

## Students and Campus Elections: Case Study at Sultan Idris Education University, Malaysia

**Siti Noranizahhafizah Boyman**

Sultan Idris Education University,  
Tanjung Malim, Malaysia.

### Abstract

This article aims to study the involvement of students in campus elections at Sultan Idris Education University (SIEU). The electoral college is not just a program and procedures. It is a platform for a general election. The campus elections are important to the student as it is one of the elements of practicing democracy. Therefore, this study investigates the level of knowledge, sources of information and the level of political involvement in campus elections. Also, the study identifies the factors that influence student voting in election's campus. The survey used to address all the objectives in this study. The data used are more detailed as the empirical aspect involving in the research field. This study discovered four things. First, the findings show that the knowledge level of students about the development of the electoral college is still small, but the student's knowledge of the voting process is the higher with 83 percent. Second, the study found that the primary source of political information for students in SIEU are websites, followed by newspaper and television. Third, the level of student involvement in campus elections is at a moderate level. However, female students are more likely to be involved. Fourth, the factors that influence student voting in SIEU is a candidate, manifesto, and current issues. However, this choice is different from gender. The notable findings from this study contribute to the body of knowledge that involves students and campus elections.

**Keywords:** Campus election, politic campus, pro-students, pro-aspirations, SIEU.

### Introduction

Students play an important role as heirs to the country. Students' role in politics had begun before the era of independence. They are responsible for motivating people to rise against invaders through associations, magazines, and newspapers. Until now, students have a significant role in the community, state, and nation. Two perspectives of student involvement in politics can be listed, namely, conventional and non-conventional participation. In conventional involvement, students participate as candidates in voting, campaign, and office in campus elections. In non-conventional involvement, students are involved in rallies, petitions, demonstrations, and other activities.

However, the participation of students in politics is very limited because Section 15 of the Colleges and Universities Act (CAUA) prevents students from forming or

joining political parties (www.agc.gov.my, 2017). However, the Ministry of Higher Education allows those involved in campus elections conducted by a university or college to elect the Student Representative Council (SRC). For example, in SIEU, Section 57 of the University constitution allows the polls to elect members of the SRC and to hold elections on campus (SRCEC, 2014). This activity can indirectly educate students involved in politics about control before leaving for the community.

Student involvement in campus elections processes helps students to understand the democratic system to elect leaders. Electoral college students revealed to choose candidates, campaigning, voting, and the system itself. However, it is interesting when they label their groups with specific names. The students label themselves like pro-aspiration and pro-student, not from the university. The pro-aspiration group supports the ideology of the university administration, and the pro-students are a group that tries to bring ideas and issues related to students. The diversity of this group has made campus politics boisterous because of competition for victory in each group. The students can make election platforms to highlight their willingness to be capable leaders and responsible individuals in the society and the nation.

Therefore, it can be said that the electoral campus is not just a program and procedure but a platform to practice because the electoral process is almost the same with the country's general election. Campus elections are important to students as one of the elements of experience practicing democracy before the realities of the real democracy. Hence, the method of the election on campus is meant to produce a quality leader in the elections through democratic practices at universities to develop future leaders.

### **Problem Statement and Objective Research**

Sultan Idris Education University (SIEU) is a public university that is important in the history of education. Formerly, SIEU was known as Sultan Idris Training College (SITC) (29 November 1922 to 1957). It was then changed to Maktab Perguruan Sultan Idris (MPSI) (1957–1987), to Institut Perguruan Sultan Idris (IPSI) (21 February 1987 to April 1997), and finally to SIEU (1997 to the present). Throughout its development, this institution has produced Malay intellectuals who fight and bring awareness to the people. MPSI had a significant role to bring forth teachers and educated Malays, whose responsibility was to inspire nationalism that ultimately considered radical because it was anti-imperialist. MPSI churned out Malay intellectuals who had the higher political consciousness to resist invaders, such as Ibrahim Yaakob, Zainal Abidin Ahmad (Za'aba), Harun Aminurrashid, and many other great figures in the country.

SIEU's role as a university has shown an educated generation a platform by this institution in the last 75 years. SIEU was incorporated on May 1, 1997, beginning a new role as a university under the Universiti Pendidikan Sultan Idris (Incorporation) Act 1997 and Order of the Sultan Idris Education University (Campus) 1997 through the Government Gazette PU (A) 132 & 133 dated February 24, 1997. Then, reaching nearly a century, the continuity of the role of SIEU and its students in the community and the nation is imperative. However, times have changed, and the involvement of students in politics is barred because students are subject to the CAUA in section 15 that prevents them from forming or joining political parties (www.agc.gov.my, 2017). However, they do have campus elections conducted by the university or college to elect representatives to apply their knowledge and be involved in the practice of democracy.

