

Analysis of Demographic Factors of Young Voters on the Change in Support for Government Leadership Towards Civil Malaysia

Siti Khatijah Yasin¹, Farah Syazrah Mohd Ghazali², Nurshuhada Mohammad³

Faculty of General Studies and Advanced Education, Universiti Sultan Zainal Abidin

DOI: https://dx.doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2025.930000031

Received: 10 December 2025; Accepted: 16 December 2025; Published: 25 December 2025

ABSTRACT

The change in government leadership after the 14th General Election has undoubtedly marked an important milestone in history after more than 60 years of Barisan Nasional controlling the country's leadership. The new leadership that is so committed ensures that the country continues to develop and sustain the community's agenda towards a more progressive. The objective of this study is to analyse the demographic factors of young voters towards the change in support for government leadership. The quantitative research involved 384 respondents representing seven states that experienced changes in support for government leadership. The study was conducted using a survey method by distributing questionnaires based on stratified random and simple sampling. The data obtained from the field was then analysed using the Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS) 26.0. The data was analysed using descriptive analysis to obtain inferential analysis to test the study hypothesis. The study results showed demographic differences in young voters in the polling place and residential area towards changes in support for government leaders. The findings of this study have significant implications for the government in ensuring that the highlighted leaders can shoulder fair responsibilities in realising the wishes and dreams of voters and moving towards a superior, civilised country.

Keyword: Demographic Factors, Young Voters, Support Changes, Government Leadership, Civil Malaysia

INTRODUCTION

Building a developing country requires having leaders who carry out responsibilities fairly across religious, party and racial boundaries. Changes in support for government leadership will occur if the current leadership cannot shoulder the trust and bring the country's stability in a better direction. These changes are primarily a result of the pressure borne by the people, such as political repressions, human rights violations and so on; for example, in the Philippines, the people rose up against the autocratic Marcos regime and finally, President Marcos was overthrown by the people in 1986 (Dori Efendi & Jayum Jawan, 2017). A change of government also occurred in Tunisia in 2011, namely the people's uprising against nepotism and corruption led by Ben Ali (Ottaway & Hamzawy, 2011). Malaysia is no exception to receiving a change in support for the government leadership after the 14th General Election (GE) after being controlled by the Barisan Nasional (BN) for a long time. However, GE-15 also saw a change in government leadership, proving that Malaysia practices a democratic system.

The Malaysian general election has been held 15 times since 1955. The transition of power from BN to the leadership of Pakatan Harapan (PH) took place in GE-14 (Asmady, Asri & Mohd Rizal, 2021). The results of GE-15 reveal that BN could only defend 30 parliamentary seats (Election Commission, 2022). However, studies have identified that after GE-14, there were two changes in support for the government leadership before GE-15. After the GE-15 was passed, voters also accepted the change in government leadership at the state level and the formation of the Unity Government at the federal level. The support of young voters is an element that plays an important role in influencing the change in government leadership towards a civilised Malaysia. The 10th PM brought this idea to map out an effective administrative and governance strategy based on the principles of values, ethics and morality.



ISSN No. 2454-6186 | DOI: 10.47772/IJRISS | Volume IX Issue XXX December 2025 | Special Issue

Within the context of the study Analysis of Demographic Factors of Young Voters on the Change in Support for Government Leadership towards Civil Malaysia, two hypotheses were formulated to examine the relationship between demographic factors and changes in young voters' support for government leadership, as follows:

H⁰¹: There is a significant relationship between polling location and changes in support for government leadership.

H⁰²: There is a significant relationship between voters' residential area and changes in support for government leadership.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The Role of Young Voters in Government Leadership Changes

Young voters now receive more attention in national politics than before when this group was sidelined in discussing political issues. The change in government leadership has opened the eyes of all parties to the importance of the next generation to a sovereign and constitutional country (Nur Ellyanis Mohd Basori & Junaidi Awang Besar, 2020). The proof is how the government's concern for young people in national politics has led to the approval of the 18-year-old vote (SPR, 2019) to work together in planning the development and future of the country. A study by Yazid Saleh et al. (2020) on the support patterns of young voters before the GE-14 demonstrates that young voters have different and distinctive views when selecting candidates. Of course, matters involving leaders' misconduct are the main reason that prompted them to make changes in the last GE14 (Case, 2017; Hutchinson, 2018).

Nur Ellyanis and Junaidi (2020) believe that many young voters showed courage in determining changes to the country's leadership in GE-14. According to him, most of the voters on the fence are young voters, and this group is what drives the change in government leadership when the GE arrives. If examined, various offers in the manifesto for young people include PTPTN exemption, GST elimination, and gradual toll elimination if PH wins GE-14. Researchers Muhamad Takiyuddin and Muhamad Nadzri (2018) believe that the sustainability of implementation is quite limited, but it has managed to influence almost 40 per cent of young voters to express support for the opposition in GE-14. However, can the politician's promises be fulfilled in practice, or is it just political rhetoric.

Mohammad Agus Yusoff and Shah Mohd Akmal Abdul Halim (2019) explained that young voters focus more on important issues, including economic development, welfare, education, job opportunities and public facilities. In GE-14, the young people's power was so great that it changed the government that had ruled the country for decades. However, after the change happens, would the voice of young people still be a priority in national development, or was it just bait to win elections? The results of GE-15 also indicate the contribution of young voters, especially first-time voters, that led to a change in government leadership after GE-15.

In addition, in the 2017 British General Election, the Labour Party succeeded in addressing the hearts of young voters due to the effectiveness of a manifesto specifically for young people. Tuition fee restrictions, many job opportunities and financial aid for students are among their demands, and finally, the Labour Party has succeeded in defeating the Conservative Party in the British General Election (Norris, 2017; Sloam, Raqib & Henn, 2018). This is also supported by previous studies that reveal that the change in the political landscape of Türkiye also occurred due to the young voters. According to Haziman (2017), the victory of the Welfare Party was due to the full support of this group because of the 'social welfare' campaign that guarantees a fairer life for them. Realising the above fact, the support of young voters will change if they still enrich the old leadership in managing the country's governance, and the impact on young people will be high.

The support of young voters is critical and necessary in making the best decisions for the country. A study by Suresh Kumar and Sivarajan (2018) found that young voters focus more on current issues, the attitude of leaders, party policies, and candidate credibility than older voters, who are more sentimental about party politics and reciprocity. PH has succeeded in influencing young voters with the manifesto of promises regarding the issues that young people are concerned about and that the previous government ignored, while statistics illustrate that 90 per cent of young voters under the age of 30 chose PR in GE-13 in 2013. In this regard, young voters prefer



ISSN No. 2454-6186 | DOI: 10.47772/IJRISS | Volume IX Issue XXX December 2025 | Special Issue

candidate leaders who are aware of political morality, integrity, democracy, and basic human rights, and the party offers policies for future interests. Young voters are no longer concerned with material development; rather, conducive leadership is necessary for a civilised country, in line with the requirements of religion, which highly demands responsible leaders and carries out trust fairly in realising the concept of civil Malaysia, which is the main thrust of national administration.

The voter behaviour model by Ghazali Mayudin (2006) explains that voter behaviour is closely related to the democratic process and electoral practices in Malaysia. According to Ghazali, there are three behavioural approaches that influence voters' tendencies in selecting political leaders, namely party identification behaviour, rational choice behaviour, and sociological behaviour. He further argues that these three approaches can be measured and analysed based on the electoral processes in Malaysia. These behavioural approaches are interrelated and remain relevant within the context of the present study. The findings of this study indicate that all three behavioural approaches are appropriate for assessing the extent to which voters adapt following changes in their support for government leadership.

