

Role of the Mass Media in Malaysia's General Elections*

by:

Dr. Bukhory Hj. Ismail

Professor

**Faculty of Communication and Media Studies,
Universiti Teknologi MARA**

and

Dr. Sankaran Ramanathan

Consultant

Synopsis

Malaysia, a federation of 13 states, formerly under British rule or control has held periodic elections since its creation in 1957. As with any democracy, the media have played an important role in the pre-election build-up as well as during the two-week campaign periods. The role of the media in the political process has become even more significant in the eighties, with the increasing levels of sophistication of the electorate brought about by greater education, progress and development as well as the development, increasing sophistication and diversification of the mass media themselves.

The paper is based on a research project headed by the authors. Apart from providing a background to Malaysia's political history, it discusses the eight general elections held since 1955.

Emphasis has been given to the role of the media in the 1986 general elections and the general elections (of 1990).

* Paper presented at the XVIIth General Assembly and Scientific Conference, International Association for Mass Communication Research (IAMCR), Bled, Yugoslavia, Aug. 26-31, 1990.

Malaya and Malaysia: Background and Political History

Background

Malaysia is a federation of 13 states which were formerly either British colonies or under British protection located at the tip of Southeast Asia. The nucleus of the Federation consists of the 11 states in peninsular Malaysia (located at the tip of Southeast Asia), namely Perlis, Kedah, Kelantan, Terengganu, Pahang, Perak, Selangor, Negeri Sembilan, Penang, Melaka and Johor, which obtained independence as the Federation of Malaya in August 1957. In September 1963, the original Federation was expanded to include Singapore and the two states in Borneo (Sabah and Sarawak). However, Singapore left the Federation in mid-1965, leaving Malaysia with 13 states, viz. the 11 Peninsular Malaysia states, referred to as West Malaysia.

While Malays constitute the majority of the estimated 15 million population in Malaysia (about 52% in 1988), there are also Malaysians of Chinese origin, who constitute about 38%, and Malaysians of Indian and Sri Lankan origin, who constitute about 10% of the population. Out of the approximately 1.5 million Malaysians of Indian and Sri Lankan origin, the vast majority are of South Indian origin, with a predominance of Tamils and Telegus.

There is also a number of indigenous groups in the Borneo states, such as Kadazan, Dayak, Murut, Melanau and Penan (Table 1) *see page 69*. The term bumiputra is commonly used to denote the Malays and these indigenous groups.

The existence of so many ethnic groups has led Malaysia to be described as a plural society, with numerous societal systems and sub-systems. Nevertheless, Islam is the official religion, while Bahasa Malaysia is the official language of the country.

Economically, the country is still based on primary industries, although efforts have recently been made to diversify the economy through a heavy industrialisation programme, including development of the national car, Proton Saga. Apart from being amongst the world's leading producers of palm oil, tin and rubber, Malaysia also exports cocoa, timber, petroleum and natural gas. Though Malaysia's petroleum exports are small compared to the other countries (about 500,000 barrels per day) the country's economy may get an unexpected windfall of world oil prices continue to increase in the face of the current Middle East Crisis. Malaysia has a written constitution which is the supreme law of the country.¹ Apart from the Federal Constitution, each state also possesses its own constitution, which contains essential provisions to ensure the supremacy of the federal Government. The head of state is the Yang Di-Pertuan Agong, who is elected for a five-year term from among the hereditary rulers of the nine Malay states.

The power of government is however vested with the Prime Minister who is the leader of the party with the most number of seats in the Dewan Rakyat (House of Representatives), for which periodic elections are held every four to five years. At the state level, the power of government vests with elected Chief Ministers (in the states of Sabah, Sarawak, Melaka,

and Penang) and Menteri Besar (in the nine Malay states). Thus, Malaysia is regarded as a constitutional democracy, wherein general elections are held at both state and federal levels at periodic intervals.

There have been six general elections held in Malaysia since its formation on 31 August 1963, that is, in 1984, 1969, 1974, 1978, 1982 and 1986. Prior to this, there were two general elections in the Federation of Malaya, i.e. in 1955 and 1959. The next section briefly describes these elections.

