Declaration of Authorship Correction: Removal of Author

Upon notification and agreement from all co-authors, it has been brought to our attention that one author was unintentionally omitted from the original publication. The following author has now been officially removed to the author list:

Added Author

Name: Mohd Mizan Mohamad Aslam

Affiliation: Fakulti Pengajian dan Pengurusan Pertahanan, Universiti Pertahanan Nasional Malaysia (UPNM), MALAYSIA

Email: mohdmizan@gmail.com

This correction has been made with the consent of all authors and verified by the editorial office. The amendment does not affect the scientific integrity, results, or conclusions of the published article.

This cover note serves as an official declaration. It is attached to the article for transparency and to maintain the accuracy and integrity of the publication.

If you have any questions or concerns regarding this matter, please contact the journal's editorial office.

Sincerely,

Editorial Board of Human Sustainability Procedia (HSP)

Political Leadership in Malaysia

Ku Hasnan Ku Halim[1], Mohd Ainuddin Iskandar Lee Abdullah[3], Jamal Rizal Razali[4], Sharifudin Abdullah[5], Suhaimi Sulaiman[6], Ahmad Mujahid Ahmad Zaidi[2], Zahrul Akmal Damin[1]

[1] *Centre for General Studies and Co-curricular, Universiti Tun Hussein Onn Malaysia, MALAYSIA*

[2] *Universiti Pertahanan Nasional, MALAYSIA*

[3] *Institut Pemikiran Tun Perak Kerajaan Negeri Melaka, MALAYSIA*

[4] *Universiti Malaysia Pahang Al-Sultan Abdullah, MALAYSIA*

[5] *Universiti Perguruan Sultan Idris, MALAYSIA*

[6] *Universiti Malaysia Sabah, MALAYSIA*

*Corresponding Author: hasnan@uthm.edu.my
DOI: https://doi.org/10.30880/hsp.2024.04.01.010

Article Info	Abstract
	This study was conducted to clarify and elaborate on the question of nationalism and political leadership in Malaysia, aimed at justifying the analysis in relation to the phenomenon of political leadership split from the perspective of nationalism. The ethnic diversity that exists in Malaysia makes it difficult to describe the relationship between the diversity of ethnic-identities and national-identities institutionally. However, from another point of view, the question of national-identity that is still not found or there is still no solution can be analyzed or understood through the perspective of the conflict between nationalism-collective and nationalism-individualistic. The political elite or the ruling party, which often plays the role of 'the spokesman' to the whole of Malaysian society, regardless of race or ethnic background, is seen as a group that highlights this nationalist-collective perspective. The findings of this study are expected to provide an overview of the current scenario of political leadership in Malaysia.

1. Introduction

Studies of political leadership often look at it in a broader dimension not merely discussing leadership from a behavioral point of view but seeing the relationship of leadership with power as an important element. It starts from the formation of the group and the occurrence of influence-influencing efforts among the members of the group. If individuals begin to influence other individuals then leadership activities begin to emerge (Norazmi et al., 2019; Norazmi, 2020; Fauziyana et al., 2020). At this stage influence and power also begin to color the activities in the group (Fauziyana et al., 2021; Aminah et al., 2021; Azlisham et al., 2021). The relationship between influence and power is closely linked in political leadership. A leader is someone who should have the power to use as influencing other individuals. An individual who is appointed or elected as a leader whether in a group, party or country has no meaning if he does not have power. With the power it has as legitimacy in carrying out its responsibilities as a leader (Firkhan et al., 2021; Ishak et al., 2021). Below will be explained some epistemology of leadership from Western scholars and local scholars.

The emergence of a political leader according to Case (1993) occurs due to three factors namely. First; depending on the leader's personality, appearance, image, character and behavior. Not all leaders have this complete personality package. Second; depending on the nature of the group and the members it leads. It covers the extent to which others accept a leader and how the members they lead react. Third; situations or events that occur and desired changes or problems faced by group members can be resolved by an individual chosen as

leader. The emergence of a leader is colored by the events or circumstances that occur. Mahatma Gandhi, Nelson Mandela, Soekarno emerged at a time when the people needed 'freedom'. Although the event took quite a long time to emerge a leader.

