

Empirical Investigation of Millennial Perception Towards Past Human Rights Abuses in Indonesia

Riyad Febrian Anwar

Candidate of Research Master in Law School of Law,
Tilburg University, Netherlands.

E-mail: r.f.anwar@tilburguniversity.edu

Abstract

This paper empirically investigates millennials perception on the series of human rights violations that occurred in Indonesia from 1965 to 1966, in the aftermath of *Gerakan 30 September* (G30S). The model emphasises the role of commonly perceived traits of millennial and the theory of social internalisation of human rights in predicting individual attitude towards past grave human rights abuses. Through snowball sampling, this survey-based research managed to collect 318 respondents associated themselves with the referred traits. While the considerate amount of respondent claimed to retain the traits, such upbringing does not strongly correspond with their attitude on two key human rights issues: 1) the recognition of abuses in post-G30S and 2) the victims' right to remedy facilitated by the 1956 International People Tribunal. The analysis instead yields new insight where millennial status as diaspora, or living abroad from Indonesia, is a better predictor for millennial attitude on the two featured issues.

Keywords: Millennial Traits; Social Internalization; Human Rights Studies

1. Introduction

The systemic manslaughter occurred from 1965 to 1966 which also known as Indonesian Communist Purge, were large-scale manhunts which occurred in Indonesia over many months. The widespread violence was deliberately targeted at the proponents of communism, ethnic Chinese, or alleged supporters for the left movement. This was allegedly done under the instigation of the armed forces and government (McGregor & Katharine, 2009). It was considered as an act of retaliation in response to the 30th September 1965 Movement or *Gerakan 30 September 1965* (G30S) –the high-profile killing of several military generals by the supporting militants of the Indonesian Communist Party (PKI) with the objective of thwarting the presiding ruler, Soekarno, and his cabinets (Jong 2015).

The acts of killing in 1965 could be loosely treated as crimes against humanity. According to the U.S. Central Intelligence Agency report in 1968, in terms of the number of casualties, the anti-PKI massacres in Indonesia rank as one of the worst mass murders of the 20th century; alongside the Soviet purges of the 1930, the Holocaust during the Second World War, and the Maoist bloodbath of the early 1950. Gellately held that the most widely accepted estimates of deaths caused by this campaign are that at least 500,000 were killed (Gellately 2013: 290–291).

After 50 years left untouched, partly due to the embedded state propaganda led by President Soeharto (Jong 2015) and scarcity of accessible evidence during Soeharto's era (Cribb and Ford 2010), the call for an open investigation brought once again under public discourse in 2015. The cause is even more compelling when sympathisers for the victims in the 1965 violations managed to push on the creation of civilian-initiated "court of inquiry" called as the '1965 International People's Tribunal for the 1965 Crimes against Humanity' (IPT). The Tribunal goal is a straightforward one – to seek accountability from Indonesian government for the alleged mass crimes committed in 1965; to break down the vicious cycle of denial, distortion, taboo and secrecy about the 1965 killings (Palatino 2015; Santoso 2015)

Unfortunately, the government took a stance to reject the final recommendation given by the IPT (Rahman 2016). The Tribunal, in their views, was established on a contentious ground, with no clear binding effect. This rationale came to no surprise; the Tribunal has neither approved by the Government nor represents a formal, national or international, forum to seek remedies (Asril, 2016). From this outset, one may pragmatically concur that the 'absence of approval from the authority' would diminish the effort of justice collaboration between independent finding derived from the Tribunal and the self-prompted investigation conducted by the Indonesian judiciaries.

The paper challenges the underlying assumption above by referring to Koh's (2015) notion of social internalisation. Contrary to popular belief, the effort to enforce human rights law does not exclusively facilitated by the national authorities. The process of internalisation infers that the effective and sensible enforcement of human rights rules should be backed by pre-existing human rights values embedded within the society (Koh 1999: 1413). Such condition, however, is not an instantaneous one. For social internalisation to hypothetically established, individuals within a society are expected to possess a clear network of shareable knowledge on human rights value, including their mutual awareness on human rights deficiencies currently at stake (Koh 1999: 1413).

