alternative actors' methods to put issues on political agenda

NO	METHODS TO PUT ISSUES ON POLITICAL AGENDA	RANK 1*		RANK 2		RANK 3		CUMULATIVE RESPONSES**	
		<i>f</i>	%***	<i>f</i>	%***	<i>f</i>	%***	<i>f</i>	%****
1	Be active in a party and thus put the issue on the agenda	214	19.8%	22	2.0%	25	2.3%	261	8.7%
2	Be active in an interest organization and bring the issue to	417	38.6%	247	22.9%	102	9.5%	766	25.5%
3	Build TV/radio stations	12	1.1%	25	2.3%	19	1.8%	56	1.9%
4	Writing articles in media, press briefing	173	16.0%	266	24.7%	115	10.7%	554	18.4%
5	Offering support	59	5.5%	154	14.3%	171	15.8%	384	12.8%
6	Petition	58	5.4%	157	14.6%	177	16.4%	392	13.1%
7	Demonstration, Mass action	79	7.3%	116	10.8%	202	18.7%	397	13.2%
8	Working with academician, university, research institutions	4	0.4%	7	0.6%	21	1.9%	32	1.1%
9	Direct contact to community to get support, "sosialisasi"	37	3.4%	13	1.2%	32	3.0%	82	2.7%
10	Using bureaucracy, regulations	2	0.2%	3	0.3%	8	0.7%	13	0.4%
11	Using business network, economic resources to influence	1	0.1%	1	0.1%	6	0.6%	8	0.3%
12	Others	4	0.4%	15	1.4%	39	3.6%	58	1.9%
TOTAL RESPONSES								3003	100.0%

* Rank 1 column reflects the most important method among others

** Cumulative responses column reflects the most popular method among others

*** Percentages based on number of alternative actors (N=1079)

**** Percentages based on number of responses

Q5.18. When promoting their issues, do the dominant actors and sub-ordinated actors typically frame them as single issues/specific interests or as issues and interests that are part of strategic reforms?
(Pick only one option per actor)

Table Q5.18. How the actors framing the issues

NO	ISSUE FRAMING	DOMINANT ACTORS		ALTERNATIVE ACTORS	
		<i>F</i>	%	<i>F</i>	%
1	Single issue	239	20.9%	315	29.2%
2	Part of strategic issue	874	76.5%	738	68.4%
3	Unknown	30	2.6%	26	2.4%
TOTAL		1143	100.0%	1079	100.0%

Q5.19. How successful do you think that the dominant actors and sub-ordinated actors are in turning their issues into public matters, i.e. to put them on the political agenda?

Table Q5.19. Indicators of successful in turning their issues into public matters

NO	INDICATORS OF SUCCESSFUL	DOMINANT ACTORS		ALTERNATIVE ACTORS	
		<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
1	Presence in media	42	3.7%	44	4.1%
2	Presence in public discourse	83	7.3%	111	10.3%
3	Presence in agendas of government, parliaments, parties and and/or social movements	21	1.8%	24	2.2%
4	Resulting in physical infrastructures	14	1.2%	5	0.5%
5	Resulting becoming a state official, a member of parliament	148	12.9%	131	12.1%
6	Resulting in welfare policies and/or the implementation of welfare policies (education, health, physical security, income rate, working condition, etc.)	71	6.2%	44	4.1%
7	Resulting in political in political supports from society, other groups/parties, etc. and formation of coalition as well as ending of tensions	178	15.6%	153	14.2%
8	Resulting in a good governance	41	3.6%	31	2.9%
9	Resulting in a specific material/financial benefits and/or socio-political status advantages	44	3.8%	12	1.1%
10	Resulting in social activities and events involving people	16	1.4%	11	1.0%
11	Resulting in development program in general and economic development in particular	38	3.3%	10	0.9%
12	Resulting in policy change	16	1.4%	16	1.5%
13	Resulting in new regulations	63	5.5%	27	2.5%
14	Resulting in peaceful condition, (political) fairness, implementation of human rights, improved political awareness, ethical improvement of social life and/or democracy	18	1.6%	64	5.9%
15	Resulting in a successful program, strategy or policy	54	4.7%	24	2.2%
16	Resulting in fulfilled demands and in influencing political process	32	2.8%	92	8.5%
17	Others	99	8.7%	88	8.2%
18	Combined	48	4.2%	50	4.6%
19	Unknown	117	10.2%	142	13.2%
TOTAL		1143	100.0%	1079	100.0%

Q5.20. In their attempts to turn issues into public matters, in what situation do the actors fail?

