Young Voters and Politics Based on Integrity and Leadership Ahead of the 15th GE

Arena Che Kasim, Nik Hairi Omar, Jamiah Manap

Center for Research in Psychology and Human Well-Being, Faculty of Social Science and Humanities, The National University of Malaysia, 43600 Bangi, Selangor, Malaysia
Corresponding Author Email: arena@ukm.edu.my

Abstract
Young people are tomorrow's leaders. The age limit for voting in general elections is 21 years, but the amendment to the Federal Constitution approved and enforced in 2021, the voting age has been lowered to 18 years. It automatically allows young people to vote in the 15th general election. This young group was chosen as the focus of the study because it is said to have more aggressive and logical views and ideas compared to the older group who prefer parties or candidates based on their experiences and sentimental values. The purpose of this study is to analyse the factors that influence young voters to go out to vote by examining whether the integrity and leadership factors of candidates affect their election patterns. This study was carried out using quantitative methods to gather primary data using questionnaire instruments and simple random selection. Respondents for this study are focused on youth who are categorized as young voters aged between 18-25 years as the focus of the study without specifying the number of respondents who need to answer the questionnaire that was distributed for two months which has been done through online platforms namely Google forms, FB, Whatsapp, Telegram and Instagram. 454 respondents have met the characteristics of respondents that have been set by the researcher. The data obtained was analysed descriptively using version 23 of the SPSS application to see the distribution of young voters and discussed based on the average of young voters. The findings of the study show that the majority of these young voters strongly agree that the candidate nominated by each political party must be a person with integrity and good leadership. The results of the survey indicate that the number of voters who agree and strongly agree is relatively balanced. Selecting candidates with high integrity and leadership competencies is important for the survival of a political party.
Keywords: Young Voters, Views, Integrity, Religion, Quantitative

Introduction
Young people are the future leaders. That is a slogan that has been chanted since time immemorial. The age limit to be eligible to vote in general elections is 21 years. However, the amendment to the Federal Constitution that was approved and enforced in 2021, the voting

age was lowered from 21 to 18 years and voter registration was automatic, giving these young people the right to vote in the next general election (GE). In the 15th General Election, young voters will vote based on the lowering of the age limit that has been approved by the government. The impact that this group of approximately 6.9 million new voters will have on the country's political landscape has yet to be determined. Will they be decisive in GE15 later? Known as Gen Z, this group is known for their attitude that is very vocal and brave to give their views, voice out the needs and demand for their rights without cover. These people will definitely examine important issues that are happening in their environment, such as the issue of corruption and economic factors such as job opportunities for their group. Nevertheless, it is still a big and important question, what motivates them to go out to vote and what are the factors that become a measure for them to choose the candidates who will be named later.

Research Objective

This study will focus on the group of first time voters who are between 18 and 25 years old as the focus of the study. This selection was made because these young people are said to have more aggressive and logical views and ideas compared to the older people who prefer parties or candidates based on their experiences and sentimental values. Specifically, this study wants to see the level of willingness of young people or first-time voters to go out to vote, the extent to which the integrity values of potential candidates influence the selection of candidates by young or first-time voters and what party is the choice of young voters or first-time voters.

Research Methodology

This study was conducted using quantitative methods to gather primary data using questionnaire tools and simple random selection. The method is chosen because quantitative research is an approach that can explain the phenomena in a situation. According to Chua (2006), quantitative research will generalize the results, as the form of quantitative research involves numeric data and accuracy. Respondents for this study are focused on youth who are categorized as young voters aged between 18-25 years as the focus of the study without specifying the number of respondents who needs to answer the questionnaire that was distributed for two months. It has been done through online platforms namely Google forms, FB, WhatsApp, Telegram and Instagram. A total of 652 respondents answered this questionnaire, but only 454 respondents met the characteristics that had been set by the researcher. The data obtained was analysed descriptively using the SPSS application version 23 to see the distribution of young voters and discussed based on the mean of young voters.

