SOCIAL COHESION IN RUKUN TETANGGA (NEIGHBOURHOOD WATCH) IN HULU LANGAT, SELANGOR MALAYSIA

Mohd Syariefudin bin Abdullah, Mansor Mohd Nor, Ahmad Rizal Mohd Yusof &
Faridah Che Hussain

ABSTRACT

Begin in 1971 a new era in the Malaysian development has been started in which the emphasis on national unity became the national agenda. Tun Abdul Razak policy become an important person to bring the development through the New Economy Policy which the last product is unity. The impact of the policy the community has changed from traditional society to a modern society. Emile Durkheim already uses the concept as mechanical solidarity (rural community) and organic solidarity (modern community) to describe the changes. Ferdinand Tonnies described the changes through the concept of *Gemeinschaft* (community) to *Gesellschaft* (society). Through changes and modernization, society has changed to a more individualistic but still blend in among them in a new way, through association. In Malaysia, we have a department that manages the unity called the Rukun Tetangga-RT (Neighbourhood Watch). RT is the institution that officially is under the Department of National Unity and Integration (JPNIN). Therefore, RT plays important roles, especially in organizing the community, especially in the state of multicultural society. RT in this study area covers the district of Hulu Langat Selangor, Malaysia. There are seven zones in the district that includes Kajang, Ampang, Cheras, Beranang, Hulu Langat and Semenyih and Bangi. This study uses the questionnaire. This paper attempts to look at social cohesion in the community, especially in the neighborhood of RT in the district. This study has used the concept of social cohesion brought by Jenson (1998) and Paul Bernard (2000). There are six dimensions used to measure social cohesion: Belonging-Isolation, Inclusion-Exclusion, Participation-Non-involvement, Recognition-rejection, Legitimacy-Illegitimacy and Equality-inequality. A total of 588 questionnaires were analyzed. The discussion in this paper try to get feedback and input from presenters and participants of the seminar to improve the research was conducted.

Keyword: Social Cohesion, Community, Neighbourhood Watch, Rukun Tetangga, Selangor

INTRODUCTION

Social cohesion is an essential element to ensuring the communities in a peace and harmonies. It is a prerequisite to a stable state and society without conflict. Thus, developed countries like United States, Canada, United Kingdom, France and Australia have put social cohesion as an important policy for their countries. Social cohesion concept is not something new. Even the father of sociology like Emile Durkheim looks social cohesion in his works through the idea of integration of mechanical solidarity and organic solidarity. Then, continue by figures such

as Ferdinand Tonnies, Robert Redfield, Hillery and so on. In Malaysia, Shamsul Amri Baharuddin has highlighted the concept of social cohesion lately as an important formula for managing plural society. The location plays a significant role in social cohesion is neighborhoods where the community is located. In Malaysia, the neighborhood community is usually composed of multi-ethnic areas, especially in urban areas (urban and inner city) and rural (suburb). The government has established the National Unity and Integration Department (JPNIN) under the Prime Minister's Department under the Neighbourhood Watch program to integrate the separate communities. Therefore, social cohesion is implemented indirectly in community programs in the neighborhood. Hence this study will look at the pattern of social cohesion in KRT in Hulu Langat District.

METHOD

This study is used quantitative methods using questionnaires. A total of 1800 questionnaires were distributed in the district that includes seven zones covering Kajang, Ampang, Cheras, Beranang, Hulu Langat, Hulu Semenyih and Semenyih and had been circulated to 50 unit of KRT.

The attention given in this questionnaire is to answer only one aspect of objectives it was about to see the pattern and the level of social cohesion in KRT. In determining the pattern and level of social cohesion and the effectiveness of RT activity quantitative data based on descriptive statistics focused on the distribution of the data regarding frequency or percentage of respondents answer used in the analysis. This descriptive statistical tests using cross tabulation as below.

Table 1: Level of Ethnic Relations Pattern

Ethnic Relations	Percent
Built	50-100
Unbuilt	1-49

Background of Studies

The position of the study area of the district is one of the nine districts in the state and one of the areas that represent the municipal zoning areas in the Klang Valley with municipal solid. Hulu Langat bordering the Federal Territory of Kuala Lumpur (WPKL) and Gombak northwest, Petaling Jaya in the west, in the southwest Sepang, Negeri Sembilan in the south and east, while in the eastern state of Pahang curved. The district is an area of 829.44 square km and consists of seven districts, namely:

   i. Kajang;
  ii. Ampang;
 iii. Cheras;
 iv. Beranang;

    v. Hulu Langat;
   vi. Semenyih; dan
  vii. Hulu Semenyih.

