



*Your complimentary
use period has ended.
Thank you for using
PDF Complete.*

[Click Here to upgrade to
Unlimited Pages and Expanded Features](#)

Ethnic Inequality in Educational and Occupational Attainment in Peninsular Malaysia: 1970 -2000

Charles Hirschman

Fulbright Visiting Professor, 2012-13

Faculty of Economics and Administration

University of Malaya

July 19 2013

Terima Kasih

- “ ULPAUM: Che Hashim Hassan, Ong Chon Sooi, Faridah Noor Mohd Noor, Chua Yan Piaw
- “ FEA: Prof Noor Azina, Prof Rajah Rasiah
- “ PSU: Tey Nai Peng – LPPKN & DOSM
- “ MACEE: Fulbright Office in KL
- “ Countless Friends from past & present:
 - . Thillainathan, Yeoh Suan Pow, Norma Mansor, Cheong Kee Cheok, Evelyn Shyamala Paul Davidson, Lee Poh Ping, Selvaratnam, Khoo Siew Mun, Mavis Puthuchearry, Khong Kim Hoong, Patrick Pillai, Sumit Mandel, Tham Siew Yean, Ng Sor Tho, Yap Su Fei, Lee Hwok Aun, Goh Kim Leng, Kwek Kian Teng, and a cast of thousands

Ethnicity in Malaysia

“ Three FEA Lectures:

- . Racial ideology on ethnic classifications: past & present
- . Full employment economy: a Malaysian story
- . Trends in educational and occupational inequality

“ Many other Dimensions of Ethnicity in Malaysia

- . Power and Privilege
- . Exposure to Prejudice and Discrimination
- . Integration: Shared Spaces and Institutions:
 - “ Neighborhoods, schools, workplaces, associations
- . Intermarriage

al Indicators Tradition: What are the Facts?

- “ Ethnic inequality in education and occupations:
 - . 1970 to 2000 Malaysian censuses from IPUMS
 - . Limited to Peninsular Malaysia

- “ Cohort Analysis:
 - . Similar to concept of generations
 - . Cohort is pop that experiences event in same year(s)
 - . Birth cohorts that experience “history” at same age

- “ Considerable attention on measurement

What are Causes of Ethnic Inequality?

“ Short Term (indirectly addressed)

- . Differential family resources & access to education/employment
- . Ethnic preference (discrimination) by gatekeepers
- . Differences in ambition & cultural orientations

“ Long Term (not addressed today)

- . Ethnic Blurring and Blending is long term historical process, but...

“ Inequality and Animosity are influenced by:

- . Geographic isolation
- . Segregation and segregated institutions
 - “ Neighborhoods, schools, workplaces, religious institutions
- . Economic organization based on exploitation
- . Differential citizenship and ethnic based politics



*Your complimentary
use period has ended.
Thank you for using
PDF Complete.*

[Click Here to upgrade to
Unlimited Pages and Expanded Features](#)

Measuring Educational Attainment

Years of Schooling Completed
Credentials and Degrees Earned
Quality of Schooling

nt Pop Age 25-54: PM 1970-2000.

	1970	1980	1991	2000
None	38%	24%	12%	9%
Some: < LCE	53%	57%	45%	28%
LCE, no MCE	4%	8%	16%	20%
MCE, No Tertiary	4%	8%	19%	29%
Tertiary	1%	4%	9%	14%
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%	100%

Measure Social Change

Simple Time Series:

- . Intercensal change from T1 to T2
- . “exits,” “entrants,” but most are in both T1 & T2
- . Little change in educational attainment after age 25

” Cohort Analysis

- . Inter-cohort change:
 - ” Baby boomers, gen x, millennial’s
 - ” Compare changes across groups defined by year of birth
- . Intra-cohort change
 - ” life cycle change of same cohort

by Age in Censuses, 1970-2000

Birth Cohort	~Age 10	~ Age 20	AGE in:			
			1970	1980	1991	2000
Before 1905	1905-14	1915-24	65+	75+	85+	
1905-14	1915-24	1925-34	55-64	65-74	75-84	85+
1915-24	1925-34	1935-44	45-54	55-64	65-74	75-84
1925-34	1935-44	1945-54	35-44	45-54	55-64	65-74
1935-44	1945-54	1955-64	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64
1945-54	1955-64	1965-74	15-24	25-34	35-44	45-54
1955-64	1965-74	1975-84		15-24	25-34	35-44
1965-74	1975-84	1995-04			15-24	25-34
1975-84	1995-04	2005-14				15-24

ata Across all Censuses

- “ More reliable data because of larger population
 - . Each census is released as .02 sample file

