# Appendix

This appendix has four sections:

A. Sampling Reports
B. Independent and Control Variables
C. Dependent Variables
D. Supplementary Tables

## A. Sampling Reports

**Number of Coded Reports by Year**

| | 1997 | 1999 | 2004 | 2009 | 2014 | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Reports Coded | 64 | 73 | 68 | 80 | 82 | 367 |
| Reports Not Coded | 64 | 72 | 68 | 81 | 81 | 366 |
| Total | 128 | 145 | 136 | 161 | 163 | 733 |

**Number of Coded Reports by Political Party**

| | 1997 | 1999 | 2004 | 2009 | 2014 | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Gerindra | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 6 |
| Golkar | 38 | 10 | 12 | 21 | 27 | 108 |
| Hanura | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 6 |
| Nasdem | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 8 |
| PAN | 0 | 10 | 8 | 17 | 7 | 42 |
| PBB | 0 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 8 |
| PD | 0 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 7 | 17 |
| PDI | 10 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 |
| PDI-P | 0 | 3 | 10 | 4 | 2 | 19 |
| PDS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 |
| PKB | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 8 |
| PKPI | 0 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 12 |
| PKS | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 9 | 14 |
| PPP | 16 | 8 | 9 | 6 | 2 | 41 |
| Other Minor Parties | 0 | 35 | 21 | 8 | 0 | 64 |
| Total | 64 | 73 | 68 | 80 | 82 | 367 |

## B. Independent and Control Variables

The independent variable for testing is Candidate-centric Rules. Decentralization, number of parties and the ideology of parties (Islamic or nationalist).

### 1. Candidate-centric Rules

Used a dummy variable of 1 for all reports in 2009 and 2014 and 0 for party-centric rules for all reports from 1997, 1999, and 2004.

### 2. Decentralization

Used a dummy variable of 1 for elections held after financial decentralization was implemented. All reports from 2004, 2009, and 2014 were coded 1. 1997 and 1999 were coded 0.

### 3. Party Number

The number of parties fluctuates from election to election. To control for the number of parties that competed in each election I include a variable that is a count of the number of parties competing.

### 4. Islamic Parties

Islam versus nationalism-secular is the main ideological cleavage for political parties in Indonesia. The variable 'Islamic Party' is used in the regression analysis to control for party ideology. Each report that is from an Islamic party is coded 1, while the nationalist parties (all the rest) are coded as 0. The four main parties coded as Islamic were:

- Partai Persatuan Pembangunan
- Partai Kedadilan Sejahtera
- Partai Bulan Bintang
- Partai Bintang Reformasi.

The other smaller parties coded as Islamic were Partai Kebangkitan Umat, Partai Kebangkitan Nasional Ulama, Partai Matahari Bangsa, Partai Persatuan Nahdlatul Ummah Indonesia, Partai Keadilan, Partai Masyumi Baru, Partai Persatuan, Partai Politik Islam Indonesia Masyumi, Partai Syarikat Islam Indonesia, Partai Syarikat Islam Indonesia – 1905, and Partai Ummat Islam.

The more moderate Islamic parties included Party Amanat National, Party Kebangkitan Bangsa, Party Islam Democrat, and Party Umat Muslimin Indonesia. They were not coded as Islamic.

**Summary Data for Independent and Control Variables**

| | 1997 | 1999 | 2004 | 2009 | 2014 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Candidate-Centric Rules | No | No | No | Yes | Yes |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Decentralization | No | No | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Number of Parties | 3 | 48 | 24 | 38 | 12 |
| % Reports from Islamic Parties Coded | 25% | 18% | 24% | 18% | 16% |

**Summary Statistics for Independent and Control Variables**

| Variable | Obs | Mean | Std. Dev. | Min | Max |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Candidate-Centric Rules | 367 | 0.44 | 0.50 | 0 | 1 |
| Decentralization | 367 | 0.63 | 0.48 | 0 | 1 |
| Number of Parties | 367 | 25.48 | 16.28 | 3 | 48 |
| Islamic Party | 367 | 0.20 | 0.40 | 0 | 1 |

## C. Dependent Variables

The dependent variables were coded from the newspaper reports. There were three main categories of dependent variables used in this manuscript—events, endorsements, and identity group appeals. For all the dependent variables the unit of analysis is the report, and whether a specific event, endorsement, etc. is present or absent in each report. All the dependent variables are binary (1 = present, 0 = absent). Brief descriptions and summary statistics of the dependent variables follow. For more detailed instructions on how each variable was coded see the codebook.

