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Abstract: This study offers an analysis of organisations’ heritage-related Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) projects with reference to the multi-ethnic communities in UNESCO George Town, Penang, Malaysia. The existing analysis towards the battles to promote and conserve the UNESCO heritage enclave’s tangible and intangible heritage properties have generally revolved around local, state, and federal-level organisations, neglecting the voices of marginalised ethnic groups. The marginalised ethnic group of concern is the Malay communities. The aims to be achieved are three-fold: (i) To examine the patterns of ethnic marginalisation occurring in the ethnic composition of the organisations, (ii) to explore the patterns of ethnic marginalisation occurring in heritage-related CSR projects of the organisations, and (iii) to develop the emergent typologies stemming from the patterns of ethnic marginalisation. 22 CSR executives participated in this study. The findings indicate four typologies of organisational marginalisation with reference to the Malay community in the heritage enclave.
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Introduction

In 2008, George Town was successfully conferred the UNESCO Cultural World Heritage status. The status was based on the Outstanding Universal Values (OUVs) of UNESCO and represents the following criteria: (i) the multicultural histories, (ii) the living multicultural traditions, and (iii) the multicultural townscapes (Ramli, 2017). Multiculturalism was the main element that secured the respected designation. The importance of maintaining the prestigious status became one of the key objectives that united the state and federal governments, residents, hotels, activists, and other organisations (Nomination Dossier, 2007; Connolly, 2017). In 1996, the Penang state government institutionalised the State Heritage Committee (SHC) to manage the heritage enclave. The SHC comprises local-, state-, and federal-level organisations, independent members, heritage experts, as well as a few local community leaders, as listed in Table 1 (Nomination Dossier, 2007).

The federal-level National Heritage Department is responsible for conserving, preserving, and protecting natural and cultural heritage properties of the UNESCO heritage enclave through the enforcement of heritage awareness, documentation, promotions, and research. The Penang Heritage Department is a state-level representative and its responsibility is to manage the tangible heritage properties in the heritage enclave, which include the enforcement of the building guidelines, approval of building plans, and redevelopment and conservation of historical buildings that are sited inside and outside of the heritage enclave. George Town World Heritage Incorporated (GTWHI) is responsible for promoting, managing, and safeguarding the heritage enclave as a sustainable heritage enclave.

Other state-level organisations include the Penang State Islamic Religious Council, Penang State Museum, and Hindu Endowment Board. The Penang Council is in charge of the state’s Muslim properties in Penang. The Penang State...
Museum’s responsibilities include conducting, collecting, and displaying information regarding the rich history and heritage of Penang and its community. The main role of the Hindu Endowment Board is to administer the Hindu endowments and to benefit the Penang Hindu community. In addition, the representatives of SHC also consist of the Nanyang Folk Culture Group, Penang Heritage Trust, and the Chinese Clans and Associations (Nomination Dossier, 2007). Nanyang Group promotes the Chinese heritage and arts while the Penang Heritage Trust focuses on heritage and conservation projects. Chinese Clans are responsible for managing their heritage properties.

Since the inscription, much has been spoken about efforts to promote and conserve UNESCO George Town’s heritage properties. The debate arises between the federal and state governments and also involves civil society organisations. In the debates, the voices of residents seem neglected.

George Town has been popular as a potpourri of multi-ethnic communities for at least the past 200 years. The Chinese communities are the majority even though the Malay communities were the natives and once the majority of this heritage area. Socio-economically, the Indian Muslims are doing well but not the Malay community. This phenomenon has grave implications for the sustainability of the Malay communities, especially in UNESCO George Town (Abdullah et al., 2013).

In problematising this phenomenon, this study tends to examine how the local, state, and federal organisations manage UNESCO George Town’s heritage properties and how such efforts can be limited to a certain ethnic group in Penang. The objectives of this study are three-fold:

1. To examine, if at all, the patterns of ethnic marginalisation taking place in the ethnic composition of the federal, state, and local-level organisations in Penang.
2. To explore, if at all, the patterns of ethnic marginalisation occurring in heritage-related CSR projects with reference to the Malay community in the heritage enclave.
3. To develop the emergent typologies derived from the patterns of ethnic marginalisation.