Literature Reviews

Integrity is the foundation of human well-being. A superior, balanced and praiseworthy civilization can only be developed and defended by a generation of integrity. Integrity comes from the Latin word: 'integer' which means complete, perfect, firm unity (Widang & Fridlund, 2003) and wholeness (Hooks, 2010), the state or quality of being complete or whole (Monga, 2016). Integrity refers to knowledge, awareness, appreciation and firm adherence to good values consistently accompanied by full commitment to those values in every word and action to achieve personal and organizational excellence (Jamiah et al., 2005). Integrity is more than honest, conscientious and principled because other factors are determining factors for integrity. Values such as responsibility, sincerity, consistency, compliance, awareness, pride,

social norms, government policies and awareness play a major role in the value of integrity (Zahari et al., 2022).

A leader is someone who leads and leadership is his style, therefore every leader has his own style of leadership (Sobian, 2022). According to Isaac et al (2001) all the members are believed can be influenced and stimulated towards a result or goal that has been set due to the leader's behaviour and the elements of the good relationship between them (Mohamad & Zulhamri, 2012). The characteristics of a good and authoritative leader are individuals who have all positive values such as having a strong identity and high integrity, attractive and neat skills, having high communication skills, practicing pure values in life, wise in doing tasks and honest in carrying trust (2023. https://www.irujukan.my/ciri-ciri-kepemimpinan/). General Elections are held when the Parliament or State Legislative Assembly is dissolved itself after the expiry of 5 years. Since 1957, Malaysia has maintained a multi-party political system in which the political party that obtains a majority of seats in the House of Representatives or State Legislative Assembly can establish the Federal or State Government. The system used in Malaysia is based on the 'First-Past-The-Post-System'. This means that the candidates who obtain the majority will be declared winners in the relevant election section (https://www.spr.gov.my/ms/pilihan-raya/penjalanan-pilihan-raya/umum).

In making this election a success, all qualified citizens are encouraged to vote to ensure the success of a candidate who has been named to represent the existing political parties. Typically, involvement in politics and a high level of civics reflect that a person is more likely to turn out to vote. However, studies and surveys have found that Malaysian youth are quite behind in this aspect compared to regional countries such as Thailand, Indonesia and the Philippines, as shown by the Youth Development Index 2020 (Bernama, 2022). Based on the studies that have been done, it shows that the uncertainty and difficulty in determining the wishes and choices of the young voters will definitely be the deciding factor in the decision of the party that will win GE-15. The formation of a nation-state in this country is still facing challenges, plus the role played by the media at the time, which further complicates the situation (Suhana et al., 2012). This statement is acknowledged based on the findings of a study conducted by Naemah et al (2019) finding that social media is the main connecting medium for the people to obtain information during the election, where they read the newspaper on the internet to find out the news related and consequential.

The transition of political power in Malaysia in 2018 (GE-14) saw Barisan Nasional fall to Pakatan Harapan (PH), consisting of a coalition of parties such as DAP, PKR, Amanah, Bersatu, and Warisan from Sabah. As it is known, Barisan Nasinal, known as Parti Perikatan, is the only party that has won elections since 1955 (Mohd, 2021). The expectation of political observers that there will be conflict and chaos in the event of a transition of power is not accurate at all. If Malaysia is compared to some other 3rd world countries, it can be said that the situation in Malaysia is more at risk of chaos due to the diversity of races and religions, which, as said earlier, are sensitive and easy to cause fights. On the other hand, countries that are dominated by one race and one culture are more likely to experience chaos in the transition of power.

Although the majority of voters choose a candidate who is soulful and friendly to the people, followed by a good leadership personality, honest and trustworthy, and does not practise corruption, for political parties, they will choose a party that fights for transparency, justice, human rights, and anti-corruption and that is able to bring development and eradicate poverty (Junaidi et al., 2012).

However, this situation may also be caused by the failure of the contesting parties to name the best candidates and meet the wishes of the young voters in this country. It should be remembered that even though their numbers are not large, their votes can still have an impact on the candidates, whether they win stylishly or lose big in the 15th election later. The loyalty of this group to a party is not as high as the loyalty of the elderly, so politicians need to be prepared to change according to the pace of this group.