If the premise above is correct, I would then further argue if millennial, which currently emerged as one of the dominant generational groups in Indonesia, would be more inclined to pro-actively opposed current government from denouncing internalised human right movement such as IPT. This deduction took inspiration from a series of empirical studies (see Section 2) that

presupposed millennial as a generational group, with higher likeability to support the human right “causes” as a result from their distinct personalities. Taking into consideration the 33% coverage of millennial as part of the overall population in Indonesia (Ali and Purwandi, 2016: 9), this paper would, therefore, aim to empirically investigate the social internalisation process of human rights values through the lens of Indonesian millennials. Using the parameter of millennial traits, we questioned the extent of its potential to shape millennial attitudes on critical human rights issues: 1) The recognition of crimes against humanities occurred in post G30S and 2) acknowledgement for victims’ right for a remedy as facilitated by the 1965 International People Tribunal.

The paper organised as follows. Section 2 briefly describes the commonly perceived traits of millennial as its own isolated group in the generational studies. The discussion follows by theoretical consideration seeking to identify potential extraneous factors, which might alter or distort the correlation link, between millennial personalities and their attitude on human rights protection. Section 3 then explores the methodological foundation in this paper. Section 4 addresses the results. The paper concluded with reflections for the future research which utilised millennial as the subject of research sampling, and to those who keen to develop social internalisation as the empirical model for human right law studies.

1.1. Millennial Traits

Claims have been put forth that each generation brings its own set of values, beliefs, life experiences, and attitudes, that different generations will not become more alike with age. Accordingly, they [generational group] will carry their ‘generational personalities’ with them throughout their lives.” (Stillman and Lancaster 2002: 8). This hypothesis was a successor of the original claim made by Strauss and Howe (1999) that ‘there are patterns of differences among individual generations including the Silent Generation (1925–1942), Baby Boom Generation (1943–1960), Generation-X (1961–1981), and the Millennial Generation (1982–2001)’ (Strauss and Howe 1991: 418).

From the statement above, one might subsequently question the rationale behind urging an isolated empirical test for millennial. For that, I would argue that the currently existing and ‘young’ millennial demographics will eventually grow up and replace their predecessor, baby boomers, in all aspect of social affairs in the future (Papini 2007: 8). Hence, our understanding of millennial traits today would be proven critical for our socio-legal understanding of preferred norms and rules for the future society. Keeling (2003) proposed at least 7 (seven) distinguishing traits for a millennial, namely: special, sheltered, confident, team-oriented, achieving, pressured, and conventional. These traits make this generation unique and notably different from its successor group, generation X (Keeling 2003: 31).

In part of its generational development, millennial group is remarkable for having to oversight the rapid development for the standard of human right protection while may also suffer the veils of ignorance, for not directly witnessing the great tragedy of human rights violations such as the Holocaust, systemized slavery by colonizing powers, or in Indonesia case, the 1965 killings. However, it is important to point out that despite not taking part in the great human right tragedies as previously mentioned, millennial, through the course of his/her own experienced history, may run across handful cases of human right abuse. As each generation ages into the next life phase (and a new social role), the group mood and behaviour could fundamentally evolve and gave rise to a new turning of societal attitude, which also took reference from its historical experience. Thus, a symbiotic relationship exists between historical events and generational personas. In sequence, it can be said that historical events were responsible for shaping early generational phases, childhood and young adulthood. Then, as parents, leaders in midlife, or old age, a certain generation may partake a dominant position and in turn, shape the history (Strauss and Howe 1997). As a generation which naturally displaced from the great human rights tragedies, it is then fascinating to see how millennial would behave when confronted with human rights issues that do not occur in their lifetime.

1.2. Millennial and Human Rights Awareness

The studies which explore layman perception on the past human rights abuses are not only limited, but the one that exclusively delved into Indonesian millennial is currently non-existing. Fortunately, studies which investigate the extent of millennial persona are abundant. Accordingly, Millennial is the first generation to gained access to the internet during their formative years (US 2008). As quoted from Septiari and Kusuma (2016), Nickell (2012) finds that millennial love internet (Septiari and Kusuma 2016: 34). In a survey conducted by Ipsos Mendolsohn, they (millennial group) reported spending an average of nearly 40 hours per week on the Internet, of which 81% of them claimed to access social media on a daily basis. The rise of the digital era brought a new paradigm shift in how people navigate their lives and relate to one another and the world around them (Palfrey and Gasser 2008: 19). Therefore, a millennial frequently identified as 'tech-savvy' individual with a moderate exposure on the global social causes such as human rights; the issues that commonly discussed among internet users.