Literature Review
This section reviews the past literature about the heritage enclave. Since the heritage enclave was listed as a UNESCO heritage enclave in 2008, 25 academic studies with regard to the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisations</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National Heritage Department</td>
<td>Manage cultural heritage through documentation, research, and heritage awareness promotion</td>
<td>Federal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage Department</td>
<td>Physical management</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Town World Heritage Incorporated</td>
<td>Manage non-statutory matters</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penang State Museum</td>
<td>Manage art gallery and museum</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penang State Islamic Religious Council</td>
<td>Manage the Muslim-owned properties</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindu Endowment Board</td>
<td>Manage Hindu properties</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penang Heritage Trust</td>
<td>Safeguard the heritage</td>
<td>Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nanyang Folk Culture Group</td>
<td>Promote Chinese arts and heritage</td>
<td>Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese Clans</td>
<td>Manage the clans’ properties</td>
<td>Local</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

organisations’ responsibilities in regard to the heritage enclave between 2008 and 2022 have been reviewed. The organisations participating in this research are the local, state, and federal-level organisations.

The first part of the literature focused on studies of single organisations. Shamsuddin et al. (2012), Ch'ng et al. (2013), Aljunied (2013), and Ch'ng et al. (2014) examined Think City Sdn. Bhd. The findings showed that Think City Sdn. Bhd. manages the George Town Grant Programme (GTGP). Cheng et al. (2014) studied the Penang Heritage Trust (PHT). The findings revealed that PHT is active in heritage conservation and organises heritage projects like workshops, book fairs, seminars, and site visits, along with the Penang Apprenticeship Programme for Artisans (also known as PAPA). Sabri and Suleiman (2014) and Musa and Feng (2016) examined the George Town World Heritage Incorporated (also known as GTWHI). The findings showed that GTWHI is in charge of documenting the oral history of the heritage enclave and monitoring heritage buildings that are situated within the heritage enclave. Abdulrauf and Merican (2015) and Liang (2017) analysed Joe Sidek Productions Sdn. Bhd.’s roles in promoting the heritage enclave. The authors found that the productions have been actively organising the well-known George Town Festival (GTF) since 2010. Lee et al. (2008) and Kamarudin et al. (2015) emphasised that the Penang state government is responsible for organising conservation education for the community as well as being in charge of conservation-friendly heritage policies. In addition, other authors that studied single organisations in their research are Chai (2011) and Nasution (2017). Nasution (2017) examined the Penang State Islamic Religious Council. The council manages the Penang Muslim endowments. Meanwhile, Chai (2011) found that the Penang Tourism Authority is in charge of preserving the UNESCO enclave’s heritage resources.

In contrast, authors who study about multiple organisations are Ismail and Mohd-Ali (2011), Harun and Ismail (2011), Nasution (2012), Farahani et al. (2012), Bideau and Kilani (2012), Said et al. (2013), Shukuri and Awang (2014), Sadatiseydmahalleh et al. (2015), Mohamed et al. (2015), Lai and Ooi (2015), and Sayed (2017). The organisations involved in their studies are the local, state, and federal-level organisations, for instance the Penang State Heritage Committee, Ministry of Tourism, Arts and Culture Malaysia (MOTAC), George Town World Heritage Incorporated (GTWHI), National Heritage Department, Penang Municipal Council, Think City, Penang Heritage Trust, Joe Sidek Productions as well as the Penang Development Corporation. Furthermore, the researchers also include other organisations from websites such as Penang Tourism, Wiki travel, Asia Web, Cuti.com, Yahoo Travel, Visit Penang, Visit Penang 2010-2012, and Pulau Pinang and Penang Global Tourism. These websites offer rich information about Penang’s heritage.

Nevertheless, none of the authors conducted thorough studies on a specific organisation. Thus far, past studies on specific organisations and their responsibilities towards the heritage enclave and its community have been studied separately. Taking the terms of the debates about conservation efforts of UNESCO George Town’s heritage properties that occur among the federal and state governments and Penang civil society organisations (Aljunied, 2013) and also the sustainability of the Malay communities in the heritage enclave (Abdullah et al., 2013); this study about organisations’ heritage-related CSR projects with reference to the Malays in the heritage area is worth to be conducted.