General Elections 1955 to 1982

The electoral system adopted in the first general election in Malaya in 1955 was the same as the British 'first past the post' system, by which the candidate with the highest number of votes in each constituency is elected.²

The Alliance National Council met for the first time on 10 April 1955 to work out arrangements for the Federal Legislative Council Elections, elections which would make the Alliance the dominant political force in the country. The Alliance, which by 1955 included the United Malay National Organisation (UMNO), Malaysian Chinese Association (MCA), and Malaysian Indian Congress (MIC), showed at a number of local elections that it had enough support from all the different communities to qualify as the prospective government when the British left.

In 1955, the registered electorate was about 84 percent Malays, 11 per cent Chinese, 4 per cent Indians, and 1 per cent others. UMNO was the leading party in the Alliance. The alliance won the 1955 general election, with a landslide victory, capturing 51 of the 52 seats contested.

The electoral system adopted in 1959 was the same as in 1955, by which, in each constituency, the candidate with plurality of the votes is elected.

In the 1959 election, the Alliance proportion of votes decreased from 79.6 per cent to 51.8 per cent. It only won 74 of the 104 seats contested, with UMNO winning 52 seats, the MCA 19, and MIC 3. The Alliance obtained 70 per cent of the votes.

Conducted against the backdrop of confrontation with Indonesia over the formation of Malaysia, the 1964 election favoured the ruling parties. Apart from the Confrontation, another very significant aspect of the 1964 election was the unexpected challenge by Singapore's ruling party, the People's Action Party (PAP). It resulted in an intense Alliance-PAP conflict that ended in the separation of Singapore from Malaysia fifteen months later.

The 1969 general election has become very notable in Malaysian history for it ended up in the May Thirteenth riots. The election campaign was conducted in an atmosphere of ethnic distrust and hostility. When the election results for the Peninsular Malaysian states were announced it was clear that the Alliance had won but with a vastly-reduced majority. In the state elections, the alliance won only 162 out of a total of 282 seats and 47.95 per cent of the votes.

The May Thirteenth Incident also resulted in a declaration of a state of Emergency, the suspension of Parliament, and the imposition of rule under a National Operations Council (NOC). The first prime minister, Tunku Abdul Rahman, was replaced by his Deputy, Tun Abdul Razak, who became head of the NOC.

During the NOC period, laws were also enacted to curb the excesses of uncontrolled political competition, including amendments to the Sedition Act and the Internal Security Act. And from 1971 to 1974, the BN was able to initiate a series of moves aimed at increasing the understanding among the three races and in prompting a political compromise acceptable to all component parties. Chief among these were the New Economic Policy (NEP) and the establishment of a Department of National Unity.

The 1974 general election was restrained as compared to previous elections. The mood of the voters was cautious. The election focused primarily on personalities and on the state of the economy. Tun Abdul Razak, the second prime minister, announced that they wanted a national government drawn from all the communities, and not a Malay government. He, therefore, introduced the concept of a much-broader National Front (Barisan Nasional, (BN), whereby the three-party Alliance was expanded to include eight other parties. The 1974 general election results showed that the BN had obtained a clear mandate from the people. The 1978 general election was held almost immediately after the March 1978 Kelantan state elections in which the BN coalition managed to overthrow the opposition Parti Islam SeMalaysia (PAS) after nineteen years of PAS rule. PAS had left the BN because of basic disagreements and its return to the opposition meant that UMNO again faced the challenge of a Malay nationalist and Islamic party in competition with it for the Malay vote. UMNO's campaign during the 1978 election was on the proven record of the government in providing ethnic peace and stability in tandem with economic development. For non-Malay BN Parties like MCA, Gerakan and the MIC, they emphasised the same BN platform, stressing the government's solid achievements in terms of ethnic harmony and political stability. The election results given the BN 131 of 154 parliamentary seats with 57.6 per cent of the total valid votes, and 239 of 275 state seats, giving it control of all state governments. Only five PAS candidates won out of the 87 contesting for the parliamentary seats.

