URBAN ETHNIC INTER-RELATIONS :

A Case Study in Kuala Lumpur and Petaling Jaya

Wong Leh Hoon

No. Metrik 039821

Latihan Ilmiah

Bagi Memenuhi Sebahagian

Daripada Syarat-syarat Untuk

Ijazah Sarjana Muda Sastera

JABATAN ANTROPOLOGI DAN SOSIOLOGI

UNIVERSITI MALAYA

KUALA LUMPUR

Sesi 1983

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am deeply indebted to Dr. Raymond Lee, my thesis mentor, for his able direction in the study, patient supervision, friendly encouragement, and helpful advice in this case study which involves coding of the data, keypunching of the computer cards, and the analysis, presentation, and interpretation of the data based on the computer print-out prepared by Dr. Lee. I owe special gratitude to the final year undergraduates in the Department of Anthropology and Sociology, University Malaya, of the sessions 1981/82 and 1982/83 , who carried out the survey of this case study. I am also especially grateful to my friends for their sympathetic concern and encouragement throughout the study, who have been a source of moral support, each in his or her own way.

Wong Leh Hoon

University Malaya

January 1984

SINOPSIS

Tajik latihan ilmiah ini ialah "Urban Ethnic Inter-relations: A Case Study in Kuala Lumpur and Petaling Jaya". Ia merupakan satu kajian 'exploratory' ke atas perhubungan ethnik di kawasan bandar melalui penyelidikan terhadap 'social network' para responden yang terdiri dari berbilang kaum.

Penulisan kajian ini telah dibahagikan kepada lima bab, mengikut aspek-aspek tertentu. Dalam bab I, penulis telah menghuraikan bidang dan tujuan kajian. Selain daripada itu penulis juga membincangkan had-had pengkajian ini dan ciri-ciri tertentu responden-responden kajian ini.

Bab II merupakan satu peninjauan sejarah ringkas terhadap perkembangan masyarakat majmuk di Malaysia dan perubahan-perubahan yang terdapat dalam perhubungan ethnik. Bab III dan IV adalah berkaitan dengan perbincangan terhadap perhubungan ethnik di bandar dalam konteks persatuan-persatuan sosial, organisasi-organisasi politik dan agama, tempat bekerja dan juga dalam konteks persahabatan. Angkubah-angkubah yang dianggap mempunyai pengaruh terhadap perhubungan ethnik juga dianalisa.

Kajian ini telah menunjukkan bahawa kumpulan-kumpulan ethnik di bandar kurang berinteraksi pada peringkat 'primary', malahan tidak begitu memuaskan pada peringkat 'secondary'. Penyusunan anggota masyarakat lebih berdasarkan faktor ethnik walaupun terdapat tanda-tanda

tertenu yang menunjukkan kemungkinan pembentukan masyarakat kelas.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

iii

This thesis is ... concerned with studying patterns of ethnic relations in urban Malaysian society, and more specifically to ascertain to what extent the urbanisation affected ethnic interaction. The purpose is to present an analysis of the current impact of urbanisation on the prevailing pattern of cultural pluralism and social class formation. The contemporary position of race relations in urban ... be ... is undergoing changes. Through an examination of ethnic interaction, ... way to ascertain whether urban multi-ethnic Malaysian society is moving towards a point of convergence whereby class ... are ... formed across racial or ethnic lines, or towards ... cleavages.

An 'ethnic group' has been defined by Abner Cohen[1] as "a collectivity of ... who share some patterns of normative behaviour and form a part of a larger population, interacting with people from other collectivities within the framework of a social system". On the other hand, Abner Cohen also defined 'ethnicity' as "the conformity by members of the collectivity to the shared norms in the course of social interaction". As ethnicity is essentially a form of interaction among different cultural groups in a society, this phenomenon is evident in the multi-ethnic urban society of Malaysia. It has been said that the major social cleavages in industrial towns run along racial lines

- 1 -

I

INTRODUCTION

This thesis is concerned essentially with studying patterns of ethnic relations in urban Malaysian society, and more specifically to ascertain to what degree has urbanization affected ethnic interaction. The purpose is to present an analysis of the current impact of urbanization on the evolving pattern of cultural pluralism and social class formation. The contemporary position of race relations in urban Malaysian society is undergoing changes. Through an examination of ethnic interaction, I try to ascertain whether urban multi-ethnic Malaysian society is moving towards a point of convergence whereby class society is formed across racial or ethnic lines, or towards widening ethnic cleavages.

An 'ethnic group' has been defined by Abner Cohen [1] as "a collectivity of people who share some patterns of normative behaviour and form a part of a larger population, interacting with people from other collectivities within the framework of a social system". On the other hand, Abner Cohen also defined 'ethnicity' as "the conformity by members of the collectivity to the shared norms in the course of social interaction". As ethnicity is essentially a form of interaction among different cultural groups in a society, this phenomenon is evident in the multi-ethnic urban society of Malaysia. It has been said that the major social cleavages in industrial towns run along racial lines

most of the time.

As no ethnic boundary can remain static throughout history or for every situation, it is feasible for ethnic communities to lose their distinct cultural identities in varying degrees. At the same time, these ethnic categories would transform into status or class categories. Status categories determine the differential access to the various forms of political and economic resources and power. Changes in the nature of ethnicity may be rendered inevitable as existing ethnic forms might get in the way of success. Thus the old ethnic forms may be adapted or rejected by those members of ethnic groupswho value success more than traditions. Thus a change in the social system, especially the economic system, can be said to have entailed a change in the ethnic system. Ethnicity is dynamic in nature primarily because human psyche is flexible and is an open system which undergoes constant modification through continual socialization under changing cultural and economic conditions.

Urban living with its division of labour gives rise to the element of interdependence or mutual dependency regardless of ethnic affiliation. There is always a need to ally in common causes and to co-operate in pursuing common objectives. So contacts may become established across ethnic lines. However, members of different ethnic groups could establish such contacts without relaxing their personal reserve. But it may be feasible that ethnic loyalties is gradually replaced by class loyalties, the dividing line between the ethnic groups changes from a horizontal line to a slanted one and eventually

- 2 -

to a vertical one. People would then associate on a class basis and ethnic differences are gradually minimized. Members of the privileged classes regardless of ethnic origin may become so similar that they identify with one another. Thus in the long run, this would work towards dissolution of ethnicity as a factor of social cohesiveness.

On the other hand, a complex urban system of social and economic stratification may prevent different ethnic groups from interacting except for a limited number of purposes, for instance, at work. There would be ethnic groups living in the same area, but to a large extent, from separate communities, resulting in cultural pluralism. There is a high degree of such possibility especially in a society where class cleavages coincides with ethnic groupings. Then, the cultural differences between different ethnic groups will become entrenched, consolidated and strengthened in order to articulate the struggle between the social groups across the new class lines. Old customs will tend to persist and social stratification based on ethnic origin will persist.

The idea of social network is employed here as a means to understand the inter-ethnic behaviour in the complex urban society. The basic premise is that structure in social relationships can be fruitfully operationalized in terms of networks. The aim is to examine features of the acquaintance network that exist within the urban multi-ethnic population.

As according to Granovetter [2], the social network paradigm is especially suited to bridge micro and macro levels of social phenomena. The micro level is the everyday, interpersonal networks of acquaintance, friendships and contacts which provide the means by which individual behaviour is routinized and collected into large social patterns, that is, at the macro level. Granovetter noted that variation in the strength of interpersonal acquaintance can be related to large-scale social processes such as social mobility; political, social and economic organizations. So, here the concept of network is used to make concrete the notion of structure or pattern in social relation.

Network analysis is also believed to be a convenient and effective way of penetrating to the heart of various social orders and social actions because to explain adequately the behaviour of real people and the patterns and forms of these behaviours entails examinations of other influences besides those of custom, coercion and the moral order. Individuals in the society decide their course of action not on the basis of the accepted and sanctioned norms of behaviour, but on the basis of what they think is best for their interests.

In this study, the point of orientation of a social network or 'anchorage' is examined to trace who are the acquaintance of individuals from the various ethnic groups. The extent of which links in the network existing among these individuals actually exists, or in another word, the 'density' of the network, is also examined. Besides this, the individual behaviour vis-a-vis one another is perceived in

4

terms of the characteristics of the interactional process itself.

Here, the 'content' and 'frequency' of the interaction is examined.
This content may be, among other possibilities, kinship obligation,
economic assistance, friendship or religious cooperation. 'Frequency'
here refers to the regularity of contact among people in a network.
It is a significant factor in interpreting social behaviour.

Basically this network analysis focuses on the process of
interaction among the members from different ethnic groups in the
social context, or, the dynamic lines of linkages between these
individuals. This network study is assumed to be able to shed some
lights on the impact of urbanization on the formation of ethnic
interaction pattern.

METHODOLOGY

Data collection for this research project involved only
one method, namely survey. The unit of analysis is the individual
urban residents. Only a small sample of the total population
residing in the areas interviewed is taken as it is not feasible to
study the entire population.

The questionaire consists of questions on biosocial status
of the respondents as well as their social relationships. Respondents
are chosen on the non-random basis. That is to say, the sample
selection is done on a spur-on-the-moment basis, from door to door,
taking advantage of available respondents without the statistical

complexity of a probability sample.

The survey was carried out by students from Jabatan
Antropologi dan Sosiologi, Universiti Malaya in the year 1981 and 1982.
The interviews were conducted either in English, Cantonese or Bahasa
Malaysia. The interviewers went to the respondents' homes during the
morning between nine and eleven o'clock. The information gathered
from the survey was then coded for computer analysis.

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

Since the probability of selecting an interviewee is not
known, this study does not claim in any way that the sample is
representative of the larger population. Whatever generalizations
made, they are limited to the specific sample studied.

As the sample population is picked on a non-random basis, it
does not reflect the actual proportional components of the multi-ethnic
urban society comprising of Malays, Chinese, Indians and 'Others'.

This study does not claim to have achieved absolute validity.
Not all answers are considered to be genuine for many respondents were
suspicious of the interviewers, especially those from the upper-class
areas because of the fear of crime. Besides, the Chinese and Indians
respondents were found to be less open than their Malay counterparts.

As the interviewing of the respondents was carried out
during the morning from nine to eleven o'clock, a time when most

household heads are normally out at work, therefore, an overwhelming proportion of the sample population is comprised of housewives, thus further limiting the representativeness of the sample.