- “ Capture same people at multiple times:
 - . Age 25 at 1970, age 35 at 1980, and so on

- “ Assume that education does not change after age 25

erent Completing MCE

Birth Cohort	1970	1980	1991	2000	Average
Before 1905	1%	1%	1%	3%	1%
1905-14	1%	1%	2%	2%	1%
1915-24	2%	2%	3%	4%	2%
1925-34	3%	3%	4%	5%	4%
1935-44	7%	8%	10%	11%	9%
1945-54	10%	17%	20%	23%	20%
1955-64		22%	36%	40%	38%
1965-74			45%	54%	53%



*Your complimentary
use period has ended.
Thank you for using
PDF Complete.*

[Click Here to upgrade to
Unlimited Pages and Expanded Features](#)

Ethnic Inequality in Education

Focus on Proportion Completing MCE/SPM
(Form 5 Exam) across successive cohorts

Percent with MCE or Higher

Birth Cohort	MALE					FEMALE				
	Malay	Bumi	Chinese	Indian	Total	Malay	Bumi	Chinese	Indian	Total
Before 1905	0%	0%	2%	1%	1%	0%	0%	0%	1%	0%
1905-14	1%	0%	3%	3%	2%	0%	0%	1%	1%	0%
1915-24	2%	0%	6%	5%	4%	0%	0%	2%	2%	1%
1925-34	3%	2%	7%	9%	6%	0%	1%	3%	4%	2%
1935-44	10%	2%	15%	18%	13%	2%	1%	7%	8%	5%
1945-54	25%	9%	25%	24%	25%	14%	6%	18%	13%	15%
1955-64	51%	12%	35%	32%	42%	40%	7%	32%	21%	35%
1965-74	66%	22%	46%	41%	53%	65%	19%	49%	40%	55%
TOTAL	30%	6%	23%	23%	26%	23%	4%	18%	16%	20%

Explaining Ethnic Gap in Education

Decompose the **Percent with MCE** into three components:

1. Percent Entering School of Total Population
2. Percent Completing LCE of those Entering School
3. Percent completing MCE of those with LCE

COMPARE ETHNIC PATTERNS

Percent Entering Standard One

Birth Cohort	Malay	Oth. Bumi	Chinese	Indian
Before 1905	35%	---	53%	53%
1905-14	47%	26%	58%	58%
1915-24	59%	37%	71%	71%
1925-34	72%	53%	76%	76%
1935-44	84%	59%	87%	87%
1945-54	93%	68%	93%	93%
1955-64	96%	67%	94%	94%
1965-74	97%	71%	94%	94%

Percent From Some Schooling to LCE

Birth Cohort	Malay	Oth. Bumi	Chinese	Indian
Before 1905	2%	---	7%	---
1905-14	4%	---	8%	15%
1915-24	5%	1%	14%	13%
1925-34	7%	5%	16%	18%
1935-44	19%	9%	27%	34%
1945-54	45%	26%	44%	50%
1955-64	75%	37%	60%	63%
1965-74	89%	54%	77%	78%

Percent From LCE to MCE

Birth Cohort	Malay	Oth. Bumi	Chinese	Indian
Before 1905	20%	---	58%	---
1905-14	56%	---	55%	47%
1915-24	62%	---	64%	59%
1925-34	65%	---	60%	65%
1935-44	63%	41%	63%	61%
1945-54	60%	51%	62%	53%
1955-64	71%	47%	62%	55%
1965-74	76%	58%	63%	56%

Global Inequality: Conclusions

- “ Malays behind through c. 1935-44: (1950s)
 - . Reached parity in the 1960s
 - “ universal primary schooling
 - “ expansion of secondary schooling (lower & middle)
 - . Malay LCE to MCE transition – parity in 1920s
 - “ No evidence of different ambitions
- “ Chinese/Indians lower gains in 1970s to 1990s
- “ 10-20 percentage point gap
 - . Major problem in LCE & especially MCE transition
 - . Likely tied to higher failure rates
- “ Chinese have no problem from MCE to tertiary

Occupations

- “ More complex phenomenon than education
 - . Number of categories
 - . Problems of summarization:
 - “ Service/Sales: (Barbers, policemen, cooks, shop assistants)

- “ Occupations = link between educ and income

- “ Firms & organizations
 - . Hiring and promotion

- “ “What you do is who you are”

Measuring Occupations and Occupational Status

1. Census Questions
2. Convert Text to Numbers (1968 and 1988 ISCO)
3. Collapsing of detailed occupational titles to 3, 2, and 1 digit occupational categories
4. Assigning Occupational Status Scores (ISEI) to detailed occupational categories

QUESTIONS ON OCCUPATION

(a) What is your occupation?

