



UNIVERSITI PUTRA MALAYSIA

***ETHNIC AND POLITICAL TOLERANCE ON RATIONAL VOTING
BEHAVIOUR IN MALAYSIA***

MOHD AZMIR BIN MOHD NIZAH

FEM 2017 11



**ETHNIC AND POLITICAL TOLERANCE ON RATIONAL VOTING
BEHAVIOUR IN MALAYSIA**

By

MOHD AZMIR BIN MOHD NIZAH

**Thesis Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies, Universiti Putra Malaysia,
in Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy**

January 2017

COPYRIGHT

All material contained within the thesis, including without limitation text, logos, icons, photographs and all other artwork, is copyright material of Universiti Putra Malaysia unless otherwise stated. Use may be made of any material contained within the thesis for non-commercial purposes from the copyright holder. Commercial use of material may only be made with the express, prior, written permission of Universiti Putra Malaysia.

Copyright © Universiti Putra Malaysia



DEDICATION

To Mom and Dad, Wife and Kids



© COPYRIGHT UPM

Abstract of thesis presented to the Senate of Universiti Putra Malaysia in fulfillment of the requirement for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

**ETHNIC AND POLITICAL TOLERANCE ON RATIONAL VOTING
BEHAVIOUR IN MALAYSIA**

By

MOHD AZMIR BIN MOHD NIZAH

January 2017

Chairman : Ku Hasnita Bt Ku Samsu, PhD

Faculty : Human Ecology

Tolerance has been regarded as an essential key element in the modern multi-diversity society culturally, ethnically, religiously and politically. Various empirical evidence confirmed that tolerance has a positive effect towards social stability and harmony. However, when it involves voting behaviour as rational on ethnic and political tolerance, there has not been a sufficient study to explain such phenomenon. This study adds to the existing literature on ethnic tolerance, political tolerance and voting behaviour in Malaysia. This study has been conducted to address these matters, specifically, exploring the levels of ethnic tolerance and political tolerance in Malaysia. It also examines the relationships between ethnic tolerance, political tolerance and voting behaviour, as well as the effect of ethnic political tolerance on voting behaviour. This study also analysed the relationship between social status and voting behaviour. Finally, this study scrutinised ethnic political tolerance in the context of multi-ethnic Malaysia, with specific reference to the Johor Bahru (P160), Shah Alam (P108) and Bukit Bendera (P48) parliamentary. This quantitative study approach uses survey method with the self-administered set of the questionnaire as a data collection technique. Data were analysed using Structural Equation Modelling (SEM). 600 respondents were engaged in the survey using multistage cluster and random sampling techniques. The findings revealed that the level of ethnic tolerance can be considered as a medium with Bukit Bendera (P48) is the more ethnically tolerant compared to the other two constituencies. On the note of political tolerance level, the medium-good level is achieved with Bukit Bendera (P48) is the more politically tolerant as opposed to two other constituencies. The study discovered that ethnic tolerance had a significant negative relationship with voting behaviour, while political tolerance is not statistically significant. But both, ethnic tolerance and political tolerance had a significant positive correlational relationship. It also discovered that social status that is; level of education, party supported and ethnicity had a significant positive relationship with voting behaviour. Thus, it is evident that ethnic political tolerance has a considerable effect on the rationale of voting behaviour. However, the consequences vary, in which homogeneous and heterogeneous ethnicities act as intervention factors. The present study filled the gap to the current

body of knowledge and bears great significance at a situation where ethnic politics are perceived as the most important matter, and tolerance has increasingly become Malaysia's national agenda in managing a multi-cultural society.



Abstrak tesis yang dikemukakan kepada Senat Universiti Putra Malaysia sebagai memenuhi keperluan untuk Ijazah Doktor Falsafah

TOLERANSI ETNIK DAN POLITIK TERHADAP RASIONAL KELAKUAN MENGUNDI DI MALAYSIA

Oleh

MOHD AZMIR BIN MOHD NIZAH

Januari 2017

Pengerusi : Ku Hasnita Bt Ku Samsu, PhD

Fakulti : Ekologi Manusia

Toleransi dianggap sebagai satu elemen utama dalam masyarakat moden yang pelbagai dari segi budaya, etnik, agama dan politik. Pelbagai dapatan empirikal membuktikan toleransi mempunyai kesan yang positif terhadap keharmonian dan kestabilan sosial. Walau bagaimanapun, apabila faktor tingkah laku pengundi di anggap sebagai rasional terhadap sikap toleransi etnik dan toleransi politik, masih terdapat kekurangan kajian yang menjelaskan fenomena tersebut. Kajian ini memperkaya bahan rujukan yang sedia ada dalam bidang toleransi etnik, toleransi politik dan tingkah laku pengundi di Malaysia. Kajian ini dijalankan untuk menjawab persoalan-persoalan, khususnya, dalam meneroka tahap toleransi etnik dan toleransi politik di Malaysia. Ia juga mengkaji hubungan antara toleransi etnik, toleransi politik dan tingkah laku pengundian, serta kesan toleransi politik etnik ke atas tingkah laku mengundi. Kajian ini juga menganalisis hubungan antara status sosial dan tingkah laku pengundi. Akhir sekali, kajian ini meneliti toleransi politik etnik dalam konteks masyarakat pelbagai etnik di Malaysia, dengan menumpukan kepada kawasan Parlimen Johor Bahru (P160), Shah Alam (P108) dan Bukit Bendera (P48). Pendekatan kajian kuantitatif menggunakan kaedah tinjauan dengan set soalan soalselidik yang ditadbir sendiri sebagai teknik pengumpulan data. Data dianalisis dengan menggunakan *Structural Equation Modelling*. 600 orang responden telah terlibat dalam kajian ini yang ditentukan melalui teknik sampel kelompok berbilang dan persampelan rawak. Dapatan kajian menunjukkan bahawa tahap toleransi etnik adalah sederhana. Parlimen Bukit Bendera (P48) didapati lebih toleran berbanding dua kawasan kajian lain. Manakala dalam konteks tahap toleransi politik pula, tahap sederhana baik telah dapat ditentukan. Dapatan menunjukkan Parlimen Bukit Bendera (P48) adalah lebih toleran dalam politik berbanding dua kawasan lain. Kajian ini mendapati bahawa toleransi etnik mempunyai hubungan negatif yang signifikan dengan tingkah laku mengundi, manakala toleransi politik secara statistik adalah tidak signifikan. Namun begitu, kedua-duanya mempunyai hubungan korelasi positif yang signifikan. Dapatan kajian juga mengenalpasti bahawa status sosial iaitu; tahap pendidikan, parti yang disokong dan etnik mempunyai hubungan positif yang signifikan dengan tingkah laku pengundi. Oleh itu, adalah jelas bahawa toleransi etnik

politik mempunyai kesan yang besar ke atas rasional tingkah laku pengundi. Walau bagaimanapun, kesan yang pelbagai ini, adalah berbeza berdasarkan ciri homogen dan heterogen yang dikenalpasti boleh bertindak sebagai faktor yang mampu mengubah kesan tersebut. Kajian ini dapat memenuhi jurang kepada ilmu pengetahuan semasa dan mampu memberi sumbangan terhadap situasi semasa di mana politik etnik dilihat sebagai perkara yang paling penting, dan sikap toleransi pula menjadi agenda nasional dalam menguruskan masyarakat Malaysia yang pelbagai budaya dan berbilang etnik.



ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Firstly, praise is to ALLAH, the Most Gracious and the Most Merciful: from HIM I got the health, the power, and the patience to complete this work. In completing this dissertation, I acknowledge the support of several invaluable individuals.

First of all, I would like to gratefully acknowledge my principal supervisor Dr. Ku Hasnita Ku Samsu and my supervisory committee member Associate Professor Dr. Sarjit S. Gill for their generous guidance, invaluable assistance and continuous encouragement given over the entire period of this study. Their guidance proved to be very constructive during hard times.

My special appreciation goes to my former principal supervisor and current supervisory committee member, Professor. Jayum A. Jawan for his continuous support and encouragement from abroad; serving for our nation as a Tun Abdul Razak Chair holder and Visiting Professor of Political Science at Ohio University, United States of America.

I wish to express my gratitude and appreciation to my loving wife; Noor Azah bt Mahbob for love, encouragement, du'a and her unconditional support. My profound thanks go to my parents, Mohd Nizah Ahmad and Sokmah Yaacob for their never ending du'a. Also to my beloved kids, Azaan Aydin, Azim Addin and Nawwal Azra who have cherished me throughout the journey. I would like to extend my gratitude to my friends Dr. Abd Rahim Zumrah, Dr. Nurzali Ismail, Dr. Muhammad Shamshinor Abd Azzis, Redhauddin Dato' Kamaruzaman, Mohd Nasrul Khairi and Allahyarham Khairu'l Najmi Idris and a few others for their assistance to complete this work.

Special mention to the Ministry of Higher Education, Government of Malaysia, and Universiti Sains Islam Malaysia who provided scholarship; and particularly the staff at the Centre for Core Studies namely, Dr. Adibah Mohamad, Puan Wan Ainor Rahmah Abd Aziz, and former centre's director, Assoc. Prof. Paimah Atoma who administered my study leave, which enables me to pursue my PhD at the Universiti Putra Malaysia.

Special thanks to the respondents of this study, who provided invaluable information on ethnicity, politics, tolerance and voting behaviour. I am most sincerely grateful to all those listed above for their contribution to the research process and the development of my thesis.

I certify that a Thesis Examination Committee has met on 25 January 2017 to conduct the final examination of Mohd Azmir bin Mohd Nizah on his thesis entitled "Ethnic and Political Tolerance on Rational Voting Behaviour in Malaysia" in accordance with the Universities and University Colleges Act 1971 and the Constitution of the Universiti Putra Malaysia [P.U.(A) 106] 15 March 1998. The Committee recommends that the student be awarded the Doctor of Philosophy.

Members of the Thesis Examination Committee were as follows:

Laily binti Hj Paim, PhD
Professor
Faculty of Human Ecology
Universiti Putra Malaysia
(Chairman)

Lee Yok Fee, PhD
Senior Lecturer
Faculty of Human Ecology
Universiti Putra Malaysia
(Internal Examiner)

Mohd Daud bin Awang, PhD
Senior Lecturer
Faculty of Human Ecology
Universiti Putra Malaysia
(Internal Examiner)

Pal Ahluwalia, PhD
Professor
University of Portsmouth
United Kingdom
(External Examiner)



NOR AINI AB. SHUKOR, PhD
Professor and Deputy Dean
School of Graduate Studies
Universiti Putra Malaysia

Date: 28 April 2017

This thesis was submitted to the Senate of the Universiti Putra Malaysia and has been accepted as fulfillment of the requirement for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy. The members of the Supervisory Committee were as follows:

Ku Hasnita Bt Ku Samsu, PhD

Senior Lecturer
Faculty of Human Ecology
Universiti Putra Malaysia
(Chairman)

Jayum A. Jawan, PhD

Professor
Faculty of Human Ecology
Universiti Putra Malaysia
(Member)

Sarjit S. Gill, PhD

Associate Professor
Faculty of Human Ecology
Universiti Putra Malaysia
(Member)

ROBIAH BINTI YUNUS, PHD

Professor and Dean
School of Graduate Studies
Universiti Putra Malaysia

Date:

Declaration by graduate student

I hereby confirm that:

- this thesis is my original work;
- quotations, illustrations and citations have been duly referenced;
- this thesis has not been submitted previously or concurrently for any other degree at any institutions;
- intellectual property from the thesis and copyright of thesis are fully-owned by Universiti Putra Malaysia, as according to the Universiti Putra Malaysia (Research) Rules 2012;
- written permission must be obtained from supervisor and the office of Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research and innovation) before thesis is published (in the form of written, printed or in electronic form) including books, journals, modules, proceedings, popular writings, seminar papers, manuscripts, posters, reports, lecture notes, learning modules or any other materials as stated in the Universiti Putra Malaysia (Research) Rules 2012;
- there is no plagiarism or data falsification/fabrication in the thesis, and scholarly integrity is upheld as according to the Universiti Putra Malaysia (Graduate Studies) Rules 2003 (Revision 2012-2013) and the Universiti Putra Malaysia (Research) Rules 2012. The thesis has undergone plagiarism detection software

Signature: _____ Date: _____

Name and Matric No.: Mohd Azmir Bin Mohd Nizah , GS33638

Declaration by Members of Supervisory Committee

This is to confirm that:

- the research conducted and the writing of this thesis was under our supervision;
- supervision responsibilities as stated in the Universiti Putra Malaysia (Graduate Studies) Rules 2003 (Revision 2012-2013) were adhered to.