### 1. Events

The main types of events were used as dependent variables. Each report was coded as 1 if it contained the particular type of event. Some reports contained more than one event. This occurred when, for example, a single article reported on a candidate's rally in the morning, and door-to-door visits in a local community in the afternoon. In this case the article would be coded 1 for 'Party Event' and 1 for 'Community Event'. There were reports that had no events. These were usually interviews with a reporter at no specific event, or a profile piece on a candidate. The main types of events were:

- **Party Events:** Political rallies and party leader/cadre visits.
- **Religious Events:** Religious ceremony/festivals and religious group visits.
- **Indigenous Events:** Indigenous ceremony/festivals and indigenous group visits.
- **Community Events:** Community group visit, community service events, and sports events.
- **Occupational Events:** Occupational group visits.
- **Other Events:** Nationalist group visits, officeholder visits, forum/debates, and political protests.
- **No Events:** Reports that comprise of interviews with reporters or profile pieces and have no mention of campaign events.

**Number of Reports with each Type of Event by Year**

| Type of Event | 1997 | 1999 | 2004 | 2009 | 2014 | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Party | 46 | 38 | 51 | 15 | 23 | 173 |
| Religious | 4 | 5 | 1 | 7 | 11 | 28 |
| Indigenous | 2 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 6 | 16 |
| Community | 1 | 7 | 7 | 20 | 23 | 58 |
| Occupational | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 7 |
| Other | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 8 |
| None | 13 | 21 | 9 | 31 | 25 | 99 |

## 2. Endorsements

The main types of endorsements/support were used as dependent variables. Each report was coded as 1 if it contained the particular type of endorsement. Some reports contained more than one endorsement. This occurred when, for example, a single article reported that both religious and indigenous leaders came and spoke at a candidate's campaign event. In this case the article would be coded 1 for 'Religious Endorsement' and 1 for 'Indigenous Endorsement'. There were reports that had no endorsements. In these reports there was no mention of other leaders or associations in the report. The main types of endorsements/support were:

- **Party Endorsements:** Support from the head of the party or a party leader on the provincial or national level.
- **Religious Endorsements:** Support from a religious house of worship, organization, educational institution, youth group, women's group, or leader.
- **Indigenous Endorsements:** Support from an indigenous association, youth group, or leader
- **Community Endorsements:** Support from a local community association or leader; a local social, sports, youth, or student association; or a local educational institute or NGO.
- **Occupational Endorsements:** Support from an occupational association/leader, or a business association/leader.
- **Other Endorsements:** Any other support or endorsement from an elite or an association.
- **No Endorsements:** Reports that lack any mention of elite or associational support in a report.

**Number of Reports with each Type of Endorsement by Year**

| Type of Endorsement | 1997 | 1999 | 2004 | 2009 | 2014 | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Party | 22 | 24 | 48 | 5 | 13 | 112 |
| Religious | 5 | 3 | 3 | 9 | 11 | 31 |
| Indigenous | 2 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 6 | 17 |
| Community | 3 | 3 | 3 | 12 | 10 | 31 |
| Occupational | 3 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 12 |
| Other | 8 | 3 | 5 | 9 | 4 | 29 |
| None | 31 | 44 | 17 | 47 | 44 | 183 |

## 3. Identity Group Appeals

The main types of identity group appeals were used as dependent variables. Each report was coded as 1 if it contained the particular type of identity group appeal. Some reports contained

more than one group appeal. This occurred when, for example, a candidate appealed to an indigenous group and transportation workers. In this case the article would be coded 1 for 'Indigenous Identity Group Appeal' and 1 for 'Occupational Identity Group Appeal'. There were reports that had no group appeals. In these reports candidates tended to focus on issues without explicitly invoking identity groups. For an appeal to an identity group, a specific group needed to be verbally appealed to or invoked. The main types of identity group appeals were:

- **Religious Group Appeals:** Any religious group.
- **Indigenous Group Appeals:** Any indigenous group.
- **Occupational Group Appeals:** Any occupational group.
- **The Poor Group Appeals:** Appeals to the poor or marginalized.
- **Other Group Appeals:** Any other group. Includes children, youth, women, etc.
- **No Group Appeals:** No mention of any identity group in a report.