Education for students should include not only academics but also character development, and take into account the students' personality with regard to a political character. This is because they are the intellectual generation that will lead the country in the future. Therefore, the involvement of students in campus elections helps them understand the processes of the democratic system to elect leaders. The electoral process at the university reveals to the students how to choose candidates, how to campaign, how to vote and the system itself. These activities indirectly educate students about politics before they leave university to live in the community.

The study focused on the electoral college is less widespread than the study of the general election. The general election studies have been so prevalent that they include early elections, such as the Ratnam (1965) study, which discussed the political developments in Malaysia by analyzing the GE 1955 and 1959. He also studied voting patterns that are allegedly still racist because the community is still practicing traditional customs and is in the process of development (Ratnam & Milne, 1967). While Vasil (1971), indicates that there have been multi-ethnic parties, such as the Independence of Malaya Party, the National Party, the Labor Party and the Party of Malaya, they have been unsuccessful in attracting the people and, thus, been ephemeral. Furthermore, the study of the general elections also includes the issue of media and voters, like the Samsudin (2010) and Syed Arabi (2011). Recent studies on the general election are many, such as those by Shamsul Amri (2008), Goh Cheng Teik (2008), Abdul Rashid Moten (2009), Siti Noranizahhafizah et al. (2015), Siti Noranizahhafizah & Jayum (2016) and Junaidi (2017) (to name a few).

Although it seems that elections on campus are not important, they are a platform for students to cultivate the political spirit and learn to be candidates, to campaign, vote and understand the electoral system itself. This is essential when they start interacting with the community later. Nevertheless, studies on campus elections are few. Thus, there are many gaps in knowledge, such as student involvement in campus elections, the level of awareness about campus elections, the sources of media, the factors that influence their votes and issues close to the hearts of students.

Therefore, this study investigated the students and their participation in elections on the SIEU campus. Why the electoral college? The campus elections are good to study as they are a reflection of students' willingness to engage with people outside after graduation. They are also the future leaders of this country. Why students in SIEU? SIEU is one of the renowned educational institutions that produces great leaders. Based on the issues above, the objective of this study is to determine the following items:

- i) Identify the level of students' knowledge related to elections on the SIEU campus.
- ii) Describe the sources of political information to SIEU students.
- iii) Analyze the level of student involvement in campus elections in SIEU.
- iv) Determine the factors that influence the voting of students in SIEU.

### **Literature Review**

This part explains previous studies related to the students' behavior in politics, their political participation and their sources of political information. These three themes in literature are interrelated and mutually connected. They always get attention from the community and the public. This is because elections are an important element in a democratic country. The students are young voters who will determine the future leadership by practicing it in the elections organized by the university. Furthermore, students also always get political attention from the public because students are a valuable asset to the country as agents of progress and as a source of energy for the country.

### **Students Voting Behavior**

Among the researchers who conduct research on the political behavior of students is Lipset (1967), which found that political student politics do not overlap with adults. Therefore, it can be said student politics has its ideas and formulas in the fight for the issues and problems in society. This means that students' political behavior is independent and has its struggle. The ideological struggle is shown by UM students in 1960 with the establishment of a Socialist Association and practices the concept of socialism (Muhammad Abu Bakar, 1973). However, the environment in the university also affects the students' struggle. This fact supports the finding Altbach (1968), which states that the ideas of freedom and community development are learned influenced their thinking and character. This means that the character and paradigm of the student are affected by what they know about the idea of freedom and community. Furthermore, the development of age also influences the students to revolt, because the process maturity leads students to find their identity. They also want to maintain the image of a student, and if there is a disruption of the university, they will oppose it (Lipset & Albach, 1969). The study by Muhammad Abu Bakar (1987a) reveals that their struggle philosophy was formed by the position of their social status as a university student. Therefore, the election of campus is the most important platform for any public university in the country to choose a student leader in the SRC. It can be concluded that student participation in campus elections serves as the useful experience of preparing students for life as a mature adult citizen (Mohd Fuad et al., 2005 & 2009; Ramírez et al. 2010; Roslizawati & Mohd Rizal, 2017).

### **Students Participation in Politics**

The next theme is student participation in politics. Lipset (1967) indicates that the political activity of students is part of the culture of the campus. Research on political participation among students led by Muhammad Ali and Ahmad Faiz (2005), entitled *Gerakan Politik Mahasiswa di Malaysia*, studied various angles of political activities of students. He said politics not only focuses on the political affairs of state government only, but it covers a broader nature of love and patriotism to the country. At the same, Thock Ker Pong (2012), a study of student activism and reform of China's post-reform era in Malaysia. The results of his study showed that many Chinese student activists influenced by the call of the reform movement. The student action has been under pressure from the university. This caused the Chinese student activists to join the opposition and NGOs after coming out of universities. Meanwhile, the results of his study also found that some activists became candidates in the 2008 general election and managed to become members of the legislative assembly and of the parliament.