Signature: _____
Name of Chairman
of Supervisory
Committee: Dr. Ku Hasnita Bt Ku Samsu

Signature: _____
Name of Member
of Supervisory
Committee: Professor Dr. Jayum A. Jawan

Signature: _____
Name of Member
of Supervisory
Committee: Associate Professor Dr. Sarjit S. Gill

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT	i
ABSTRAK	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	v
APPROVAL	vi
DECLARATION	viii
LIST OF TABLES	xiii
LIST OF FIGURES	xvi
LIST OF APPENDICES	xvii
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	xviii
CHAPTER	
1 INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Introduction	1
1.2 Background of Study	1
1.3 Problem Statement	3
1.4 Research Questions	5
1.5 Research Objectives	5
1.6 Research Hypotheses	6
1.7 Research Significance	6
1.8 Research Scope	8
1.9 Research Outline	10
1.10 Chapter Summary	11
2 LITERATURE REVIEW	12
2.1 Introduction	12
2.2 Tolerance	12
2.3 Ethnic Tolerance	15
2.3.1 Measurement of Ethnic Tolerance	17
2.4 Political Tolerance	19
2.4.1 Measurement of Political Tolerance	22
2.5 Ethnic Political Tolerance	23
2.6 Social Status	24
2.7 Voting Behaviour	27
2.8 Research Framework	32
2.9 Theoretical Framework	33
2.9.1 Democratic Learning Theory	33
2.9.2 Rational Choice Theory	35
2.10 Definitions of Variables	39
2.11 Chapter Summary	40
3 METHODOLOGY	42
3.1 Introduction	42
3.2 Research Design	42
3.3 Research Framework	43
3.3.1 Population and Sampling	45

	3.3.2	Research Instrument	50
	3.4	Data Collection	52
	3.5	Data Analysis	53
	3.5.1	Descriptive Analysis	53
	3.5.2	Inferential Analysis	54
	3.6	Chapter Summary	58
4		ANALYSIS RESULTS AND FINDINGS	59
	4.1	Introduction	59
	4.2	Data Validity and Reliability	59
	4.3	The Sample Demographic	60
	4.4	Descriptive Result Analysis	66
	4.4.1	The Level of Ethnic Tolerance	66
	4.4.2	The Level of Political Tolerance	68
	4.5	Analysis of the Assumptions	70
	4.5.1	Multivariate Normality	70
	4.5.2	Outliers	71
	4.5.3	Linearity and Homoscedasticity	73
	4.5.4	Multicollinearity	73
	4.6	Factor Analysis Result	74
	4.7	Exploratory Factor Analysis	74
	4.7.1	Perceptions Construct	75
	4.7.2	Democratic Values Construct	76
	4.7.3	Civic Participation Construct	77
	4.7.4	Federal Evaluative Construct	79
	4.7.5	State Evaluative Construct	80
	4.7.6	Non Evaluative Construct	81
	4.8	Confirmatory Factor Analysis	82
	4.9	Structural Model Validity	95
	4.10	Summary	99
5		DISCUSSIONS	101
	5.1	Introduction	101
	5.2	Background Context	101
	5.3	Discussion of Findings	102
	5.3.1	Level of Ethnic Tolerance	102
	5.3.2	Level of Political Tolerance	105
	5.3.3	Relationship between ethnic tolerance and voting behaviour	108
	5.3.4	Relationship between political tolerance and voting behaviour	109
	5.3.5	Effect of ethnic political tolerance on voting behaviour	110
	5.3.6	Ethnic political tolerance in Shah Alam, Johor Bahru & Bukit Bendera	111
	5.3.7	Relationship between social status and voting behaviour	112
	5.3.8	Correlation between ethnic tolerance and political tolerance	113
	5.4	Summary	114

6	SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION	116
6.1	Introduction	116
6.2	Strengths of the Research	116
6.3	Theoretical Implications	117
6.4	Practical Implications	119
6.5	Summary	120
	REFERENCES	122
	APPENDICES	155
	BIODATA OF STUDENT	173
	LIST OF PUBLICATIONS	174



LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
3.1 Total Number of Sample Populations	48
3.2 Number of Samples	50
4.1 Demographic Profiles of Gender and Ethnic Group Based	61
4.2 Demographic Profiles of Age Based on Parliamentary Areas	62
4.3 Academic Qualification Based on Parliamentary Areas	64
4.4 Individual Income Based on Parliamentary Areas	65
4.5 Reliability Statistics for Level of Ethnic Tolerance	66
4.6 Mean Value of Ethnic Tolerance	66
4.7 Mean Value of Ethnic Tolerance According to Area	67
4.8 ANOVA Test on Ethnic Tolerance	67
4.9 Post Hoc Analysis	67
4.10 Reliability Statistics for the Level of Political Tolerance	68
4.11 Mean Value of Political Tolerance	68
4.12 Mean Value of Political Tolerance According to Area	68
4.13 ANOVA test on Political Tolerance	68
4.14 Post Hoc Analysis	69
4.15 Interpretations of Mean Score	69
4.16 Level of Ethnic and Political Tolerance	70
4.17 Assessment of normality	71
4.18 Observations farthest from the centroid (Mahalanobis distance)	72
4.19 Correlation Matrix	74
4.20 The KMO and Bartlett's Test for Perceptions	75
4.21 Total Variance Explained for Perceptions	76

4.22	Factor Communalities, Loading and Cronbach Alpha value	76
4.23	The KMO and Bartlett's Test for Democratic Values	77
4.24	Total Variance Explained for Democratic Values	77
4.25	Factor Communalities and Cronbach Alpha value	77
4.26	The KMO and Bartlett's Test for Civic Participation	78
4.27	Total Variance Explained for Civic Participation	78
4.28	Factor Communalities and Cronbach Alpha value	78
4.29	The KMO and Bartlett's Test for Federal Evaluative	79
4.30	Total Variance Explained for Federal Evaluative	79
4.31	Factor Communalities and Cronbach Alpha value	80
4.32	KMO and Bartlett's Test for State Evaluative	80
4.33	Total Variance Explained for State Evaluative	80
4.34	Factor Communalities and Cronbach Alpha value	81
4.35	KMO and Bartlett's Test for Non Evaluative	81
4.36	Total Variance Explained for Non Evaluative	82
4.37	Factor Communalities and Cronbach Alpha value	82
4.38	Index Category and CFA Goodness-of-fit Statistics	85
4.39	Squared Multiple Correlations Full Measurement	86
4.40	Modification Indices Result	87
4.41	Final Measurement Model and CFA Goodness-of-fit Statistics	91
4.42	Standardised Measurement Coefficient resulting from CFA	92
4.43	Unstandardised Factor Loading Estimates	93
4.44	Validity and Reliability	94
4.45	Factor Correlation Matrix and Square Root of AVE	94
4.46	Structural model Goodness-of-Fit Statistics	97

4.47	Standardised Regression Weights	99
4.48	Correlations Estimate	99
4.49	Summary of the Hypotheses Tests	100
5.1	Post Hoc Analysis Between Constituency	108
5.2	Statistic of Significant for Ethnic Tolerance Level	108
5.3	Statistic of Significant for Political Tolerance Level	110
5.4	The Effect of ethnic political tolerance on voting behaviour	110
5.5	Ethnic Political Tolerance in Researched Areas	111
5.6	Post Hoc Analysis on Ethnic Political Tolerance	112
5.7	Relationship between Social Status and Voting Behaviour	113
5.8	Correlations between Ethnic Tolerance & Political Tolerance	114

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure		Page
2.1	The Research Framework	33
2.2	The Theoretical Framework	38
4.1	Scatterplot of the standardised residuals	73
4.2	Full Measurement Model	84
4.3	Modified Full Measurement Model	90
4.4	Structural Model	96
4.5	Final Structural Model	98

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix		Page
A	Questionnaire to the respondents	155
B	13th General Election Result (Johor Bahru)	167
C	13th General Election Result (Shah Alam)	168
D	13th General Election Result (Bukit Bendera)	169
E	Ethnic Compositions (Johor Bahru)	170
F	Ethnic Compositions (Shah Alam)	171
G	Ethnic Compositions (Bukit Bendera)	172

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

1MDB	1Malaysia Development Berhad
AMOS	Analysis of Moments Structures
ANOVA	Analysis of Variance
APA	American Psychological Association
AVE	Average Variance Extracted
BJP	Bharatiya Janata Party
BN	Barisan Nasional
CBSEM	Covariance Based Structural Equation Modeling
CFA	Confirmatory Factor Analysis
CFI	Comparative Fit Index
DAP	Democratic Action Party
EC	The Election Commission of Malaysia
EFA	Exploratory Factor Analysis
ETS	Ethnic Tolerance Scale
GE	General Election
GSS	General Social Survey
IBM	International Business Machines Cooperation
KMO	Kaiser-Mayer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy
LCA	Latent Class Analysis
MI	Modification Indices
MLE	Maximum Likelihood Estimation
MP	Member of Parliament
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization

OECD	Organization for Economic Co-operation & Development
PAS	Parti Islam SeMalaysia
PCFA	Pooled Confirmatory Factor Analysis
PERKASA	Persatuan Pribumi Perkasa Negara
PR	Pakatan Rakyat
RMSEA	Root Mean Square Error of Approximation
SEM	Structural Equation Modelling
SPSS	Statistical Program for Social Sciences
SRMR	Standardise Root Mean Residual
UMNO	United Malays National Organization
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific & Cultural Organization
USA	The United States of America

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Introduction

The introductory section provides the general background of the study, the problem statement, research questions and objectives of the studies, the significance of the study, research scope and outline of the study.

1.2 Background of Study

The fifth challenge of the National Vision Policy has clearly mentioned on its aim to establish a matured, liberal and tolerant society in which Malaysians of all colours and creeds are free to practise and profess their customs, cultures and religious belief and yet feeling that they belong to one nation (Mahathir, 1991). This aim is based on the fact that, Malaysia is an ethnically, culturally and religiously diverse society, where historically it has recorded some conflicts, evidently in 1969, 1998, and 2001 (Fazilah, 2008; Hari Singh, 2010; Mohd Nizah, Atoma, Mohd Azmir, & Paimah, 2012) and several "red-dot" occasions occurred in its multi-ethnic relations. Except for the 13th May tragedy, ethnically heterogeneous Malaysia had a remarkable and desirable record of political stability and general social peace, reiterating Shamsul Amri (2008) term of *stable tension* that characterized Malaysian plurality; but there is a tendency for every political issue to be transformed into a communal one (Crouch, 1996; Zakaria, 1989). As Malaysia has been considered a successful nation and a model for developing countries (Lijphart, 1977; Shamsul, 2005) and seemingly settled quite comfortably into nationhood (Sidel, 2012), it is then a huge challenge to maintain its racial harmony and tolerance (Cheah, 2004). While Malaysian political climate is ever negotiated through ethnic line (Jayum A. Jawan & King, 2004; Jayum A. Jawan & Mohammad Agus, 2008), it indicates that ethnic political tolerance is a great matter and important factor for political continuity in Malaysia.

If classical Geertz (1963) and Horowitz (1985) premises suggest ethnic groups engaged in political activities for political leverage for their fear and threat of losing identity and other interests, clearly signify the absence of toleration, but rather bound with neo-colonialist perspective. As Ahluwalia (2001) contend that settler transformation must be based on consent as evidenced in the Federation of Malaya 1948, where native and settler are required to jointly worked together (Jayum A. Jawan, 2003), and thus, reconciliation of post-colonialism is instructive (Ahluwalia, 2000) for the future multi-ethnic society of Malaysia. And there is only one attitude, that is tolerant that *glued* this plural society.

Tolerant behaviour politically and ethnically is equally vital in order to guarantee Malaysia's economic, political, and social stability (Banton, 1985; Jayum A. Jawan, 1996; Sanusi, 1989). Therefore, in order to achieve that specific aim, a broad public

support for basic democratic values is necessary. As characterised by Gibson, Duch, & Tedin, (1992), a liberal democratic citizen is one who believes in individual liberty, one who is politically tolerant, and one who supports basic democratic institutions and processes, which clearly sets a standard measurement of the tolerant individual. Based on the principle that *attitudes influence behaviour*, it leads to an assumption that citizens, who embraced these norms in principle attitudinally, may apply them behaviourally. However, it raises the question of how citizens apply political tolerance behaviourally? Can a belief in political tolerance explain voting behaviour in an election?

In plain sight, not all citizens are ethnically and politically tolerant, but evidence confirmed that tolerance can generally be learnt and taught (Finkel, 2000; McClosky & Brill, 1983). Ethnic and political tolerance are not synonymous, and empirically, the relationship between the two forms of tolerance is weak (Gibson, 2006). Even though tolerance often regarded as a purely bourgeois idea, and perceived as a necessary and ever important element of modern, multi-diversity, complicated democratic societies (Zholdsbekova, 2011), there were still insignificant numbers of literature emphasising on political tolerance behaviour, especially in developing countries. Political behaviour scholars disagree over the degree to which values influence political tolerance behaviourally; but how tolerant behaviour matter for political behaviour remains a core and unresolved issue in political science (Finkel, Sigelman, & Humphries, 1999).

Therefore, there is no doubt that, ethnic political tolerance certainly requires a sacrifice of its citizens, which is necessary for the sake of the survival of the nation. In a stable, democratic state, the consistent election adheres, and political behaviour is a great matter. And when political behaviour is a subject, ethnic becomes a salient factor, which requires tolerance as a quality. Ethnic tolerance; either attitudinally, perceptions or behaviour, becomes the only substance that "*glued*" relations between "*pieces*" of ethnic. Nevertheless, more complicated, political behaviour (in this dissertation, voting) is highly dependent on the electoral logic of three dominant ethnic, namely, the Malays, the Chinese and the Indians.

Recent 12th and 13th General Election results had shown a distinctive pattern of voting behaviour amongst Malaysians, including urban-rural relationship and perceptions, an act of protest voting, ethnic political tolerance, and strategic voting that became significant features (Balasubramaniam, 2006; G. Brown, 2005b; Fernando, 2013; Lee Hock Guan, 2013; Maznah, 2008). This may indicate another phenomenon, to some account, as a recent research found that 2008 United States presidential election was considered the "*most-racial*", despite Obama historically dubbed as the first Non-White President.

It is acknowledged that urban areas reflect the nation's identity, where primary economic, political activity, and social rewards are put into play (Omer, Romann, & Goldblatt, 2013; Shamsul & Fauzi, 2007), but recent voting trends have made it more distinguished as compared to previous election outcomes. Recent studies on

heterogeneous society found that tolerance increased due to exposure to diverse political opinions, but it decreases political participation (Mutz, 2005). However, voting behaviour becomes more complex in Malaysia, where ethnicity, urban and rural factors increasingly becoming an important predictor (Wei, Ng, Rangel, Vaithilingam, & Pi, 2015). Recent studies showed that rural voters differ in their understanding of democracy, policy preferences, access to free media, knowledge of opposition parties, or a combination of all, as factors in supporting for or against ruling party (Dendere, 2013; Mohammad Redzuan & Amer Saifude, 2013; Wan Asna & Zainon, 2013). It has to acknowledge that one of the fastest growing fields of study is the study of voting behaviour. The prospect of democratic elections indicated a clear impetus to political parties and independent researchers; to examine for the first time the beliefs of all Malaysian, and to predict the results of the elections. Yet, this field moved slowly beyond the shallow analysis associated with the crudely sociological 'racial census' theory that explained the voting patterns in terms of race alone. This concern is specific with electoral implications of tolerance behaviour.

