

Institutionalization Of Political Parties: A Case Study Of The Party Democrats In The Era Of Agus Harimurti Yudhoyono's Leadership For The 2020-2022 Period

Arif D Hasibuan¹, Julian Aldrin Pasha Rasjid²

Universitas Indonesia

Article Info

Article history:

Received : 10 October 2023

Publish : 09 January 2024

Keywords:

Party Institutionalization,
Democratic Party,
Personalization

Info Article

Article history:

Received : December 20, 2023

Publis : 09 January 2024

Abstrak

This study discusses the institutionalization of the Democratic Party in the Era of Agus Harimurti Yudhoyono's (AHY) Leadership for the 2020-2022 period. Using qualitative methods to examine case studies, this study identifies that the Democratic Party in the era of AHY leadership for the 2020-2022 period has made various efforts in order to realize the strengthening of party institutionalization. However, SBY's figure where Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono (SBY) as chairman of the party's upper house and Edi Baskoro Yudhoyono (Ibas) as chairman of the party faction as well as deputy chairman in the structure of the Democratic Party's Central Leadership Council (DPP) for the 2020-2025 period is a factor in itself for the process of strengthening the institutionalization. As a result of the findings, the Democratic Party in the AHY leadership era for the 2020-2022 period has a relatively strong level of institutionalization. This is based on the fact that although the Democratic Party is inseparable from the strong figure and personalization of SBY, the impact on the institutionalization of the Democratic Party in the era of AHY leadership for the 2020-2022 period is not so significant. This research uses the theory of institutionalization of political parties from Randall and Svasand through internal aspects in terms of system dimensions and value identities and also from external aspects in terms of policy autonomy and public image.

Abstract

Penelitian ini membahas Institusionalisasi Partai Demokrat di Era Kepemimpinan Agus Harimurti Yudhoyono (AHY) Periode 2020-2022. Dengan menggunakan metode kualitatif untuk mengkaji studi kasus, penelitian ini mengidentifikasi bahwa Partai Demokrat di era kepemimpinan AHY Periode 2020-2022 telah melakukan berbagai upaya dalam rangka mewujudkan penguatan kelembagaan partai. Namun demikian, figur SBY di mana Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono (SBY) sebagai ketua majelis tinggi partai dan Edi Baskoro Yudhoyono (Ibas) sebagai ketua fraksi partai sekaligus wakil ketua umum dalam struktur Dewan Pimpinan Pusat (DPP) Partai Demokrat Periode 2020-2025 menjadi faktor tersendiri bagi proses penguatan kelembagaan tersebut. Sebagai hasil temuan, Partai Demokrat di era kepemimpinan AHY Periode 2020-2022 memiliki tingkat kelembagaan yang tergolong kuat. Hal ini berdasarkan bahwa meskipun Partai Demokrat tidak terlepas dengan adanya kuatnya figur dan personalisasi SBY, namun dampaknya terhadap kelembagaan Partai Demokrat di era kepemimpinan AHY Periode 2020-2022 tidak begitu signifikan. Penelitian ini menggunakan teori institusionalisasi partai politik dari Randall dan Svasand melalui aspek internal yang ditinjau dari dimensi kesisteman dan identitas nilai dan juga dari aspek eksternal yang ditinjau dari dimensi otonomi kebijakan dan citra publik.

This is an open access article under the [Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/)



Corresponding Author:

Arif D Hasibuan

University of Indonesia

Email: arifdarmawanhasibuan12@gmail.com

1. INTRODUCTION

The end of the New Order regime, marked by the arrival of the reform era, was the beginning of major changes for political life in Indonesia. The development of a multiparty system accompanied by the proliferation of political parties, proves a major change in political life after the New Order. At least of the hundreds of parties born in that era, there were 48 parties that participated in the 1999 elections. This number is very different when compared to the previous election, in 1997 which was only attended by 3 political parties.

Various hopes and expectations for the presence of a democratic system became the reason for the birth of a number of new parties at the beginning of the reform. The democratic system is also the trigger for political parties to play a central role and as the core of the development of democracy itself. Thus, it is no exaggeration if Max Weber (1918) mentions political parties as children of democracy.

As an important political institution in a democratic society, political parties have 3 (three) important roles including; *First*, the role of political parties to bridge between the wishes of the community and the government. *Second*, the participation of political parties in preparing potential leaders. *Third*, the involvement of political parties in formulating every government policy in accordance with the expectations and desires of the community (Friedrich Ebert Stiftung, 2012). Therefore, political parties are seen as absolutely necessary for democracy to function (Larry Diamond and Richard Gunther, 2001).

Nevertheless, an accountable democracy requires institutionalized parties (Richard Rose and William Mishler, 2010). Therefore, Randal and Svasand mention that democratization emphasizes the contribution of political parties through the institutionalization of parties (Vicky Randall and Lars Svasand, 2002). Moreover, Magnus B. Rasmussen (2017) said the institutionalization of political parties is one of the keys so that the state can achieve prosperity. Therefore, the institutionalization of political parties becomes important for democratic development, although measurement is a neglected area of research ([Matthias Basedau](#) and [Alexander Stroh, 2008](#)).

According to Samuel P. Huntington, party institutionalization is the process of organizing and procedures so as to achieve stability and certain values for political parties. Parties that have strong institutionalization will have an impact on building a good democratic system. Therefore, the party can be said to be well institutionalized if it has been able to implement the values contained within the party itself so as to give birth to the internal stability of the political party. (Samuel P. Huntington, 1968)

Meanwhile, Randall and Svasand (2002) define institutionalization or institutionalization of parties as the process of developing political parties in terms of patterns of behavior, attitudes, or culture so that parties become more than just organizations. Randal and Svasand are of the view that party institutionalization involves four important dimensions which can then be used as a measuring tool to determine the degree of institutionalization of political parties, namely, *Systemness*, decisional autonomy, value infusion, and *reification*.

In essence, institutionalization or institutionalization of the party is considered crucial so that the party can work within the corridors of its proper functions. Therefore, strengthening the institutionalization of political parties is one of the main tasks of parties in the Indonesian political constellation. This strengthening is carried out so that political parties are able to firmly support the course of democratization and political stability. But in fact, Lili Romli (2016) revealed that serious problems in political parties in the reform era lie precisely in the low institutionalization of political parties themselves.

Research that raises the institutionalization of political parties in the reform era is found in the research of Lili Romli (2016), Akmaludin (2016) and Aprista Ristjawati (2019). The three studies both reveal that political parties in the reform era experienced serious problems from the institutional side. The three researchers also explained that the life of political parties after the reform showed the dynamics of party institutions that still needed improvement. This shows that, strengthening party institutionalization is not only an inevitable need, but also a need that cannot be delayed (Lili Romli, et al, 2008, p, 4).

In this context, Moch Nurhasim (2013) in his research stated that among the causes of the failure of institutionalization of political parties in the reform era was due to the influence of traditional forces. According to him, the influence of traditional forces that

weaken the institutionalization of the party gave birth to the phenomenon of centralistic leadership within political parties that only depend on one figure, causing leadership regeneration and the regeneration system and internal democracy not to run optimally.

Undeniably, the phenomenon of centralized leadership or personalization of political parties is not new. Personalistic parties were even more common after the reform, an unusual thing because it went against the spirit of reform itself, namely the principles of democracy. Karvonen (2010), Mancini and Swanson (1996), Rahat and Sheaffer (2007) define political party personalization as a condition in which elite individuals have a more important position than their party organization or other collective identities.