The study also reveals that the three theories outlined have been applied by previous scholars, including Barry (1970), who identified two primary approaches: the economic and sociological approaches. These theories explain the functioning of democratic political systems and their relationship with political issues and voter behaviour, particularly voting decisions, with a focus on the United States. Gomez (1990), on the other hand, emphasised that within the framework of voter behaviour, the rational choice approach highlights the influence of business and economic considerations within political parties, which subsequently increases party membership and strengthens voters' support tendencies towards a particular political party.

Based on the conceptual discussion and relevant previous studies concerning voter behaviour models, it can be concluded that the three theories party identification, rational choice, and sociological approaches, particularly those proposed by Ghazali are crucial in understanding Malay voter behaviour in relation to changes in support for government leadership. Through an understanding of these behavioural approaches, clearer insights can be gained into individual voting patterns. This study also seeks to identify and evaluate voters' political responses to policies, governance strategies, issues, and related factors within the electoral decisionmaking process.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This study uses statistical analysis within quantitative research methodology regarding the demographic factors of young voters that influence the change in government leadership towards a civil Malaysia. A questionnaire was designed to conduct a survey and used as a data collection instrument. A total of 384 respondents from seven states were involved, namely Terengganu, Selangor, Melaka, Negeri Sembilan, Johor, Kedah, and Perak. Respondents were taken according to the sample size set by Krejcie and Morgan (1970). Data obtained from the questionnaire were analysed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) Version 26 software. The study data were analysed using a descriptive analysis test, the ANOVA test, which is an analysis of variance conducted to compare the mean values of three or more independent sample groups (Chua, 2014). This study conducted the ANOVA test to determine socio-demographic aspects, such as constituency areas and residential area.

Reliability test

Reliability refers to the stability and consistency of the instrument to measure a concept outlined. According to Mohd Majid (2000), a popular and often-used test to measure consistency in a concept is Cronbach's Alpha. Cronbach's Alpha reliability value is between 0.0 and 1.0. Cronbach's Alpha value of more than 0.60 is often used as an index of reliability for research conducted, including in this study. Therefore, the study has set a Cronbach's Alpha value of more than 0.06 as the reliability value for each part of the questionnaire tested. Pallant (2016) states that a Cronbach's Alpha value of 0.7 and above is acceptable. Next, a pilot study was conducted to determine the reliability value of the prepared questionnaire.

Reliability Value of Change in Support for Government Leadership

This study will analyse the reliability value of the construct and each item of change in support of government leadership, which is explained in detail in the Table below.



ISSN No. 2454-6186 | DOI: 10.47772/IJRISS | Volume IX Issue XXX December 2025 | Special Issue

Table 1: Reliability Value of Change in Support for Government Leadership

Variable	Cronbach's Alpha
Change in Government Leadership	0.867

Table 1 highlights that the construct for the variable of change in support for government leadership has a Cronbach's Alpha value of 0.867. This indicates that all items in this construct achieve the required internal reliability.

Table 2: Reliability Value of Each Item of Change in Support for Government Leadership

Total	Total Item	Cronbach Alpha if Item Deleted
1	Support from young voters	0.865
2	BN performance declined	0.858
3	Guaranteed economic stability	0.882
4	National issues resolved	0.849
5	Religious institutions more secure	0.854
6	Manifesto fulfilled	0.849
7	Guaranteed the rights of the Malays	0.851
8	Leaders involved in corruption removed	0.841
9	People's living standards are more secure	0.849
10	Election promises of each party fulfilled	0.848

According to Table 2, for the variable of change in support for government leadership, the highest Cronbach's Alpha value is 0.882 on item question 3, while the lowest Cronbach's Alpha value is 0.841 on item question 8. All Cronbach's alpha values show values exceeding the minimum limit of 0.6, so all constructs are reliable and relevant (Hair et al., 2014). This indicates that all items in this construct achieve the required internal reliability.

ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

Results of Respondent Demographic Profile Analysis

The demographic profile below (see Table 3) shows the distribution of respondent profiles according to detailed categories to identify the frequency and percentage of results. It includes age groups, polling places, occupations, and residential areas. The total number of respondents who were registered Malay voters was 384.

The descriptive analysis in this study explains the interpretation of the data obtained, such as the average value (mean), percentage (per cent), total (total), standard deviation (standard deviation), range, variance (variance), minimum value, maximum value and so on. However, this study only uses the average value (mean) and percentage (per cent) to analyse the data obtained.

Table 3: Demographic Profile of Young Voter Respondents

Demographics	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Polling Place:		
Terengganu	32	8.3
Selangor	106	28
Johor	80	21
Kedah	50	13
Perak	67	17
Negeri Sembilan	27	7
Melaka	22	5.7

ISSN No. 2454-6186 | DOI: 10.47772/IJRISS | Volume IX Issue XXX December 2025 | Special Issue

Residential Area:		
Urban	134	34.9
Semi-Urban	139	36.2
Rural	111	28.9
TOTAL	384	100%

The findings in Table 3 depict that Selangor is the state with the highest number of respondents, namely 106 respondents (28per cents), followed by Johor with 80 respondents (21per cent), Perak with 67 respondents (17per cent), Kedah with 50 respondents (13 per cent), Terengganu with 32 respondents (8.3 per cent), Negeri Sembilan with 27 respondents (7 per cent) and the lowest number of respondents representing the state of Melaka with 22 respondents (5.7 per cent). All respondents involved were from seven states, and the number of samples taken was not the same because the number was according to the voter population in each state. For the respondents' residential area, 139 respondents (36.2 per cent) were in semi-urban areas, followed by 134 respondents (34.9 per cent) in urban areas and 111 respondents (28.9 per cent) in rural areas.

Results of Analysis of Differences in Demographic Profiles of Young Voters Against Changes in **Government Leadership Polling Place Profile Analysis**

This test analyses the significant relationship between changes in government leadership according to polling place through H1b. This test is formed based on the following hypothesis:

H1b: There is a significant difference between polling places and changes in government leadership.

ANOVA test analysis was conducted to compare the mean difference between the polling place factors and changes in government leadership. The results of the analysis found that there was a significant difference between polling places and changes in government leadership. The analysis displays a value of F = 5.905 and P = 0.000, which shows a value of P < 0.05. Therefore, this hypothesis is accepted because there is a significant difference between polling places and changes in government leadership. The results of the analysis are illustrated in Table 4.

Table 4: ANOVA Test based on Polling Station

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	77.140	6	12.857	5.905	0.000
Within Groups	820.803	377	2.177		
Total	897.942	383			

The ANOVA test depicts a significant value, and a follow-up Post-Hoc Test was conducted to examine the significant mean difference between polling stations. Based on Table 4.1, the results of the Post-Hoc Multiple Comparisons tests showed that there was a significant difference in the mean score of government leadership change according to polling stations. The analysis revealed that Terengganu and Selangor differed based on the significant value of ($P = 0.003 < \alpha = 0.05$). The analysis also showed that Kedah and Negeri Sembilan also had a difference where the significant level was ($P = 0.008 < \alpha = 0.05$). However, the analysis presented that the polling stations in the states of Perak and Johor found no significant difference, namely $P = 0.976 > \alpha = 0.05$. The analysis also revealed that the polling stations in Melaka and Negeri Sembilan states found no significant difference, namely $P = 1.000 > \alpha = 0.05$. The entire Post Hoc test analysis has been explained in Table 4.1.

