### Appendix D - Main figures and tables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D1</td>
<td>Election results in Indonesia, 1971-2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2</td>
<td>Vote for PDI-P/Nasdem by religion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3</td>
<td>Support for selected Indonesian political parties among practicing Muslims</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4</td>
<td>Vote for PDI-P/Nasdem by income group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D5</td>
<td>Support for selected Indonesian political parties among top-income voters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1</td>
<td>The structure of political cleavages in Indonesia, 2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Appendix DA - Composition of the electorate and election results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure DA1</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DA1</td>
<td>Election results in Indonesia, 1971-2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DA2</td>
<td>Election results in Indonesia by group, 1971-2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DA3</td>
<td>Composition of the electorate by education level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DA4</td>
<td>Composition of the electorate by age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DA5</td>
<td>Composition of the electorate by religion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DA6</td>
<td>Composition of the electorate by location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DA7</td>
<td>Composition of income quintiles by religion, 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DA8</td>
<td>Composition of income quintiles by religion, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DA9</td>
<td>Composition of income quintiles by education, 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DA10</td>
<td>Composition of income quintiles by education, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DA11</td>
<td>Rural-urban composition of income deciles, 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DA12</td>
<td>Rural-urban composition of income deciles, 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DA13</td>
<td>Composition of income groups by ethnicity, 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DA14</td>
<td>Composition of income groups by ethnicity, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DA15</td>
<td>Composition of ethnic groups by income, 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DA16</td>
<td>Composition of ethnic groups by income, 2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Appendix DB - Structure of the vote for Golkar/Gerindra/Hanura

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure DB1</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DB1</td>
<td>Vote for Golkar/Gerindra/Hanura by education level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure Name</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure DB2</td>
<td>Vote for Golkar/Gerindra/Hanura among higher-educated voters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure DB3</td>
<td>Vote for Golkar/Gerindra/Hanura by income group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure DB4</td>
<td>Vote for Golkar/Gerindra/Hanura among top-income voters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure DB5</td>
<td>Vote for Golkar/Gerindra/Hanura by religion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure DB6</td>
<td>Vote for Golkar/Gerindra/Hanura among practicing Muslims</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure DB7</td>
<td>Vote for Golkar/Gerindra/Hanura by age group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure DB8</td>
<td>Vote for Golkar/Gerindra/Hanura among young voters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure DB9</td>
<td>Vote for Golkar/Gerindra/Hanura by location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure DB10</td>
<td>Vote for Golkar/Gerindra/Hanura among urban voters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure DB11</td>
<td>Vote for Golkar/Gerindra/Hanura by ethnicity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure DB12</td>
<td>Vote for Golkar/Gerindra/Hanura among Javanese voters</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Appendix DC - Structure of the vote for PDI-P/NasDem**

| Figure DC1 | Vote for PDI-P/NasDem by education level |
| Figure DC2 | Vote for PDI-P/NasDem among higher-educated voters |
| Figure DC3 | Vote for PDI-P/NasDem by income group |
| Figure DC4 | Vote for PDI-P/NasDem among top-income voters |
| Figure DC5 | Vote for PDI-P/NasDem by religion |
| Figure DC6 | Vote for PDI-P/NasDem among practicing Muslims |
| Figure DC7 | Vote for PDI-P/NasDem by age group |
| Figure DC8 | Vote for PDI-P/NasDem among young voters |
| Figure DC9 | Vote for PDI-P/NasDem by location |
| Figure DC10 | Vote for PDI-P/NasDem among urban voters |
| Figure DC11 | Vote for PDI-P/NasDem by ethnicity |
| Figure DC12 | Vote for PDI-P/NasDem among Javanese voters |

**Appendix DD - Structure of the vote for Islamic parties**

| Figure DD1 | Vote for Islamic parties by education level |
| Figure DD2 | Vote for Islamic parties among higher-educated voters |
| Figure DD3 | Vote for Islamic parties by income group |
| Figure DD4 | Vote for Islamic parties among top-income voters |
| Figure DD5 | Vote for Islamic parties by religion |
| Figure DD6 | Vote for Islamic parties among practicing Muslims |
| Figure DD7 | Vote for Islamic parties by age group |
| Figure DD8 | Vote for Islamic parties among young voters |
| Figure DD9 | Vote for Islamic parties by location |
| Figure DD10 | Vote for Islamic parties among urban voters |
| Figure DD11 | Vote for Islamic parties by ethnicity |
| Figure DD12 | Vote for Islamic parties among Javanese voters |

**Appendix DE - Structure of the vote for Partai Demokrat**

| Figure DE1 | Vote for PD by education level |
| Figure DE2 | Vote for PD among higher-educated voters |
| Figure DE3 | Vote for PD by income group |
| Figure DE4 | Vote for PD among top-income voters |
| Figure DE5 | Vote for PD by religion |
| Figure DE6 | Vote for PD among practicing Muslims |
| Figure DE7 | Vote for PD by age group |
| Figure DE8 | Vote for PD among young voters |
| Figure DE9 | Vote for PD by location |
| Figure DE10 | Vote for PD among urban voters |
| Figure DE11 | Vote for PD by ethnicity |
| Figure DE12 | Vote for PD among Javanese voters |