However, the claim where millennial is characteristically leaning into human right advocacy is objectionable at best, if not deserve more in-depth empirical testing. For example, in a 2015 study by the American Civil Liberties Union on millennial attitude towards trending issues in fundamental rights to privacy, the CSO group collect the opinion of millennials across several countries about Edward Snowden's decision to leaked confidential documents

containing the NSA surveillance activities directed against the US population. The poll reveals a contravening view on the uniformity among millennials. Whereas millennials in Continental Europe (i.e. Italy, Germany, Spain, France and The Netherlands) are mostly expressed positive opinions on Snowden, with 78%-86% approval range, its US counterpart showed more mixed views with only 56% in favour of Snowden actions. The studies also presented more polarising view within the Continental Europe group, where only roughly 54% to 56% of respondents agrees that Snowden's action should lead to stronger reform for the fundamental protection of privacy rights (ACLU 2015: 7).

1.3. Control Variables: Religion, Location, and Gender

Given the simplified assumption that millennial is closely linked to 'pro-human rights' personas, this assumption requires further validity check from a different range of distorting variables. The lack of studies to examine the process of social internalisation had constituted a challenge for us to identify component necessary for individuals to value-normative aspect such as human rights. Fortunately, the studies on group and population shared perception does suggest us that religion, location, and gender might be influential in shaping one own personal perception.

I argued that Indonesian millennials, which is central unit of analysis in this paper, could potentially express a different take on human rights from its western counterparts as a result from being the part of a deeply embedded Muslim society. Indonesia is known to be a nation with the highest numbers of the Muslim population, and like most of the Moslem majority countries; it may share distaste on the westernised origin of the human rights law. As Hoffmann (2009) describes, Islamist scholars, along with the group of some Asian and African scholars have historically opposed the claim of universality of human rights as promulgated in the United Nations Declaration of the Human Rights. For Islamists, the instrument referred should be treated as Judeo-Christian document coming from the West, thus irrelevant to their [Islamists] belief (Hoffman 2009: 10).

Furthermore, the levels of religious conservatism among Indonesian youths have gradually on the rise recently. In a randomised survey given to 760 Indonesian students, the polls indicate approximately 69 per cent of student believes that religious values should regulate social and political affairs while 58 per cent felt the need to implement Sharia law in Indonesia (Setara: 2015). While this research is not an attempt to test the cultural relativism between millennial groups, it would be wise to take into consideration whether the variables of religion and government trust would somehow affect our dependency variable.

In terms of the geographical implication, every single country across the globe may offer a distinctly different cultural experience for anyone living in it. Individuals who are moving away from their country, either for permanent or

temporary stay (e.g. study abroad, temporary employee placement, and others), might have to undergo a personal cultural transition process called acculturation. Acculturation in this respect could be understood as a process of self-identification where an individual is learning and adopting cultural traits different from the one in which he/she was initially raised (DiMaggio and Louch 1998; Hernandez, Cohen and Garcia 2000; Kang and Kim 1998; as cited in Chaw et al., 2002: 162). Some authors postulate that the acculturation process behaves as a voluntary value transition process. Donthu and Cherian (1992), for instance, suggested that a slight increase of individual social involvement in the host society (current country of residence) could decrement the individual engagement of his/her heritage tradition from its own origin country (Donthu and Cherian 1992; as cited in Chaw et al., 2002: 162). Hence, excluding Indonesia diaspora would be unthinkable, as they present an additional 6 million towards the current population. Thus, their potential differing views should also be tested.

Finally, while the study of gender on perceptions are relatively saturated (Allen and Wall 1987; Collins et al. 2008; and Cook 1981), the results are varied and often inconclusive (Collins Jr. et al. 2010: 261). For example, a study by Rosler et al. (2016) indicates that when given a choice, women tend to suppress conflict by resorting to conflict resolution or reconciliation process with their opponents (Rosler et al. 2016: 23). In behavioral studies for women in the judge position, Collins (2010) finds that although a single woman judge is unlikely to deliver a different decision than its male counterparts, putting the woman as the majority in a court panel would increase the likelihood of them having a different court judgment than its baseline comparison (Collins Jr. et al. 2010: 274). With at least 49.7% female comprising the total Indonesia population in 2010 (Badan Pusat Statistik 2012), gender perception should not be overlooked as a potential variable affecting social internalisation process for the country in question.