Muhammad Abu Bakar's (1987) study, on the other hand, found that the political student behavior is closely tied to their involvement in student associations. Most of the students are active in campus politics and also in the association. His research also showed that students active in the association had a high interest and engagement in campus politics, while students who were passive in campus politics were not active in the association. This active minority group considered campus politics as part of their lives as students. Additionally, aspects of the personality of students affect their political behavior, which, in turn, affects the political situation in a country (Baranowski & Weir, 2010). It can be seen that medical students in the United States are more likely to be liberal in politics than adults because they are subjective and rationally thinking in evaluating the political issue (Frank, Carrera & Dharamsi, 2007). Meanwhile, Gardner and Stough (2002) believe that spiritual intelligence is imperative because these factors may contribute to the formation of the leadership style of adult leaders. Therefore, participation in campus elections is considered important for students because it can serve as useful experience in preparing them for life as mature adult citizens (Mohd Fuad et al., 2005; Marshelayanti et al., 2016). Hamidah et al. (2004) have conducted research on the connection between student

awareness and the role and responsibilities of the SRC. Their study found that the level of students' knowledge of the existence and the role and responsibilities of the SRC is moderate. Additionally, students' perceptions of the electoral process are also average. Therefore, there is significant room for improvement to ensure that the electoral process is orderly and transparent.

### **Sources of Political Information**

The final theme is the source of the political information used by students. Among the researchers studying this issue are Mondak and Halperin (2008), who found that the introduction of non-news television formats, such as talk, chat, and reality shows, can be an important source of political discourse and political participation among students. Sources of information obtained from television enable students to get information that helps them think more critically and assists them in shaping political ideas on campus. Additionally, Junaidi et al. (2013) conducted a study to examine the use of the Internet and the political perceptions of students at Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia (UKM). Their study found that the internet and social media play a significant role in influencing the political behavior of students. They also found that although students are critical of the current issue, only a group of intellectuals support the university administration and government. However, the government should listen and consider their views in developing communities and countries. At the same, Sampson and Korn (1970) noted the role played by the mass media in exposing the irregularities of the government fueled the student struggle. However, we can see today that the younger generation has been influenced by the elements and do not stick to materialistic values that resulted from both the passage of time and the increased focus on information and digital fingerprints. This situation shows the destruction of our socio-cultural society and the corruption of students who are considered to be the heirs to the leadership of the future. The political mold of campuses today is becoming less and less venomous, so it is still not able to compete with the products of campus politics during the time of pre-independence and early post-independence.

It can be summarized that students have their ideas and desires related to good and bad issues that they want to express to the government. The issues may relate to the government or the party. At the university, democracy and freedom of speech can be seen in the university elections and the student movements. The purpose of the electoral process is to see to what extent the students are concerned about the issues that are important. This is because the students have three basic demands; they want their voices heard, their role recognized, and their issues addressed in a fair way that is beneficial to the youth (Saifuddin, 2009; Roslizawati & Mohd Rizal, 2017). The fundamental demand would require the government or related parties to be looked at seriously because students are future leaders.

### **Methodology**

Quantitative methods were used in this study to obtain data in the form of a numeric. Descriptive analysis was used to see the profile of the demographic characteristics of the respondents, the source of political information of the respondents, the level of student involvement in campus elections and voting student factors. The analysis is to calculate the frequency and percentage of each category of data for comparison in quantity. Some previous studies that used this method to study the relevant election are Downs (1957), An economic theory of democracy; Lipset (1973), Political Man; Campbell, et al. (1980), The American voter; and Junaidi et al. (2015), Patterns of ethnic politics in Malaysia's 13th General Election: A case study of Selangor.

### **Data Collection**

This study will begin by analyzing the documents. After that, the method used is quantitative surveys. In the first phase, the analyzes carried out by making reference document library. Analyze documents at an early stage is essential to acquire the data and the initial impression on the students and the campus elections, previous studies related to the student, campus politics scrutinized. However, what is more important is that the first phase will closely link to the last stage of analyzing the data field, where researchers need to develop a specific theme and linked as a whole. This situation can only build on the information has to analyze at an early stage, so that researchers can attach to its relationship with the research conducted in the field. The sources used for analyzing documents are books, articles, journals, reports from the Student Affairs SIEU, paper, newspapers and leaflets relating to student, elections, and political campus. However, basically researchers had examined previous studies before starting or selecting the study, to ensure that research conducted new research that can benefit and enhance the dynamics of knowledge in the field.

The next method used is a survey using questionnaires. The survey used in this study to obtain information relating to the objectives of the study. The questionnaires survey provide the data numerically obtained is required to identify the level of student knowledge related campus elections in SIEU, explain sources of political information for students, the level of involvement of students in campus elections and determine the factors that influence the voting of students in SIEU. According to Gilgun & Abrams (2002), "... survey research is helpful in understanding the distribution of qualities and statistical relationships among variables...". The use of this survey helps to explain the distribution obtained regarding quality and relationships between variables numerically. The results of the study will be to the right with the scientific evidence through numerical data obtained.