**Number of Reports with each Type of Identity Group Appeal by Year**

| Type of Identity Group Appeal | 1997 | 1999 | 2004 | 2009 | 2014 | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Religious | 26 | 23 | 11 | 29 | 28 | 117 |
| Indigenous | 4 | 3 | 1 | 9 | 9 | 26 |
| Occupational | 27 | 20 | 17 | 9 | 22 | 95 |
| Marginalized | 11 | 19 | 11 | 13 | 15 | 69 |
| Other | 21 | 14 | 6 | 18 | 21 | 80 |
| None | 13 | 17 | 34 | 24 | 23 | 111 |

**Summary Statistics for Dependent Variables**

| **Events** | Obs | Mean | Std. Dev. | Min | Max |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Party | 367 | 0.47 | 0.50 | 0 | 1 |
| Religious | 367 | 0.08 | 0.27 | 0 | 1 |
| Indigenous | 367 | 0.04 | 0.20 | 0 | 1 |
| Religious + Indigenous | 367 | 0.12 | 0.32 | 0 | 1 |
| Community | 367 | 0.16 | 0.37 | 0 | 1 |
| Occupational | 367 | 0.02 | 0.14 | 0 | 1 |
| Other | 367 | 0.02 | 0.15 | 0 | 1 |
| None | 367 | 0.27 | 0.44 | 0 | 1 |
| **Endorsements** | Obs | Mean | Std. Dev. | Min | Max |
| Party | 367 | 0.31 | 0.46 | 0 | 1 |
| Religious | 367 | 0.08 | 0.28 | 0 | 1 |
| Indigenous | 367 | 0.05 | 0.21 | 0 | 1 |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Religious + Indigenous | 367 | 0.11 | 0.32 | 0 | 1 |
| Community | 367 | 0.08 | 0.28 | 0 | 1 |
| Occupational | 367 | 0.03 | 0.18 | 0 | 1 |
| Other | 367 | 0.08 | 0.27 | 0 | 1 |
| None | 367 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0 | 1 |
| **Group Appeals** | Obs | Mean | Std. Dev. | Min | Max |
| Religious | 367 | 0.32 | 0.47 | 0 | 1 |
| Indigenous | 367 | 0.07 | 0.26 | 0 | 1 |
| Religious + Indigenous | 367 | 0.36 | 0.48 | 0 | 1 |
| Occupational | 367 | 0.26 | 0.44 | 0 | 1 |
| Marginalized | 367 | 0.19 | 0.39 | 0 | 1 |
| Other | 367 | 0.22 | 0.41 | 0 | 1 |
| None | 367 | 0.30 | 0.46 | 0 | 1 |

*Note.* Religious + Indigenous refers to reports that have either a religious or indigenous campaign activity. The mean can be less than the sum of the mean for religious and indigenous because some reports contain both a religious and indigenous campaign activity.

# D. Supplementary Tables

## Supplementary Data for Table 2 in Manuscript

**Democratization and the change in religious and indigenous aspects of campaigns (full results)**

| | Authoritarian Election 1997 | Transitional Election 1999 | Change |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Events** | | | |
| Party | 71.9% | 52.1% | -19.8% |
| Religious | 6.3% | 6.8% | 0.6% |
| Indigenous | 3.1% | 0.0% | -3.1% |
| Community | 1.6% | 9.6% | 8.0% |
| Occupational | 1.6% | 2.7% | 1.2% |
| Other | 1.6% | 4.1% | 2.5% |
| None | 20.3% | 28.8% | 8.5% |
| **Endorsements** | | | |
| Party | 34.4% | 32.9% | -1.5% |
| Religious | 7.8% | 4.1% | -3.7% |
| Indigenous | 3.1% | 0.0% | -3.1% |
| Community | 4.7% | 4.1% | -0.6% |
| Occupational | 4.7% | 0.0% | -4.7% |
| Other | 12.5% | 4.1% | -8.4% |
| None | 48.4% | 60.3% | 11.8% |
| **Group Appeals** | | | |
| Religious | 40.6% | 31.5% | -9.1% |
| Indigenous | 6.3% | 4.1% | -2.1% |
| Occupational | 42.2% | 27.4% | -14.8% |
| The Poor | 17.2% | 26.0% | 8.8% |
| Other | 32.8% | 19.2% | -13.6% |
| None | 20.3% | 23.3% | 3.0% |

*Note*: Each figure is the percentage of coded reports from that election that mention the type of event, endorsement or group appeal. Some reports contained more than one, so a column can sum to more than 100%. 'Change' is the difference in percentage points between 1997 and 1999. 64 reports were coded for the 1997 election and 73 for the 1999 election.

