

*Kajian Malaysia, Jld. XXV, No. 1, Jun 2007*

**TRUST IN MONO-ETHNIC AND MIXED-ETHNIC  
ASSOCIATIONS IN PENANG**

James K. Campbell  
Faculty of Education  
Deakin University, Australia  
Jamesca@deakin.edu.au

Yen Siew Hwa  
School of Distance Education  
Universiti Sains Malaysia  
Penang  
shyen@usm.my

*Investigation into trust has become a topical issue in current social science research. This is, in large part, a result of a perception that trust in institutions has declined markedly in the past two decades. This paper investigates trust in some of Penang's civil associations as a way of measuring the health of social capital in Penang. It focuses on issues of trust and diversity since both are critical issues in Malaysian society in general and civil associations in particular. We began our analysis expecting higher forms of trust among members in the mono-ethnic associations, based on the power of bonding. However, findings from this study tend to suggest that rather than leading to lesser trust and ineffectiveness, involvement in mixed-ethnic associations have in fact generated higher trust among their members. These findings reveal an interesting corrective to more pessimistic view on the relationship between trust and diversity. Data from this study also provide important insight into how bridging between different people in associations marked by diversity can accentuate trust over and above the levels found in associations where bonding between like types is the dominant characteristic. The data also indicate that for both, mono-ethnic and mixed-ethnic associations, it is the extent of members' involvements in their associations that form trust and not vice versa.*

Keywords: mono-ethnic, mixed-ethnic, dominant, characteristic

## **INTRODUCTION**

The literature on Malaysian society is broad yet the literature and in depth studies of social capital and associations in Malaysia is in need of fuller elaboration. Ground breaking literature on communalism and ethnic politics in Malaysia offers some insight into the dilemmas of Malaysian society but are ultimately limited (Milne, 1967; Milne & Mauzy, 1978; Ratnam, 1965; Vasil, 1971). The growth and development of Malaysian non-governmental organisations and social movements, are posing questions about how Malaysia can move towards an actual multicultural democracy rather than simply an 'actually existing' one. Weiss and Hassan point out that this development and shifting constitutes an important political shift as much as a cultural one has also led to an increased interest in social capital and associations in Malaysian society (Weiss & Hassan, 2002). The issue of trust in Malaysian society goes to the heart of the problem of Malaysia's liberal democracy. If associations are the root or laboratory of democratic society, then trust among their participants is an interesting and useful indicator of social change in Malaysia as well as the possibilities of broader political and cultural change. The problem of trust and what forms it forms the backbone of debates about associations and social capital in civil society. In multicultural societies such as Malaysia, the issue of trust as a positive attribute of social capital is a critical issue. Social and political theorists from a wide range of perspectives have theorised on the importance and significance of trust as a critical constitutive element of social capital and lately on the centrality of trust for societies to function in a non-confrontational and consensual manner. Involvement in community and associations produces what Robert Bellah termed 'habits of the heart' (Bellah, 1985; 1987; 1988). Theorists of trust argue that trust has its origins in the maze of associations communities that make up civil society and are the educators of citizenship (Misztal, 2001). The importance of associations as intermediaries between the market and the state and as important 'laboratories of democracy', in Dewey's phraseology has become a mainstay of contemporary social theory.

### **Good and Bad Social Capital**

The Malaysian example is a salient one since it involves associations that have members of divergent faiths and ethnicities. In this example,

the bonds of trust between members is of particular importance. What types of social capital generate outcomes that serve the public good? What kinds of trust are positive to the public good? Interestingly educational literature can provide us with some insight into these issues (Brown, 2007; Campbell & Dyer, 2007; Ismail, 2005; Kaur, 2001; Kim, 2003; Mustapha & Abu, 2001; Neo & Neo, 2002; Wong et.al., 2003; Yap, 2004; Yen, et.al. 2005). While networks and trust generate social solidarity and inclusion and knit communities together, they can also have negative consequences. There is a significant gap in the contemporary literature between sophisticated conceptualisations of social capital and trust, and empirical application and understanding of how trust works in associations and how this translates to broader virtues in society in general are often weak (Coleman, 1988; Dekker & Uslaner, 2001; Lemmel, 2001; Teachman, Paasch & Carver, 1997; Veenstra, 2003).