2. Literature Review

The general understanding of political leadership is that an individual who is powerful in the party, more powerful than others, an effective leader who holds the helm of the government and has the power and tools to help his party members (Mustafa, 1990). By possessing the legitimacy of power a leader can fulfill the wishes of his supporters. A leader will emerge when in a community of society there is a willingness among members to be followers and support other individuals of their own free and rational choice (Een et al., 2021). For example, a leader is elected through elections without coercion. Rational acceptance means that members will accept with the factor of authority of individuals who have honesty, dedication, responsibility, sensitive to environmental problems and prioritize the people they lead (Roszi et al., 2021).

The notion of leadership associated with groups and communities according to the sociological-anthropological point of view has been studied by Nair (1999), Ong (1984). The presence of leaders is important because it relates to the foundations of community life. It acts as a guide or structure all affairs in society either by one or a group of people who act as leaders. Leaders play a role in the organization of society is necessary so that there is a systematic system of survival. The leader or leader will form the rules as a guideline through its legitimacy as strengthening the position as well as respect between the leader and within the group members (Norazmi et al., 2020). The leader's job as a structurer means that if there is a conflict or disagreement among group members, then the leader's role is to find a solution to ensure a systematic life that has been agreed upon together (Norazmi et al., 2020). The formation of certain rules and norms in society will be adhered to so that conflicts do not occur. It is at this point that individuals begin to identify themselves within their group that conflict needs to be avoided for survival.

To strengthen group solidarity, there is a relationship between the leader and the person being led in the form of self -identification. Identification exists through abstract emotional bonds between group members and leaders. group members identify themselves with the leader through a process of introjection which is a process of bringing into the self. This process occurs on the assumption that the member only takes the good elements as his or her responsibility and the bad things or problems as belonging to the leader (Ozay; 1984). In this context problems and responsibilities become a burden to the individual appointed or elected as a leader.

The notion of leadership in relation to personal relationships begins to occur when in that relationship there exists power and influence that are unequally distributed so that one individual can direct, controlling the actions of others more than their control over other individuals (Parmer; 1964). Its implementation approach shows that there is a process of leader and leadership when there is an individual who can direct, control others. the legitimacy acquired by the individual is usually based on age, economic status, social stratification, class hierarchy that may differentiate the position of an individual, so that he is considered higher position in a social community (Alter, 1969). Influence in the context of this personal relationship is derived from another individual's level of trust in his or her position and it is used to strengthen his or her leadership position.

Bass (1973) gives the definition of political leadership as those who have the authority to use resources and choose the goals of a political unit and then affect its policies (Bass: 1973). The authority referred to here is a legitimate and legally acquired power and it differs from the concept of power as meant by Parmer (1964). According to Hermann power is acquired when a political leader gains authority because he holds the highest position in government and it is legally ratified through the legislative, constitutional or constitutional process of a country. Through this process, legitimacy is gained and a leader is more comfortable to create and select some goals for further action.

Behavioral -related political leadership refers to a leader's behavior that has to do with the structure and functions of the organization that support and maintain his or her leadership. In this context the leader needs voters through elections to maintain his position. It is done through a process of appeal, persuasion and it depends on the individual who has the ability, the skills to convince his followers and voters. The success of an individual as a result of his political behavior will enable him to carry out the structure and functions of the party or organization he represents more effectively.

For Bass (1973) behavioral -related political leadership exists when individuals are given the responsibility of directing group activities toward shared goals and a process of influencing influence occurs in a particular situation through a communication process (Parmer, 1964). This process results in the emergence of a leader as a result of the adaptation between an individual's personality and the location of his or her environment. Beissinger (1998) explains that this notion means a set of behavioral actions of a leader who should devise appropriate measures to overcome any problem. Actions taken either harshly (negative) or diplomatic (positive) will result in labeling against a leader.