Sartori in Mair (2002) explained that political personalization in the party body is not an accident but occurs because the party has limited ability to make choices and changes to its institutions. The limitations of party management are often triggered by the high loyalty of constituents to the party leadership, the increasing role and influence of the leader (Pilet & Cross, 2015), the charisma of a very strong figure (Rhodes and Hart, 2014), and the growing patronage culture within the party (Blondel and Thiebaut, 2010).

Research by Budiatri (2018) and Nurhasim (2013) states that the impact of personalization of political parties is the main cause of factions within the party. However, the personalization factor does not always have a bad impact. Another perspective in Budiarti (2018) and Rahat and Kning (2018) revealed that there are times when political personalization actually makes the party survive because it gets an injection of enthusiasm from the echoed figure.

Both studies show that while personalization within the party can be detrimental to the institutionalization of the party itself, in some cases political personalization within the party can actually benefit the party. This is in line with the research of Esty Ekawati and Mouliza Sweinstani (2020) which states that personalization of political parties has a positive side because it can maintain internal party solidarity. However, Ekawati and Sweinstani also considered the personalization of political parties not ideal because the party was not well institutionalized.

Based on the opinions of the researchers mentioned above, it can be concluded that the institutionalization of political parties in the reform era is actually faced by personalization problems, the phenomenon of centralistic leadership, and the influence of family political factors. These factors hindered the ongoing institutionalization process and caused the party's institutions to become weak. The problem of personalization, centralistic leadership and family politics has actually been seen from the dominance of the role of figures or figures from the beginning of the birth of the political party.

For example, parties that were born during the early reform election period (1999) include: Parta Demokrasi Indonesia Perjuangan or PDI-P known as Megawati Soekarnoputri. In addition, the National Awakening Party (PKB) is known as the figure of Abdurrahman wahid aka Gus Dur. In addition, the National Mandate Party (PAN) is known as the figure of Amin Rais. Then the parties that were born and as participants in the 2004-2014 elections include the Democratic Party known as the figure of Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono (SBY), and the Great Indonesia Movement Party (Gerindra) with Prabowo's figure

Subianto is also the National Democratic Party (Nasdem) known as Surya Paloh, Hanura Party (Wiranto) and the Indonesian Unity Party (Perindo) with Hary Tanoesudibjo.

A series of central figures in political parties mentioned above become the main actors in party management who are also influential in every decision/policy making of political parties holistically. In addition, these main figures become an inherent and personalized identity with the political party. In the context of this study, researchers will place the Democratic Party as the object of a case study in this study.

The relationship between SBY and the Democratic Party cannot be let go. Bawono Kumoro (2015) mentioned that between SBY and the Democratic Party are like two sides of a coin. Both are like mutualism symbiosis that is, a mutually beneficial relationship. As a fairly new party, the Democratic Party needs to optimize its existence in the public eye so that it is quickly known. For this reason, the name SBY was used which was already popular at that time to get significant votes in the election. Similarly, SBY needed a political party to get a ticket as a presidential candidate in the 2004 election.

At the V Congress of the Democratic Party in Jakarta, Agus Harimurti Yudhoyono (AHY), who is none other than Putra SBY, was elected by acclamation as Chairman of the Democratic Party for the 2020-2025 period. The management structure in that period further strengthened the strong influence of SBY's political dynasty on the Democratic Party. Where Edhi Baskoro Yudhoyono (Ibas) who is also SBY's son serves as Vice Chairman of the Democratic Party as well as occupying the position of Chairman of the Democratic Party Faction in the House of Representatives of the Republic of Indonesia, while SBY himself serves as Chairman of the Upper House of the Democratic Party.

Some of the phenomena that occur in the Democratic Party, then make researchers interested in making the Democratic Party as a research case study in the context of party institutionalization studies. Researchers want to see how the efforts to institutionalize the Democratic Party in the era of AHY leadership for the 2020-2022 period. Moreover, these institutionalization efforts must face various challenges. Both the challenges in dealing with the Covid-19 Pandemic and the challenges of internal conflicts marked by the movement to take over the leadership of the Democratic Party (GPKPD). So in the context of this research, researchers will analyze the institutionalization or institutionalization of the Democratic Party in the era of Agus Harimurti Yudhoyono's leadership for the 2020-2022 period. This study also seeks to show how the impact of SBY's personalization on the institutionalization of the Democratic Party in the era of Agus Harimurti Yudhoyono's leadership for the 2020-2022 period.

2. THEORETICAL REVIEW

Institutionalization of Political Parties

The study of institutionalization or institutionalization is still a central issue in party studies. Regarding the institutionalization of political parties, some scholars have defined the institutionalization of political parties, such as Samuel Huntington (1968) who interprets institutionalization as the process by which organizations and procedures acquire value and stability. In contrast to Huntington, Angelo Panebianco (1988) defines institutionalization as the way in which organizations create solidity. Meanwhile, Scott Mainwaring and T.R. Scully (1995) argue that institutionalization as a condition in which an organization becomes established and accepted by many parties. While Randall and Svasand (2002) define institutionalization as the process of strengthening political parties both structurally in order to pattern behavior and culturally in patterning attitudes and culture.

If referring to some of the opinions of the experts above, it can be concluded that institutionalization or institutionalization of political parties is an effort or process of revamping political parties carried out so that political parties can work in the corridor of proper functions to achieve ideal party institutions so as to be able to firmly support the course of democratization and political stability.

In the context of this study, researchers refer to the theory of Randal and Svasand (2002) which states that the institutionalization process contains two aspects, namely internal-external aspects and structural-cultural aspects. Related to this, Randal and Svasand outlined four dimensions to measure the degree of institutional political parties, namely:

(1) *Systemness* Dimension, (2) Value Identity Dimension (*value infusion*), (3) Autonomy Dimension (*decisional autonomy*), and (4) Public Image Dimension (*reification*).

Figure 1.1. Political Party Institutionalization Framework

	Internal <i>Development within the party itself</i>	External <i>Party relations with parties outside the party</i>
Structural	(1) System Dimension The implementation of party functions is carried out based on the provisions stipulated in AD / ART, which are formulated comprehensively and in detail	(3) Autonomy Dimension Decision-making is done alone with or without consultation with outside party actors, either with sources of authority, sources of funds, or sources of mass support
Cultural	(2) Identity Dimension Values The party has loyal supporters from a certain social base and the support it obtains is based on the pattern and direction of policies that the party champions according to the political orientation of its supporters.	(4) Public Image Dimension The figure and work of political parties are defined by the general public based on the platform that the party stands for. This aspect is determined by the party's ability to communicate its historical footprint and symbolic values.

Source: Randall and Svasand 2022. "Party Institutionalisation in New Democracies". Party politics, Vol 8, No.1, : 5-29.

First, the system dimension. Ramlan Surbakti (2017) defines the system dimension as a process of implementing political party functions carried out according to the rules of the game, requirements, procedures, and mechanisms. These rules and mechanisms have been mutually agreed upon and formulated in the Articles of Association (AD) and Bylaws (ART) of political parties.