This district was under two local authorities of Kajang Municipal Council (MPKj) and Ampang Jaya Municipal Council (the Council). Mukim-mukim under the administration of Hulu Langat is under the administration MPKJ Ampang but lived under the authority of the council. Hulu Langat is the only area in the Klang Valley Region has Kampung Melayu Traditional totaling 11.431 hectares located in the district of Hulu Langat, Semenyih, Kajang, and Beranang.

Regarding population, the number of population in the district is increasing from year to year. In 1970 the total population of the district was 109.976 people and in 1980 rose to 188.370 people. In 1990 the total population continued to increase to 413.900 people with an increase of 225.530 people, an increase of 3.7 percent. In 2000 the total population continued to increase to 864.451 people, an increase of 450.551 people. Mukim Ampang (195.160 people), Kajang (105.590 people) and Cheras (55.551 people) showed that three counties the most populous in 1991. In 2000, based on census population statistic records show Ampang has a population of 357.925 people (41.4%), Kajang totaled 229,655 people (26.6%) and Cheras 163.550 people (18.9%). The overall population in the District in 2000 was 864.451 people of whom are ethnic Malays (50%), followed by Chinese (35%) and India (11%) and other ethnic groups (4%).

DISCUSSION OF CONCEPTS

1.   Social Cohesion

Emile Durkheim as a father of Sociologist looks social cohesion to assess the ability of the community to stay in touch in various stages of development. Social cohesion is a fusion form of mechanical (pre-industrial societies) to form an organic unity which refers to the modern world. Emile Durkheim sees the coherence can be maintained by the government and the law established. Among the concepts related to the integration of conflict is contrary to the concept solidaristic (cohesion), anomie (riots/divisions) and alienation (isolation) to see a stable society and cooperation rather than conflict. Therefore, social cohesion is related to a country's development process.

Max Weber sees social cohesion as collective ideas and values that are important in social development. Talcott Parsons sees the social cohesion of the functional structure of which society is founded are combined with a shared value system. Among the recent scholars who see integration is Judith Maxwell (1996). He sees social cohesion in dimensions of economic development. Thus, in his view, social cohesion is a process that builds and maintains a feeling of belonging (sense of belonging) in the community and the atmosphere that puts a person in a community. If observed, the concept and definition of social cohesion are not played out in the community, and a form of social cohesion is the feeling of being in the community. The sense of belonging is the basis for the establishment of social cohesion.

Jane Jenson (1998) stated that social cohesion is used to describe the processes that not only involve the state or the country but the sense of responsibility and commitment or desire or ability to live together in harmony. Among others who talk about social cohesion is Berger (1998) and Gough and Olofsson (1999). According to them, social cohesion is about social integration, stability, and failure of integration (disintegration). Hence social cohesion

is related to the inability to integrate and integrate. This issue will see the level of integration which will determine the level of social cohesion.

In 1996 major economic organizations, namely the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) said that social cohesion is an important tool in the era of globalization (OECD 1996). This is because to maintain stability and prosperity in the society; the world needs the values that can be shared and maintaining social cohesion from time to time.

According to Lockwood (1999), social cohesion refers to a combination of active social networks such as brotherhood and local voluntary organizations at the local level. In this context, Lockwood has put a clear framework of discussions on social cohesion indicators traits such as altruism trust (trust) and willingness to provide assistance (Lockwood 1999: 69).

Bollen and Hoyle (2001) have suggested two perspectives on social cohesion, namely regarding objectives and impact. It refers to an actual contribution to the group as a whole. It is based on the impact of social cohesion on the relationship and the closeness of each member in the group. Thus, in this context, it involves a perception among members of the group. According to him, there are two things clear in social cohesion, namely:

a) The feeling of "individual" which is characteristic sense of belonging to a group; and
b) The feeling of "spirit" (i.e., emotional response) associated with the membership and the group.

Feeling a "sense of belonging" be the basis of the existence of the group, while "spirit" has a direct impact on the motivation of the members of the group. Thus, according to them, "sense of belonging" and "spirit" are two important things to social cohesion in the community.

Beauvais and Jenson (2002) has provided five possible different concept of social cohesion:

1. Social cohesion as a civic and cultural values;
2. Social cohesion as a social order (social order) and social control;
3. Social cohesion as social cohesion and reducing the wealth gap;
4. Social cohesion as a social network and social capital (social capital); and,
5. Social cohesion as the determination of place and identity.

Thus, the concept of the five possibilities brought by Beauvais and Jenson will determine which way the social cohesion to be brought in a discussion or study. If the note is the final goal of social cohesion welfare (well-being), that can be created in the community. In other words, the extent of social cohesion will be able to overcome the problems that exist in society. The issues are as poverty, unemployment, discrimination, denial (exclusion), dissatisfaction with certain political parties and so on. For policymakers, this is important to create the appropriate policy.