Table Q5.20. Cause of failure in turning issues into public matters

NO	CAUSES OF FAILURE IN TURNING ISSUES INTO PUBLIC MATTERS	DOMINANT ACTORS		ALTERNATIVE ACTORS	
		<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
1	Commercialization of media control, fragmentation	2	0.2%	22	2.0%
2	The powerful are dominating everything	13	1.1%	100	9.3%
3	Education is poor so no demands for important issues	38	3.3%	36	3.3%
4	People are afraid of some issues so these are avoided	0	0.0%	3	0.3%
5	Lack of support and trust from society, other parties, other (key) figures and/or other institutions	245	21.4%	166	15.4%
6	Unreliable and unperformed institutions and institutional framework (e.g. being inefficient, ineffective, malfunction, etc.)	67	5.9%	45	4.2%
7	Political apathy	8	0.7%	22	2.0%
8	Lack of “sosialisasi”, good and proper communications, and reliable social and political networks	31	2.7%	39	3.6%
9	Cultural difference (e.g. ethnic and religious differences)	16	1.4%	11	1.0%
10	Conflicting interests	26	2.3%	20	1.9%
11	Lack of economic, social and political resources	34	3.0%	114	10.6%
12	Geographical barriers	5	0.4%	2	0.2%
13	Democracy, political inclusions, increasing political awareness	41	3.6%	7	0.6%
14	Political conflict	81	7.1%	45	4.2%
15	Actor’s lack of capacity	41	3.6%	38	3.5%
16	Actors are involved in and/or implied by political scandals (e.g. corruption, power abuse etc.)	28	2.4%	15	1.4%
17	The problem is on the strategy, on the selected issues and on how the society is approached	16	1.4%	37	3.4%
18	Others	109	9.5%	73	6.8%
19	Combined	88	7.7%	92	8.5%
20	Unknown	254	22.2%	192	17.8%
TOTAL		1143	100.0%	1079	100.0%

Q5.21. How do the actors try to increase their capacity to mobilize and organize support for their demands and policies? (Pick three methods that are most important for each actor, and rank them)

Table Q5.21a. Dominant actors' capacity to mobilize and organize support

NO	METHODS OF MOBILIZATION	RANK 1		RANK 2		RANK 3		TOTAL RESPONSES	
		F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
1	Develop populism	519	45.4%	60	5.2%	54	4.7%	633	18.5%
2	Charismatic leadership	135	11.8%	211	18.5%	37	3.2%	383	11.2%
3	Offer patronage to clients	137	12.0%	115	10.1%	84	7.3%	336	9.8%
4	Offer alternative protection and support	57	5.0%	82	7.2%	58	5.1%	197	5.7%
5	Provide contacts with influential people	48	4.2%	178	15.6%	103	9.0%	329	9.6%
6	Utilize family or clan connections	65	5.7%	133	11.6%	154	13.5%	352	10.3%
7	Build networks between equal actors	70	6.1%	132	11.5%	223	19.5%	425	12.4%
8	Coordinate groups and movements	39	3.4%	107	9.4%	149	13.0%	295	8.6%
9	Facilitate the building of organizations from below	32	2.8%	59	5.2%	154	13.5%	245	7.1%
10	Unknown	41	3.6%	66	5.8%	127	11.1%	234	6.8%
TOTAL		1143	100.0%	1143	100.0%	1143	100.0%	3429	100.0%