**Appendix DF - Structure of the vote for Gerindra**

| Figure DF1 | Vote for Gerindra by education level |
| Figure DF2 | Vote for Gerindra among higher-educated voters |
| Figure DF3 | Vote for Gerindra by income group |
| Figure DF4 | Vote for Gerindra among top-income voters |
| Figure DF5 | Vote for Gerindra by religion |
| Figure DF6 | Vote for Gerindra among practicing Muslims |
| Figure DF7 | Vote for Gerindra by age group |
| Figure DF8 | Vote for Gerindra among young voters |
| Figure DF9 | Vote for Gerindra by location |
| Figure DF10 | Vote for Gerindra among urban voters |

**Appendix DG - Structure of the vote for Hanura**

| Figure DG1 | Vote for Hanura by education level |
| Figure DG2 | Vote for Hanura among higher-educated voters |
| Figure DG3 | Vote for Hanura by income group |
| Figure DG4 | Vote for Hanura among top-income voters |
### Appendix DH - Structure of the vote for Golkar

| Figure DH1  | Vote for Golkar by education level |
| Figure DH2  | Vote for Golkar among higher-educated voters |
| Figure DH3  | Vote for Golkar by income group |
| Figure DH4  | Vote for Golkar among top-income voters |
| Figure DH5  | Vote for Golkar by religion |
| Figure DH6  | Vote for Golkar among practicing Muslims |
| Figure DH7  | Vote for Golkar among young voters |
| Figure DH8  | Vote for Golkar by location |
| Figure DH9  | Vote for Golkar among urban voters |
| Figure DH10 | Vote for Golkar by ethnicity |
| Figure DH11 | Vote for Golkar among Javanese voters |

### Appendix DI - Structure of the vote for PDI-P

| Figure DI1  | Vote for PDI-P by education level |
| Figure DI2  | Vote for PDI-P among higher-educated voters |
| Figure DI3  | Vote for PDI-P by income group |
| Figure DI4  | Vote for PDI-P among top-income voters |
| Figure DI5  | Vote for PDI-P by religion |
| Figure DI6  | Vote for PDI-P among practicing Muslims |
| Figure DI7  | Vote for PDI-P by age group |
| Figure DI8  | Vote for PDI-P among young voters |
| Figure DI9  | Vote for PDI-P by location |
| Figure DI10 | Vote for PDI-P among urban voters |
| Figure DI11 | Vote for PDI-P by ethnicity |
| Figure DI12 | Vote for PDI-P among Javanese voters |

### Appendix BD - Appendix tables

<p>| Table DA1  | Survey data sources |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table DA2</th>
<th>Complete descriptive statistics by year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>


Source: authors' computations using official election results.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by selected Indonesian political parties or groups of parties in legislative elections between 1977 and 2019. Islamic parties include the PAN, PBB, PBR, PKB, PKNU, PKS, and PPP.
Figure D2 – Vote for PDI-P/NasDem by religious affiliation

Source: authors' computations using Indonesian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by PDI-P/NasDem by religious affiliation. Practicing Muslims corresponds to Muslims declaring participating "Often" or "Very often/Always" to collective prayers.
Figure D3 – Support for selected Indonesian political parties among practicing Muslims

Support for Islamic parties among practicing Muslims
Support for Golkar/Gerindra/Hanura among practicing Muslims
Support for PDI-P/Nasdem among practicing Muslims

Source: authors' computations using Indonesian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the difference between the share of practicing Muslims voting for Islamic parties and the share of non-practicing Muslims and non-Muslims voting for Islamic parties, and the same difference for Golkar/Gerindra/Hanura and PDI-P/Nasdem, after controlling for income, education, rural-urban location, employment status, age, and gender.
Figure D4 – Vote for PDI-P/NasDem by income group

Source: authors’ computations using Indonesian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by PDI-P/NasDem by income group.
Figure D5 – Support for selected Indonesian political parties among top-income voters

Source: authors' computations using Indonesian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the difference between the share of top 10% earners and the share of bottom 90% earners voting for Islamic parties, and the same difference for Golkar/Gerindra/Hanura and PDI-P/Nasdem, after controlling for religion, education, rural-urban location, employment status, age, and gender.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall vote share</th>
<th>PDI-P</th>
<th>PD</th>
<th>Golkar</th>
<th>Nasdem</th>
<th>Hanura</th>
<th>Gerindra</th>
<th>Islamic Parties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18.95%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14.75%</td>
<td>6.72%</td>
<td>5.26%</td>
<td>11.81%</td>
<td>31.41%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Education**
- Primary or lower: 17% PDI-P, 9% PD, 18% Golkar, 8% Nasdem, 5% Hanura, 11% Gerindra, 31% Islamic Parties
- Secondary: 21% PDI-P, 11% PD, 12% Golkar, 7% Nasdem, 5% Hanura, 12% Gerindra, 32% Islamic Parties
- Tertiary: 20% PDI-P, 13% PD, 13% Golkar, 2% Nasdem, 6% Hanura, 14% Gerindra, 33% Islamic Parties