(b) Please describe your duties/nature of your work

Record the name of the position or occupation in detail. For example, store clerk, finance clerk, lorry driver, construction worker, lift attendant, rubber tapper, rubber estate manager, restaurant manager, primary school teacher, fisherman, shoe production worker in a factory, etc.

If the respondent has two or more jobs, record the one which he spent most of his time.

Standard Classification of Occupations 1968, 1988, & 2008

Based on ILO International ISCO

- ” One digit – about 10 major groups
- ” Two digit – dozens of occupational categories
- ” Three digit – hundreds of categories

- ” Revised as technology changes work roles

- ” Problems of Comparability

- ” Most researchers rely on 1 digit classification

Teachers, nurses, engineers, accountants, writers

Managers & Executives

General managers, department managers, proprietors, chief executives

Assoc Professionals/Tech.

Engineering tech., assoc. prof. in nursing/midwifery, teaching, finance and sales

Clerks

secretaries and keyboard clerks, numerical clerks, transport clerks, cashiers

Service & Shop Sales Wrkrs.

Service wrkrs in hotels & restaurants, shop sales, stall and market sellers

Craft & Related Wrkrs.

Building trades, mechanics, tailors

Machine Oper. & Assemblers

Factory machine operators, drivers

Elementary Wrkrs.

street vendors, laborers, caretakers, cleaners

Agricultural and Fishery Wrkrs.

market oriented and subsistence farmers

Comparable Measures of Occupational Status International Standard Classification of Occupations

HARRY B. G. GANZEBOOM

Utrecht University

AND

DONALD J. TREIMAN

University of California at Los Angeles

This paper provides operational procedures for coding internationally comparable measures of occupational status from the recently published International Standard Classification of Occupation 1988 (ISCO88) of the International Labor Office (ILO, 1990).

ed 3-digit occupations in 1988 ISCO

77	College teaching professionals
70	Directors and chief executives
61	Other department managers
55	Finance and sales associate professionals
51	General managers
43	Shop salespersons and demonstrators
37	Stall and market salespersons
34	Motor-vehicle drivers
31	Assemblers
29	Street vendors and related workers
21	Mining and construction labourers
16	Subsistence agricultural and fishery workers



*Your complimentary
use period has ended.
Thank you for using
PDF Complete.*

[Click Here to upgrade to
Unlimited Pages and Expanded Features](#)

Mean ISEI (occupational standing)

All Employed Persons, age 25-54
By sex, ethnicity, and year

Ethnic comparisons, separately for men
and women, for each census year

PENINSULAR MALAYSIA

ETHNICITY	1970	1980	1991	2000
Malay	32.4	35.6	39.0	37.8
Other Bumiputera	28.1	29.6	28.1	29.7
Chinese	38.2	40.4	42.1	41.8
Indian	34.3	35.9	38.4	38.9
Other	46.1	43.0	33.5	37.7
NIU	---	---	30.3	30.5
TOTAL	34.6	37.3	39.4	38.5



*Your complimentary
use period has ended.
Thank you for using
PDF Complete.*

[Click Here to upgrade to
Unlimited Pages and Expanded Features](#)

Relative to the Total population

Each Ethnic Group – Total Population

Table 1: Deviation from the Total Population

Ethnicity	EMPLOYED AGE 25-54			
	1970	1980	1991	2000
MALES				
Malay	-2.2	-1.6	-0.4	-0.7
Other Bumiputera	-6.5	-7.7	-11.3	-8.8
Chinese	3.5	3.1	2.7	3.3
Indian	-0.4	-1.4	-0.9	0.4
Other/NIU	11.4	5.7	-7.7	-7.5
TOTAL	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
(N)	21,932	25,953	46,582	62,841
Peninsular Malaysia				
FEMALES				
Malay	-2.3	-0.6	0.8	0.8
Other Bumiputera	-6.1	-7.8	-13.5	-10.0
Chinese	6.0	4.2	3.2	2.7
Indian	-3.8	-8.2	-7.8	-4.4
Other/NIU	5.7	4.8	-9.3	-9.6
TOTAL	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
(N)	9,015	10,829	20,574	30,203

of Birth Cohorts by Age at Census: PM

Birth Cohort	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65+
Before 1905					1970
1905-14				1970	1980
1915-24			1970	1980	1991
1925-34		1970	1980	1991	20000
1935-44	1970	1980	1991	2000	
1945-54	1980	1991	2000		
1955-64	1991	2000			
1965-74	2000				
1975-84					