The characteristics of the party that most influence the party system itself include, (1) the way the party grows and develops, (2) relevant resources, especially party funding, (3) who determines more in the party whether personal leaders are respected by party members or member sovereignty is exercised according to organizational mechanisms, (4) how the party maintains relations with its members, whether by clientelism/patronage or by party constitution (AD/ART). (Randal and Svasand, 2002, p. 19)

Second, the value identity dimension. Value identity according to Ramlan Surbakti (2013) relates to the policy orientation and actions of political parties according to party ideology or platform, namely the pattern and direction of policies championed by political parties and their supporting social bases. According to Ramlan, social layers or groups of people give support to a party because they identify their political orientation with the party's ideology or platform.

Value identity appears not only in the pattern or direction of the policy being fought for, but also in the social base of its supporters. The party in fighting for its policies does not only rely on strength from oneself. The party also makes use of wing organizations or affiliated organizations. It is the party that is the backbone to stimulate the development of other organizations. (Randall and Svasand, 2002, p.21)

Third, the dimension of autonomy. This dimension refers to the party's dependence on external actors. The presence of these external actors tends to lead to weak institutionalization of the party because the source of legitimacy of the leadership and the

object of party loyalty is outside the party. (Randall and Svasand, 2002, p.22). That is, this dimension of autonomy is related to the relationship of the party with actors outside the party, both with certain sources of authority and with sources of funds and sources of mass support. According to Ramlan Surbakti (2013) external actors or external actors in question can be governments, rulers, entrepreneurs, or community organizations.

Fourth, public image/knowledge. This dimension refers to the extent to which political parties are inherent in the public imagination. According to Ramlan Surbakti (2013), this dimension of public image is seen from the extent of the work of each political party for the community, not about people's attitudes towards political parties. However, a political party can be said to have institutionalized in terms of public image / knowledge if the general public defines the figure and work of the political party according to the identity of the party's values (platform) so that the public can understand why a political party performs certain types of actions and does not perform other types of actions.

The Concept of Political Party Personalization

Maria and Dwayne (2015) say that personalistic parties are the result of construction or conversion of leaders who have ideals and ambitions to get national political positions. Electoral appeal lies in the personality and charisma of prospective candidates or party leaders who are considered as solutions to the nation's problems.

Meanwhile, Karvonen (2020) defines personalistic parties or personalization of political parties as conditions where individual actors become more important than political parties or their collective identities. Even the actor often becomes the *image* and identity of the party. Renwick and Pilet (2016) say that personalization leads to political party leaders as the main actors. While Richard Gunther and Larry Diamond (2003) define a personalistic party as a political vehicle deliberately created by a certain individual figure and no one party claims that it exists a common party. Gunther and Diamond described the personalistic party as a weak and opportunistic organization and the legitimacy of the personalistic party became centered on the party leader.

In giving a typological conception of parties, Richard Gunther and Larry Diamond divide parties into three criteria bases. First, the nature of the party organization (fat/thin, elite or mass, and so on); Secondly, the orientation of the party program (ideological, particularistic-clientelistic, and so on); Third, tolerant and pluralist (democratic) or protogenic (anti-system). From the basis of these criteria, Gunther and Diamond found 5 *party genera*, namely elite parties, mass parties, ethnicity parties, electoral parties, and movement parties. *The* elite party genus has two party species, local and *clientelistic*. While mass parties have six species, namely, denominational, fundamentalist, pluralist-nationalist, ultra-nationalist, leninist party and mass-class party (Ghunther and Diamond, 2003: 172)

Ethnic parties have two species: ethnic parties and congress parties. The species of movement parties are the libertarian left and *postindustrial extreme-right* parties. The electoral party has 3 species in its atnara *atchall* party, programmatic party, and personalistic party. In the context of this study, researchers will focus on personalistic parties that are part of the *genus* of electoral parties.

Barry Levit and Tatiana Kostadinova (2014) revealed that there are three characteristics of personalistic parties, namely First, the presence of dominant leadership in the party; Second, the party organization was not well institutionalized; Third, interactions between leaders and other members of politicians run with loyalty rather than commitment to programs, ideologies, or organizational rules.

The first indication of personalistic party characteristics is illustrated by the existence of personalization politics (*politick personlizing*), which is a process of increasing political burden borne by individual actors, while the centrality of political groups (political parties)

is decreasing. This is called personalistic *leadership*, where the exercise of authority is given to influential individuals based on personal attributes rather than organizational roles. While the characteristics of the second and third personalistic parties give a picture of an organization that is driven by patronage relations of its members. This makes it difficult for the party to be institutionalized as well as the development of patron-client reciprocity with access to patronage resources distributed by the dominant leader.

Jean Louis Thiebault (2011) describes three impacts that arise for parties that are personalistic, including: first, personal power is related to the influence and limits of control exercised by personal leaders regarding the main decisions taken by the party. Changes in the ideology, program or strategy of a political party, can result in internal divisions. Second, the ability of the leader to bring change to the party at the structural level. Personal power can be exercised by considering decisions relating to the law and the party's constitution.

Third, the ability of the leader to bring changes to his party at the level of selection of parliamentary candidates. Highly personalistic parties include leaders who usually have a way of suppressing factionalization, while on internally competing sides, leadership disputes can have significant consequences including splits, defections and dismissals by the dominant leader.

3. RESEARCH METHODS

The method in this study uses a qualitative approach using case studies on the Democratic Party in the Leadership Era of Agus Harimurti Yudhyono. In this study, researchers will analyze cases in depth, collect complete information using a number of data collection procedures based on things that happened in the 2018 regional elections in Central Mamberamo Regency. Cases are limited by the time and activity associated with the event. (Creswell, 2016).

This type of research in this study is carried out explanatively with the aim of explaining and testing hypotheses from research variables. Research is built based on exploratory and descriptive research which then moves on to the question of how and what impact behind the event or phenomenon under study. Primary data sources come from in-depth interviews with the parties involved and are conducted directly between two or more people to obtain the information needed. While secondary data sources come from documentation, such as AD / ART, Guidelines

Organization, decrees and instructions of the general chairman related to the Democratic Party in the era of Agus Harimurti Yudhyono's leadership. In addition, this study also uses data derived from articles, archives and other literature as well as electronic publications that discuss studies on the institutionalization of political parties.

The subjects in this study are people who served in the management structure of the Democratic Party's Central Leadership Council (DPP) and former Democratic Party administrators as parties who contradicted the current leadership of the Democratic Party. The criteria in selecting informants are people who researchers consider to understand the situation and situation in the Democratic Party and understand the problems to be studied and are able to provide information and data that can be analyzed more deeply. There were as many as 7 (seven) informants or resource persons interviewed by researchers with various sources of information, ranging from core administrators of the Democratic Party, former Democratic Party administrators and observers / academics.

There are four stages of data analysis in this study. *First*, primary data and information obtained from interviews with resource persons and secondary data in the form of several supporting documents obtained from related parties. *Second*, the primary and secondary data that have been obtained are compiled and then analyzed by examining to find out the main points to be used in this study. *Third*, the main points that have been examined in

depth are then categorized according to the topics discussed in this study to answer research problems. *Fourth*, the overall results of the data that have been analyzed in depth, then arranged properly so that they can be the results and findings of adequate research to provide conclusions and can be used in answering problems in this study.

