

Mapping network society: Network dynamics in the transition to democracy in Indonesia

Yanuar Nugroho and Gindo Tampubolon
University of Manchester

**11th International Conference on
Alternative Futures and Popular Protest
19-21 April 2006, Manchester Metropolitan University
© 21 April 2006**

Outline


- **Question: Mutually reinforcing links ?**
- **Context of study: Indonesia**
- **Synthesis & Hypothesis**
- **Methods: triangulation**
- **Results: network dynamics**
- **Conclusion: chequebook activism?**

Outline

- **Question: Mutually reinforcing links ?**
- **Context of study: Indonesia**
- **Synthesis & Hypothesis**
- **Methods: triangulation**
- **Results: network dynamics**
- **Conclusion: chequebook activism?**

Mutually reinforcing links?

Although relationship between global civil society, democracy and network society can be problematic, the predominant views of their relationships are positive



Predominant Views

- Global civil societies can be seen as conducive to democracy (e.g. Anheier, et al., 2005).
- Global civil society goes hand in hand with global network society (e.g. Warkentin, 2001):
 - through facilitation of communication and participation through ICT
 - the very ideas at the core of civil society (a society that is open and participatory) is very much in tune with network society (a society that is less hierarchical, less bureaucratic, open and inclusive).
- Democracy and network society are conducive to the support of each other. Democratic participation can be facilitated through multiple connections which ensure informed and interactive politics (Sey and Castells, 2004: 363).
- A new relationship between civil society and democracy is being forged at the international level, where there is a new impetus to build organisations of civil society as a force for achieving and deepening democracy or rebuilding it in a radically new context (Wainwright, 2005).

Questions and aims

SOME QUESTIONS

- How did this mutually reinforcing relationship evolve historically?
- What conjunctive circumstances led to the establishment of these relationships?

Sey and Castell (2004: 364) suggest that the answer “*has to be established by observation, not proclaimed as fate*”.

OUR AIMS

“To study civil society is not to defend some abstract or universal connection between civil society and democracy. Rather ... an analysis of democracy which points to civil society as a potential source of power for democracy ... through several examples –some positive, some negative– the condition under which, and the ways in which, this potential is realised.” (Wainwright, 2005: 94-95)

- We try to answer some of these questions by examining the roles of global and local civil society embedded in a network society at an instance of bloody regime change from authoritarianism to democracy.

Universal or particular link?

Civil society and democracy: Universal or particular connection?

- Civil society is a relatively new concept and academics are still grasping it. Loosely yet operationally defined (e.g. Anheier, et al., 2005), civil society is understood as a sphere of ideas, values, different kinds of groups with some degree of autonomy in relation to the state, economic entities and the family.
- Groups in this sphere develop identities, articulate interests and try to promote a specific political agenda. That is why it is no surprise that much research on civil society and democratisation have used civil society as a variable explaining the democratisation of formal political institutions. The literatures are rich in hypotheses about the relationship between civil society and democracy.
- But is this relation universal? There is contingent nature of links between civil society and democracy, which implies the possibility of links between civil society and democracy to be severed (Wainwright, 2005): dissident networks composed of civil society had moved from a defensive role to something more proactive, that is an agency for change with an emphasis on self organisation, mutual support and autonomy, which became a de facto challenge to authority.

Outline

- **Question: Mutually reinforcing links ?**
- **Context of study: Indonesia**
- **Synthesis & Hypothesis**
- **Methods: triangulation**
- **Results: network dynamics**
- **Conclusion: chequebook activism?**

Indonesia



Indonesia: periodisation

- **Pre 1995 : Authoritarian period [Pre transformation]**
 - Civil society was weak, depoliticised and fragmented (Hill, 2000).
- **1995 – 1998 : Bloody transformation [Transformation]**
 - The end of Soeharto's 36 years of authoritarian government (precipitated by the Asian economic crisis in 1997).
 - Students pioneered and led mass demonstrations. CSOs joined in with them giving support to the movement which demanded the President's resignation.
 - Short and bloody period which cost the lives of students who protested in the streets, accounts of missing activists who were protesting the government's policies, thousands of people dead in mass riots, many reports of women raped and vast material destruction.
- **1999 – 2002 : Fraught euphoria [Post transformation]**
 - 200+ political parties (48 run for election), 300+ new media, electronic and print
 - Hundreds of new CSOs
 - Three presidents in 4 years
 - Relatively chaotic political change due to the euphoric reaction after the displacement of the authoritarian leader.
- **2003 – after : Towards stability**
 - Reform in election system
 - A new era in the democratisation process in Indonesia. CSOs have a wider sphere to act as a 'check-and-balance' for both government and business.
 - CSOs have more diverse issues and concerns compared to its identity during the authoritarian regime.

Outline

- Question: Mutually reinforcing links ?
- Context of study: Indonesia
- **Synthesis & Hypothesis**
- Methods: triangulation
- Results: network dynamics
- Conclusion: chequebook activism?

Synthesis & hypothesis - SNA

- **Two alternative roles for global civil society: ‘initiator’ and ‘responsive participant’.**

(To anchor our ideas, we use three typical periods of democratic change; pre-transformation, transformation and post transformation.)