Methodology

This section presents the research methodology that adopts the layers of research onion model (Saunders et al., 2007) as a research design. It includes the qualitative research method, case study selection, sampling and technique, and procedure of data collection and data analysis (Figure 1).
Method
This study employed a qualitative research method. According to Lewis (2015), this method is best to understand and explore the meaning groups or individuals ascribe to a social issue. This study proposes to gain an exhaustive understanding and insights into ethnic marginalisation existing among the local, state, and federal-level organisations and their heritage-related CSR projects.

Case Study
Case study is one of the frequently used methods in qualitative research (Baskarada, 2014; Yazan, 2015). According to Simon (2009), a case study is a thorough investigation from multiple perspectives of a specific policy, project, institution, system, or programme in a ‘real life’. In case study, the sampling of qualitative research depends on the selection of the particular case to be studied, as well as the sampling of the people within the particular case (Merriam, 1998).

Case Study Selection
For this study, the heritage-related CSR projects with reference to the Malay community in UNESCO George Town are selected as a case study. As mentioned, in 2008, the old town of George Town was listed as a World Heritage Site (WHS) (Connolly, 2017) and since the inscription, the heritage enclave has benefited from the increased attention on heritage status (Hitchcock et al., 2010). With more than 200 years of rich history, the heritage enclave possesses numerous collections of historic vernaculars religious and administrative buildings (Sayed, 2017). There are 5,013 heritage properties in the heritage enclave, of which 2,569 of them can be found in the core zone while 2,444 properties are in the buffer zone (Foo & Krishnapillai, 2019) (Figure 2).

The year 2023 marks George Town’s 16th year of being inscribed as a WHS. The Kellogg Foundation (2004) stated that the impact and outcome on the people involved in a project are best evaluated between the range of seven to ten years after the project is underway. Additionally, according to Rashid et al. (2019), strategically, an intensive study of one or a small number of organisations, where multiple sources of evidence are used to develop a holistic description of the organisations can be chosen as a case study as long as the organisations are connected for the purpose of doing the same business. Therefore, the 16 years of the UNESCO heritage status is assumed could support the researchers to explore a deep and thorough understanding of organisations’ heritage-related CSR projects with reference to the Malay community in the heritage enclave.
Sampling Selection

According to Parlee and Berkes (2006), the criteria for choosing the participants can be based on the sampling and method of the study. In this particular case study, the researchers employ purposive sampling and interview methods in order to choose the participants. In addition, the chosen participants have common criteria and experiences of the phenomenon (Porter, 1999). Hence, the participants taking part in this study are CSR executives from local, state, and federal organisations who are actively promoting and managing the heritage enclave and also the community.

Information regarding the CSR executives are listed in Table 2. The in-depth interviews were conducted with 22 CSR executives from 16 organisations. They are aged between 27 and 64 years old. The participants were among the Top Management Team (TMT), ranging from researchers, officers, engineers, executives, managers, honorary secretaries, assistant directors, deputy directors, directors, and vice president. They had been working with their respective organisations between three and 36 years. Both participants and organisations’ names are given pseudonyms to protect their anonymity. As for organisations, F1 and F2 are federal-level organisations number 1 and 2. Other organisations that start with S are state-level organisations while organisations that start with L are local-level organisations.

Data Collection

In-depth interview is the most appropriate data collection strategy for phenomenological case studies (Creswell, 2007). It focuses on the description of the meanings of phenomena (Rubin & Rubin, 2012). In this case study, interviews were conducted with CSR executives from local, state, and federal organisations who are actively promoting and managing the UNESCO heritage enclave and also the community.

Data Analysis

In this study, the data analysis process of this study is shown in Figure 3.

Analysis and Findings

Analysis: Organisations’ TMT Ethnic Composition

Figure 4 shows the ethnic composition of TMT of the organisations. The TMT ethnic composition includes the Malay, Indian, Chinese, and Siamese, as well as three foreign ethnic groups, which are the British, Indonesian, and Filipino descendants.