The general election of 1982 was held more than a year before the term of the Parliament elected in 1978 was due to expire. The major reasons attributed to the early election were provide a mandate for Datuk Seri Dr. Mahathir Mohamad who succeeded Datuk Hussein Onn was Prime Minister in mid-1981 and to conduct the election at a more favourable time in the light of the deteriorating state of the economy (the Malaysian economy being heavily dependent on international trade and investment was increasingly being threatened by the world recession). The victory of the BN in the 1982 election was as expected. It won 139 of the 154 parliamentary seats with 60.4 per cent of the popular vote, and 280 of 311 state seats, which also gave it control of all state assemblies. The 1982 election saw the BN recording its best performance in the Chinese-majority constituencies since the 19 election. Of the 15 parliamentary areas in which Chinese voters totalled 60 per cent or more, the BN in 1982 won 9 as compared to only 2 in 1978.

The 1986 General Election

The 1986 general election was different from the previous elections for a number of reasons. Firstly, the contest was for a greater number of seats (177 as opposed to 154 previously), based on revisions of electoral boundaries and constituencies. Secondly, it had been widely speculated that the supremacy of the ruling Barisan Nasional (BN) component parties would be strongly challenged, particularly by the opposition Democratic Action Party (DAP) and Parti Islam SeMalaysia (PAS). Thirdly, as with most developing countries, there was an increasingly greater number of franchised people, mostly younger voters, many exercising their vote for the first time. Fourthly, the BN had been wracked by internal strife as the then Deputy Prime Minister, Datuk Musa Hitam, had resigned from the Cabinet just six months before the election. Fifthly, the country's economy was in the throes of a bad recession, with no prospects of immediate recovery. Because of these factors, there was much interest, both within and outside the country, in the outcome of the 1986 general election.

In the event, the results were unexpected for many quarters, particularly PAS, which suffered a debacle, and the DAP, which won a significantly large number of seats, particularly in the urban constituencies. BN component parties therefore experienced mixed fortunes, with the United Malays National Organisation (UMNO trouncing PAS in practically every rural constituency, while the Malaysian Chinese Association (MCA) and Gerakan Rakyat Malaysia (Gerakan) lost many urban constituencies to the DAP. Six of the BN candidates were returned unopposed on nomination day.

This compared unfavourably with the 1982 election, when eight BN candidates were returned unopposed, and did not seem to augur well for the BN, considering the greater number of seats at stake in the 1986 election. Further, initial results announced in the late hours of 3rd August pointed to strong opposition showing.

However, just before dawn on 4th August 1986, the BN had secured the crucial two-thirds majority and TV3, the private television channel, was playing the song "Barisan Telah Berjaya" (Barisan's victorious), a song which was to be repeated at least five times in the course of the morning as the BN swept to victory in state after state. By six-thirty that morning, it was clear that the BN had achieved an unexpected and unprecedented victory, particularly in the predominantly-Malay states, where PAS had been convincingly trounced.

In the final tally, the BN won 148 seats, the DAP 24, independents 4, and PAS only 1 seat in the parliamentary election (see Table 2). In the state elections, the BN won all the seats in Perlis, all but one in Johore and Pahang, and all but two in Terengganu. In Kedah, Melaka, Negeri Sembilan, and Selangor, it obtained 85 per cent or more of the seats contested. It lost 10 seats to PAS in Kelantan, and 10 in Penang and 13 in Perak to the DAP. In spite of this, it had more than a two-thirds majority in all these states (see Table 3). The BN won 299 of the 351 seats in all the state assemblies (85.2 per cent).

The BN's supremacy in seats was, however, not reflected in the percentage of the votes obtained. In 1982, the BN had obtained 80.4 percent of the votes cast, whereas its percentage of votes fell to 55.82 in the 1986 election. Further, both the DAP and PAS improved on

their share of the votes cast, with the DAP obtaining 20.4 percent as compared to 19.57 percent previously and PAS obtaining 15 percent (14.46 percent in 1982) as Table 4 indicates. *see page 78*

Role of the Mass Media in the Electoral Process

Studies on the Electoral Process

As periodic elections constitute a vital ingredient in the practice of all democracies, the electoral process is a subject of study in all those countries which subscribe to the democratic tradition. Jennings and Ziegler have, for example, emphasized the importance of ethnic politics, the influence of the mass media, and other issues influencing the results of congressional elections in the United States.³

In presenting a framework for analysing citizen voting behaviour, Asher has discussed party identification, issues and candidates, mass media campaign, financing of campaigns and other issues affecting the outcome of presidential elections in the United States from 1964 to 1976.⁴

The close relationship between coalition strategies and citizen choice in determining the outcome of elections has been emphasized by Kessel, who criticises electoral studies which rely completely on voting data and do not undertake voter surveys to gauge the perceptions and attitudes of voters.⁵ According to him, the level of citizens' knowledge about candidates and issues, influence of the mass media, and party identification are important variables in determining the outcome of elections.