Table 4.1: Post Hoc Tests of Government Leadership Changes between Polling Stations

(I) Polling Station	(J) Polling Station	Mean Difference (I–J)	Std. Error	Sig.
Terengganu	Selangor	1.14197*	0.29586	0.003
Terengganu	Johor	1.19068*	0.30472	0.002
Terengganu	Kedah	0.46578	0.32964	0.795
Terengganu	Perak	0.97984*	0.31230	0.030





ISSN No. 2454-6186 | DOI: 10.47772/IJRISS | Volume IX Issue XXX December 2025 | Special Issue

Terengganu Negeri Sembilan 1.71414* 0.38290 0.000 Terengganu Melaka 1.70152* 0.40613 0.001 Selangor Terengganu -1.14197* 0.29586 0.003 Selangor Johor 0.04871 0.22008 1.000 Selangor Kedah -0.67620 0.25347 0.109 Selangor Perak -0.16213 0.23046 0.992 Selangor Negeri Sembilan 0.57217 0.31968 0.556 Selangor Melaka 0.55954 0.34716 0.675 Johor Terengganu -1.19068* 0.34716 0.675 Johor Kedah -0.72491 0.26376 0.089 Johor Negeri Sembilan 0.52346 0.32790 0.685 Johor Melaka 0.51083 0.35474 0.780 Johor Melaka 0.51083 0.35474 0.780 Kedah Terengganu -0.46578 0.32904 0.795 Keda					
Selangor Terengganu -1.14197* 0.29586 0.003 Selangor Johor 0.04871 0.22008 1.000 Selangor Kedah -0.67620 0.25347 0.109 Selangor Perak -0.16213 0.23046 0.992 Selangor Negeri Sembilan 0.57217 0.31968 0.556 Selangor Melaka 0.55954 0.34716 0.675 Johor Terengganu -1.19068* 0.30472 0.002 Johor Kedah -0.72491 0.26376 0.089 Johor Kedah -0.72491 0.26376 0.089 Johor Negeri Sembilan 0.52346 0.32790 0.685 Johor Melaka 0.51083 0.35474 0.780 Johor Melaka 0.51083 0.35474 0.780 Kedah Terengganu -0.46578 0.32964 0.795 Kedah Selangor 0.67620 0.25347 0.109 Kedah	Terengganu	Negeri Sembilan	1.71414*	0.38290	0.000
Sclangor Johor 0.04871 0.22008 1.000 Selangor Kedah -0.67620 0.25347 0.109 Selangor Perak -0.16213 0.23046 0.992 Selangor Negeri Sembilan 0.57217 0.31968 0.555 Johor Terengganu -1.19068* 0.30472 0.002 Johor Selangor -0.04871 0.22008 1.000 Johor Kedah -0.72491 0.26376 0.089 Johor Perak -0.21084 0.24173 0.976 Johor Negeri Sembilan 0.52346 0.32790 0.685 Johor Melaka 0.51083 0.35474 0.780 Kedah Terengganu -0.46578 0.32964 0.795 Kedah Johor 0.72491 0.26376 0.089 Kedah Johor 0.72491 0.26376 0.089 Kedah Perak 0.51407 0.27248 0.490 Kedah Negeri Sembila	Terengganu	Melaka	1.70152*	0.40613	0.001
Selangor Kedah -0.67620 0.25347 0.109 Selangor Perak -0.16213 0.23046 0.992 Selangor Negeri Sembilan 0.57217 0.31968 0.556 Selangor Melaka 0.55954 0.34716 0.675 Johor Terengganu -1.19068* 0.30472 0.002 Johor Selangor -0.04871 0.22008 1.009 Johor Kedah -0.72491 0.26376 0.089 Johor Perak -0.21084 0.24173 0.976 Johor Negeri Sembilan 0.52346 0.32790 0.685 Johor Melaka 0.51083 0.35474 0.780 Kedah Terengganu -0.46578 0.32964 0.795 Kedah Selangor 0.67620 0.25347 0.109 Kedah Perak 0.51407 0.27248 0.490 Kedah Negeri Sembilan 1.24837* 0.35118 0.008 Kedah <td< td=""><td>Selangor</td><td>Terengganu</td><td>-1.14197*</td><td>0.29586</td><td>0.003</td></td<>	Selangor	Terengganu	-1.14197*	0.29586	0.003
Selangor Perak -0.16213 0.23046 0.992 Selangor Negeri Sembilan 0.57217 0.31968 0.556 Selangor Melaka 0.55954 0.34716 0.675 Johor Terengganu -1.19068* 0.30472 0.002 Johor Selangor -0.04871 0.22008 1.000 Johor Kedah -0.72491 0.26376 0.089 Johor Perak -0.21084 0.24173 0.976 Johor Negeri Sembilan 0.52346 0.32790 0.685 Johor Melaka 0.51083 0.35474 0.780 Kedah Terengganu -0.46578 0.32964 0.795 Kedah Selangor 0.67620 0.25347 0.109 Kedah Johor 0.72491 0.26376 0.089 Kedah Perak 0.51407 0.27248 0.490 Kedah Negeri Sembilan 1.24837* 0.35118 0.00 Kedah Mela	Selangor	Johor	0.04871	0.22008	1.000
Selangor Negeri Sembilan 0.57217 0.31968 0.556 Selangor Melaka 0.55954 0.34716 0.675 Johor Terengganu -1.19068* 0.30472 0.002 Johor Selangor -0.04871 0.22008 1.000 Johor Kedah -0.72491 0.26376 0.089 Johor Perak -0.21084 0.24173 0.976 Johor Negeri Sembilan 0.52346 0.32790 0.685 Johor Melaka 0.51083 0.35474 0.780 Kedah Terengganu -0.46578 0.32964 0.795 Kedah Selangor 0.67620 0.25347 0.109 Kedah Johor 0.72491 0.26376 0.089 Kedah Perak 0.51407 0.27248 0.490 Kedah Negeri Sembilan 1.24837* 0.35118 0.008 Kedah Melaka 1.23574* 0.37637 0.019 Perak Teren	Selangor	Kedah	-0.67620	0.25347	0.109
Sclangor Melaka 0.55954 0.34716 0.675 Johor Terengganu -1.19068* 0.30472 0.002 Johor Selangor -0.04871 0.22008 1.000 Johor Kedah -0.72491 0.26376 0.089 Johor Perak -0.21084 0.24173 0.976 Johor Negeri Sembilan 0.52346 0.32790 0.685 Johor Melaka 0.51083 0.35474 0.780 Kedah Terengganu -0.46578 0.32964 0.795 Kedah Selangor 0.67620 0.25347 0.109 Kedah Johor 0.72491 0.26376 0.089 Kedah Perak 0.51407 0.27248 0.490 Kedah Negeri Sembilan 1.24837* 0.35118 0.008 Kedah Melaka 1.23574* 0.37637 0.019 Perak Terengganu -0.97984* 0.31230 0.030 Perak Selangor <td>Selangor</td> <td>Perak</td> <td>-0.16213</td> <td>0.23046</td> <td>0.992</td>	Selangor	Perak	-0.16213	0.23046	0.992
Johor Terengganu -1.19068* 0.30472 0.002 Johor Selangor -0.04871 0.22008 1.000 Johor Kedah -0.72491 0.26376 0.089 Johor Perak -0.21084 0.24173 0.976 Johor Negeri Sembilan 0.52346 0.32790 0.685 Johor Melaka 0.51083 0.35474 0.780 Kedah Terengganu -0.46578 0.32964 0.795 Kedah Johor 0.67620 0.25347 0.109 Kedah Johor 0.72491 0.26376 0.089 Kedah Perak 0.51407 0.27248 0.490 Kedah Negeri Sembilan 1.24837* 0.35118 0.008 Kedah Melaka 1.23574* 0.37637 0.019 Perak Terengganu -0.97984* 0.31230 0.30 Perak Selangor 0.16213 0.23046 0.992 Perak Kedah	Selangor	Negeri Sembilan	0.57217	0.31968	0.556
Johor Terengganu -1.19068* 0.30472 0.002 Johor Selangor -0.04871 0.22008 1.000 Johor Kedah -0.72491 0.26376 0.089 Johor Perak -0.21084 0.24173 0.976 Johor Negeri Sembilan 0.52346 0.32790 0.685 Johor Melaka 0.51083 0.35474 0.780 Kedah Terengganu -0.46578 0.32964 0.795 Kedah Johor 0.67620 0.25347 0.109 Kedah Johor 0.72491 0.26376 0.089 Kedah Perak 0.51407 0.27248 0.490 Kedah Negeri Sembilan 1.24837* 0.35118 0.008 Kedah Melaka 1.23574* 0.37637 0.019 Perak Terengganu -0.97984* 0.31230 0.30 Perak Selangor 0.16213 0.23046 0.992 Perak Kedah	Selangor	Melaka	0.55954	0.34716	0.675
Johor Kedah -0.72491 0.26376 0.089 Johor Perak -0.21084 0.24173 0.976 Johor Negeri Sembilan 0.52346 0.32790 0.685 Johor Melaka 0.51083 0.35474 0.780 Kedah Terengganu -0.46578 0.32964 0.795 Kedah Selangor 0.67620 0.25347 0.109 Kedah Johor 0.72491 0.26376 0.089 Kedah Perak 0.51407 0.27248 0.490 Kedah Negeri Sembilan 1.24837* 0.35118 0.008 Kedah Melaka 1.23574* 0.37637 0.019 Perak Terengganu -0.97984* 0.31230 0.030 Perak Selangor 0.16213 0.23046 0.992 Perak Johor 0.21084 0.24173 0.976 Perak Kedah -0.51407 0.27248 0.490 Perak Negeri Sembilan		Terengganu	-1.19068*	0.30472	0.002