Analysis and Discussion

This questionnaire has been divided into five parts namely Part A: Basic Sociodemographic Information. Part B: Political involvement and willingness of young people to vote in GE-15, Part C: Political idealism of young people (first-time voters), Part D: Political realism of young people and Part E: Evaluation of parties and political figures. Based on the questionnaires that have been distributed, a total of 454 questionnaires have been received and analysed descriptively. This article will discuss the findings that have been obtained for the question on Part C: Political idealism of young people (first-time voters). For the analysis of the questions that have been given to the respondents, the researcher has divided them into two categories only, namely agree and disagree. To calculate the percentage of agreement, the researcher put strongly agree and agree in one category which is agree while strongly disagree, disagree and not sure in one category also which is disagree.

a) Values of Integrity of Candidate

This section will analyse the extent to which young voters agree or disagree with the candidate nominated in the context of their integrity and religion.

No	Part C: Question No	Agree	Disagree
1	C1. Not having any court case	406 (89.5%)	48 (10.5%)
2	C2. Not overthrowing people in order to stay in power	440 (96.9%)	14 (3.1%)
3	C3. Never convicted by a court	392 (86.3%)	62 (13.7%)
4	C4. Not prioritizing certain groups / groups only	427 (94.0)	27 (6.0%)
5	C5. Separate family affairs from political affairs when in power	387 (85.3%)	67 (14.7%)
6	C8. Has been proven to keep election promises	434 (95.7%)	20 (4.3%)
7	C10. Declare his property to public knowledge	321 (70.7%)	133 (29.3%)
8	C13. Not betraying party decisions even if it is against personal interests	413 (91.0%)	41 (9.0%)
9	C14. Loyal (intact) to the principles of the party's struggle despite being tested with various obstacles	423 (93.2%)	31 (6.8%)
10	C16. Taking care of every word when speaking	433 (95.5%)	21 (4.5%)
11	C17. Prioritizing facts when arguing/talking	437 (96.2%)	17 (3.8%)
12	C19. Loyal to the party (does not change membership/jump party under any circumstances)	395 (87.0%)	59 (13.0%)
13	C20. Not entering the world of politics to accumulate personal wealth	430 (94.7%)	24 (5.3%)
14	C23. Free from any corruption issues	436 (96.1%)	18 (3.9%)
15	C24. Respect everyone (friend or opponent)	437 (96.3%)	17 (3.7%)
16	C25. A trustworthy person	438 (96.5%)	16 (3.5%)

Figure: 1 Candidate's Integrity and Religion Values

Research findings for the analysis of question C1 show that although the majority of young voters (89.5%) agreed that the chosen candidate should not have any court cases, there were 10.5% who disagreed with this question. For the findings of the analysis of question C2, the majority of young voter respondents agree with this statement, which is 96.9% (440 respondents). However, there are 14 respondents (3.1%) who disagree with the question of not overthrowing people in order to remain in power.

Next, the results of the analysis of question C3 show that the majority of young respondents agree with this question (86.3%). Nevertheless, there were 13.7% of respondents who disagreed with the question that the candidate to be elected must never have been convicted of a crime by the court as their chosen candidate. While the results of the analysis of question C4 show that the majority of young voter respondents agree with this question however, there are still 13.7% or 62 people who disagree with the question of which candidate to be selected is a candidate who does not prioritize a certain group or group only.

Findings from the analysis of question C5 show that the majority of young voter respondents agree, which is a total of 387 people (85.3%). On the other hand, there were 67 respondents who did not agree with the candidate question who separates his family affairs from political affairs when in power is the candidate to be elected. Next, the findings of the analysis of question C8 show that the majority of young voter respondents agree with a percentage of 95.7%, but there are 4.3% of respondents who do not agree with the candidate's question has been proven to keep election promises as their preferred candidate.