The notion of role -based leadership according to Alter (1969) concluded that political leadership not only refers to the interaction between individuals but also emphasizes the role of individuals in carrying out

tasks appropriate to the environment, societal values that are also expressed indirectly through behavior. The role meant here is whatever an individual will do when he or she has been considered and chosen to be a leader. It seems that the opinions of Beissinger (1998), Bass (1969), Parmer (1964) who have been referred to above have indeed led to the concept of role -based political leadership. Alter (1969) on the other hand tried to differentiate in principle a political leader should be able to distinguish his role as a leader with his role in the family, his role towards friends he should not prioritize position for the sake of nepotism and cronyism. While ATMA (1988) gives the meaning of political leadership in the context of the role when an individual who is given responsibility and entrusted legally mobilizes material and human resources, integrates, manages and monitors and directs change towards goals in line with national development. Political leaders are individuals whose role is to bear the responsibility of avoiding the country from a social crisis to overcome protracted problems as well as individuals who are capable of making a political system stable and able to stimulate change towards development.

When studying about leadership usually the concept of charisma is often an element that is also important to look at. To emerge as a good leader and be able to lead a person needs to have certain characteristics that allow him to be seen and seen as capable of being a leader (Mohd Norazmi et al., 2021). That ability is naturally inherent in personality or that is patterned by circumstances, situations and the ability to adapt it to current needs (Rosnee et al., 2021). This innate ability -based leadership arises from the concept of charismatic leadership put forward by Weber. This concept is borrowed in this study to be a tool in, analyzing whether the success of the chosen leadership is influenced by personality traits or the extent to which the charisma of the divine gift is present in it. This is as expressed by Weber as a special divine gift that distinguishes him from others and makes him an individual who is considered exceptional as well as possessing a level of quality as a superior leader (Weber; 1968).

Charismatics is a personal element apart from awards as understood above. Charisma allows a person to seem to have extraordinary abilities and powers (Zaid et al., 2020). It is used by Weber to explain the ability of a leader based on the ability of the leader without any material impulse and coercion. From the epistemological sense charisma is derived from the Greek meaning "miracle of grace" taken from the early vocabulary of Christianity in the context of religion (Ting Chew Peh; 1979). For most scholars who study leadership in political contexts it is rare not to use this concept so much that it is so synonymous with Weber's name itself. That is, when it comes to leadership and charisma then Weber's name and his ideas will at least be noticed.

According to Weber charisma refers to an individual's ability or personality possessed by an individual that distinguishes himself or herself from others. The individual seems to possess an endowment with extraordinary abilities and capabilities from others (Zaid et al., 2020). It is considered to have an ability by a quality leader and that ability is due to a leader being given grace and respect. He discusses this concept of charisma by touching on the rights or authority of a leader in its application. This means that the charisma of the personality must also be seen from the aspect of authority which it has or is classified. This is because it will involve the relationship between leaders and being led in a community or institution (Nik Nurhalida et al., 2021). There are three forms of authority namely traditional authority, legal authority and charismatic authority.

Traditional authority refers to beliefs that have long been practiced and become a tradition to those involved. It deals with the purity, superiority, height, absolute (authentic) truth that is undisputed about the status and position of those who exercise power for the followers under it. Usually the obedience and obedience as well as respect of followers or subordinates to this authority is given to the leader who occupies the power that is traditionally inherited and bound by that tradition hereditarily or inheritance (Weber; 1968). Examples of this kind of authority on feudal elements like kings, sultans, princes and dignitaries in the community. Charismatic authority, on the other hand, refers to the award given to a Leader who has the characteristics of heroism, excellence, example that is considered different from others. Adherence to this type of leadership is due to a feature of privilege, an extraordinaryness that makes the value of respect of followers even stronger. An important element in this charismatic authority is the characteristic of abilities that are different from others and exist in the observations of his followers. According to Weber the legitimacy of this charisma depends on the recognition of followers. Thus the leader will prove the charismatic trait with roles, actions and so on to maintain the charismatic label (Zaid et al., 2021).