In the United Kingdom, the concept of social cohesion has been debated in the aim of creating social cohesion in the context of ethnic and cultural diversity. The concept is used there is a 'community cohesion' (community cohesion). This concept is based on community cohesion as more efficient than social class or economic status. The concept of 'community cohesion' has been received in the various communities because of ethnic riots in 2001 in the North of England. Because of that, a team called The Community Cohesion Review Team were developed in the United Kingdom to evaluate the events that occurred during the year. This team uses the concept of 'community cohesion' to include the values and attitudes in

ethnic communities in repairing the relationship better. The idea of 'community cohesion' means "... there are a shared vision and sense of belonging to all communities; the diversity of people's different backgrounds and circumstances is appreciated and positively valued…" (Local Government Association 2002: 6). According to Ted Cantle (2001) 'community cohesion' is a reference to "... those from different backgrounds have similar life opportunities; and robust and positive relationships are being developed between people from different backgrounds in the workplace, in schools and within neighborhoods…" (Cantle 2001: 14). Thus, 'community cohesion' supports the concept of social cohesion brought before this.

Thus, for developed countries such as Canada, France, the European Union (EU) and the United Kingdom, social cohesion is a solution to the problem by forming new policies based on problems in one or two decades ago.

According to Jenson (1998), five dimensions exist in social cohesion. However, Paul Bernard (2000) have added another, namely equality - inequality into six dimensions are as outlined below:

1. *Belonging–Isolation*: it refers to the existence or absence of shared values and common sense of identity.
2. *Inclusion–Exclusion*: This dimension refers to the degree of equality and opportunity among citizens in the economy, especially the market.
3. *Participation–Non-involvement*: it focuses on involvement in politics among the people either in the central or local government.
4. *Recognition–Rejection*: This dimension refers to the concern on the difference or tolerance in an increasingly diverse society.
5. *Legitimacy–Illegitimacy*: it relates to the maintenance of legitimacy in the political and social institutions - from the state to individuals in the community who have different interests.
6. *Equality–Inequality*: it refers to equality and equal opportunities in society regardless of ethnicity, religion, culture and language.

All of this domain is an important measure to look at the social cohesion that has been incorporated between Jenson idea of the dimension of the first to fifth and Paul Bernard of the sixth dimension. These dimensions are an important tool in assessing social cohesion in the community.

2.   Rukun Tetangga

Neighbourhood Watch is a voluntary organization and regarding the concept is the same as an organization established in developed countries such as Japan called Tonarigumi and in the United Kingdom under the name of Neighbourhood Watch. In Malaysia, neighborhood organizations patronized by the Department of National Unity and Integration (JPNIN). In the period January 2011 to October 2012 the number of Neighbourhood Watch area has increased from 3995 to 6031, an increase of 2036 RT areas simultaneously increase by 51 percent (Gandesan a/l Letchumanan 2013). Neighbourhood Watch in Malaysia has over 30 years old. In this age, Neighbourhood has undergone several transformations by the changing times and the modernization of the country. Mahani Abu Bakar (2008: 26) states that Neighbourhood Watch Now this is more than the concept of community development in the past Neighbourhood Watch more on the concept of neighborhood and local security. However, the concept of neighborhood is still applied and not overlooked, in line with the neighborhood

that emphasizes solidarity and good neighborliness. Whereas in the context of this relationship is a priority of the various races in the neighboring population and the implementation of activities.

Regarding historical background, Neighbourhood Watch Scheme initiated by calling RT and was launched by the Prime Minister at the time, the late Tun Abdul Razak on August 29, 1975. At that point, the scheme is put under "Regulations", (Pillars Neighbors) enacted under the Emergency (Essential Powers) Ordinance 1969 (Ordinance 1) (Rashid Saad 2004). At the same time, he began to be enforced in Peninsular Malaysia. Among the areas which were the pioneers of this scheme is to Kampung Hemalatha in Wilayah Persekutuan Kuala Lumpur. Later, the scheme was further expanded in Sabah and launched on 31 August 1985 and then again in Sarawak launched on 1 February 1988. At this time, the situation is not exactly stable than the communist threat. Thus in addition to the role played by the security forces, the local community has also been given the responsibility of safeguarding and fostering unity through this scheme.

When the situation is getting better by the 1980s, the concept of Neighbourhood Watch Scheme has been reviewed, and amendments were made to the Regulations (RT) RT 1975. The scheme has been transferred regarding focus, from the concept to the concept of neighborhood safety starting in 1983. This because in the last two decades, from 1970 to 1990, the urbanization process has changed dramatically regarding modernization. As a result, a densely populated urban area of the composite of various races, activity, and lifestyle. This scenario provides a new phenomenon in the context of neighborhood and community development (Mohd. Taib Dora, 2009: 34). The changes taking place in the situation in the country where the communist threat had ceased following the surrender of the communists.