ISEI Change by Ethnicity

Males circa 1970

- “ Chinese: high 30s, Indians: mid 30s, Malay: low 30s, Other Bumi: 20s

Inter-Cohort Changes

- “ All groups rise, 3-6 points, except Other Bumi
- “ Slight narrowing of gaps

Females circa 1970

- “ Chinese: low 30s; all others in low 20s

Inter-Cohort Changes

- “ All groups gain 10-20 points; most for Malays, least for Other Bumi. Narrowing of ISEI gaps between groups

BETWEEN ETHNIC GROUPS BY BIRTH COHORT AND SEX

Birth Cohort	MALAY			CHINESE-OTHER BUMI			CHINESE-INDIAN		
	25-34	35-44	45-54	25-34	35-44	45-54	25-34	35-44	45-54
1915-24			7.3			10.6			4.9
1925-34		5.3	5.6		8.7	10.5		3.6	3.9
1935-44	5.4	5.4	5.6	10.9	10.2	16.8	3.3	3.3	2.3
1945-54	4.2	5.0	5.5	11.0	13.8	10.3	5.1	4.3	2.2
1955-64	1.0	3.7		13.3	12.4		4.3	3.4	
1965-74	3.2			13.1			3.1		

FEMALES

Birth Cohort	CHINESE-MALAY			CHINESE-OTHER BUMI			CHINESE-INDIAN		
	25-34	35-44	45-54	25-34	35-44	45-54	25-34	35-44	45-54
1915-24			6.3			8.2			8.9
1925-34		6.9	4.4		9.6	7.7		7.6	9.4
1935-44	9.0	5.1	5.3	15.2	11.1	12.1	10.8	10.4	6.8
1945-54	4.7	3.6	3.5	13.4	11.7	12.4	14.3	11.8	5.7
1955-64	1.3	1.9		17.3	14.8		12.7	8.8	
1965-74	2.0			13.6			7.6		

WHICH OF ISEI GAP IS DUE TO EDUCATIONAL INEQUALITY?

- “ Recall that NonMalays had higher education in 1960s, but Malays had higher education in 1980s and 1990s.
- “ Compute Predicted ISEI assuming each ethnic group had the educational distribution of the total population.
- “ Observed – Predicted is the share of the observed gap that is due to unequal educational attainment

NET" FOR THOSE AGE 25-34 IN 1970, 1980, 1991 AND 2000

	MALES				FEMALES			
OBSERVED GAP IN OCCUPATIONAL ISEI								
	1935-44	1945-54	1955-64	1965-74	1935-44	1945-54	1955-64	1965-74
CHINESE-MALAY	5.4	4.2	1.0	3.2	9.0	4.7	1.3	2.0
CHNESE-OTH BUMI	10.9	11.0	13.3	13.0	15.2	13.4	17.3	14.0
CHINESE-INDIAN	3.3	5.1	4.3	3.1	10.8	14.3	12.7	7.6
PREDICTED ISEI GAP IF EQUAL EDUCATION								
	1935-44	1945-54	1955-64	1965-74	1935-44	1945-54	1955-64	1965-74
CHINESE-MALAY	3.0	4.0	3.9	5.2	1.8	2.9	4.0	4.4
CHNESE-OTH BUMI	5.5	8.1	5.5	6.6	13.9	9.4	3.6	6.0
CHINESE-INDIAN	3.9	5.0	3.4	1.5	6.9	8.5	6.0	4.0
GAP ATTRIBUTABLE TO UNEQUAL EDUCATION								
	1935-44	1945-54	1955-64	1965-74	1935-44	1945-54	1955-64	1965-74
CHINESE-MALAY	2.4	0.2	-2.8	-2.0	7.2	1.8	-2.7	-2.4
CHNESE-OTH BUMI	5.3	2.9	7.8	6.4	1.3	3.9	13.7	7.9
CHINESE-INDIAN	-0.6	0.1	0.9	1.6	3.9	5.8	6.7	3.6

CONCLUSIONS

- “ The observed (actual) Chinese-Malay occupational gap narrowed, esp. for women.
 - . Indian men on par with Malay men
 - . Indian women gained, but remain far behind
 - . Other Bumi, far far behind and no progress.
- “ About ½ of Indian and Other Bumi observed gap is due to their lower education.
- “ The share of the Chinese-Malay occupational gap that is not due to education is modest (3-4 points), but has not narrowed over time.