### **Research Location**

The study conducted in SIEU, Tanjung Malim Perak. Located in Tanjung Malim, Perak has two campuses, Sultan Azlan Shah and Sultan Abdul Jalil Shah. Also, SIEU has four residential colleges, namely Ungku Omar College, Harun Aminurashid College, Aminuddin Baki College, and Za'aba College. The maximum capacity of Ungku Omar College and Harun Aminurashid College is 2,592 people, while Za'aba College and Aminuddin Baki College are able to accommodate a maximum of 1,248 people. In addition, some students live outside the campus and are managed by the Off-Campus Housing Units.

### **Population & Research Sample**

The student population consists of students at Universiti Pendidikan Sultan Idris. The number of current students is estimated at 12,589 people (JHEPA, 2015). Based on the table of sample size determination by Krejcie Dan Morgan (1970), the required number of respondents is 384 people to be adequate. However, the researchers add the number of respondents, favoring information and data obtained better and reliable to strengthen the study. A total of 508 respondents were involved in this study. Respondents in this study were randomly selected and came from various backgrounds and different ideologies to ensure that the data obtained was of a wide range.

### **Findings and Discussion**

This section discusses the results obtained through a survey carried out in the vicinity of the SIEU campus. The analysis is based on information and data obtained from questionnaires distributed to students. A total of 508 questionnaires were distributed to the first-year students to final year includes diploma programs. Data collected through the survey were analyzed by using

frequency distribution and percentage of respondents. The data were analyzed according to the objectives set in the study. Data were analyzed using Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 21 for an appropriate and regular analysis of the data. The next section discusses the findings obtained one by one.

### Background of Respondent

This part discusses the diversity of backgrounds of respondents with a view that is based on demographic factors such as gender, age, program, and voted year in as all these features are necessary to analyze one by one. The analysis shows (referring to Table 1) females were the highest number of respondents in a survey conducted as much as of 81.1 percent, or 412 people. The remaining 96 respondents, with a percentage of 18.9 percent, were male. For gender according to the study, a total of 4.1 percent of the respondents were diploma students, comprising 2.1 percent of male and 4.6 percent of female students.

**Table 1: Distribution of Respondents by Gender, Age and Program**

Respondent	Frequency	Percentage (%)
<b>Gender</b>		
Male	96	18.9
Female	412	81.1
Total	508	100.0
<b>Age</b>		
17-20	169	33.3
21 Above	339	66.7

  

Program	Male	Female	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Diploma	2	19	21	4.1
Degree	94	393	487	95.9
Total	96	412	508	100.0

Sources: Fieldwork Data, 2015.

The results of the subsequent analysis show the distribution of respondents by age group (Table 1). Results show that 339 respondents are in the age group 21 years and over, with a share of 66.7 percent, while 169 people were 17 to 20 years old or 33.3 percent of the total 508 respondents. It can be summarized that some in the age group 17 to 20 years old are students from diploma and degrees programs (DP) as shown in Table 1, with only 21 students from the Diploma program and the rest are DP students. The DP students are all in the age group 21 years and over.

The breakdown of male and female respondents by age group was 25 percent or 24 respondents were male in the age group 17 to 20 years old, and the rest were 21 years of age or older; for the female respondents, 35.2 percent or 145 persons were in the age group 17 to 20 years, and the remaining were 21 years of age or older.

Further analysis is shown in Table 2, which shows the distribution of respondents who voted in the poll. According to Table 2, Electoral College year 2014/2015 had the highest number of votes, involving a total of 259 persons from 508 respondents, or 51 percent. Female respondents represented 83 percent of respondents, or 215 people, and the remaining 17 percent were male respondents.

**Table 2: Respondent Distribution by Year Voting**

Voted Year (Session)	Male	Female	Frequency	Percentage (%)
2011/2012	5	4	9	1.8
2012/2013	10	32	42	8.3
2013/2014	25	100	125	24.6
2014/2015	44	215	259	51.0
Not Voting	12	61	73	14.4
Total	96	412	508	100.0

Sources: Fieldwork Data, 2015.

For the year 2013/2014, the number of respondents who voted was 125, or 24.6 percent (Table 2). In the breakdown by gender for the year 2013/2014, 25 respondents, or 20 percent, were male and 80 percent female. The analysis also showed that, of the 508 respondents, 14.4 percent, or a total of 73 people, had never voted, and the majority of respondents are in first semester for a total of 37 people at the same 7.2 percent. Analysis based on the gender of respondents showed that 12 percent of respondents were female, and 2.4 percent were male.