Table Q5.21b. Alternative actors' capacity to mobilize and organize support

NO	METHODS OF MOBILIZATION	RANK 1		RANK 2		RANK 3		TOTAL RESPONSES	
		F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
1	Develop populism	326	30.2%	53	4.9%	37	3.4%	416	12.9%
2	Charismatic leadership	108	10.0%	80	7.4%	20	1.9%	208	6.4%
3	Offer patronage to clients	39	3.6%	26	2.4%	35	3.2%	100	3.1%
4	Offer alternative protection and support	212	19.6%	138	12.8%	89	8.2%	439	13.6%
5	Provide contacts with influential people	61	5.7%	115	10.7%	62	5.7%	238	7.4%
6	Utilize family or clan connections	20	1.9%	53	4.9%	34	3.2%	107	3.3%
7	Build networks between equal actors	103	9.5%	216	20.0%	139	12.9%	458	14.1%
8	Coordinate groups and movements	99	9.2%	241	22.3%	250	23.2%	590	18.2%
9	Facilitate the building of organizations from below	82	7.6%	110	10.2%	307	28.5%	499	15.4%
10	Unknown	29	2.7%	47	4.4%	106	9.8%	182	5.6%
TOTAL		1079	100.0%	1079	100.0%	1079	100.0%	3237	100.0%

Q5.22. How do the actors use their specific capacity and methods to mobilize people (e.g. to use populism or networks)?

Table Q5.22. Methods to mobilize people

NO	METHODS TO MOBILIZE PEOPLE	DOMINANT ACTORS		ALTERNATIVE ACTORS	
		<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
1	Using trust in e.g. religious, ethnic, clan based organizations	45	3.9%	42	3.9%
2	Using social media	46	4.0%	74	6.9%
3	Via organizations	142	12.4%	54	5.0%
4	Addressing hot issue	42	3.7%	54	5.0%
5	By way of spreading and linking people through common ideology	12	1.0%	5	0.5%
6	By way of and developing (political) coalition	5	0.4%	1	0.1%
7	By providing money or other resources	58	5.1%	17	1.6%
8	By cultivating and mobilizing elite supports	31	2.7%	15	1.4%
9	Using charisma and/or political image	55	4.8%	31	2.9%
10	Using populism and egalitarianism	111	9.7%	33	3.1%
11	By way of networking	168	14.7%	245	22.7%
12	Using coercive means and violence	15	1.3%	7	0.6%
13	Using patronage	15	1.3%	2	0.2%
14	By advocacy and political education	3	0.3%	107	9.9%
15	The answer is not clear	124	10.8%	143	13.3%
16	The answer consist of more than one category	188	16.4%	165	15.3%
17	Unknown	83	7.3%	84	7.8%
TOTAL		1143	100.0%	1079	100.0%

Q5.23. How successful do you think that the actors are in mobilizing and organizing support for demands and policies?

Table Q5.23. Indicators of successful in mobilizing and organizing support

NO	INDICATORS OF SUCCESSFUL	DOMINANT ACTORS		ALTERNATIVE ACTORS	
		f	%	f	%
1	Enable to conducting more frequent demonstration, rally	5	0.4%	22	2.0%
2	Have good connection, link to parties	33	2.9%	17	1.6%
3	Have many friends, connection, alliances	37	3.2%	77	7.1%
4	Engage in policy making processes collectively	36	3.1%	16	1.5%
5	The issue become public interest, get media coverage	163	14.3%	256	23.7%
6	Enable to get into power, formal public/political position	293	25.6%	134	12.4%
7	Enable to form mass organization	27	2.4%	24	2.2%
8	Have supporter, mass base	332	29.0%	329	30.5%
9	Others	134	11.7%	106	9.8%
10	Unknown	83	7.3%	98	9.1%
TOTAL RESPONSES		1143	100,0%	1079	100,0%

Q5.24. In their attempts to mobilize and organize support for demands and policies, in what situation do the actors fail?

Table Q5.24. Causes of failure in mobilizing and organizing support

NO	CAUSES OF FAILURE IN MOBILIZING AND ORGANIZING SUPPORT	DOMINANT ACTORS		ALTERNATIVE ACTORS	
		f	%	F	%
1	Fragmentation	51	4.5%	40	3.7%
2	Lack of ideology	27	2.4%	26	2.4%
3	Loose network, not well organized	141	12.3%	207	19.2%
4	Active only in social media (facebook, twitter, etc)	1	0.1%	0	0.0%
5	Unclear concepts/substances/issues	30	2.6%	14	1.3%
6	Fail to identify basic problems and mapping the actors	126	11.0%	117	10.8%
7	The opponent is stronger and well organized	168	14.7%	102	9.5%
8	Lack of public support/ Public resistance/cynical	173	15.1%	122	11.3%
9	Lack of political awareness	46	4.0%	32	3.0%
10	Lack of institutions/personal capacity	89	7.8%	189	17.5%
11	Others	31	2.7%	37	3.4%
12	Unknown	260	22.7%	193	17.9%
TOTAL		1143	100.0%	1079	100.0%

Where do the dominant actors go to solve/address their problems and promote their visions and interests?