Occupational Structure

MALES

- “ Decline in Agriculture
- “ no change in Prof/Manag.
- “ Assoc. Prof./Technicians
- “ Blue Collar expansion

FEMALES

- “ 90% decline in Agriculture
- “ Huge Growth in:
 - . Clerical
 - . Assoc. Prof/Tech
 - . Factory Wrkr & Laborer

MALES, AGE 15-54 IN PENINSULAR MALAYSIA

OCCUPATION (MAJOR)	1970	2000
Professionals	4%	5%
Managers & Executives	8%	8%
Assoc Professionals/Technicians	1%	11%
Clerks	5%	5%
Service & Shop Sales Wrkrs.	11%	13%
Craft & Related Wrkrs.	11%	11%
Machine Operators & Assemblers	7%	16%
Elementary Wrkrs.	8%	13%
Agricultural and Fishery Wrkrs.	45%	15%
Occupation Unknown	3%	4%
TOTAL EMPLOYED	100%	100%

FEMALES, AGE 15-54 IN PENINSULAR MALAYSIA

OCCUPATION (MAJOR)	1970	2000
Professionals	5%	7%
Managers & Executives	2%	5%
Professionals	5%	7%
Assoc Professionals/Technicians	0%	14%
Clerks	4%	18%
Service & Shop Sales Wrkrs.	10%	13%
Craft & Related Wrkrs.	8%	5%
Machine Operators & Assemblers	1%	17%
Elementary Wrkrs.	3%	12%
Agricultural and Fishery Wrkrs.	59%	6%
Occupation Unknown	7%	4%
TOTAL EMPLOYED	100%	100%

Selected Occupations

” White Collar Occupations

- . Professional, Managers/Administrative, Associate Professional and Technicians, Clerical

” Craft and Related Occupations

Overview:

- ” Ethnic parity in high growth occupations & those based on educational qualifications
- ” Modest Chinese advantage in managers/crafts
 - . Linked family enterprises & informal recruitment
- ” Other Bumiputra are far behind & Indians lagging

WHITE COLLAR WORKERS

Birth Cohort	MALAY GAP			CHINESE-OTHER BUMI GAP			CHINESE-INDIAN GAP		
	25-34	35-44	45-54	25-34	35-44	45-54	25-34	35-44	45-54
1915-24			18%			24%			7%
1925-34		16%	19%		17%	23%		1%	5%
1935-44	11%	13%	14%	18%	20%	35%	0%	0%	2%
1945-54	8%	11%	8%	20%	26%	19%	5%	9%	3%
1955-64	0%	3%		26%	25%		8%	6%	
1965-74	2%			29%			5%		

WHITE COLLAR WORKERS

FEMALES Birth Cohort	CHINESE-MALAY GAP			CHINESE-OTHER BUMI GAP			CHINESE-INDIAN GAP		
	25-34	35-44	45-54	25-34	35-44	45-54	25-34	35-44	45-54
1915-24			10%			16%			10%
1925-34		11%	12%		16%	19%		7%	11%
1935-44	16%	13%	7%	27%	26%	28%	13%	15%	5%
1945-54	8%	2%	2%	31%	19%	30%	25%	21%	11%
1955-64	-1%	-1%		36%	40%		28%	23%	
1965-74	0%			34%			19%		

Summary of Findings: White Collar

- “ Overall Chinese-Malay gap in white collar jobs has been eliminated for young workers in the 1980s & 1990s
 - . Due to rise in associate professional/tehnnician & clerical; Chinese maintain edge in managerial jobs.
- “ Modest shift in Other Bumi occupational structure – fell even further behind.
- “ Modest gains for Indians. Indian men, and especially Indian women, have fallen behind Chinese and Malays.