In reference to the data obtained from SRCEC, turnout at the Electoral College for the 2013/2014 and 2014/2015 sessions shows a relatively high reduction of 243 people; 7,404 people voted in 2013/2014 (SRCEC, 2013), compared with 7,161 in 2014/2015 (SRCEC, 2014). This reduction in turnout among eighth-semester students can be explained by the fact that they were not in university because of practicum and industrial training.

### Levels of Knowledge Students on Campus Election

This part will analyze and discuss two important aspects of students' knowledge, the first relating to the development of the campus electoral procedure and the second relating to the voting process in campus elections. The first is to know the extent to which students take out the electoral college. The analysis shows (Table 3) a total of 193 respondents with a percentage of 38 percent chose "sometimes" as their option for awareness of campus election. Most respondents select this option. This situation shows that students are less interested in keeping up with the election of campus and campus politics because it is less relevant to their daily lives. Also, the study by Mohd Fuad et. al. (2005) also found that the level of political interest among youth IPT is low, and only 27.2 percent of registered voters are among the youth IPT.

**Table 3: Awareness of the Campus Election**

Level of Awareness	Male	Female	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Constantly	13	29	42	8.3
Frequent	18	48	66	13.0
Sometimes	31	162	193	38.0
Seldom	22	107	129	25.4
Never	12	66	78	15.4
Total	96	412	508	100.0

Sources: Fieldwork Data, 2015.

According to Table 3, the analysis by gender for the level of awareness about campus election, the highest chosen is sometimes; it shows male respondents made up to 31 respondents or 16.1 percent, and 83.9 percent or 162 respondents were female. These findings indicate that female respondents were the ones who most chose "sometimes" for awareness of campus



elections. Moreover, for the second rank is "seldom," followed by "never aware of campus election."

The next is an analysis of the level of knowledge about the voting process in campus elections. Table 4 shows the analysis of the level of knowledge of the voting process in elections on the SIEU campus.

**Table 4: The Respondent's Knowledge of the Voting Process**

Level of Knowledge	Male	Female	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Yes	81	344	425	83.7
No	15	68	83	16.3
Total	96	412	508	100.0

Sources: Fieldwork Data, 2015.

The results of the analysis show that 83.7 percent of respondents knew about the voting process implemented in campus elections (Table 4). This number is very high and a positive sign, which is very good for any campus election held. The respondents had participated in the voting process during the campus election that was conducted earlier, and this contributes to the high percentage. Only 83 respondents (16.3 percent) did not know how the campus electoral process is conducted. In terms of gender, both sexes responded positively - 84.4 percent of male respondents and 83.5 percent of female respondents. Thus, the respondents can be classified as being knowledgeable about the voting process in campus elections. This is important because it shows that the electoral process is easy, and campus students know it well.

### Sources of Political Information

It is important to know how students get their political information. The previous study shows voters prefer the news they get from the media (Syed Arabi, 1994; 2011). In the view of voters, the media is not in favor of any party, in contrast with the political speaker or political worker. His research proved that the mass media had a profound influence on and captured the hearts of voters. Therefore, this study investigated political information sources used by students.

**Table 5: Respondent Sources of Political Information**

Sources	Male	Female	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Newspapers	19	99	118	23.2
Radio	4	8	12	2.4
Televisions	11	92	103	20.3
Political Discourses	20	39	59	11.6
Blog	2	25	27	5.3
Website	30	129	159	31.3
Other Resources	5	18	23	4.5
No Feedback	5	2	7	1.4
Total	96	412	508	100

Sources: Fieldwork Data, 2015.

The results indicated that (Table 5) sources of information on the website are the primary source of respondents to get information about politics with a total of 159 respondents, equivalent of 31.3 percent. The catalyst for this result is from internet access facilities to the

student such as wifi and inexpensive subscription mobile internet data plan to facilitate access to get easy information from a website. According to Mohd Fuad et al. (2012), websites that often prevails in improving knowledge about current political issues are *Malaysiakini.com*, *Agenda Daily* and *Daily News Online* that gets attention and is visited by youth at universities. Whereas the breakdown by gender, the female respondents are most high respondents chose a website as sources of political information for 81.1 percent or 129 respondents were female and male respondents were 18.9 percent.

The next source of political information for student choice is newspaper and television. Sources of information will be the second and third reference for the latest information. The number of respondents who chose the newspapers of origin and television is a total of 118 people and 103 respondents respectively, with percentages of 23.2 percent and 20.3 percent. According to Mondak & Halperin (2008), the introduction of non-news television formats talks on television and reality shows can be an important source of political discourse and political participation among students. The gender breakdown of respondents chooses the newspaper source comprised 16.1 percent of male respondents and 83.9 percent of female respondents. Similarly, with the television source, the male respondents were 10.7 percent and 89.3 percent of the respondents were women.

Hence, it can be concluded that the main source of political information is a student at SIEU website, then follow the newspaper and television. Ease of internet access drives this were students in SIEU like wifi facility and subscription mobile internet data plan to facilitate access to information quickly on the site.