Q5.25. To what institution of governance?

Q5.26. Via what mediators?

Table Q5.25.

NO	CHANNELS	RESPONSE	PERCENT OF RESPONSES
1	Institutions for private governance	223	10.3
2	Institutions for community and civil self-governance	407	18.8
3	Joint state- and stakeholders agencies	639	29.5
4	Civil and military administration	333	15.4
5	Judiciary and police	190	8.8
6	Political executive	373	17.2
TOTAL RESPONSES		2165	100.0

Table Q5.26.

NO	MEDIATOR	RESPONSE	PERCENT OF RESPONSE
1	Civil society organizations	438	13.8
2	Media	682	21.5
3	Issue and interest organizations	397	12.5
4	Individual direct participation	296	9.3
5	Political society	609	19.2
6	Informal leaders	535	16.9
7	Ways of bypassing democratic representation	214	6.8
TOTAL RESPONSES		3171	100.0%

Where do the sub-ordinated/alternative actors go to solve/address their problems and promote their visions and interests?

Q5.27. To what institution of governance?

Q5.28. Via what mediators?

Q5.27. To what institutions of governance?

NO	CHANNELS	RESPONSE	PERCENT OF RESPONSE
1	Institutions for private governance	238	11.5
2	Institutions for community and civil self-governance	800	38.7
3	Joint state- and stakeholders agencies	500	24.2
4	Civil and military administration	112	5.4
5	Judiciary and police	203	9.8
6	Political executive	215	10.4
TOTAL RESPONSES		2068	100.0

Q5.28. To what institutions of governance?

NO	MEDIATOR	RESPONSE	PERCENT OF RESPONSE
1	Civil society organizations	703	23.0
2	Media	791	25.8
3	Issue and interest organizations	387	12.6
4	Individual direct participation	304	9.9
5	Political society	373	12.2
6	Informal leaders	391	12.8
7	Ways of bypassing democratic representation	113	3.7
TOTAL RESPONSES		3062	100.0

Q5.29. Why do the different dominant and alternative actors go to the specific institutions and mediators in the ways that you have indicated in your answer to the previous question?

Table Q5.29. Reasons for opt to specific institutions and mediators

NO	REASONS	DOMINANT ACTORS		ALTERNATIVE ACTORS	
		f	%	f	%
1	Quick and good results	137	12.0%	166	15.4%
2	Strategic calculation	157	13.7%	175	16.2%
3	Have good connection with people in the institution	48	4.2%	45	4.2%
4	Other institutions are not welcome	8	0.7%	17	1.6%
5	The institution has authority	293	25.6%	209	19.4%
6	The institution has strong influence	175	15.3%	135	12.5%
7	Lobby and personal contact	2	0.2%	1	0.1%
8	The institution is rooted in society	10	0.9%	30	2.8%
9	Need institutional based solution, not personal	17	1.5%	20	1.9%
10	The institution is under influence of main actors	110	9.6%	45	4.2%
11	The institution is independent	18	1.6%	39	3.6%
12	More trust to informal leaders	8	0.7%	17	1.6%
13	The institution can solve the problems effectively	25	2.2%	26	2.4%
14	Others	60	5.2%	63	5.8%
15	Unknown	75	6.6%	91	8.4%
TOTAL		1143	100.0%	1079	100.0%

Q5.30. How successful do you think that these are in seeking participation and developing representation in the way that you have indicated in your previous answer?