Therefore, an empirical, well-specified, and scholarly analysis of such situations should be treated as urgency. Ethnic political tolerance is a significant and dynamic segment to be discussed. A rational analysis of ethnic political tolerance behaviour may provide a better understanding of tolerance literature and its effects toward voting behaviour in Malaysia. This may be a significant finding, and worth to be analysed.

1.3 Problem Statement

The 12th and 13th general election and by-election results somehow exhibited a distinguish patterns of voting behaviour of Malaysian ethnically. In the mixed constituency where there is no particular ethnic making majority of voters, the opposition, Pakatan Rakyat (PR), won most of the seats. This specific pattern has never been occurred prior to the 2008 general election, where those seats were believed to be extremely difficult to win by any opposition parties. Wong Chun Wai (2008) characterised that 'there was cross-ethnicity voting, with Malays voting for the Democratic Action Party (DAP) and the non-Malays readily backing Parti Islam Se-Malaysia (PAS)'. This action had bewildered Barisan Nasional (BN) politicians into disbelief. It somehow raises the question of whether racial politics is no longer an issue among voters or politics of development is no longer attractive to the voters (Ming, Azhar, Hazri, & Mulakala, 2012; Mohammad Redzuan & Amer Saifude, 2013). It also raises questions about the degree of social statuses influence, including the level of education, the level of income, ethnic belonging, and tendency to support certain political party. This evidence backs a claim that social positions are no longer determined political positions (Dalton, 2000) and thus challenges the venerable cleavages party system framework of Lipset & Rokkan (1967). A recent case involving a candidate of DAP for P.076 Telok Intan by-election, Dyana Sofya Bt Mohd Daud, further attested Dalton's claim, although Dyana lost in that contest (Yap Tzu Ging, 2015). It is worth to note that Dyana's mother, Yammy Samat, is the former United Malays National Organization (UMNO) Women's division secretary and former far-right Malay Non-Government Organization (NGO) Persatuan Pribumi Perkasa Negara (PERKASA) Women's chief. This peculiar scene never occurred previously; perhaps modernization, urbanisation and new political progress

contributed to such action. Perhaps the hypothesis of stable democracy in the third world proposed by van Amersfoort & van der Wusten (1981), where they assumed sizable state apparatus and post-material period makes democratic rights and legitimation of government, is now considered important. These political changes must have brought, with some notable effect, a political tolerance and ethnic tolerance shaped voting behaviour trends in Malaysia.

In account for that, Malaysia has successfully implemented democracy and federalism over 56 years, which according to Peffley & Rohrschneider (2003) this situation should increase its citizens' levels of ethnic and political tolerance. On the contrary, a research found that Malaysia is, in fact, has been affected by subcultural pluralism (Robert A Dahl, 1970); that is, the differences of religion, race, and language of its three major ethnic groups. Indeed, it has contributed to strong group identities (Gibson, 2006), and social polarisation (Amir Hasan Dawi & Faridah Karim, 2004; Balasubramaniam, 2006; Ramlee Mustapha, Norzaini Azman, Faridah Karim, Abdul Razak Ahmad, & Maimun Aqsha Lubis, 1999), and may "*infect*" the political system (Chandra, 2005), which impede ethnic political tolerance attitude, thus affecting the ethnic political tolerance behaviour. Therefore, ascertaining political tolerance behaviour among ethnic is the most important feature in managing "*unity in diversity*" community, especially in Malaysia.

Among other reasons on why the study of ethnic and political tolerance has endured is that it deals with fundamental questions, e.g., whether representative democracy is an effective form in diverse society (Dahl, 1961), what makes citizen cast their votes, even though it is irrational to do so (Downs, 1957), and to what extent has tolerance affected individuals political and ethnically behaviour in the modern diverse society. These political changes garner interest amongst social scientists to study on significant implications of tolerances on voting behaviour (Enos, 2010; Golebiowska, 2009; Kasara, 2013). As emphasized by Shamsul (2007) that due to the "*mass conscientisation*" that empirically and systematically analysed politics beyond elections and ethnic related issues, which raised epistemologically political literacy; that serves the central tenet of citizenship education (Lund & Carr, 2008) but tolerance is definitely the quality that served as "buffer" for this phenomenon transpired.

Studies on voting behaviour in Malaysia are very much focused on the issue of ethnicity (Jayum A. Jawan & Mohammad Agus, 2008), parties (Mohammad Redzuan & Amer Saifude, 2013; Shamsul, 2013a; Vejai Balasubramaniam, 2005), individual level (Syed Arabi Idid, Mohamad Sahari, & Nik A Hisham, 2007), colonial perspectives and communalism (Jayum A. Jawan & Mohammad Agus, 2008), and urban and rural point of view (G. Brown, 2005b; Fernando, 2013). However, there are still insubstantial and unknown details, in terms of the effect of ethnic political tolerance behaviour on voting behaviour in Malaysia.

But, it is also surprising that detailed empirical evidence and sufficient studies have yet to be conducted on the political tolerance, ethnic tolerance and voting behaviour among Malaysian voters. These divergent accounts revealed that certain fundamental

questions remain unanswered and need to be explored. It must be acknowledged in order to understand that voting in an election is one of the determinants in a democratic society, and election cannot succeed without citizenship participation. Citizen participation in election certainly requires political tolerance; the act of acceptance of different political party, approach, ideologies or even differences in ethnicity. Each individual perceives the situation differently, and so as the need to look at how individual behave, rather than assuming a uniform perspective. Therefore, ethnic political tolerance served best with a framework to understand ethnic voting behaviour in Malaysia. Voting behaviour is an important predictor in identifying the present and future patterns and trends, where in this study, the political and ethnic tolerance behaviour of voters becomes the focus of argument; in order to chart strategies for upcoming general election.

1.4 Research Questions

It is imperative and essential that this research raises the following questions:

1. What is the level of ethnic and political tolerance?
2. To which degree the relationship between ethnic tolerance and voting behaviour?
3. How is the relationship between political tolerance and voting behaviour?
4. Why is there a relationship between social status and voting behaviour?
5. How ethnic political tolerance affects voting behaviour?
6. Why are the consequences of ethnic political tolerance behaviour amongst Malaysian voters in Shah Alam, Johor Bahru, and Bukit Bendera constituencies differ from one to another?

The above research questions are clearly in need for an intensive study since it may contribute significantly to the study of ethnic tolerance, political tolerance, and voting behaviour in Malaysia. To distinguish ethnic tolerance pattern in research areas is essential as it may generalise ethnic tolerance as a whole. Determinant factors involved in such process may serve in quantifying ethnic and political tolerances. Recognising a relationship between both tolerances is considered indispensable since managing diversity requires holistic approaches including electoral behaviour perspectives, as Malaysia is considered a stable democratic nation with election constantly held as stipulated in the federal constitution.

1.5 Research Objectives

Based on the previous discussion on problem statement and elaborated research questions, this research sets few specific objectives as follows:

1. To determine the level of ethnic tolerance and political tolerance.
2. To examine the degree of relationship between ethnic tolerance and voting behaviour.
3. To investigate the relationship between political tolerance and voting behaviour.

4. To analyse the relationship between social status and voting behaviour.
5. To dissect the effect of ethnic political tolerance on voting behaviour.
6. To scrutinise the ethnic political tolerance behaviour among Malaysian voters in Shah Alam, Johor Bahru, and Bukit Bendera constituencies.

Based on these objectives, the connection between those statements is viable. Firstly, analysis of the level of ethnic and political tolerance is important in order to establish its effect on voting behaviour. Secondly, the latent statistical analysis is effective in order to scrutinise the level of ethnic tolerance behaviour on their voting behaviour. Thirdly, an aggregate level of ethnic groups' political tolerance is established in order to determine its differences and explanation to follow suit.

1.6 Research Hypotheses

In order to validate the research questions, this study sets a few hypotheses as assured below:

Hypothesis 1 : Ethnic tolerance do have significant relation with voting behaviour

Hypothesis 2 : Political tolerance do have significant relation with voting behaviour

Hypothesis 3: Social status do have significant relation with voting behaviour

Hypothesis 4: Ethnic tolerance is significantly related to political tolerance

Thus, by accepting or rejecting these hypotheses may contribute to the effort in providing an empirical answer to question posted in previously.

1.7 Research Significance

In a simple statement, this thesis argues the importance of ethnic and political tolerance and its significance on voting behaviour. Considering the fact that ethnic tolerance is important in Malaysia, and political tolerance is the pillar for Malaysia's stability, it is worth to research on the level of ethnic and political tolerance specifically, but limited to the urban area. Urban areas make a huge number of Malaysian populations, and the generalizability of ethnic tolerance and political tolerance pattern in Malaysia is plausible. Nevertheless, this thesis does not aim to defend or justify political and ethnic tolerance from a normative perspective. Rather, it evaluates empirically how tolerance behaviour, politically and ethnically affects voting behaviour.

The first research question is focusing on investigating and determining the level of ethnic and political tolerance on the research area. It is critical to acknowledge the level of respected tolerance because it will be a standpoint for measuring its effect on voting behaviour.

The second question analyses the effect of ethnic tolerance on voting behaviour. It is important to know how ethnic tolerance may have an effect on voting behaviour amongst Malaysian voters. It is significant because it may explain the support for democratic principles matter for ethnic political behaviour as highlighted by Finkel et al., (1999).

On the third question, the research is focused on investigating and acknowledging political tolerance. It is important to know then; in what possible ways does political tolerance affects Malaysian's voting behaviour. As Agomor & Adams (2014) argue that available information on the political issue is one of the premier determinants of voting behaviour in Ghana, then there is an assumption that it may be replicated in Malaysia.

The fourth question is directed to the association between social statuses and voting behaviour. Social statuses depict the fabrics of society that divide between the poor and the rich, educated and uneducated, masses and elites (Streb, 2008), which largely based on attainment. However, the important of social statuses in social sciences cannot be ignored (Arwine & Mayer, 2012). Therefore, this study obliged to such consideration.

Meanwhile, the fifth question is focusing and acknowledging, after combining ethnic and political tolerance into one account, the possibility of paving to another avenue of the body on particular knowledge. Before merging both accounts, the relationship between ethnic and political tolerance needs to be examined using statistical analysis and scholarly argument. Then, it is important to assess whether there are possible ways that voting behaviour will have an effect, in terms of ethnic political tolerance dimensions.

The sixth question attempts to examine the variation of ethnic political tolerance level that may affect voting behaviour at a geographical level. Geographical differences and scale have a significant effect on tolerance attitude, either ethnically or politically (Gill, Johnstone, & Williams, 2012; Omer et al., 2013); or to some extent of socio-economic disparity (Jamalunlaili Abdullah, 2012). It is significant because it may add to the literature that tolerance may positively influence participation, or rather than the reversed in the participation modes of a theoretical framework that may compliment the rational choice framework. It is based on the assumption put forward by Jelen & Wilcox (1990) that individual-level tolerance is an important value because a tolerant politics require a tolerant citizenry, but they never tested this assumption due to an argument that social scientists take the values of ordinary citizens quite seriously. However, given the current situation, geographical differed tolerance level has become more significant than ever.

The discussion on ethnic tolerance, political tolerance, and voting behaviour in this study enable to further establish a framework for future studies. More importantly, to author's knowledge, only a limited amount of studies has examined ethnic and political

tolerance simultaneously, and little to none attention was given to the study of voting behaviour as the dependent variable. In addition to that, there is a clear benefit to extending the geographic scope of research on the impact of ethnic demography, on ethnic tolerance, and on political tolerance behaviour. Furthermore, developing countries provide a concrete test for theories on tolerance in plural ethnic societies (Francis L. F. Lee, 2013; Ichino & Nathan, 2013; Kasara, 2013; World Public Opinion.Org, 2009).

This study highlights the level of ethnic political tolerance that may significantly affect voting behaviour. Therefore, it may add to the body of knowledge on ethnic and political tolerance, and on voting behaviour especially in developing countries and Malaysia in particular. It may generate additional insights regarding people's tolerance and its effect on their voting behaviour.

1.8 Research Scope

The scope of this study encompasses geographical and time frame. In the aspect of geography, the research is conducted in three carefully chosen urban areas, namely Johor Bahru, Shah Alam and Bukit Bendera. The research areas are based on electoral parliamentary constituencies. Therefore, all those three areas have similarities and differences.

In order to determine such areas, several criteria are set as standards of selection. Firstly, the elected Members of Parliament (MPs) belongs to the majority ethnic that is Malay. Johor Bahru voters elected Sharil @Shahrir Ab Samad as the Member of Parliament. Shah Alam voters then elected Khalid Abd Samad as their representative to the House of Representatives. People in Bukit Bendera unpredictably voted Zairil Khir Johari as the Member of Parliament despite his maiden attempt. This is due to the fact that, based on various researchers, the majority seems to be less tolerant towards other (Ahmad Tarmizi, Sarjit Singh Gill, Razaleigh, & Puvaneswaran Kunasekaran, 2013; Bettelheim & Janowitz, 1949; Hodson, Sekulic, & Massey, 1994; Massey, Hodson, & Sekulić, 1999). Therefore, these three areas provide the exact criteria needed to test the level of tolerance, both ethnically and politically.