### Students Participation in Campus Election

This section analyzes the level of student involvement in campus elections in SIEU. Table 6 shows the level of involvement of the respondents in the campus elections. Results show that 154 respondents, or 30.3 percent, are directly involved in campus elections. While 354 respondents (69.7 percent of respondents) were not involved in campus elections are held. According to gender, of the 154 respondents who are directly engaged in campus elections, as much as 76 percent, or 117 respondents, were female, and the rest were male respondents participating in campus elections. As for who did not participate in the campus election, 83 percent of respondents were female, and the rest were male respondents who were not involved in campus elections.

**Table 6: Respondents Participation**

Participation	Male	Female	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Involve	37	117	154	30.3
Not Involve	59	295	354	69.7
Total	96	412	508	100.0

Sources: Fieldwork Data, 2015.

When examined, the number of relatively small involvement reflects the limited places to engage directly and campus electoral that has not gained ground among the students as less important to them. This is in line with the findings of Hamidah et. al. (2004), who made an inquiry in connection with student awareness of the role and responsibilities of the SRC. Their study found that the level of students' awareness of the existence and the role and responsibilities of the SRC is moderate. Furthermore, students' perceptions of the electoral process are also moderate. Therefore, much more to improvement to ensure the electoral process to ensure structure and transparency. Also, a study by Muhammad Abu Bakar (1987) stated that the political behavior of students has close ties with their involvement in student associations. Most

of the students who are actively involved in politics also have active roles in the association. An active student association was found to have a high interest in and engage actively in political matters on campus. By contrast, students who were passive in campus politics were not active in the association.

The following analysis is related to the roles of students directly involved in campus elections. Their roles in campus elections can be classified as candidates, election committee members, ordinary members, and so on. Table 7 has more details.

**Table 7: Respondents Role in Election Campus**

Role	Male	Female	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Candidate	7	13	20	3.9
Election Committee	6	3	9	1.8
Members	11	52	63	12.4
Others	13	41	54	10.6
Total	38	108	146	28.7

Sources: Fieldwork Data, 2015.

Based on Table 7, the analysis shows that 146 respondents, or 28.7 percent of the total, played a significant role in the electoral process on campus. The first role analyzed was that of the candidate. As many as 20 people, or 3.9 percent of respondents, served as candidates in the elections held on campus. This number indicates that the number of candidates is relatively high. There were more female candidates (13) among the respondents than male candidates (7). While 9, or 1.8 percent, of the respondents had been a member of the election committee consisting of 6 male respondents and 3 female respondents.

Overall, it can be seen from the level of involvement of the respondents in the campus elections that female students are more likely to engage in mobilizing and play a significant role in the campus elections. This situation reflects an exciting atmosphere in campus politics at SIEU.

### **Factors Influencing Student Voting**

Previous discussions have obtained findings that indicate the level of knowledge, a source of political information, and the level of student involvement. As part of this continuing discussion on the objectives of the study, the discussion in this section concerning the factors that influence the student voting.

After examining respondents' knowledge, sources of information, and the level of political involvement, this section will discuss the factors that influence the respondents as a whole according to the position of the main core to less. Among the factors analyzed in this study are group, candidate, current issues, ethnicity, manifesto, and other factors. The analysis is used to determine the factors that influence the respondents as a whole according to the position of the most important to less (rank). This analysis will put the frequency of the highest frequency as the main and lower the opposite.

Referring to Table 8, the candidate becomes the main factor in the choice of respondents. In the 2014/2015 campus elections, candidates included the Residential College President, Chairman of the Association, Members the Supreme Council of Residential College and Association, a former member of the Student Representative Council, a former candidate in previous campus elections, and student activists (SRCEC, 2014). This shows that the association's activities and leadership influence students' political participation. This is an

opportunity for candidates to campaign in campus elections. The position of candidates contesting the election encouraged students to participate in campus elections to elect the best candidate to represent them in the Student Representative Council. Seen from the gender viewpoint, respondents who indicated candidate choice as the main factor in voting were 19.2 percent (45) male and 80.8 percent female.

**Table 8: Factors Influence Student Voting**

Factors	Male	Female	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Group	11	37	48	9.4
Candidate	45	189	234	46.1
Current Issues	17	57	74	14.6
Ethnic	4	12	16	3.1
Manifesto	16	105	121	23.8
Others	3	7	10	2.0
Not Related	0	5	5	1.0
Total	96	412	508	100

Sources: Fieldwork Data, 2015.

The second factor that influences the voting of university students is the use of a manifesto (Table 8). Results show that manifestos influenced the choices made by university students (121 respondents or 23.8 percent). The manifesto is important because the university students believe that the manifestos presented by candidates are best suited to their requirements. Manifesto frequently gained ground among university students fight with the demands and welfare of university students.