## Supplementary Data for Table 3 in Manuscript

**Events (Logit)**

| | Party | Religious | Indigenous | Community | Occupational | Other | None |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Candidate-centric Rules | -1.84** | 0.89* | 2.26** | 1.52** | 0.53 | -0.88 | 0.69** |
| | (0.24) | (0.41) | (0.76) | (0.32) | (0.77) | (0.82) | (0.24) |
| Constant | 0.66** | -2.97** | -4.62** | -2.54** | -4.21** | -3.50** | -1.33** |
| | (0.15) | (0.32) | (0.71) | (0.27) | (0.58) | (0.41) | (0.17) |
| Log likelihood | -219.86 | -96.47 | -58.91 | -147.41 | -34.41 | -37.88 | -209.74 |
| Pseudo-$R^2$ | 0.13 | 0.03 | 0.10 | 0.08 | 0.01 | 0.02 | 0.02 |
| Observations | 367 | 367 | 367 | 367 | 367 | 367 | 367 |

*$p < .05$; **$p < .01$; ^$p < 0.10$.

**Endorsements (Logit)**

| | Party | Religious | Indigenous | Community | Occupational | Other | None |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Candidate-centric Rules | -1.91** | 0.91* | 2.34** | 1.23** | 0.59 | 0.03 | 0.45* |
| | (0.29) | (0.39) | (0.76) | (0.41) | (0.60) | (0.39) | (0.21) |
| Constant | -0.17 | -2.87** | -4.62** | -3.08** | -3.69** | -2.47** | -0.21 |
| | (0.14) | (0.31) | (0.71) | (0.34) | (0.45) | (0.26) | (0.14) |
| Log likelihood | -197.90 | -103.42 | -61.23 | -101.29 | -52.34 | -101.42 | -252.07 |
| Pseudo-$R^2$ | 0.12 | 0.03 | 0.11 | 0.05 | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.01 |
| Observations | 367 | 367 | 367 | 367 | 367 | 367 | 367 |

*$p < .05$; **$p < .01$; ^$p < 0.10$.

**Group Appeals (Logit)**

| | Religious | Indigenous | Occupational | The Poor | Other | None |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Candidate-centric Rules | 0.27 | 1.12* | -0.65** | -0.18 | 0.24 | -0.10 |
| | (0.23) | (0.44) | (0.25) | (0.27) | (0.25) | (0.23) |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Constant | -0.88** | -3.20** | -0.79** | -1.39** | -1.39** | -0.79** |
| | (0.15) | (0.36) | (0.15) | (0.17) | (0.17) | (0.15) |
| Log likelihood | -229.00 | -90.30 | -206.36 | -177.16 | -192.00 | -224.84 |
| Pseudo-$R^2$ | 0.00 | 0.04 | 0.02 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Observations | 367 | 367 | 367 | 367 | 367 | 367 |

*$p < .05$; **$p < .01$; ^$p < 0.10$.

## Supplementary Data for Table 4 in Manuscript

### Impact of candidate-centric system on campaigns (OLS)

| | **Events** | | | **Endorsements** | | | **Appeals** | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Rel.** | **Ind.** | **Comb.** | **Rel.** | **Ind.** | **Comb.** | **Rel.** | **Ind.** | **Comb.** |
| Candidate-centric rules | 0.09* | 0.08** | 0.17** | 0.08* | 0.09** | 0.13** | 0.22** | 0.09* | 0.26** |
| | (0.04) | (0.03) | (0.05) | (0.04) | (0.03) | (0.05) | (0.06) | (0.04) | (0.07) |
| Decentralization | -0.05 | -0.01 | -0.07 | -0.02 | -0.01 | -0.03 | -0.21** | -0.04 | -0.22** |
| | (0.04) | (0.03) | (0.05) | (0.04) | (0.03) | (0.05) | (0.07) | (0.04) | (0.07) |
| Number of parties | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Islamic party | -0.06 | -0.03 | -0.08* | -0.01 | -0.02 | -0.03 | 0.37** | -0.07^ | 0.34** |
| | (0.03) | (0.03) | (0.04) | (0.04) | (0.03) | (0.04) | (0.06) | (0.03) | (0.06) |
| Constant | 0.09** | 0.03 | 0.11** | 0.08* | 0.02 | 0.10** | 0.30** | 0.07* | 0.31** |
| | (0.03) | (0.03) | (0.04) | (0.03) | (0.03) | (0.04) | (0.06) | (0.03) | (0.06) |
| $R^2$ | 0.03 | 0.04 | 0.06 | 0.02 | 0.04 | 0.04 | 0.13 | 0.03 | 0.11 |
| Observations | 367 | 367 | 367 | 367 | 367 | 367 | 367 | 367 | 367 |

*Note.* Rel. = religion; Ind. = Indigenous. Comb. = Combined (religion + indigenous). Values are OLS coefficients with standard errors in parentheses.
*$p < .05$; **$p < .01$; ^$p < 0.10$.