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

AHY Era Democratic Party Institutionalization Efforts

The Democratic Party in the era of AHY leadership is carrying out an institutionalization process with various challenges faced. At least these institutionalization efforts can be divided into four dimensions of institutionalization from Randal and Svasand as theories that researchers use in this discussion, including;

First, analyze the results of the system dimension. As the newly elected chairman of the Democratic Party in 2020, AHY began the institutionalization process by trying to take initial steps to strengthen the party structure and improve the quality of cadres through recruitment and selection of management structures in the Democratic Party DPP. AHY then revamped the party's organizational structure by streamlining the position structure of the previously overlapping tupoksi and determining party management according to the standard management criteria that had been determined by referring to the party's AD / ART.

In carrying out this mechanism, AHY conducts the selection stage for prospective administrators by considering the age, profile, academic history, and track record of prospective management. If you look at the current DPP Democratic Party management structure, it can be seen that young people dominate in the core management ranks of the Democratic Party. Although some old administrators are also still trusted to serve in strategic positions in the management of the Democratic Party DPP.

However, the problem is that there is a tendency for dynastic political influence in determining the management structure, which according to researchers can strengthen family power relations in the management of the Democratic Party in the era of AHY leadership. This can be proven by the election of SBY as Chairman of the Upper House, and Ibas as Chairman of the Faction. Although the appointment of SBY as Speaker of the Upper House is legitimate and does not violate the Democratic Party's AD / ART in 2020, researchers see that the party's high authority is full of interests and opens wide the conflict of *interest* and further strengthens SBY's personalization of the Democratic Party.

Therefore, researchers see that the management structure of the Democratic Party still seems to be influenced by close relationships or kinship politics, aka dynastic politics. In her research, Winda Roselina Effendi (2018) found that dynastic politics can be interpreted as a political tactic to maintain power by transferring it to other individuals who are still related by blood. Meanwhile, Titin Purwaningsih (2015) in her research revealed that the joining of several family members into a particular political party party is a manifestation of political pragmatism and an effort to strengthen family power in politics.

Departing from the various facts mentioned above, researchers are of the view that the Democratic Party is still inseparable from SBY's personalization. Researchers also see a tendency for the Democratic Party to become a political vehicle only for the interests of the SBY family or what in this study is called the Family Party. However, when asked about the election mechanism and the reason why the position of the Upper House of the Party was handed over to SBY, Herzaky Mahendra Putra clarified that this was based on votes from cadres and proposals submitted by DPD to DPC level officials. Here's what Herzaky Mahendra said during an interview:

"The upper house of the party (MTP) in terms of party, when Mr. SBY said that "I'm done, but I'm not going anywhere, because my home is Democratic". Then the upper house body outside the DPP raised a proposal from the DPD DPC that Mr. SBY as the

chairman of the MTP, because he is the founder of the Democratic party, the Democratic party cannot be separated from Mr. SBY, this party was raised because of the figure of Mr. SBY. The beginning of this party was due to Mr. SBY as the founder. If the Democratic party is said to have nothing to do with Mr. SBY it is nonsense, the magnitude of this party is because of Mr. SBY; Emblems, flags, names, ideologies are all Mr. SBY." (interview with Head of Democratic Party DPP Strategic Communication Agency, Herzaky Mahendra Putra, Democratic Party DPP Office, February 10, 2023).

Although clarifying the issue of SBY's election as the Upper House of the Party, the statement of the Democratic Party Spokesperson mentioned above actually also confirmed that the Democratic Party has not been separated from SBY's influence or personalization. In this context, researchers argue that this certainly has a significant impact on weakening the institutionalization of the Democratic Party itself. As Lili Romli (2011) mentions, that the combination of traditional elements is caused by the large influence of personalization that makes party institutions not function or even almost non-existent.

In addition to strengthening the party's management structure and improving the quality of cadres, in making efforts to institutionalize the Democratic Party, AHY has also planned, compiled and launched 10 strategic programs that became a reference during his leadership. The ten programs include, (a) producing superior and militant human resources (HR), (b) strengthening effective management leadership, (c) modernizing the Democratic Party towards a smart party, (d) strengthening effective political communication for every line, (e) improving community service programs, (f) fostering and expanding constituent networks, (g) winning the votes of the younger generation, (h) succeeding the 2020 regional elections, (i) the success of the 2024 Presidential Election, and (j) the success of the 2024 Presidential Election.

The mechanism for realizing these programs is carried out through the line of command by issuing instructions to all management, members, councils, and cadres of the Democratic Party. As Partai Demokrat has done in the program to assist the government in dealing with Covid-19 and helping people affected economically by the Covid-19 pandemic. The strategy by giving *Top Down instructions* shows the concept, system and management of an institutionalized party organization.

At least AHY has issued six Chairman's Instructions to the management, board members, and cadres of the Democratic Party to the lower levels, including the Chairman's Instruction on the National Movement of the Democratic Party to Care and Share. In addition, Instructions on the National Movement of the Democratic Party to Build Micro, Small and Medium Enterprises (MSMEs), and also Instructions on the National Movement of the Democratic Party "Free Wifi" for Underprivileged Students.

Second, analyze the results of the value identity dimension. The findings of researchers in this ideological dimension show that the "Nationalist-Religious" ideology of the Democratic Party is a contribution to the ideas compiled by SBY. Akbar Faizal (2004) revealed that SBY was the one who made the ideology of the Democratic Party. SBY who compiled a party platform that was religious, humanist, and pluralist.

The platform of the Democratic Party is formulated as a party that is able to unite nationalists with religious people, the majority of whom are Islamic, in one place. For this reason, the party's ideology is formulated as religious-nationalist, as stated in the Democratic Party's AD/ART. The Democratic Party is a beautiful home of diversity, especially for party cadres who have diverse ethnic and religious origins, this is basically the core of the religious nationalist ideology carried by the Democratic Party. The "Nationalist-Religious" ideology of the Democratic Party is actualized in every agenda of the party's program, including in the management structure of the DPP.

So in the context of value identity, efforts to institutionalize the Democratic Party can be seen by internalizing the ideology and values of the party's struggle, both manifested in the composition of management, the strong solidity of party members, to be realized by the policies of the Democratic Party in parliament in overseeing various government policies that favor the community.

Third, analyze the results of the policy autonomy dimension. In dealing with internal conflicts within the Democratic Party, AHY conducts proportional conflict resolution. One of them is to carry out internal mitigation by consolidating the base of the party structure and limiting groups that want to *take over* AHY's power in the Democratic Party. There are several steps taken by AHY, one of which is by conducting BAP against cadres who have reported the plan of the Democratic Party leadership takeover movement (GPK-PD) both to the DPD and to the DPP Democratic Party

In addition, AHY also implements the *Commanders Call strategy*. This strategy is carried out in order to resolve internal conflicts within the Democratic Party. *This Commanders Call* is routinely carried out during conflicts in order to maintain comprehensive communication with DPD and DPC leaders throughout Indonesia. This is done to form a harmonious understanding of leaders and cadres so as to maintain solidity. *This Commanders Call* also signifies the running of internal democracy and shows how the mechanism of the Democratic Party in the AHY leadership era in maintaining relations with its members

Fourth, the analysis of the results of the public image dimension of the Democratic Party. A number of survey results have conducted public opinion polls that are known to show that there is a positive trend in the electability of the Democratic Party in the era of AHY leadership. The researchers found that the increase in the electability of the Democratic Party was due to several factors including: (a) the active participation of the Democratic Party in the field in realizing programs to help people affected by Covid-19, (b) the consistency of the Democratic Party as an opposition party in taking a critical stance on government policies that are not in favor of the community, (c) awareness of the Democratic Party in utilizing various *platforms* social media as a space to build the image of the Democratic Party to the public.