For Coleman, social capital explains trust, and for Putnam, it includes trust. Both Fukayama and Putnam argue that trust is a key constituent of social capital. Putnam celebrates the benefits of joining: "Participation in civic organisations inculcates skills of cooperation as well as a sense of shared responsibility for collective endeavors"(Putnam, Leonardi & Nanetti, 1993). Putnam and many others argue that communities and nations with high levels of civic engagement are more trusting, happier, and more prosperous. Trust in this sense stems from participation. In this sense, trust occurs as a result of the existence of social capital and the daily positive interactions that constitute social capital (Dekker & Uslaner, 2001; Uslaner & Conley, 2003). The opposite of participation causing trust is trust-fuelling participation. This is an important point since it is also arguable that trust is also a precursor of participation and that in fact the success or other wise of social capital depends upon pre-existing trust. Trust is important, because it leads to cooperation among strangers. Uslaner and Conley argue:

'If we only socialize with people like ourselves and only join organizations composed of people like ourselves, we will not have the opportunity to get to know people from different backgrounds. If knowing people leads to trusting them, we will not develop faith in people unlike ourselves'(Dekker & Uslaner, 2001; Uslaner & Conley).

*James K. Campbell & Yen Siew Hwa*

Putnam provides us with further insight when he argues that there are two types of trust we find in contemporary societies *bonding* or exclusive trust and *bridging* or inclusive trust. Bonding is inward looking. This kind of trust functions to reinforce exclusive identities and homogeneous groups (Putnam, 2000). This kind of trust exists in tightly knit familial or clan associations and is closely related to what Luhmann refers to as the pre modern forms of trust based on confidence and familiarity (Luhmann, 1988). Bridging on the other hand is more outward-looking. Bridging trust is necessary in situations where we do not know or necessarily share common backgrounds with people. In situations where we are dealing with people who are different. In the Malaysian context, these distinctions are especially important. Bonding social capital involves social ties linking people who are more alike than different. Bridging social capital can generate broader identities and reciprocity, whereas bonding social capital bolsters our narrower selves.

### **Types of Trust in Associations**

To what extent then are there differences in trust among Malaysian participants in voluntary associations? Are we looking at bonding or bridging forms of trust? Is diversity forming mistrust or engendering trust? The theoretical issue in front of us is to what extent the need for interaction and cooperation between different groups engenders trust or distrust? Historically Malaysian associations have relied extensively on bonding forms of social capital. This is especially so in societies characterised by polarised relations between ethnic groups. Over the years, however, there has been significant change with growing cross ethnic membership of associations and clubs in Malaysia. This transformation and growing complexity is important for several reasons. Firstly, the multi-ethnic diversity of Malaysian society and the growing ethnic diversity within associations is both a positive marker for Malaysian democracy as well as a litmus test on how relations between diverse groups in Malaysia actually manifest (Hwang, 2003). Nowhere is this more important than in an ethnically and religiously diverse society. The growth of social movements with a broad base in Malaysian society and the growing cross ethnic membership of many associations has put a premium on forms of bridging social capital and trust as opposed to familiarity or confidence as a way of enabling people to work together for common goals.

## **THE SCOPE AND OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY**

This study focuses on a sample size of fifty-five associations in the north-east district of Penang. Drawing upon the data we compare the level of trust among members in the mixed and mono-ethnic associations. We relate trust with other important indicators of social capital such as participation, reciprocity and friendship bonds. We attempt to measure the bonding and bridging social capital stocks and compare between the mixed and mono-ethnic groups.

### **Associations in Penang**

By 2005, there were 1464 associations registered with the Registrar of Societies (ROS) in the North-East district of Penang. The total number of associations based on different categories and ethnic groups is given in Table 1. The mono-ethnic associations are divided into four groups; Malay, Chinese, Indian and Sikh where majority of their members are from the same ethnic background. The mixed-ethnic group consists of associations, which have members from at least two different ethnic backgrounds.

The Chinese associations accounted for about 79% (or 597) out of the total number of the 756 mono-ethnic associations. In this district itself alone, there are about 160 *huay kuan* and *kongsi* which were formed based on rather specific purposes such as welfare of a particular surname or dialect group. Besides that, there are about 250 Chinese religious associations where about 200 of them were registered under the association of a certain deity followers, that is, the '*Persatuan Penganut Dewa*'. Only a few associations for ethnic Malay under the religion category are registered with ROS as most of the associations related to the Islamic religion are registered with the Jabatan Agama Negeri.

The 55 associations involved in this study are given in Appendix on pages 93 and 94. There are 23 associations categorised as mixed-ethnic followed by 18 Chinese, 5 Malays and 9 Indian associations.

Table 1: Total Number of Associations in North East District of Penang.

Category	Ethnic				Total
	Malay	Chinese	Indian	Mixed	
Religion	3	257	47	48	355
Social Well-being	23	175	9	120	327
Social & recreation	12	13	1	133	159
Culture	7	25	3	41	76
Mutual benefit	13	29	2	5	49
Commerce	11	22	8	104	145
Sports	3	8	-	58	69
Youth	1	1	5	22	29
Education	-	8	-	8	16
Labour association	2	-	-	11	13
General	5	59	4	158	226
Total	80	597	79	708	1464

Source: Registrar of Societies, Penang, 2005.