Having reviewed the studies above, our starting hypothesis presupposed that *'regardless of its national origin, millennial individual (IV) tends to slightly more supportive towards protection of human rights and actively involved in promoting such rights (DV)'*. If the outcome for the hypothesis is positive, the paper will check whether the dependent variable could, alternatively, be linked to exogenous variables such as gender, location or religion. Considering this paper's main objective that is to investigate the effect of social internalisation of human rights, the paper's second hypothesis claimed that *'the rates of proactive support to human rights would closely be correlated to individual support to investigate the 1965-1966 abuses as well as the support for the establishment of the 1965 IPT'*.

2. Research Design and Measurement

This is a survey-based research where the questionnaire was randomly distributed into at least three social media platforms; Facebook, Twitter, and

WhatsApp. This method is preferred to enunciate the effect of randomised snowball sampling and mitigate the risk of bias in sampling selection. In addition, as the issues revolving around the September 30th Movement and series of crimes onwards are commonly treated as sensitive topics in Indonesia; All the respondents are kept anonymous by not requiring them to disclose their name.

For respondent to be eligible to participate in the survey, he or she should be born within the generational years of a millennial group. It should be noted that the caveat in this sampling decision is that there is no universally agreed year gap for what constitutes a millennial timeline. The original literature on millennial by Strauss and Howe (2004) suggested that they are born from 1982 to 2004. Stein proposed two years backwards from Strauss and Howe timeline (1980 to 2000) (Stein 2013); and more recently, Pew Research Center concludes the cutoff in between 1981 to 1996 (Dimock 2018). But since their differences are marginal, we opted for Stein's generational timeline which was frequently cited in the mainstream media (Stein 2013).

This research accounted for 318 respondents in total (N = 318). At least 178 respondents identified themselves as female (56%). Nearly half of the respondents are students (49%), whereas 41 respondents (13%) working in governmental bodies and 54 others are working in private firms (17%). For its geographic proximities, 276 participants claimed to currently live in Indonesia (87%) while the rest of 42 are living abroad (13%).

The preliminary analysis started by testing whether the alleged generational traits of millennial is equally shared amongst the millennials originated from Indonesia. In this exploratory phase, the quantitative analysis is used to check the frequencies and means for each trait followed by standard deviation check for any potential outlier (Dijck and Hagenaar N.A.: 3). It then proceeds to a descriptive analysis to demonstrate whether the starting hypothesis could be maintained. The sequence started by test on frequency, mean, and median respectively on three coded key statements; "HR" (statement related on human rights), "G30S" (statement related to the aftermath of G30S), and "IPT" (statement related to the International People Tribunal).

Finally, it is worth noting that this research adopted the Likert-scale measurement. Hence, the response value started from "1" for strongly disagree and scaled to "5" for strongly agree a response. Alternatively, the scaling values are reversed whenever the question is affiliated with negative attitude position (i.e. "*Do you consider human rights as non-essential?*"). The standard deviation is set on " $60\% \times 2.0 = 1.2$ " whereas the minimum percentage of significance rest on $p \rightarrow .005$ [chi-square test].

3. Statistical Outcomes

3.1. Millennial Identification Test

Table 1 reports the result of characteristics evaluation among respondents. From the total of 24 categorical responses, we excluded 14 statements and maintained 10 statements. Six key statements are picked to confirm the millennial traits as described by the past empirical studies (US 2008; Septiari and Kusuma 2016: 34; Palfrey and Gasser 2008: 19), while the rest 4 are reserved for non-millennial traits statements used to check the logical consistency of the 6 previously selected statements.

