THE INFLUENCE OF SOCIOLOGICAL FACTORS, PARTY ID, EXPECTATION CONFLICT, AND CHECKS AND BALANCES ON SPLIT TICKET VOTING BEHAVIOR IN BALI IN THE 2024 ELECTION

[1]Komang Putri Ganeesha Pratista
putriganeesha20@gmail.com

Received: 01-12–2025 Revised: 06-12-2025 Accepted: 15-12-2025

Abstract

The 2024 Indonesian general election, held on February 14, 2024, featured significant political shifts, particularly in Bali. Historically, Bali has been a stronghold for the Indonesian Democratic Party of Struggle (PDI-P), which has consistently supported its candidates in legislative and presidential elections since the introduction of direct elections in 2004. However, a surprising change emerged in 2024: although the PDI-P remained dominant in the legislative elections, its presidential candidate lost to the Prabowo-Gibran ticket. This study analyses the factors behind voters' split-ticket voting behaviour, which deviates from the usual voting patterns in Bali. Using four theoretical frameworks, sociological theory, party identification (non-rational approach), expectation conflict, and checks and balances (rational approach), this research employs quantitative methods and logistic regression analysis with the backward Wald method to assess voter behaviour. The findings indicate that sociological variables, particularly place of residence, education level, and gender, as well as party identification, significantly influence split-ticket voting. On the other hand, rational choice theory does not show a significant effect. These results indicate that non-rational factors remain more influential in shaping electoral decisions in Bali, challenging the application of rational choice theory in the Indonesian electoral context. This study suggests the need for alternative or expanded theoretical models to better capture the complexity of voter behaviour in future Indonesian elections.

Keywords: *2024 Indonesian Election, Split Ticket Voting, Voting Behaviour.*

[1] Universitas Airlangga

INTRODUCTION

Conceptually, split-ticket voting describes a situation in which a voter casts their vote for two different parties in presidential and parliamentary elections. These elections may be held simultaneously or at other times (Burden & Helmke, 2009).[2] The phenomenon of split-ticket voting has been around in the United States since the 1940s. Observers at the time noted that some voters in the United States split their votes in elections. However, scientific research into this phenomenon was not conducted until 1957 by Campbell and Miller, who suspected that split-ticket voting occurred because voters had lower party identification than those who did not split-ticket vote. Split-ticket voting is a common phenomenon in democratic countries, particularly because elections often involve multiple contests taking place simultaneously. In this context, voters do not always vote for the same candidate or party at all levels of the election, but may split their votes between different parties or candidates for various positions. This reflects the complex dynamics of voters' political preferences and shows that voting decisions are not always based on loyalty to a single party, but rather take into account individual factors, specific issues, or the candidate's performance in a particular position.

[2] Burden, B.C. and Helmke, G. (2009). The comparative study of split-ticket voting. *Electoral Studies*, *28*(1), pp.1-7

The phenomenon of split ticket voting is a political phenomenon that can be explained using analytical tools of voting behavior theory, both rational approaches (theories based on political economy approaches) such as equilibrium theory or moderation theory, checks and balances theory, conflict theory of expectations and issue ownership theory, as rational theories that have been used in analyzing the phenomenon of split ticket voting by previous researchers, as well as theories of voting behavior with a non-rational approach, namely theories based on psychological (Michigan School) and sociological (Columbia School) approaches. The dominant theories used to analyse the phenomenon of split-ticket voting in countries with an established level of democracy are those with a rational or intentional approach. The four theories above are classified as rational theories because they are the output of rational actions demonstrated by voters in a political contest (Wittek, 2013).[3] Researchers examined the influence of both sensible and non-rational voting behaviour on split-ticket voting in Bali Province in 2024.