Legal authority, on the other hand, is the right of individuals who have a position and authority in writing, documents, letters of agreement, appointments, etc. that have a solid basis to defend that authority. However, the owner is still governed by a pattern of rules and norms that have been set in his position. Compliance with this authority is bound by rules that are not influenced by individuals but by those occupying a position given this authority (Weber; 1968). This form of authority is usually found in people who hold positions in departments, government institutions and so on.

3. Discussions

Undoubtedly there are various dimensions to looking at the role of leadership. This study will highlight some of the roles of political leadership that are considered more dominant. The role of political leadership begins to exist when there is an attempt to influence the behavior of individuals or groups. In this process the political leadership sometimes achieves goals that are not in line with the wishes of the party it represents. This view is justified because one of the roles of political leadership is to influence others to submit to it (Fiedler; 1967). However, the role of political leadership is not merely to influence and force others but there are other roles played by political leadership to the interests of the party or organization it represents.

The simplest role is as a figure to the party or group he represents. A common role is performed to represent the party or organization he or she leads in formal or informal related opportunities, issues and spaces. Formal nature when a leader is considered a symbol and obligated to perform tasks from the position he holds (Piege; 1977). The task includes ceremonial events involving inaugural activities or similar ceremonies. Without the presence of figures, ceremonies and ceremonies are considered bland, rigid and meaningless (Saadiah et al., 2021). While the informal nature of the figure is that it acts abstractly as an idol, model or as a teacher who is a reference, guide, example for the followers and supporters of the leader. Admiration for this figure will remain and permeate the extreme followers even if the leader is no longer in office or dead. It is different from a formal figure that is temporary in nature that is when the individual is still holding a position or as a leader.

The next role of political leadership is the role of leader. The leader will perform the process of mobilizing interaction with the people he leads by performing the main functions as a leader which is to lead, motivate, mobilize, expand and operate the party he leads (Kellerman; 1984). led by it will run systematically whether it is organized by one person or a group of people. In informal organizations usually the leader is obeyed for possessing charismatic power and physical strength but in formal organizations such as the party, the leader relies on the authority gained through the position he holds.

Political leadership also serves as an intermediary. What this type of political leader does is by interacting among colleagues (leaders) or others from outside the group or party in order to obtain new information (Piege; 1977). This is done because a party cannot stand alone to gain power, retain power or for the long term. A leader can use his government machinery for that purpose but for a long period of time it needs to get new input from outside. The aim is to organize new strategies to gain support from the people. Thus the leader makes his role as an intermediary to communicate with certain individuals or groups who are outside the group or party for the benefit of the group he leads.

4. Conclusion

The role as a decision maker is considered the most popular and fundamental in political leadership. Here leaders are involved in the strategy -making process before decisions are made. The process of strategy formulation and decision-making is a process that makes party decisions made significant and relevant. In this case the leader is authoritatively and formally allowed to engage and think of actions that are important to his group or party. Leaders act to make decisions based on their knowledge of wisdom. This decision -making process is considered the right and authority of one's leadership in exercising control over all elements of the process before reaching the decision it takes.

Acknowledgement

Conflict of Interest

Authors declare that there is no conflict of interests regarding the publication of the paper.

References

A. Rashid Rahman, 1994. The Conduct of Election in Malaysia. Kuala Lumpur: Berita Publishing.
Abdul Aziz Deraman, 2001. *Masyarakat dan Kebudayaan Malaysia: Satu Analisis Perkembangan Kebudayaan di Malaysia*. Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka.

Abdul Latiff Mohd Ibrahim, 2004. Budaya Politik Melayu Bandar: Kajian Kes Di Shah Alam: *Tesis Ijazah Doktor Falsafah.* Fakulti Sastera & Sosial Sains: Universiti Malaya.