Johor Perak -0.21084 0.24173 0.976 Johor Negeri Sembilan 0.52346 0.32790 0.685 Johor Melaka 0.51083 0.35474 0.780 Kedah Terengganu -0.46578 0.32964 0.795 Kedah Selangor 0.67620 0.25347 0.109 Kedah Johor 0.72491 0.26376 0.089 Kedah Perak 0.51407 0.27248 0.490 Kedah Negeri Sembilan 1.24837* 0.35118 0.008 Kedah Melaka 1.23574* 0.37637 0.019 Perak Terengganu -0.97984* 0.31230 0.030 Perak Selangor 0.16213 0.23046 0.992 Perak Johor 0.21084 0.24173 0.976 Perak Kedah -0.51407 0.27248 0.490 Perak Kedah -0.51407 0.23495 0.302 Perak Melaka <t< td=""><td>Johor</td><td>Selangor</td><td>-0.04871</td><td>0.22008</td><td>1.000</td></t<>	Johor	Selangor	-0.04871	0.22008	1.000
Johor Negeri Sembilan 0.52346 0.32790 0.685 Johor Melaka 0.51083 0.35474 0.780 Kedah Terengganu -0.46578 0.32964 0.795 Kedah Selangor 0.67620 0.25347 0.109 Kedah Johor 0.72491 0.26376 0.089 Kedah Perak 0.51407 0.27248 0.490 Kedah Negeri Sembilan 1.24837* 0.35118 0.008 Kedah Melaka 1.23574* 0.37637 0.019 Perak Terengganu -0.97984* 0.31230 0.030 Perak Selangor 0.16213 0.23046 0.992 Perak Johor 0.21084 0.24173 0.976 Perak Kedah -0.51407 0.27248 0.490 Perak Melaka 0.72167 0.36127 0.418 Negeri Sembilan Terengganu -1.71414* 0.38290 0.000 Negeri Sembilan	Johor	Kedah	-0.72491	0.26376	0.089
Johor Melaka 0.51083 0.35474 0.780 Kedah Terengganu -0.46578 0.32964 0.795 Kedah Selangor 0.67620 0.25347 0.109 Kedah Johor 0.72491 0.26376 0.089 Kedah Perak 0.51407 0.27248 0.490 Kedah Negeri Sembilan 1.24837* 0.35118 0.008 Kedah Melaka 1.23574* 0.37637 0.019 Perak Terengganu -0.97984* 0.31230 0.030 Perak Terengganu -0.97984* 0.31230 0.030 Perak Selangor 0.16213 0.23046 0.992 Perak Johor 0.21084 0.24173 0.976 Perak Kedah -0.51407 0.27248 0.490 Perak Melaka 0.72167 0.36127 0.418 Negeri Sembilan Terengganu -1.71414* 0.38290 0.000 Negeri Sembilan <td< td=""><td>Johor</td><td>Perak</td><td>-0.21084</td><td>0.24173</td><td>0.976</td></td<>	Johor	Perak	-0.21084	0.24173	0.976
Kedah Terengganu -0.46578 0.32964 0.795 Kedah Selangor 0.67620 0.25347 0.109 Kedah Johor 0.72491 0.26376 0.089 Kedah Perak 0.51407 0.27248 0.490 Kedah Negeri Sembilan 1.24837* 0.35118 0.008 Kedah Melaka 1.23574* 0.37637 0.019 Perak Terengganu -0.97984* 0.31230 0.030 Perak Terengganu -0.97984* 0.31230 0.030 Perak Selangor 0.16213 0.23046 0.992 Perak Johor 0.21084 0.24173 0.976 Perak Kedah -0.51407 0.27248 0.490 Perak Kedah 0.72167 0.33495 0.302 Perak Melaka 0.72167 0.36127 0.418 Negeri Sembilan Terengganu -1.7414* 0.38290 0.000 Negeri Sembilan K	Johor	Negeri Sembilan	0.52346	0.32790	0.685
Kedah Selangor 0.67620 0.25347 0.109 Kedah Johor 0.72491 0.26376 0.089 Kedah Perak 0.51407 0.27248 0.490 Kedah Negeri Sembilan 1.24837* 0.35118 0.008 Kedah Melaka 1.23574* 0.37637 0.019 Perak Terengganu -0.97984* 0.31230 0.030 Perak Selangor 0.16213 0.23046 0.992 Perak Johor 0.21084 0.24173 0.976 Perak Kedah -0.51407 0.27248 0.490 Perak Negeri Sembilan 0.73430 0.33495 0.302 Perak Melaka 0.72167 0.36127 0.418 Negeri Sembilan Terengganu -1.71414* 0.38290 0.000 Negeri Sembilan Selangor -0.57217 0.31968 0.556 Negeri Sembilan Kedah -1.24837* 0.35118 0.008 Negeri Sem	Johor		0.51083	0.35474	0.780
Kedah Johor 0.72491 0.26376 0.089 Kedah Perak 0.51407 0.27248 0.490 Kedah Negeri Sembilan 1.24837* 0.35118 0.008 Kedah Melaka 1.23574* 0.37637 0.019 Perak Terengganu -0.97984* 0.31230 0.030 Perak Selangor 0.16213 0.23046 0.992 Perak Johor 0.21084 0.24173 0.976 Perak Kedah -0.51407 0.27248 0.490 Perak Negeri Sembilan 0.73430 0.33495 0.302 Perak Melaka 0.72167 0.36127 0.418 Negeri Sembilan Terengganu -1.71414* 0.38290 0.000 Negeri Sembilan Selangor -0.57217 0.31968 0.556 Negeri Sembilan Kedah -1.24837* 0.35118 0.008 Negeri Sembilan Melaka -0.73430 0.33495 0.302 N	Kedah	Terengganu	-0.46578	0.32964	0.795
Kedah Perak 0.51407 0.27248 0.490 Kedah Negeri Sembilan 1.24837* 0.35118 0.008 Kedah Melaka 1.23574* 0.37637 0.019 Perak Terengganu -0.97984* 0.31230 0.030 Perak Selangor 0.16213 0.23046 0.992 Perak Johor 0.21084 0.24173 0.976 Perak Kedah -0.51407 0.27248 0.490 Perak Negeri Sembilan 0.73430 0.33495 0.302 Perak Melaka 0.72167 0.36127 0.418 Negeri Sembilan Terengganu -1.71414* 0.38290 0.000 Negeri Sembilan Selangor -0.57217 0.31968 0.556 Negeri Sembilan Kedah -1.24837* 0.35118 0.008 Negeri Sembilan Kedah -1.24837* 0.33495 0.302 Negeri Sembilan Melaka -0.01263 0.42379 1.000	Kedah	Selangor	0.67620	0.25347	0.109
Kedah Negeri Sembilan 1.24837* 0.35118 0.008 Kedah Melaka 1.23574* 0.37637 0.019 Perak Terengganu -0.97984* 0.31230 0.030 Perak Selangor 0.16213 0.23046 0.992 Perak Johor 0.21084 0.24173 0.976 Perak Kedah -0.51407 0.27248 0.490 Perak Kedah -0.51407 0.27248 0.490 Perak Negeri Sembilan 0.73430 0.33495 0.302 Perak Melaka 0.72167 0.36127 0.418 Negeri Sembilan Terengganu -1.71414* 0.38290 0.000 Negeri Sembilan Johor -0.52346 0.32790 0.685 Negeri Sembilan Kedah -1.24837* 0.35118 0.008 Negeri Sembilan Melaka -0.01263 0.42379 1.000 Melaka Terengganu -1.70152* 0.40613 0.001	Kedah	Johor	0.72491	0.26376	0.089
Kedah Melaka 1.23574* 0.37637 0.019 Perak Terengganu -0.97984* 0.31230 0.030 Perak Selangor 0.16213 0.23046 0.992 Perak Johor 0.21084 0.24173 0.976 Perak Kedah -0.51407 0.27248 0.490 Perak Negeri Sembilan 0.73430 0.33495 0.302 Perak Melaka 0.72167 0.36127 0.418 Negeri Sembilan Terengganu -1.71414* 0.38290 0.000 Negeri Sembilan Selangor -0.57217 0.31968 0.556 Negeri Sembilan Kedah -1.24837* 0.32790 0.685 Negeri Sembilan Kedah -1.24837* 0.35118 0.008 Negeri Sembilan Melaka -0.01263 0.42379 1.000 Melaka Terengganu -1.70152* 0.40613 0.001 Melaka Selangor -0.55954 0.34716 0.675	Kedah	Perak	0.51407	0.27248	0.490
Perak Terengganu -0.97984* 0.31230 0.030 Perak Selangor 0.16213 0.23046 0.992 Perak Johor 0.21084 0.24173 0.976 Perak Kedah -0.51407 0.27248 0.490 Perak Negeri Sembilan 0.73430 0.33495 0.302 Perak Melaka 0.72167 0.36127 0.418 Negeri Sembilan Terengganu -1.71414* 0.38290 0.000 Negeri Sembilan Selangor -0.57217 0.31968 0.556 Negeri Sembilan Johor -0.52346 0.32790 0.685 Negeri Sembilan Kedah -1.24837* 0.35118 0.008 Negeri Sembilan Perak -0.73430 0.33495 0.302 Negeri Sembilan Melaka -0.01263 0.42379 1.000 Melaka Terengganu -1.70152* 0.40613 0.001 Melaka Selangor -0.55954 0.34716 0.675	Kedah	Negeri Sembilan	1.24837*	0.35118	0.008