## **METHODOLOGY AND DATA**

With respect to research methodology, two questionnaires (Q1 and Q2) were used. Q1 was used to get information about the association; such as its profile, networks and activities. A committee member answers Q1. Q2 elicits information directly from members about his/her association. The aim is to obtain information regarding members and their participations in the activities organised by their associations, their perceptions about trust, friendship bonds, reciprocity and sense of belonging among members in their associations as well as with other associations. For each association, we interviewed three ordinary members (Q2) and one member of the exco (Q1). The following tables and discussion outline our basic findings.

### **Extent of Involvement in Associations**

To gauge the extent of involvement of members in their associations we have asked the exco's perception in Q1 and also the members themselves. Table 2a shows that members in mixed-ethnic associations were perceived to have a high rate of involvement in activities organised

*Trust in Mono-Ethnic and Mixed-Ethnic Associations*

by the associations but that it is not significantly higher than mono-cultural associations. Indeed, Indian associations appear to also have a high rate of involvement. These statistical variations may be due to the low numbers involved. On the whole members involvement is still high in mixed-ethnic associations as shown in Table 2b.

Extent of involvement in mixed and mono-ethnic associations:

Table 2a: Exco Perception on Members Involvement.

	How involved are your members in your association's activities? (Q1)							
	Mixed-Ethnic		Mono-Chinese		Mono-Malay		Mono-Indian	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
very involved	10	43.5	7	38.09	1	20.0	5	55.6
somewhat involved	13	56.5	7	38.9	4	80.0	4	44.4
not too involved			3	16.7				
not at all			1	5.6				

Table 2b: Member Response on Whether They are Active or Not.

		Are you active in this association?			
		No		Yes	
		Count	%	Count	%
Mixed/Mono	Mixed	18	26.1%	51	73.9%
	Chinese	18	33.3%	36	66.7%
	Malay	5	33.3%	10	66.7%
	Indian	8	29.6%	19	70.4%

Table 3a: Level of Trust Among Members in the Association.

		On a scale of 1–5, how would you rate your level of trust with members of this association?											
		Least trusted		Less trusted		Normal		Somewhat trusted		Most trusted		Don't know	
		Scale	%	Scale	%	Scale	%	Scale	%	Scale	%	Scale	%
Mixed/ Mono	Mixed	1	1.4%	-	-	13	18.8%	27	39.1%	28	40.6%		
	Chinese	2	3.7%	-	-	19	35.2%	19	35.2%	12	22.2%	2	3.7%
	Malay	-	-	1	6.7%	4	26.7%	5	33.3%	5	33.3%		
	Indian	-	-	-	-	9	33.3%	8	29.6%	9	33.3%	1	3.7%



**Trust in Mixed and Mono-Ethnic Associations**

Table 3a provides us with some very interesting data. According to our findings, trust in mixed-ethnic associations is markedly higher than found in the mono-ethnic associations. This points to a possible positive role that mixed associations has on engendering trust. This is something we will discuss later in the paper.

Table 3b: Inter-ethnic Relationship Within the Association? (Only Applicable in the Mixed-Ethnic Group).

How would you assess the inter-ethnic relationship within this association? (Q1)				
Mixed-ethnic	Strong	Moderate	Weak	Not applicable
	29(42%)	34(49.3%)	2(2.95)	4(5.8%)

Table 3b also provides some interesting data. From what our respondent’s claims it appears that the perception of people involved in mixed associations is that inter, group relationships are strong and well developed. Again, this data tends to support the contention that bridging social capital is built in mixed associations and that trust is not dissipated in mixed groups but built in them. In other words, the data tends to support the supposition that at a minimum mixed associations do not lead to less participation or trust.

Table 3c: Level of Trust with Members of the Same Ethnic Background.

On a scale of 1–5, how would you rate your level of trust in members of this association in general who are in the same ethnic background as you?											
	Least trusted (1)		Less trusted (2)		Normal (3)		Somewhat trusted (4)		Most trusted (5)		NA
Mixed		2	2.9%	12	17.4%	27	39.1%	27	39.1%	1	1.4%
Chinese	1	1.9%	1	1.9%	20	37.0%	20	37.0%	12	22.2%	
Malay	1	6.7%	1	6.7%	4	26.7%	5	33.3%	4	26.7%	
Indian					10	37.0%	7	25.9%	10	37.0%	

Note: NA = respondents treats everybody the same irrespective of ethnic background

Table 3d: Level of Trust with Members of Other Ethnic Groups.