SAMPLE CHARACTERISTICS

The survey sample consists of 414 respondents from urban residential areas in Kuala Lumpur and Petaling Jaya, namely, Pantai Hill, Section 16, Taman Tun Doktor Ismail, Kawasan Melayu Lama, Kampung Kerinchi, Kampung Pantai and Kampung Sentosa. Pantai Hill and Section 16 are considered middle to upper-class areas, and Taman Tun Doktor Ismail and Kawasan Melayu Lama as middle to lower-middle-class areas. Kampung Sentosa, Kampung Kerinchi and Kampung Pantai Dalam are lower-class areas where the working class as well as the squatters live.

The distribution of the respondents, according to sex from each area, is shown in Table 1 below. 267 of the respondents were females which equals to 64.7 per cent of the total number of respondents interviewed. 146 of the respondents were males consisting 35.3 per cent of the total number of respondents. The overwhelming number of female respondents could be due to the fact that the survey was done during the working hours when the males were out working and only the housewives were home at the time the survey was conducted.

Table 1 : Place of Interview and Sex of Respondents (in percentage)

PLACE OF INTERVIEW		SEX (PER CENT)	
		Female	Male
Middle to upper-middle-class	Pantai Hill Section 16	15.3	14.4
Middle to lower-middle-class	Taman Tun Doktor Ismail Kawasan Melayu Lama	21.7	29.5
Lower-class (squatters and working class	Kampung Kerinchi Kampung Sentosa Kampung Pantai Dalam	63.0	56.2
	N = 414	64.7	35.3

        The distribution of the sample respondents in the various areas
according to the ethnic origin of the respondents is shown in Table 2.
The Malays are mainly from the lower-class areas, that is, from
Kampung Sentosa, Kampung Kerinchi and Kampung Pantai Dalam. These
places are noted for the number of rural Malay in-immigrants who 'squat'
in these urban Kampungs. 71.3 per cent of the Malays live in these
lower-class areas, and 20.6 per cent of them live in the middle to
lower-middle-class areas. The Chinese live mostly in the lower-middle
to upper-middle-class areas and only 16.7 per cent of them live in the
lower-class areas. This pattern applies too to the Indians with 25
per cent of them living in the lower-class areas. The respondents of
other minority origins were mostly found in the middle to upper-middle-
class areas, that is a total of 66.6 per cent; as opposed to Kampung

Kerinchi and Kampung Pantai Dalam where all the respondents were of
Malay origin with an exception of one respondent. Of the total
number of respondents, 80 per cent of them are Malays, 13 per cent
are Chinese, 4.8 per cent are Indians and only 2.2 per cent are of
'Others' ethnic origin.

Table 2 : Ethnicity of Respondents (in percentage)

Place of Interview	Malay	Chinese	Indian	Others	Total
Middle to upper-middle-class	8.1	38.9	40.0	66.6	24.4
Middle to lower-middle-class	20.6	44.4	35.0	22.2	23.5
Lower-class	71.3	16.7	25.0	11.1	52.1
Total (%)	80.0	13.0	4.8	2.2	100

The sample population has a small proportion of old people
(6.1 per cent), and of those who are below twenty years old (5.6 per
cent). 67 per cent of the respondents are in the age groups of
twenty-one to forty years old, and 12.9 per cent are of forty-one to
fifty years old age group as shown in Table 3.

Table 3 : Age Groups of Respondents (in percentage)

Age Groups	Count	Percentage
10-20	23	5.6
21-30	144	35.0
31-40	132	32.0
41-50	53	12.9
51-60	35	8.5
60 +	25	6.1
Total	414	100

Of the total 414 respondents, 261 or 63 per cent received education not higher than primary school and/or lower secondary school level. Only 23.1 per cent of them received higher school education or attended university. As shown in Table 4, the less educated respondents are found mostly in the lower-class areas, whereas those who received colleges or university level of education are predominantly from the lower-middle to upper-middle-class areas.

Table 4 : Place of Interview by Education (in perncentage)

	None	Religious	Primary	LCE	MCE	HSC	College	University
Middle to Upper-mid.	12.6	0	3.1	10.6	26.2	25	47.4	31.6
Middle to Lower-mid.	25	0	12.6	21.2	32.2	33.3	42.1	52.7
Lower	77.7	100	84.3	68.2	41.7	41.7	10.6	15.8
Total	7.7	1	38.4	15.9	20.3	2.9	4.6	9.2

The occupational features of the respondents according to the different areas are shown in Table 5. 75.6 per cent of the professionals are found in the middle to lower-middle-class areas. These professionals include accountants, doctors, managers, lecturers, teachers, bankers, pilots, engineers and company directors. They encompass 10 per cent of the 414 respondents.

The white collar job holders consists of 8.3 per cent of the total sample population. They are found mainly in the middle to lower-middle-class areas. They are reporters, staff nurses, accounts clerks, personnel assistants, reservation clerks and typists. They represent the second largest group among the working respondents.

The hawkers, shopkeepers, businessmen, salesmen, housing developers are categorized as 'traders', making up a total of 6.6 per cent of the total sample population only. 62.9 per cent of them

live in the lower-class areas.

The hospital attendants, drivers, technicians, hair-
dressers, cooks, factory workers, mechanics and, police and armed forces
are grouped under blue collar job holders. The majority of them,
that is 84.7 per cent live in the lower-class areas. They form the
largest group among the working respondents.

Those who fall under the labourer category are the
construction workers, and public service workers, consisting of 5.6 per
cent of the total sample population and 95.6 per cent of them live in
the lower-class areas.

4.6 per cent or 19 of the respondents are students and only
two respondents or 0.5 per cent are unemployed. 43.1 per cent are
housewives and 5.4 per cent are retired.

Table 5 : Occupational Features of Respondents (in percentage)

	Pro.	W-C	Tra.	B-C	Lab.	Stu.	H-W	U-E	Ret.
Mid. to upper-mid.	14.7	17.6	11.1	3.1	0	31.6	16.3	0	37.5
Mid. to lower-mid	75.6	35.3	25.9	12.3	4.3	5.3	17.6	50	47.5
Lower	9.7	47.1	62.9	84.7	95.6	63.2	66.1	50	15.0
Total	10.0	8.3	6.6	15.8	5.6	4.6	43.1	0.5	5.4

Pro. = Professional; W-C = White collar; Tra. = Traders; B-C = Blue
collar; Lab. = Labourer; Stu. = Students; H-W = Housewives;
U-E = Unemployed; Ret. = Retired

Footnote

1. Cohen, Abner, (ed), Urban Ethnicity, London : Tavistock Publications, 1974, (ix - x).

2. Granovetter, Mark, "The Strength of Weak Ties" in Social Network: A Developing Paradigm, Leinherdt, Samuel (ed), New York : Academic Press, 1977.

HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF ETHNIC RELATIONS IN MALAYSIA

Before discussing the present pattern of ethnic relations in urban Kuala Lumpur and Petaling Jaya, it is necessary to examine the background of the Malaysian society itself. To understand the pattern of interactions in multi-ethnic urban settings, it is essential to view it within the social structure of the whole Malaysian society. For every social situation has its historical roots and a knowledge of the past is necessary to achieve an understanding of the complexities of the present society.

Ethnic relations or race relations is a problem that arise from the contacts of people who differ from each other either racially or culturally. Social interaction, an inescapable aspect of human life, provides organization, and organization, in turn, structures the interaction. Each individual, regardless of his ethnic origin, lives within a network of economic, social and political influences. These influences provide constraints and encouragements for his racial beliefs and relationships with members of other ethnic groups. More often than not, it is politically and socially profitable to emphasize and distinguish the biological or cultural differences, and to iminmize or even to deny the more important universality. Thus, ideologies and patterns of ethnic relations are the result of a society's economic and social history and they operate within a given socio-economic

system.

Malaysia is a plural society. Tan Chee-Beng defines a
Malaysian plural society as one which has such characteristics as:
"(a) Different ethnic groups, each with their own culture, living side
by side within the same political unit (nation); (b) A keen
competition for political power and economic resources along ethnic
lines, at least between the numerically more dominant groups; (c) A
significant conflict in interests (socio-economic, political and
cultural) along ethnic lines such that there is a problem of ethnic
group conflicts and adjustments at different social levels. This is
reflected in such national organizations as the political system, the
economic system or even the education system." [3]

According to the 1980 census, the largest ethnic group in
Peninsula Malaysia is the Malays (56 per cent), followed by Chinese
(33.4 per cent), Indians (9 per cent) and 'Others' (0.6 per cent). [4]
This element of plurality is most exemplified in the urban centres
which are the centres of modernization, improvement in economic status
and relative stable employment. In the state of Selangor and Federal
Territory where this study is conducted, the largest ethnic group is
Chinese (42.7 per cent), followed closely by the Malays (40.6 per cent)
and Indians (16 per cent) and 'Others' (0.7 per cent). [5]

The development of Malaysia as a multi-ethnic nation is
closely linked with the historical development of the country itself
as well as its relationships with the other nations of the world.

15

Due to its geographical position, Peninsula Malaysia has become a meeting place between the East and the West. It has been for many centuries been under the direct influence of diverse social and cultural forces from India, China, Indonesia and the Middle-East. People of different nationalities came but relatively few settled down to live with the indigenous Malay population. This was the situation during the pre-colonial times, or before 1850 whereby the nature of contacts between the Malays and the foreign traders was one of peaceful economic contact.

It was not until the introduction of British colonial rule in the later part of the nineteenth century that the country began to assume its multi-ethnic character. During the colonial era, Malaya underwent rapid development in plantation agriculture and tin-mining industries. A large labour force was required in the rubber plantations and tin mines. However, the local Malay population failed to meet this urgent demand for cheap, industrious labour. The Malays had plentiful access to land and other resources but were not interested to work in plantations and mines as wage labourers under harsh working conditions. On the other hand, the social and economic turmoil experienced by the peasantry in India and China provided the 'push' factors for the immigration of labour from these countries, as well as the encouragement of the colonial government. Therefore, cheap Chinese and Indian immigrant labourers were brought in by large numbers, thus creating a multi-ethnic society.