Table 1: Frequency, Mean and Standard Deviation Tests

MILLENNIAL TRAITS	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Easy Access to Information	262	4.66	.664
Prioritizing Education	262	3.84	.979
Technological Savvy	261	4.54	.709
Social Media Dependent	261	3.95	.882
Trusting Authority	262	3.47	.791
Politically Tolerant	261	4.47	.617
NON-MILLENNIAL TRAITS			
Religiously Devoted	253	3.76	.840
Threatened by Liberalism	245	2.79	1.140
Threatened by Communism	243	2.54	1.193
Threatened by non-supporter of his/ her political ideology	239	2.60	1.027

Column (2) displays a slightly high median for each millennial trait with 'Easy Access to Information' being the highest (4.6) and 'Trusting Authority' as the lowest (3.4). The column also indicates the moderate contrast between the millennial categories and non-millennial categories, with low mean range (2.6 – 3.7). In addition, a considerably high standard deviation can be seen in the non-millennial traits, where intolerance against liberal, communism and non-scriber to one's own ideology were valued 1.14, 1.19, and 1.02, respectively.

3.2. Perception on Human Rights, G30S and the People Tribunal

Table 2 demonstrates the overall perception of key variables in this study, namely 'support on proactive human rights engagement', 'support on the G30S investigation', and 'support on the establishment of the 1965 People Tribunal'.

Synonymous to Table 1, the table introduces an opposing statement for each key variable to maintain the reliability of the result.

Table 2: Descriptive Statistics

POSITIVE ITEMS			
	Will actively engage in human rights promotion “HR” (N = 207)	Supporting the G30S Investigation “G30S” (N = 199)	Supporting the 1965 People Tribunal “IPT” (N = 151)
Strongly Disagree	.5 (1)*	1.0 (2)	2.6 (4)
Disagree	5.3 (11)	5.5 (11)	4.0 (6)
Slightly Disagree	22.7 (47)	13.6 (27)	19.2 (29)
Agree	58.0 (120)	50.3 (100)	59.6 (90)
Strongly Agree	13.5 (28)	29.6 (59)	14.6 (22)
Mean	3.79	4.02	3.79
Median	4.00	4.00	4.00
Std. Deviation	.759	.864	.835
NEGATIVE ITEMS			
	Sees human rights as non-essential “HR ^R ” (N = 217)	Sees investigation of the G30S would only shatter the Nation’s Unity “G30S ^R ” (N = 190)	Sees the 1965 People Tribunal as illegal Court and should not be recognised “IPT ^R ” (N = 131)
Strongly Agree	11.1 (24)	10.0 (19)	7.6 (10)
Agree	26.7 (58)	24.2 (46)	27.5 (36)
Slightly Disagree	47.5 (103)	39.5 (75)	46.6 (61)
Disagree	10.1 (22)	14.7 (28)	15.3 (20)
Strongly Disagree	4.6 (10)	11.6 (22)	3.1 (4)

Mean	2.71	2.94	2.79
Median	3.00	3.00	3.00
Std. Deviation	.955	1.120	.903

*Numbers of frequency

As shown in Table 2, there is a gradual dropout on the key statements. One could notice the slight reduction of valid cases (N) as it went into a more specific statement on G30S investigation and the People Tribunal

HR (N207) → G30S (N199) → IPT (N151) and HR^R (N217)
→ G30S^R (N190) → IPT^R (N131)

The table illustrated a considerable dropout rate, as the total submitted cases are 318. To check whether this may affect the reliability of the data, author subsequently runs the reliability check and discovered that approximately 121 responses were considered valid with the ratio of combined variables of .631. This is 38.1% valid cases of the total respondents. The result on reliability check will further be addressed in the discussion section.

Substantially, the table represents three apparent features: 1) respondents general attitude to “agree” on the given key statements, HR (58%), G30S (50%), and IPT (59%); 2) trends to “slightly disagree” could be seen at the negative key statements, HR^R (47%), G30S^R (39%), and IPT^R (46%); and 3) the Negative statements, although not exceeding the threshold of standard deviation we set, may still be considered as potential outliers. Therefore, we added the median measurement that is less susceptible to the outliers (Dijck and Hagenaar N.A.: 11). Median of positive statements stood at 4 and 3 for the opposing statements. It is also worth noting that only 42% (N = 86) of the respondents ‘agree’ that they have no knowledge of what the 1965 IPT is. That is slightly lower than 55% responses agreeing that they know what G30S is.