Starting in 2001, the focus is on the aspect of neighborhood community development. Thus, activities that formed the concept of various aspects including "education for life" and empower communities to improve the ability of society to social and lifestyle changes (Ruslan Ngah 2007: 50). The programs are coordinated by JPNIN. RT if viewed objectively established is to preserve, enhance and strengthen national unity and integration in line with national development policies based on the Federal Constitution and Rukun Negara (Shamsul Amri 2008: 183). Based on this, it can be viewed in detail the concepts emphasized in recent stepped Fundamental concepts:

1. Build community by encouraging participation and responsibility to unit of RT in developing communities;
2. Being a bridge between leaders and the public where RT play an important role among two sides through social activities;
3. Improve the ability of communities to meet the challenges of social change, lifestyle and family system;
4. Improve the quality of life through social services, especially to groups of low-income, physically challenged and special groups should be assisted;
5. 5. Encourage active participation among members in efforts to eradicate poverty - 'One Sector KRT One Product';
6. Encourage the involvement of professionals, highly educated, corporate groups, pensioners and civil servants concerned to lead Pillars stepped; and
7. Encourages ethnic relations and national integration.

(Alias Mohamad 2005: 116)

According to Mohd. Taib Dora (2009) RT areas ideal must be in the vicinity of 2,000 people or 80 houses. However, the size of a Neighbourhood Watch area should not exceed 6,000 residents to enable close communication and know one (Mohd. Taib Dora, 2009: 34).

Rashid Saad (2004) explains that the concept of Neighbourhood Watch can be categorized as the concept of Neighbourhood Watch New Millennium (RT 21) which meet the requirements and preparations community Neighbourhood Watch in the face of the new millennium in which he evolved from the concept of 'security (1975)', ' neighborliness (1983) 'and now the concept of' community development '. Among the primary emphasis in community development assistance approach (social outreach) which gives emphasis to helping marginalized groups. Thus, the changes experienced by the stepped Pillars is by current needs. These changes are essential to face the social and economic changes in the country. This will enable the role and function of the Pillars stepped relevant from time to time and made Pillars stepped as a body that is respected and has a high image among the local community as a resource and an area shaded.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

A.   Demographic and Profile Respondents

1.   Respondents by Ethnics

According to Table 2 below, of the 600 respondents were 61.8 percent are ethnic Malays, 23.8 percent are ethnic Chinese and Indians 12.3 per cent and 2 per cent are ethnic Malay Bumiputera not. This study describes the population of Malaysia, where 60 per cent Malays and Bumiputeras, 28 percent ethnic Chinese and 12 percent Indians.

Table 2: Respondents by Ethnics

Ethnics	Percentage
Malay	61.8
Chinese	23.8
Indian	12.3
Bumiputra Non-Malay	2.0
TOTAL	**100**

2.   Status of KRT Membership Respondent

Based on Table 3 below can be concluded that most of the respondents were of the respondents were regular members, regardless of whether the ethnic Malay, Chinese and Indian. Of data available per cent of respondents to all three ethnicities were great in terms of regular membership with 83 per cent for ethnic Malays followed by Chinese at 79 percent and India by 77 percent. This study shows that community involvement is high regardless of ethnicity. Meanwhile, the status of the KRT committee members who responded represents a fifth of respondents, regardless of ethnicity. The data shows the number of respondents from the three ethnic groups is almost the same regarding percentage. However, the Indians showed the largest proportion of 23 per cent, followed by ethnic Chinese, 21 percent Malay and only 17 per cent. This study indicates the involvement of the committee members is involved across ethnic groups.

Table 3: Percentage of KRT Membership by Ethnics

KRT Status	ETHNIC		
	MALAY	CHINESE	INDIAN
Committies	17.0	21	23.0
Member	83.0	79.0	77.0
Total	**100**	**100**	**100**

3.   Respondents by Gender

Table 4 below shows the percentage of KRT based on gender. By comparison, it was found that the percentage of sex between men and women is about the same. However, the study also found that the proportion of female respondents was larger than the male to all ethnic Chinese but showing the number of males larger than female, at 54 percent compared to women had over 45 per cent. Percent ethnic Malays recorded a total of approximately 53 per cent ethnic man in about 46 percent. Similarly, the Indians had some larger percent of respondents, around 52 percent compared to 46 percent men.

Table 4: Percent of Respondent by Gender

Gender	ETHNIC		
	MALAY	**CHINESE**	**INDIAN**
Man	46.1	54.5	47.3
Women	53.9	45.5	52.7
Total	**100**	**100**	**100**

4.   Respondents by Age

Based on Table 5 below were ethnic participation in this study is to show the age between 31 and 50 years of 79 per cent for ethnic Malays, followed by ethnic Indians by 76 per cent and 67 per cent ethnic Chinese. However, data showing the ethnic Malay and Indian people are in the age group 31 to 40 years of 44 per cent and 47 per cent respectively. While much ethnic Chinese were in the age group 41 to 50 years of 42 per cent. This situation gives a basic overview that members of the public KRT of the age group 31 to 40 years old are the age group that is active and productive for both community building.