16

On the whole, the picture of Malaya's labour force was one of labour segementation and occupational specialization according to ethnic group during the colonial era. Traditionally the Malays constituted the great bulk of the peasantry. They were rice cultivators, small holders and fishermen, though there was an elite class of the middel-class officials. The Indians were prominent in agricultural life, in the rubber estates and oil-palm plantations. Nevertheless, a number of them were also urban workers, traders, financiers and professional men. The Chinese were found in a wide range of occupations and income groups, but a large number of them were predominantly in the mining industries and trading activities.

The Chinese and Indian populations were concentrated in the 'tin and rubber belt', located on the western seacoast of the peninsula, the most economically developed region. According to Simoniya,[6] the Chinese population of Malaya played a very important role in the process of urbanization. In 1931, 38.8 per cent of the Chinese population of Malays lived cities, and they made up 59.6 per cent of all urban population. In 1947, 43.1 per cent of the Chinese lived in cities, and they constituted 62.3 per cent of all urban population in the Federated States of Perak, Selangor, Negeri Sembilan and Johore. The tin-mining areas where small villages grew into huge urban centres, were from the beginning predominantly populated by the Chinese, followed by the Malays and Indians.

The different ethnic groups of Malays, Chinese, Indians and 'Others' lived side by side under the colonial rule in apparent

17

harmony. But in social reality, there were major cleavages as each
of these ethnic groups had its own distinct religion, language and
educational system, customs and norms and they continued to maintain
these differences. The segmentation of the labour force along ethnic
lines created few opportunities for direct interaction between
members of different ethnic groups. As a result, class relations at
the level of production did not develop between members of different
ethnic groups. There seemed to be no structural conflict or inter-
group conflict between the ethnic communities.

However, in the early twentieth century, signs of inter-ethnic
conflict under the colonial rule were discernable with the development
of Malay nationalism and the formation of pro-Malay policies made by
the British in an attempt to keep this nationalist force under control.
Under the colonial rule, the Chinese and Indians were assigned the
economic role of middle-men in domestic trade which facilitated the
import and export trade controlled by foreign capital. In this
economic exploitation, the Chinese and Indians were merely junior
partners forming the weakest yet the most visible link in this chain
of exploitation. Their dominance in the retail and wholesale sectors
was glaringly displayed in shops everywhere and the Malay peasants came
into contact with them as consumers or producers of local products.
Antogonistic relations developed as a result of this unequal economic
relationships entered into by members of different classes who also
happened to be members of different ethnic communities. In other
words, class relations form the basis of ethnic relations. But no

18

serious conflict occurred as the British carefully co-ordinated the whole system, forming walls of insulation between the ethnic communities.

After the First World War, there were pressures form the Malay community to stop the flow of immigrant races into the country. By 1938, most of the Chinese and Indians settled down permanently and they began to demand more economic and political rights in the country which they considered as their home. The Malays arose in fear that their interests might be overwhelmed by the immigrant communities and fought for their special rights as the 'sons of the soil'.

The different ethnic groups began to compete for scarce resources in the political and economic spheres after the Second World War. The brief period of Japanese rule in Malaya from 1942 to 1945 served to ignite the hitherto latent ethnic antagonisms. The Japanese exploited the ethnic cleavages and adopted separate policies for each ethnic community. The revenge campaign which the Malayan Peoples Anti-Japanese Army, predominantly Chinese, launched against the Malays for their collaboration with the Japanese further aggravated ethnic relations. The return of British rule after the Japanese defeat served to heighten ethnic contradictions. The Malayan Union was introduced in 1946 by the British with the intention of granting citizenships and equal rights to all communities residing in Malaya, and the abolishment of the position of the Malay rulers had led to further antagonistic feelings between the indigenous Malays and the migrant groups of Chinese and Indians, especially among the Malays

who felt threatened. As a result, it led to the formation of the Federation of Malaya in 1948 with policies more favourable to the Malays.

The departure of the British and the independence of Malaya deprived the local population of a buffer in their interactions. Inequalities in economic and politic continued. Various attempts were made by Malayan government to raise the standards of living of the predominantly rural based Malay population to the level of other communities. Great emphasis was placed on the development of rurual areas and the policy of four Malays to one non-Malay was adopted in recruitment into both the Malaysian Home civil and foreign service. These and other numerous privileges for Malays established by legislation have been one of the main sources of non-Malay discontent.

Social modernization and political independence have intensified communal tensions economically and politically. Each ethnic community formed its own political party to look after, self-guard and compete for its own communal interest. There have been serious racial riots, for example, in Penang in 1976, and most seriously of all, in Kuala Lumpur in 1969, resulting in numerous deaths and heavy property loss and threw the whole country into a state of 'emergency', and a twenty-four hour curfew was imposed. The 1969 racial riots occurred just after the country's general election. The ruling Alliance Party made up of communal parties of the Malays, Chinese and Indians suffered considerable set-back to the gain of the non-Alliance Chinese Communal Opposition parties. The Malays

felt that their political power was threatened. Meanwhile the jubilant opposition supporters celebrated their success jointly with grand parades. In some of these parades they used offensive language against the Malays in Kuala Lumpur. The Malays organized counter-demonstrations. These demonstrations disintegrated into communal violence between the Malays and the Chinese, which later spread to the Indians. Thus it became a direct Malay/non-Malay confrontation.

After the 1969 tragic events of communal killings, the government considered the prevailing identification of economic sectors by ethnicity as a source of social instability. The New Economic Policy[7] was formulated. The New Economic Policy 'seeks to eradicate poverty among all Malaysians and to restructure Malaysian society so that the identification of race with economic function and geographical location is reduced and eventually eliminated'. It also set its target 'the ownership and management by Malays and other indigenous people of at least 30 per cent of commercial and industrial activities in economy and employment structure at all levels of operation and management that reflects the racial composition of the nation by 1990'.[8]

Quotas in facour of Malays were used for recruitment into the armed forces and the police forces, as well as in allocating scholarship and places of study in higher educational institutions. Rural Malays were encouraged to migrate to the urban areas and to take up business to compete with the Chinese and the Indians.

The present decade has seen increased Malay participation in commerce and industries, a result attributed to the Malaysian government's effort to reduce the economic gap between the Malays and the non-Malays. There is the official encouragement of urban migration among the traditionally rural Malays. To help these immigrants to adjust to city life, the government has supplied commercial-technical training programmes and there is a marked expansion of the market activities to accommodate the incomers, as well as a restriction of non-Malay enterprises. Hence, the different ethnic groups are thrown into a position whereby they compete for the limited resources.

To conclude, present ethnic relations in Malaysia is one of accommodation. Different polarisation exist among the different ethnic groups. Power and social class position tends to overlap with racial or ethnic identity in many ways. The struggle between the different groups for limited resources economically and politically continues and more often than not, inter-racial or inter-ethnic interaction is minimal and is on the basis of competition and conflict. It is basically still very much a plural society where different ethnic communities tend to interpret social issues according to racial line. True national integration is yet to be achieved whereby every individual in the society can participate fully and equally in the life of the society without distinctions made along ethnic lines. Nevertheless, it is the intention of this study to examine the validity of the above general outlook at the grass-roots level, that is, at the

level of inter-personal ethnic relationships in urban Kuala Lumpur
and Petaling Jaya.

Footnote

3   Tan Chee-Beng, "Ethnic Relations in Malaysia" in Ethnicity and
    Interpersonal Interaction : A Cross Cultural Study , David Y. H.
    Wu, (ed). (37 - 61), Hong Kong : Maruzen Asia, 1982.

4   Department of Statistics, 1980, "1980 Population and Housing
    Census of Malaysia : Community Groups." Kuala Lumpur : Jabatan
    Perangkaan Malaysia.

5   Ibid.

6   N. A. Simoniya, Overseas Chinese in Southeast Asia - A Russian
    Study, Translated by U. S. Joint Publications Research Service.
    Data Paper : Number 45, Southeast Asia Program, New York : Cornell
    University, 1961. (33).

7   Third Malaysia Plan 1976 - 1980. Kuala Lumpur : The Government
    Press, 1976.

8   Ibid.

III

ETHNIC AFFLCIATIONS IN ORGANIZATIONS

The founding and preservation of a national community calls for the integration of its component parts. The division between ethnic groups is considered an obstacle to national integration. It is the common belief that the urban population stands out conspicuously as showing the greatest sign of integration and change. The urban Malays, Chinese, Indians and 'Others' are supposed to be the most acculturated to urban and secular values than their counterparts in rural areas. This is based on the assumption that the urban way of living inevitably may entail more intergroup social contacts through inter-personal relationships or common affiliation to the various existing voluntary and non-voluntary organizations. It is feasible that if these interactions between the various ethnic groups are intimate, prolonged and covers a wide range of activities, more positive attitudes can be fostered and subsequently narrow down the ethnic cleavages.

The condition of 'equal-status contact' across group boundaries has been shown to lead to decreased ethnic prejudice and hostility.[9] Such contacts bring knowledge and acquaintance of and sounder beliefs concerning outgroups, that is, they are stereotype-breaking contacts. This would lead to the assumption that the likeli-

24

hood of harmonious inter-ethnic relations; that people who deal with one another tend to like each other more than those who keep entirely to themselves. So, it is possible that after a period of sustained contact, cultural differences between ethnic groups progressively diminish. Friendships may cut across the ethnic lines breaking down inter-ethnic barrier.

But on the other hand, people who interact frequently may not tend to like one another. Neither physical proximity in urban type of living nor frequent contact necessarily results in the reduction of social distance between ethnic groups nor in the formation of favourable sentiments. Malaysians are noted for their very self-consciousness attitudes about the ethnic heterogeneity of their society. This acute awareness more often than not pushes ethnicity into the limelight. The struggle among urbanites toward higher political and economic statuses may bring them into conflict; for each has what the other wants. The maintenance of ethnicity among urbanites may be said to be based upon interaction in socio-economic and political spheres rather than their isolation and focuses on the boundaries between groups. For in their effort to promote their own interests, the various ethnic groups may view it more advantageous to organize and to strengthen ethnicity. So, it is assumed that prejudiced ethnic relations with its consequent lack of interaction is a struggle for status, recognition, position, or prestige within an existing moral and political order. Thus in some measure, the crucial determinant in the degree of inter-ethnic contact is not objective class status

but that of increased or decreased status between ethnic groups.