3.3. Dependence and Correlation on Human Rights, G30S and the People Tribunal Variables

For the interrelation between the key variables, we calculated the dependence ratio using the Chi-square test of independence. The sequential test of HR & G30S had resulted with, $X^2(2) = 33.75 p = .006$, and $X^2(2) = 12.67 p = .393$ for both HR and IPT. We then tested whether each of the contradictory key statements is mutually dependent. The outcomes are HR & HR^R ($X^2(2) = 19.19$, $p = .259$), G30S & G30S^R ($X^2(2) = 74.17 p = .000$), and IPT & IPT^R ($X^2(2) = 56.18 p = .000$). Considering the significant ratio is set at $p \rightarrow .005$, therefore only G30S and G30S^R and IPT and IPT^R which are deemed significant.

Table 3: Bivariate Correlations

Independent Variables (IV)	Dependent Variables (DV)		
	HR	G30S	IPT
Easy Access to Information	.132	-.119	.082
Prioritizing Education	.031	-.025	.045
Technological Savvy	.019	-.037	.241
Social Media Dependency	-.053	.087	.105
Trusting Authority	-.167	.024	.044
Religiously Devoted	.057	-.169	.048
Politically Tolerant (Negative Item)	.041	.137	.107

Table 3 further provides us with a correlation check between millennial traits and the key variables, HR, G30S, and PT respectively. Only a handful of millennial traits are positively correlated to our key variables. What seems noticeable from a singular reading on each IV is the significant positive correlation between being “technological savvy” and being a supporter of the 1965 People Tribunal (.241). Alternatively, the designated spurious variable, religion, pose a moderate negative correlation for the support of G30S (-.169) followed by a minor positive correlation to HR and IPT.

To investigate whether significant positive correlation between IPT and technology savvy is reliable, we run an additional bivariate test on the other statements (“*I must not go out without bringing my phone or any electronic gadget with me,*” and “*Generally, it is easier to retrieved information from the internet*”) from the category of Technology Savvy. The result shows the similar positive correlation, ($p = .241$) and ($p = .167$) respectively. Furthermore, we also run a correlation test between each key variable akin to what has been done to the previous Chi-square independence test. The output test reveals the significant portion of positive correlation for HR & G30S ($p = .201$), G30S & IPT ($p = .120$), and IPT & HR ($p = .175$).

3.4. Linear Regression and Robustness Check

After using the bivariate correlation, it is left to Linear Regression to help us to confirm the positive correlation between the key variables once again. We do this by sequentially assigned key variables as either IV or DV. The statistical analysis processor reported the following; First, with HR (IV) and G30S (DV), our model generates predictive value of $F(1, 185) = 7.798$, $p = 006$, $R^2 = .040$ and $Sig = .244$. It means that for each 1 unit increase in IV will result to probability increase on DV for roughly .224 per unit. Second, G30S (IV) and IPT (DV), our model produces predictive value of $F(1, 144) = 2.091$, $p = .150$,

R2 = .014 and Sig = .122. This implies a positive relationship, as an increase in a unit would lead to .122 probabilities of DV increase.

Table 4: Robustness Check: Linear Regression with Dummy Variables

No	Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardised Coefficients	t	Sig
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	Female (Gender) Dummy	-.222	.105	-.146	-2.112	.036
2	Abroad (Location) Dummy	-.155	.146	-.074	-1.064	.289

We closed this data overview with another regression test to further detect potential alternative variable(s) capable of threatening the reliability of our final result. Past studies suggest a test on demographic variables; gender and location. Table 4 presents a noticeable pattern. While female (gender) dummy is not significantly correlated to HR (.036), it is the abroad (location) dummy which signifies a positive relationship towards HR statements.

4. Discussion

4.1. Social Internalization of Human Rights

Can we empirically concur that the people with positive support for human rights value may *ipso facto* keen to explore past human rights tragedy such as the aftermath of G30S? To answer that, this paper has designated three attitudinal templates based on Koh's two prerequisite factors for social internalization process (i.e. knowledge of human rights standard and awareness on human rights deficiencies), those are: 1) attitude towards active human rights engagement; 2) justice seeking for the victims of the 1965-1966 grave human rights abuses; and 3) the creation of the 1965 IPT.