Table 5: Percentage for Respondent by Age

Age	ETNIK		
	Melayu	**CINA**	**INDIA**
30 years below	14.6	21.7	14.9
31-40 years	43.9	25.2	47.3
41-50 years	35.0	42.0	28.4
51 above	6.5	11.2	9.5
JUMLAH	**100**	**100**	**100**

B.   Social Cohesion

This section will try to see to what extent the building of community cohesion in Neighbourhood Watch (RT) in the Hulu Langat district. This chapter will look at the pattern of social cohesion in communities RT and measured by pitting the six dimensions of dimensional sense of belonging, recognition, inclusion, participation, inclusiveness, and equality.

1.   Social Cohesion Socio-Culture: Dimension Sense of Belonging

In general, the analysis of the findings shows that social cohesion in the socio-cultural dimension based on the feeling of belonging showed significant differences among ethnic Malays, Chinese and Indians. From this analysis it was found that the Indians were relatively more developed social cohesion than other ethnic groups, followed by ethnic Malays and ethnic Chinese lastly shows the percentage point less social cohesion built. From this analysis also indicates that there are significant disparities between ethnic groups regarding social cohesion.

From Table 6 below shows the findings in detail based on the assumption of a questions-dimensional sense of belonging to social cohesion. From this analysis, it was found that different ethnic data. Indians are relatively higher income per cent compared to other ethnic groups in which 3 of the four questions assumptions feeling of belonging is positive. While ethnic Malay 2 of 4 question is worth the percentage of positive while only one of the four questions that were asked were positive assumptions. It was found that the three-three ethnic groups agree that assist different ethnic neighbors is an item to ask the social cohesion dimension of the feeling of belonging that most agreed upon where the percentage is 50 percent or higher for all ethnic groups showed a positive value. This indicates that respondents have no problem to help a neighbor dies regarding the percentage of respondents only Malays and Indians which gives a neighbor in distress. As for items that feeling of belonging to two is sad when a positive value where ethnic Indian higher percentage than ethnic Malays while a negative value for the Chinese. Although the percentage shows the proportion of respondents, who negatively to China but still a high level of a percent can be said to question sadly if a neighbor died. Practically all ethnicities were saddened if any neighbors who died regardless of ethnicity. The next item is a questions-dimensional sense of belonging that is comfortable to three different neighboring ethnic Indians were found only giving the percentage of positive ethnic Malays and Chinese while providing a negative percentage. This gives the impression that the ethnic Malays and Chinese are not comfortable being in the communal areas Multi ethnic neighborhood. They are more comfortable to live in mono-ethnic areas. While the item is the last question relates to a hypothetical question-dimensional sense of belonging to an invitation to a celebration in which all ethnic groups studied showed a negative percentage. This suggests that each ethnic comfortable inviting only their only ethnic group for a celebration or festivity.

Table 6: Sense of Belonging by Ethnic (Percentage)

Dimension/Ethnic	Agree on answer/Positive Only		
	Malay	**Chinese**	**Indian**
Feeling sad event of the death of another ethnic	59	40	69
Helping other ethnic neighbors	74	50	83
Comfortable with multiethnic neighbors	33	34	50
Multi-ethnic celebration invitation	34	19	27

Overall it can be concluded that the dimensions of the feeling of belonging to a community of solidarity in which the respondents were Malays, Chinese and Indians are at the intermediate level and negative. Of all surveyed ethnic Indians are found to be positive regarding the social cohesion dimensional sense of belonging than ethnic Malays and Chinese. Chinese respondent most loose or weak sense of belonging in the neighborhood compared to other ethnic communities.

2.   Sosial Cohesion Sosio-Culture: Dimensi Of Recognition

In general, the findings show that the dimensions of the recognition of the socio-cultural social cohesion are built among the Malay and Indian respondents, but at a moderate level for ethnic Chinese. Malay respondents of this study showed that the highest recognition of the dimensions of ethnic Chinese while the lowest level of the dimension of recognition to social cohesion. Relative gaps between ethnic groups. For Malay and Indian ethnic disparity are small but ethnic Malay and Chinese rather wide gap.