Henceforth, this study of ethnic relations among urbanites will examine whther the respondents' points of orientation and anchorage in his social network in clubs, religious and political organizations, with members of his own ethnic group will be more favourable than with members of other ethnic groups in these relationships. Thus, it is assumed that the respondents' attitudes toward associating with members of other ethnic groups will vary. The variation will depend upon the identity of the respondent's ethnic group, the identity of the stimulus groups, and on conditions such as culture, religion, political affiliation and social class which will affect the density of his social network with other ethnic groups. The respondent's socio-economic background can be an important determinant of his social network anchorage. The assumption is that respondents from lower socioeconomic classes keep more to their own ethnic community than those of the middle and upper ones. Some bases for this assumption are first, a heightened psychological insecurity resulting from economic or status insecurity, both objective and subjective; second, a lack of 'sophistication' due to factors such as low education and low participation in political or voluntary organizations; and third, a tendency to conform to a certain social norms regarding ethnic relation as a result of factors such as status-related values. Thus, it is feasible to assume that the higher the socio-economic class is, the more evenly distributed is the respondents' social network anchorage among the different ethnic groups.

From this study of the urbanites in Kuala Lumpur and Petaling Jaya areas, the respondents can be placed at different points along a continous scale. At one end of the scale are those who belong to a large number of clubs and associations, have wide cultural interests and are generally exposed to a broad range of influences. At the other end of the scale are those with few interests, who rarely go out except to travel to and from their place of work, who have little contact with their fellow men, even indirectly. Between these extremes will come those who are the in-betweens. According to the findings of this study, the sample population generally do not take part in any organizations, be it clubs or religious organizations or political organizations; 70.1 per cent of them do not belong to any club or society, 73.3 per cent of them do not belong to any political organ- ization, and 59.3 per cent of them do not belong to any religious organizations.

A sizable section of the urbanites seem to keep very much to themselves, not taking part in any social organizations. However, this low rate of participation in organizations may be explained by the fact that 43 per cent of the sample population are housewives. Generally, in Malaysian society, women, especially housewives, keep very much to their homely life style and have limited social life.

SOCIAL CLUBS

Of the total number of 414 respondents, 70.1 per cent of them do not join any social club at all, 5.3 per cent are members of high-

27

class clubs such as Lake Club, Selangor Club, Lions Club, Golf Club and others, which exclusively cater for the upper class of the urban population. 2.9 per cent are members of professional or trade clubs, 4.1 per cent are members of recreational clubs, 1 per cent are affiliated to sales clubs, 0.2 per cent to political or reform clubs. Community clubs have the highest rate of participation, that is, 14.5 per cent of the sample population. Only 1.9 per cent join several clubs at the same time.

To break it down to the different ethnic groups, as shown in Table 6, it can be seen that 70.1 per cent of the Malays do not belong to any clubs as compared to 64.8 per cent of the Chinese, 90.5 per cent of the Indians and 55.6 per cent of the 'Others'.

Among the Indians who are members of some social clubs, all of them, that is, 9.5 per cent of the total number of Indian respondents join the community club. Only the Malays join political or reform organization.

Table 6 : Club Affiliation of Respondents (in percentage)

	High	Pro.	Rec.	Com.	Sal.	Pol.	Sev.	None
Malays	3.3	3.0	4.2	16.3	0.6	0.3	2.1	70.1
Chinese	18.5	3.7	5.6	3.7	3.7	0.0	0.0	64.8
Indians	0.0	0.0	0.0	9.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	90.5
'Others'	0.0	0.0	0.0	22.2	0.0	0.0	11.1	55.6

High=High class clubs; Pro.=Professional; Rec.=Recreational; Sal.=Sales Com.=Community; Pol.=Political & Reform; Sev.=Several

The frequency of going to meetings in various social clubs is relatively low as shown in the Table 7 below. Those who go on the weekly basis made up of 13.3 per cent of the total sample population, 10.1 per cent of them go on the monthly basis, 3.6 per cent of them on the yearly basis, 1.2 per cent of them are not sure of their rate of attendance.

Table 7 : Frequency of Involvement in Social Clubs (in percentage)

	None	Week	Month	Year	Not Sure
Malays	71.3	13.0	10.9	3.3	1.2
Chinese	68.5	18.5	7.4	3.7	1.9
Indians	90.5	0.0	4.8	4.8	0.0
'Others'	55.6	22.2	11.1	11.1	0.0

The ethnic components of associates in clubs are shown in Table 8. 13.3 per cent of the Malays have Malays only as their associates in clubs, and 15.7 per cent of the Malays have associates of different ethnic origins in clubs. 7.4 per cent of the Chinese have Chinese associates only in clubs and 26 per cent of them have associates of various ethnic origins. 4.8 per cent of the Indians associates with Indians only and 4.8 per cent of them associate with various ethnic members of their clubs. None of the 'Others' have club associates of their own ethnic origins and 44.4 per cent of them have associates of various ethnic groups.

Table 8 : Associates in Social Clubs (in percentage)

	None	Malay only	Chinese only	Indian only	Multi-ethnic
Malays	71.0	13.3	0.0	0.0	15.7
Chinese	66.7	0.0	7.4	0.0	2.6
Indians	90.5	0.0	0.0	4.8	4.8
'Others'	55.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	44.4

Thus, it can be said that among the Malays who are involved in organizations such as social clubs, 45.8 per cent of them keep to their own ethnic group only, and 54.1 per cent of them have associates of multi-ethnic origins. Among the Chinese, only 22.2 per cent of those who do have associates in clubs have associates of their own ethnic origin, that is, Chinese; and 77.8 per cent of them have club associates of multi-ethnic origins. Among the Indians, 50.0 per cent of them keep to their own ethnic group in choosing associates in social clubs and 50.0 per cent of them have associates of different ethnic origins. Of the 'Others', 100 per cent of them have associates of multi-ethnic origins, none of them have associates of their own origin only. Thus it can be said that of the sample population, the Malays (45.8 per cent) and the Indians (50.0 per cent) relatively still tend to have associates of own ethnic group as compared to the Chinese (22.2 per cent) and the 'Others' (0.0 per cent).

POLITICAL ORGANIZATIONS

Besides social clubs, some of the urbanites take part in political organizations. Since self-government and independence, political parties in Malaysian society tend to be organized on racial or ethnic lines. However, inter-ethnic alliances and fronts have been formed which have narrowly limited the range of electoral conflicts among the ethnic groups. The ruling party, the Barisan Nasional is made up of several separate communal political parties. The intense joint participation politically appears to be limited to the political leaders of the component parties of the Barisan Nasional, and there is very limited integration politically at the grass-root level, that is, among the ordinary members of the various communal parties at large. The various component parties of the Barisan Nasional are basically exclusively mono-ethnic, with little interaction generally.

Of the sample population, 73.3 per cent of them do not belong to any political organizations, reflecting the low level of political participation and general attitude of political apathy or indifference in one way or another. The Malays are the most active politically as compared to the other ethnic groups. 69.2 per cent of the Malays do not belong to any political organization as compared to 88.9 per cent Chinese, 85.7 per cent Indians and 100 per cent 'Others'. Of the sample population who belong to some political organizations, among the Malays, 99.0 per cent of them joined Malay political organizations such as United Malays National Organization (UMNO). 83.0 per cent of the Chinese joined the Malayan Chinese Association (MCA), another communal

party, and 100 per cent of the Indians joined the Malayan Indian Congress (MIC), a communal party. 17.0 per cent of the politically active Chinese joined multi-racial political party such as Gerakan, which nevertheless is more Chinese than multi-ethnic. Below is Table 9 that shows the distribution of the various ethnic groups as according to the various political organizations which are of communal or claim to be of multi-racial nature.

Table 9 :   Distribution of the various ethnic groups to the Political Organization (in percentage)

	Malay Communal	Chinese Communal	Indian Communal	Multi-ethnic	None
Malays	30.5	0.0	0.3	0.0	69.2
Chinese	0.0	9.3	0.0	1.9	88.9
Indians	0.0	0.0	14.3	0.0	85.7
'Others'	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100

Of the various ethnic groups who do belong to some political organizations, the data collected in this study shows that of the sample population, the most active politically, as measured by frequency of involvement in those organizations, are the Malays, followed by the Indians and the Chinese. The 'Others' do not take part in any political organization at all.

11.9 per cent of the Malays who are members of some political organizations claimed to attend political meetings always, and 32.7 per

cent on a 'sometimes' basis, and 55.4 per cent of them said they
seldom go to meetings in political organizations that they belong to.

None of the Chinese claimed to go to political meetings always,
39.8 per cent on a 'sometimes' basis, 66.4 per cent seldom attend the
meetings held. The frequency of involvement in political organizations
is shown in Table 10 below.

Table 10 : Frequency of Political Involvement of the Ethnic Groups
(in percentages)

	None	Always	Sometimes	Seldom
Malays	72.2	3.3	9.1	15.4
Chinese	90.7	0.0	3.7	5.6
Indians	85.7	0.0	4.8	9.5
'Others'	100	0.0	0.0	0.0

There is very little inter-ethnic mixing in the political
organizations among the different ethnic groups in Kuala Lumpur and
Petaling Jaya as shown in Table 11. Of the Malays who are taking
part in political organizations, 88.0 per cent of them associates with
Malays only, 2.2 per cent have associates of Malays and Indians origin,
and 8.8 per cent have Chinese, Indian and Malay associates in political
organizations. Among the Chinese 88.9 per cent of them do no have any
associate in political organization and 66.7 per cent of those who do
have, their associates are of Chinese origin only, and 33.3 per cent

of them claimed to have political associates of Malay, Chinese and
Indian origins. 85.7 per cent of the Indians have no political
associates, and of the rest who do have, they have associates of their
own ethnic group only. Thus it can be seen that the Indians entirely
themselves to their own ethnic group in political organization, followed
by the Malays. The Chinese tend to mix more with other ethnic groups,
that is, 33.3 per cent compared to 11.0 per cent of the Malays and
0.0 per cent of the Indians.

Table 11 : Ethnic Associates in Political Organizations (in percentages)

	None	Malays only	Chinese only	Indians only	Malay & Indians	Malay, Indians & Chinese
Malays	72.8	24.2	0.0	0.0	0.6	2.4
Chinese	88.9	0.0	7.4	0.0	0.0	3.7
Indians	85.7	0.0	0.0	14.3	0.0	0.0
'Others'	100	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

This study show that among the urbanites in Kuala Lumpur and
Petaling Jaya area, they do not mix inter-ethnically in political
organizations, only a very limited percentage of them have political
associates other than their own ethnic group.