Perhaps the classic study of voter perceptions and attitudes influencing his choice was undertaken by Lazarsfeld, Berelson, and Gaudet who surveyed 3,000 respondents in Erie County, Ohio in 1944. The respondents were purposively selected in order to represent as closely as possible the population of the United States as a whole.⁶ Although the authors had initially set out to determine the role of the mass media, they found that there was a great deal of person-to-person interaction, particularly during the critical campaign months. They found that the personal influence of opinion leaders was important in helping the people to make up their minds during campaign periods. In addition, local issues were as equally important as national issues and the characteristics of the candidates contesting the elections.

In studying the British general election of 1983, Butler and Kavanagh found that party share of news for the Conservative and Labour parties was almost equal while the newspaper coverage reflected the familiar tripartite 'division', that is, working-class tabloids, social tabloids, and quality papers.⁷ They concluded that:

Each of the three main parties could take consolation in some positive aspects of the campaign. The conservative won in spite of the unemployment figures and in spite of the availability of a new non-Labour electoral alternative. Labour... still managed, despite its poor campaign, to hold off the Alliance and to gain 8 1/2 million votes. The Alliance... steady-

ly improved its popular standing on the major issues... The scant reward in seats dramatised the distortions of the first-past-the-post electoral system. (p.272).

These studies indicate that communicators interested in politics should not only comment about election results, but also find out why people voted the way they did, particularly in instances where the election results are contrary to those generally expected or forecast.

Mass Media and the Electoral Process in Malaysia.

Since Malaysia is a newly-emergent democracy just 43 years old, it is not clear to what extent the mass media influence the perceptions and choice of voters in general elections. This is particularly so since the means of measuring, evaluating and predicting public opinion are not as sophisticated as those which operate in Western countries, such as the Gallup and Roper polls.

Nevertheless, the generally-held belief is that government control of the mass media gives incumbent political parties undue advantage influencing voter perceptions and choice during general elections.⁸

For example, officials of the opposition Parti Islam SeMalaysia (PAS), which was soundly trounced in Malaysia's 1986 general election, minced no words in regarding the mass media as the "devils mouthpiece" and alleging that the mass media greatly contributed to PAS fiasco. Nevertheless, only 4.3% of 1000 respondents surveyed in 1986 stated that the PAS defeat was due to the alleged ruling parties manipulation and control of the mass media.⁹

The 1986 survey (undertaken by a group of lecturers and 15 students from the MARA Institute of Technology) also indicated that the rural electorate was not influenced by the extensive grassroots campaign launched by PAS in the Malay-majority states. This campaign mainly consisted of ceramahs (politics-religious meetings in the forms of dialogue sessions, usually held in common meeting places such as mosques, suraus (smaller prayer houses) and houses of prominent persons, as public rallies were (and still are) banned. The public response to PAS-organised gatherings had been overwhelming, with thousand of voters turning up to hear PAS leaders attack the UMNO-led government -its un-Islamic policies, its cooperation with non-Muslims, its purported weaknesses and alleged corruption.

Audio cassettes of speeches by PAS leaders were found in almost every kampung in the rural Malay states. Its posters, banners and flags had vastly outnumbered those of the BN. Hence, although the BN had control of the mass media, especially the government-controlled electronic media, the PAS tried to counter-balance this through interpersonal channels of communication, such as the ceramahs, use of cassettes, posters, flags, banners etc. and also through house-to-house campaigns.

Why then did PAS lose (and lose so badly) in the rural areas? Many observers believed that PAS had been killed by its own hand by having strategies that contradicted what it preached. The main strategy (which seemed to have failed) was its attempt to align itself with other opposition non-Muslim parties and groups in an opposition front. The BN-controlled mass media had a field day denouncing the "unholy alliance" and also in giving

wide coverage to the negotiations and bickerings between the parties in the abortive opposition front.