From Table 7 below shows the findings in detail based on the assumption of the question of recognition of the dimensions of social cohesion. From this analysis, it was found that different ethnic data. Relatively speaking ethnic Malays showed the highest percentage compared to other ethnic groups and for each item that asked the question the assumption that ethnic Malays are higher than other ethnic and showed a positive percentage for each item that was asked a hypothetical question. Similarly to the Indians which shows the percent positive for each item asked. In relative terms between Malay and Indian respondents were found to show a small percentage difference. However, the situation is different for the Chinese respondents showed only two items only which shows the percent positive that is proud and honored to be the ethnic composition in other ethnic celebrations. However, the percentage obtained is to be at 50 percent, which is still at the level of medium. Hence it can be concluded from the survey that the ethnic Chinese in neighborhood communities RT gives recognition to the law and the original inhabitants of the simple percentage.

Table 7: Dimensi of Recognition (Percentage)

Dimension/Ethnic	Agree on answer/Positive Only		
	Malay	**Chinese**	**Indian**
Acknowledge the differences between religious law	58	45	53
Pride in ethnic composition	80	50	74
Proud to be in other ethnic celebrations	71	50	69
Giving recognition to the majority of religious believers	62	39	55

Overall from this study can be stated that the dimensions in the neighborhood community recognition for the positive responders was different for ethnic Malays and Indians but not for ethnic Chinese. Ethnic Chinese provides a simple percentage and negative items that are valued dimensions recognition.

3. Social Cohesion In Economy: Dimension Of Inklusif

In general, it can be said that social cohesion in the economy based on the dimensions of inclusiveness built among respondents Malay, Indian and straightforward for respondents less built for Chinese respondents. It can be seen that the gap between the ethnic significant percentage of those surveyed. Four dimensions of inclusiveness was a hypothetical question 3 is positive for the ethnic Malay respondents, while only two were positive for Chinese respondents and none of the respondents were positive for ethnic Chinese. Malay respondents were relatively more developed regarding the dimensions of inclusiveness.

From Table 8 below shows the findings in detail based on the assumption of the question of inclusiveness dimension to social cohesion. From this analysis, it was found that different ethnic data. Available shows the percentage of ethnic Chinese to question the assumption that negative items that were inclusive. Only items for disclosure of the education sector shows a relatively high percentage of 46 percent in value while other items show the percent negative. For respondents ethnic Malay and Indian items that mention inclusiveness and transparency of job opportunities open education sector shows a positive value. While questions relating to the acceptance of meritocracy only ethnic Malays who showed a positive value.

Table 8: Dimension of Inclusiveness (Percentage)

Dimension/Ethnic	Agree on answer/Positive Only		
	Malay	**Chinese**	**Indian**
Openness in job opportunities	69	35	61
Openness service system	34	13	20
Openness of the education system	67	46	60
Acceptance of meritocracy	66	35	47

Overall it can be concluded from this study that the dimensions of ethnic inclusiveness appear more positive than other ethnic groups. Chinese was the lowest level of acceptance to

the dimensions of inclusiveness where shows all the negatives to a hypothetical question that was asked.

4.   Social Cohesion In Economy: Dimension Of Equality

In general, the findings show that the dimension of equality for economic and social cohesion are changing for all ethnic groups. Malay respondents were the relatively more built-ethnic dimension of equality versus India and China. Regarding percent answered agrees found lowest ethnic Chines

From Table 9 below shows the findings in detail based on the assumption of the equality dimension to the question of social cohesion. From this analysis, it was found that different ethnic data. However, relatively speaking Malay and Indian respondents showed a similar pattern regarding positive responses based on a hypothetical question of equality item. Two of the four items that were showing the percentage is relatively high at questions related to government subsidies and developed countries. While the two items again demonstrate the percentage of negative answers to questions rather poverty gap between ethnic and government policies. Meanwhile, China also shows the percentage of respondents who negatively to the question of government subsidies compared with ethnic Malays and Indians.

Table 9: Equality Dimension by Ethnic (Percentage)

Dimension/Ethnic	Agree on answer/Positive Only		
	Malay	**Chinese**	**Indian**
The poverty gap significantly	11	10	10
Government subsidies to all	75	35	62
Government policies to all	38	19	19
Developed countries the cooperation of all ethnic	84	60	70

Overall it can be concluded from this study that the equality dimension is found to ethnic Malays, and Indians is more positive than the Chinese. For the Chinese, they just accept that this country will move forward if the cooperation of all the people around while others question asked is worth percent negative.

5.   Social Cohesion In Politic: Dimension Of Participation

In general, the findings show that the dimensions of political participation for social cohesiveness are located right in the middle and down for all respondents surveyed by ethnicity. The relative difference between the percentage of respondents is small, between 6 to 14 percent.