RELIGIOUS ORGANIZATIONS

So far, it can be ssen that there is very limited interaction among the various ethnic groups in social organizations and in political organizations. Another fundamental activity that forms the main framework of people's lives, or, to be more accurate, the lives of a sizeable section of the population, is religion. Among the sample population, 59.3 per cent of them admitted to not joining any religious organization. 42.3 per cent of the Malays who claimed to belong to some religious organization but all of them joined Islamic religious organization. The Indians and Chinese were more polytheistic, as opposed to the monotheistic feature of the Muslim Malays. Of the 33.3 per cent of the Chinese who are involved in religious organization, 50.0 per cent of them were Christian organization and another 50.0 per cent were Buddhist organizations. Among the 52.4 per cent of the Indians who are involved, 27.3 per cent were Muslims, 27.3 per cent were Christians and 45.4 per cent were Hindus. The distribution of the ethnic groups involved in religious organization is shown in Table 12.

Table 12: Distribution of Ethnic Groups in Religious Organizations (in percentages)

	None	Islamic	Christian	Buddhist	Hindu
Malays	57.7	42.3	0.0	0.0	0.0
Chinese	66.7	0.0	16.7	16.7	0.0
Indians	47.6	14.3	14.3	0.0	23.8
'Others'	100	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Among the four ethnic groups in this study, the Malays have the highest frequency of attending religious organizations. 69.8 per cent of the Malays who belong to this religious organization always go to religious meetings and 18.1 per cent of them claimed to go on a 'sometimes' basis and 12.1 per cent of them seldom involved themselves in religious activities. The Indians who were involved in religious organizations, hve a high frequency rate of involvement. 60.0 per cent of them always attend meetings in those organizations and 20.0 per cent of them attend sometimes only, and 20.0 per cent of them seldom go to such meetings. The Chinese have the lowest rate of involvement in religious organization. Of those who are involved, 31.3 per cent claimed to go always, and 43.7 per cent sometimes would involve in religious activities and 25.0 per cent seldom involved themselves. The 'Others' do not involve themselves in any religious organization at all in this study. The frequency of involvement in religious organizations by the different ethnic groups is shown in Table 13.

Table 13 : Frequency of Involvement in Religious Organizations
            (in percentages)

	None	Always	Sometimes	Seldom
Malays	58.0	29.3	7.6	5.1
Chinese	70.4	9.3	13.0	7.4
Indians	52.4	28.6	9.5	9.5
'Others'	100	0.0	0.0	0.0

As in the pattern in social organizations and political organizations, the rate of inter-ethnic mixing in relgious organizations, the rate of inter-ethnic mixing in religious organizations is limited especially among the Malays, who keep very much to themselves. This reflects the fact that very few Indians, Chinese and 'Others' have embraced Islam as their religion. On the other hand, the Chinese and Indians have more associates of other ethnic groups than the Malays. This is shown in Table 14.

57.5 per cent of the Malays do not have any associates in religious organizations, and of those who claimed to have, 95.7 per cent of them have Malays as associates only. Only 4.3 per cent of them have associates other than Malays.

70.4 per cent of the Chinese do not have any associates at all in religious organizations. Of those who do, 50.0 per cent of them have only their own ethnic group as associates, and the other 50.0 per cent have religious associates of other ethnic groups also.

Likewise, among the Indians, 52.4 per cent of them do not have any religious associates. Among those who have such associates, 50.0 per cent of them claimed having Indian associates only, and the other 50.0 per cent claimed having associates of other ethnic groups as well. All the 'Others' do not have any religious associates at all.

37

Table 14 : Associates in Religious Organizations (in percentages)

	None	Malays only	Chinese only	Indians only	Multi-ethnic
Malays	57.7	40.5	0.3	0.0	1.5
Chinese	70.4	0.0	14.8	0.0	14.9
Indians	52.4	4.8	0.0	23.8	19.1
'Others'	100	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

To concludes, it can be said that there is comparatively
limited inter-ethnic mixing in organizations, be it social, political
or religious in nature among the urbanites in Kuala Lumpur and Petaling
Jaya. Each ethnic group still keeps very much to themselves and the
element of a plural society whereby different ethnic groups live side
by side but with little mixing with each other. Ethnicity is still a
very important factor that influences members of the various ethnic
groups in their interaction in the various organizations examined in
this study.

Footnote

9 Allport, Gordon, W., The Nature of Prejudice, New York : Doubleday
   Anchor, 1958. (250 - 268).

INTER-ETHNIC MIXING IN INFORMAL SOCIAL INTERACTION

In this chapter, relationships among ethnic groups in urban
Kuala Lumpur and Petaling Jaya areas are examined from the perspective
of intergroup friendship choice. The operation of the dynamics of
ethnicity in everyday life is examined through the rates of friendship
choice between ethnic groups. The low rates of choice would indicates
strong boundaries between ethnic groups, with few who succeeded in
transcending the constraints of ethnicity. Informal social interaction
such as visitation among friends and relatives, rate of mixing with
colleagues outside working hours are taken into account.

FRIENDSHIP LOCALISATION

Of the sample population of 414, as shown in Table 15, most
of them, regardless of what ethnic group they belong to, have relative
high rate of contact with friends through visitation. Only 5.5 per
cent of them interviewed claimed that they do not visit any friend and
are not visited by any friend at all.

57.8 per cent of them meet their friends once or more in a
week, and 22.7 per cent of them meet at least once a month. 3.1 per
cent of them claimed that their frequency of visit to and by friends is
on yearly baiss, and 0.5 per cent visit each other once in every two

or three years' time. 10.4 per cent of them are not sure of the
frequency of visitation to and by friends.

Among the Malays, Chinese, Indians and 'Others', the
percentage of them meeting friends through visitation on the weekly
basis is 58.6 per cent, 48.1 per cent, 57.1 per cent and 88.9 per cent
respectively. On the monthly basis, it is 22.7 per cent among the
Malays, 25.9 per cent among the Chinese, 23.8 per cent among the
Indians and none among the 'Others'. Only a handful of the respondents
regardless of ethnic affiliation have as low frequency of visitation
to and by friends as once a year or once in every two or three years.

Table 15 : Frequency of Visits to and by Friends (in percentages)

	None	Week	Month	1 year	2/3 yr.	not sure
Malays	5.1	58.6	22.7	1.8	0.3	11.5
Chinese	9.3	48.1	25.9	13.0	0.0	3.7
Indians	4.8	57.1	23.8	0.0	4.8	9.5
'Others'	0.0	88.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	11.1

Among the four ethnic groups, the Malays have the highest
rate of only choosing those of their own ethnic group as friends; that
is 61.3 per cent of them as compared to 33.3 per cent of the Chinese,
4.8 per cent of the Indians, and 22.2 per cent of the 'Others'.

As shown in Table 16, 20.5 per cent of the Malays have

40

friends mostly of Malay origin, 1.2 per cent of them claimed to have

friends of mostly Chinese origin. Another 12.3 per cent of them

claimed to have relative even distribution of friends from all the

ethnic groups.

Among the Chinese, 33.3 per cent of them have friends of

their own ethnic group only. 1.9 per cent of them claimed having

friends of multi-ethnic origin.

4.8 per cent of the Indians claimed to have friends of

their own ethnic origin only, and 28.6 per cent of them have friends

mostly of their own ethnic origin. 4.8 per cent of them have friends

of Malay origin only and 14.4 per cent of them have friends of mostly

Chinese origin. The Indians have the highest rate of having multi-

ethnic friends, that is, 43.0 per cent of them, as compared to 27.9 per

cent of Chinese, 22.2 per cent of the 'Others', and 12.3 per cent of

Malays.

Among the 'Others', 22.2 per cent of them claimed to have

friends from their own ethnic group only, and another 33.3 per cent of

them with friends who are mostly of their own origin too. 22.2 per

cent of them have friends of multi-ethnic origin, and 11.1 per cent

have Chinese friends only.

Table 16 : Friendship Localisation (in percentages)

	N.	Mo	Co	Io	Oo	MM	MC	MI	MO	ME
Malays	4.5	61.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	20.5	1.2	0.0	0.0	12.3
Chinese	7.4	0.0	33.3	0.0	1.9	0.0	29.7	0.0	0.0	27.9
Indians	4.8	4.8	0.0	4.8	0.0	0.0	14.4	28.6	0.0	43.0
Others	0.0	11.1	11.1	0.0	22.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.3	22.2

N. = None; Mo = Malays only; Co = Chinese only; Io = Indians only;
Oo = Others only; MM = Mostly Malays; MC = Mostly Chinese;
MI = Mostly Indians; MO = Mostly Others; ME = Multi-ethnic.

FRIENDSHIP LOCALIZATION IN WORKING PLACE

Of the total sample population of 414, 46.5 per cent or 191 of them are working urbanites. To accertain the inter-ethnic relation, the inter-ethnic friendship choice is examined by looking at the frequency of colleagues having lunch together, and the grequency of taking part in sports and games together and other activities as well.

Table 17 shows the frequency of working people going out to lunch with their colleagues. 64.4 per cent of them do not have lunch together with their colleagues, 2.2 per cent of them have lunch with their colleagues once in two or three months' time, 3.9 per cent a few times in a month's time, 8.9 per cent on the weekly basis, and 20.5 per cent of them have lunch with their colleagues everyday.

The percentages of the working Malays, Chinese, Indians and 'Others' who have lunch together with their colleagues everyday are

42

20.5 per cent, 20.4 per cent, 19.0 per cent and 22.2 per cent respectively. Those who have luch with their colleagues on the weekly basis included 9.1 per cent Malays, 9.3 per cent Chinese, 9.5 per cent Indians and none from the 'Others'. On the whole, there is not much variation on the frequency of having lunch with colleagues among the different ethnic groups.

Table 17 : Frequency of Having Lunch with Colleagues (in percentages)

	None	Everyday	Week	1 month	2/3 months
Malays	64.0	20.5	9.1	4.2	2.1
Chinese	64.8	20.4	9.3	3.7	1.9
Indians	66.7	19.0	9.5	0.0	4.0
'Others'	77.8	22.2	0.0	0.0	0.0

Compared to the relatively low frequency of having lunch with colleagues (35.4 per cent of the total working respondents), the frequency of meeting colleagues for games and sport is even lower, that is, only 13.5 per cent of the total number of working respondents. 86.5 per cent of them never involved themselves in any sport activities with their working colleagues.