**Income**
- Bottom 50%: 17% PDI-P, 10% PD, 16% Golkar, 8% Nasdem, 5% Hanura, 11% Gerindra, 33% Islamic Parties
- Middle 40%: 21% PDI-P, 10% PD, 14% Golkar, 6% Nasdem, 6% Hanura, 11% Gerindra, 30% Islamic Parties
- Top 10%: 23% PDI-P, 12% PD, 12% Golkar, 3% Nasdem, 5% Hanura, 15% Gerindra, 30% Islamic Parties

**Religion**
- Practicing Muslims: 16% PDI-P, 9% PD, 15% Golkar, 7% Nasdem, 5% Hanura, 12% Gerindra, 35% Islamic Parties
- Non-practicing Muslims: 19% PDI-P, 10% PD, 14% Golkar, 6% Nasdem, 7% Hanura, 11% Gerindra, 32% Islamic Parties
- Non-Muslims: 38% PDI-P, 13% PD, 17% Golkar, 13% Nasdem, 1% Hanura, 10% Gerindra, 8% Islamic Parties

**Location**
- Urban: 23% PDI-P, 7% PD, 13% Golkar, 5% Nasdem, 5% Hanura, 13% Gerindra, 34% Islamic Parties
- Rural: 15% PDI-P, 13% PD, 17% Golkar, 9% Nasdem, 6% Hanura, 11% Gerindra, 29% Islamic Parties

**Source**: authors' computations using CNEP surveys.

**Note**: the table shows the detailed structure of the vote for Indonesian political parties in the 2014 legislative election. Islamic parties include the PAN, PBB, PBR, PKB, PKNU, PKS, and PPP.
Source: authors' computations using official election results.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by selected Indonesian political parties or groups of parties in legislative elections between 1977 and 2019. Islamic parties include the PAN, PBB, PBR, PKB, PKNU, PKS, and PPP.
Source: authors' computations using official election results.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by selected Indonesian political parties or groups of parties in legislative elections between 1977 and 2019. Islamic parties include the PAN, PBB, PBR, PKB, PKNU, PKS, and PPP.
Figure DA3 – Composition of the electorate by education level

Source: authors' computations using Indonesian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the composition of the electorate by education level.
Figure DA4 – Composition of the electorate by age group

Source: authors’ computations using Indonesian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the composition of the electorate by age group.
Figure DA5 – Composition of the electorate by religion

Source: authors’ computations using Indonesian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the composition of the electorate by religious affiliation.
Source: authors’ computations using Indonesian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the composition of the electorate by rural-urban location.
Figure DA7 – Composition of income quintiles by religion, 1999

Source: authors’ computations using Indonesian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the composition of income quintiles by religious affiliation in 1999.
Source: authors’ computations using Indonesian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the composition of income quintiles by religious affiliation in 2014.
Figure DA9 – Composition of income quintiles by education, 1999

Source: authors’ computations using Indonesian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the composition of income quintiles by education level in 1999.
Figure DA10 – Composition of income quintiles by education, 2014

Source: authors’ computations using Indonesian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the composition of income quintiles by education level in 2014.
Figure DA11 – Rural-urban composition of income deciles, 1999

Source: authors’ computations using Indonesian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the composition of income deciles by rural-urban location in 1999.
Figure DA12 – Rural-urban composition of income deciles, 2014

Source: authors’ computations using Indonesian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the composition of income deciles by rural-urban location in 2014.
Figure DA13 - Composition of income groups by ethnicity, 1999

Source: authors' computations using Indonesian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the composition of income groups by ethnic affiliation in 1999.
Figure DA14 - Composition of income groups by ethnicity, 2014

Source: authors' computations using Indonesian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the composition of income groups by ethnic affiliation in 2014.
Figure DA15 - Composition of ethnic groups by income, 1999

Source: authors' computations using Indonesian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the composition of ethnic groups by income group in 1999.
Figure DA16 - Composition of ethnic groups by income, 2014

Source: authors' computations using Indonesian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the composition of ethnic groups by income group in 2014.
Figure DB1 – Vote for Golkar/Gerindra/Hanura by education level

Source: authors' computations using Indonesian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by Golkar/Gerindra/Hanura by education level.
Figure DB2 – Vote for Golkar/Gerindra/Hanura among higher-educated voters

- Difference between (% top 10% educated voting Golkar/Gerindra/Hanura) and (% bottom 90% voting Golkar/Gerindra/Hanura)
- After controlling for religion
- After controlling for religion, location, age, income, employment status, gender

Source: authors’ computations using Indonesian political attitudes surveys.