Table Q5.30. Indicators of successful in seeking participation and developing representation

NO	DESCRIPTION	DOMINANT ACTORS		ALTERNATIVE ACTORS	
		RESPONSE	PERCENT	RESPONSE	PERCENT
1	Successful Inclusive forum for public are available	93	8.1%	96	8.9%
2	Successful, There are more inclusive forum for public	73	6.4%	133	12.3%
3	Successful, increasing variation in the type of issues talking	23	2.0%	72	6.7%
4	Successful, More issues coming from society	20	1.7%	60	5.6%
5	Successful, People are more active	84	7.3%	133	12.3%
6	Successful, Influencing basis of civil society	18	1.6%	15	1.4%
7	Successful, Resulting policies	104	9.1%	38	3.5%
8	Successful, Resulting legitimate policies	61	5.3%	7	0.6%
9	Unsuccessful, more money using instruments	4	0.3%	2	0.2%
10	Unsuccessful, more use of the instruments of violence	7	0.6%	10	0.9%
11	Unsuccessful, more use of the instruments of office	21	1.8%	4	0.4%
12	Unsuccessful , more use of the instrument connection/nepotism	30	2.6%	8	0.7%
13	Unsuccessful, because it is dominated by government agencies	17	1.5%	9	0.8%
14	Unsuccessful, because formal regulations and practice are not in line	20	1.7%	33	3.1%
15	Unsuccessful, because of the enthusiasm of the community is still low	43	3.8%	13	1.2%
16	Unsuccessful, due to the participation of the institution's performance is getting worse	17	1.5%	20	1.9%
17	Unsuccessful, because the public interest did not materialize	86	7.5%	328	30.4%
18	Others	312	27.3%	98	9.1%
19	Unknown	110	9.6%	96	8.9%
TOTAL		1143	100.0%	1079	100.0%

Q5.31. When do the actors fail in their attempts to solve/address problems and promote their vision and interests through channels and mediators as you mentioned before?

Table Q5.31. Causes of failure in using channels and mediator institutions

NO	DESCRIPTION	DOMINANT ACTORS		ALTERNATIVE ACTORS	
		Number of responses	Percent	Number of responses	Percent
1	Public forum are still exclusive	42	3.7%	21	1.9%
2	Limited public forum is inclusive	34	3.0%	36	3.3%
3	Limited variation issue type	12	1.0%	20	1.9%
4	Limited issue coming from society	3	0.3%	9	0.8%
5	People are more passive/apathetic/resistance	146	12.8%	102	9.5%
6	No influencing basis of civil society	9	0.8%	15	1.4%
7	Don't have money instrument	44	3.8%	96	8.9%
8	Don't have coercive and violence instrument	1	0.1%	11	1.0%
9	Don't have position / authority	11	1.0%	22	2.0%
10	Do not have connection or nepotism	7	0.6%	37	3.4%
11	Actors who can not be trusted	43	3.8%	29	2.7%
12	Actors who do not have a social base	15	1.3%	33	3.1%
13	Difference interest and understanding between actors	170	14.9%	128	11.9%
14	Lack of capacity	84	7.3%	67	6.2%
15	Inadequate regulatory support	24	2.1%	21	1.9%
16	Failed to consolidate collective action	20	1.7%	29	2.7%
17	The design policies fail to implement	18	1.6%	22	2.0%
18	Social structure of patronage	5	0.4%	9	0.8%
19	Bureaucratic resistance and no independent initiative	46	4.0%	46	4.3%
20	Others	71	6.2%	78	7.2%
21	Unknown	338	29.6%	248	23.0%
TOTAL		1143	100.0	1079	100.0

Where in your judgement do ordinary people go to solve/address their problem and promote their vision and interests?

Q5.32. To what institution of governance?

Q5.33. Via what mediators?

Q5.32. Institutions of governance where ordinary people go to solve their problems

NO	INSTITUTIONS OF GOVERNANCE	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	PERCENT OF RESPONSES	PERCENT OF INFORMANTS
1	Institutions for private governance	106	9.8%	17.9%
2	Institutions for community and civil self-governance	397	36.8%	67.1%
3	Joint state- and stakeholders agencies	214	19.8%	36.1%
4	Civil and military administration	79	7.3%	13.3%
5	Judiciary and police	170	15.8%	28.7%
6	Political executive	113	10.5%	19.1%
TOTAL		1079	100.0%	N=592

Q5.33. Mediator that used by ordinary people to go to the institutions of governance