The Impact of SBY's Personalization on the Institutionalization of the Democratic Party in the AHY Era

The crucial problem faced by political parties in the reform era is the problem of party institutionalization. Weak party institutionalization tends to occur due to personalistic party management. That is, party personalization has a negative impact on political party institutions. The existence of a very strong central figure as well as being a determinant in every direction of party policy, causing the party's dependence on this figure. As a result, the party leads to de-institutionalization where party institutions are eroded because internal democracy is disrupted and the management of party management does not work well.

Endrina and Efriza (2022) in their research revealed that if internal party democracy has been damaged by the presence of party personalization, then democracy in the broad context is hampered by the entanglement of personalization, so that in simple reasoning personalization also hinders democracy in Indonesia. Party personalization can also have a positive impact including, avoiding internal party conflicts, maintaining party stability, shortening the span of party control, and extending the life of the party. However, these positive impacts are only temporary and short-term. The reason is, dependence on figures / individuals and families causes the party to be unable to transform into a modern party.

The problem of the impact of the personalistic party is currently also facing the Democratic Party. The party that was founded at the beginning of this reform must

experience the dynamics of the political journey that cannot be separated from the shadow of SBY's figure. SBY's personalization of the very strong Democratic Party is a challenge, especially for party leaders or Democratic Party chairmen in making institutionalization efforts.

At the beginning of the Democratic Party's journey to participate in the national political constellation, SBY's personalization had a mutually beneficial impact or mutualism symbiosis. The Democratic Party, which was founded as SBY's political vehicle, succeeded in delivering SBY as president and at the same time the Democratic Party profited from the popularity of SBY's figure by successfully becoming a party called a *rising star* because it won the 2004 election. The success of the Democratic Party in managing SBY's personalization continued in the 2009 election, where SBY again became president and the Democratic Party became the winning party of the 2009 election.

But unfortunately, SBY's personalization of the Democratic Party has strengthened over time. Efforts to depersonalize SBY in the Democratic Party were actually carried out when Anas Urbaningrum was elected chairman of the Democratic Party Congress in Bandung where SBY nominated Andi Malaranggeng. The support of the majority of cadres for Anas Urbaningrum is proof of the hope of the Democratic Party to transform into a modern party to escape the shadow of SBY. The results of the congress are also proof that SBY's figure in the party is no longer taken into account and no longer has a strong influence.

However, SBY is the Democratic Party and the Democratic Party is SBY. That perception has also never been separated from the public's view of the Democratic Party to this day, that the Democratic Party belongs to SBY. When Anas Urbaningrum became chairman, SBY's role was still dominant in determining the direction and policy of the Democratic Party, especially SBY at that time serving as president. However, the result of the lack of leadership of Anas because he was not "SBY's person" caused the beginning of the internal conflict of the Democratic Party. It began with the emergence of factions and their turmoil and the peak of the party was hit by the problem of corruption cases that ensnared the main members of the party.

Various problems that plagued the Democratic Party at that time were considered as the impact of SBY's personalization. Ironically, the various problems facing the party at that time were actually used as a momentum to strengthen SBY's dominance and personalization of the Democratic Party. Inevitably, SBY took over the leadership of the Democratic Party by becoming the general chairman of the Democratic Party under the pretext of wanting to save the party. SBY became the general chairman of the Democratic Party in the remaining leadership of Anas at the Democratic Party KLB in Bali and continued to be the chairman elected by acclamation at the Democratic Party Congress in 2015 in Surabaya.

During his tenure as party chairman, SBY slowly strengthened his political dynasty in the Democratic Party by giving entrance to AHY to be prepared to become the general chairman of the Democratic Party. The door begins the moment where

AHY was nominated by the Democratic Party as a candidate for the governor of DKI Jakarta in the 2017 regional election. Then it continued, with the granting of AHY's position in the party to act as the head of the victory command with the Democratic Party in the 2019 Presidential Election. Not waiting long, at the V Congress of the Democratic Party in 2020 in Jakarta, AHY was elected chairman of the Democratic Party for the 2020-2025 period.

Under AHY's leadership, the political dynasty of the SBY family became more prominent with SBY's appointment as chairman of the upper house. At the same time, Ibas was given the position of deputy chairman as well as head of the faction. The role and authority of the three strategic positions contained in the Democratic Party's AD/ART 2020

– although the changes are questionable – make the authority of three members of the SBY family hold the key to control power in the Democratic Party.

Indeed, the involvement of SBY's relatives and family members in every party management has occurred since the beginning of the Democratic Party. For example, when at the beginning of the establishment of the Democratic Party, several relatives of the SBY family entered the management (2001-2005 period), among them, Kristiani Herawati Bambang Yudhoyono (SBY's wife) served as vice chairman. In addition, Hadi Utomo (SBY's brother-in-law) served as deputy secretary general.

The involvement of the SBY family in the management of the Democratic Party continued after the implementation of the First Congress of the Democratic Party held in Bali in 2005, where Hadi Utomo was elected as chairman of the Democratic Party for the 2005-2010 period. In terms of figure and political career, Hadi Utomo has not had good enough experience. But because of the close relationship with SBY, Hadi Utomo got a good place in the party. Of course, this is also an interest for SBY in maintaining his influence in the Democratic Party (Albert, 2021: 47)

Furthermore, in the management of the Democratic Party for the 2010-2015 period chaired by Anas

Urbaningrum, Edhi Baskoro Yudhoyono or commonly called Ibas (SBY's Second Son) occupies a strategic position as secretary general. Not only that, Sartono Utomo (SBY's cousin) was appointed as deputy general treasurer. Agus Hermanto (SBY's brother-in-law) was appointed as the Election Winning Commission. Agung Budi Santoso, (SBY's brother-in-law) served as Secretary of the Department of State Apparatus Empowerment and Bureaucratic Reform and Hartanto Edhy Wibowo (SBY's cousin) became the Head of the SOE Department. Meanwhile, SBY served as Chairman of the Upper House and Chairman of the Board of Trustees of the Democratic Party and at the same time also as President of the Republic of Indonesia. These roles, of course, gave SBY a privileged position of power. This is because SBY has full control over all actions of the Democratic Party's Central Leadership Council (DPP).

It culminated in the extraordinary congress (KLB) of the Democratic Party held in Bali. SBY was elected as Chairman and at that time Ibas (SBY's Second Son) served as Secretary General. This phenomenon became history in the world of political parties in Indonesia where for the first time a father and son served as chairman and secretary general simultaneously.

Related to these conditions, one of the founders of the Democratic Party, Ahmad Yahya, said that the management structure of the Democratic Party for the 2013-2015 period was the beginning of the Democratic Party transforming into a family party. He considered that the *trend* of the image of the Democratic Party as a family party continued until Agus Harimurti Yudhoyono was elected as Chairman of the Democratic Party for the 2020-2025 period.