Note: the figure shows the difference between the share of top 10% educated voters voting for Golkar/Gerindra/Hanura and the share of other voters voting for these parties, before and after controls.
Figure DB3 – Vote for Golkar/Gerindra/Hanura by income group

Source: authors' computations using Indonesian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by Golkar/Gerindra/Hanura by income group.
Figure DB4 – Vote for Golkar/Gerindra/Hanura among top-income voters

- Difference between (% top 10% earners voting Golkar/Gerindra/Hanura) and (% bottom 90% voting Golkar/Gerindra/Hanura)
- After controlling for religion
- After controlling for religion, location, age, education, employment status, gender

Source: authors' computations using Indonesian political attitudes surveys.

Note: the figure shows the difference between the share of top 10% earners voting for Golkar/Gerindra/Hanura and the share of other voters voting for Golkar/Gerindra/Hanura, before and after controls.
Figure DB5 – Vote for Golkar/Gerindra/Hanura by religion

Source: authors' computations using Indonesian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by Golkar/Gerindra/Hanura by religion.
Figure DB6 – Vote for Golkar/Gerindra/Hanura among practicing Muslims

- Difference between (% pract. Muslims voting Golkar/Gerindra/Hanura) and (% other voters voting Golkar/Gerindra/Hanura)
- After controlling for income, education
- After controlling for location, age, income, education, employment status, gender

Source: authors’ computations using Indonesian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the difference between the share of practicing Muslims voting for Golkar/Gerindra/Hanura and the share of other voters voting for Golkar/Gerindra/Hanura, before and after controls.
Figure DB7 – Vote for Golkar/Gerindra/Hanura by age group

Source: authors' computations using Indonesian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by Golkar/Gerindra/Hanura by age group.
Figure DB8 – Vote for Golkar/Gerindra/Hanura among young voters

- **Red line**: Difference between (% voters aged 20-39 voting Golkar/Gerindra/Hanura) and (% other voters voting Golkar/Gerindra/Hanura)
- **Blue line**: After controlling for income, education
- **Green line**: After controlling for location, income, education, religion, employment status, gender

Source: authors' computations using Indonesian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the difference between the share of voters aged 20 to 39 voting for Golkar/Gerindra/Hanura and the share of other voters voting for Golkar/Gerindra/Hanura, before and after controls.
Source: authors' computations using Indonesian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by Golkar/Gerindra/Hanura by rural-urban location.
Figure DB10 – Vote for Golkar/Gerindra/Hanura among urban voters

- Difference between (% urban voters voting Golkar/Gerindra/Hanura) and (% other voters voting Golkar/Gerindra/Hanura)
- After controlling for income, education
- After controlling for age, income, education, religion, employment status, gender

Source: authors' computations using Indonesian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the difference between the share of urban voters voting for Golkar/Gerindra/Hanura and the share of other voters voting for Golkar/Gerindra/Hanura, before and after controls.
Figure DB11 – Vote for Golkar/Gerindra/Hanura by ethnicity

Source: authors' computations using Indonesian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by Golkar/Gerindra/Hanura by ethnic affiliation.
Figure DB12 – Vote for Golkar/Gerindra/Hanura among Javanese voters

Source: authors' computations using Indonesian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the difference between the share of Javanese voters voting for Golkar/Gerindra/Hanura and the share of other voters voting for Golkar/Gerindra/Hanura, before and after controls.
Figure DC1 – Vote for PDI-P/NasDem by education level

Source: authors' computations using Indonesian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by PDI-P/NasDem by education level.
Figure DC2 – Vote for PDI-P/NasDem among higher-educated voters

Difference between (% top 10% educated voting PDI-P/NasDem) and (% bottom 90% voting PDI-P/NasDem)

- After controlling for religion
- After controlling for religion, location, age, income, employment status, gender

Source: authors' computations using Indonesian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the difference between the share of top 10% educated voters voting for PDI-P/NasDem and the share of other voters voting for these parties, before and after controls.
Figure DC3 – Vote for PDI-P/NasDem by income group

Source: authors' computations using Indonesian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by PDI-P/NasDem by income group.
Figure DC4 – Vote for PDI-P/NasDem among top-income voters

Difference between (% top 10% earners voting PDI-P/NasDem) and (% bottom 90% voting PDI-P/NasDem)

After controlling for religion

After controlling for religion, location, age, education, employment status, gender

Source: authors’ computations using Indonesian political attitudes surveys.