Other reasons for the PAS defeat are:-

- i. PAS went overboard with Islamic religious issues, with its over emphasis on morality, its call for a fundamentalist Islamic legal system, its opposition to pop music and culture and with the dominance of theologians leading the party:
- ii. It spread itself too thinly, hence not concentrating on its strongholds and venturing into constituencies where there were only slim chances of winning. For example, PAS leaders spent two days out of the 10-day campaign period in Sabah.
- iii. The record of the BN's developmental successes, particularly in terms of bringing development to the rural areas.

It must be reiterated that the rural Malay electorate, particularly in Kelantan and Terengganu, has matured considerably since the first two decades of independence, when PAS exercised considerable political clout. Developments brought about by the ruling BN plus the prospects of new economic wealth as well as higher levels of education have influenced the people's choice in subsequent elections. Hence, neither the ruling BNs control of the mass media nor the intensive use of interpersonal channels of communication by PAS during the 1986 elections seemed to have influenced the rural electorate in their choice; they seem to have made up their minds based on issues and personalities.

With regard to the urban electorate, the BNs control of the mass media seems to have worked against its interests. Traditionally, the urban electorate is made up mainly of non-Malay voters located in and around the major cities and towns in Malaysia, such as Kuala Lumpur, Penang, Ipoh and Johore Bahru. Hence, they are considered as opposition strongholds, having in fact largely remained as such since the first general election.

Hence, the election battle has usually been between the non-Malay parties in the BN (MCA, Gerakan and MIC) and the opposition Democratic Action party (DAP). Although other minor parties such as the Socialist People's Party (Parti Sosialis Rakyat Malaysia, PSRM) and the Social Democratic Party (SDP) have stepped into the fray from time to time, they have not proved effective, as the 1986 election results indicate (Table 2).

In the 1986 election, the urban Malaysian electorate voted for a stronger opposition. Hence the DAP more than doubled the number of federal seats, from the previous 10 to 24, which gave it more seats than the MCA and Gerakan combined. The DAP's performance was its best ever in Malaysia elections history, for it obtained 20.39 per cent of the votes cast and emerged: as the undisputed champion of Malaysia's urban Chinese.¹⁰

Major Developments in Malaysia 1986-90

Despite having obtained a strong mandate from the voters in the 1986 election, the BN has had to cope with a number of political problems chief among which was the split in UMNO which came out in the open during UMNO's party elections in April 1987. There were two camps, one led by Mahathir Mohamad and his deputy, Ghaffar Baba (known as Camp A) and the other led by former finance minister, Tengku Razaleigh Hamzah and former deputy prime minister, Musa Hitam (known as Camp B). The victory of Camp A candidates led to a purge of Camp B candidates from ministerial and key party posts and to the subsequent court battles, which in turn led to the deregistration of the old UMNO. Currently, former members of the old UMNO have reorganised themselves into two parties, the "new" UMNO and a party called Semangat 46 (Spirit of 1946, the founding date of the old UMNO).

Led by Tengku Razaleigh Hamzah (Musa Hitam has joined the "new" UMNO), the Semangat 46 has aligned itself with opposition parties principally the DAP and PAS and has made public its intentions to contest as many seats as possible in the next general election. While most observers feel that it will not win enough seats to form the next government, they rate its chances of winning in Kelantan (Razaleigh's home state) as quite good. Hence, the split within the old UMNO, its deregistration and its replacement by two parties have resulted in a weakening of Malay political unity.

Another area of concern for all parties in the ruling coalition had been the state of the country's economy. The effects of the recession in 1986 continued to be felt for most of the following year. However, the economy began to pick up in 1988 and continued to do so in 1989, as a result of which the current economic situation is very good. (Growth rate of the first quarter of 1990 was 11%, so level which the country had not achieved since 1980). Even the Proton Saga project, which had been criticised at its inception by many quarters (and had been used by the opposition as an election issue in 1986), has proved to be a profitable venture. The same applies to the Penang bridge project, other heavy industrialisation projects and the various moves towards privatisation. Hence, Malaysia is regarded by many as having obtained the status of an NIC (Newly Industrialised Country), a recognition which the Prime Minister does not want so soon (The New Straits Times, Aug. 21, 1990, p.2). The Prime Minister was elaborating his earlier statement that Malaysia is ranked fifth among the developing countries.