2.9 per cent of the total 191 working respondents interviewed claimed to meet colleagues for games everyday, 6.5 per cent on weekly basis, 2.9 per cent on monthly basis, and 1.2 per cent once in every two or three month.

None of the 'Others' ever meet their colleagues for games, as well as 90.5 per cent of the Indians, 81.5 per cent of the Chinese, and 86.7 per cent of the Malays. Only 2.7 per cent of the Malays, 3.7 per cent of the Chinese, 4.8 per cent of the Indians have games with their colleagues everyday. 6.3 per cent Malays and 11.1 per cent Chinese have games with their colleagues a few times a week. 3.0 per cent Malays, 1.9 per cent Chinese and 4.8 per cent Indians have games with their colleagues on the monthly basis as shown in Table 18 below.

Table 18 : Frequency of Meeting Colleagues for Games (in percentages)

	None	Everyday	Weekly	1 monthly	2/3 monthly
Malays	86.7	2.7	6.3	3.0	1.2
Chinese	81.5	3.7	11.1	1.9	1.9
Indians	90.5	4.8	0.0	4.8	0.0
'Others'	100	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

The frequency of working urbanites meeting their colleagues for other activities other than for lunch or sports and games. 92.3 per cent of the total working urbanites do not meet their colleagues on this basis, and they are 93.1 per cent of the Malays, 87.0 per cent of the Chinese, 90.5 per cent of the Indians but none from the 'Others'. As can be seen from Table 19, the frequency of those who meet their colleagues for activities other than for meals and sports is also very low.

Table 19 : <u>Frequency of Meeting Colleagues for Activities Other than</u>
<u>for Lunch or Sports (in percentages)</u>

	None	Everyday	Weekly	1 monthly	2/3 monthly
Malays	93.1	1.2	2.7	1.8	1.2
Chinese	87.0	3.7	0.0	5.6	3.7
Indians	90.5	9.5	0.0	0.0	0.0
'Others'	100	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Table 20 shows the ethnic breakdown of working respondents'
choice of friendship or their friendship anchorage with their colleagues,
particularly those with whom they go out together for lunch or sports
and games and other activities.

62.2 per cent of the total 191 working respondents claimed
not to have any friend of the above mentioned category at their
working places. Of these are 61.9 per cent of Malays, 59.0 per cent
of Chinese, 66.6 per cent of Indians and 77.8 per cent of 'Others'. Of
those who have friends purely of their own ethnic group are 5.4 per
cent of Malays, 5.6 per cent of Chinese and none of the Indians and
the 'Others'. 14.0 per cent of Malays, 13.0 per cent Chinese, 14.3
per cent Indians claimed to have friends mostly of their own ethnic
origin. Of those who claimed to have friends of multi-ethnic nature
are 15.4 per cent of Malays, 15.0 per cent of Chinese, 14.3 per cent
of Indians, and 11.1 per cent of of the 'Others'.

0.3 per cent of the Malays claimed to have Chinese friends

only and another 3.0 per cent of them claimed to have friends of mostly Chinese origin. 1.8 per cent of the Chinese also claimed to have friends of purely Malay origin in their working places, and another 5.6 per cent with friends of mostly Malay origin. 4.8 per cent of the Indians claimed to have mostly Malay friends as well as 11.1 per cent of the 'Others'.

Table 20 : Ethnic Affiliation in Working Places (in percentages)

	None	Mo	Co	MM	MC	MI	ME
Malays	61.9	5.4	0.3	14.0	3.0	0.0	15.4
Chinese	59.0	1.8	5.6	5.6	13.0	0.0	15.0
Indians	66.6	0.0	0.0	4.8	0.0	14.3	14.3
'Others'	77.8	0.0	0.0	11.1	0.0	0.0	11.1

Mo = Malays only; Co = Chinese only; MM = Mostly Malays;
MC = Mostly Chinese; MI = Mostly Indians; ME = Multi-ethnic

So far, the data show that the urbanites in Kuala Lumpur and Petaling Jaya fulfill their social needs by generally keeping to members of their own ethnic groups. In choosing friends, 83.7 per cent of the Malays, who claimed to have such friends, have friends mostly of their own ethnic origin, and so are 67.9 per cent of the Chinese, 55.5 per cent of the 'Others' and 35.0 per cent of the Indians.

Those who have developed friendship with their colleagues comparatively are better inter-ethnic mixer; 50.9 per cent of the Malays who do develop personal relationship with their colleagues have these

46

colleagues mostly of their own ethnic origin, as well as 45.4 per cent
of the Chinese, 42.9 per cent of the Indians and none from the 'Others'.
Table 21 below shows the variation between the level of inter-mixing
with other ethnic groups in places of work and otherwise.

Table 21 : Inter-ethnic Mixing (in percentages)

	Limited Inter-ethnic mixing		Free Inter-ethnic mixing	
	Friends	Colleagues	Friends	Colleagues
Malays	83.7	50.9	14.3	49.1
Chinese	67.9	45.4	32.1	54.6
Indians	35.0	42.9	65.0	57.1
'Others'	55.5	0.0	44.5	100

VISITATION TO/BY RELATIVES

The low rate of inter-ethnic interaction and mixing on
personal level and the relative high rate of socializing among relatives
may indicate that different ethnic groups in this study maintain their
isolation in spite of physical proximity in urban living style bacuase
their social needs are fulfilled with interaction with their relatives.
Table 22 shows that generally all the ethnic groups have contacts with
their relatives pretty frequently. 4.2 per cent of the Malays only
do not visit their relatives. 29.6 per cent of them have visitation

47

to and by friends once or more a week. 42.6 per cent of them once or more a month, 15.4 per cent of them once or more a year and 8.2 per cent are not sure of the frequency.

All the Chinese respondents have visitation to and by relatives with 37.0 per cent of them on the weekly basis, 33.3 per cent on the monthly basis, 22.2 per cent on the yearly basis and 7.4 per cent are not sure of the frequency.

14.3 per cent of the Indians do not have contact with relatives through visitation, 28.6 per cent on weekly basis, 38.1 per cent on the monthly basis, 19.0 per cent on the yearly basis.

The 'Others' have the highest rate of non-contact with relatives through visitation, that is, 33.3 per cent of them. But 22.2 per cent of them do meet on weekly basis and 44.4 per cent of them on the yearly basis.

The 'Others' have a much lower rate of meeting with their relatives and this could be due to the fact that 44.4 per cent of their relatives stay in another state, and only 11.1 per cent of them have relatives staying in Kuala Lumpur or Petaling Jaya areas.

Among the Malays, Chinese and Indians, relatively high percentages of their relatives stay in Kuala Lumpur and Petaling Jaya; that is, 34.2 per cent of Malays, 48.1 per cent of Chinese and 33.3 per cent the Indians. Table 23 shows the residential sites of the respondents' relatives.

Table 22 : Frequency of Visitation to and by Relatives (in percentages)

	None	Weekly	Monthly	Yearly	Not Sure
Malays	4.2	29.6	42.6	15.4	8.2
Chinese	0.0	37.0	33.3	22.2	7.4
Indians	14.3	28.6	38.1	19.0	0.0
'Others'	33.3	22.2	0.0	44.4	0.0

Table 23 : Relatives' Homes (in percentages)

	NR	KL/PJ	SEL	AS	KPAS	KPS	OS	OSL
Malays	3.3	34.2	8.8	19.7	21.5	10.0	0.6	1.8
Chinese	0.0	48.1	1.9	18.5	18.5	3.7	5.6	3.7
Indians	9.5	33.3	9.5	23.8	4.8	4.8	9.5	4.8
'Others'	33.3	11.1	0.0	11.1	0.0	0.0	44.4	0.0

NR = No Relatives; KL/PJ = Kuala Lumpur & Petaling Jaya; Sel = Selangor;
AS = Another State; KPAS = Kuala Lumpur & Petaling Jaya & Another State;
KPS = Kuala Lumpur & Petaling Jaya & Selangor; OS = Overseas;
OSL = Overseas & Local.

PATTERNS OF FRIENDSHIP LOCALIZATION IN RELATION TO LENGTH OF RESIDENCE

Table 24 shows the variation in the frequency of visiting
friends between those who have been staying in their present residence
for a long period of time and those who are just recent migrants.

60.6 per cent of the respondents live in Kampung Sentosa,

49

Kampung Pantai Dalam and Kampung Kerinchi, which are generally known as squatters villages, whose occupants are mostly recent in-immigrant from the rural area to Kuala Lumpur and its suburb.

Of the sample population, 14.3 per cent of them have lived in their present site of residence for less than one year, 28.5 per cent for a period as long as two years to give years. 26.6 per cent for six years to ten years. 24.2 per cent for eleven years to twenty years. 2.8 per cent for twenty-one years to twenty-five years. 2.7 per cent for twenty-six years to thiery years. 0.8 per cent for as long as thirty-one years to forty years.

Table 24 shows that 34.0 per cent of those recent immigrants of less than one year have friends of different ethnic groups. Those who stayed for a period of two years to five years show the highest rate of mixing with other ethnic groups, that is, 56.8 per cent of them. But, as the length of residence increases, the percentages of them having friends of mulit-ethnic nature also decreases; that is, 39.9 per cent of the six years to ten years group, 31.0 per cent of the eleven years to twenty years group, 20.0 per cent of the twenty-one years to twenty-five years group, 16.6 per cent of the twenty-six to thirty years group. Those who have been staying in urban Kuala Lumpur and Petaling Jaya for the longest period, that is, thirty-one years to forty years, shows a relatively gigher percentages of 25.0 per cent.

Thus, it can be said that the very recent immigrants and the old residents (eleven years or more) seem to keep more to their own

ethnic groups in friendship localization. It is the group who have

moved to their present residence for at least two years to ten years

that are the least ethnic concious in choosing friends as shown in

Table 24 below.