From Table 10 below shows the results obtained in detail based on the assumption of the question of participation dimension to social cohesion. From this analysis, it was found that there were no significant differences between ethnic groups regarding the percentage of questions the assumption that participation dimensions are studied. Most of the questions asked of respondents gave a negative answer agree. Of the four questions asked questions are available on the ethnic-based party participation is the lowest percentage of respondents said that between 13 to 19 percent of all ethnic groups studied. However, relatively speaking Malay respondents higher than other ethnic groups, namely 19 percent. Meanwhile, the

question of freedom of voting showed a negative percentage and the second lowest of all the ethnic groups of between 19 to 33 percent. Ethnic Malays highest 33 percent ethnic Chinese and the lowest at 19 percent. This situation explains the respondents felt that their freedom to make a choice in politics is low. Also, the question of freedom to discuss political issues also showed a negative percentage, between 31 to 42 percent where the highest percentage of ethnic Malays and ethnic Chinese is very low. Only the question of participation in the freedom of association only shows the percent positive for all respondents by ethnicity. Relatively speaking respondents from ethnic Malays and Indians shows the percentage exceeds 60 percent, a relatively high proportion of ethnic Chinese, while at 51 percent on average. In general, it can be seen that the participation of respondents in the association is high with the percent positive.

Table 10: Dimension of Participation by Ethnic (Percentage)

Dimension/Ethnic	Agree on answer/Positive Only		
	Malay	**Chinese**	**Indian**
Freedom to voting	33	19	31
Freedom to discuss political matters	42	34	31
Freedom of participation in society	69	51	62
Participation in ethnic-based parties	19	13	14

Overall it can be concluded from this study that the dimension of participation found that all respondents indicated a low level of participation in the community except for participation in the association that shows a positive value. Four items assumption participation of social cohesion found three questions are negative and one positive question. This finding explains that the level of participation is still low-ethnic.

6.   Social Cohesion In Politic: Dimensi Of Legitimasion

In general, the findings show that the dimension of social cohesion and political legitimacy is its built-in among all ethnic groups studied. In relative terms over the built-ethnic social cohesion of the ethnic dimension of legitimacy against China and India. Chinese is the most built-dimension of legitimacy for social cohesion.

From Table 11 below shows the results obtained in detail based on the assumption of legitimacy questions dimensions to social cohesion. From this analysis found more built-ethnic social cohesion dimension of legitimacy. Of all the hypothetical question the legitimacy of the available dimensions Malay respondents gave answers per cent of respondents agreed compared to China and India were higher except for items freedom of expression rights of ethnic Indians are showing highly positive compared to other ethnic groups. Two of the four questions that were asked were positive to the ethnic Malay is the question of freedom of states rights and government governance news while two more questions are negative, i.e., government services and rising cost of living. For the Indians showed only one positive item, namely items freedom of expression rights as other questions is negative and the ethnic Chinese all four questions is to give a negative answer. Also, there is a significant difference in responses especially for items freedom of expression rights.

Table 11: Dimension of Legitimacy by Ethnic (Percentage)

Dimension/Ethnic	Agree on answer/Positive Only		
	Malay	**Chinese**	**Indian**
Freedom of expression rights	55	29	84
Government services	20	14	14
Obtain information governance through government TV station	54	30	47
The rising cost of living	19	17	14

Overall it can be concluded from this study that the dimension of legitimacy found the legitimacy of respondents are moderate and negative. Ethnic Malays showed positive responses were positive findings, but simple for two questions and two questions were negative. Indians only the items which showed high positive response and built-dimensional legitimacy but three questions again negative. For ethnic Chinese all questions that were asked were negative.

CONCLUSION

There are six dimensions of social cohesion that has been discussed before. The dimension of social cohesion discussed in Table 12 below is a dimension of social cohesion using the data according to the mean value based on ethnicity. Overall found the mean value for the dimension of social cohesion by the mean value for each dimension according to the mean value is positive and high for all ethnic groups studied.

In relative terms compared to the three-three respondents surveyed ethnic Malay, Chinese and Indian respondents were Malay the mean value of the highest compared to respondents from other ethnic groups, followed by Indians and Chinese. Malay respondents were found to be higher than respondents in India for five dimensions including dimensions of inclusiveness, participation, recognition, legitimacy and fairness. The dimensional sense of belonging showed a higher mean value than the Malay respondents.

In relative terms between the three-three ethnic conducted this study found no significant difference between the average value of the lots in which all the dimensions are positioned over the 3:00 of strong positive values except for the dimension of the legitimacy of the Chinese respondents had a mean value of 2.92. If observed between respondents Malays, Chinese, and Indians with the highest mean value obtained for the mean value of the Malay respondents is the highest recognition dimension. While the dimension with the highest mean value of the respondents India and China are the dimensions of the feeling of belonging to a mean value, respectively 3.53 and 3.23. If the observed relative found by ethnic dimension mean for social cohesion of the Chinese respondents were found to be consistently below than the mean for ethnic Malays and Indians.