Another development is a more liberal attitude on the government's part in areas and subjects where it had previously exercised control. This includes a greater tolerance of opposition criticism, to the extent that applications by opposition parties to publish their own newspapers have been approved, resulting in the appearance of Harakah, the PAS publication. Further, although a considerable number of opposition politicians (including DAP leader, Lim Kit Siang) were detained under the Internal Security Act following the Operation Lalang (in Oct. 1987), almost all have been released. There are now very few people (less than 50 according to government figures) under preventive detention. Because of these developments, the currently prevalent mood of the people seems to indicate that

the ruling coalition (the BN) and particularly the Prime Minister, Datuk Seri Dr. Mahathir Mohamed have performed well over the past four years despite the numerous problems that they have had to overcome.

The Current Election Fever in Malaysia

Although the term of office of the present government headed by Malaysia's fourth Prime Minister, Datuk Seri Dr. Mahathir Mohamed, is not due to expire until August 1991, Malaysia is currently in the grip of a strong election fever. There is speculation that the next general election is just around the corner, with the mass media and political parties being involved in a guessing game about the exact date.

Part of the reason for this guessing game stems from the pronouncements of the Prime Minister himself. He had suffered a heart attack and undergone coronary by-pass surgery two years ago and has hinted that he would like to see a clear line of succession established soon. Another reason is the buoyant state of the country's economy, as mentioned earlier. A third reason is the desire of the new UMNO, to deal with the challenge posed by Semangat 46 as quickly as possible.

While it is doubtful that the political supremacy of the BN may be eroded to the extent that it will lose its comfortable majority in Parliament, it may be possible that the BN may lose some ground, particularly in the state of Kelantan.

With regard to the role of the mass media in the electoral process, there is sufficient cause to believe that the Malaysian electorate is not easily influenced by what they see, hear or read in the mass media. Neither do they seem to be influenced by intense interpersonal appeals launched especially by opposition parties during the election campaign periods. They seem to make up their minds based upon campaign issues and personalities contesting in the elections. This finding, however, has to be further substantiated through a follow-up study on the role of the mass media in Malaysia's forthcoming general election.

TABLE 1 POPULATION ESTIMATES BY ETHNIC GROUPS IN MALAYSIA

		YEARS					
		1980		1985		1990	
		000	%	000	%	000	%
Peninsular Malaysia	Malays & Other Bumiputera	6,324.4	55.1	7,325.6	56.5	8,493.0	58.1
	Chinese	3,894.3	33.9	4,248.4	32.8	4,579.2	31.4
	Indian	1,178.9	10.3	1,311.9	10.1	1,441.1	9.9
	Others	75.4	0.7	82.9	0.6	91.9	0.6
	Sub-Total:	11,473.0	100.0	12,968.8	100.0	14,605.2	100.0
Sabah	Bumiputera	874.6	82.9	1,077.0	84.2	1,299.0	85.3
	Chinese	171.1	16.2	191.0	14.9	209.7	13.8
	Indian	5.9	0.6	7.2	0.6	8.6	0.6
	Others	3.5	0.3	4.3	0.3	5.1	0.3
	Sub-Total:	1,055.1	100.0	1,279.5	100.0	1,522.4	100.0
Sarawak	Bumiputera	939.8	69.6	1,080.0	70.1	1,242.2	70.9
	Chinese	394.7	29.2	442.9	28.7	490.4	27.9
	Indian	3.4	0.2	4.0	0.2	4.6	0.2
	Others	13.2	1.0	15.1	1.0	17.4	2.0
	TOTAL	13,879.2		15,791.1		17,877.2	

Source: *Fifth Malaysia Plan, 1986-90, National Printing Dept. Kuala Lumpur, 1986, p. 129.*