Next, the findings of the analysis of question C10 show that the majority of young voter respondents agree with this question, which is 321 (70.7%). However, there are 29.3% of respondents who do not agree with the question of the candidate needing to declare his property to the public. This shows that young people feel that it is not important if the nominated candidate does not declare their property before becoming a candidate. Next, the findings of the analysis of question C13 do not betray the party's decision even if it is against personal interests, showing that the majority of young voter respondents agree with this question, but there are still 41 (9.0%) respondents who do not agree with this question as a candidate criterion.

Next, despite of the findings of question C14 analysed show that the majority of young voter respondents agree with this question, there are 6.8% of respondents who do not agree with the question that the candidate must be loyal (intact) to the principles of the party's struggle despite being tested with various obstacles as the preferred candidate. Next, the findings of the analysis of question C16 show that the majority of young voter respondents agree with this question. However, there are 4.5% of respondents who do not agree with the question that the named candidate must guard every word when speaking as the preferred candidate. The findings of the analysis of question C17 show that the majority of young voter respondents agree with this question. However, there are 0.7% and 1.1% of respondents who disagree with the candidate's question must be a person who prioritizes facts when arguing/talking. The findings of the analysis of question C19 show that the majority of young voter respondents agree with this question. However, it can be seen that there are 59 respondents who disagree with the question that candidates must be loyal to the party, i.e. do not change membership or jump to the other party under any circumstances.

Next, the findings of the analysis of the C20 question show that the majority of young voter respondents agree with this question. Even so, there was the same percentage of 5.3% (24 people) of respondents who disagreed with the question of the candidate not entering the world of politics to accumulate personal wealth. Perhaps the justification was made because

the matter is difficult to assess. Meanwhile, despite the majority agreeing with the given question C23 that the candidate must be free from any corruption, there are 18 respondents (3.9%) who disagree that the nominated candidate must be free from corruption.

The majority of voters agree (96.3%) that the chosen candidate must respect all people whether friends or opponents (C24). Even so, there are still six respondents (1.3%) who choose to disagree with this question. Despite the findings showing that more than 97% of voters agree with question C25 that the nominated candidate must be a trustworthy person, ironically there are still respondents who feel that trustworthiness is not important. This is shown whereby 16 respondents (3.5%) disagree that the candidate must be a trustworthy person.

b) Candidate's leadership value

This section will analyse the extent to which young voters agree or disagree with the nominated candidate in the context of the leadership values possessed by the candidate named by the contesting party.

No	Part C: Question No	Agree	Disagree
1	C6. Has shown character/ability to lead	330 (94.7%	24 (5.3%)
2	C7. Have a high academic qualification of at least a diploma level.	372 (82.0%)	82 (18.0%)
3	C9. Extensive experience in leading organizations efficiently	432 (95.2%)	22 (4.8%)
4	C11. Be fair to people from all walks of life	440 (97.0%)	14 (3.0%)
5	C12. Caring for/prioritizing the welfare of the people represented	438 (96.5%)	16 (3.5%)
6	C15. Always actively involved in community activities, not just appearing before the general election	437 (96.3%)	17 (3.7%)
7	C18. A person with firm principles (not easily influenced by others)	438 (96.5%)	16 (3.5%)
8	C21. Open-minded / liberal	319 (70.3%)	135 (29.7%)
9	C22. Guiding/bringing back leaders	427 (94.1%)	27 (5.9%)
10	C26. Able to communicate well in Malay and English	431 (95.0%)	23 (5.0%)

Figure 2: Candidate Leadership Values

The findings of the analysis of question C6, which is the candidate's question has shown the strength or ability to lead, show that the majority of young voter respondents agree with this question. However, there are 24 (5.3%) of respondents who disagree with this question. Next to the findings of the analysis of question C7, candidates must have high academic qualifications at least diploma level, this shows that the majority of young voter respondents 372 (82.0%) agree with this question. However, there are 82 (18.0%) of respondents who disagree with this question. This shows that education is very important in matters of good and efficient leadership, but other factors can also be overlooked such as the charisma and leadership talent that exists in each individual. Next, the findings of the analysis of question C9 show that the majority of young voter respondents agree with this question (95.2%). On the other hand, there are 22 (4.8%) disagree with the question of a candidate who has extensive experience in leading organizations efficiently as their preferred candidate. Next, the findings of the analysis of question C11 show that the majority of young voter respondents

agree with this question. Meanwhile there are 14 (3.0%) of respondents who disagree with the candidate question who has never been convicted by the court as the preferred candidate.