RESEARCH METHODS

This study aims to explain the relationship among sociological factors, party ID, conflicting expectations, and checks and balances in split-ticket voting behaviour in Bali Province. To explain this relationship, the researchers have identified four aspects that are of primary concern in the study of split-ticket

[3] Wittek, R., Snijders, T. A., & Nee, V. (Eds.). (2013). *The handbook of rational choice social research*. Stanford University Press.

voting in Bali. First, do sociological factors influence voters' split-ticket voting decisions in Bali? Second, does party ID influence the phenomenon of split-ticket voting? Third, do conflicting expectations influence split-ticket voting among voters in Bali? Fourth, do checks and balances influence this phenomenon?

Therefore, the researchers adapted to the current political conditions in Indonesia, particularly in Bali Province, and hypothesised that both rational and non-rational theories are relevant to explaining the split-ticket voting phenomenon in Bali. To test the relationship between split-ticket voting and the four existing theories, the researchers in this study employed quantitative research with a survey method for data collection. According to Garand and Litch (2000), the survey method is the most appropriate for researching split-ticket voting. This method is the most widely used in previous studies on split ticket voting. The sampling method used was multistage random sampling (MRS). This method is often used in studies with heterogeneous characteristics and spread across a wide area (Silvia, 2015).[4] In this study, the researchers established a sampling frame based on the permanent voter population in Bali Province, as seen in the Permanent Voter List (DPT) data for the 2024 election, which totalled 3,269,516. The sample size for this study was 400, divided among nine cities/regencies in Bali based on each city/regency's

[4] Silvia, C., Wilandari, Y., & Hoyyi, A. (2015). Ketepatan Klasifikasi Tingkat Keparahan Korban Kecelakaan Lalu Lintas Menggunakan Metode Regresi Logistik Ordinal Dan Fuzzy K-nearest Neighbor In Every Class. *Jurnal Gaussian*, *4*(3), 441-451.

population.

The data in this study were obtained from two types: primary and secondary. Primary data were collected by distributing questionnaires to respondents. These questionnaires included a list of written questions to be answered by respondents either by completing a printed paper form or by filling out a Google Form. Secondary data were selected from the results of the 2024 general election in Bali Province, managed by the Bali Provincial Elections Commission (KPU), as well as from previous books and research journals that discussed split-ticket voting, both of which were related to case studies in Indonesia and abroad. This research was conducted from October to December 2024. This relatively long time span was due to limited resources and the broad research area required to uncover the phenomenon of split-ticket voting in Bali Province. Therefore, this timeframe was chosen to help researchers present specific data on this phenomenon.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Analysis Of Variables Influencing Split Ticket Voting In Bali Province In The 2024 Election

Based on the results of the logistic regression test, three variables influenced the split-ticket voting phenomenon in Bali Province in the 2024 Election: the sociological variables of gender and residence, and the party ID variable. To further analyse each variable's influence on the split-voting phenomenon, the researcher used crosstabulation to determine the frequency of splits across these influential variables.

Analysis of the Sociological Variable: Gender

Table 1. Crosstabulation of the Gender Variable

Gender * Split Voting Crosstabulation				
Count				
		Split Voting		Total
		No	Yes	
Gender	Female	118	49	167
	Male	167	66	233
Total		285	115	400

Table 1 shows that female respondents were most likely to split their votes, at 29.3%. Meanwhile, the split vote was at 28.3%. This minimal difference supports Persson's Paper, which states that the difference in split-voting behaviour between the genders is almost indistinguishable. However, Persson notes that female respondents are more likely to split their vote. This is also supported by the reality on the ground, where, based on the researcher's observations, male respondents were more willing to indicate their party affiliation than female respondents. The researcher concluded that male voters' party affiliation also shows a higher party ID than that of female voters, making them more likely to split the vote.