Abdul Rahman Embong, 2002. *State-Led Modernization and the New Middle Class in Malaysia.* Palgrave: New York.

Abdul Rashid Moten, 2008. *Government and Politics in Malaysia*. Singapore: Cengage Learning Asia Pte. Ltd.

Ahmad Atory Hussain, 2009. *Politik Melayu Di Persimpangan: Suatu Analisis Pilihan Raya Umum 2008*. Kuala Lumpur: Utusan Publication & Distributors Sdn. Bhd.

Ahmad Boestaman, 1972. *Dr. Burhanuddin Putera setia Melayu raya*. Pustaka Kejora: Kuala Lumpur.

Buchanan, James M., 2003. Public Choice: Politic Without Romance: *American Economic Review.* Chamil Wariya, 1988. *UMNO era Mahathir*. Petaling Jaya: Penerbit Fajar Bakti Sdn. Bhd.

Chandra Muzaffar, 1979*. Protector? An Analysis of The Concept and Practice of Loyalty in Leader-Led Relationship Within Malay Society.* Pulau Pinang: Aliran.

Crouch, H., 1980. *Malaysian Politics and the 1978 Election*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Dorussen, H & Taylor, M., 2002*. Economic Voting*. London: Routledge.
Downs, 1957. *An Aeconomic Theory of Democracy*. New York: Harper and Row.

Gellner, E., 1977. Patron and Client. Dlm. Gellner, E. & Waterbury, J (pnyt). *Patrons and Clients in Mediterranean Societies*. London: Gerald Duckworth.

Ghazali Mayudin, 1999. *Teori Sains Politik Pilihan: Aplikasinya Dalam Konteks Malaysia.* Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia: Bangi.

Ghazali Mayudin, 2014. Demokrasi Dan Pilihan Raya Di Malaysia. Dlm. Ghazali Mahayudin, Jamaie Hamil, Sity Daud dan Zaini Othman (pnyt). *Demokrasi Kepimpinan & Keselamatan Dalam Politik Malaysia*. Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia: Bangi.

Ghazali Mayudin, Jamaie Hamil, Sity Daud & Zaini Othman, 2014. *Demokrasi Kepimpinan dan Keselamatan dalam Politik Malaysia.* Bangi: Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia.

Gullick, 1978. Sistem *Politik Bumiputera Tanah Melayu Barat*. Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka.

Han Kohn, 1967. *The Idea of Nationalism*. Collier Books: New York.

Hanapi Dollah, 1998. *Institusi Perhambaan Dalam Masyarakat Melayu Tradisional. Satu Analisa Dari Segi Teori Nilai.* Bangi: Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia.

Haron Daud, 1993. *Sejarah Melayu: Satu Kajian Daripada Aspek Persejarahan Budaya.* Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa & Pustaka.

Hasrom Hassan, 1973. Barisan Nasional: Selayang Pandang Tentang Konsep dan Perkembangannya: *Jurnal Persatuan Sejarah Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia,* hal. 89.

Inglehart, R., 1977. *The Silent Revolution: Changing Values And Political Styles Among Western Publics.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Jamaie Hamil, 2004. Budaya Politik Melayu: Kesinambungan dan Perubahan. Dlm. Sity Daud & Zarina Othman (pnyt). *Politik Dan Keselamatan.* Bangi: Penerbit Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia.

Jamaie Hamil, 2016. *UMNO dalam Politik dan Perniagaan Melayu*. Bangi: Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia.

Jamaie Hamil, Mohd Mahadee, Nidzam, Suzanna & Zaini, 2005. Budaya Politik Melayu: Kesinambungan dan Perubahan. Dlm. Sity Daud & Zarina Othman (pnyt). *Politik Dan Keselamatan*. Bangi: Universiti Kebangsaan.