On a scale of 1–5, how would you rate your level of trust with members of other ethnic groups?																
		Least trusted (1)		Less trusted (2)		Normal (3)		Somewhat trusted (4)		Most trusted (5)		Other factors		Not applicable		
Mixed			1	1.4%	13	18.8%	24	34.8%	19	27.5%	12	17.3%				
Chinese	1	1.9%	1	1.9%	12	22.2%	3	5.6%	2	3.7%			35	64.8%		
Malay						5	33.3%					1	6.7%	9	60.0%	
Indian						5	18.5%	2	7.4%	7	25.9%	3	11.1%	10	37.0%	

*Trust in Mono-Ethnic and Mixed-Ethnic Associations in Penang*

Table 3c appears to both confirm yet challenge our findings so far. It appears that trust in mixed groups is most attenuated with members from the same ethnic background. In other words there is strong bonding social capital in mixed associations as well as strong bridging social capital. Yet in associations with the same ethnic group, overall trust is significantly lower.

Bridging trust among members in mixed-ethnic associations as depicted in tables 3a, 3c and 3d, is higher in the mixed-ethnic associations compared to the mono-ethnic groups. This result may indicate that bridging between individuals or members from different ethnic groups are relatively higher than the bonding trust among members of the same ethnic groups. Does this indicate high trust in Penang's associations? What does it tell us about the levels of trust generated in mixed associations? The following tables use a Pearson correlation, which indicates a bivariate relationship, i.e., a two-way relationship.

Overall data given in Table 4a indicates that members in associations with higher trust among themselves tend to have higher trust on the office bearers too. Higher trust among members or with office bearers has a relationship to higher participation or involvements in the association. However, when separate analysis was carried out on this relationship for mixed and mono-ethnic associations the outcome showed that mixed-ethnic groups were the main contributors to such a relationship. This can be seen in Table 4b, where trust amongst members and towards the office bearers seemed to be significantly correlated with the extent of the respondents' involvements in their associations. Such relationships were proven to be not significant among the mono-ethnic associations. In other words, participation in mixed associations created trust but in mono-ethnic associations, its impact was shown to be not significant.

Table 4a: Correlations Between Trust and the Extent of Involvement (overall).

		On a scale of 1–5, how would you rate your level of trust with members of this association?	On a scale of 1–5, please indicate how much you trust office bearers of this association in general.	Roughly how often do you involve yourself in this association?
On a scale of 1–5, how would you rate your level of trust with members of this association?	Pearson Correlation	1	.705(**)	.237(**)
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.002
	N		162	162
On a scale of 1–5, please indicate how much you trust office bearers of this association in general.	Pearson Correlation		1	.202(**)
	Sig. (2-tailed)			.010
	N			162

\*\* Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 4b: Correlations Between Trust and the Extent of Involvement (Mixed and Mono-Ethnic Groups).

		Roughly how often do you involve yourself in this association?	
		Mixed-ethnic	Mono-ethnic
On a scale of 1–5, how would you rate your level of trust with members of this association?	Pearson Correlation	.285(*)	.195
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.017	.061
	N	69	93
On a scale of 1–5, please indicate how much you trust office bearers of this association in general.	Pearson Correlation	.298(*)	.122
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.013	.244
	N	69	93

\* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

*Trust in Mono-Ethnic and Mixed-Ethnic Associations*

Table 5: Correlations Between Trust and Other Indicators of Social Capital (Mixed and Mono).

	How well the members in organisation help each other out these days?		Feeling of togetherness or closeness in this association		Level of friendship with members in the association	
	Mixed-ethnic	Mono-ethnic	Mixed-Ethnic	Mono-ethnic	Mixed-ethnic	Mono-ethnic
Trust with members of this association	.517(**) [.000]	.250(*) [.017]	.666(**) [.000]	.684 (**) [.000]	.529(**) [.000]	.507(**) [.000]
N	69	91	69	93	62	85
Trust with office bearers of this association in general	.584(**) [.000]	.286 (**) [.006]	.456(**) [.000]	.705 (**) [.000]	.370(**) [.003]	.441(**) [.000]
N	69	91	69	93	62	85

\*\* Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). Values in parentheses are significant level.

**Trust and Other Social Capital Indicators**

Table 5 shows the relationships between trust and other indicators of social capital such as reciprocity, feeling of togetherness and friendship bonds. The Pearson correlation coefficients indicate strong positive relationship between trust and the three given indicators of social capital. Such strong relationships exist in both the mixed-ethnic and mono-ethnic groups.

Table 6: Directional Measures.

	Value	Asymp. Std. Error (a)	Approx. T(b)	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Lambda				
Nominal				
Participation: Dependent	.017	.012	1.423	.155
Trust: Dependent	.175	.076	2.121	.034

(a) Not assuming the null hypothesis.