Note: the figure shows the difference between the share of top 10% earners voting for PDI-P/NasDem and the share of other voters voting for PDI-P/NasDem, before and after controls.
Figure DC5 – Vote for PDI-P/NasDem by religion

Source: authors’ computations using Indonesian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by PDI-P/NasDem by religion.
Figure DC6 – Vote for PDI-P/NasDem among practicing Muslims

- Difference between (% pract. Muslims voting PDI-P/NasDem) and (% other voters voting PDI-P/NasDem)
- After controlling for income, education
- After controlling for location, age, income, education, employment status, gender

Source: authors' computations using Indonesian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the difference between the share of practicing Muslims voting for PDI-P/NasDem and the share of other voters voting for PDI-P/NasDem, before and after controls.
Figure DC7 – Vote for PDI-P/NasDem by age group

Source: authors' computations using Indonesian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by PDI-P/NasDem by age group.
Figure DC8 – Vote for PDI-P/NasDem among young voters

Difference between (% voters aged 20-39 voting PDI-P/NasDem) and (% other voters voting PDI-P/NasDem)
- After controlling for income, education
- After controlling for location, income, education, religion, employment status, gender

Source: authors' computations using Indonesian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the difference between the share of voters aged 20 to 39 voting for PDI-P/NasDem and the share of other voters voting for PDI-P/NasDem, before and after controls.
Figure DC9 – Vote for PDI-P/NasDem by rural-urban location

Source: authors' computations using Indonesian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by PDI-P/NasDem by rural-urban location.
Figure DC10 – Vote for PDI-P/NasDem among urban voters

Difference between (% urban voters voting PDI-P/NasDem) and (% other voters voting PDI-P/NasDem)

After controlling for income, education

After controlling for age, income, education, religion, employment status, gender

Source: authors' computations using Indonesian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the difference between the share of urban voters voting for PDI-P/NasDem and the share of other voters voting for PDI-P/NasDem, before and after controls.
Figure DC11 – Vote for PDI-P/NasDem by ethnicity

Source: authors' computations using Indonesian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by PDI-P/NasDem by ethnic affiliation.
Figure DC12 – Vote for PDI-P/NasDem among Javanese voters

Difference between (% Javanese voting PDI-P/NasDem) and (% other voters voting PDI-P/NasDem)

After controlling for income, education

After controlling for age, income, education, religion, location, employment status, gender

Source: authors' computations using Indonesian political attitudes surveys.

Note: the figure shows the difference between the share of Javanese voters voting for PDI-P/NasDem and the share of other voters voting for PDI-P/NasDem, before and after controls.
Figure DD1 – Vote for Islamic parties by education level

Source: authors’ computations using Indonesian political attitudes surveys.

Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by Islamic parties by education level.
**Figure DD2 – Vote for Islamic parties among higher-educated voters**

- **Red line**: Difference between (% top 10% educated voting Islamic parties) and (% bottom 90% voting Islamic parties)
- **Blue line**: After controlling for religion
- **Green line**: After controlling for religion, location, age, income, employment status, gender

Source: authors' computations using Indonesian political attitudes surveys.

Note: the figure shows the difference between the share of top 10% educated voters voting for Islamic parties and the share of other voters voting for Islamic parties, before and after controls.
Source: authors' computations using Indonesian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by Islamic parties by income group.
Figure DD4 – Vote for Islamic parties among top-income voters

Difference between (% top 10% earners voting Islamic parties) and (% bottom 90% voting Islamic parties)  
After controlling for religion  
After controlling for religion, location, age, education, employment status, gender

Source: authors' computations using Indonesian political attitudes surveys.  
Note: the figure shows the difference between the share of top 10% earners voting for Islamic parties and the share of other voters voting for Islamic parties, before and after controls.
Figure DD5 – Vote for Islamic parties by religion

Source: authors' computations using Indonesian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by Islamic parties by religion.
Figure DD6 – Vote for Islamic parties among practicing Muslims

Source: authors’ computations using Indonesian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the difference between the share of practicing Muslims voting for Islamic parties and the share of other voters voting for Islamic parties, before and after controls.
Figure DD7 – Vote for Islamic parties by age group

Source: authors' computations using Indonesian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by Islamic parties by age group.
Figure DD8 – Vote for Islamic parties among young voters

- Difference between (% voters age 20-39 voting Islamic parties) and (%other voters voting Islamic parties)
- After controlling for income, education
- After controlling for location, income, education, religion, employment status, gender

Source: authors’ computations using Indonesian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the difference between the share of voters aged 20 to 39 voting for Islamic parties and the share of other voters voting for Islamic parties, before and after controls.
Figure DD9 – Vote for Islamic parties by rural-urban location

Source: authors’ computations using Indonesian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by Islamic parties by rural-urban location.
Figure DD10 – Vote for Islamic parties among urban voters

After controlling for income, education
After controlling for age, income, education, religion, employment status, gender

Source: authors' computations using Indonesian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the difference between the share of urban voters voting for Islamic parties and the share of other voters voting for Islamic parties, before and after controls.
Figure DD11 – Vote for Islamic parties by ethnicity

Source: authors' computations using Indonesian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by Islamic parties by ethnic affiliation.
Figure DD12 – Vote for Islamic parties among Javanese voters

- **Red line**: Difference between (% Javanese voting Islamic parties) and (% other voters voting Islamic parties)
- **Blue line**: After controlling for income, education
- **Green line**: After controlling for age, income, education, religion, location, employment status, gender

Source: authors' computations using Indonesian political attitudes surveys.