The results of the analysis of question C12 found that the majority of 96.5% of respondents agreed that the candidate that the party wants to highlight must be someone who takes care of and prioritizes the welfare of the people they represent. Meanwhile, it is surprising when it is found that 16 (3.5%), of respondents disagree with this statement. Next, the findings of the analysis of question C15 show that the majority of young voter respondents agree with this question. However, there are 17 (3.7%) of respondents who disagree with the question that candidates must always be actively involved in community activities, not just appearing before the general election as their preferred candidate. The findings for the analysis of question C18 show that the majority of young voter respondents agree with this question. There is 16 (3.5%) of respondents who gave the answer of disagree with the question's that candidate must be a person with firm principles (not easily influenced by others). Next, the findings of the analysis of this question C21 show that the majority of young voter respondents agree with this question. However, there are 135 (29.7%) of respondents who disagree with the question that the candidate should be open-minded or liberal.

Next, the findings of the analysis of question C22 show that the majority of young voter respondents strongly agree with this question (78.6%). However, there were 27 (5.9%) of respondents who disagreed with the question of which candidates to be named are those who can guide or produce back-up leaders as preferred candidates. The results of this finding (C26) show that most of the respondents or the voters put a lot of emphasis on the ability of the candidate who can use Malay and English in a balanced way who is chosen as a candidate. However, there are 23 (5.0%) of voters who disagree with this statement. Based on the table shown in Figures 1 and 2, it can be seen idealistically that the average young voter chooses to support a candidate who has high values of integrity, religion and leadership to be elected as their future leader. This is proven through the response based on the answers that have been given.

Respondents' answers to questions about integrity, the percentage of their answers agreeing in general is very high. Only five of the 16 questions given received an agreement percentage of less than 90%. The questions are, questions C1 (Not having any court case), C3 (Never been convicted by a court), C5 (Separating his family affairs from political affairs when in power), C10 (Declaring his assets to public knowledge) and, C19 (Loyal to the party (do not change membership/jump party under any circumstances), only got less than 90% support. This may indicate that young voters feel that the candidates have not yet been convicted by the courts and cannot be punished until they are found guilty.

For questions C10 which got the lowest percentage of agreement which is 70.7%, maybe in the eyes of young voters, the property declaration is not important as a criterion to see the level of integrity of the candidate. While for the candidate's leadership value section, only two questions namely C7 (Having high academic qualifications at least diploma level) and C21 (Being open minded / liberal) received less than 90% approval with the question number C21 got the lowest votes. Although education is recognized as important in producing a competent and dedicated leader, young voters do not see it as the most important thing. This situation may be driven by the current situation where this group believes that leadership can be formed and trained based on the social media that have become their closest companion these days. It is not surprising that many voters do not agree with liberal-minded leaders, because such leaders can have a negative impact on society. However, a leader needs to be

open-minded and always ready to accept the views of those under his leadership to ensure the superiority and greatness of a society or organization.

Conclusion

GE15 has drawn its curtain on November 19, 2022. After the announcement of the GE15 results, we can see the pattern of voter selection is encouraging and cannot be checked because there are many candidates who have been entangled with issues of corruption and integrity still winning, even if not with the big majority. Although idealistically, the majority of young voters choose to support candidates who have positive characteristics and have high integrity, such as the questions above, but what has been translated on the ballot papers is different. This phenomenon shows that voter sentiment can still be bought with sweet promises and candy from the manifesto of a certain political party, even though the idealism of voters' awareness and will is different. What can be concluded is that the manifesto issued by the party plays an important role in the success of a party in the General Election in Malaysia.