The third factor influencing the choice of respondents in the voting university students are current issues with a total of 14.6 percent, or 74 respondents. Whereas for choosing the current issues in terms of gender, male respondents were 23 percent and 77 percent were female respondents. This number shows the current issue gets the attention of the male respondents compared to the candidates and manifesto factors. The current issue is indeed a matter of getting the attention of university students. This is because the current issue is a matter very close and should be known by university students as a means to improve skills and gain information by comparing between the issues that bring goodness and conversely

It can conclude that overall factors influencing the voting in SIEU students are a candidate, manifesto, and current issues. However, this option is different between the genders. It was found the female respondents prefer to factor manifesto for first place, followed by the candidate and current issues (Table 8) while the male respondents preferred candidate is the first factor, followed by current issue and the manifesto (Table 8).

## Conclusion

The research study conducted in four main findings. First, the results showed that university students have a low level of knowledge of the first aspect of campus elections development. A total of 193 respondents (38 percent of respondents) chose "sometimes" as their answer. This situation shows that students have little interest in keeping up with campus elections and politics because these have little relevance to their daily lives. The next aspect is students' knowledge of the voting process. The results showed that 83.7 percent of respondents knew something about the voting process in campus elections (Table 4). This number is very high and is a positive sign for the implementation of campus elections. If we add to this the number of respondents who had participated in the voting process for campus elections conducted earlier, the resulting number is significant. The second finding is that the main source of political information for students is the SIEU website, followed by newspapers and television. The ease of Internet

access, driven by the availability of wi-fi facilities and subscription mobile Internet data plans, facilitates the access to information. Third, the empirical results found that the number of university students involvement in campus elections is moderate with 154, or 30.3 percent of respondents, being directly involved in campus elections. This amount reflects the limited places to engage directly and circumstances electoral campus that still has not got a place among university students as less important to them. In addition to this, students' perceptions of the electoral process are also moderate. Therefore, much more room for improvement to ensure the electoral process to ensure orderly and transparent. The findings also showed that female students are more likely to engage in mobilizing and playing a significant role in the electoral arena campus. This situation reflects an exciting atmosphere in campus politics at SIEU. Finally, the analysis was able to identify the factors that influence the university students the voting. Overall factors influencing the voting in SIEU students are a candidate, manifesto, and current issues. However, this choice is different between the genders. It was found the female respondents prefer to factor manifesto for first place, followed by the candidate and current issues (Table 8) while with the male respondents, the candidate is the first preferred, followed by current issue and the manifesto (Table 8). This finding means that the choice of male and female respondents have different choices.

## References

- Abdul Rashid Moten. (2009). 2004 and 2008 General Elections in Malaysia: Towards a multicultural, bi-party political system? *Asian Journal of Political Science*, 17 (2), 173-194. DOI: 10.1080/02185370903077469.
- Colleges and Universities Act (CAUA). (2017). Retrieved on 22 December 2017 from: [www.agc.gov.my](http://www.agc.gov.my).
- Altbach, P.G. (1968). *Students politics in Bombay*. London: Asia Publishing House.
- Baranowski, M. & Weir, K. (2010). Power and politics in the classroom: The effect of student roles in simulations. *Journal of Political Science Education*, 6 (3), 217-226.
- Frank, E., Carrera, J. & Dharamsi, S. (2007). Political self characterization of U.S medical students. *Journal of General Internal Medicine*, 22 (4), 514-517.F
- Gardner, L. & Stough, C. (2002). Examining the relationship between leadership and emotional intelligence in senior level managers. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 23, 2, 68-78.
- Goh Cheng Teik. (2008). *Election setbacks in Malaysia: 1969 and 2008 Election results compared*. Bandar Sunway, Selangor: Sunway University College.
- Hamidah Ab. Rahman, Nik Hasnaa Nik Mahmood, Rozeyta Omar, Salwa Abdul Patah, Roziana Shaari Lily & Suriani Mohd Arif. (2004). Student awareness and responsibilities of the Student Representative Council (SRC) as a representative of the students in Universiti Teknologi Malaysia, Skudai. *Research Report*. Universiti Teknologi Malaysia.
- Junaidi Awang Besar, Mohd Fuad Mat Jali, Novel Lyndon & Mazlan Ali. (2013). Internet usage and student political perceptions at Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia. *Jurnal Personalia Pelajar*, 16, 1-13.
- Junaidi Awang Besar, Muhammad Hazim Abdul Ghani, Mohd Fuad Mat Jali & Novel Lyndon. (2015). Patterns of ethnic politics in Malaysia's 13th General Election: A case study of Selangor. *Malaysian Journal of Society and Space*, 11 (9), 99-111.
- Junaidi Awang Besar. (2017). Trend of voting in the 13th Malaysia General Election. *E-Bangi Journal of Social Science and Humanities*, 12 (2), 126-149.
- Krejcie, R.V., & Morgan, D.W. (1970). Determining sample size for research activities. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 30, 607-610.
- Lipset, S.M. (1967). *Student politics*. New York: Basic Books Inc.
- Lipset, S.M. (1972). *Rebellion in the university; A history of student activism in America*. London: Routledge And Keagen Paul.
- Lipset, S.M. & Albach P.G. (1969). *Student revolt*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin & Co.
- Lipset, S.M. & Wolin S.S. (1965). *The Berkeley student revolt, facts and Interpretation*. New York: Anchor Books, Double Day & Co. Inc.