James Chin, 2013. Pertandingan Tak Setanding: Hubungan Persekutuan-Negeri di Bawah Mahathir. Dlm. Ho Khai Leong & James Chin (pnyt) *Pentadbiran Mahathir: Prestasi dan Krisis dalam Pemerintahan.* Kuala Lumpur: Times Books International.

Jomo, K.S, 1988. *Pembangunan Ekonomi Dan Kelas Sosial Di Semenanjung Malaysia.* Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka.

Khoo Kay Kim, 1984. *Negeri-Negeri Melayu Pantai Barat 1850-1873: Kesan Perkembangan Dasar Terhadap Politik Melayu.* Petaling Jaya: Fajar Bakti Sdn.Bhd.

Miller, H., 1965. *The story of Malaya.* Latiuner Trend & Co. Ltd: Playmouth. Milne & Mauzy, 1999. *Malaysian Politics Under Mahathir*. London: Routledge.

Milner, A., 2016. *Kerajaan: Budaya Politik Melayu Di Ambang Pemerintahan Kolonial.* Petaling Jaya: Strategic Information & Research Development Centre.

Mohamed Anwar Omar Din, 2004. *Dinamika Bangsa Melayu: Menongkah Arus Globalisasi.* Bangi: Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia.

Mohd Ali Kamarudin, 2004. *Penaungan Dalam Kepimpinan Politik Melayu: UMNO Kelantan 1946-1990*. Bangi: Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia

Mohd Ali Kamarudin & Jamaie, 2005. Budaya Politik: Perspektif Kepimpinan Politik Melayu Daripada Tradisi Ke Kontemporari. Dlm. Maizatul HaizanMahbob & Mohamad Zain Musa (pnyt). *Tinjauan Baru Politik Malaysia*. Bangi: Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia.

Mohd Hamdan Adnan, 2008. *Perkembangan Perhubungan Awam Kerajaan dan Politik Malaysia.* Shah Alam: UPENA.

Mohd Izani, 2005*. Demokrasi Dan Dunia Islam: Perspektif Teori Dan Praktik*. Kuala Lumpur: University of Malaya Press.

Mohd Izani, 2012. Agama Dan Politik: Pendemokrasian Dan Ancaman Militan Di Malaysia. Dlm. Kamarulnizam Abdullah (pnyt). *Keselamatan Nasional Malaysia*. Bangi: Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia.

Mohd Jalaluddin, Azman Mahadi, Fuad Mat Jali & Junaidi Awang Besar, 2013. Pilihan Raya Umum Ke-13 dan Politik Baru Di Malaysia. Bangi: Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia.

Mohd Jalaluddin, Fuad Mat Jali & Junaidi Awang Besar, 2013. Model Tingkahlaku Pengundian dalam Kajian Pilihan Raya Di Malaysia: Satu Tinjauan Awal. Bangi: Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia.

Mohd Sabri Md Nor, 2016. Persaingan Politik Melayu Di Semenanjung Malaysia, 1978-2013: *Tesis Ijazah Doktor Falsafah*. Kuala Lumpur: Universiti Malaya, hal. 100.

Mohd Yusof Kassim & Azlan Ahmad, 2002. *Politik Baru Dalam Pilihan Raya Umum.*Bangi. Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia.

Muhamad Takiyuddin Ismail, 2011. *Konservatisme Dalam Politik UMNO*. Bangi: Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia.

Muhamad Takiyuddin Ismail, 2014. *Saga Neokonservatif: Abdullah Ahmad Badawi, UMNO dan Konservatif.* Bangi: Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia.

Muhamad Takiyuddin Ismail & Sity Daud, 2016. *Pilihan Raya Umum Ke-13: Kesinambungan Politik Baru, Kekentalan Politik Lama*. Sintok: Penerbit Universiti Utara Malaysia.

Muhamad Takiyuddin Ismail & Sity Daud, 2016. *Pilihan Raya Umum Ke-13: Refleksi Politik Perubahan.* Bangi: Penerbit Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia.