Analysis of Sociological Variables by Place of Residence

Table 2. Crosstabulation of Sociological Variables by Place of Residence

Split Voting * Residence Crosstabulation

Count				
		Residence		Total
		Outside Denpasar City / Outside Badung Regency	Denpasar City / Badung Regency	
Split Voting	No	242	43	285
	Yes	14	101	115
Total		256	144	400

Table 2 shows that respondents residing in Denpasar City/Badung Regency most frequently used split-ticket voting. This aligns with Sara Persson's theory in her journal on split-ticket voting, which posits that those living in urban areas are more likely to use split-ticket voting than those living outside urban areas (Persson, 2020).[5] In the context of Bali Province, researchers define not only Denpasar City as a metropolitan area but also Badung Regency. Daldjoeni (1997: 44-45)[6] states that cities were initially not residential areas, but service centres. The extent to which a city became a service centre depended on the extent to which the surrounding countryside utilised city services. Sjoberg, in Daldjoeni (1997: 30),[7] viewed the emergence of cities as more than the emergence of a non-agrarian specialised group,

[5] Persson, S. (2020). Exploring split ticket voting motives. *Dalam Swedish National Election Studies Program Report Series*, *14*.

[6] Daldjoeni. 1997. Seluk Beluk Masyarakat Kota. Bandung: Alumni

[7] *Ibid*

emphasising that educated people constituted the most crucial segment of the population. This definition demonstrates that cities have become centres of services (government services, education, recreation, and others), as well as centres of social and economic activity and residential areas.

Figure Map of the Regional Division of Bali Province

Source : https://tarubali.baliprov.go.id/karakteristik-wilayah-provinsi-bali/[8]

The figure shows that Badung Regency's geographical distribution encompasses key tourism areas in Bali, such as Nusa Dua, Seminyak, Kuta, and Canggu. Besides being a key tourism destination in Bali, Badung Regency is also one of Bali's leading educational centres, alongside Denpasar City. Several leading Balinese universities are located in the area, such as the Bukit Jimbaran Campus. Udayana University, the main campus of Udayana University, and the Nusa Dua Tourism College (STP), now

[8] https://tarubali.baliprov.go.id/karakteristik-wilayah-provinsi-bali/

renamed the Bali Tourism Polytechnic. Furthermore, according to the Bali Provincial Statistics Agency (BPS), Badung Regency has the highest Regional Original Income (PAD), surpassing that of Denpasar City. This aligns with Sjoberg's observation that urban areas are characterised by their economic centres.

Table 3: Data on Regional Original Income of Cities/Regencies in Bali Province, 2017-2022

Kabupaten /Kota	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
Jembrana	121.342.475	126.477.267	133.698.784	148.045.103	185.004.035	175.990.000
Tabanan	426.635.751	363.370.469	354.558.239	313.042.530	362.314.631	432.970.000
Badung	4.172.457.396	4.555.716.407	4.835.188.460	2.116.974.302	1.750.345.226	2.733.010.000
Gianyar	662.753.475	770.204.849	997.478.368	545.869.873	430.172.109	857.550.000
Klungkung	153.210.776	186.974.284	225.063.772	220.893.875	254.494.496	309.460.000
Bangli	104.592.163	122.686.254	127.040.436	104.325.150	163.537.096	144.060.000
Karangasem	198.575.057	200.361.247	233.013.033	219.176.733	252.688.747	301.330..000
Bersambung Lanjutan						
Buleleng	455.195.426	335.555.494	365.595.301	318.986.891	391.988.445	433.450.000
Denpasar	1.008.710.712	940.110.335	1.010.779.481	731.261.281	792.362.414	888.050.000
Provinsi Bali	**3.398.472.278**	**3.718.499.635**	**4.023.156.316**	**3.069.474.218**	**3.117.070.009**	**3.862.880.000**

Source: Badan Pusat Statistik Provinsi Bali 2023[9]

Analysis Variabel *Party-ID*

Pilihan Partai Politik * Party-ID Crosstabulation				
Count				
		Party Id		Total
		Faithful/Very Faithful	Unfaithful/ Very Unfaithful	
Choice	PDI-Perjuangan	149	16	165