Secondly, referring to the urban status of the area, which is based on a report by Department of Statistics Malaysia (2010) and from the works of Jamalunlaili Abdullah (2012) and Usman Yaakob, Tarmiji Masron, & Masami (2010), these selected areas met the selection criterion. Urban is defined as gazetted areas with their adjoining built-up areas or specific development areas, which had a combined population of 10,000 persons or more, and at least 60 per cent aged 15 years and above engaged in non-agricultural activities (Department of Statistics Malaysia, 2009). These three areas doubted as capital for its respective states and worth to mention that the rates of urbanisation are high.

Thirdly, both Sharil @ Shahrir Ab Samad and Khalid Abd Samad are siblings but represent different political parties. Meanwhile, Zairil Khir Johari is the son of former education minister, and a former Member of Parliament from 1955 to 1982, Tan Sri Khir Johari. This fact is interesting to scrutinise as rational choice and democratic learning theory may be explained this contrary accounts. On the other note, from elite's theory point of view, the notion of preserving their status quo is prevalent despite different platform of political parties.

In respect of differences, the elected MP's are from three different political parties, firstly, Sharil @ Shahrir Ab Samad from UMNO/BN in Johor Bahru, which has been re-elected for 2013 GE, an incumbent since 1978-1990, 2004 until 2013. It has been said that, the personality factor of Sharil @ Shahrir that allowed him to retain his parliamentary seats for a number of terms. Secondly, PAS/PR in Shah Alam represented by Khalid Abd Samad. He was re-elected in 13th GE and served the chair since 2008. However, it also worth to mentioned that since the internal crisis of PAS which led to the formation of the new political party called Parti Amanah Negara (PAN) which saw Khalid became its member may jeopardise his seats for the upcoming elections. Another factor is perhaps the weakness of opposite candidates that subsequently allowed him to be re-elected after 13th GE. Thirdly, Zairil Khir Johari represented DAP/PR of Bukit Bendera constituency, which is his inaugural service to the office. So, the selection of these constituencies may also provide different perspectives on the factor of service terms.

On the composition of ethnic wise, it is, therefore, set with (1) majority Malay, that is a total number of voters are two-thirds Malay; (2) mixed majority, a constituency that is between one-third and two-thirds are Malay; and (3) majority non-Malay area of constituencies, where Malay voters are less than one-third. The category of electoral constituencies is referring to Balasubramaniam (2006) works on electoral tactical voting and ethnic consciousness. Therefore, based on election online data result obtained from official website of Suruhanjaya Pilihan Raya Malaysia (2014) and Utusan Online (2013), these areas meet the demand. Brown (2005b), in his work on five (1986-2004) Malaysia's general election analysis also categorised constituencies into three different groups as suggested above. Thus, by categorising these constituencies into three different groups are valid and empirically accepted by scholars.

In terms of ethnic demography, Johor Bahru is considered mixed majority areas with 51 percent are Malays and 49 are non-Malays (refer Appendix E : Ethnic Compositions (Johor Bahru)), Shah Alam with Malay majority of 70 per cent, and non-Malays are 30 percent (refer Appendix) and Bukit Bendera is a Chinese-majority constituency with 74 percent are Chinese, 11 percent are Indian, 1 percent is others, with Malays at about 14 percent (refer Appendix). Meanwhile, the result analysis will only cover the period of 2004-2013, that is from Malaysia General Election (GE) 12th (2008) and GE 13th (2013).

In the aspect of the geographical location of these cities, southern part (Johor Bahru), the central region (Shah Alam) and northern area (Bukit Bendera) of peninsular may represent peninsular Malaysia in general. It also worth to mentioned on why cities in Borneo states of Sabah and Sarawak is not selected in this study. Among of the reason is the different political concern such as party politics, ethnic diversity and cultural difference of Sabah and Sarawak that need to be explained in another avenue. Another factor is the geographical obstacles, which impede the cost of this study as mentioned in research limitation.

1.9 Research Outline

This thesis consists of six chapters. The first chapter addressed the research background and problems to be highlighted. It sets out objectives of the study, research questions and hypotheses developed. Then, it argues the significance of conducting such study. It also outlined briefly the scope of the particular study and limitation set. Finally, an overview of the research content is explicitly provided.

Chapter Two reviews relating literature to the specific study on tolerance and voting behaviour. It begins with an introduction to the larger concept of tolerance and narrowing to the ethnic tolerance and political tolerance. It reviews on how both specific concepts interchangeably used to address the issue of tolerance, whilst both concepts are distinguished from one another. Then, it addressed on how both concepts have effects on voting behaviour. As for voting behaviour, this chapter attempts to outline the insufficient available literature, which makes this particular study is imperative enough to be conducted.

Chapter Three provides information on the methodology issues in conducting this particular study. It describes the research design applied and justification for such design. Population and sample of the study have been graphically described for better understanding of applied research design. A detailed explanation of data collection procedures and data mining steps has been extensively addressed. Then, the analysis techniques used for conceptual framework and hypotheses are explained.

Chapter Four presents the quantitative result analyses. It begins with a discussion on the demographics of respondents. The chapter also provides a discussion on the findings of various analyses including multivariate normality, outlier issues, linearity, homoscedasticity, and multicollinearity. The exploratory factor analysis, the measurement model validity including the goodness of fit of the measurement model, the construct reliability, the construct convergent validity and the construct discriminant validity have been performed. Later, this chapter will address the structural model validity, along with the results of the hypotheses testing.

Chapter Five extensively discusses the findings in Chapter Four. It started with a discussion based on the objective mentioned in Chapter One. Later, guided with

hypotheses statement, the discussions are inclined to meet the expectation of hypotheses. An integrated discussion across chapters will be presented here.

Chapter Six summarise the extensive findings in Chapter Five. It includes a summary of the background of the study, including the gaps found in the literature and possible contribution of this particular study to the body of knowledge. Later, it discusses the strength of this study and possible recommendations for future study. The chapter concludes with a summary of the thesis.

1.10 Chapter Summary

There has been a significant voting behaviour made by voters, which may be related to urbanites characteristics that shaped their ethnic tolerance attitude and reshaping their political tolerance, thus resulting in their voting behaviour. The research aimed at distinguished ethnic tolerance pattern in areas involved, established determinant factors for such areas, then recognise if there is any relationship between ethnic tolerance and political tolerance, and appraised ethnic tolerance level with political tolerance attitude and electoral behaviour in all three constituencies. Thus, as outlined in research questions, research objectives, and research hypotheses, this chapter presents logical and empirical reason d'être for generalizability of specific body of knowledge.

REFERENCES

- Abbarno, A. J. (2011). *Tolerance Matters: A Cognitive Dissonance Model of the Effects of Protecting Rights and Restricting Liberties on Political Attitudes and Behavior*. Washington.
- Abbarno, A. J. (2013). *The Behavioral Consequence of Political Tolerance*. The University of Pittsburgh.
- Abdillah Noh, (2014). Malaysia 13th General Election: A short note on Malaysia's continuing battle with ethnic politics. *Electoral Studies*, 34, 266–269. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.electstud.2013.09.003>
- Abdul Razaq Ahmad, ., & Ahmad Ali Seman, (2012). Diversity as a Medium to Reinforce Ethnic Tolerance in History Subject in Malaysia. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 2(12), 317–326.
- Abdullah Taib, . (1984). *Interaksi dan Polarisasi Mahasiswa Universiti di Malaysia*. Bangi, Selangor.
- Adams, G. R. (1985). Identity and Political Socialization. *New Directions for Child and Adolescent Development*, 61–77. <http://doi.org/10.1002/cd.23219853006>
- Agomor, K., & Adams, S. (2014). Determinants of Voting Behaviour in Ghana. In J. Pomfret (Ed.), *Global Awareness Society International 23rd Annual Conference* (pp. 1–12). Montego Bay: Global Awareness Society International. Retrieved from <http://organizations.bloomu.edu/gasi/>
- Ahluwalia, P. (2000). Towards (Re)Conciliation: The Post-Colonial Economy of Giving. *Social Identities*, 6(1), 29–48. <http://doi.org/10.1080/13504630051345>
- Ahluwalia, P. (2001). When Does a Settler Become a Native? Citizenship and Identity in a Settler Society. *Pretexts: Literary and Cultural Studies*, 10(1), 63–73. <http://doi.org/10.1080/713692599>
- Ahmad Tarmizi, Talib, Sarjit Singh Gill, ., Razaleigh, . Muhamat Kawangit, & Puvaneswaran Kunasekaran, .. (2013). Religious Tolerance: The Key between One ASEAN One Community. *Life Science Journal*, 10(4), 1382–1385.
- Ahmad Tarmizi Talib, ., & Mohd Mahadee Ismail, (2006). *Toleransi Agama: Kajian Kes di Malaysia*. Putrajaya.
- Ajzen, I. (1985). From Intentions to Actions: A Theory of Planned Behavior. In J. Kuhl & J. Beckmann (Eds.), *Action Control: From Cognition to Behavior* (pp. 11–39). Heidelberg, Germany: Springer.

- Ajzen, I. (1991). The Theory of Planned Behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 50, 179–211.
- al Faruqi, I. R. (1992). *AL-TAWHID: Its Implications for Thought and Life* (2nd ed.). Virginia: International Institute of Islamic Thought.
- Alba, R. D. (1978). Ethnic Networks and Tolerant Attitudes. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 42(1), 1–16. Retrieved from <http://poq.oxfordjournals.org/content/42/1/1.short>
- Alba, R. D., & Jang, S. J. (1992). Reply to Wilson: Type of Place Matters Too. *Social Science Quarterly*, 73(3), 613–614.
- Albright, S. C., Winston, W. L., & Zappe, C. J. (2009). *Data Analysis and Decision making with Microsoft Excel, Revised*. Ohio: South-Western Cengage Learning.
- Alesina, A., & La Ferrara, E. (2002). Who Trusts Others? *Journal of Public Economics*, 85(2), 207–234.
- Allison, P. D. (2002). *Missing Data*. Thousand Oaks, CA, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Allport, G. W. (1954). *The Nature of Prejudice*. Reading, Mass: Addison-Wesley.
- Almond, G. A., & Verba, S. (1989). *The Civic Culture*. California: SAGE Publications Inc.
- American Psychological Association. (2007). *APA Dictionary of Psychology*. California: American Psychological Association.
- Amir Hasan Dawi, . (2006). Interaksi antara Etnik di Malaysia. In . Zaharah Hassan, . Abd Latif Samian, & A. D. Silong (Eds.), *Readings on Ethnic Relations in a Multicultural Society*. Serdang: Fakulti Pengajian Pendidikan UPM.
- Amir Hasan Dawi, ., & Faridah Karim, . (2004). Bangsa Malaysia: Suatu Realiti dalam Masyarakat yang Berpola. In *4th International malaysia Studies Conference* (pp. 1–13). Bangi, Selangor: Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia.
- Ammann, S. L. (2014). *Essays on Religion and Political Behavior: How Religion Facilitates Political Development and Change*. University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee.
- Antunes, R. (2010). Theoretical Models of Voting Behaviour. *Exedra*, 4, 145–170.
- Arwine, A., & Mayer, L. (2012). *The Impact of Tolerance on Political Behavior* (2012 Annual Meeting). Portland, Oregon.
- Arwine, A., & Mayer, L. (2014). Tolerance and the Politics of Identity in the European Union. *Social Science Quarterly*, 95(3), 669–681. <http://doi.org/10.1111/ssqu.12061>

- Avery, P. G. (1988). Political Tolerance Among Adolescents. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 16(3), 183–201.
- Babbie, E. (2011). *The Basics of Social Research* (5th ed.). California: Cengage Learning.
- Baharudin Ali Masrom, (1989). *Politik Melayu abad 21*. “D” Enterprise.
- Bajunid, A. F. I., Abbas, M. Y., & Nawawi, A. H. (2013). Social Cohesion of the Malaysian Cul-de-sac Neighborhoods: Brief Critical Review of Concepts. *Asian Journal of Environment-Behaviour Studies*, 4, 99–107.
- Baker, T. L. (1999). *Doing Social Research*. Boston: McGraw-Hill International.
- Balasubramaniam, V. (2006). Strengthening ethnic identity consciousness and the role of tactical voting in multi-racial Malaysia. *Asian Ethnicity*, 7(1), 75–88. <http://doi.org/10.1080/14631360500498536>
- Bambulyaka, M. (2011). The Implicit Methods for the Study of Tolerance. *World Academy of Science, Engineering and Technology*, 60, 1915–1919.
- Banton, M. (1985). *Promoting Racial Harmony* (1st ed.). Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.
- Banton, M. (2005). Three current issues in ethnic and racial studies. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 56(4), 621–33. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-4446.2005.00086.x>
- Banton, M., & Mansor, M. N. (1992). Research report: The study of ethnic alignment: A new technique and an application in Malaysia. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 15(4), 599–613. <http://doi.org/10.1080/01419870.1992.9993765>
- Bass, J. R. (1970). Malaysia: Continuity or Change. *Asian Survey*, 10(2), 152–160.
- Bentler, P. M. (1990). Comparative Fit Indexes in Structural Models. *Psychological Bulletin*, 107(2), 238–246. <http://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.107.2.238>
- Bentler, P. M. (2006). *EQS 6 Structural Equations Program Manual*. Los Angeles: BMDP Statistic Software. Encino, CA: Multivariate Software, Inc. Retrieved from <http://www.econ.upf.edu/~satorra/CourseSEMVienna2010/EQSManual.pdf>
- Berelson, B. R., Lazarsfeld, P. F., & McPhee, W. N. (1954). *Voting- A Study of Opinion Formation in a Presidential Campaign*. Chicago: University of Chicago.
- Berger, J., Cohen, B. P., & Zelditch, M. (1965). *Status Characteristics and Expectation States*.