(b) Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.

Participation is measured by using the responses for question: Roughly how often do you involve yourself in this association?

Trust is represented by question: ‘On a scale of 1–5, how would you rate your level of trust with members of this association?’

### **Is Trust an Outcome or Precursor of Participation in Penang Associations?**

The earlier analyses using Pearson’s correlation do not identify the unidirectional relationship between the two variables, such as trust bringing more participation or vice versa. The value of Lambda in Table 6 gives an asymmetric measure. Its value depends on which variable is being used as the dependent variable. For example, Lambda value of 0.175 indicates that the reduced error rate is 17.5% when we take into account participation in the prediction of the level of trust. In other words, participation influences the level trust among members. Members who participate more frequently in the association have higher trust among themselves. The approximate significance level when trust is used as the dependent variable is 0.034. On the other hand, there was only a 1.7% reduction in error in when we used trust to explain participation. The approximate significance level when participation is the dependent variable is less significant, that is, 0.155.

As stated in Putnam and many others, communities and nations with high levels of civic engagement are more trusting, happier, and more prosperous. Trust in this sense stems from participation. In this sense, trust occurs as a result of the existence of social capital and the daily

positive interactions that constitute social capital (Dekker & Uslaner 2001; Uslaner & Conley). The opposite of participation causing trust is trust-fuelling participation. We were interested to find out which side of the equation our data supported. Trust-fuelling participation or participation fuelling trust. This is an important point since it is also arguable that trust is also a precursor of participation and that in fact the success or other wise of social capital depends upon pre-existing trust. Trust in this view is important, because it leads to cooperation among strangers, and hence is a precursor of participation, not its result. It appears from our analysis that participation leads to increased trust, thus confirming Putnam's observations regarding the significance of civic participation to building trust. This finding is significant since it confirms the significance and importance of mixed associations in building trust not only among people of similar backgrounds (bonding trust) but also among people of diverse backgrounds (bridging trust). This finding merely opens more questions for us.

## **DISCUSSION**

We expected mono-cultural associations, which evidenced presumably strong bonding social capital to have higher forms of trust. What we found challenged the conventional wisdom (Baumans, 1991). In other words, our data tends to suggest that rather than leading to lesser trust and infectiveness, multi-ethnic associations in fact generate trust and that participation in them accentuates and build on trust. Furthermore we speculate from the data that the individualistic motivations that characterise the reasons for joining the types of associations that are multi-ethnic. According to our data the process of bridging to people who are different builds trust and does not dissipate it. If this is true in the Penang examples, it provides an interesting corrective to more pessimistic views on the relationship between trust and diversity. This data provides important insight into how bridging between different people in associations marked by diversity can accentuate trust over and above the levels found in associations were bonding between like types is the dominant characteristic.

The correlations between trust and friendship bonds and feelings of togetherness reveal a process of mutual accommodation that occurs in

*James K. Campbell & Yen Siew Hwa*

multi-ethnic associations. This process as Marion Iris Young argues is central to democratic development (Young, 1990; 2000). The recognition that occurs as a result of such interactions is in part a measure of the democratic sensibility that Charles Taylor argues is central to multi-ethnic societies (Taylor, 1991; 1992; Taylor & Gutmann, 1992). In other words, the data reveals that multi-ethnic associations can actually build trust and mutual respect, which are significant contributors to democratic character. What we found was that cross ethnic associations had higher trust and that increased participation in these associations increased trust between members. We found that participation generally correlated to higher trust.

In other words we found that the arguments of those who see higher forms of trust in associations and communities characterised by single ethnic identity to be reversed in our case. The implications of this finding are three fold. Firstly, there is no necessary correlation between high trust and social sameness in associations. Secondly, that participation in cross ethnic associations can build deeper trust between its members and finally that mixed associations were more inclined to have activities that crossed borders and hence built on the trust developed by them in other ways. The significance of the positive correlations between mixed groups and the strong social capital and trust developed is of extreme significance to analysing Malaysian politics and culture.

We expected forms of trust to be higher in the mono-ethnic associations, as the same ethnic background bonding may be stronger. In other words, we expected associations characterised by strong bonding relationships to have high levels of trust and to have higher participation levels. In this study, the bonding social capital stock were measured based on trust, reciprocity, friendship bond and feeling of togetherness among members in the association. Based on these indicators, our finding shows otherwise. The implications of some of our findings deserve continued research. First, we found that associations that were established for hobbies, or relaxation had very high participation rates and were usually mixed-ethnic associations. This finding is of some importance. It appears that we need to interrogate the issue of trust in associations as it relates to motivation for joining. In other words, we need to look at the possibility that formally less significant motivations for joining an association (such as relaxation) as compared to religious motivation for



example, may in fact correlate to very positive outcomes concerning bridging and integrative social capital. This at first appears counter intuitive. After all, would there not be higher trust and participation in associations where the members were of the same ethnic group? Our research tends to suggest that in fact the less serious motivation based upon individualistic pursuits may in fact lead to positive social outcomes. This is an apparent paradox and one worth investigating. A further aspect of our research points to the strong bonding and bridging social capital and trust that exists in mixed associations. There does not appear to be a contradiction between strong trust between same ethnic identity and strong trust across ethnic identities in mixed associations.