Craft Occupations

- “ Highly skilled “Blue Collar” (apprenticeships)
 - . Carpenters and other skilled building trades
 - . Skilled metal workers, including blacksmiths
 - . Machinery mechanics, tool makers
 - . Electronic and electrical equipment mechanics

- “ 10-15% of employed population, slow increase but decline in 1997-98 AFC (in 2000 data)

- “ Work in small firms: hiring and training through kinship and social networks (not education)

NET OCCUPATIONS OF EMPLOYED MEN BY BIRTH COHORT, AGE, AND ETHNICITY

Birth Cohort	OTHER BUMIPUTRA MALES			CHINESE MALES			INDIAN MALES					
	25-34	35-44	45-54	25-34	35-44	45-54	25-34	35-44	45-54			
1915-24			5%			5%			17%			11%
1925-34		5%	6%		4%	3%		18%	17%		10%	8%
1935-44	7%	7%	8%	5%	4%	3%	20%	17%	16%	9%	8%	6%
1945-54	9%	9%	7%	5%	10%	9%	21%	19%	17%	13%	12%	6%
1955-64	13%	8%		3%	6%		26%	21%		18%	9%	
1965-74	11%			7%			22%			11%		

CRAFT WORKERS

MALES	CHINESE-MALAY GAP			CHINESE-OTHER BUMI GAP			CHINESE-INDIAN GAP		
	25-34	35-44	45-54	25-34	35-44	45-54	25-34	35-44	45-54
1915-24			12%			13%			7%
1925-34		13%	11%		14%	14%		8%	8%
1935-44	13%	11%	8%	16%	14%	13%	11%	10%	9%
1945-54	13%	10%	11%	16%	10%	9%	9%	8%	12%
1955-64	14%	13%		23%	15%		9%	12%	
1965-74	12%			16%			11%		

Summary of Findings: Craft Occupations

- ” 1/5 - 1/4 of young Chinese men are skilled craftsmen
- ” Slow increase of Malay and Indian craft workers
- ” Very few Other Bumiputera

- ” Little change in inter-ethnic gaps across cohorts
 - . Informal recruitment is different from white collar jobs and factory work
 - . Is there less training for Malays and Indians?

- ” Zaid Ibrahim anecdote

Major Findings: Education

- “ Historically, Malay had less education
 - . primarily a result of lack of access to schooling
 - . Family SES was probably a factor
 - . No evidence of less ambitions

- “ Parity in 1960s and 1970s

- “ Chinese and Indians fall behind in 1980s and 1990s
 - . Emigration of higher educated
 - . Alternative credentials
 - . Exams combined with apprenticeship employment

ings: Occupational Patterns

- “ Malays: major gains in the 1970s to 1980s
 - . Strongest for women
 - . Closed gap in educ based occupations: esp. assoc prof & technicians.
 - . Also factory work: operatives & assemblers
- “ Chinese retain a 3-5 point ISEI edge
 - . Primarily in managerial and craft occupations
 - . Not due to education
 - . Inference:
 - “ Small shop sector, apprenticeship system, informal hiring

Ethnic Groups Left Behind

- “ Other Bumiputra – limited to Pen. Malaysia
 - . Slow drift out of agriculture
 - . over represented in unskilled elementary jobs
 - . risk of becoming an “underclass”

- “ Indian community
 - . Education gap with Malays (even lower than Chinese)
 - . White collar gap has widened
 - “ Especially for women
 - . Also slight increase in elementary (unskilled) occupations

Interpretation I

Malaysia's record of educational expansion, occupational transformation, and economic growth has few parallels in modern history

- “ One more achievement to report card:
 - . Malay community has higher educational levels and “almost” parity in economic roles (occupation).
 - . Remaining gap is small and primarily in sectors based on kinship and informal recruitment.

- “ NEP is partially responsible: education, roads, & government jobs: but other factors: oil, rapid growth of manufacturing, international economy were impt.

Interpretation II

- “ Other Bumiputera, Indian community, Sabah & Sarawak have benefited much less
- “ Affirmative Action: negative consequences
 - . Lower educ for Chinese/Indians is a national issue
 - . Ethnic groups no longer segregated by geography, but in schools, employment, and organizations.
 - . Erosion of belief in equal opportunity
- “ Civic Culture is very weak:
 - . Too focused on yesterday's not tomorrow's problems
 - . More concerned about “my group” than the nation:
 - . Striking lack of empathy