Table 24 : Length of Residence/Types of Friends (in percentages)

Years	Mono-ethnic	Multi-ethnic	None
1	57.6	34.0	8.5
2 - 5	37.2	56.8	5.9
6 - 10	56.3	39.9	3.6
11 - 20	67.0	31.0	2.0
21 - 25	73.3	20.0	6.7
26 - 30	83.4	16.6	0.0
31 - 40	75.0	25.0	0.0

PATTERNS OF FRIENDSHIP LOCALIZATION IN RELATION TO POLITICAL ORGANIZATIONS

Most of the politica organizations are very communal in

nature, whereby their membership is exclusively or overwhelmingly of

one ethnic group only. 73.3 per cent of the total 414 respondents do

not involve themselves in any political organizations. These included

75.3 per cent Malays, 15.8 per cent Chinese, 5.9 per cent Indians and

3.0 per cent 'Others'. 5.6 per cent of these respondents who are

politically inactive claimed having no friends at all, 45.7 per cent

have Malay friends only, 5.9 per cent of Chinese friends only, 0.3 per cent have Indian friends only, 1.0 per cent have 'Others' friends only, and 41.4 per cent claimed to have friends of multi-ethnic nature.

Among the respondents who are members of Malay communal political organizations, 64.4 per cent of them have Malay friends only. 16.8 per cent have friends of mostly Malay origin. 15.9 per cent have multi-ethnic friendship affiliation.

Among those who belong to Chinese communal political organizations, 20.0 per cent claimed to have friends of Chinese origin only. 60.0 per cent of them have friends of mostly Chinese origin. 20.0 per cent have friends of multi-ethnic nature.

Among those of Indian communal political organizations, 25.0 per cent of them have friends of Malay origin only and the other 75.0 per cent claimed to have friends of multi-ethnic nature.

Only 0.2 per cent of the total 414 respondents belong to political organization which claimed to be non-communal, but in practice is more Chinese than multi-ethnic. All of them have mostly Chinese friends.

Between the four major ethnic groups in this study, the Malays mix the least with other ethnic groups, followed by the Chinese and the Indians. None of the 'Others' take part in any political organization. Those who are members of multi-ethnic organization are least ethnic-concious in choosing friends. However, this could be

due to the fact that they have more opportunities to mix with members of other ethnic groups since they all belong to the same organization. Table 25 below shows the relationship between patterns of friendship localization in relation to political organizations.

Table 25 : Political Organizations/Types Of Friends (in percentages)

	N	M	C	I	O	MM	MC	MI	MO	ME
None	5.6	45.7	5.9	0.3	1.0	16.8	6.3	1.9	1.0	15.4
Malays	3.0	64.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	16.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	15.9
Chinese	0.0	0.0	20.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	60.0	0.0	0.0	20.0
Indians	0.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	75.0
Multi-ethnic	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100	0.0	0.0	0.0

N = None; M = Malays only; C = Chinese only; I = Indians only;
O = Others only; MM = Mostly Malays; MC = Mostly Chinese;
MI = Mostly Indians; MO = Mostly Others; ME = Multi-ethnic.

PATTERNS OF FRIENDSHIP LOCALIZATION IN RELATION TO RELIGIOUS ORGANIZATIONS

There are Islamic, Christian, Buddhist, and Hindu religious organizations that the respondents are involved in. However, this only included 40.7 per cent of the total number of respondents, and they are 77.6 per cent Malay, 14.6 per cent Chinese, 4.1 per cent Indians and 3.7 per cent 'Others'.

59.3 per cent of the total number of respondents are not members of any religious organization, and 6.1 per cent of these claimed having no friends at all. 46.3 per cent of them have friends of Malay origin only. 6.1 per cent have Chinese friends only. 0.8 per cent have 'Others' friends only. 40.4 per cent of them have multi-ethnic friendship localization.

Among the respondents who belong to Islamic organization, 63.6 per cent of them have Malay friends only, and another 18.2 per cent have friends of mostly Malay origin. 33.6 per cent of them have friends of multi-ethnic nature.

Among those who belong to Christian organization, 8.3 per cent have friends of 'Others' origin only and 8.3 per cent of Chinese friends only. 41.6 per cent of them have mostly Chinese friends. 41.6 per cent of them have friends of multi-ethnic origin.

11.1 per cent of those who belong to Buddhist organization claimed not to have nay friends at all, 33.3 per cent have Chinese friends only, 44.4 per cent with friends of mostly Chinese origin, and 11.1 per cent have multi-ethnic friendship affiliation.

20.0 per cent of those who are involved in Hindu organization have Indian friends only, and another 20.0 per cent have friends of mostly Indian origin. 60.0 per cent of them have friends of multi-ethnic nature.

Among the various religious groups, the Muslims keep the most

54

to their own ethnic group, that is, a total of 81.8 per cent of them.
The Christians have the highest rate inter-ethnic mixing, that is, a
total of 83.2 per cent of them. This is followed by the Hindus (80.0
per cent) and Buddhists (55.5 per cent), as can be seen from Table 26
below.

Table 26 : Religious Organizations/Types of Friends (in percentages)

	None	Mo	Co	Io	Oo	MM	MC	MI	MO	ME
None	6.1	46.3	6.1	0.0	0.8	17.0	5.2	1.6	1.2	15.4
Islamic	2.8	63.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	18.2	0.7	0.7	0.0	14.0
Christian	0.0	0.0	8.3	0.0	8.3	0.0	41.6	0.0	0.0	41.6
Buddhist	11.1	0.0	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	44.4	0.0	0.0	11.1
Hindu	0.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	0.0	60.0

Mo = Malays only; Co = Chinese only; Io = Indians only; Oo = Others only;
MM = Mostly Malays; MC = Mostly Chinese; MI = Mostly Indians;
MO = Mostly Others; ME = Multi-ethnic.

PATTERNS OF FRIENDSHIP LOCALIZATION IN RELATION TO CLUBS

70.1 per cent of the total 414 respondents are not involved
in any social club. They are 79.9 per cent Malays, 12.0 per cent Chinese,
6.5 per cent Indians and 1.7 per cent 'Others'. Among them, only 6.5
per cent claimed not to have any friends. 51.2 per cent have Malay
friends only, 4.1 per cent have Chinese friends only, 14.5 per cent
have friends of mostly Malay origin and 15.1 per cent of them claimed

to have multi-ethnic friends.

5.3 per cent of the total 414 respondents belong to the high-class social clubs. They are 50.0 per cent Malays, 45.5 per cent Chinese and 4.5 per cent 'Others'. 40.8 per cent of them claimed to have friends of mostly Malay origin. 36.4 per cent have friends of mostly Chinese origin. Only 18.0 per cent of them have mulit-ethnic friends.

2.9 per cent of the total number of respondents are involved in professional clubs. They are 83.3 per cent Malays, 16.7 per cent Chinese, 8.3 per cent of them claimed to have no friends, 66.6 per cent have friends of mostly Malay origin. Those who claimed to have Chinese friends only, 'Others' friends only, and friends of multi-ethnic nature have the same percentages of 8.3 per cent each.

Of the total sample population, 4.1 per cent belongs to recreational clubs. They are 82.4 per cent Malays, 17.6 per cent Chinese. 76.4 per cent of them have friends of mostly Malay origin. 5.9 per cent have Chinese only as friends. 17.7 per cent have multi-ethnic friends.

14.5 per cent of the sample population are members of community clubs. They are 90.0 per cent Malays. 73.4 per cent of them have friends of mostly Malay origin and 21.8 per cent have multi-ethnic friends.

Only 1.0 per cent of the sample population belong to the sales club. They are made up of equal number of Malays and Chinese.

Half of them have friends of mostly origin and the other half have friends of mostly Chinese origin.

0.2 per cent of the total number of respondents are members of political reform club and all of them have friends of mostly Malay origin.

1.0 per cent of the total sample population are members of several clubs and 87.5 per cent of them are Malays, the rest are 'Others'. 62.5 per cent of them have friends of mostly Malay origin, 12.5 per cent have friends of mostly 'Others' origin. 25.0 per cent have friends of multi-ethnic origin.

It can be seen that clubs that have high percentage of its members from a certain ethnic group also have high percentage of friendship localization in that particular ethnic group. Among all the social clubs, respondents who are members of several clubs are the least 'ethnocentric' in choosing friends, with 25.0 per cent of them having friends of multi-ethnic nature. They are followed by community club (21.8 per cent), high-class club (18.0 per cent), recreational club (17.7 per cent), those who do not join any club (15.1 per cent), and professional club (8.3 per cent). Members of sales clubs and political reform club are the most 'ethnocentric' in friendship localization. None of them have friends of multi-ethnic origin, as shown in Table 27.

57

Table 27 : Social Clubs/Types of Friends (in percentages)

	N	Mo	Co	Io	Oo	MM	MC	MI	MO	ME
None	6.5	51.2	4.1	0.0	0.3	14.5	5.8	2.0	0.3	15.1
Pro.	8.3	25.0	8.3	0.0	8.3	41.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.3
High	0.0	22.7	18.2	0.0	4.5	18.1	18.2	0.0	0.0	18.0
Recre.	0.0	41.2	5.9	0.0	0.0	35.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	17.7
Comm.	0.0	60.0	0.0	1.7	0.0	13.4	1.7	0.0	1.7	21.8
Sales	0.0	25.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Pol.	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Sev.	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	12.5	0.0	0.0	12.5	25.0

Pro. = Professional club; High = High-class club; Recre. = Recreational
Club; Comm. = Community club; Pol. = Political reform club;
Sev. = Several club.

N = None; Mo = Malays only; Co = Chinese only; Io = Indians only;
MM = Mostly Malays; MC = Mostly Chinese; MI = Mostly Indians;
MO = Mostly 'Others'; ME = Multi-ethnic.

PATTERNS OF FRIENDSHIP LOCALIZATION IN RELATION TO SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS

The socio-economic variable or social status of the respondents
is operationally defined here in terms of their residential sites.
Pantai Hill and Section 16 are considered as the middle to upper-middle
class area or Area A. 15.0 per cent of the total number of respondents
live in this area. They are 42.8 per cent Malays, 34.7 per cent Chinese,
13.0 per cent Indians and 9.4 per cent 'Others'.

Taman Tun Doktor Ismail and Kawasan Melayu Lama is considered as the middle to lower-middle class area or Area B. 24.4 per cent of respondents come from Area B. They are 66.0 per cent Malays, 24.0 per cent Chinese, 13.1 per cent Indians and 9.4 per cent 'Others'.

Kampung Kerinchi, Kampung Sentosa and Kampung Pantai Dalam are considered as the lower class area or Area C. 60.6 per cent of the total number of respondents live in this area. They are 92.8 per cent Malays, 4.3 per cent Chinese, 2.4 per cent Indians and 0.5 per cent 'Others' as shown in Table 28 below.