Muhammad Yusoff Hashim, 2008. Daulat: Satu Persepsi Sejarah dan Budaya. Dlm. *Polemik Sejarah Malaysia*. Kuala Lumpur: Arkib Negara Malaysia.

Nadzri, 2009. *Politik Malaysia di Persimpangan: Praktik Politik dalam PRU 2008 dan Kontemporari.* Petaling Jaya: SIRD.

Nadzri & Ghazali Mayuddin, 2008. *Hagemoni Dan Kontra Hagemoni: Memahami Perubahan Pilihan Raya Umum Ke-12*. Bangi: Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia.

Nazri Muslim, 2014. *Islam Dan Melayu: Tiang Seri Hubungan Etnik Di Malaysia*. Bangi: Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia.

Ness, G.D., 1969. *Bureaucracy and Rural Development in Malaysia*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Nidzam Sulaiman, 2002. Budaya Politik dalam Masyarakat Majmuk di Malaysia. Dlm. Abdul Monir Yaacob & Suzalie Mohamad (pnyt). *Etika dan Budaya Berpolitik dari Perspektif Islam.* Kuala Lumpur: IKIM.

Nidzam Sulaiman, 2005. Pemerintah dan Hagemoni Dalam Dunia Politik Melayu: Ke Arah Masyarakat yang lebih Sivil". *Seminar on Government and Civilisation: Towards a Comprehensive Understanding of Civil Society* (SOGOC) 18-19 Mei 2005. Universiti Putra Malaysia.

Nidzam Sulaiman & Zaini Othman, 2005. Pembangunan Politik Malaysia: Menjejak Perubahan Budaya Politik Melayu. Dlm. Junaenah, Norazizan, Nik Hairi & Mohd Yusof (pnyt). *Masyarakat Perubahan Dan Pembangunan*. Bangi: Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia.

Noor Sulastry & Nidzam Sulaiman, 2008. *Kedudukan Barisan Nasional Dalam Pilihan Raya Di Malaysia: Berakhirnya Era Hagemoni.* UiTM Shah Alam: UPENA.

Noor Sulastry & Nor Azila, 2013. *Transisi Kontra Hagemoni Dalam Budaya Politik Melayu Di Malaysia.* Universiti Malaya.

Noor Sulastry, 2014. *Hagemoni Budaya Politik Melayu*. Bangi: Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia.

Norazimah Zakaria, 2005. Sejarah Melayu: Sebuah Genre Sintesis Yang Baik Bagi Memenuhi Tuntutan Moral Islam dan Aspek Pengawalan Politik: *Jurnal Pengajian Melayu* (16), hal. 319-323.

Norazit Selat, 1983. Penaung Dalam Masyarakat Melayu: Tradisi dan Moden. Dlm. Mohd Taib Osman & Wan Kadir Yusoff, *Kajian Budaya dan Masyarakat di Malaysia*. Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka.

Roff, W.R., 1967. *The Origins of Malay Nationalism*. University of Malaya Press: Kuala Lumpur.

Roff, W.R., 1975. *Nasionalisme Melayu*. Kuala Lumpur: Universiti Malaya.

Rohana Yusof, 2004. *Penyelidikan Sains Sosial*. Pahang: PTS Publication & Distributors Sdn. Bhd.

Rusniyati Mahiyaddin, 2008. Pilihan Raya Ke-12: Satu Perubahan Di Malaysia:*Prosiding Seminar Politik Malaysia.* UiTM Shah Alam: UPENA.

Rustam A. Sani, 1983. Kepimpinan Dalam Perkembangan Politik Melayu Awal: Aspek Sosial. Dlm. *Isu Ekonomi, Sosial dan Politik Malaysia*. Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka, hal. 141.

Rustam A. Sani, 2000. Globalisasi, Krisis Dan Politik 1998. Dlm. Norani Othman & Sumit K. Mandal (pnyt). *Malaysia Menangani Globalisasi: Peserta atau Mangsa?.* Bangi: Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia.