"After 2009, it turned into a new chapter, precisely after Anas Urbaningrum was replaced by SBY as Chairman of Umun KLB products in Bali 2013, and his son Edy Baskoro Yudoyono remained secretary general. So from then on people gave the stamp of the Democratic Party is a family party," (Ahmad Yahya interview quoted from kabar24.bisnis.com)

A series of phenomena related to the dominance of the SBY family in the Democratic Party mentioned above shows how the dynamics of the Democratic Party's journey cannot be separated from SBY's personalization as a central figure. The problem of SBY's personalization then became a big challenge that AHY had to face as chairman of the Democratic Party for the 2020-2025 period in carrying out efforts to institutionalize the party. Therefore, researchers argue, AHY's leadership is a transition phase for the

Democratic Party to make internal adjustments after SBY's leadership as general chairman. This is AHY's challenge in order to transform the Democratic Party into a modern and institutionalized party.

If referring to the discussion in the previous chapter, it was indeed found that the Democratic Party in the era of AHY leadership experienced a significant institutionalization process. This is known by several steps and efforts taken by AHY in carrying out the institutionalization process. One of them is through the selection of management candidates and management structuring carried out in accordance with the mechanism guided by AD / ART.

However, in the management structure of AHY in the 2020-2025 period, researchers have their own records on the positions of three members of the SBY family who occupy strategic positions in the party. In this condition, the researcher argues, although AHY has made institutionalization efforts through the process of preparing management structuring in accordance with AD / ART guidelines, SBY's role in the position of chairman of the upper house has an impact on strengthening SBY's personalization of the Democratic Party.

This impact can be seen when the Democratic Party faces internal conflicts in the form of a movement to take over the leadership of the Democratic Party (GPK-PD) carried out by cadres who are dissatisfied with AHY's leadership and disagree with the changes in the 2020 Democratic Party AD / ART. According to researchers, the GPK-PD event is the result of the impact of SBY's personalization which continues to be managed by the party, resulting in internal conflicts that are maintained like a time bomb. So the birth of GPK-PD which resulted in the Democratic Party KLB in Deli Serdang was actually not only a form of cadre dissatisfaction with AHY's leadership but also wanted to show efforts to depersonalize SBY against the Democratic Party.

Apart from that, according to researchers, SBY's involvement in resolving the conflict is very prominent. SBY delivered a speech responding to the issue of the coup. SBY's attitude in his speech that will "go down the mountain" in the face of the movement to take over the Democratic Party leadership shows SBY's distrust of AHY's leadership to resolve the conflict that occurred. On the other hand, SBY took a very large portion in the public in responding to the conflict so that SBY's personalization of the Party is still very strong.

However, AHY's role and contribution as general chairman in solving the case is also quite large. This event became a moment for AHY in increasing the solidity of cadres throughout the country. In the face of this movement, AHY routinely holds a consolidation agenda of management cadres at all levels with a term called *Comanders Call*. In addition to legal remedies, the honorary court of the Democratic Party also issued a strict policy by dismissing cadres involved in the GPK-PD in accordance with the rules and procedures applicable in the party's AD/ART.

Researchers argue that SBY's personalization of the Democratic Party will continue to strengthen in line with efforts to institutionalize the party. This is also in line with SBY's position in the party's structure as chairman of the upper house whose role and authority are very strong as regulated in the 2020 Democratic Party AD / ART. In this context, researchers see that there is an impact of SBY's personalization on the institutionalization of the Democratic Party in the AHY era in the 2020-2022 period, although it is not so significant. This is because efforts to institutionalize the party in the leadership of AHY are still being carried out. However, it cannot be denied that SBY's personalization disrupted the institutionalization process of the Democratic Party in the AHY era for the 2020-2022 period.

So in this context, researchers are of the view that SBY's personalization in the Democratic Party in addition to disrupting the ongoing party institutionalization process also has an impact on the weak institutions of the Democratic Party. Among these impacts

include: *First*, the leadership in the Democratic Party became centralized and every policy or decision of the party became a heavy dependence on SBY.

Such conditions can be detrimental to democratic and participatory decision-making processes because decisions are taken based on family considerations rather than broader interests. According to researchers, this can hinder leadership regeneration and regeneration within the party. When the party is too concentrated in one particular leader or family, this can hinder the process of institutionalization of the party.

Second, the SBY family's dominance within the Democratic Party could result in candidate selection based more on personal relationships and loyalty to the SBY family than on qualifications and competencies. This can certainly hinder the democratization process in candidate selection and reduce accountability within the party.

Third, when the SBY family dominates key positions in the party, it does not rule out the emergence of nepotism practices where family members or close friends are given power or positions in the party or government. This could damage the party's image and of course disrupt the party's institutionalization process. *Fourth*, the dominance of the SBY family could lead to a potential identity crisis within the party. Party members will feel that the party serves the interests of the SBY family more than the public or the party itself. This can divide the party so that it has the potential to give birth to faction and internal conflicts within the Democratic Party.

Thus, in the span of AHY's leadership period as Chairman of the Democratic Party for the 2020-2022 period as in the case study of this study, researchers can reveal that the impact of SBY's personalization on the institutionalization of the Democratic Party is actually reflected by internal conflicts through the Democratic Party Leadership Takeover Movement (GPK-PD) or the Extraordinary Congress (KLB) of the Democratic Party in Deli Serdang, North Sumatra. Although AHY as Chairman of the Democratic Party has shown his ability to resolve the conflict, the trigger for the GPK-PD event caused by the interest to strengthen the political dynasty and personalize SBY cannot be denied.

Nevertheless, researchers see, although SBY's personalization is still very strong, in carrying out its political functions, the Democratic Party under the leadership of AHY as general chairman still makes institutionalization efforts guided by the party's AD / ART and complies with democratic principles and applicable legal rules.

Therefore, from the results of this research study, it can be revealed that the Democratic Party in the era of Agus Harimurti Yudhoyono's leadership for the 2020-2022 period seeks to carry out the institutionalization process by carrying out the functions of political parties according to AD / ART guidelines by prioritizing more democratic internal mechanisms and paying attention to the principle of accountability, so that SBY's personalization does not have a significant impact on the course of the institutionalization process of the Democratic Party in the era of Agus Harimurti Yudhoyono's leadership for the 2020-2022 period.

5. CONCLUSION

This study analyzes the institutionalization of the Democratic Party in the era of Agus Harimurti Yudhoyono's (AHY) leadership for the 2020-2022 period. As the general chairman of the party who was elected by acclamation in 2020, AHY is faced with various challenges of party institutionalization which are quite heavy. Especially the challenge of the party which is still personalistic by hanging all party directions and policies on the figure or figures of SBY.

The challenge is getting tougher where AHY's leadership must be faced with the Covid-19 pandemic situation which causes all party activities to undergo adjustments. Not only that, the problem of internal party conflicts in the form of conflicts in the Democratic Party

leadership takeover movement (GPK-PD) is a challenge for AHY in carrying out the process of institutionalization of the Democratic Party.

This research shows that there is a strong and significant role of SBY's figure in the dynamics of the Democratic Party's political journey since its inception until now. The journey of the Democratic Party in the political constellation in Indonesia is inseparable from the political journey of SBY itself. SBY's great influence and/or personalization of the Democratic Party paved the way for SBY to place his family members in strategic positions in the Democratic Party structure. In other words, SBY succeeded in building a political dynasty within the Democratic Party.

As a result, SBY's personalization and the political dominance of the SBY family in the Democratic Party had an impact on disrupting the institutionalization process of the Democratic Party in the AHY era. Internal conflicts within the Democratic Party through the Democratic Party leadership takeover movement (GPK-PD) or the Extraordinary Congress (KBL) in 2021 in Deli Serdang, North Sumatra became part of SBY's strong personalization in the Democratic Party.