Perak Selangor 0.16213 0.23046 0.992 Perak Johor 0.21084 0.24173 0.976 Perak Kedah -0.51407 0.27248 0.490 Perak Negeri Sembilan 0.73430 0.33495 0.302 Perak Melaka 0.72167 0.36127 0.418 Negeri Sembilan Terengganu -1.71414* 0.38290 0.000 Negeri Sembilan Selangor -0.57217 0.31968 0.556 Negeri Sembilan Johor -0.52346 0.32790 0.685 Negeri Sembilan Kedah -1.24837* 0.35118 0.008 Negeri Sembilan Perak -0.73430 0.33495 0.302 Negeri Sembilan Melaka -0.01263 0.42379 1.000 Melaka Terengganu -1.70152* 0.40613 0.001 Melaka Selangor -0.55954 0.34716 0.675 Melaka Johor -0.51083 0.35474 0.780 <	Kedah	Melaka	1.23574*	0.37637	0.019
Perak Johor 0.21084 0.24173 0.976 Perak Kedah -0.51407 0.27248 0.490 Perak Negeri Sembilan 0.73430 0.33495 0.302 Perak Melaka 0.72167 0.36127 0.418 Negeri Sembilan Terengganu -1.71414* 0.38290 0.000 Negeri Sembilan Selangor -0.57217 0.31968 0.556 Negeri Sembilan Johor -0.52346 0.32790 0.685 Negeri Sembilan Kedah -1.24837* 0.35118 0.008 Negeri Sembilan Perak -0.73430 0.33495 0.302 Negeri Sembilan Melaka -0.01263 0.42379 1.000 Melaka Terengganu -1.70152* 0.40613 0.001 Melaka Selangor -0.55954 0.34716 0.675 Melaka Johor -0.51083 0.35474 0.780 Melaka Perak -0.72167 0.36127 0.418 <td>Perak</td> <td>Terengganu</td> <td>-0.97984*</td> <td>0.31230</td> <td>0.030</td>	Perak	Terengganu	-0.97984*	0.31230	0.030
Perak Kedah -0.51407 0.27248 0.490 Perak Negeri Sembilan 0.73430 0.33495 0.302 Perak Melaka 0.72167 0.36127 0.418 Negeri Sembilan Terengganu -1.71414* 0.38290 0.000 Negeri Sembilan Selangor -0.57217 0.31968 0.556 Negeri Sembilan Johor -0.52346 0.32790 0.685 Negeri Sembilan Kedah -1.24837* 0.35118 0.008 Negeri Sembilan Perak -0.73430 0.33495 0.302 Negeri Sembilan Melaka -0.01263 0.42379 1.000 Melaka Terengganu -1.70152* 0.40613 0.001 Melaka Selangor -0.55954 0.34716 0.675 Melaka Johor -0.51083 0.35474 0.780 Melaka Perak -0.72167 0.36127 0.418	Perak	Selangor	0.16213	0.23046	0.992
Perak Negeri Sembilan 0.73430 0.33495 0.302 Perak Melaka 0.72167 0.36127 0.418 Negeri Sembilan Terengganu -1.71414* 0.38290 0.000 Negeri Sembilan Selangor -0.57217 0.31968 0.556 Negeri Sembilan Johor -0.52346 0.32790 0.685 Negeri Sembilan Kedah -1.24837* 0.35118 0.008 Negeri Sembilan Perak -0.73430 0.33495 0.302 Negeri Sembilan Melaka -0.01263 0.42379 1.000 Melaka Terengganu -1.70152* 0.40613 0.001 Melaka Selangor -0.55954 0.34716 0.675 Melaka Johor -0.51083 0.35474 0.780 Melaka Kedah -1.23574* 0.36127 0.418	Perak	Johor	0.21084	0.24173	0.976
Perak Melaka 0.72167 0.36127 0.418 Negeri Sembilan Terengganu -1.71414* 0.38290 0.000 Negeri Sembilan Selangor -0.57217 0.31968 0.556 Negeri Sembilan Johor -0.52346 0.32790 0.685 Negeri Sembilan Kedah -1.24837* 0.35118 0.008 Negeri Sembilan Perak -0.73430 0.33495 0.302 Negeri Sembilan Melaka -0.01263 0.42379 1.000 Melaka Terengganu -1.70152* 0.40613 0.001 Melaka Selangor -0.55954 0.34716 0.675 Melaka Johor -0.51083 0.35474 0.780 Melaka Kedah -1.23574* 0.37637 0.019 Melaka Perak -0.72167 0.36127 0.418	Perak	Kedah	-0.51407	0.27248	0.490
Negeri Sembilan Terengganu -1.71414* 0.38290 0.000 Negeri Sembilan Selangor -0.57217 0.31968 0.556 Negeri Sembilan Johor -0.52346 0.32790 0.685 Negeri Sembilan Kedah -1.24837* 0.35118 0.008 Negeri Sembilan Perak -0.73430 0.33495 0.302 Negeri Sembilan Melaka -0.01263 0.42379 1.000 Melaka Terengganu -1.70152* 0.40613 0.001 Melaka Selangor -0.55954 0.34716 0.675 Melaka Johor -0.51083 0.35474 0.780 Melaka Kedah -1.23574* 0.37637 0.019 Melaka Perak -0.72167 0.36127 0.418	Perak	Negeri Sembilan	0.73430	0.33495	0.302
Negeri Sembilan Selangor -0.57217 0.31968 0.556 Negeri Sembilan Johor -0.52346 0.32790 0.685 Negeri Sembilan Kedah -1.24837* 0.35118 0.008 Negeri Sembilan Perak -0.73430 0.33495 0.302 Negeri Sembilan Melaka -0.01263 0.42379 1.000 Melaka Terengganu -1.70152* 0.40613 0.001 Melaka Selangor -0.55954 0.34716 0.675 Melaka Johor -0.51083 0.35474 0.780 Melaka Kedah -1.23574* 0.37637 0.019 Melaka Perak -0.72167 0.36127 0.418	Perak		0.72167	0.36127	0.418
Negeri Sembilan Selangor -0.57217 0.31968 0.556 Negeri Sembilan Johor -0.52346 0.32790 0.685 Negeri Sembilan Kedah -1.24837* 0.35118 0.008 Negeri Sembilan Perak -0.73430 0.33495 0.302 Negeri Sembilan Melaka -0.01263 0.42379 1.000 Melaka Terengganu -1.70152* 0.40613 0.001 Melaka Selangor -0.55954 0.34716 0.675 Melaka Johor -0.51083 0.35474 0.780 Melaka Kedah -1.23574* 0.37637 0.019 Melaka Perak -0.72167 0.36127 0.418	Negeri Sembilan	Terengganu	-1.71414*	0.38290	0.000
Negeri Sembilan Kedah -1.24837* 0.35118 0.008 Negeri Sembilan Perak -0.73430 0.33495 0.302 Negeri Sembilan Melaka -0.01263 0.42379 1.000 Melaka Terengganu -1.70152* 0.40613 0.001 Melaka Selangor -0.55954 0.34716 0.675 Melaka Johor -0.51083 0.35474 0.780 Melaka Kedah -1.23574* 0.37637 0.019 Melaka Perak -0.72167 0.36127 0.418	Negeri Sembilan	Selangor	-0.57217	0.31968	0.556
Negeri Sembilan Perak -0.73430 0.33495 0.302 Negeri Sembilan Melaka -0.01263 0.42379 1.000 Melaka Terengganu -1.70152* 0.40613 0.001 Melaka Selangor -0.55954 0.34716 0.675 Melaka Johor -0.51083 0.35474 0.780 Melaka Kedah -1.23574* 0.37637 0.019 Melaka Perak -0.72167 0.36127 0.418	Negeri Sembilan	Johor	-0.52346	0.32790	0.685
Negeri Sembilan Melaka -0.01263 0.42379 1.000 Melaka Terengganu -1.70152* 0.40613 0.001 Melaka Selangor -0.55954 0.34716 0.675 Melaka Johor -0.51083 0.35474 0.780 Melaka Kedah -1.23574* 0.37637 0.019 Melaka Perak -0.72167 0.36127 0.418	Negeri Sembilan	Kedah	-1.24837*	0.35118	0.008
Melaka Terengganu -1.70152* 0.40613 0.001 Melaka Selangor -0.55954 0.34716 0.675 Melaka Johor -0.51083 0.35474 0.780 Melaka Kedah -1.23574* 0.37637 0.019 Melaka Perak -0.72167 0.36127 0.418	Negeri Sembilan	Perak	-0.73430	0.33495	0.302
Melaka Selangor -0.55954 0.34716 0.675 Melaka Johor -0.51083 0.35474 0.780 Melaka Kedah -1.23574* 0.37637 0.019 Melaka Perak -0.72167 0.36127 0.418	Negeri Sembilan	Melaka	-0.01263	0.42379	1.000
Melaka Selangor -0.55954 0.34716 0.675 Melaka Johor -0.51083 0.35474 0.780 Melaka Kedah -1.23574* 0.37637 0.019 Melaka Perak -0.72167 0.36127 0.418	Melaka	Terengganu	-1.70152*	0.40613	0.001
Melaka Kedah -1.23574* 0.37637 0.019 Melaka Perak -0.72167 0.36127 0.418	Melaka		-0.55954	0.34716	0.675
Melaka Perak -0.72167 0.36127 0.418	Melaka	Johor	-0.51083	0.35474	0.780
	Melaka	Kedah	-1.23574*	0.37637	0.019
Melaka Negeri Sembilan 0.01263 0.42379 1.000	Melaka	Perak	-0.72167	0.36127	0.418
	Melaka	Negeri Sembilan	0.01263	0.42379	1.000