Overall, the results indicate that bonding social capital stock (high trust between people of a similar ethnic group) is higher in the mixed-ethnic associations compared to the mono-ethnic groups. Similar to the earlier outcome, members in the mixed ethnic group are shown to have higher trust both in bridging between different groups and in bonding between members of the same group. How can we understand this? It appears that the high bonding and high bridging social capital and trust in mixed associations bears out Putnam's argument regarding the possible relationship between bonding and bridging trust. Putnam argues that rather than assuming that bonding loyalties (loyalties between people of the same ethnicity language group or religion) and bridging loyalties (loyalties between people of different backgrounds) preclude each other we must see to what extent high forms of bonding loyalty are also the prerequisite for high bridging loyalty. According to Putnam (2007),

Too often, without really thinking about it, we assume that bridging social capital and bonding social capital are inversely correlated in a kind of zero-sum relationship: If I have lots of bonding ties, I must have few bridging ties, and vice versa. As an empirical matter, I believe that assumption is often false. In other words, high bonding might well be compatible with high bridging, and low bonding with low bridging.

How we understand the lower bonding trust in mono ethnic associations maybe due to the lower trust and participation that occurs in such associations. This in turn may be due to the nature of the association and the reasons for joining it. The critical findings that we make confirm two

*James K. Campbell & Yen Siew Hwa*

of Putnam's main contentions. Firstly, that increased participation in civic associations develops trust and secondly, that high bonding and bridging trust are not exclusive but compatible. If this is correct, the question in front of us is the following: why is it that mixed associations have higher participation and higher bridging and bonding social trust than mono-associations? Are mixed associations in some ways more equal? Are there educational differences that need to be taken account of? Are some associations more naturally political and hence mistrustful? Is there a kind of free rider mentality that characterises some associations? Is the assumption that sameness leads to trust merely an assumption? If we are, correct that diversity in fact can engender trust then we may be in a position to speculate on the positive support that should be given to diverse associations.

#### **ACKNOWLEDGEMENT**

The data source used in this study is from a USM short-term grant project-Social Capital in Penang under Associate Professor Dr. Chan Lean Heng (Project Leader), Prof Dr. Johan Saravanamuttu and Yen Siew Hwa (one of the writers of this paper). Both writers greatly appreciate the permission given to them to use the data for this study.

#### **REFERENCES**

- Bauman, Z., 1991, *Modernity and Ambivalence*, Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Bellah, R.N., 1985, *Habits of the Heart: Individualism and Commitment in American life*, Berkeley: University of California Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_, 1987, *Individualism & Commitment in American Life: Readings on the Themes of Habits of the Heart*, New York: Perennial Library.
- \_\_\_\_\_, 1988, "Civil religion in America," *Daedalus*, 117: 97–118.
- Bourdieu, P., 1983, "Forms of capital," in *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education*, J.C. Richards (ed.), New York: Greenwood Press, 241–260.

*Trust in Mono-Ethnic and Mixed-Ethnic Associations*

- Brown, G., 2007, "Making ethnic citizens: The politics and practice of education in Malaysia," *International Journal of Educational Development*, 27: 318–330.
- Campbell, J.K. and Dyer, J., 2007, "The dialectics of cross cultural collaboration: Malaysia and Australia: case study. EME 150- Introduction to Learners and Learning Theory," in *National Conference on Environment and Community Development 2007 (NCECD 2007)*, Pulau Pinang: Universiti Sains Malaysia.
- Coleman, J.S., 1973, *Power and the Structure of Society*, New York: Norton.
- \_\_\_\_\_, 1988, "Social capital in the creation of human capital", *American Journal of Sociology*, 94: S95–S120.
- \_\_\_\_\_, 1990, *Foundations of Social Theory*, Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Cox, E. and Putnam, R.D., 2002, *Democracies in Flux: The Evolution of Social Capital in Contemporary Society*, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Dekker, P. and Uslaner, E.M., 2001, *Social Capital and Participation in Everyday Life*, New York: Routledge.
- Fukayama, F., 1995, *Trust: The Social Virtues and the Creation of Prosperity*, New York: Free Press.
- Hwang, I.W., 2003, *Personalized Politics: The Malaysian State under Mahathir*, Singapore: ISEAS.
- Inglehart, R., 1999, "Trust, Well Being and Democracy," in M.E. Warren (Ed.), *Democracy and Trust*, Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press, 88–120.
- Ismail, H.N., 2005, "Learning within scripted and nonscripted peer tutoring sessions: The Malaysian context", *The Journal of Educational Research*, 99: 67–77.