NO	MEDIATOR INSTITUTION	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	PERCENT OF RESPONSES	PERCENT OF INFORMANTS
1	Civil society organizations	387	24.2%	65.4%
2	Media	360	22.5%	60.8%
3	Issue and interest organizations	157	9.8%	26.5%
4	Individual direct participation	134	8.4%	22.6%
5	Political society	218	13.6%	36.8%
6	Informal leaders	298	18.6%	50.3%
7	Ways of bypassing democratic representation	46	2.9%	7.8%
TOTAL		1600	100.0%	N=592

Table Q5.32-5.33. How ordinary people solve their problems

NO	INSTITUTIONS OF GOVERNANCE AND MEDIATOR	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	PERCENT OF RESPONSES
1	Institutions for private governance	106	9.8%
	Via Civil society organizations	78	73.6%
	Via Media	65	61.3%
	Via Issue and interest organizations	45	42.5%
	Via Individual direct participation	21	19.8%
	Via Political society	23	21.7%
	Via Informal leaders	61	57.5%
	Ways of bypassing democratic representation	7	6.6%
2	Institutions for community and civil self-governance	397	36.80%
	Via Civil society organizations	304	76.6%
	Via Media	247	62.2%
	Via Issue and interest organizations	114	28.7%
	Via Individual direct participation	99	24.9%
	Via Political society	137	34.5%
	Via Informal leaders	208	52.4%
	Ways of bypassing democratic representation	33	8.3%
3	Joint state- and stakeholders agencies	214	19.80%
	Via Civil society organizations	145	67.8%
	Via Media	141	65.9%
	Via Issue and interest organizations	58	27.1%
	Via Individual direct participation	58	27.1%
	Via Political society	99	46.3%
	Via Informal leaders	105	49.1%
	Ways of bypassing democratic representation	15	7.0%
4	Civil and military administration	79	7.30%
	Via Civil society organizations	49	62.0%
	Via Media	47	59.5%
	Via Issue and interest organizations	20	25.3%
	Via Individual direct participation	22	27.8%
	Via Political society	39	49.4%
	Via Informal leaders	41	51.9%
	Ways of bypassing democratic representation	5	6.3%
5	Judiciary and police	170	15.80%
	Via Civil society organizations	114	67.1%
	Via Media	113	66.5%
	Via Issue and interest organizations	41	24.1%
	Via Individual direct participation	38	22.4%
	Via Political society	68	40.0%
	Via Informal leaders	97	57.1%
	Ways of bypassing democratic representation	15	8.8%
6	Political executive	113	10.50%
	Via Civil society organizations	63	55.8%
	Via Media	83	73.5%
	Via Issue and interest organizations	25	22.1%
	Via Individual direct participation	25	22.1%
	Via Political society	55	48.7%
	Via Informal leaders	69	61.1%
	Ways of bypassing democratic representation	10	8.8%
TOTAL		1079	100.00%

Q5.34. In your judgment, why do ordinary people go to the specific institutions and mediators etc.?

Box Q5.34. Why do ordinary people go to the specific institutions and mediators etc.?

Base on Informants perspective about public affairs governance institution is divided into two ways state intermediary institution such as bureaucracy and legislative and also extra-parliament intermediary institution such as media, traditional institutions, CSO and NGO.

Most of informants that used public affairs governance institution argue this institution more accessible- because only this institution who can solve their problems. The other informants reasoned that their problems are government responsibility, because government institution considered independent, strategic, accessible, more procedural, legitimate, effective, aspirational and habit.

The informants that chose extra-parliament intermediary institution argue that government institution slow response and make people distrust. The other information in this case, argue that extra-parliament intermediary institution result of their socialization and advocacy.

On the other hand, the informant argue that impossible to solve the problems it self and more effective if they use the institution.

G. STRATEGIES (DYNAMICS) OF DEMOCRATISATION

Q6.1. What are dominant and alternative actors' main strategies to reach their own aims?