The findings of the analysis show that there is a difference between polling stations and changes in government leadership. This can be identified through the results of the GE-14, which showed a historic result for PH that has succeeded in overcoming BN at the national level and in several states. Among the states in the peninsula that have undergone changes, namely Terengganu, Selangor, Melaka, Negeri Sembilan, Johor, Kedah, and Perak, Pahang and Perlis still remain with the BN administration. At the same time, PAS managed to remain in Kelantan and reclaim Terengganu and Kedah (SPR, 2018). Political observers also labelled the GE-14 a "People's Tsunami" without religion, the races unanimously rejecting authoritarian rule (Shahidah, Arif & Ahmad Firdaus, 2019). However, the GE-15 also witnessed a change of government leadership in several states.

According to Junaidi et al. (2015), the voting patterns of Malay voters differ according to the state, and this study is in line with the findings which demonstrate that the support and behaviour of Kedah and Negeri Sembilan voters also have differences towards the change of government leadership. This difference also occurs in the

ISSN No. 2454-6186 | DOI: 10.47772/IJRISS | Volume IX Issue XXX December 2025 | Special Issue



states of Terengganu and Selangor, which indicates that the majority of support in Terengganu is from Malay voters compared to Selangor, a multi-ethnic state. It is clear that the change of government leadership in each state is different.