- Marshelayanti Mohamad Razali, Siti Noranizahhafizah Boyman, Nafisah Ilham Hussin & Wan Asna Wan Mohd Nor (2016). Youth political involvement: An analysis of conventional participation in Malaysia. *Journal Perspektif*, 8 (2), 70-78.
- Muhammad Abu Bakar. (1973). *Student arise*. Kuala Lumpur: Pustaka Antara.
- Muhammad Abu Bakar. (1987a). *Philosophy of student struggle in social science*. Kuala Lumpur: Persatuan Sains Sosial Malaysia.
- Muhammad Abu Bakar. (1987b). *Malay students and national politics at University of Malaya*. Kertas Kerja Seminar AUKU. Bangi: UKM
- Muhammad Ali Embi & Ahmad Faiz Abdul Hamid. (2005). *Student political movement in Malaysia*. Petaling Jaya: Pearson Prentice Hall.
- Mondak J.J. & Halperin K.D. (2008). A framework for the study of personality and political behaviour. *British Journal of Political Science*, 38 (2), 335-362.
- Mohd Fuad Mat Jali, Junaidi Awang Besar, Novel Lyndon & Viknesh a/l Ramachandran. (2012). Persepsi politik belia India di Institut Pengajian Tinggi Awam (IPTA) Malaysia. *Malaysia Journal of Society and Space*, 8 (8), 1 – 11.
- Mohd Fuad Mat Jali, Rashila Ramli & Mohd Yusof Kassim. (2005). Minat, aspirasi dan pilihan politik belia IPT Malaysia. In. Rohany Nasir, Hazita Azman, Ruzy Suliza Hashim & Mohd Yusof Hj. Abdullah, Rozmi Ismail (eds) *Prosiding Seminar penyelidikan pembangunan generasi muda: Realiti generasi muda melangkah ke hadapan*. Bangi: Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia.
- Mohd Fuad Mat Jali, Yahaya Ibrahim, Noor Aziah Mohd Awal, Abdul Halim Sidek & Khaidzir Ismail. (2009). Youth's aspirations and political support of the Malaysian IPT. *Malaysian Journal of Youth Studies*, 1 (6), 99-116.
- Ratnam K.J. (1965). *Communalism and the political process in Malaya*. Kuala Lumpur: University Of Malaya Press.
- Ratnam K.J. & Milne R.S. (1967). *The Malayan Parliamentary Election of 1964*. Singapura: University Of Malaya Press.
- Roslizawati Taib & Mohd Rizal Yaakob. (2017). Undergraduate students involvement in political protest in the 2016 Bi-election at public higher educational institutions. *E-Bangi Journal of Social Science and Humanities*, 2, 104-115.
- Saifuddin Abdullah. (2009). *New politics demolished Malaysia's democracy*. Kuala Lumpur: Institut Terjemahan Malaysia.
- Sampson, E.E. & Korn, H.A. (1970). *Student activism and protest*. London: Jorsey Bass.
- Samsudin A. Rahim (2010). Media, democracy and the younger generation: Analysis of the results of the 12th general election. *Malaysian Journal of Communication*, 26 (2), 1-15.
- Shamsul Amri Baharuddin. (2008). Opposition. *Dewan Masyarakat*, April: 8-10.
- Siti Noranizahhafizah Boyman, Nafisah Ilham Hussin, Marshelayanti Mohamad Razali & Junaidi Awang Besar (2015). Voting patterns and issues of the 2013 General Election. *Journal Perspektif*, 7 (3), 96-100.
- Siti Noranizahhafizah Boyman & Jayum Jawan. (2016). The vulnerability of Pakatan Rakyat in Perak. In. Muhamad Takiyudin Ismail & Sity Daud (editor.) *Pilihan Raya Umum ke 13* page. 90-101. Sintok: Universiti Utara Malaysia.
- Student Representative Council Election Commission (SRCEC). (2014). *Notice of election declaration of Student Representative Council*. Universiti Pendidikan Sultan Idris (UPSI).
- Syed Arabi Idid. (1994). *Determination of the agenda: The role of mass media in general election*. Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka.
- Syed Arabi Idid. (2011). *The role of mass media in the General Election*. Batu Caves: Universiti Islam Antarabangsa Malaysia.
- Vasil R.K. (1971). *Politics in a plural society a study of non-communal political parties in West Malaysia*. Kuala Lumpur: Oxford University Press.