Table 6.1.a. Dominant actors' strategies to reach aims

NO	DOMINANT ACTORS' MAIN STRATEGY TO REACH THEIR OWN AIMS	RESPONSES	
		F	PERCENT
1	Inter-elite networking, alliance	141	12.3%
2	Socializing program, media actions	187	16.4%
3	Populist and charismatic actions	179	15.7%
4	Getting support from party, parliament	139	12.2%
5	To mobilize people, mass	99	8.7%
6	Accumulating and to mobilize economic resources	84	7.3%
7	Making use power to get support from bureaucracy	125	10.9%
8	Getting support from clan, ethnic and religious groups	66	5.8%
9	To develop economic growth programs, investment	13	1.1%
10	Supporting good governance, law enforcement	54	4.7%
11	No answer/Not relevant	56	4.9%
TOTAL		1143	100.0

Table 6.1.b. Dominant actors' strategies to reach aims (grouped)

NO	STRATEGY TO REACH AIMS	GROUP OF DOMINANT ACTORS*									
		STATE ACTORS		POLITICAL SOCIETY ACTORS		BUSINESS ACTORS		SOCIETY ACTORS		UNKNOWN	
1	Inter-elite networking, alliance	77	12.0%	30	12.3%	13	17.8%	16	11.5%	5	11.1%
2	Socializing program, media actions	77	12.0%	39	16.0%	10	13.7%	51	36.7%	10	22.2%
3	Populist and charismatic actions	117	18.2%	34	13.9%	11	15.1%	10	7.2%	7	15.6%
4	Getting support from party, parliament	72	11.2%	46	18.9%	6	8.2%	9	6.5%	6	13.3%
5	To mobilize people, mass	56	8.7%	18	7.4%	7	9.6%	14	10.1%	4	8.9%
6	Accumulating and to mobilize economic resources	41	6.4%	21	8.6%	15	20.5%	5	3.6%	2	4.4%
7	Making use power to get support from bureaucracy	88	13.7%	27	11.1%	3	4.1%	7	5.0%	0	0.0%
8	Getting support from clan, ethnic and religious groups	39	6.1%	11	4.5%	3	4.1%	10	7.2%	3	6.7%
9	To develop economic growth programs, investment	10	1.6%	1	0.4%	0	0.0%	1	0.7%	1	2.2%
10	Supporting good governance, law enforcement	39	6.1%	9	3.7%	4	5.5%	2	1.4%	0	0.0%
11	No answer/Not relevant	26	4.0%	8	3.3%	1	1.4%	14	10.1%	7	15.6%
TOTAL		642	100.0%	244	100.0%	73	100.0%	139	100.0%	45	100.0%

* Groups of dominant actor:

State actors: Public officials, bureaucrats, commissioners of state auxiliary bodies, military/police;

Political society actors: Members of parliament (local and national), party leaders/members; Business

actors: Businessmen; Society actors: CSO activists, public figure/adat leaders/ethnic group leaders, religious leaders, militia/preman, professional, academicians

Table 6.1.c. Alternative actors' strategies to reach aims

NO	ALTERNATIVE ACTORS' MAIN STRATEGY TO REACH THEIR OWN AIMS	RESPONSES	
		F	PERCENT
1	To develop organizations, network, strengthening bases	257	23.8%
2	Accumulating and making use economic resources	32	3.0%
3	Advocacy people's interests	143	13.3%
4	Campaign, media activities	220	20.4%
5	To develop intellectual capacity, research, data collecting	40	3.7%
6	Getting support from parties and parliament	65	6.0%
7	Attending public seminar, discussions	32	3.0%
8	Doing lobby, communicate with executives and influential figures	115	10.7%
9	Entering political parties, elections	8	0.7%
10	Mobilizing people	39	3.6%
11	Getting support through cultural, religious and local community groups	67	6.2%
12	No answer/Not relevant	61	5.7%
TOTAL		1079	100.0

Q6.2. What are major challenges related to democratization that the actors face when implementing their strategies?