The output tests conclude that, if tested in cycling sequence, all three of the variables produce significant positive correlation among each other. Even as we tested that interaction against the negative statements derived from each of the key variables, the output persisted, whereas the contradictory positive and negative statements remain to be mutually dependent. Thus, I would argue that considerable portion of sampled individuals are currently undergoing the internalisation process, in a sense that they claimed to possess the layman

understanding of human rights and expressed their concerns to justice-seeking initiative for past human rights abuses in Indonesia.

4.2. Millennial and Human Rights Advocacy

In the next part of the survey analysis, we explore whether the Indonesian millennial shared the same traits as the other millennial. The survey shows that the overall majority of Indonesian millennial 'agree' to identify themselves as technological savvy, intense social media users, politically open-minded, education over-achiever, and trustful to its government. In one extreme, some have admitted that they are strongly dependent on information access and internet access in their daily lives.

Overall reading on the median values reveals Indonesian millennials willingness to put themselves as a pro-active human right advocate. However, such statistical values do not correspond well with most of the perceived traits. Accordingly, only those statements derived from "easy access to information" category who imposed positive, if not, significant correlation towards the pro-human rights attitude. Two categorical statements; 'trust on government' and 'social media dependency' are both negative correlated, while the rest are by far insufficiently correlated. The paper, therefore, concludes that there is no correlation between millennial traits and millennial stance on human rights protection, nullifying our starting hypothesis.

4.3. Geographical Proximity and Human Rights Advocacy

The paper final and unexpected discovery are coming from its robustness check. As per the result of the regression analysis, the gender variable had limited to no contribution for our respondents' pro-active human rights attitude. Instead, it was location variable which signifies a positive correlation for the attitude. Unfortunately, since the location merely designed as an exogenous variable, this finding should not be perceived as a direct correlation between both ends.

4.4. Research Limitation

While this analysis offers a novel insight into the role of millennial traits in social internalisation, it is still a general one and did raise some follow-up questions. For example, why there were only a handful of millennials in Indonesia actively campaigning against the grave human rights abuses from 1965 to 1966 despite presumably shared a common conviction to bring justice to the human right violations. If millennial is described as individuals with the tech-savvy trait –capable to easily access and digest latest digital information–

why only half of the 'valid' respondents of this study aware what the 1965 IPT is and what it stood for the victims of the 1965-1966 grave human rights abuses.

For potential research direction, further study should be directed to exclusively test whether Indonesian females would react differently towards different types of abuses suffered by the victims of 1965-1966 violations (e.g. rape, manslaughter, arson, etc.); an aspect this study is limited to address. This paper also paved the way to test the effect of geographical or cultural proximity empirically. Eventually, one should question if a population of diaspora pose the potential as a predictor for survey research on human rights deficiencies.***

References

- Asril, S. (2016) *Menlu: Putusan IPT 1965 Tidak Mengikat Indonesia*. Kompas 21/7/2016 <<https://nasional.kompas.com/read/2016/07/21/21245241/menlu.putusan.ipt.1965.tidak.mengikat.indonesia>> (Retrieved Dec. 23, 2016).
- Ali, H. and Purwandi, L. (2016) *Indonesia 2020: The Urban Middle-Class Millennials*. Jakarta, INA: Alvara Research Center.
- Badan Pusat Statistik sub-Direktorat Statistik Demografi (2012). *Estimasi Parameter Demografi: Tren fertilitas, Mortalitas, dan Migrasi, Hasil Sensus Penduduk 2010*. Jakarta, INA: BPS.
- Chaw, M. J. and Ali, M. Y. (2002). Impact of Acculturation, Ethnic Identity, and Ethnic Ties on the Consumption Behaviour of Ethnic Chinese Consumers in Australia. *ANZMAC 2002 Conference Proceedings*. 161-169.
- Dijck, G. and Hagenars, J. (N.A). *Empirical Legal Research: Principles and Procedures*. Part IV.
- DiMaggio, P. and Louch, H. (1998). Socially embedded consumer transactions: for what kinds of purchases do people most often use networks? *American Sociological Review*. 63 (October), 619-637.
- Donthu, N. and Cherian, J. (1994). Impact of strength of ethnic identification on Hispanic shopping behavior. *Journal of Retailing*. 70(4), 383-393.
- Gellately, R. and Kiernan, B. (2003). *The Specter of Genocide: Mass Murder in Historical Perspective*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Hernandez, S.A., Cohen, J. and Garcia, H. (2000). Hispanic acculturation: conceptual and modelling issues. *The Journal of Applied Business Research*. 16(4), 73-82.
- Kang, J. and Kim, Y. (1998). Ethnicity and acculturation: Influences on Asian American consumers' purchase decision making for social clothes. *Family and Consumer Sciences Research Journal*. 21(1), 91-117.
- Keeling, S. (2003), Advising the Millennial Generation. *NACADA*, 23(1 & 2), 30-36.