The 2020 Democratic Party AD/ART changes produced by SBY at the V Congress of the Democratic Party became a public spotlight on how SBY's efforts to secure his family's political power in the Democratic Party.

Nevertheless, the impact of SBY's personalization on the institutionalization of the Democratic Party in the AHY Era was not so significant. This is because the Democratic Party in the era of Agus Harimurti Yudhoyono's leadership for the 2020-2022 period has made various efforts in order to realize an ideal party institution and carry out party functions guided by AD / ART. This makes SBY's personalization factor not have a significant impact on the institutionalization process of the Democratic Party in the era of Agus Harimurti Yudhoyono's leadership for the 2020-2022 period.

In the context of the system, the Democratic Party in the era of AHY leadership has a fairly strong level of institutionalization. This is marked by the implementation of various party functions ranging from succession of internal party management, recruitment and selection of candidates with established mechanisms and the realization of programs carried out systematically, to internal conflict resolution strategies guided by AD / ART.

In the context of value identity, efforts to institutionalize the Democratic Party can be seen by internalizing the ideology and values of the party's struggle, both manifested in the composition of management, the strong solidity of party members, to be realized by the policies of the Democratic Party in parliament in overseeing various government policies that favor the community

While in policy autonomy, the findings in this study show that the decision-making mechanism in the Democratic Party in the era of AHY leadership was carried out by prioritizing aspects of internal party democracy through the consolidation space of board members which in the Democratic Party is called *the Commander Call*.

While in the context of public image, the Democratic Party in the era of AHY leadership has a strong level of institutionalization. This is marked by the results of various surveys about the upward trend in the electability of the Democratic Party in the era of AHY leadership. The results of the party's increasing electability survey show public satisfaction with the performance of the Democratic Party, especially in helping people affected by the economy due to the Covid-19 Pandemic.

In addition, the success of the Democratic Party in positioning itself as an opposition party through an attitude of rejection of various government policies that are not in favor of the public. This means that the existence of the Democratic Party is reflected through various policies that focus on the public so as to produce a positive image and imagination

of the public towards the Democratic Party in the era of Agus Harimurti Yudhoyono's leadership for the 2020-2022 period

6. BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Agustino, Leo. 2010. *'Dinasti Politik Pasca Otonomi Daerah Orde Baru: Pengalaman Banten'*, PRISMA, Vol 29.
- Ahmad Solikhin. 2017. *Menimbang Pentingnya Desentralisasi Partai Politik di Indonesia*. FISIPOL Universitas Islam Darul 'Ulum Lamongan. Journal of Governance, Volume 2
- Ahmad Solikhin. *Menimbang Pentingnya Desentralisasi Partai Politik di Indonesia*. FISIPOL Universitas Islam Darul 'Ulum Lamongan. Journal of Governance, Volume 2, No.
- Aisah Putri Budiatri. 2015. *Pelebagaan Sistem Kepartaian di Bawah Sistem Demokrati Indonesia (1998-Sekarang)*. LIPI
- Alan Ware, 2002. *The American Direct Primary: Party Institutionalization and Transformation in the north*. Cambridge University Press.
- Alessandro Chiaramonte, Vincenzo Emanuele. 2015. *Party system volatility, regeneration and de-institutionalization in Western Europe (1945–2015)*
- Alfian, M. Alfian. 2009. *Menjadi Pemimpin Politik: Perbincangan Kepemimpinan dan Kekuasaan*. Jakarta: Gramedia Pustaka Utama.
- Allen Hicken, Erik Martinez Kuhonta. 2011. *Shadows From the Past: Party System Institutionalization in Asia*. McGill University, Montreal, Canada.
- Angulo, Joan Richart. 2010, dalam Seminar kebijakan internasional (policy forum) dengan tajuk "Desentralisasi dan Sistem Kepartaian" yang diselenggarakan pada tanggal 10 Agustus 2010 bertempat di Ruang Seminar MAP UGM.
- Ariyanto, Bambang. 2016. *Desentralisasi Pengelolaan Partai Politik: Upaya Penataan Kelembagaan Partai Politik Menuju Partai Modern*. Pusat Studi Konstitusi (PUSaKo) Fakultas Hukum Universitas Andalasa: Padang.
- Aurel Croissant, Philip Völkel. 2010. *Party system types and party system institutionalization: Comparing new democracies in East and Southeast Asia*.
- Bakar, Abu. 2013. *Politik Dinasti dan Pelebagaan Partai Politik. Pelebagaan Partai Politik Pengalaman DPC PDIP dan Keluarga Banteng di Kepulauan Selayar*. Ad-daulah, Vol.1/No2. 105-119.
- Bathoro, Alim. 2011. "Perangkap Dinasti Politik dalam Konsolidasi Demokrasi." *Jurnal FISIP Umrah* 2 (2): 115-125.
- Cipto, Bambang. 1999. *Bebek Dungu "Presiden Profesional atau Politik Dinasti"*. Yogyakarta: Bigraf Publisihing.
- Djawamaku, Anto. 2005. *Percehan Partai Politik, Pemberantasan Korupsi dan Berbagai Masalah Politik Lainnya dalam Jurnal Analisis CSIS: Peran masyarakat dan demokrasi lokal*. Jakarta, Vol 34 No 2, halaman 126-127.
- Efriza. 2012. *Political Explore: Sebuah Kajian ilmu Politik*, Bandung: Alfabeta.
- Fachri, Setiadi. 2019. *Pelebagaan Partai Kebangkitan Bangsa di Kabupaten Kendal Tahun 2014-2019*. UIN Walisongo.
- Fatkhuri. 2010. *Politik Dinasti Apakah Berbahaya*.
- Firmansyah, Firdaus Ali. 2015. *Wajah Faksionalisasi Ditubuh Partai Demokrat*. Jakarta: Jurnal Transformatif, Vol I, Nomor 1
- Firmanzah. 2011. *Mengelola Partai Politik: Komunikasi dan Positioning Ideologi Politik di Era Demokrasi*. Jakarta: Yayasan Pustaka Obor Indonesia.
- Haboddin, Muhtar. 2015. *Politik Primordialisme dalam Pemilu di Indonesia, Malang*, UB Press.