Note: the figure shows the difference between the share of Javanese voters voting for Islamic parties and the share of other voters voting for Islamic parties, before and after controls.
**Figure DE1 – Vote for PD by education level**

Source: authors' computations using Indonesian political attitudes surveys.

Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by PD by education level.
Figure DE2 – Vote for PD among higher-educated voters

Difference between (% top 10% educated voting PD) and (% bottom 90% voting PD)

After controlling for religion

After controlling for religion, location, age, income, employment status, gender

Source: authors' computations using Indonesian political attitudes surveys.

Note: the figure shows the difference between the share of top 10% educated voters voting for the Democratic Party and the share of other voters voting for the Democratic Party, before and after controls.
Figure DE3 – Vote for PD by income group

- Bottom 50%
- Middle 40%
- Top 10%

Source: authors' computations using Indonesian political attitudes surveys. Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by PD by income group.
Figure DE4 – Vote for PD among top-income voters

Difference between (% top 10% earners voting PD) and (% bottom 90% voting PD)

- After controlling for religion
- After controlling for religion, location, age, education, employment status, gender

Source: authors’ computations using Indonesian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the difference between the share of top 10% earners voting for the Democratic Party and the share of other voters voting for the Democratic Party, before and after controls.
Source: authors' computations using Indonesian political attitudes surveys.  
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by PD by religion.
Figure DE6 – Vote for PD among practicing Muslims

Source: authors' computations using Indonesian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the difference between the share of practicing Muslims voting for the Democratic Party and the share of other voters voting for the Democratic Party, before and after controls.
Figure DE7 – Vote for PD by age group

Source: authors' computations using Indonesian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by PD by age group.
Figure DE8 – Vote for PD among young voters

- Difference between (% voters age 20-39 voting PD) and (% other voters voting PD)
- After controlling for income, education
- After controlling for location, income, education, religion, employment status, gender

Source: authors' computations using Indonesian political attitudes surveys.

Note: the figure shows the difference between share of young voters voting for the Democratic Party and the share of other voters voting for the Democratic Party, before and after controls.
Figure DE9 – Vote for PD by rural-urban location

Source: authors' computations using Indonesian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by PD by rural-urban location.
Figure DE10 – Vote for PD among urban voters

- **Difference between (% urban voters voting PD) and (% other voters voting PD)**
- **After controlling for income, education**
- **After controlling for age, income, education, religion, employment status, gender**

Source: authors' computations using Indonesian political attitudes surveys.

Note: the figure shows the difference between the share of urban voters voting for PD and the share of other voters voting for PD, before and after controls.
Source: authors' computations using Indonesian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by PD by ethnic affiliation.
Figure DE12 – Vote for PD among Javanese voters

- Red line: Difference between (% Javanese voting PD) and (% other voters voting PD)
- Blue line: After controlling for income, education
- Green line: After controlling for age, income, education, religion, location, employment status, gender

Source: authors' computations using Indonesian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the difference between the share of Javanese voters voting for PD and the share of other voters voting for PD, before and after controls.
**Figure DF1 – Vote for Gerindra by education level**

Source: authors’ computations using Indonesian political attitudes surveys.

Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by Gerindra by education level.
Figure DG2 – Vote for Gerindra among higher-educated voters

Source: authors’ computations using Indonesian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the difference between the share of top 10% educated voters voting for Gerindra and the share of other voters voting for Gerindra, before and after controls.
Source: authors' computations using Indonesian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by Gerindra by income group.
Figure DF4 – Vote for Gerindra among top-income voters

Difference between (% top 10% earners voting Gerindra) and (% bottom 90% voting Gerindra)

Source: authors' computations using Indonesian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the difference between the share of top 10% earners voting for Gerindra and the share of other voters voting for Gerindra, before and after controls.
Figure DF5 – Vote for Gerindra by religion

Source: authors' computations using Indonesian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by Gerindra by religion.
Figure DF6 – Vote for Gerindra among practicing Muslims

- Difference between (% pract. Muslims voting Gerindra) and (% other voters voting Gerindra)
- After controlling for income, education
- After controlling for location, age, income, education, employment status, gender

Source: authors' computations using Indonesian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the difference between the share of practicing Muslims voting for Gerindra and the share of other voters voting for Gerindra, before and after controls.
Figure DF7 – Vote for Gerindra by age group

Source: authors' computations using Indonesian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by Gerindra by age group.
Figure DF8 – Vote for Gerindra among young voters

Source: authors’ computations using Indonesian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the difference between share of young voters voting for Gerindra and the share of other voters voting for Gerindra, before and after controls.
Figure DF9 – Vote for Gerindra by rural-urban location

Source: authors' computations using Indonesian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by Gerindra by rural-urban location.
Figure DF10 – Vote for Gerindra among urban voters

- Difference between (% urban voters voting Gerindra) and (% other voters voting Gerindra)
- After controlling for income, education
- After controlling for age, income, education, religion, employment status, gender

Source: authors’ computations using Indonesian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the difference between the share of urban voters voting for Gerindra and the share of other voters voting for Gerindra, before and after controls.
Figure DG1 – Vote for Hanura by education level

Source: authors' computations using Indonesian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by Hanura by education level.
Figure DG2 – Vote for Hanura among higher-educated voters

Difference between (% top 10% educated voting Hanura) and (% bottom 90% voting Hanura) after controlling for religion, location, age, income, employment status, gender.