Findings that are Based on the Ethnic Composition of TMT

Based on the analysis of TMT’s ethnic composition in local, state, and federal-level organisations, the findings showed that there are two typologies occurred. The first typology is the tendency towards mono-ethnic composition of TMT and another typology is the tendency towards Malay marginalisation in private organisations.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Organisations’ Level</th>
<th>Length of Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Executive 1</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Deputy Director</td>
<td>F1</td>
<td>Preserve and promote Penang’s culture and arts</td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive 2</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>Assistant Director</td>
<td>F1</td>
<td>Preserve and promote Penang’s culture and arts</td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive 3</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Cultural Officer</td>
<td>F1</td>
<td>Preserve and promote Penang’s culture and arts</td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive 4</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>F2</td>
<td>Promote Penang-related events</td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive 5</td>
<td>50s</td>
<td>Engineer</td>
<td>S1</td>
<td>Advisory and inspection of heritage buildings’ maintenance</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive 6</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Research Officer</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td>Monitor heritage buildings</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive 7</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Community Resource Officer</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td>Organise heritage-related events with the local community</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive 8</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>S3</td>
<td>Create variety shows at Penang State Museum</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive 9</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>Head of Researcher</td>
<td>S4</td>
<td>Publish research</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive 10</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Head of Researcher</td>
<td>S4</td>
<td>Publish research</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive 11</td>
<td>30s</td>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>S5</td>
<td>Initiate Islamic programmes in Penang</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive 12</td>
<td>50s</td>
<td>Vice President</td>
<td>L1</td>
<td>Conservation consultation in Penang</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive 13</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Honorary Secretary</td>
<td>L2</td>
<td>Organising meetings and seminar</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive 14</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>Chief Operating Officer</td>
<td>L3</td>
<td>Manage operations in George Town, Penang</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive 15</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Programme Executive</td>
<td>L3</td>
<td>Monitor conservation in George Town, Penang</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive 16</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Event Director</td>
<td>L4</td>
<td>Organise yearly events</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Typology 1: The Tendency Towards Monoe-ethnic Composition of TMT

Based on the in-depth interview with the CSR executives in regard to the TMT’s ethnic composition, the findings showed that the S1, S2, S4, L3, L4, L5, L6, L7, L8, and L9 employ multi-ethnic groups in their TMT. Nevertheless, F1, F2, S3, S5, L1, and L2 employed mono-ethnic groups in their TMT.

Table 3 shows that the Malay employees most likely dominate F1, F2, S3, S5, and L2’s TMT. The F2, F1, S5, and S3 are governmental organisations while the L1 and L2 are non-governmental organisations (NGOs). The S5 and L2’s TMT are all Malay employees. As stated by the executives of the organisations, this is because compared to other organisations, both S5 and L2 were established as Muslim- and Malay-based organisations. Founded in 2011, S5 is a Muslim-based state governmental organisation that aims to revitalise the Muslim community in Penang. Meanwhile, L2, established in 1927 is a Malay-based NGO. The key objective of the NGO is to engage the Penang Malay communities through religious and community activities. Hence, based on the organisations’ objectives, L2 and S5 are obligated to appoint only Malay-Muslim teams in their organisations.

Additionally, F1, F2, and S3 also hire only Malays as their TMT. Contrasting to S5 and L2, the F1, F2, and S3 have different obligations in hiring Malay-Muslim teams in their organisations. Notably, the ethnic composition issue within the governmental agencies in this country is taken into account. In 2015, it was reported that the total number of civil servants was 1,606,463 and 78.8% were Malays, followed by Bumiputera Sabah (6.1%), Bumiputera Sarawak (4.8%), other Bumiputera (Peninsular Orang Asli) (0.3%), Chinese (5.2%), Indians (4.1%), and other minority groups (0.7%) (Free Malaysia Today, 2017). Also, in the same year, 28% out of 146,621 Malay applicants were hired into the service, followed by Chinese, where 51% out of 5,338 applicants were employed and 36% out of 6,158 Indian interviewees were employed. This
data confirms that there was a low number of applicants from the non-Bumiputera groups. This could be the factor of low representation of the non-Bumiputera groups in Malaysia’s civil service (Free Malaysia Today, 2015).