James K. Campbell & Yen Siew Hwa

- Kahn, J.S., 1996, "Growth, economic transformation, culture and the middle class," in *The New Rich in Asia: Mobile Phones, McDonald's and Middle-Class Revolution* edited by R. Robison and D. S. G. Goodman. London: Routledge.
- Kaur, A., 2001, "Teacher survival in a web-based constructivist learning environment: A Malaysian experience" in *Proceedings of World Conference on Educational Multimedia, Hypermedia and Telecommunications*, Chesapeake, VA: AACE, 902–905.
- Kim, L.S., 2003, "Multiple identities in a multicultural world: A Malaysian perspective", *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education* 3: 137–158.
- Kymlicka, W. and Wayne, N., 1994, "Return of the citizen: A survey of recent work on citizenship theory", *Ethics* 104: 352–381.
- Lemmel, L., 2001, "The dynamics of social capital: Creating trust-based relationships and trustworthy environments", *National Civic Review* 90: 97–103.
- Luhmann, N., 1988, Familiarity, Confidence, Trust: Problems and Alternatives in *Trust: Making and Breaking Cooperative Relations*, NY: Blackwell, 94–107.
- Macedo, S., 2000, *Diversity and Distrust: Civic Education in a Multicultural Democracy*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Milne, R.S., 1967, *Government and Politics in Malaysia*, Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Milne, R.S. and Mauzy, D.K., 1978, *Politics and Government in Malaysia*, Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.
- Misztal, B.A., 2001, "Trust and cooperation: The democratic public sphere", *Journal of Sociology* 37: 371–386.

*Trust in Mono-Ethnic and Mixed-Ethnic Associations*

- Neo, M. and Neo, T.K., 2002, "Building a constructivist learning environment using a multimedia design project – A Malaysian experience", *Journal of Educational Multimedia and Hypermedia* 11: 141–153.
- Newton, K., 2004, "Social trust: Individual and cross-national approaches", *Portuguese Journal of Social Science* 3: 15–35.
- Ng, L.Y., Kamariah Abu Bakar, Samsilah Roslan, Wong Su Luan and Petri Zabariah Megat Abd Rahman, 2005, "Predictors of self-regulated learning in Malaysian smart schools," *International Education Journal* 6: 343–353.
- Portes, A., 2000, "The two meanings of social capital", *Sociological Forum* 15: 1–12.
- Portes, A. and Sensenbrenner, J., 1993, "Embeddedness and immigration: Notes on the social determinants of economic action", *American Journal of Sociology* 98: 1320–1350.
- Post, R.C. and Rosenblum, N.L., 2001, "Introduction" in R.C. Post and N.L. Rosenblum (Eds.), *Civil Society and Government*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1–25.
- Putnam, R.D., 2002, *Democracies in flux: The evolution of social capital in contemporary society*, Madison Avenue, NY: Oxford University Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_, 2007, "E Pluribus Unum: Diversity and community in the twenty-first century the 2006 Johan Skytte prize lecture", *Scandinavian Political Studies*, 30: 137–174.
- \_\_\_\_\_, 1993, "What makes democracy work?", *National Civic Review*, 82: 101–108.
- \_\_\_\_\_, 2000, *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community*, New York: Simon & Schuster.

*James K. Campbell & Yen Siew Hwa*

- Putnam, R.D., Leonardi, R. and Nanetti, R., 1993, *Making Democracy Work: Civic Traditions in Modern Italy*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Ramlee Mustapha and Abu Abdullah, 2001, "Globalization and its impact on technical-vocational education and training in Malaysia," in *Annual Conference of the Association of Career and Technical Education*, New Orleans.
- Ratnam, K.J., 1965, *Communalism and the Political Process in Malaya*, Kuala Lumpur: University of Malaya Press.
- Saravanamuttu, J., 2001, "Malaysian civil society – Awakenings?" in Maznah Mohamad and S.K. Wong, *Risking Malaysia: Culture, Politics and Identity*, Bangi: Penerbit UKM in association with Malaysian Social Science Association, 93–111.
- Seligman, A.B., 1992, *The Idea of Civil Society*, New York: Free Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_, 2000, "Trust and Civil Society," in F. Tonkiss (Ed.), *Trust and civil society*, London: Palgrave MacMillan, 12–30.
- Taylor, C., 1991, *The Ethics of Authenticity*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_, 1992, *Sources of the Self: The Making of the Modern Identity*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Taylor, C. and Gutmann, A., 1992, *Multiculturalism and the Politics of Recognition: An Essay*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Teachman, J.D., Paasch, K. and Carver, K., 1997, "Social capital and the generation of human capital", *Social Forces*, 75: 1343–1359.
- Tonkiss, F., Passey, A. and Fenton, N., 2000, *Trust and Civil Society*, New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Uslaner, E.M. and Conley, R.S., (n.d.), "Civic engagement and particularized trust: The ties that bind people to their ethnic communities," *American Politics Research*, 31: 331–360.