Source: authors' computations using Indonesian political attitudes surveys.

Note: the figure shows the difference between the share of top 10% educated voters voting for Hanura and the share of other voters voting for Hanura, before and after controls.
Figure DG3 – Vote for Hanura by income group

Source: authors' computations using Indonesian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by Hanura by income group.
Figure DG4 – Vote for Hanura among top-income voters

- Difference between (% top 10% earners voting Hanura) and (% bottom 90% voting Hanura)
- After controlling for religion
- After controlling for religion, location, age, education, employment status, gender

Source: authors’ computations using Indonesian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the difference between the share of top 10% earners voting for Hanura and the share of other voters voting for Hanura, before and after controls.
Figure DG5 – Vote for Hanura by religion

Source: authors' computations using Indonesian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by Hanura by religion.
Figure DG6 – Vote for Hanura among practicing Muslims

- Difference between (% pract. Muslims voting Hanura) and (% other voters voting Hanura)
- After controlling for income, education
- After controlling for location, age, income, education, employment status, gender

Source: authors’ computations using Indonesian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the difference between the share of practicing Muslims voting for Hanura and the share of other voters voting for Hanura, before and after controls.
Figure DG7 – Vote for Hanura by age group

Source: authors' computations using Indonesian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by Hanura by age group.
Figure DG8 – Vote for Hanura among young voters

Source: authors’ computations using Indonesian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the difference between share of young voters voting for Hanura and the share of other voters voting for Hanura, before and after controls.
Figure DG9 – Vote for Hanura by rural-urban location

Source: authors' computations using Indonesian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by Hanura by rural-urban location.
Figure DG10 – Vote for Hanura among urban voters

- Difference between (% urban voters voting Hanura) and (% other voters voting Hanura)
- After controlling for income, education
- After controlling for age, income, education, religion, employment status, gender

Source: authors’ computations using Indonesian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the difference between the share of urban voters voting for Gerindra and the share of other voters voting for Gerindra, before and after controls.
Source: authors' computations using Indonesian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by Golkar by education level.
Figure DH2 – Vote for Golkar among higher-educated voters

Difference between (% top 10% educated voting Golkar) and (% bottom 90% voting Golkar)

- After controlling for religion
- After controlling for religion, location, age, income, employment status, gender

Source: authors’ computations using Indonesian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the difference between the share of top 10% educated voters voting for Golkar and the share of other voters voting for Golkar, before and after controls.
Figure DH3 – Vote for Golkar by income group

Source: authors' computations using Indonesian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by Golkar by income group.
Figure DH4 – Vote for Golkar among top-income voters

- Difference between (% top 10% earners voting Golkar) and (% bottom 90% voting Golkar)
- After controlling for religion
- After controlling for religion, location, age, education, employment status, gender

Source: authors’ computations using Indonesian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the difference between the share of top 10% earners voting for Golkar and the share of other voters voting for Golkar, before and after controls.
Figure DH5 – Vote for Golkar by religion

Source: authors' computations using Indonesian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by Golkar by religion.
Figure DH6 – Vote for Golkar among practicing Muslims

- Difference between (% pract. Muslims voting Golkar) and (% other voters voting Golkar)
- After controlling for income, education
- After controlling for location, age, income, education, employment status, gender

Source: authors' computations using Indonesian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the difference between the share of practicing Muslims voting for Golkar and the share of other voters voting for Golkar, before and after controls.
Source: authors' computations using Indonesian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by Golkar/Gerindra/Hanura by age group.
Figure DH8 – Vote for Golkar among young voters

Source: authors' computations using Indonesian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the difference between share of voters aged 20-40 voting for Golkar and the share of other voters voting for Golkar, before and after controls.
Figure DH9 – Vote for Golkar by rural-urban location

Source: authors' computations using Indonesian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by Golkar by rural-urban location.
Figure DH10 – Vote for Golkar among urban voters

- Difference between (% urban voters voting Golkar) and (% other voters voting Golkar)
- After controlling for income, education
- After controlling for age, income, education, religion, employment status, gender

Source: authors' computations using Indonesian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the difference between the share of urban voters voting for Golkar and the share of other voters voting for Golkar, before and after controls.
Figure DH11 – Vote for Golkar by ethnicity

Source: authors' computations using Indonesian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by Golkar by ethnic affiliation.
Figure DH12 – Vote for Golkar among Javanese voters