The voting preferences of Malay voters across the seven selected states were found to vary considerably. In Terengganu, the transition of state leadership from Barisan Nasional (BN) to the Pan-Malaysian Islamic Party (PAS) was particularly significant, as PAS secured a substantial number of State Legislative Assembly (DUN) seats during that period. Malay voters in Terengganu predominantly supported PAS in the 14th General Election (GE-14), while Pakatan Harapan (PH) failed to secure a single DUN seat in the state. In contrast, the voting behaviour of Malay voters in Selangor exhibited a different pattern. PAS did not emerge as the preferred choice among Selangor voters; instead, PH achieved a decisive majority in the state. The discussion of the findings suggests that Malay voters across different states demonstrate distinct voting behaviours in the selection of political leadership. These variations indicate the presence of multiple determining factors that influence voters' decisions prior to casting their votes.

Residential Area Profile Analysis

This test aims to analyse the significant relationship between changes in government leadership according to the respondents' residential areas through H1d. This test is formed based on the following hypothesis:

H1d: There is a significant difference between residential areas and changes in government leadership.

ANOVA test analysis was conducted to compare the mean difference between residential areas and changes in government leadership. The results of the analysis found that there was a significant difference between the respondents' residential area and changes in government leadership. The analysis showed a value of F = 3.699 and P = 0.026, revealing a value of P < 0.05. Therefore, H1i is accepted because there is a significant difference between the respondents' residential area and changes in government leadership. The results of the analysis are depicted in Table 7.

Table 5: ANOVA Test based on Residential Area

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	31.753	2	15.877	3.699	0.026
Within Groups	613.487	346	1.773		
Total	645.240	348			

Next, a follow-up Post-Hoc Test was conducted to examine the significant mean difference based on the voters' area of residence. Based on Table 5.1, the results of the Post-Hoc Multiple Comparisons tests showed a significant difference in the mean score of government leadership change according to the voters' area of residence. The analysis highlights that the residential area of voters in urban areas and semi-urban areas differed based on the significant value of ($P = 0.036 < \alpha = 0.05$). However, the analysis showed that voters in rural areas and those in urban areas found no significant difference, namely $P = 0.076 > \alpha = 0.05$. The entire Post Hoc test analysis is depicted in Table 7.1.

Table 5.1: Post Hoc Tests for Government Leadership Changes between Residential Areas

(I) Residential Area	(J) Residential Area	Mean Difference (I-J)	Standard Error	Sig.
	Semi-Urban	.45576*	.18408	.036
Urban	Rural	.42477	.19514	.076
Semi-Urban	Urban	45576*	.18408	.036
	Rural	03098	.19355	.986

ISSN No. 2454-6186 | DOI: 10.47772/IJRISS | Volume IX Issue XXX December 2025 | Special Issue

Rural	Urban	42477	.19514	.076
	Semi-Urban	.03098	.19355	.986

The findings indicate that the residential areas of urban and semi-urban voters show differences in the change of government leadership. The study found that the rejection of BN by urban voters is due to anger against Najib's rule, such as the FELDA issue, the issue of old and new candidates, GST and several internal party issues that have caused voters' dissatisfaction with his administration (Junaidi Awang Besar, 2020). However, voters in semi-urban areas are less likely to support BN Terengganu due to candidates who are not liked by young voters and voters on the fence in GE-13. However, BN remains in control of Terengganu. In line with the analysis obtained, urban and semi-urban voters differ in determining leaders during elections based on the issues and problems among them.

However, the residential areas of rural voters and urban voters show no difference, as a previous study by Junaidi Awang Besar (2021) explains that Terengganu voters are smart in choosing leaders. In GE-11, PAS was given the mandate to govern the state of Terengganu, but the transition of power changed to BN in GE-12 and GE-13 after voters lost trust in PAS to govern the state. However, in GE-14 and GE-15, PAS was again accepted by voters and almost swept the state seats in GE-14 due to the support of rural and urban voters, which is in line with the results of the analysis obtained. GE-15 PAS continued to receive great support from Terengganu voters.

In addition, the study elaborates on the victory of Pakatan Harapan (PH) in the 14th General Election (GE-14), which demonstrated dominance in urban and semi-urban constituencies in the state of Pahang, specifically Indera Mahkota (urban), Kuantan (urban), Bentong (semi-urban), and Temerloh (semi-urban). In contrast, semi-urban constituencies such as Paya Besar and Pekan, as well as all rural parliamentary seats, remained under the control of Barisan Nasional (BN). The findings of this study provide empirical evidence that voters' residential location whether urban, semi-urban, or rural plays a significant role in influencing changes in support for government leadership in the post GE-14 period.

Nevertheless, by-elections (PRK) held after GE-14 in several parliamentary and state legislative assembly (DUN) constituencies, encompassing both urban and rural areas, also experienced shifts in political support from PH to BN. PH was unable to sustain its electoral dominance and remain the preferred choice of voters in the post GE-14 period, largely due to the strengthened political cooperation between BN and the PanMalaysian Islamic Party (PAS). This alliance successfully influenced voters, particularly Malay voters. The discussion of the findings suggests that BN and PAS were perceived as parties that championed the interests of Islam and the Malay community, thereby becoming a significant source of political hope among Malay voters during that period.

The study further examines how PH's victory in GE-14 was not solely driven by urban voters; rather, voters from rural and semi-urban areas also contributed to the leadership transition. This observation is supported by previous studies indicating that despite the Malay ethnic composition of FELDA communities exceeding 85 per cent in rural and semi-urban areas, BN failed to retain its electoral dominance in GE-14, even though these areas had traditionally been regarded as BN strongholds (Mohd Firdaus & Azmil Tayeb, 2022). However, in the post GE-14 context, support for BN gradually increased as support for PH declined, largely due to the emergence of issues that generated dissatisfaction among Malay voters, including concerns related to religious sensitivities, the Jawi script, unfulfilled manifesto promises, and related matters.

In conclusion, the study found that polling places and residential areas show differences in changes in government leadership. However, for the demographic profile of age and occupation, both show no differences in changes in government leadership.

CONCLUSION

The young voter factor is significant in leading to changes in government leadership and contributing to the percentage in determining the political party that wins the General Election, just as the government's action in introducing the 18-year-old vote and first-time voters being able to vote automatically contributed to the change in government leadership in the last GE-15. Young voters want leaders with morals and integrity who have their

ISSN No. 2454-6186 | DOI: 10.47772/IJRISS | Volume IX Issue XXX December 2025 | Special Issue



primary interests and the manifesto to be fulfilled. The study concluded that young voters are the heart of the country in determining the direction of more competent and productive development. Young voters are seen as the primary focus for every political party because the rise of this group can change a government institution's ability to achieve dreams and visions towards a civilised Malaysia.