- Bettelheim, B., & Janowitz, M. (1949). Ethnic Tolerance : A Function of Social and Personal Control. *American Journal of Sociology*, 55(2), 137–145.
- Birbir, J. K. (2007). *Ethnicity and Electoral Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Blais, A. (2000). *To Vote or Not To Vote : The Merits and Limits of Rational Choice Theory*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.
- Blais, A. (2006). What Affects Voter Turnout? *Annual Review of Political Science*, 9(1), 111–125. <http://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.polisci.9.070204.105121>
- Blalock, H. M. (1967). *Toward a Theory of Minority-Group Relations*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Bogardus, E. S. (1925). Social Distance and Its Origins. *Journal of Applied Sociology*, 9, 216–226. Retrieved from http://www.brocku.ca/MeadProject/Bogardus/Bogardus_1925b.html
- Boo Su-Lyn, (2013). GE13 an urban, not Chinese swing, say analysts. Retrieved February 12, 2014, from <http://www.themalaysianinsider.com/malaysia/article/ge13-an-urban-not-chinese-swing-say-analysts/>
- Borgonovi, F. (2012). The relationship between education and levels of trust and tolerance in Europe. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 63(1), 146–67. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-4446.2011.01397.x>
- Bowyer, B. T. (2009). The Contextual Determinants of Whites' Racial Attitudes in England. *British Journal of Political Science*, 39(3), 559. <http://doi.org/10.1017/S0007123409000611>
- Boyas, J., & Sharpe, T. L. (2010). Racial and Ethnic Determinants of Interracial and Ethnic Trust. *Journal of Human Behavior in the Social Environment*, 20(5), 618–636. <http://doi.org/10.1080/10911351003673682>
- Bratton, M. (2013). *Voting and Democratic Citizenship in Africa*. (M. Bratton, Ed.). Colorado: Lynne Rienner Publishers.
- Breslavs, G. (2011). Insufficiency of theoretical models in the field of intergroup relations: Towards the Ethnic Tolerance Scale elaboration. In *European Conference on Psychological Assessment*. Riga. <http://doi.org/10.1037/e523472012-058>
- Breslavs, G. (2014). Ethnic Tolerance Scale Development : Renovation of Integrated Approach. *Journal of Siberian Federal University. Humanities & Social Sciences*, 4(7), 579–596.

- Brown, D. S. (2004). Democracy and Gender Inequality in Education: A Cross-National Examination. *British Journal of Political Science*, 34(1), 137. <http://doi.org/10.1017/S0007123403210395>
- Brown, G. (2005a). Making ethnic citizens : The politics and practice of education in Malaysia October 2005, (23).
- Brown, G. (2005b). Playing the (non)ethnic card: The electoral system and ethnic voting patterns in Malaysia. *Ethnopolitics*, 4(4), 429–445. <http://doi.org/10.1080/17449050500348675>
- Brown, G. K. (2010). Legible Pluralism: The Politics of Ethnic and Religious Identification in Malaysia. *Ethnopolitics*, 9(1), 31–52. <http://doi.org/10.1080/17449050903557401>
- Bulmer, M. G. (1979). *Principles of Statistics*. New York: Dover Publication Inc.
- Bulmer, M., & Solomos, J. (1998). Introduction: Re-thinking Ethnic and Racial Studies. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 21(5), 819–837. <http://doi.org/10.1080/014198798329667>
- Byrne, B. M. (2005). Factor analytic models: viewing the structure of an assessment instrument from three perspectives. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 85(1), 17–32. http://doi.org/10.1207/s15327752jpa8501_02
- Byrne, B. M. (2010). *Structural Equation Modeling with AMOS: Basic Concepts, Applications, and Programming*. *Structural Equation Modeling* (2nd ed.). Taylor & Francis Group, LLC.
- Cain, B., Citrin, J., & Wong, C. (2000). *Ethnic Context, Race Relations, and California Politics*. San Francisco, CA, CA: Public Policy Institute of California.
- Caldwell, C. (2009). Fear masquerading as tolerance. Retrieved March 17, 2014, from https://www.prospectmagazine.co.uk/magazine/fearmasqueradingastolerance/#.UyaJGPQW0_R
- Campbell, A., Converse, P. E., Miller, W. E., & Stokes, D. E. (1960). *The American Voter* (3rd ed.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Campbell, D. E. (2006). *Why We Vote: How Schools and Communities Shape Our Civic Life*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Cargan, L. (2007). *Doing Social Research*. Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.
- Carlson, J. M., & Hyde, M. S. (2003). *Doing Empirical Political Research*. Houghton Mifflin Harcourt Publishing Company.

- Carter, J. S. (2003). *Revisiting Urbanism, Region, and Tolerance: The Cases of Racial and Gender Prejudice*. University of South Carolina.
- Carter, J. S., & Corra, M. (2012). Beliefs about the Causes of Racial Inequality: The Persisting Impact of Urban and Suburban Locations? *Urban Studies Research*, (April), 1–7. <http://doi.org/10.1155/2012/242741>
- Carter, J. S., Steelman, L. C., Mulkey, L. M., & Borch, C. (2005). When the rubber meets the road: effects of urban and regional residence on principle and implementation measures of racial tolerance. *Social Science Research*, 34(2), 408–425. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssresearch.2004.04.004>
- Catt, H. (1996). *Voting Behaviour: A Radical Critique*. London: Leicester University Press.
- Center for Glocal Concern. (2013). Pilihanraya Umum Ke 13. Retrieved January 2, 2015, from <http://pru-13.appspot.com>
- Chandra, K. (2005). Ethnic Parties and Democratic Stability. *Perspectives on Politics*, 3(2), 235–252.
- Chatterjee, S., Hadi, A. S., & Price, B. (2000). *Regression Analysis By Example* (3rd Editio). New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Cheah, B. K. (2004). *The Challenge of Ethnicity; Building a Nation in Malaysia*. (B. K. Cheah, Ed.) (1st ed.). Singapore: Marshall Cavendish International.
- Chua Yan Piaw, . (2014). *Kaedah Penyelidikan (Buku 1)* (Edisi Keti). Kuala Lumpur: McGraw-Hill.
- Chuan, C. L. (2006). Sample Size Estimation Using Krejcie and Morgan and Cohen Statistical Power Analysis: A Comparison. *Jurnal Penyelidikan IPBL*, 7, 78–86.
- Chzhen, Y. (2013). Education and Democratisation: Tolerance of Diversity, Political Engagement, and Understanding of Democracy.
- Cigler, A., & Joslyn, M. R. (2002). The Extensiveness of Group Membership and Social Capital: The Impact on Political Tolerance Attitudes. *Political Research Quarterly*, 55(1), 7–25.
- Clow, K. E., & James, K. E. (2014). *Essentials of Marketing Research: Putting Research Into Practice*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications Inc.
- Coakes, S. J., & Ong, C. (2011). *SPSS: Analysis Without Anguish: version 18.0 for Windows* (18th ed.). Queensland: John Wiley & Sons Australia, Ltd.
- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical Power Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences*. Hillsdale, New Jersey: Lawrence Earlbaum Associates, Inc.

- Cohen, J. (1992). A Power Primer. *Psychological Bulletin*, 112(1), 155–159. <http://doi.org/10.1037//0033-2909.112.1.155>
- Cole, L. A. (1977). Blacks & Ethnic Political Tolerance. *Polity*, 9(3), 302–320.
- Corneo, G., & Jeanne, O. (2009). A Theory of Tolerance. *Journal of Public Economics*, 93(5), 691–702.
- Cote, R. R., & Erickson, B. H. (2009). Untangling the Roots of Tolerance: How Forms of Social Capital Shape Attitudes Toward Ethnic Minorities and Immigrants. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 52(12), 1664–1689. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0002764209331532>
- Cox, G. W. (1997). *Making Votes Count. Political economy of institutions and decisions* (Vol. 7). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <http://doi.org/10.1002/ncr.4100520906>
- Crepaz, M. M. L., & Damron, R. (2008). Constructing Tolerance: How the Welfare State Shapes Attitudes About Immigrants. *Comparative Political Studies*, 42(3), 437–463. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0010414008325576>
- Crespi, I. (1971). What Kinds Of Attitude Measures Are Predictive Of Behavior ? *The Public Opinion Quarterly*, 35(3), 327–334.
- Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative and Mixed Methods* (3rd ed.). California: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Creswell, J. W., & Clark, V. L. P. (2007). *Designing and Conducting Mixed Methods Research*. California: SAGE Publications Inc.
- Crouch, H. A. (1996). *Government and Society in Malaysia*. New York: Cornell University Press.
- Dahl, R. A. (1961). *Who Governs? Democracy and Power in An American City*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Dahl, R. A. (1971). *Polyarch: Participation and Opposition*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Dalton, R. J. (2000). Citizen Attitudes and Political Behavior. *Comparative Political Studies*. <http://doi.org/10.1177/001041400003300609>
- Das, J., DiRienzo, C., & Tiemann, T. (2008). A global tolerance index. *Competitiveness Review: An International Business Journal Incorporating Journal of Global Competitiveness*, 18(3), 192–205. <http://doi.org/10.1108/10595420810905975>
- Davis, D. W. (2007). *Negative Liberty: Public Opinion and the Terrorist Attacks on America*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

- De Neve, J.-E. (2011). *Essays in Political Economy and Voting Behaviour*. London School of Economics and Political Science. London School of Economics and Political Science.
- de Vries, C. E., van der Brug, W., van Egmond, M. H., & van der Eijk, C. (2011). Individual and contextual variation in EU issue voting: The role of political information. *Electoral Studies*, 30(1), 16–28. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.electstud.2010.09.022>
- Demarree, K. G., Petty, R. E., & Briñol, P. (2007). Self-certainty : Parallels to Attitude Certainty. *International Journal of Psychology and Psychological Therapy*, 7(2), 159–188.
- Dendere, C. (2013). Ordinary People Voting Under Extraordinary Times. Retrieved from <http://papers.ssrn.com/abstract=2237194>
- Department of Statistics Malaysia. (2009). *Urbanization & Urban Growth Issues for the Next Malaysia Census 2010*. Hong Kong.
- Department of Statistics Malaysia. (2010). *Population Distribution and Basic Demographic Characteristics*. Putrajaya.
- Derichs, C. (2002). A Step Forward: Malaysian Ideas for Political Change. *Journal of Asian and African Studies*, 37(1), 43–65. <http://doi.org/10.1177/002190960203700103>
- Downs, A. (1957). *An Economic Theory of Democracy*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Duch, R. M., & Gibson, J. L. (1991). “Putting Up With” Fascists In Western Europe: A Comparative, Cross-Level Analysis of Political Tolerance. *The Western Political Quarterly*, 237–273.
- Dunbar, E., Blanco, A., Sullaway, M., & Horcajo, J. (2004). Human rights and ethnic attitudes in Spain: The role of cognitive, social status, and individual difference factors. *International Journal of Psychology*, 39(2), 106–117. <http://doi.org/10.1080/00207590344000196>
- Dustmann, C., & Preston, I. (2001). Attitudes To Ethnic Minorities , Ethnic Context And Location Decisions. *The Economic Journal*, 111(470), 353–373.
- Economic Planning Unit. (2014). *Pendapatan Kasar Bulanan Isi Rumah Purata*. Putrajaya, Malaysia. Retrieved from <http://www.epu.gov.my/household-income-poverty>
- Eder, J. F. (2010). Ethnic Differences, Islamic Consciousness, and Muslim Social Integration in the Philippines. *Journal of Muslim Minority Affairs*, 30(3), 317–332. <http://doi.org/10.1080/13602004.2010.515812>

- Eisenstein, M. A. (2006). Rethinking the Relationship between Religion and Political Tolerance in the US. *Political Behavior*, 28(4), 327–348. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s11109-006-9014-5>
- Enos, R. D. (2010). Testing the Elusive: A Field Experiment on Intergroup Competition and Voting. Los Angeles: unpublished.
- Eys, M. A., Carron, A. V., Bray, S. R., & Brawley, L. R. (2007). Item Wording and Internal Consistency of a Measure of Cohesion: The Group Environment Questionnaire. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 29(3), 395–402. <http://doi.org/10.1123/jsep.29.3.395>
- Ezhar Tamam, ., Tien, W. Y. M., Fazilah Idris, ., & Azimi Hamzah, (2006). News Media Socialization and Ethnic Tolerance. *15th AMIC Annual Conference*, (July), 1–10.
- Ezhar Tamam, ., Wendy Yee Mei Tien, ., Fazilah Idris, ., & Azimi Hamzah, . (2006). Relationship of Exposure to Public Affairs News with Cognitive, Attitudinal and Behavioural Dimensions of Ethnic Tolerance among Malaysian Youths. *Kajian Malaysia*, XXIV, 171–184.
- Fan, X., & Sivo, S. A. (2007). Sensitivity of Fit Indices to Model Misspecification and Model Types. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*. <http://doi.org/10.1080/00273170701382864>
- Fanning, E. (2005). Formatting a paper-based survey questionnaire: Best practices. *Practical Assessment, Research & Evaluation*, 10(12), 1–14. Retrieved from http://parkdatabase.org/files/documents/2005_Formatting-a-paper-based-Survey-Questionnaire_E-Fanning.pdf
- Faul, F., Erdfelder, E., Buchner, A., & Lang, A. (2009, November). Statistical power analyses using G*Power 3.1: tests for correlation and regression analyses. *Behavior Research Methods*. <http://doi.org/10.3758/BRM.41.4.1149>
- Fauzi Bin Hussin, ., Jamal Ali, ., & Mohd Saifoul Zamzuri Noor, . (2014). *Kaedah Penyelidikan & Analisis Data SPSS*. Penerbit UUM.
- Fauziah Ahmad, ., Ali Salman, ., Samsudin A. Rahim, ., Latiffah Pawanteh, ., & Abdul Latiff Ahmad, . (2013). Interethnic tolerance among multiethnic youth: Accommodating differences in the construction of social citizenship. *Journal of Asian Pacific Communication*, 23(2), 270–285.
- Fazilah, I. (2008). *The Influence of Individual Attributes On Inter-Ethnic Tolerance among Early Youth in Selangor*. Universiti Putra Malaysia.
- Fennema, M., & Tillie, J. (1999). Political participation and political trust in Amsterdam: Civic communities and ethnic networks. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 25(4), 703–726. <http://doi.org/10.1080/1369183X.1999.9976711>