Appreciation

References

Bernama. (2022). Pengundi muda, baharu masih 'atas pagar', berpotensi jadi penentu. Berita *Harian. https://www.bharian.com.my/berita/nasional/2022 /10/1011225/pengundi-muda-baharu-masih-atas-pagar-berpotensi-jadi-penentu.*

Irujukan. (2023). Ciri-ciri Kepemimpinan yang baik dan berwibawa (Pemimpin) *© Sumber Asal Informasi. https://www.irujukan.my/ciri-ciri-kepemimpinan/*

Chua, Y. P. (2006). Kaedah penyelidikan. Malaysia: McGraw Hill (M) Sdn. Bhd.

Hooks, B. (2010). *Teaching critical thinking: practical wisdom.* New York & London: Routledge.

Jamiah, M., Azimi, H., Ezhar, T., Sidek, M. N., Amini, A. A., Norizan Y., Halimah, A. O., & Hanina H. H. (2005). Pemantapan nilai integriti individu sebagai teras pembangunan staf berkualiti, Prosiding Seminar Kebangsaan Sumber Manusia 2005, anjuran Universiti Teknologi Malaysia pada 2 & 3 Febuari 2005 di Hotel Sofitel, Senai, Johor Bahru.

Junaidi, A. B., Mohd, F. M. J., Y. I., Novel L., Khaidzir, I., Noor, A. M. A., Jeniri, A., Ahi, S., Rosmadi, F., & Amer, S. G. (2012). Kriteria pemilihan calon dan parti dalam pilihan raya umum Dewan Undangan Negeri Sarawak. *GEOGRAFIA OnlineTM Malaysia Journal of Society and Space* 8 issue 4 (44-55) 44   © 2012, ISSN 2180-2491.

Mohamad, S. A., & Zulhamri, A. (2012). Hubungan antara Pertimbangan Pemimpin, Pertukaran Komunikasi, dan komitmen organisasi. *Jurnal Komunikasi Malaysian Journal of Communication* Jilid 28(1): 121-136

Mohd, Z. M. D. (2021). Kelancaran Peralihan Kuasa Politik di Malaysia pada Pilihan Raya Umum Ke-14 (PRU-14). *Malaysian Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities* (MJSSH), Volume 6, Issue 6, (page 53 - 59), 2021.

Monga, M. (2016). Integrity and its antecedent: A unified conceptual framework of integrity. *The Journal of Developing Areas 50(5),* 415-421. doi:10.1353/jda.2016.0040.

Nurul, N. H., Syed A. S. A., & Akmar, H. A. G. (2019). Media, Isu dan Tingkah Laku Pengundi dalam Pilihan Raya Umum ke-14: Satu Kajian Awal. *Jurnal Komunikasi: Malaysian Journal of Communication* Jilid 35(2) 2019: 293-312

Palanski, M. E., & Yammarino, F. J. (2007). Integrity and leadership: Clearing the conceptual confusion. *European Management Journal*, Elsevier, vol. 25(3), pages 171-184, June.

Sobian, P. (2022). *Pemimpin dan kepemimpinan*. Editor: Nurdin Mahendra. Indonesia: Penerbit Lakeisha.

Suhana, S., Ali, S., Novel, L., Selvadurai, S., Zaimah, R., Azima, A. M., & Yusof, M. H. (2012). Krisis politik Melayu dan pembinaan negara bangsa. *GEOGRAFIA OnlineTM Malaysia Journal of Society and Space* 8 issue 9 (39 - 45), ISSN 2180-2491.

Widang, I., & Fridlund, B. (2003). Self-respect, dignity and confidence: conceptions of integrity among male patients. *Journal of Advanced Nursing, 42*(1), 47-56.

Zahari, A. I., Said, J., & Arshad, R. (2022). Examining the Components of Integrity. *Integr. psych. behav*. 56, 234–265 (2022). https://doi. org/10.1007/s12124-021-09626-8.