Table 28 : Ethnicity/Residential Areas (in percentages)

			Malays	Chinese	Indians	'Others'
Area A	middle to upper-middle	Pantai Hill Section 16	42.8	34.7	13.1	9.4
Area B	middle to lower-middle	T.T. Dr. Ismail Kws. Melayu Lama	66.0	24.0	7.0	2.4
Area C	lower-class	Kampung Kerinchi Kampung Sentosa Kampung Pantai Dalam	92.8	4.3	2.4	0.5

The data collected show that the higher the social status of the respondents, the less their tendency to have friends from their own ethnic group only. Area A has the highest percentage of respondents claiming not to have any friends at all, that is, 8.4 per cent, as

compared to 4.5 per cent of Area B and 3.3 per cent of Area C. 24.3 per cent of the respondents of Area A have friends of mono-ethnic origin only, as compared to 38.1 per cent of Area B and 67.4 per cent of Area C. Thus it can be seen that the lower the socio-economic status of the respondents, the less inclined they are in mixing inter-ethnically.

42.3 per cent of Area A respondents have friends of mostly of one particular ethnic origin and some from other ethnic group. They have the highest percentages among the three socio-economic areas, followed by Area B with 39.9 per cent, and Area C with 13.3 per cent, Area A also has the highest percentage of its sample residents having friends of multi-ethnic in nature, that is, 25.0 per cent, as compared to 17.5 per cent of Area B, and 15.9 per cent of Area C as shown in Table 29 below.

Table 29 : Residential Areas/Types of Friends (in percentages)

		Mono-ethnic	Mostly mono-ethnic	Multi-ethnic	None
Area A	middle to upper-middle-class	24.3	42.3	25.0	8.4
Area B	middle to lower-middle-class	38.1	39.9	17.5	4.5
Area C	lower-class	67.4	13.3	15.9	3.3

To conclude, among the sample population, there is relative
little inter-ethnic mixing in informal social interaction. Despite
the urban style of living with its phusical proximity whether in terms
of work or residence, relatively few individuals in the various ethnic
groups develop lasting personal relationship with members of other
ethnic groups. The findings of the variation in friendship anchorage
among different socio-economic classes apparently tally with the
prior assumption that the lower socio-economic classes keep more to
their own ethnic community than those of the middle and upper ones.
But the low rate of intergroup mixing in the lower class areas could be
explained by the fact that these are areas which are almost exclusively
occupied by Malays only. For example, all the respondents of Kampung
Pantai Dalam are Malays, and there are 98.4 per cent Malay respondents
from Kampung Sentosa. This would have limited the chances of building
up friendship ties among the various ethnic groups due to lack of
contacts caused by residential segregation among the lower class
respondents.

However, individuals of various ethnic groups have ample
opportunities to com into contact with each other in their places of
work, schools, markets and other institutional settings. The myth of
occupational segregation of Chinese dominating commercial, mining and
manufacturing sectors, Malays in civil service and agriculture sectors,
and Indians in trade and plantation industry does not hold true
anymore. The economic shpere is becoming increasingly less confined
to the Chinese and Indians with increasing Malay upliftment. For

example, among the sample population, 77.8 per cent of the traders are Malays, 18.5 per cent are Chinese and 3.7 per cent are Indians. Among the professionals, 64.3 per cent are Malays, 23.8 per cent are Chinese, 9.5 per cent are Indians and 2.4 per cent are 'Others'.

Residential segregation may not be a causal variable here because the urban mode of living always results in neighbors who actually do not know each other or have little association with each other. Thus an area of different ethnic groups may have fairly self-contained unit of individual households with little interaction between them. This is feasible because every house has its own driveway running straight to the main road, a fence around the property, a telephone which enables its occupants to reach friends miles away almost as quickly as his next-door neighbor, newspapers and televisions to bring news, modern means of transport to reach friends far away with relative ease and speed. All these factors cut down the needs to interact with neighbours, even though the neighbor may be of the same ethnic group.

Therefore, it is feasible to conclude that the findings of this study does show that the respondent's socio-economic background is one of the many determinants of his social network anchorage. Those of lower socio-economic classes keep more to their own ethnic community than those of the middle and upper classes.

V
CONCLUSION

This study on the patterns of ethnic relations through an examination of inter-ethnic social network in urban Kuala Lumpur and Petaling Jaya areas has revealed that the new era of industralization and intense urbanization has brought about new trends in the patterns of ethnic relations.

When the multi-ethnic society came into being during the colonial era, there was little direct contact among the groups due to occupational and residential segregation. The colonial masters had always endeavoured to avoid any situation whereby inter-ethnic conflict might arise or the integration of the groups might be achieved. More-over, the status of the migrant groups of Chinese and Indians as foreign labourers and entrepreneurs was not felt as a threat to the indigenous Malays.

However, the pattern of ethnic relations changed drastically during the period shortly before Malaya achieved independence and during the post-independence period. The various ethnic groups came into direct contact with each other. The Chinese and Indians had decided to settle down in Malaya and demanded equal status and treat-ment as citizens of the same nation. Malays felt that they were at a great disadvantage in the laissez-faire capitalism system as compared

to the migrant groups. Their fear of being overwhelmed by the migrant
groups induced them to seek for constitutional and legal protection.
They succeeded in procuring exclusive rights and privileges as the
'sons of the soil'. The era of inter-ethnic competition and conflict
came into being.

The most prominent venue for inter-ethnic competition and
conflict is the urban area. During the past decade or so, governmental
policies such as the New Economic Policy and the process of modernization
and urbanization has brought a large influx of Malays into the urban
and suburb areas. The fact that Kuala Lumpur and Petaling Jaya are
predominantly Chinese and Indian area does not hold true anymore.
The Malays have moved into these areas. However, it is in the lower
class areas such as some of the squatters' villages that the occupants
are still very mono-ethnic in nature, consisting of mainly the Malays
in-migrants.

Malaysia has been independent for more than two decades.
However, integration, a state of affairs whereby every individual in
the society can participate fully and equally in the life of society
without distinctions made along ethnic lines has yet to be achieved.
This is largely reflected in the findings of this study which indicates
that urban Malaysian society is still basically a plural society with
its many ethnic groups living together but rarely interact with each
other on the level of primary relationships.

64

that the level of free inter-ethnic mixing among the members of these
organizations are very low.

In informal social interaction, the friendship localization
of the various ethnic groups is found to be more multi-ethnic in
nature than in formal institutional settings. The Malays are found
to have the least tendency to mix with other ethnic groups, followed
by the Chinese, Indians and 'Others'. Generally, there is much more
inter-ethnic mixing and interaction among those who are working
together than those without this common factor.

The urbanites seems to have fulfilled their social needs by
very much limiting to their own ethnic groups and relatives. The
length of residence proves to be determinative in the rate of inter-
ethnic mixing. The very recent migrants of less than two years and
those who stayed for more than eleven years are found to be keeping
more to their own ethnic groups in friendship localisation. The
communal political affiliation of the various ethnic groups is also
reflected in their friendship choice. However, there is variation
in friendship localization as the respondents' religious affilations
differ. The Muslims have the least tendency to inter-ethnic mixing
while the Christians have the highest rate of free inter-ethnic
mixing. In social clubs affiliation, members of sales clubs and
political reform clubs are found to be most 'ethnocentric' in
friendship localisation.

The socioeconomic status of the urbanites is found to be

perpetuation of the Malay special position, and finally the communal

politicking of the political parties.

between the Principal Ethnic Groups of
Malaysia and Singapore,' In South-east Asian Journal of
Sociology Vol 1, 1968.

2. Leinhardt, Samuel, (ed), Social Network : A Developing Paradigm.
New York : Academic Press, 1977.

3. Lim Mah-Hui, 'Ethnic and Class Relations in Malaysia.' Journal
of Contemporary Asia 10 (1/2) : 130-154, 1980.

4. Mitchell, J. Clyde, 'Social Networks.' Annual Review of
Anthropology Vol 3, 1974.

5. Ratnam, K.J., Communalism and the Political Process in Malaya.
Kuala Lumpur : University of Malaya Press, 1965.

6. Stenson, Micheal, 'Class and Race in West Malaysia.' In Bulletin
of Concerned Asian Scholars. 1976.

7. Tan Chee-Beng, 'Acculturation, Assimilation and Integration : The
Case of the Chinese in Malaysia.' paper presented at 'Modernisation
and National-cultural Identity Conference' at Merah University,
University Malaya, Kuala Lumpur, 1981.

8. Tan Chee-Beng, 'Ethnic Relations in Malaysia,' In Ethnicity and
Interpersonal Interaction : A Cross Cultural Study, ed., David Y.
H. Wu, pp. 37-61. Hong Kong : Maruzen Asia.

9. Whitten & Wolfe, 'Network Analysis.' In Handbook of Social and
Cultural Anthropology, ed., John J. Honigmann, pp. 717-741. Chicago.

Bibiography

1. Chiew Seen-Kong, 'Relations Between the Principal Ethnic Groups of Malaysia and Singapore.' In South-east Asian Journal of Sociology Vol 1, 1968.

2. Leinherdt, Samuel, (ed), Social Network : A Developing Paradigm, New York : Academic Press, 1977.

3. Lim Mah-Hui, 'Ethnic and Class Relations in Malaysia.' Journal of Contemporary Asia 10 (1/2) : 130-154, 1980.

4. Mitchell, J. Clyde, 'Social Networks.' In Annual Review of Anthropology Vol 3, 1974.

5. Ratnam, K.J., Communalism and the Political Process in Malaya. Kuala Lumpur : University of Malaya Press, 1965.

6. Stenson, Micheal, 'Class and Race in West Malaysia.' In Bulletin of Concerned Asian Scholars. 1976.

7. Tan Chee-Beng, 'Acculturation, Assimilation and Integration : The Case of the Chinese in Malaysia.' paper presented at 'Modernization and National-cultural Identity Conference' at Rumah University, University Malaya, Kuala Lumpur, 1983.

8. Tan Chee-Beng, 'Ethnic Relations in Malaysia,' In Ethnicity and Interpersonal Interaction : A Cross Cultural Study, ed., David Y. H. Wu, pp. 37-61. Hong Kong : Maruzen Asia.

9. Whitten & Wolfe, 'Network Analysis.' In Handbook of School and Cultural Anthropology, ed., John J. Honigmann, pp. 717-741. Chicago.