- In the initiator role, global civil society tends to be involved in networks which are dense during both the pre-transformation and the transformation period. During the post transformation period, it matters less whether the network is dense. Furthermore, we expect that the shape of networks during the first two periods is quite similar; i.e. there is a high network correlation between pre-transformation and transformation periods and lower correlation between the transformation and post-transformation period.
- Global civil society as the responsive participant would be consistent with a network that is relatively sparse during pre-transformation and significantly denser during transformation. The latter is the result of being responsive to the change that is taking place. Furthermore we expect a low network correlation between the two periods and perhaps a higher degree of correlation during transformation and post-transformation periods.
- **We characterise our expectation in terms of network density and shape correlation to give a more precise handle on the empirical evidence.**

Outline

- **Question: Mutually reinforcing links ?**
- **Context of study: Indonesia**
- **Synthesis & Hypothesis**
- **Methods: triangulation**
- **Results: network dynamics**
- **Conclusion: chequebook activism?**

Triangulation of methods

■ Survey

- No census/register of CSOs in Indonesia, hence exploratory
- 957 CSOs invited, responded to by 254 (26.8%) as per 15 Jan '06 (300+ by now)
- Disheartening, but encouraged by:
 - Not response rate, but nominal rate
 - Novelty in conducting on-line survey (esp. among CSOs in developing country)
 - What we lack in breadth, we make up for in depth – through interviews, FGDs and workshops.

■ Social Network Analysis

- Social networks maps are generated using Pajek (Batagelj and Mrvar, 2003) version 1.10. and put into the socio-political context, i.e. periodisation of political change.
 - Examination of sequence of network maps: network density and network correlation
- Webcrawler (www.gov.com) to map the current network

■ Interview

- Extensive interviews with 31 respondents, @ 45 mins to 120 mins (avg 75 mins).
 - leaders or senior activists purposively sampled to cover dimensions such as **activities** (advocacy v. developmentalists) and **structure** (formal/centralised v. informal/networked).
 - located in different positions in the networks (centre, periphery and in-between) to capture the depth of meaning these networks hold for them.


■ Workshops & Focus Group Discussions

- Workshops in Jakarta, Surabaya and Yogyakarta
- Focus Group Discussion in Aceh

Outline

- **Question: Mutually reinforcing links ?**
- **Context of study: Indonesia**
- **Synthesis & Hypothesis**
- **Methods: triangulation**
- **Results: network dynamics**
- **Conclusion: chequebook activism?**


Inter-Network of IndoCSO



Significant increase in global civil society post-transformation

- Authoritarian : 3-core, $d=0.21$
- Transformation: 3-core, $d=0.27$
- Euphoria : 5-core, $d=0.64$
- Stability : 6-core, $d=0.92$


Donor-Network of IndoCSO



Even more significant increase in global civil society post-transformation through funding.

- Authoritarian : 3-core, $d=0.39$
- Transformation: 3-core, $d=0.53$
- Euphoria : 4-core, $d=1.36$
- Stability : 5-core, $d=1.60$

ActiveCSO-Net of IndoCSO




Less significant increase in global civil society post-transformation through active links.

- Authoritarian : 2-core, $d=0.17$
- Transformation: 2-core, $d=0.22$
- Euphoria : 3-core, $d=0.46$
- Stability : 4-core, $d=0.81$

Summarising involvement

<u>Period :</u>	Authoritarian	Transformation	Euphoria	Stability
<u>k-core :</u>				
Donor	3	3	4	5
All	3	3	5	6
Active	2	2	3	4
<u>Density :</u>				
Donor	0.39	0.53	1.36	1.60
All	0.21	0.27	0.64	0.92
Active	0.17	0.22	0.46	0.81





Summarising involvement







Outline

- **Question: Mutually reinforcing links ?**
- **Context of study: Indonesia**
- **Synthesis & Hypothesis**
- **Methods: triangulation**
- **Results: network dynamics**
- **Conclusion: chequebook activism?**





If global CSOs were initiator ..

Authoritarian	Transformation	Euphoria	Stability
			
Dense	Dense	Sparse	Sparse

.. or active counterpart ...

Authoritarian	Transformation	Euphoria	Stability
 A network graph with many black nodes and a few blue edges, representing a sparse network.	 A network graph with many black nodes and a high density of blue edges, representing a dense network.	 A network graph with many black nodes and a few blue edges, representing a sparse network.	 A network graph with many black nodes and a few blue edges, representing a sparse network.
Sparse	Dense	Sparse	Sparse

.. but ...

Authoritarian	Transformation	Euphoria	Stability
 A network graph showing a central cluster of nodes with blue edges, surrounded by a sparse ring of peripheral nodes. The overall structure is sparse.	 A network graph showing a central cluster of nodes with blue edges, surrounded by a sparse ring of peripheral nodes. The overall structure is sparse.	 A network graph showing a central cluster of nodes with blue edges, surrounded by a dense ring of peripheral nodes. The overall structure is dense.	 A network graph showing a central cluster of nodes with blue edges, surrounded by a very dense ring of peripheral nodes. The overall structure is dense.
Sparse	Sparse	Dense	Dense

Conclusion

- Relationship between global civil society, democracy and network society is contingent.
- Chequebook activism may have characterised global civil society's involvement in this particular instance.
 - The increase in the density of the networks after transformation is mostly affected by the increase in the links with donors rather than the links with active global civil society.
 - the increasing activity of Indonesian CSOs after regime change is much more a result of the increase of their relationships with international donors rather than real participation with global CSOs.
 - The global civil society may have missed an opportunity to actively foster democratisation in Indonesia during the important transition.

Limitation?

- One limitation of the study arises from its reliance on the perceptions and activities of CSOs in Indonesia.
- One can argue that the picture and the argument may be very different had the international CSOs also been consulted. Their role and mode of activism may be interpreted significantly differently.
- However, we disagree with this position.
 - Fundamentally, even if it were to be the case that international CSOs were active throughout the period of this study, their activism obviously was not recognised as such by those activists on the streets during the turbulent years.
 - Even on reflection many years later, the participants still fail to recognise this alternative position.
 - Therefore, if we accept this alternative position of more activism on the part of international CSOs, the evidence points to their failure to translate more activism into real actions that is understood by their Indonesian counterpart.
- The proposed scheme linking these concepts can be applied in other contexts.

Comments & questions?