[9] Badan Pusat Statistik Provinsi Bali 2023

of Political Party				
	Gerindra	22	27	49
	Demokrat	7	18	25
	Nasdem	14	19	33
	PKB	13	31	44
	Golongan Karya	37	27	64
	PKS	0	5	5
	PSI	0	11	11
	PPP	0	2	2
	Partai Buruh	0	2	2
Total		242	158	400

Tabel 4. *Crosstabulation* Variabel Test of Party-ID

Table 4 shows that respondents who preferred the Indonesian Democratic Party of Struggle (PDI-P) were the dominant group, with 90.3% choosing "close/very close" to their chosen party. This figure also indicates that PDI-P voters have a relatively high party identity compared to voters from other parties in Bali Province in the 2024 Election. Meanwhile, voters from different parties overwhelmingly chose "not close/very close" to their chosen party. The table below shows that not all those who decided "Close/Very Close" engaged in split-ticket voting. For example, PDI-P, as shown in Table 5, 149 respondents chose "Close/Very Close." However, eight respondents did engage in split-

ticket voting, even though they defined themselves as close/very close to PDI-P. Similarly, respondents who chose political parties other than PDI-P and answered “Not Close/Very Close” were more likely to vote straight, such as Nasdem and the National Justice Party (PKB).

Table 5. Analysis of Respondents for Split Voting and Straight Voting: Each Political Party

Split Ticket Voting					
Tidak				Ya	Total
Partai	Demokrat	Count	16	9	25
		% within Partai	64.0%	36.0%	100.0%
	Gerindra	Count	9	40	49
		% within Partai	18.4%	81.6%	100.0%
	Golongan Karya	Count	35	29	64
		% within Partai	54.7%	45.3%	100.0%
	Nasdem	Count	31	2	33
		% within Partai	93.9%	6.1%	100.0%

	Partai Buruh	Count	1	1	2
		% within Partai	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	'artai Keadilan Sejahtera	Count	3	2	5
		% within Partai	60.0%	40.0%	100.0%
	Count		42	2	44

Tabel 6. Results of the Validity Test of Conflict of Expectations

Component Matrix[a]	
	Component
	1
Free Educations	.610
Enforcement of human rights	.667
Law enforcement	.711
Eradication of corruption	.787
Free healthcare	.708
Religious Diversity	.814
Infrastructure Development	.784

In testing the validity of conflict of expectations, which typically has more than one indicator, researchers use convergent validity testing. Convergent validity assesses the extent to which indicators of a construct or latent variable are related to one

another. Convergent validity means that a set of indicators represents a single latent variable and underlies it. This representation can be demonstrated by unidimensionality, as measured by the average variance extracted (AVE). The AVE value is at least 0.5. This value indicates adequate convergent validity, meaning that, on average, one latent variable explains more than half of the variance in its indicators (Ghozali, 2016).[10]

Convergent validity can be assessed using outer loadings, loading factors, and the Average Variance Extracted (AVE). Research typically uses a loading factor threshold of 0.70. An indicator is considered to meet convergent validity and to possess a high level of validity when its outer loadings exceed 0.70. Its Average Variance Extracted (AVE) is greater than 0.50 (Chin & Todd, 1995).[11] For example, if each indicator in a research variable has an outer loading value greater than 0.70, it can be concluded that all indicators meet convergent validity and are high. For example, if the Average Variance Extracted (AVE) value for each research variable exceeds 0.50, it can be concluded that all research variables exhibit good convergent validity (Sekaran & Bougie, 2016).[12] The validity test results in Table IV.3 above indicate that the values for each indicator of the expectancy conflict

[10] Ghozali, Imam. 2005. Aplikasi Analisis Multivariate dengan SPSS. Semarang: Badan Penerbit UNDIP.