- Fennema, M., & Tillie, J. (2001). Civic Community, Political Participation and Political Trust of Ethnic Groups. *Connections*, 24, 26–41.
- Fernando, J. M. (2013). The urban drift in Kuala Lumpur in the 2008 General Election: a return to the old ways? *Malaysian Journal of Democracy and Election Studies*, 1(1), 24–41.
- Ferree, K. E. (2006). Explaining South Africa's Racial Census. *Journal of Politics*, 68(4), 803–815. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2508.2006.00471.x>
- Finkel, S. E. (2000). Can Tolerance be Taught? In *Rethinking Democracy in the New Millennium*. Houston: University of Houston.
- Finkel, S. E., Sigelman, L., & Humphries, S. (1999). Democratic Values and Political Tolerance. In J. P. Robinson, P. R. Shaver, & L. S. Wrightsman (Eds.), *Measures of Political Attitudes* (Vol. 2, pp. 203–296). San Diego, California: Academic Press.
- Fischer, C. S. (1995). The Subcultural Theory of Urbanism: A Twentieth-Year Assessment. *American Journal of Sociology*, 101(3), 543–577.
- Fischer, H. (2011). *History of the Central Limit Theorem*. New York: Springer Science + Business Media LLC.
- Fisher, S. D. (2004). Definition and Measurement of Tactical Voting: The Role of Rational Choice. *British Journal of Political Science*, 34(1), 152. <http://doi.org/10.1017/S0007123403220391>
- Florida, R. (2003). Cities and the Creative Class. *City & Community*, 2(March), 3–19.
- Florida, R. (2006). The Flight of the Creative Class: The New Global Competition for Talent. *Liberal Education*, 92(3), 22–29. <http://doi.org/10.1002/pam.20204>
- Forrest, J. (1988). Social status, urbanisation and the ethnic dimension of voting behaviour in Australia. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 11(4), 489–505. <http://doi.org/10.1080/01419870.1988.9993617>
- Francis L. F. Lee, . (2013). “Tolerated One Way but Not the Other”: Levels and Determinants of Social and Political Tolerance in Hong Kong. *Social Indicators Research*, (September 2013). <http://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-013-0433-5>
- Francis Loh Kok Wah, . (2003). Developmentalism versus Reformism: The Contest for Bukit Bendera. In . Francis Loh Kok Wah & . Johan Saravanamuttu (Eds.), *New Politics in Malaysia* (pp. 158–177). Singapore: Institute of Southeast Asian Studies (ISEAS).
- Freitag, M., Vatter, A., & Mueller, S. (2015). Switzerland's Immigration Challenge. *Swiss Political Science Review*, 21(1), 1–4. <http://doi.org/10.1111/spsr.12149>

- Frølund Thomsen, J. P. (2012). How does Intergroup Contact Generate Ethnic Tolerance? The Contact Hypothesis in a Scandinavian Context. *Scandinavian Political Studies*, 35(2), 159–178. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9477.2011.00282.x>
- Furedi, F. (2012). On Tolerance. *Policy: A Journal of Public Policy and Ideas*, 28(2), 30–37.
- G25. (2015, July 23). It is time for Malaysians to think seriously about the state of inter-ethnic relations. *Malay Mail Online*, pp. 23–25. Retrieved from <http://www.themalaymailonline.com/what-you-think/article/it-is-time-for-malaysians-to-think-seriously-about-the-state-of-inter-ethni>
- Galam, S. (2008). Sociophysics: A review of Galam models '. *International Journal of Modern Physics C*, 19(3), 409.
- Gaskin, J. (2012). Statistical Tools Package. Utah.
- Gaskin, J. (2013). Pattern Matrix Model Builder. <http://statwiki.kolobkcreations.com/>.
- Geertz, C. (1963). The Integrative Revolution : Primordial Sentiments and Politics in the New States. In C. Geertz (Ed.), *Old Societies and the new states: the quest for modernity in Asia and Africa* (pp. 105–157). London,UK: Collier-Macmillan.
- Geertz, C. (1973). *The Interpretation Of Cultures*. New York: Basic Books.
- Gefen, D., Straub, D. W., & Boudreau, M.-C. (2000). Structural Equation Modeling and Regression : Guidelines for Research Practice. *Communications of the Association for Information Systems*, 4(October), 7. <http://doi.org/10.1.1.25.781>
- Gelman, A. (2010). *Red State, Blue State, Rich State, Poor State: Why Americans Vote the Way They Do*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- George, D., & Mallery, P. (2011). *SPSS for Windows Step by Step: A Simple Guide and Reference 18.0 Update*. Allyn & Bacon/Pearson.
- Gerard, H. B., & Miller, N. (1967). Group Dynamics. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 18(1), 287–332. <http://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.ps.18.020167.001443>
- Ghazali Mahyudin, . (1999). *Teori Sains Politik Pilihan: Aplikasinya dalam Konteks Malaysia*. (G. Mahyudin, Ed.). Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia (UKM).
- Ghazali Mahyudin, . (2006). Demokrasi dan Pilihan Raya dalam Malaysia. In . Ghazali Mayudin, . Jamaie Hamil, . Sity Daud, & . Zaini Othman (Eds.), *Demokrasi Kepimpinan dan Keselamatan dalam Politik Malaysia*. Bangi, Selangor: Penerbit Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia.

- Gibson, J. L. (1992a). Alternative Measures of Political Tolerance : Must Tolerance be “Least-Liked”? *American Journal of Political Science*, 36(2), 560–577.
- Gibson, J. L. (1992b). The political consequences of intolerance - cultural conformity and political freedom. *American Political Science Review*, 86, 338–356. <http://doi.org/10.2307/1964224>
- Gibson, J. L. (1995). The political freedom of African-Americans : a contextual analysis of racial attitudes , political tolerance , and individual liberty. *Political Geography*, 14(6), 571–599.
- Gibson, J. L. (2002). Becoming Tolerant? Short-Term Changes in Russian Political Culture. *British Journal of Political Science*, 32(2), 309–334. <http://doi.org/10.1017/S0007123402000121>
- Gibson, J. L. (2006). Do Strong Group Identities Fuel Intolerance? Evidence From the South African Case. *Political Psychology*, 27(5), 665–705. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9221.2006.00528.x>
- Gibson, J. L. (2013). Measuring Political Tolerance and General Support for Pro-Civil Liberties Policies: Notes, Evidence, and Cautions. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 77(S1), 45–68. <http://doi.org/10.1093/poq/nfs073>
- Gibson, J. L., & Bingham, R. D. (1982). On the Conceptualization and Measurement of Political Tolerance. *The American Political Science Review*, 76(3), 603–620. <http://doi.org/10.2307/1963734>
- Gibson, J. L., Duch, R. M., & Tedin, K. L. (1992). Democratic Values and the Transformation of the Soviet Union. *The Journal of Politics*, 54(2), 329–371. <http://doi.org/10.2307/2132030>
- Gill, N., Johnstone, P., & Williams, A. (2012). Towards a geography of tolerance: Post-politics and political forms of toleration. *Political Geography*, 31(8), 509–518. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.polgeo.2012.10.008>
- Glaser, J. M. (1994). Back to the Black Belt: Racial Environment and White Racial Attitudes in the South. *The Journal of Politics*, 56(1), 21. <http://doi.org/10.2307/2132344>
- Goh Cheng Teik, . (1994). *Malaysia: Beyond Communal Politics*. Pelanduk Publications.
- Golebiowska, E. (1995). Individual value priorities, education, and political tolerance. *Political Behavior*, 17, 23–48. <http://doi.org/10.1007/BF01498783>
- Golebiowska, E. (2009). Ethnic and Religious Tolerance in Poland. *East European Politics & Societies*, 23(3), 371–391. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0888325409333191>

- Gouws, A. (1996). Intolerance in Kwazulu-Natal: Illustrating the Complexity of Tolerance Attitudes. *Politikon: South African Journal of Political Studies*, 23(2), 22–35. <http://doi.org/10.1080/02589349608705034>
- Gouws, A., & Gibson, J. L. (2001). The study of political tolerance in the South African context. *Social Dynamics : A Journal of African Studies*, 27(2), 109–133.
- Green, D. P., Aronow, P. M., Bergan, D. E., Greene, P., Paris, C., & Weinberger, B. I. (2011). Does Knowledge of Constitutional Principles Increase Support for Civil Liberties? Results from a Randomized Field Experiment. *The Journal of Politics*, 73(2), 463–476. <http://doi.org/10.1017/S0022381611000107>
- Greenberg, S., & Pepinsky, T. B. (2013). *Data and Maps for the 2013 Malaysian General Elections* (Department of Government Working Paper). Ithaca, NY.
- Grzymala-Busse, A. (2012). Why Comparative Politics Should Take Religion (More) Seriously. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 15(1), 421–442. <http://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-polisci-033110-130442>
- Gujarati, D. N., & Porter, D. C. (2009). *Basic Econometrics* (5th ed.). Boston: McGraw-Hill Irwin.
- Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., & Anderson, R. E. (2010). *Multivariate Data Analysis*. Prentice-Hall, Inc (7th ed.). New Jersey: Pearson Prentice-Hall, Inc. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijpharm.2011.02.019>
- Hair, J. F., Money, A. H., Samouel, P., & Page, M. (2007). Research Methods for Business. *Education + Training*, 49(4), 336–337.
- Halperin, E., Pedahzur, A., & Canetti-Nisim, D. (2007). Psychoeconomic approaches to the study of hostile attitudes toward minority groups: A study among Israeli jews. *Social Science Quarterly*. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6237.2007.00453.x>
- Hansen, T., & Jensen, J. M. (2007). Understanding voters ' decisions : a theory of planned behavior approach. *Innovative Marketing*, 3(4), 87–94.
- Harell, A. (2010). The Limits of Tolerance in Diverse Societies: Hate Speech and Political Tolerance Norms Among Youth. *Canadian Journal of Political Science*, 43(2), 407–432. <http://doi.org/10.1017/S0008423910000107>
- Hari Singh. (2010). Ethnic Conflict in Malaysia Revisited. *Commonwealth & Comparative Politics*, 39(1), 42–65. <http://doi.org/10.1080/713999532>
- Harsanyi, J. C. (1969). Rational Choice Models of Political Behavior vs. Functionalist and Conformist Theories. *World Politics*, 21(4), 513–538. <http://doi.org/10.1017/S0043887100009138>

- Hazama, Y. (2010). *Determinants of Political Tolerance : A Literature Review*. Chiba, Japan.
- Helen Ting, . (2012). Interethnic Relations in Malaysian Campuses : A Historical Review. *Malaysian Journal of Chinese Studies*, 1, 60–84.
- Henseler, J. (2010). *Covariance-based Structural Equation Modeling : Foundations and Applications*.
- Hinckley, R. A. (2010). Personality and Political Tolerance: The Limits of Democratic Learning in Postcommunist Europe. *Comparative Political Studies*, 43(2), 188–207. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0010414009349327>
- Hirschman, C. (1987). Meaning and Measurement of Ethnicity in Malaysia: An Analysis of Census Classifications. *Journal of Asian Studies*, 46(3), 555–582. <http://doi.org/10.2307/2056899>
- Hodson, R., Sekulic, D., & Massey, G. (1994). National Tolerance in the Former Yugoslavia. *American Journal of Sociology*, 99(6), 1534–1558.
- Hooghe, M., & de Vroome, T. (2015). The perception of ethnic diversity and anti-immigrant sentiments: a multilevel analysis of local communities in Belgium. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 38(1), 38–56. <http://doi.org/10.1080/01419870.2013.800572>
- Hooghe, M., Reeskens, T., Stolle, D., & Trappers, a. (2008). Ethnic Diversity and Generalized Trust in Europe: A Cross-National Multilevel Study. *Comparative Political Studies*, 42, 198–223. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0010414008325286>
- Horowitz, D. L. (1985). *Ethnic Groups in Conflict*. London, England: University of California Press.
- Horowitz, D. L. (1989). Incentives and Behaviour in the Ethnic Politics of Sri Lanka and Malaysia. *Third World Quarterly*, 11(4), 18–35.
- Horowitz, D. L. (1991). *A Democratic South Africa? Constitutional Engineering in a Divided Society*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Horowitz, D. L. (2014). Ethnic Power-Sharing and Democracy. *Journal of Democracy*, 25(April), 1–17.
- Horowitz, J. (2015). Doing Less with More: Cohorts, Education, and Civic Participation in America. *Social Forces*, 0(0), 1–28. <http://doi.org/10.1093/sf/sov065>
- Hosmer, D. W., & Lemeshow, S. (2004). *Applied Logistic Regression*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

- Huber, J. D. (2010). *Measuring ethnic voting: Does proportional representation politicize ethnicity? American Journal of Political Science* (Vol. 56). Columbia.
- Huckfeldt, R., Johnson, P. E., & Sprague, J. (2004). *Political Disagreement: The Survival of Diverse Opinions Within Communications Network*. Cambridge University Press. Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.
- Huggins, C. M., & Debies-Carl, J. S. (2014). Tolerance in the City: the Multilevel Effects of Urban Environments on Permissive Attitudes. *Journal of Urban Affairs*, 0(0), n/a-n/a. <http://doi.org/10.1111/juaf.12141>
- Hutchison, M. L. (2013). Tolerating Threat?: The Independent Effects of Civil Conflict on Domestic Political Tolerance. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0022002713478566>
- Ibrahim, A. S., Shireen, H., Norshidah, N., Shaharuddin, B., Mat Zin, M. K., Yadman, S., ... Shu'aibi, Z. A. (2008). Isu & Tingkah Laku Pengundi Semasa Kempen Pilihan Raya Kecil Di Permatang Pauh: Satu Kajian Kes. In W. H. Kabul, H. Shireen, M. K. Mat Zin, & R. Abdul Kadir (Eds.), *Seminar Politik Malaysia Landskap Politik Malaysia Pasca Pilihan Raya ke 12* (pp. 139–152). Sabah: Universiti Teknologi Mara Sabah & Institut Kualiti & Pengembangan Ilmu (InQKA).
- Ichino, N., & Nathan, N. L. (2013). Crossing the Line: Local Ethnic Geography and Voting in Ghana. *American Political Science Review*, 107(2), 344–361. <http://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055412000664>
- Inglehart, R. (1997). *Modernization and Postmodernization: Cultural, Economic, and Political Change in 43 Societies*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Inglehart, R. (1999). Postmodernization Erodes Respect for Authority but Increase Support for Democracy. In P. Norris (Ed.), *Global Support for Democratic Governance* (pp. 236–257). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Inglehart, R., & Norris, P. (2003). *Rising Tide: Gender Equality and Cultural Change around the World*. Cambridge University. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <http://doi.org/10.1503/cmaj.112132>
- Inglehart, R., & Welzel, C. (2003). Political Culture and Democracy Linkages Analyzing Cross-Level. *Comparative Politics*, 36(1), 61–79.
- Inglehart, R., & Welzel, C. (2010). Changing Mass Priorities: The Link between Modernization and Democracy. *Perspectives on Politics*, 8(2), 551–567. <http://doi.org/10.1017/S1537592710001258>
- Inkeles, A. (1969). Participant Citizenship in Six Developing Countries. *The American Political Science Review*, 63(4), 1120–1141.