Additionally, based on a survey conducted by Universiti Sains Malaysia, namely “Towards a More Representative and World Class Malaysian Civil Service” (Berman, 2016); the findings showed that the Indian and Chinese communities generally give the Malaysian civil service lesser marks than the Malay communities do. This indicates another reason that contributes to the low representations of non-Bumiputeras in Malaysia’s public sector (Abdullah, 2010).
Another reason for a lower number of applicants and recruitments of non-Malays in the governmental sectors is because of lesser pay offered compared to the private sector industries. Besides that, there are some sorts of cultural perceptions about the governmental industries. As for the Malay communities, the governmental sectors provide security. For those who are from the sub-urban parts, the shift from kampung or sub-urban work (such as rubber tapper), where the income is seasonal and uncertain (such as planting rice or fruits) - to an occupation that offers a fixed monthly salary is a definite choice. Some of the Malays have at least one parent working in the civil service. Hence, there are fewer obstacles for the Malay communities to work in the civil service. Unlike the Indian and Chinese communities, they came to this country as traders and/or workers; for them, the move to join the civil service seemed a bit culturally alien (Abdullah, 2010).

Furthermore, as stated in the Federal Constitution, the Malay and other Bumiputera people of Sabah and Sarawak are granted special privileges compared to other minority groups. There has never been any policy to discourage the non-Malay and non-Bumiputera groups from joining the public service, except for isolated cases where religious belief is encountered (Abdullah, 2010). In this case study, a clear example would be the case of F2, F1, and S3.

If F2, F1, S5, S3, and L2 are favoring the Malay communities (for particular reasons), the L1 favors the Chinese community. Founded in 1986, L1 objectives include safeguarding and promoting both intangible and tangible heritage properties in the UNESCO enclave. Nevertheless, L1 has no absolute factors to recruit only Chinese people within the organisation. Therefore, the recruitment of only Chinese people in the organisation’s TMT is evidently an act of marginalising other ethnic groups.

**Typology 2: The Tendency Towards Malay Marginalisation in Private Organisations**

In addition to the recruitment of mono-ethnic groups in the TMT structure, another ethnic marginalisation issue derived from local, state, and federal-level organisations’ TMT structures is worth highlighting.

Table 4 summarises the Director-TMT ethnic diversity composition. It reveals that organisations with Malay-ethnic directors are preferably to employ Malay-ethnic associates in their TMT structures. The Malay-ethnic directors with Malay TMT comprise the F1, F2, S1, S3, S5, L2, and L3. Meanwhile, the organisations with Chinese-ethnic directors that preferably to have Chinese associates in their TMT structures consist of S4, S2, L1, L5, and L9. Besides the ‘Chinese director-Chinese TMT’ and ‘Malay director-Malay TMT’ groups, the findings revealed that the foreign-ethnic directors from L6, L7, and L8 are clearly benefiting the Chinese community by hiring them as their TMT. Other findings revealed that L4, with a ‘Malay-ethnic director’ is also benefiting the Chinese community. In this case, L4 with a ‘Malay-ethnic director’, together...
with L6, L7, and L8 with a ‘British director’ are favoring the Chinese and marginalising the Malay as their TMTs.

These findings are consistent with Lee and Khalid (2016) about the interconnection between ethnic identity and labour market outcomes in Malaysia. The findings revealed that employment discrimination occurs based on ethnic background in Malaysia’s private sectors, where the Chinese communities are more preferably to be hired, rather than the Malay community. Their study shows discrimination where job applicants of different ethnic groups but with comparable qualifications are treated differently. Within ethnic groups, the probability of employment depends on: (1) Employers’ ethnic profiles, (2) Chinese language proficiency, and (3) Chinese language as a part of the job requirement. In terms of employer profile and call-back rate, Chinese-controlled organisations prefer to call Chinese applicants compared to Malay applicants. The foreign-controlled organisations are unfavored to call Malay applicants. The Malay-controlled organisations prefer to call Chinese applicants compared to Malay applicants. It shows that, with regard to Malaysia’s labour market in the private sector, the Malay communities are less likely to be hired by foreign-, Malay-, and Chinese-controlled private organisations.