TABLE 2 THE FEDERAL (PARLIAMENTARY) ELECTION

Party	Number of Candidates	Seats Won	
		No.	%
Barisan Nasional			
UMNO	84	83	98.8
MCA	32	17	53.1
MIC	6	6	100.0
GERAKAN	9	5	55.6
HAMIM	2	1	50.0
PBB	8	8	100.0
PBDS	5	5	100.0
SNAP	5	4	80.0
SUPP	7	4	57.1
USNO	6	5	83.3
PBS	14	10	71.4
Sub-Total:	178	148	83.6
Opposition Parties			
PAS	99	1	1.0
DAP	64	24	37.5
SDP	19	—	0
BERJAYA	8	—	0
PSRM	4	—	0
NASMA	4	—	0
MOMOGAM	2	—	0
PLUS	2	—	0
Sub-Total:	253	29	16.4
TOTAL	431	177	100.0

TABLE 3 RESULTS OF STATE ELECTIONS

State	Total Seats	Seats Won			
		Barisan		Opposition	
		No.	%	No.	%
Johore	36	35	97.2	1	2.8
Kedah	28	25	89.3	3	10.7
Kelantan	39	29	74.4	10	25.6
Melaka	20	17	85.5	3	15.0
Negeri Sembilan	28	24	85.7	4	14.3
Pahang	33	32	97.7	1	3.0
Penang	33	23	70.0	10	30.0
Perak	46	33	71.8	13	28.2
Perlis	14	14	100.0	0	0.0
Selangor	42	37	88.1	5	11.9
Terengganu	32	30	93.8	2	6.2
TOTAL:	351	299	85.2	52	14.8

Note: The DAP won 37 and PAS 15 of the opposition seats. PAS's best showing was in Kelantan where it won all 10 opposition seats in Penang and all 13 in Perak.

TABLE 4 VOTES OBTAINED BY VARIOUS PARTIES CONTESTING IN THE 1986 PARLIAMENTARY ELECTION

	Votes Obtained	
	No.	%
UMNO	1,474,063	31.06
MCA	589,289	12.42
MIC	104,701	2.21
GERAKAN	149,644	3.15
HAMIM	29,943	0.63
PBB	48,367	1.02
PBDS	24,822	0.52
SNAP	34,221	0.72
SUPP	93,018	1.96
USNO	27,409	0.58
PBS	73,786	1.55
Sub-Total:	2,649,263	55.82
Opposition Parties and Independents:		
PAS	718,891	15.15
DAP	968,009	20.39
SDP	45,400	0.96
BERJAYA	20,360	0.43
PSRM	59,156	1.25
NASMA	10,228	0.22
MOMOGAM	584	0.01
PLUS	967	0.02
Independent	146,903	3.09
Sub-Total:	1,970,498	41.52
TOTAL	4,619,761	97.34
Spoiled Votes	126,236	2.66
GRAND TOTAL	4,745,996	100.00

Notes

David Butler and Dennis Kavenagh. **The British General Election of 1983**, London; Macmillan, 1984.

Elections: **A New Equation**,. Asiaweek, Hongkong, 17th Aug.1986, p. 35.

Herbert Asher. **Presidential Elections and American Politics (rev.ed.)**, Homewood, Ill. The Dorsey Press, 1980.

John Kessel. **Presidential Campaign Politics**, Homewood, Ill: The Dorsey Press, 1980.

L. Kent Jennings and Harmon Ziegler. **The Electoral Process**, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1966.

Paul Lazarsfeld, Bernard Berelson and Hazel Gaudet, **The People's Choice**, 3rd Ed., New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 1960.

Sankaran Ramanathan and Mohd. Hamdan Adnan, **Malaysia's 1986 General Election: The Urban-Rural Dictionary**, Singapore: Institut of Southeast Asian Studies, 1988.

Sankaran Ramanathan and Mohd Hamdan Adnan (Principal Researchers), **Public Opinion Survey of Perceptions and Attitudes of Voters in the States of Kelantan and Terengganu Affecting the General Elections of August 1986**. Research Report prepared for the New Straits Times Press Sdn. Bhd. (unpub.), School of Mass Communication, MARA Institute of Technology, Shah Alam, December 1986.

Sankaran Ramanathan, **Planning Information Kits for Special Information Campaigns**,. **Media Asia**, Vol. 17, No.2, Singapore: Asian Mass Communicaiton Research & Information Centre (AMIC),1990, pp. 98-103.