- Iskandarova, D., Gulova, Z., Davlatmirova, M., Karimova, N., & Fomin, A. (2015). Monitoring of Tolerance Associative Field and Forecasting of Inter-ethnic Interrelations Problems: Questionnaire Survey in the University Environment of Tajikistan. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 6(5), 35–46. <http://doi.org/10.5901/mjss.2015.v6n5s4p35>
- Ismail Kassim, . (1978). *The Politics of Accomodation: An Analysis of the 1978 Malaysian General Election*. Singapore: Institute of Southeast Asian.
- Jabareen, Y. (2009). Building a Conceptual Framework : Philosophy , Definitions , and Procedure. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 8(4), 49–62.
- Jackman, M. R. (1977). Prejudice, Tolerance, and Attitudes toward Ethnic Groups. *Social Science Research*, 6(2), 145–169. [http://doi.org/10.1016/0049-089X\(77\)90005-9](http://doi.org/10.1016/0049-089X(77)90005-9)
- Jackman, R. W. (1987). Institutions and Voter Turnout in the Industrial Democracy. *The American Political Science Review*, 81(2), 405–424. <http://doi.org/10.2307/1961959>
- Jackson, J. E. (1975). Issues , Party Choices , and Presidential Votes. *American Journal of Political Science*, 19(2), 161–185.
- Jakobsen, T. G., Isaksen, J. V., Skavhaug, G. K. O., & Bakkan, H. A. (2016). The Turning Point of Tolerance: Ethnic Attitudes in a Global Perspective. *International Journal on Minority and Group Rights*, 23(1), 80–104.
- Jamalunlaili Abdullah, . (2012). City Competitiveness and Urban Sprawl: Their Implications to Socio-Economic and Cultural Life in Malaysian Cities. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 50(July), 20–29. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.08.012>
- Janmaat, J. G., & Mons, N. (2011). Promoting Ethnic Tolerance and Patriotism : The Role of Education System Characteristics. *Comparative Education Review*, 55(1), 56–81.
- Jayum A. Jawan. (1991). *The Ethnic Factor in Modern Politics : The Case of Sarawak, East Malaysia*. Hull: University of Hull: Centre for Southeast Asian Studies Monograph No 20.
- Jayum A. Jawan. (1996). Conflict Resolution Through Consensus Building : Experiences from the Dayak Than Community of Sarawak , East Malaysia. *Pertanika Journal of Social Sciences & Humanities*, 4(2), 121–127.
- Jayum A. Jawan, & King, V. T. (2004). *Ethnicity & Electoral Politics in Sarawak*. Bangi, Selangor: Penerbit Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia.
- Jayum A. Jawan, & Mohammad Agus, Y. (2008). The 2008 General Elections: Implications for Ethnic Relations in Malaysia. In *Globalising Religions and Cultures in the Asia Pacific* (pp. 3–40). Adelaide: The University of Adelaide.

- Jayum A.Jawan, . (2003). *Malaysian Politics & Government*. Shah Alam: Karisma Publication.
- Jelen, T. G., & Wilcox, C. (1990). Denominational Preference and the Dimensions of Political Tolerance. *Sociological Analysis*, 51(1), 69–81.
- Jha, S. (2012). *Trade , Institutions and Ethnic Tolerance : Evidence from South Asia*. *American Political Science Review* (Vol. 107). California. Retrieved from http://www.journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0003055413000464
- Johnson, R. B., & Christensen, L. (2013). *Educational Research: Quantitative, Qualitative, and Mixed Approaches*. Los Angeles: SAGE Publications Inc.
- Jones, R. . (1980). Democratic Values and Preadult Virtues. *Youth and Society*, 12, 189–220.
- Joseph F Hair, Hult, G. T. M., Ringle, C. M., & Sarstedt, M. (2014). *A Primer On Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modelling (PLS-SEM)*. California: SAGE Publications Inc.
- Kamlin, M. (1977). *History, politics, and electioneering : the case of Trengganu*.
- Kanbur, R., Rajaram, P. K., & Varshney, A. (2011). Ethnic Diversity and Ethnic Strife. An Interdisciplinary Perspective. *World Development*, 39(2), 147–158. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2009.11.034>
- Kasara, K. (2013). Separate and Suspicious : Local Social and Political Context and Ethnic Tolerance in Kenya. *The Journal of Politics*, 75, 921–936. <http://doi.org/10.1017/S0022381613000777>
- Kline, R. B. (2011). *Principles and Practice of Structural Equation Modeling* (3rd ed.). New York: The Guilford Press.
- Kline, R. B. (2016). *Principles and Practice of Structural Equation Modeling* (4th ed.). New York: Guilford Press.
- Kokkonen, A., Esaiasson, P., & Gilljam, M. (2010). Ethnic Diversity and Democratic Citizenship: Evidence from a Social Laboratory. *Scandinavian Political Studies*, 33(4), 331–355. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9477.2010.00253.x>
- Kotler-Berkowitz, L. A. (2001). Religion and Voting Behaviour in Great Britain: A Reassessment. *British Journal of Political Science*, 31(3), 523–554. <http://doi.org/10.1017/S0007123401000205>
- Kottonau, J., & Pahl-Wostl, C. (2004). Simulating political attitudes and voting behavior. *Journal of Artificial Societies and Social Simulation*, 7(4).
- Krejcie, R. V, & Morgan, D. W. (1970). Determining Sample Size For Research Activities. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 38, 607–610.

- Kruglova, N. V. (2011). Stages of the Tolerance Determination as a Social and Cultural Norm. *The World of Science, Culture and Education*, 4(29), 109–112.
- Kulkova, A. Y. (2014). *Religiosity and Political Participation in Contemporary Russia: A Quantitative Analysis* (Political Science No. WP BRP 20/PS/2014). Moscow.
- Kunovich, R. M. (2004). Social structural position and prejudice: An exploration of cross-national differences in regression slopes. *Social Science Research*, 33(1), 20–44. [http://doi.org/10.1016/S0049-089X\(03\)00037-1](http://doi.org/10.1016/S0049-089X(03)00037-1)
- Kunovich, R. M., & Kunovich, S. (2016). The Gender Gap in Political Knowledge in Poland. *Polish Sociological Review*, 1(193), 33–49. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s11109-016-9380-6>
- La Grange, A. (2011). Neighbourhood and class: A study of three neighbourhoods in Hong Kong. *Urban Studies*, 48(6), 1181–1200. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0042098010370628>
- Lane, J.-E., & Redissi, H. (2009). *Religion and Politics* (Second). Surrey: Ashgate Publishing Ltd.
- Larreguy, H. A., & Marshall, J. (2013). *The Effect Of Education On Political Engagement In Weakly Institutionalized Democracies: Evidence From Nigeria* (Fall 2013 Meeting). Cambridge.
- Lazarsfeld, P. F., Berelson, B., & Gaudet, H. (1944). *The People's Choice: How the voter makes up his mind in a presidential campaign*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Lazarsfeld, P. F., & Henry, N. W. (1968). *Latent Structure Analysis*. New York: Houghton, Mifflin.
- Lee, J. J., Sohn, Y., & Fowler, J. H. (2013). Emotion Regulation as the Foundation of Political Attitudes: Does Reappraisal Decrease Support for Conservative Policies? *PLOS ONE*, 8(12), e83143. <http://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0083143>
- Lee Hock Guan, . (2013). Steadily Amplified Rural Votes Decide Malaysian Elections. *ISEAS Perspective*, (34).
- Leedy, P. D., & Ormrod., J. E. (2005). *Practical research : planning and design* (8th ed.). New Jersey: Upper Saddle River, N.J. : Merrill Prentice Hall.
- Leshem, S., & Trafford, V. (2007). Overlooking the conceptual framework. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, 44(1), 93–105. <http://doi.org/10.1080/14703290601081407>
- Lijphart, A. (1977). *Democracy in plural societies: a comparative exploration*. Yale: Yale University Press.

- Lijphart, A. (1999). *Patterns of Democracy : Government Forms and Performance in Thirty-Six Countries* (1st ed.). New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Lindberg, S. I., & Morrison, M. K. C. (2008). Are African Voters Really Ethnic or Clientelistic? Survey Evidence from Ghana. *Political Science Quarterly*, 123(1), 95–122.
- Lipset, S. M. (1960). *Political Man*. London: Heinemann Educational Books Ltd.
- Lipset, S. M. (1969). Some Social Requisites of Democracy : Economic Development and Legitimacy. *American Political Science Review*, 53(1), 69–105.
- Lipset, S. M., & Rokkan, S. (1967). Party Systems and Voter Alignments: Cross-National Perspectives. In *Cleavage Structures, Party Systems, and Voter Alignments: An Introduction*. London: The Free Press.
- Lund, D. E., & Carr, P. R. (2008). *Doing Democracy: Striving for Political Literacy and Social Justice*. New York: Peter Lang Publishing, Inc.
- Lupia, A., McCubbins, M. D., & Popkin, S. L. (2000). *Lupia, McCubbins & Popkin, 2000.pdf*. (A. Lupia, M. D. McCubbins, & S. L. Popkin, Eds.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lupu, N., Pontusson, J., Aaberge, R., Bjorklund, A., Jantti, M., Palme, M., ... Swank, D. (2011). The Structure of Inequality and the Politics of Redistribution. *American Political Science Review*, 105(2), 316–336. <http://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055411000128>
- M.Harris, M., & Schaubroeck, J. (1990). Confirmatory Modeling in Organizational Behavior/ Human Resource Management: Issues and Applications. *Journal of Management*, 16(2), 337–360.
- Mahathir, .. (1991). The Way Forward-Vision 2020. Retrieved from <http://www.wawasan2020.com/vision/p2.html>
- Malešević, S. (2002). Rational choice theory and the sociology of ethnic relations: a critique. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 25(2), 193–212. <http://doi.org/10.1080/01419870120109458>
- Mansor Mohd Noor, . (1999). Crossing Ethnic Borders in Malaysia Measuring the Fluidity of Ethnic Identity and Group Formation. *Akademika*, 55(Julai), 61–82.
- Marcus, G. E., Sullivan, J. L., Theiss-Morse, E., & Wood, S. L. (1995). *With malice toward some: How people make civil liberties judgments*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Massey, G., Hodson, R., & Sekulić, D. (1999). Ethnic Enclaves and Intolerance : The Case of Yugoslavia. *Social Forces*, 78(2), 669–693. <http://doi.org/10.1093/sf/78.2.669>