*Trust in Mono-Ethnic and Mixed-Ethnic Associations*

- Vasil, R.K., 1971, *Politics in a Plural Society*, Kuala Lumpur: Oxford University Press.
- Veenstra, G., 2003, "Explicating social capital: Trust and participation in the civil space", *Canadian Journal of Sociology*, 27(4): 547–572.
- Warren, M.E., 1999, "Introduction", in M.E. Warren (Ed.). *Democracy and trust*, Cambridge University Press, 1–21.
- Weiss, M.L. and Saliha H., 2002, *Social Movements in Malaysia: From Moral Communities to NGO's*, London: Routledge Curzon.
- Wong, S.L., 2003, "Teaching a discrete information technology course in a constructivist learning environment: Is it effective for Malaysian pre-service teachers?", *The Internet and Higher Education*, 6: 193–204.
- Woolcock, M., 1998, "Social capital and economic development: toward a theoretical synthesis and policy framework", *Theory and Society*, 27: 151–208.
- Wynne, M.L., 1941, *Triad and Tabut: A Survey of the Origins and Diffusion of Chinese and Mohammedan Secret Societies in the Malay Peninsular, 1800–1935*, Singapore: Government Printing Office.
- Yap, K.C., 2004, *Teaching Primary Science*, Singapore: Pearson/Prentice Hall.
- Young, I.M., 1990, *Justice and the Politics of Difference*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_, 2000, *Inclusion and Democracy*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

## **Appendix**

### Mixed or Mono-Ethnic Groups

---

	Name of Association
Mixed-Ethnic N = 23	Persatuan Pembantuan Kristian Pulau Pinang
	Consumers Association Penang
	Persatuan Bola Sepak Pulau Pinang
	Kelab Kiwanis Georgetown
	Persatuan Kesihatan Jiwa
	Kelab Sukan Brats Penang
	Persatuan Nihon Aikido Kenkyukai Penang
	Kelab Sukan Jabatan Kerja Raya
	Persatuan Penduduk Kampung Melayu
	Penang Heritage Trust
	Rotary Club
	Penang Judo Association
	Sima Handicapped Centre
	Penang Press Club
	Society of the Disabled Person Penang
	Penang Sports Club
	Sri Sathya Sai Baba Centre
	Penang Symphony Society
	Women Centre for Change (WCC)
	Perbadanan Pengurusan Blok 33 Taman Pekaka
	Resident's Association of Bandar Bayan Baru
	Society For The Prevention Of Cruelty to Animals Penang

---



*Trust in Mono-Ethnic and Mixed-Ethnic Associations*

---

Chinese N = 18	Gabungan Belia Persatuan Klan Cina Penang Persatuan Alumni Han Chiang Jelutong Tow Boe Keong Kew Ong Tai Tay Persatuan Kebajikan Metta Malaysia Utara Khoo Kongsi Persatuan Penduduk Taman Paya Terubong Penang Basketball Association Persatuan Suma Ching Hai Penang Penang Chinese Chamber Pertubuhan Belia Dramatis Pulau Pinang Penang Chinese Chin Woo Athletic Association Pertubuhan Buddhist Tzu-Chi Merits Malaysia Penang Chinese Physician Association Pertubuhan Penganut Dewa Nah Toh Ah Peh Penang Chinese Teacher Association Petra Baptist Church Penang Senior Citizen Caring Association Penang Tao Yuan
Malay N = 5	Badan Pembangunan Akhlak Pulau Pinang Jemaah Islah Malaysia Malay Chamber Persatuan Pekerja Islam Penang Port Sdn. Bhd. Persatuan Pemandu Teksi dan Kereta Sewa Melayu Pulau Pinang
Indian N = 9	Anjuman Himayaihl Islam Masjid Kapitan Keling Muslim Jewellery and Money Changer Association North Malaysia Malayali Samajam Penang Indian Chamber Persatuan Hindu Sangam Farlim Persatuan Silsilaye Muhibhi Persatuan Wadda Gurdwara Sahib Pulau Pinang Sri Muniswara Temple Perak Road

---