In summary, the findings showed that the Malay communities have a low chance of being appointed to the TMT structure by foreign-Malay, and Chinese directors. Table 3 illustrates that L1, recruiting all Chinese TMT can be seen to discriminate against Malay ethnic groups. Table 4 shows that the private organisations – L4, L6, L7, and L8 are more preferably to favor the Chinese people in their TMT structures.
Analysis and Findings of Heritage-related CSR Projects

This part of the study investigates organisations’ heritage-related CSR projects with reference to the multi-ethnic communities in the heritage enclave. Two findings resulting from the analysis of local, state, and federal organisations’ heritage-related CSR projects with reference to the Malays in the heritage enclave are Typology 3: The marginalisation of Malay community in heritage-related CSR projects and Typology 4: The prevailing presence of organisations that marginalise the Malays.

Typology 3: The Marginalisation of the Malay Community in Heritage-related CSR Projects

From the analysis of local, state, and federal organisation’s heritage projects with reference to the multi-ethnic communities in the heritage enclave, the findings revealed that all organisations do contribute to the multi-ethnic communities where they operate. Nevertheless, not all organisations contribute their heritage-related CSR projects to the multi-ethnic communities on an equitable basis.

Figure 5 illustrates that most of the heritage-related CSR projects are favoring the Chinese by 27%, followed by the multi-ethnic community (22%), Muslims (17%), Indians (11%), non-Muslims (9%), Malay (8%), other foreign ethnic groups (4%), and other local ethnic groups (2%).

Typology 4: The Prevailing Presence of Organisations that Marginalise the Malays

Taken from Typology 3, where the overall heritage projects are preferably to favor the Chinese people; additional findings revealed that the organisations that contribute the majority of their heritage-related CSR projects to the Chinese people rather than to other communities are S2, L1, L3, and L4 (Figure 6).

The findings of organisations that contribute a majority of their heritage-related CSR projects to the Chinese group are 62% (S2), 40% (L1), 51% (L3), and 47% (L4). In addition, a specific comparison of the heritage-related CSR projects with reference to the Chinese-Malay communities, the organisations that preferably to contribute their heritage-related CSR projects to the Chinese group are the F1, F2, S1, S2, S3, S4, L1, L3, L4, L5, L6, L7, L8, and L9 (Figure 7).

Evidently, these organisations are more preferably to favor the Chinese and unlikely to benefit the Malays. The ratio of heritage projects with reference to the Chinese-Malays are as follows: F1: 5:0, F2: 32:0, S1: 22:6, S2: 62:5, S3: 26:17, S4: 18:11, L1: 40:9, L3: 51:7, L4: 47:10, L5: 25:0, L6: 18:0, L7: 20:0, L8:17:0, and L9: 29:0. So, these organisations are evidently favoring the Chinese community rather than the Malays.
Findings Revisited

The analysis of organisations’ TMT ethnic composition showed that the recruitment of only Chinese people in the organisation’s TMT is evidently an act of marginalising other ethnic groups (Typology 1). Other findings based on organisations’ TMT ethnic composition showed that private organisations are more preferably to favor the Chinese people in their TMT structures (Typology 2). The analysis of organisations’ heritage-related CSR projects showed that most of the projects favor the Chinese community (Typology 3). Other findings derived from the analysis of organisations’ heritage-related CSR projects showed that the majority of the organisations are more preferably to favor the Chinese community rather than the Malay community (Typology 4). In summary, there are four typologies of organisational marginalisation discovered, viz.: (1) Typology 1: The tendency towards mono-ethnic composition of TMT, (2) Typology 2: The tendency towards Malay marginalisation in private organisations, (3) Typology 3: The marginalisation of Malays in heritage-related CSR projects, and (4) Typology 4: The prevailing presence of organisations that marginalise the Malays. These four typologies are summarised in Figure 8.