[11] Chin, W. W., & Todd, P. A. (1995). On the use, usefulness, and ease of use of structural equation modeling in MIS research: A note of caution. *MIS quarterly*, 237-246.

[12] Sekaran, U., & Bougie, R. (2016). *Research methods for business: A skill building approach*. john wiley & sons.

variable exceed 0.60, indicating that the expectancy conflict variable is valid and supports good construct validity.

Table 7. Check and Balance Validity Test Results

Component Matrix[a]	
	Component
	1
Without government opposition	*.770*
Supervisory Function	*.770*

Similar results were also demonstrated in the validity test of the Checks and balances variable indicators. The outer loadings, or loading factors, were >0.7, indicating that the indicators in this checks-and-balances variable support good construct validity—reliability Test Results. Reliability testing assesses the consistency of respondents' answers to a single question, measured using Cronbach's Alpha. Consistency refers to whether respondents provide the same answer under similar conditions. For example, if a respondent scores highly on one question, they should also score highly on other items that measure the same question.

Table 8. Cronbach's Alpha Values in the Split Ticket Voting Study in Bali Province for the 2024 Election

Reliability Statistics	
Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.766	10

The Cronbach's Alpha value for the 10-question indicators was 0.766. This figure indicates a good level of agreement, suggesting that the items are generally well aligned in measuring the same concept.

Table 9. Cronbach's Alpha Table 'If Item Deleted'

Item-Total Statistics	
	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
Party Id	.757
Free education	.737
Enforcement of Human Rights	.732
Law enforcement	.729
Eradication corruption	.716
Free healthcare	.732
Religious Diversity	.716
Infrastructure Development	.718
Without Opposition	.800
Supervisory function	.801

Table IX above shows that the alpha value increases if items from the checks and balances variable, such as "No Opposition" and "Oversight Function," are removed, to 0.800 and 0.801, respectively. This indicates that these two items are less consistent with the other items and should be reviewed or revised. Conversely, items such as "Corruption Eradication" and "Religious Diversity" actually contribute positively to internal consistency, as

their removal actually decreases the alpha value. However, all instruments have pretty good reliability. In general (as the alpha value is stable in the range of 0.7–0.8), this suggests that the factors of party ID, conflict of expectations, sociology, and checks and balances (government opposition) in this study influence split-ticket voting (voters' decisions to vote for presidential candidates and members of the House of Representatives from different parties).

CONCLUSION

The phenomenon of split-ticket voting in Bali Province, where voters choose legislative and executive candidates from different political parties or backgrounds, reflects the complex dynamics of democracy, even in regions dominated by particular cultures and religions. From an Islamic perspective, voting is a mandate that must be carried out responsibly and with moral consideration. In Surah Al-Maidah, verse 8 of the Quran[13] emphasises the importance of acting justly, even toward those with differing views or belonging to different groups. Therefore, Muslims in Bali, despite being a minority, still have an obligation to exercise their voting rights wisely, considering the integrity, competence, and fairness of the candidates, not merely political loyalty. This demonstrates that Islamic principles can serve as an ethical foundation for making political choices, even amidst a pluralistic and dynamic socio-political reality like Bali.