- Koh, H. H. (1999) "How Is International Human Rights Law Enforced?," *Indiana Law Journal*: Vol. 74: Iss. 4, Article 9.
- Lancaster, L. C. and Stillman, D. (2002). *When Generations Collide. Who They Are. Why They Clash. How to Solve the Generational Puzzle at Work.* New York, US: Collins Business.
- N. A. (2008). 15 Economic Facts About Millennial. *The White House*. Available at: <https://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/docs/millennials_report.pdf> (Retrieved 10 December, 2016).
- Nickell, S. (2012), "Millennials: Next Consumer Target", *Gifts and Decorative Accessories*, March/April, pp 26-32.
- Nimrod Rosler, R.; David, Y.; Ellis, D. and Maoz, I. (2016). Gendering Human Rights: Threat and Gender Perceptions as Predictors of Attitudes towards Violating Human Rights in Asymmetric Conflict, *Peace and Conflict Studies*, 23(2), Article 1.
- Palfrey, J. and Gasser, U. (2008). *Born Digital: Understanding the First Generation of Digital Natives.* New York, US: Basic Books.
- Papini, J. (2007), Millennials: The Fund Industry's Next Great Hope. *Money Management Executive*. July 30.
- Septiari and Kusuma (2016), Understanding the Perception of Millennial Generation toward Traditional Market (A Study in Yogyakarta), *Rev. Integr. Bus. Econ. Res*, 5(1), 30-43.
- Strauss, W and Howe, N. (1991). *Generations: The History of America's Future, 1584 to 2069.* New York, US: Quill.
- Hoffman (2009, March 19). The Universality of Human Rights. *Judicial Studies Board Annual Lecture*. Available at: <<http://www.brandeis.edu/ethics/pdfs/internationaljustice/biij/BIIJ2013/hoffmann.pdf>> (Retrieved 9 December, 2016).
- McGregor and Katherine, E. (2009, August 4). The Indonesian Killings of 1965-1966. *SciencesPo Mass Violence and Resistance Research Network*. Available at: <<http://www.sciencespo.fr/mass-violence-war-massacre-resistance/en/document/indonesian-killings-1965-1966>> (Retrieved January 10, 2017).
- Cribb, R. and Ford, M. (2010, January 24). The Killings of 1965-66. *Inside Indonesia*. Available at: <<http://www.insideindonesia.org/the-killings-of-1965-66?highlight=WyJyb29zYSIsInJvb3NhJ3MiXQ%3D%3D>> (Retrieved December 23, 2016).
- Stein, J. (2013, May 20). Millennials: The Me Me Me Generation. *Time Magazine*. Available at: <<http://time.com/247/millennials-the-me-me-me-generation/>> (Retrieved January 21, 2017).
- Jong, A. (2015, February 6). The Forgotten Massacres. *Jacobin Magazine*. Available at: <<https://www.jacobinmag.com/2015/06/indonesian-communist-party-suharto-massacre-purge/>> (Retrieved December 23, 2016).

- ACLU (2015, March). ACLU Edward Snowden Survey: Millennial Findings, *KRC Research*. Available at: <https://www.aclu.org/sites/default/files/field_document/snowden_poll_results.pdf> (Retrieved 13 December, 2016).
- Santoso, A. (2015, April 16). The 1965 controversy and need for people's tribunal. *The Jakarta Post*. Available at: <<http://www.thejakartapost.com/news/2015/04/16/the-1965-controversy-and-need-people-s-tribunal.html>> (Retrieved December 24, 2016).
- Rahman, A. (2016, July 26). Indonesia Ignores International People's Tribunal Recommendations. *GRESNews*. Available at: <<http://gres.news/news/law/108773-indonesia-ignores-international-peopleacutes-tribunal-recommendations/0/>> (Retrieved December 23, 2016).