Table 6.2. Major challenges related to democratization that the Dominant and Alternative Actors face when implementing their strategies

NO	MAJOR CHALLENGES	DOMINANT ACTORS		ALTERNATIVE ACTORS	
		<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
1	Facing oppositions in parliament; legislative-heavy	39	3.4%	18	1.7%
2	Not getting enough support from public	173	15.1%	151	14.0%
3	Pressure and influence from business sector	47	4.1%	25	2.3%
4	Inter-elites competition, elites rivalry	171	15.0%	45	4.2%
5	Not getting support from bureaucracy; Bureaucracy still poor/weak	60	5.2%	61	5.7%
6	Facing opposition from NGO/civil society	25	2.2%	0	0.0%
7	Lack of economic resources	31	2.7%	68	6.3%
8	Law enforcement still poor/weak	26	2.3%	7	0.6%
9	Media attack, cynicism; How to make media as channel (top-down and bottom-up)	20	1.7%	17	1.6%
10	Geographic challenges	6	0.5%	3	0.3%
11	Elites/un-rooted leaders to monopolize politics	123	10.8%	46	4.3%
12	Money politics, corruption	23	2.0%	38	3.5%
13	Feudalism, patronism, incl. kesultanan, patriarchy, ethnic politics, still strong	54	4.7%	22	2.0%
14	Policies are unclear, always changing, discontinue, inconsistent	36	3.1%	13	1.2%
15	Regeneration and recruitment (cadre), difficult to find committed people	22	1.9%	46	4.3%
16	Unable to formulate good/right program and strategies	77	6.7%	136	12.6%
17	To link critical people, middle class, enlightened, into politics	83	7.3%	28	2.6%
18	Not getting support from government	0	0.0%	40	3.7%
19	Public awareness on democracy still poor	0	0.0%	31	2.9%
20	Discrimination	0	0.0%	11	1.0%
21	Premanism, coercive mass action, anti-democratic mass pressure	0	0.0%	33	3.1%
22	Fragmented movement	0	0.0%	60	5.6%
23	Pressure from government	0	0.0%	33	3.1%
24	Parties, politicians are not supportive	0	0.0%	15	1.4%
25	There's no serious challenge	44	3.8%	29	2.7%
26	Unknown	83	7.3%	103	9.5%
TOTAL		1143	100.0%	1079	100.0%

Q6.3. What effects do actors' strategies have on the problems and options of democratization that you have pointed to in the previous questions?

Table 6.3. Effects of actors' strategies on problems and options of democratization

NO	MAJOR EFFECTS	DOMINANT ACTORS		ALTERNATIVE ACTORS	
		<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
1	Promoting transparency and good governance, improving law enforcement	30	2.6%	37	3.4%
2	People become aware of citizen's rights (including to get good public services)	66	5.8%	81	7.5%
3	Public services are improved, bureaucracy become more responsive	33	2.9%	12	1.1%
4	Difficult to implement program (incl. because of media cynicism, black campaign, intrigue)	65	5.7%	28	2.6%
5	Enriching public discourse, issues are more vary	13	1.1%	33	3.1%
6	Strengthening money politics, transactional politics, hi-cost politics	43	3.8%	7	0.6%
7	Improving relationship between public officials, politicians and the people, getting more support from public	96	8.4%	42	3.9%
8	Declining public support to democracy, people are more passive, pragmatic	109	9.5%	53	4.9%
9	Opening more access for public participation, people more active, initiating public control	83	7.3%	104	9.6%
10	Fostering the importance of political imagery, only to win elections, election-oriented politics	54	4.7%	26	2.4%
11	Fostering clientism, patronage, including feudalism, clan, ethnic politics	59	5.2%	23	2.1%
12	Sharpening conflict, competition as well as collaboration among elites, public interests being excluded	81	7.1%	23	2.1%
13	More influences from business	19	1.7%	8	0.7%
14	More pressures to civil society	23	2.0%	19	1.8%
15	Resulting better democracy (in general)	116	10.1%	125	11.6%
16	Bad effect for democracy (in general)	76	6.6%	41	3.8%
17	Situation not changed significantly	50	4.4%	77	7.1%
18	Strengthening civil society's position in relation to the government and parties	0	0.0%	61	5.7%
19	Eliminating discrimination, incl. promoting gender equality	0	0.0%	12	1.1%
20	Promoting development	0	0.0%	11	1.0%
21	Improving social bases' of CSO	0	0.0%	68	6.3%
22	Improving organized movement, community based initiatives (responding to environmental issues, building infrastructures, etc.)	0	0.0%	41	3.8%
23	Worsening fragmentation among CSOs	0	0.0%	20	1.9%
24	Unknown	127	11.1%	127	11.8%
TOTAL		1143	100.0%	1079	100.0%