Shaharuddin Maaruf, 1988. *Malay Ideas on Development*. Kuala Lumpur: Times Books International.

Shamsul Amri Baharudin, 1999. The redefinition of politics and the transformation of Malaysian pluralism: *Kertas Kerja Research Workshop on Southeast Asian Pluralism*. Shah"s Village Hotel: Petaling Jaya.

Shellabear, W. G., 1982. *Sejarah Melayu*. Kuala Lumpur: Fajar Bakti.

Sheppard, M., 1982. *Tanah Melayu yang Bersejarah*. Petaling Jaya: Eastern University Press Sdn. Bhd.

Sity Daud, 2014. Negara Dan Ideologi Pembangunan. Dlm. Ghazali Mayudin, Jamaie Hamil, Sity Daud & Zaini Othman (pnyt). *Demokrasi Kepimpinan & Keselamatan Dalam politik Malaysia.* Bangi: Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia.

Sivamurugan Pandian, 2006. *Abdullah Ahmad Badawi: Satu Tahun di Putrajaya.* Kuala Lumpur: Utusan Publications & Distributors Sdn. Bhd.

Sobri Sudin & Mohd Hafidz Hussein, 2006. *Globalisasi dan Budaya Politik di Malaysia*. Sintok: Penerbit Universiti Utara Malaysia.

Soejono Soekanto, 1981. *Memperkenal Sosiologi.* Jakarta: Rajawali Press.

Soon Chuan Yean, 2012. Persaingan Politik Moral: Satu Analisis Politik Budaya Kumpulan Seni di Malaysia. Dlm. Haris Zuan & Rizal Hamdan (pnyt). *Wacana Baru Politik Malaysia*. Petaling Jaya: SIRD.

Syed Hussin Ali, 1993. *Orang Melayu: Masalah Dan Masa Depannya*. Kuala Lumpur: Penerbitan Adabi Sdn. Bhd.

Syed Hussin Ali, 2004. *Merdeka, Rakyat & Keadilan*. Petaling Jaya: SIRD.

Syeikh Abu Muhammad Iqamudin, 2004. *Menjawab Tuduhan Liar Terhadap UMNO dan Barisan Nasional.* Batu Caves: RZ Emas Sri Selasih Sdn. Bhd.

Talib Samat, 2010. *Kenali Tokoh Berjasa.* Selangor: Pekan Ilmu Publications Sdn. Bhd.

Tweedie, 1957. *Prehistoric Malaya*. Singapore: Donald Moore.

Uma Sekaran, 2003. *Research Methods for Business: A Skills Building Approach* (4th edition). United States of America: John Willey & Sons, Inc.

Wan Abdul Rahman Latiff, 2008. Demokrasi di Malaysia: Antara Persaingan dan Perwakilan. Dlm. Ghazali Mayudin (pnyt). *Politik Malaysia: Perspektif Teori dan Praktik*. Bangi: Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia, hal. 25.

Wan Abdul Rahman Latiff, 1986. *Pilihan Raya 1986: Satu Kajian Kes di Terengganu*. Kuala Lumpur: Persatuan Sejarah Malaysia.

Zainal Abidin Wahid, 1971. *Sejarah Malaysia Sa-Pintas Lalu*. Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka.

Zaini Othman, 2008. Masyarakat Sivil Dan Pendemokrasian. Dlm. Ghazali Mayudin (pnyt) *Politik Malaysia: Perspektif Teori Dan Praktik*. Bangi: Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia.

Zakry Abadi, 1990. *BN & APU: Siapa Lebih Berkuasa.* Pulau Pinang: Edaran Ilmu Sdn. Bhd.

Zawiah & Mohammad Agus, 2012. Ketidakakuran Sivil Dan Kesannya Ke Atas Pendemokrasian Di Era Abdullah Ahmad Badawi. *Jebat,* hal. 23.

Zulkifli Sulong, 1994. *Operasi Tawan Terengganu*. Batu Caves: Penerbitan Pemuda.