Ethnic Bias Regarding Employment in Malaysia’s Private Sectors

The findings of Typology 1 and Typology 2 were based on the ethnic composition of organisations’ TMT structures. These findings are parallel with the proposal about ethnic diversity employment in publicly listed companies (PLCs) in Malaysia. In 2008, the fifth prime minister of Malaysia proposed that...
all PLCs should reveal their employees’ ethnic composition as part of their CSR practices to enhance PLCs’ competitiveness. He mentioned that:

“PLCs have achieved significant progress in corporate governance compliance. To inculcate the culture of CSR, PLCs are required to disclose their CSR activities. Such activities, which are in line with the nation’s socio-economic objectives, include providing business opportunities to domestic entrepreneurs, awarding contracts to Bumiputera vendors, ensuring ethnic diversity employment, as well as developing human capital. In addition, the CSR activities will include contributions towards the well-being of the citizen, especially the less fortunate.”

(YAB Dato’ Seri Abdullah Hj. Ahmad Badawi, 2008)

In addition to the proposal of employing diverse ethnic in PLCs, Lee and Khalid (2016) revealed that ethnic discrimination occurs in Malaysia’s private sectors. Malay applicants with high Cumulative Grade Point Averages (CGPA) are unlikely to be called for job interviews compared to low CGPA Chinese applicants.

Research about ethnic discrimination in Malaysia’s private sectors was further investigated by the Centre for Governance and Political Studies (2017). The findings about ethnic discrimination for entry-level jobs in Malaysia are consistent with the previous study, where ethnic bias vis-à-vis job recruitment in the private sector occurs. The Malay applicants face a major drawback compared to their non-Bumiputera peers. These findings demonstrate that the Malay ethnic group are being discriminated against in Penang’s private sectors.

**Institutional Racism**

The findings of Typology 3 and Typology 4 were analysed based on the local, state, and federal organisations’ heritage-related CSR projects
with reference to the multi-ethnic communities in the heritage enclave. The analysis showed that overall heritage-related CSR projects are more preferably to favor the Chinese and unlikely to benefit the Malays, as well as other multi-ethnic communities. Furthermore, other findings showed that in a specific comparison between the heritage-related CSR projects with reference to the Chinese-Malay communities, F2, F1, S2, S1, S4, S3, L3, L1, L5, L4, L7, L6, L8, and L9 are most preferably to contribute their heritage-related CSR projects to the Chinese people.

Pager and Shepherd (2008) found that marginalisation and discrimination are being practised in certain organisations. Ethnic marginalisation and discrimination can be defined as unequal treatment based on their ethnic background. In this study, where the organisations are evidently more preferably to contribute their heritage projects to the Chinese, it showed that ethnic marginalisation clearly occurs.

Conclusion

In summary, this study aims to investigate patterns of ethnic marginalisation based on the ethnic composition of local, state, and federal organisations. Additionally, it seeks to examine the patterns of ethnic marginalisation occurring from heritage-related CSR projects, specifically with reference to the Malay community in the heritage enclave. Lastly, the study aims to develop typologies of ethnic marginalisation based on organisations’ ethnic composition and heritage projects. The findings of this study affirm that the Malays in the UNESCO heritage enclave are experiencing marginalisation.

Specifically, this study offers four typologies, viz.: (1) The tendency towards mono-ethnic composition of TMT, (2) the tendency towards Malay marginalisation in private organisations, (3) the marginalisation of the Malays based on heritage projects, and (4) the prevailing presence of organisations that marginalise the Malays.

Limitations and Suggestions for Future Research

This study is subject to a limitation that future research could further explore. There is no specific policy framework for heritage-related CSR projects in the heritage enclave. The findings showed that the Malay communities are being marginalised by the organisations based on their heritage-related CSR projects as well as ethnic composition in TMT structures. In the case of organisational marginalisation typologies highlighted above, three recommendations for future research include: (1) There must be a certain CSR policy framework and affirmative action in order to engage more multi-ethnic communities in heritage enclaves, (2) for the organisations to practise multi-ethnic composition on a fair basis, and (3) for the organisations to practise public disclosure in regard to the heritage-related CSR projects, so, the public can see what and who they help.
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