- Difference between (% Javanese voting Golkar) and (% other voters voting Golkar)
- After controlling for income, education
- After controlling for age, income, education, religion, location, employment status, gender

Source: authors' computations using Indonesian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the difference between the share of Javanese voters voting for Golkar and the share of other voters voting for Golkar, before and after controls.
Figure DI1 – Vote for PDI-P by education level

Source: authors' computations using Indonesian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by PDI-P by education level.
Figure DI2 – Vote for PDI-P among higher-educated voters

- Difference between (% top 10% educated voting PDI-P) and (% bottom 90% voting PDI-P)
- After controlling for religion
- After controlling for religion, location, age, income, employment status, gender

Source: authors' computations using Indonesian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the difference between the share of top 10% educated voters voting for PDI-P and the share of other voters voting for PDI-P, before and after controls.
Figure DI3 – Vote for PDI-P by income group

Source: authors' computations using Indonesian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by PDI-P by income group.
Figure DI4 – Vote for PDI-P among top-income voters

- Difference between (% top 10% earners voting PDI-P) and (% bottom 90% voting PDI-P)
- After controlling for religion
- After controlling for religion, location, age, income, employment status, gender

Source: authors' computations using Indonesian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the difference between the share of top 10% earners voting for PDI-P and the share of other voters voting for PDI-P, before and after controls.
Figure DI5 – Vote for PDI-P by religion

Source: authors' computations using Indonesian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by PDI-P by religion.
Figure DI6 – Vote for PDI-P among practicing Muslims

Difference between (% pract. Muslims voting PDI-P) and (% other voters voting PDI-P)

After controlling for income, education

After controlling for location, age, income, education, employment status, gender

Source: authors' computations using Indonesian political attitudes surveys.

Note: the figure shows the difference between the share of practicing Muslims voting for PDI-P and the share of other voters voting for PDI-P, before and after controls.
Figure DI7 – Vote for PDI-P among young voters

Difference between (% voters aged 20-39 voting PDI-P) and (% other voters voting PDI-P)

After controlling for income, education

After controlling for location, income, education, religion, employment status, gender

Source: authors' computations using Indonesian political attitudes surveys.

Note: the figure shows the difference between share of voters aged 20-40 voting for PDI-P and the share of other voters voting for PDI-P, before and after controls.
Figure D18 – Vote for PDI-P by rural-urban location

Source: authors' computations using Indonesian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by PDI-P by rural-urban location.
Figure DI9 – Vote for PDI-P among urban voters

- Red line: Difference between (% urban voters voting PDI-P) and (% other voters voting PDI-P)
- Blue line: After controlling for income, education
- Green line: After controlling for age, income, education, religion, employment status, gender

Source: authors’ computations using Indonesian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the difference between the share of urban voters voting for PDI-P and the share of other voters voting for PDI-P, before and after controls.
Source: authors' computations using Indonesian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by PDI-P by ethnic affiliation.
Figure DI11 – Vote for PDI-P among Javanese voters

- Difference between (% Javanese voting PDI-P) and (% other voters voting PDI-P)
- After controlling for income, education
- After controlling for age, income, education, religion, location, employment status, gender

Source: authors’ computations using Indonesian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the difference between the share of Javanese voters voting for PDI-P and the share of other voters voting for PDI-P, before and after controls.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Survey</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Sample size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>CNEP, 1999</td>
<td>Comparative National Elections Project</td>
<td>2488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>CNEP, 2004</td>
<td>Comparative National Elections Project</td>
<td>1194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>CNEP, 2009</td>
<td>Comparative National Elections Project</td>
<td>1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>CNEP, 2014</td>
<td>Comparative National Elections Project</td>
<td>1737</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source:* authors' elaboration.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender: Man</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity: Batak</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity: Betawi</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity: Bugis</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity: Java</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity: Madurese</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity: Malay</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity: Minang</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity: Other</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity: Sundanese</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education: Elementary or lower</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education: Primary</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education: Lower secondary</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education: Upper secondary</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education: University or higher</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age: 20-40</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age: 40-60</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age: 60+</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment status: Employed</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment status: Inactive</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location: Rural</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion: Islam</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion: Christian</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion: Others</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collective prayer: Never</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collective prayer: Sometimes</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collective prayer: Often</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collective prayer: Very often</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Source:** authors' computations using Indonesian political attitudes surveys.

**Note:** the table shows descriptive statistics by year for selected available variables.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table DA3 - Full structure of the vote in the 2014 Indonesian election</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall vote share</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary or lower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tertiary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bottom 50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle 40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practicing Muslims</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-practicing Muslims</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Muslims</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Man</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madurese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bugis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sundanese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Betawi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Java</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Batak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** authors' computations using CNEP surveys.

**Note:** the table shows the detailed structure of the vote for Indonesian political parties in the 2014 legislative election. Islamic parties include the PAN, PBB, PKB, PKS, and PPP.