REFERENCES

- 1. Ahmad Al-Munzir, Nor 'Azzah & Mohd Yakub. (2024). Strategi perhubungan awam Islam dan peranannya dalam membangunkan Masyarakat madani. Jurnal Syariah, 32(1), 129–157 DOI:https://doi.org/10.22452/syariah.vol32no1.5
- 2. Asmady Idris, Asri Salleh & Mohd Rizal Mohd Yaakop. (2021). Kupasan Artikel 'Malaysia: The 2020 Putsch for Malay Islam Supremacy. Jurnal Pengajian Melayu-JOMAS, 32(1): 118-137.
- 3. Barry, B. (1970). Sociologists, economists and democracy. Landon: The MacMillan Company.
- 4. Chua Yan Piaw. (2014). Kaedah dan Statistik Penyelidikan. McGraw-Hill Education (Malaysia) Sdn. Bhd.
- 5. Dettman, S., & Gomez, E.T. (2020). Political Financing reform: Politics, policies and patronage in Malaysia. Journal of Contemporary Asia, 50 (1): 36-55.
- 6. Dori Efendi & Jayum Jawan. (2017). Pembangunan Politik dan Pendemokrasian: Suatu Analisis Konseptual. Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities, 12(3): 1-13.
- 7. Ghazali Mayudin Jamaie Hamil, Sity Daud & Zaini Othman. (2006). Demokrasi Kepimpinan dan keselamatan dalam politik Malaysia. Bangi: Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia.
- 8. Gomez, E.T. (1990). Politik dalam perniagaan: Pelaburan korporat UMNO (Terjemahan Mohd Nazri Ismail). Kuala Lumpur: FORUM Enterprise.
- 9. Eko Prayitno Joko, Zaini Othman & Saat Awg Damit. (2016). Belia dan Kelangsunganhegemoni Barisan Nasional: Kajian Kes Pilihan Raya Umum 13 di Sabah. Jurnal Komunikasi, 14, 1-18.
- 10. Hair, J, Tomas, H. G., Christian, R., & Marko, S., (2014). A Primer on Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM). SAGE.
- 11. Junaidi Awang Besar. (2015). Pilihan Raya Umum (PRU) 2013: Satu Tinjauan Kritis Terhadap Pola Pengundian Etnik Melayu. Jurnal Melayu, 4(1), 64-91.
- 12. Junaidi Awang Besar. (2020). PRU-14 dan Pasca PRU-14: Analisis Politik di Negeri Johor Darul Takzim, Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities, 17(5), 81-98.
- 13. Junaidi Awang Besar. (2021). Melaka dalam geopolitik Malaysia pada pra PRU-14, PRU-14 dan pasca PRU-14. International Journal of Law, Government and communication (IJLGC), 6(24), 144-176.
- 14. Krejcie, R. V., & Morgan, D. W., (1970). Determining Sample Size for Research Activitis. Education and psychological measurement, 30, 607-610.
- 15. Mohammad Agus Yusoff & Shah Mohd Akmal Abdul Halim. (2019). Tingkah laku pengudi felda dalam PRU-14: Identifikasi Parti, Sosiologikal atau Pilihan Rasional, Akademika, 89(3), 167-182.
- 16. Mohd Firdaus Abd Aziz & Azmil Tayeb. (2022). Dinamika Sistem Dua Blok Parti Pada PRU 14: Kajian Kes di FELDA Trolak Utara, Perak. Malaysian Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities (MJSSH), 7(8), 1-11. https://doi.org/10.47405/mjssh.v7i8.1661
- 17. Mohd Fuad Md Jali & Junaidi Awang Besar. (2012). Pendapat dan keperluan generasi muda di kawasan Parlimen Muar, Johor. E-Bangi-Journal of social sciences and Humanities, 7(1), 50-63.
- 18. Mohd Haziman Mahmood. (2017). Impak Penyertaan Pengundi muda dalam PRU 2013 terhadap Politik Malaysia. e-Bangi: Journal of Social Science and Humanities, 12(1), 1-18.
- 19. Mohd Majid Konting. (2000). Kaedah Penyelidik Pendidikan. Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka.
- 20. Mohd Nizar Sudin, Moh Fuad Mat Jali, Junaidi Awang Besar & Marlisa Abdul Rahim. (2017). Kerelevanan Calon Muda Menjelang Pilihan Raya Umum ke-14. The 2nd International Conference on Communication, Media, Information Technology, Environment, Tourism, Economics, Politics, Art and Heritage (ICDETAH 2017). Mac 2017.
- 21. Muhamad Takiyuddin Ismail & Muhamad Nadzri Mohamed Noor. (2018). Revolusi Senyap 9 mei 2018. Jebat Malaysian Journal of History, Politics & Strategic Studies, 45(2), 161-185.
- 22. Norris, P. (2017). Why the Younger Generation of Corbynistas? In Thorsen, T., Jackson, D. & Lilleker, D. UK Election Analysis 2017: Media, Voters and the Campaign, 22-23, Poole: The Centre for the study of Journalism, Culture and Community.



ISSN No. 2454-6186 | DOI: 10.47772/IJRISS | Volume IX Issue XXX December 2025 | Special Issue

- 23. Nur Ellyanis Mohd Basori & Junaidi Awang Besar. (2020). Pengaruh Media Terhadap Sokongan Kepada Parti Politik Di Malaysia. Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities, 17(5), 62-80.
- 24. Nur Ellyanis Mohd Basori & Junaidi Awang Besar. (2020). Politik Belia dan Pilihan Raya Umum ke-14 di Malaysia. Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities, 17(7), 49-65.
- 25. Ottaway, M. & Hamzawy, A. (2011). Protest movements and political change in the Arab world. Washington, DC: Carnegie Endowmnet for International Peace.
- 26. Pallant, J. (2016). SPSS Survival Manual: A Step By Step Guide to Data Analysis Using SPSS Program (6th ed.). Landon, UK: McGraw-Hill Education.
- 27. Shahidah Abdul Razak, Ariff Aizuddin Azlan & Ahmad Firdaus Abdul Jalil. (2019). Pilihan Raya Umum Ke-14 di Malaysia: Berakhirnya Era Rejim Autoritarian, Malaysian Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities (MJSSH), 4(2), 90-101.
- 28. Sloam, J., Mohammad Raqib Ehsan & Henn, M. (2018). 'Youthquake': How and Why, Young People Reshaped the Political Landscape in 2017. Political Insight, 4(1), 4-8.
- 29. Suresh Kumar N Vellymalay & Sivarajan Ponniah. (2018). Tsunami India dalam Pilihan RayaUmum Ke-14: Peralihan Sokongan daripada Politik Etnik kepada Politik Multietnik, Jebat: Malaysian Journal of History, Politics & Strategic Studies, 45(2), 206-231.
- 30. Yazid Saleh, Siti Noranizahhafizah Boyman, Hanifah Mahat, Mohmadisa Hashim, Nisar Nayan Saiyidatina Balkhis Norkhaidi & Samsudin Suhaili. (2020). Pola Sokongan Pengundi Muda Sebelum Pilihan Raya Umum Ke-14 di Malaysia. Malaysian Journal of Society and Space, 16(1), 80-94.