The phenomenon of split-ticket voting in the 2024 Election is

[13] Al-Maidah, verse 8 of the Quran

not as simple as in the 2014 Election, which involved only two presidential and vice-presidential candidates. Therefore, the difference in votes between the presidential candidates and their coalition parties could quickly indicate whether split-ticket voting is occurring. In the 2024 election, the emergence of three presidential candidates also split the coalition parties into three distinct camps. To define the 2024 election in Bali Province as a split-ticket voting phenomenon, researchers analysed the vote deficits or surpluses for each presidential and vice-presidential candidate pair and their supporting coalition parties. Researchers compared equivalent data, namely the vote counts for the Bali Provincial Presidential Election and the Bali Provincial Legislative Council (DPRD)[14]. The results showed that the Anies-Muhaimin pair experienced the most significant vote deficit, at around 52.8%. While the 01 pair should have received at least 210,611 votes, in reality, the Anies-Muhaimin pair collected only 99,233 votes in the 2024 Bali Provincial Presidential Election[15]. This means that voters from the coalition parties supporting the Anies-Muhaimin pair split their votes. Similarly, the 03 Ganjar-Mahfud pair should have collected at least 1,316,498 votes, equivalent to the votes obtained by their coalition parties. However, the PDI-P's ticket secured only 1,127,134 votes, meaning the 03 ticket suffered a deficit of 189,364 votes, equivalent to 14.4% of the vote. Meanwhile, the 02 ticket, Prabowo and Gibran, secured a surplus of 553,789 votes. Both

[14] Bali Provincial Presidential Election with the vote count for the Bali Provincial Legislative Council (DPRD) 2024

[15] Bali Provincial Presidential Election, 2024

managed to split the votes of voters from their non-coalition political parties.

REFERENCES

Burden, B.C. and Helmke, G. (2009). The comparative study of split-ticket voting. *Electoral Studies*, *28*(1), pp.1-7

Wittek, R., Snijders, T. A., & Nee, V. (Eds.). (2013). *The handbook of rational choice social research*. Stanford University Press.

MSDM, I. Sugiyono. (2019). Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, dan R&D. Bandung: CV. Alfabeta. Sianipar, R., & Salim, V.(2019). Faktor Etos Kerja Dan Lingkungan Kerja Dalam Membentuk 'Loyalitas Kerja'Pegawai Pada Pt Timur Raya Alam Damai. Anuar, S. 2019. Th. *E-Jurnal Manajemen Universitas Udayana*, *8*(6), 3674.

Al-Maidah, verse 8 of the Quran

Bali Provincial Presidential Election with the vote count for the Bali Provincial Legislative Council (DPRD) 2024

Bali Provincial Presidential Election, 2024

Silvia, C., Wilandari, Y., & Hoyyi, A. (2015). Ketepatan Klasifikasi Tingkat Keparahan Korban Kecelakaan Lalu Lintas Menggunakan Metode Regresi Logistik Ordinal Dan Fuzzy K-nearest Neighbor In Every Class. *Jurnal Gaussian*, *4*(3), 441-451.

Ghozali, Imam. 2005. Aplikasi Analisis Multivariate dengan SPSS. Semarang: Badan Penerbit UNDIP.

Persson, S. (2020). Exploring split ticket voting motives. *Dalam Swedish National Election Studies Program Report Series*, *14*.

Daldjoeni. 1997. Seluk Beluk Masyarakat Kota. Bandung: Alumni

Chin, W. W., & Todd, P. A. (1995). On the use, usefulness, and ease of use of structural equation modelling in MIS research: A note of caution. *MIS quarterly*, 237-246.

Sekaran, U., & Bougie, R. (2016). *Research methods for business: A skill building approach*. john wiley & sons.

Born, R., 1994. Split-ticket voters, divided government, and Fiorina's policy-balancing model. *Legislative Studies Quarterly*, pp.95-115.

Evans, J. A. J. (2003). Voters and voting: An introduction.

Fiorina, M. (2016). Party Sorting and Democratic Politics. *Contemporary American Politics*, (4).

Ghozi, Muhammad Asadullah Al (2020) "Voting Behaviour in Indonesia: Critical Democrats," *Jurnal Politik*: Vol. 6: Iss. 1, Article 6.

Navia, P. and Saldaña, J.L. (2015). Mis-coordination and political misalignments in ticket-splitting: the case of Chile, 2005–2009. *Contemporary Politics*, *21*(4), pp.485-503.

Grofman, B., Koetzle, W., McDonald, M. P., & Brunell, T. L. (2000). A New Look at Split-Ticket Outcomes for House and President: The Comparative Midpoints Model. *Journal of Politics*, *62*(1), 34-50.