

MULTI-GROUP ANALYSIS BY ETHNICITY IN THE GOVERNANCE IMPACT TOWARD YOUTH TOLERANCE BEHAVIOR

¹KHAIROL ANUAR, KAMRI

²AIZATHUL HANI, ABD HAMID

³MD ROSLI, ISMAIL

⁴MANSOR, MOHD NOOR

*^{1,2}Pusat Pengajian Umum dan Kokurikulum, Universiti Tun Hussein Onn Malaysia
kbairol@uthm.edu.my*

*³Fakulti Pendidikan dan Sains Sosial, Universiti Selangor
mdrosli@unisel.edu.my*

⁴ Institut Kajian Etnik (KITA), Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia mansormohdnoor@gmail.com

Introduction

- Ethnic conflict history, unbalance socio-economy and unstable governance in a territory could lead to the ethnic conflict (Varshney, 2010)
- The Malaysia ethnic violence in 13 May 1969: unbalance socio-economy and unstable governance on ethnic management
- Kampung Medan, Selangor in 2007 & Kampung Rawa, Pulau Pinang in 1997

- Vulnerable youth identity
- disturbing statement on digital platform could lead to the ethnic violence
- their current level of satisfaction toward governance and ethnic tolerance should be identify regularly
- Pasir Gudang :
 - ethnic conflict history between Malay and Indian youth in 2007.
 - unbalance socio-economy because 50% of its population is lower and middle-income group (B40).
 - unsustainable development management that cause worst air and water pollution in 2019
- this study objective is to identify the impact of governance on ethnicity among youth in Pasir Gudang, Johor.

Methodology

- 362 respondent multi-ethnic youth (Malay 60%, Chinese 25%, Indian 15%)
- randomly chosen by using stratified sampling technique involving 10 youth from 45 Pasir Gudang Neighbourhood Association
- Data analysed by SEM-PLS (SMART PLS 3.0)

Result (Responden Profile)

Respondent Profile Variable		Frequency	Percent
Gender	Male	178	49.2
	Female	184	50.8
Ethnicities	Malay	215	59.4
	Chinese	89	24.6
	Indian	58	16.0
Age	15 to 18	306	84.5
	19 to 24	13	3.6
	25 to 30	43	11.9
Religion	Islam	214	59.1
	Hindu	53	14.6
	Buddha	75	20.7
	Cristian	18	5.0
	Others	2	0.6

Result (Measurement Model)

First Order Construct	Second Order Construct	Item	Loading	AVE	CR	Alpha
Acknowledgment		e1	0.88	0.77	0.91	0.85
		e2	0.89			
		e3	0.85			
Comfortability		e4	0.85	0.70	0.87	0.87
		e5	0.87			
		e6	0.78			
Accepting		e7	0.86	0.67	0.86	0.76
		e8	0.85			
		e9	0.73			
Sharing		e10	0.85	0.67	0.80	0.52
		e11	*deleted			
		e12	0.78			
Pride		e13	0.80	0.68	0.86	0.76
		e14	0.81			
		e15	0.86			
	Tolerance	Acknowledgment	0.75	0.61	0.83	0.81
		Comfortability	0.77			
		Accepting	0.80			
		Sharing	0.71			
		Pride	0.78			

Cont.

First order construct	Second order construct	item	loading	AVE	CR	Alpha
Economy		h1	0.88	0.73	0.89	0.82
		h2	0.89			
		h3	0.89			
Facility		h4	0.87	0.73	0.89	0.82
		h5	0.90			
		h6	0.80			
Public services		h7	0.79	0.70	0.88	0.79
		h8	0.79			
		h9	0.87			
Diversity Ethnicity Management		h10	0.81	0.71	0.88	0.80
		h11	0.87			
		h12	0.85			
	Governance	Economy	0.79	0.57	0.81	0.80
		Facility	0.81			
		Public Services	0.76			
		Diversity Ethnic Management	0.84			

Discriminant Model

	ACK	FAC	TOL	ACC	COM	DEM	ECO	GOV	PRI	PSE	SHA
ACK											
FAC	0.839										
TOL	0.687	0.807									
ACC	0.218	0.159	0.835								
COM	0.341	0.13	0.684	0.76							
DEM	0.251	0.62	0.308	0.116	0.738						
ECO	0.096	0.606	0.243	0.118	0.302	0.7					
GOV	0.195	0.503	0.283	0.135	0.243	0.386	0.811				
PRI	0.431	0.177	0.963	0.529	0.697	0.317	0.213	0.476			
PSE	0.188	0.792	0.229	0.076	0.176	0.579	0.646	0.122	0.558		
SHA	0.404	0.233	1.114	0.743	0.488	0.328	0.27	0.301	0.455	0.219	

Structural Model

	Beta Value	Std error	t-value	Decision
Tolerance -> Acknowledgement	0.53	0.06	8.07***	Significant
Tolerance -> accepting	0.73	0.03	22.33***	Significant
Tolerance -> comfortability	0.84	0.02	39.26***	Significant
Tolerance -> pride	0.80	0.02	35.00***	Significant
Tolerance -> sharing	0.77	0.03	25.46***	Significant
governance -> Facility	0.79	0.02	30.20***	Significant
governance -> Tolerance	0.22	0.05	3.61***	Significant
governance -> multi-ethnic management	0.85	0.01	48.22***	Significant
governance -> economy	0.78	0.02	29.42***	Significant
governance -> public services	0.87	0.01	55.83***	Significant

R² and Cross-validated redundancy

Ethnicity	Construct	R ²	CV-Comm (H ²)	CV-Red (Q ²)
Overall	GOV -> TOL	0.04	0.28	0.01
Malay	GOV -> TOL	0.08	0.32	0.03
Chinese	GOV -> TOL	0.08	0.32	0.02
Indian	GOV -> TOL	0.12	0.23	0.03

Multi-Group Analysis comparison between ethnicity

Malay and Chinese					
Path	Beta Value	Std error	Beta Value	Std error	T Value
governance -> Tolerance	0.29	0.07	0.08	0.11	0.10
Malay and Indian					
	Beta Value	Std error	Beta Value	Std error	T value
governance -> Tolerance	0.29	0.07	0.35	0.13	0.65
Chinese and Indian					
	Beta Value	Std error	Beta Value	Std error	T value
governance -> Tolerance	0.08	0.11	0.35	0.13	0.65

Result

- Governance is positively relate to the ethnic tolerance of youth in Pasir Gudang, Johor
- No significant differences in the impact of governance on the tolerances among ethnicity
- Significant differences only occur in each dimension which is out from this study scope.

Discussion

- Youth in industrial areas such as Pasir Gudang can develop tolerance, as long as their federal or local government supports them in facing a crisis and access to resources to competition between ethnic groups.
- The effect of modernisation in their local area may be more appropriate for youth to build a tolerance.
- Mohd Faisal, Mersat & Sarok (2012) identified even relatively some ethnicity shows higher satisfaction to the governance that leads to the tolerance attitude, the other ethnicity also shows the same pattern and there are no big differences between them.

Conclusion

- In the field of globalization and modernization, identity vulnerability among youth tend to cause them act in disturbing way to the ethnic peace.
- The ethnic disparities would have a detrimental effect on the growth of harmony and threaten a harmonious and prosperous society.
- Good governance will lead to the long terms positive effects of social change in addressing inclusion in social and economic growth.

THANK YOU