Meanwhile, if observed relative available to all three ethnic Malay, Chinese and Indian share values mean the lowest of the dimension of legitimacy where Malay respondents had the highest mean of 3.13 and was followed by respondents in India were 3.01 and Chinese respondents with the lowest the mean value of 2.92. However, if the note were, all ethnic groups studied had a mean strong dimension between the dimension of legitimacy despite receiving the lowest score.

THE CURRENT SOCIO-ECONOMIC, ENVIRONMENT, MEDIA AND POLITICAL
TRENDS IN MALAYSIA

Table 12: Min Value Dimension in Social Cohesion by Ethnic

Dimension/Ethnic	Agree on answer/Positive Only		
	Malay	**Chinese**	**Indian**
Belonging	3.42	3.23	3.53
Inclusiveness	3.59	3.14	3.35
Participation	3.26	3.09	3.15
Recognition	3.75	3.41	3.68
Legitimasion	3.13	2.92	3.01
Equality	3.47	3.09	3.19

Overall, the data showed that the highest mean for ethnic Malays are different than the ethnic Chinese and Indians where the ethnic dimension that recorded the highest mean is the dimension of recognition while the ethnic Chinese and Indians dimension which recorded the highest value is the dimension of the feeling of belonging. While the dimensions of the recorded dimensions with the lowest mean value are legitimacy in which the three-three groups showed the lowest mean value for legitimacy. However, the overall mean value recorded by the three-three ethnic groups are at a mean value of the strong positive.

REFERENCE

Bernard, P. 2000. *Social cohesion: a dialectical critique of a quasi-concept*. Kertas SRA-491. http://www.omiss.ca/english/reference/pdf/pbernerd.pdf [14 April 2013].

Ibn Khaldun. 2002. *Mukadimah*. Ed. ke-4. Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka (DBP).

Jabatan Perangkaan Malaysia. 2010. Jumlah Penduduk Malaysia. http://www.statistics.gov.my/portal/download_Stats_Negeri/files/State/2010/Selangor/06Penduduk.pdf [1 Januari 2015].

Jabatan Perpaduan Negara dan Integrasi Nasional (JPNIN). 2015. *Data Penubuhan Kawasan Rukun Tetangga Bagi Tahun 2013 (Sehingga September 2013)*. http://www.jpnin.gov.my/statistik [1 Januari 2015].

Jenson, J. 1998. *Mapping social cohesion: the state of Canadian research* (pp. 109-28). Family Network, CPRN.

Kementerian Komunikasi dan Multimedia Malaysia (KKMM). 2013. *JPNIN Berjaya tubuhkan 6,330 kawasan Rukun Tetangga*. https://besrtmkk.wordpress.com/2013/07/24/24072013-jpnin-berjayatubuhkan-6330-kawasan-rukun-tetangga/[1 Januari 2015].

Khairol Anuar Kamri. 2013. *Pengaruh Etnik, Tadbir Urus dan Etika Kerja Ke Atas Pegawai Polis Diraja Malaysia: Kajian Kes Di Kuala Lumpur*. Tesis PhD Institut Kajian Etnik (KITA), Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia (UKM).

Maxwell, J. 1996. *Social Dimension of Economic Growth.* http://www.cprn.org/ documents/28965_en.pdf [13 April 2013].

Mohd. Taib Dora. 2009. Keberkesanan Program Rukun Tetangga Dalam Memupuk Perpaduan dan Integrasi Nasional. Jurnal Perpaduan Jabatan Perpaduan Negara dan Integrasi Nasional (JPNIN). Jilid 1 Bil. 1.

Rashid Saad. 2004. Sumbangan Rukun Tetangga 21 dalam perpaduan negara dan pembangunan komuniti. Dlm. Dani Salleh (pnyt.). *Pembangunan Komuniti: Dasar, Konsep, Strategi dan Isu di Malaysia,* Sintok: Penerbit Universiti Utara Malaysia (UUM).

Shamsul Amri Baharuddin. 2008. *Modul Hubungan Etnik*. Shah Alam: Pusat Penerbit Universiti, Universiti Teknologi Mara.

Mohd Syariefudin Abdullah
Jabatan Pengajian Kewarganegaraan dan
Kemasyarakatan, Fakulti Sains Kemanusiaan
Universiti Pendidikan Sultan Idris
syariefudin@fsk.upsi.edu.my

Prof. Dr. Mansor Mohd Noor
Institut Kajian Etnik
UKM 43600 Bangi
Selangor
mnmansor@ukm.edu.my

Faridah Binti Che Husain
Pusat Pencetus Bakat & Latihan Industri
(CITra), Universiti Malaya
irdina@um.edu.my

Ahmad Rizal Mohd Yusof
Institut Kajian Etnik
Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia
army@ukm.edu.my