- Haboddin, Muhtar. 2017. *Keluarga dalam Pilkada Serentak*. Jurnal Transformative, Vol 3, Nomor 2.
- Huntington, Samuel P. 1968. *Politics Order in Changing Society*. New Haven & London : Yale University Press.
- Iwan Hardi Saputro. 2016. *Modernisasi Partai Politik Di Tingkat Lokal* (Studi Kasus Partai Demokrat Kabupaten Semarang, Kota Salatiga, dan Kabupaten Purworejo). *Politica*, Vol. 7. No 2.
- Keith R. Weghorst, Michael Bernhard, 2014. *From Formlessness to Structure? The Institutionalization of Competitive Party Systems in Africa*. University of Florida, Gainesville, USA. 2014
- Kirana, Aditya. 2021. "Karma Politik dalam Drama Demokrat". *Majalah Gatra*: Edisi 11-17.
- Labolo, Muhadam dan Teguh Ilham. 2015. *Partai Politik dan Sistem Pemilihan Umum di Indonesia; Teori, Konsep, dan Isu Strategis*. Jakarta: PT RajaGrafindo Persada.
- Lili Romli. 2016. *Masalah Kelembagaan Partai Politik di Indonesia Pasca-Orde Baru*. *Jurnal Politik LIPI*.
- Magnus B. Rasmussen. 2017. *Party Institutionalization and Welfare State Development*. Departeman of Political Science, Unvirsiy of Oslo.
- Mainwaring, Scott. 2000. "Party System in The Third Wave", dalam *Larry Diamond and Marc F Plattner, The Global Divergence of Democracies*, Baltimore and London; *The Johns Hopkins University Press*.
- Mardaya, Dkk. 2019. *Pelembagaan Partai Politik (Studi Kasus Dewan Pimpinan Provinsi (DPP) Partai Keadilan dan Persatuan Indonesia (PKPI)*. *Jurnal Ilmiah Mahasiswa FISIP Unsyiah*, Volume 4.
- Mas'oed, Mohtar dan Collin MacAndrews. 1995. *Perbandingan Sistem Politik*, Jogjakarta, UGM Press
- Michelle Kuenzi, Gina Lambright, 2001. *Party System Institutionalization in 30 African Countries*.
- Moch Nurhasim, 2013. *Kegagalan Modernisasi Partai Politik Era Reformasi*. LIPI: Jakarta
- Netherlands Institute for Multiparty Democracy (NIMD). 2004. *Institutional Development Handbook : A Framework for Democratic Party- Building*. The Haque : NIMD.
- Nico, Harjanto. 2011. *Politik Kekerabatan dan Institusionalisasi Partai Politik di Indonesia*. Artikel. *Jurnal Analisis CSIS*, Vol 40, No 2, 2011:138-159
- Nurhasim, Moch. 2013. *Kegagalan Modernisasi Partai Politik Di Era Reformasi*. *Jurnal Penelitian Politik*, Volume 10, No.1. Hal 17-28.
- Nurlatipah Nasir. 2016. *Electoraal Volatility dalam Perspektif kelembagaan Partai Politik di Indonesia: Sebuah Analisis Hubungan Partai Politik dengan Konstituen*. STISIP Tasikmalaya: *Jurnal Politik Profetik*
- O'Donnell, Guillermo dan Phillipe C Schmitter. 1993. *Transisi Menuju Demokrasi: Rangkaian Kemungkinan dan Ketidakpastian..* Jakarta: LP3ES.
- Paul Adryani Moento, Dkk. 2018 *Peran Pemerintah dalam Pembinaan Partai Politik*. *Jurnal FISIP UNMUS* Volume. 1 No. 1 Tahun
- Pippa Norris .2014. *Builiding Political Parties: Reforming Legal Regulations and Internal Rules*. *Harvard University..*
- Rachim, Akmaludin. 2016. *Menata Ulang Kelembagaan Partai Politik Agar Bebas Korupsi*. *Selisik*. Volume 2, Nomor 4.
- Raharjo Djati, Wasito. 2013. 'Revivalisme Kekuatan Familisme dalam Demokrasi'. *Jurnal Sosiologi MASYARAKAT*, Vol. 18. No.2
- Randal, Vicky and Lars Svasand. 2002. *Party Institutionalization in New Democracies*, *Party Politic*, Vol 8, No. 1, Sage Publication, London, Hal 5- 29

- Redaktur, "Merusak Demokrat, Merusak Demokrasi" Majalah Tempo, Edisi 15-21 Maret
- Richard Gunther and Larry Diamond. 2003. "Species of Political Party: A New Typology/" *Party Politics* vol 9, no. 2 (2003): 167-199.
- Richard Rose, William Mishler. 2011. *A supply-demand model of party-system institutionalization: The Russian case.*
- Ristyawati, Aprista. 2019. *Penguatan Partai Politik Sebagai Salah Satu Bentuk Pengadministrasian dan Pelembagaan Sistem Demokrasi.* *Administrasi Law and Governance Journal*, Vol 2 No 4 PP 710-120.
- ROBERT H. DIX. 1992. *Democratization and the Institutionalization of Latin American Political Parties.* Rice University: Sage Journal.
- Romli, Lili. 2011. *Reformasi Partai Politik dan Sistem Kepartaian Di Indonesia.* *Politica* November, Vol. 2, No. 2.
- Romli, Lili. 2016. *Masalah Kelembagaan Partai Polittik.* *Jurnal Politica* Vol 2 No 2
- Romli, Lili. 2017. *Koalisi dan Konflik Internal Partai Politik Pada Era Reformasi, Koalisi dan Konflik Internal Partai Politik Pada Era Reformasi).* Jakarta: LIPI.
- Rowdotusya'adah. 2018. *Pelembagaan Partai Politik dan Faksi Intra-Partai (Studi tentang Kemunculan Faksi Anas Urbaningrum dalam Partai Demokrat).* Skripsi. UIN Jakarta.
- Saka, Ricad. 2014. *Internal Partai Demokrat Menjelang Pemilihan Umum 2014.* FISIP UIN Jakarta.
- Samuel P. Huntington, 2003. *Tertib Politik di Tengah Pergeseran Kepentingan Massa (Jakarta: PT Raja Grafindo Persada)*
- Sayhrul, Ahan. 2010. *Politik Berparas DInasti.*
- Şebnem Yardımcı-Geyikçi. 2013. *Party institutionalization and democratic consolidation: Turkey and Southern Europe in comparative perspective.*
- Sentot Wahyono, Imam. 2010. *Perilaku Organisasi.* Jakarta: Graha Ilmu.
- Septianingrum, Zakia Ayu dan Panji Anugerah Permana. 2017. *Pelembagaan Partai Politik di Indonesia: Studi Kasus Partai Golongan Karya padad Periode 2014-2017.* Dpartemen Ilmu Politik, FISIP, UI: Libui.ac.id.
- Suryana, Nanang. 2020. *Pelembagaan Partai Politik: Studi Pada Partai Solidaritas Indonesia Kota Bandung Tahun 2019.* *Jurnal Civic Hukum*, Volume 5, Nomor 1
- Syamsuddin Haris, Dkk. 2016. *Panduan Rekrutmen & Kaderisasi Partai Politik Ideal di Indonesia.* Jakarta: Direktorat Pendidikan dan Pelayanan Masyarakat Kedeputan Pencegahan, KPK dan P2Politik LIPI..
- Teguh Imansyah. 2012. "Regulasi Partai Politik Dalam Mewujudkan Penguatan Peran dan Fungsi Kelembagaan Partai Politik"
- Thohari, Hajrianto Yassin. *Politik Dinasti atau Dinasti politik.* Gatra. 19 Januari 2011.
- Thomas Meyer, Thomas. 2012. *Peran Partai Politik dalam Sebuah Sistem Demokrasi: Sembilan Tesis.* Jakarta: Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung (FES).
- Uffen, Andreas "Political Party and Party System Institutionalization in Southeast Asia: Lessons for Democratic Consolidation in Indonesia, the Philippines, and Thailand," *The Pacific Review* vol. 21, no. 3 (July 20(8): 329
- Vicky Randall, Lars Svåsand . 2002. *Party Institutionalization in New Democracies*
- Zulkieflimansyah. 2009. *Dari Politik Dinasti, Nepotisme Kekuasaan ke Budaya Patisipan..*