- Mather, D., & Tranby, E. (2014). New Dimensions of Tolerance: A Case for a Broader, Categorical Approach. *Sociological Science*, 1(November), 512–531. <http://doi.org/10.15195/v1.a28>
- Matthews, L., & Wilson, L. C. (1999). Ethnic Tolerance in Urban Guyana: A Conceptual and Empirical Analysis. *International Review of Modern Sociology*, 29(1), 55–75.
- Maznah, .Mohamad. (2008). Malaysia — democracy and the end of ethnic politics? *Australian Journal of International Affairs*, 62(4), 441–459. <http://doi.org/10.1080/10357710802480691>
- McAllister, I., & Kelly, J. (1982). Class, ethnicity, and voting behaviour in Australia. *Australian Journal of Political Science*. <http://doi.org/10.1080/00323268208401859>
- McClosky, H., & Brill, A. (1983). *Dimension of Tolerance: What Americans Believe About Civil Liberties*. New York: Russel Sage Foundation.
- McGee, T. G. (1962). The Malaysian Elections of 1959: A Study in Electoral Geography. *The Journal of Tropical Geography*, 16, 70–99.
- Mill, J. S. (1869). *On Liberty*. London: Longman, Roberts & Green.
- Ming, L. L., Azhar, N. A., Hazri, H., & Mulakala, A. (2012). *The Youth Factor: 2012 Survey of Malaysian Youth Opinion*. Kuala Lumpur.
- Ministry of Women Family and Community Development. (2015). *Statistics on Women, Family and Community Malaysia 2014*. Putrajaya, Malaysia.
- Mo, J., Brady, D., & Ro, J. (1991). Urbanization and voter turnout in Korea: An update. *Political Behavior*, 13, 21–32. <http://doi.org/10.1007/BF00996997>
- Mohamad Zaini Abu Bakar, . (2006). Pengukuran Tahap Perpaduan Antara Etnik: Satu Kajian Kes di Pulau Pinang, Malaysia Malaysia. In . Zaharah Hassan, . Abdul Latif Samian, & . Abu Daud Silong (Eds.), *Readings on Ethnic Relations in a Multicultural Society* (pp. 153–165). Serdang: Universiti Putra Malaysia.
- Mohammad Redzuan, O., & Amer Saifude, G. (2013). The Voting Trend of the Parliamentary By-Elections After the Malaysian 12th General Election. *Malaysian Journal of Democracy and Election Studies*, 1(1), 96–115.
- Mohd. Fuad Mat Jali, ., & Junaidi Awang Besar, . (2005). *Kajian Corak Pengundian di Pilihanraya Kecil Pengkalan Pasir*. Bangi.
- Mohd Azmir Mohd Nizah, .. (2015). On Malaysia's Ethnic Tolerance: A Study of Two Cities. *Research Journal of Applied Sciences*, 10(8), 294–297. <http://doi.org/10.3923/rjasci.2015.294.297>

- Mohd Azmir Mohd Nizah, .., & Paimah, A. (2011). Magnitud Toleransi dan Urbanisasi dalam Kalangan Pelajar Pelbagai Etnik: Kajian Perbandingan di Kuala Lumpur dan Kuantan. In *Persidangan Kebangsaan Perpaduan Nasional 2011*. Kuala Lumpur.
- Mohd Nizah, M. A., Atoma, P., Mohd Azmir, M. N., & Paimah, A. (2012). The Relationship of Urbanization on Perception of Ethnic Relations. *Advances in Natural and Applied Sciences*, 6(7), 1143–1149.
- Mohd Noh Dalimin, . (2006). Integrasi Pelajar antara Wilayah. In H. Zaharah, A. L. Samian, & S. Abu Daud (Eds.), *Readings on Ethnic Relations in a Multicultural Society*. Serdang: Fakulti Pengajian Pendidikan UPM.
- Mohd Ridhuan Tee Abdullah, . (2010). Cabaran Integrasi Antara Kaum Di Malaysia: Perspektif Sejarah, Keluarga dan Pendidikan. *Jurnal Hadhari*, 3, 61–84.
- Moniruzzaman, M. (2016). Local Election Competition for National Party Survival: An Analysis of Merlimau By-Election in Malaysia. *Journal of Social Science Studies*, 3(2), 117. <http://doi.org/10.5296/jsss.v3i2.9202>
- Morsin Peraman @ Parman, . (1991). *Masalah Hubungan Etnik di Kalangan Mahasiswa Universiti di Malaysia*. Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia.
- Muhammad Febriansyah,.. Muhammad Takiyuddin Ismail, . (2013). Partisipasi Anak Muda Dalam Politik Baru Di Malaysia. In *Simposium Kebudayaan Indonesia Malaysia (SKIM)* (pp. 12–14). Bandung: Universitas Padjajaran, Indonesia.
- Muhammad Shamshinor Abdul Aziss, ., Farid Wajdi Mohd Nor, ., Afi Roshezry Abu Bakar, ., & Mohd Azmir Mohd Nizah, . (2016). Penerusan Kuasa Rakyat di Selangor. In . Muhamad Takiyuddin Ismail & . Sity Daud (Eds.), *Pilihan Raya Umum Ke-13: Kesenambungan Politik Baharu, Kekentalan Politik Lama*. Sintok: UUM Press.
- Mummendey, A., & Wenzel, M. (1999). Social Discrimination and Tolerance in Intergroup Relations: Reactions to Intergroup Difference. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 3(2), 158–174. <http://doi.org/10.1207/s15327957pspr0302>
- Mutang, J. A., Seok, C. B., Madlan, L., Lastar, A. I., Baharuddin, S. A., & Joseph, A. (2014). A Multiethnic Perception through the Eyes of Students. *International Journal of Information and Education Technology*, 4(3), 249–253. <http://doi.org/10.7763/IJiet.2014.V4.407>
- Mutz, D. C. (2002). The Consequences of Cross-Cutting Networks for Political Participation. *American Journal of Political Science*, 46(4), 838–855.
- Mutz, D. C. (2005). *Hearing the Other Side: Deliberative versus Participatory Democracy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Nahapiet, J., & Ghoshal, S. (1998). Social Capital , Intellectual Capital , and the Organizational Advantage. *The Academy of Management Review*, 23, 242–266.
- Najeemah Mohd Yusof, . (2006). Patterns of Social Interaction Between Different Ethnic Groups in Malaysian Secondary Schools. *Jurnal Pendidik Dan Pendidikan*, 21, 149–164.
- Nargundkar, R. (2008). *Marketing Research, Text and Cases*. New Delhi: Tata McGraw-Hill.
- Nazri Muslim, ., & Mansor Mohd Noor, . (2014). Ethnic Tolerance Among Students of Public Higher Learning Institutions in Malaysia. *World Applied Sciences Journal*, 29(3), 388–401. <http://doi.org/10.5829/idosi.wasj.2014.29.03.992>
- Norhayati Baharun, . (2014). *Parametric and Nonparametric Methods Using SPSS*. Shah Alam: UiTM Press.
- Norris, P., & Inglehart, R. (2004). *Sacred and Secular. Religion and Politics Worldwide*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- OECD. (2011). *Society At A Glance 2011: OECD Social Indicators* (Society at a Glance). OECD Publishing. Retrieved from http://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/social-issues-migration-health/society-at-a-glance-2011_soc_glance-2011-en
- OECD. (2014). *Society at a Glance 2014: OECD Social Indicators* (Society at a Glance). Paris: OECD Publishing. Retrieved from http://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/social-issues-migration-health/society-at-a-glance-2014_soc_glance-2014-en
- Ogorzalek, T. K. (2011). *Most-racial , not post-racial : Group voting in the 2008 U . S . Presidential election*. Columbia.
- Oliver, J. E., & Mendelberg, T. (2000). Reconsidering the Environmental Determinants of White Racial Attitudes. *American Journal of Political Science*, 44(3), 574–589. <http://doi.org/10.2307/2669265>
- Omer, I., Romann, M., & Goldblatt, R. (2013). Geographical Scale Of Tolerance In The Urban Area. *Journal of Urban Studies*, 0(0), 1–18. <http://doi.org/10.1111/juaf.12047>
- Orban, D. (2008). *Tolerance as a Guiding Principle. Ibn Khaldun Lecture Series*. Granada. Retrieved from <http://www.davidorban.com/2008/04/holding-the-inaugural-ibn-khaldun-lecture-on-al-andalus/>
- Osman, M. N. M. (2013). The Youth Vote in GE 2013: Kingmakers in the making? *RSIS Commentaries*, (65), 1–3.

- Ostwald, K. (2013). How to Win a Lost Election: Malapportionment and Malaysia's 2013 General Election. *The Round Table*, 102(6), 521–532. <http://doi.org/10.1080/00358533.2013.857146>
- Owens, C. T. (2006). *Sporadic Voters: How Attitude Change Influences Voter Turnout*. Texas A & M University.
- Pallant, J. (2011). *SPSS Survival Manual* (4th ed.). New South Wales: Allen & Unwin.
- Pateman, C. (2003). Participation and Democratic Theory. *The Democracy Sourcebook*, 40–48. <http://doi.org/10.2307/2613634>
- Paxton, P., & Mughan, A. (2006). What 's to Fear from Immigrants? Creating an. *Political Psychology*, 27(4), 56–59.
- Peffley, M., Knigge, P., & Hurwitz, J. (2001). A Multiple Values Model of Political Tolerance. *Political Research Quarterly*, 54(2), 379–406.
- Peffley, M., & Rohrschneider, R. (2003). Democratization and Political Tolerance in Seventeen Countries: A Multilevel Model of Democratic Learning. *Political Research Quarterly*, 56(3), 243–257. <http://doi.org/10.1177/106591290305600301>
- Pepinsky, T. B. (2015). Interpreting Ethnicity and Urbanization in Malaysia's 2013 General Election. *Journal of East Asian Studies*, 15, 199–226.
- Persell, C. H., Green, A., & Gurevich, L. (2001). Civil Society, Economic Distress, and Social Tolerance. *Sociological Forum*, 16(2), 2–3.
- Petersen, W. (2012). *Ethnicity Counts*. New Jersey: Transaction Publishers.
- Pettigrew, T. F. (1997). Generalized Intergroup Contact Effects on Prejudice. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 23(2), 173–185. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0146167297232006>
- Pettigrew, T. F. (1998). Intergroup contact theory. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 49, 65–85. <http://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.49.1.65>
- Pettigrew, T. F. (2009). Secondary transfer effect of contact: Do intergroup contact effects spread to noncontacted outgroups? *Social Psychology*, 40(2), 55–65. <http://doi.org/http://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1027/1864-9335.40.2.55>
- Pierce, R. (2008). *Research Methods in Politics* (1st ed.). London: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Plutzer, E. (2002). Becoming a Habitual Voter: Inertia, Resources, and Growth in Young Adulthood. *The American Political Science Review*, 96(1), 41–56.
- Politweet.Org. (2013). #GE13. Retrieved May 20, 2007, from <https://politweet.wordpress.com/tag/ge13/>

- Posner, D. N. (2004). The Political Salience of Cultural Difference: Why Chewas and Tumbukas Are Allies in Zambia and Adversaries in Malawi. *American Political Science Review*, 98(4), 529–545. <http://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055404041334>
- Posner, D. N. (2005). *Institutions And Ethnic Politics In Africa*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Powell, G. B. (1986). American Voter Turnout in Comparative Perspective. *The American Political Science Review*, 80(1), 17–43.
- Prothro, J. W., & Grigg, C. M. (1960). Fundamental Principles of Democracy : Bases of Agreement and Disagreement. *The Journal of Politics*, 22(2), 276–294.
- Putnam, R. D. (2000). *Bowling Alone: The collapse of American community*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Putnam, R. D. (2007). E Pluribus Unum? Diversity and community in the twenty-first century. *Scandinavian Political Studies*, 30(2), 137–174. <http://doi.org/10.1632/003081202X61188>
- Quillian, L. (1995). Prejudice as a Response to Perceived Group Threat: Population Composition and Anti-Immigrant and Racial Prejudice in Europe. *American Sociological Review*, 60(4), 586. <http://doi.org/10.2307/2096296>
- Rabushka, A. (1969). Integration in a Multi-Racial Institution: Ethnic Attitudes among Chinese and Malay Students at the University of Malaya. *Race & Class*, 11(1), 53–63. <http://doi.org/10.1177/030639686901100104>
- Rabushka, A. (1971). Integration in Urban Malaya: Ethnic Attitudes among Malays and Chinese. *Journal of Asian and African Studies*, 6(2), 91–107.
- Rabushka, A. (1973). *Race & Politics in Urban Malaya*. Stanford: Hoover Institution Studies.
- Rabushka, A., & Shepsle, K. A. (1972). *Politics in Plural Societies: A Theory of Democratic Instability*. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company.
- Rajulton, F., Ravanera, Z. R., & Beaujot, R. (2007). Measuring social cohesion: An experiment using the Canadian National Survey of Giving, Volunteering, and Participating. *Social Indicators Research*, 80(3), 461–492. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-006-0011-1>
- Ramadan, T. (2010). *The Quest For Meaning: Developing a Philosophy of Pluralism*. London: Penguin Group.
- Ramirez, C. Z., & Verkuyten, M. (2011). Values , Media Framing , and Political Tolerance for Extremist Groups. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 41(7), 1583–1602. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.2011.00775.x>

- Ramlee Mustapha, ., Norzaini Azman, ., Faridah Karim, ., Abdul Razak Ahmad, ., & Maimun Aqsha Lubis, . (1999). Social Integration Among Multi-Ethnic Students At Selected Malaysian Universities In Peninsular Malaysia: A Survey Of Campus Social Climate. *ASEAN Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, 1(1), 35–44.
- Ratnam, K. J. (1965). *Communalism and the Political Process in Malaya*. Kuala Lumpur: University of Malaya Press.
- Reilly, B. (2001). *Democracy in Divided Societies: Electoral Engineering for Conflict Management*. Cambridge University Press. Retrieved from <http://books.google.com/books?id=CHLvGawRmEwC>
- Reimer, S., & Park, J. Z. (2001). Tolerant (In)civility? A Longitudinal Analysis of White Conservative Protestants' Willingness to Grant Civil Liberties. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 40(4), 735–745.
- Riaz, H. (1974). *Interethnic Marriage in Singapore: A Study in Interethnic Relations*. Singapore: Institute of Southeast Asian Studies (ISEAS).
- Rizal, Y., & Jumaat, A. M. (2002). Politik Etnik dan Perkembangan Politik Baru. In M. Y. Kasim & A. Azlan (Eds.), *Politik Baru dalam Pilihan Raya Umum* (pp. 61–92). Bangi, Selangor: Penerbit Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia.
- Robert A Dahl. (1970). *Polyarchy: Participation and opposition*. *Democratization* (Vol. 54). New Haven: Yale University Press. Retrieved from <http://books.google.com/books?id=JcKz2249PQcC>
- Rosenstone, S. J., & Hansen, J. M. (1993). *Mobilization, Participation, and Democracy in America*. New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.
- Roth, S. K. (1998). Disenfranchised by design: Voting systems and the election process. *Information Design Journal*, 9(1), 29–38. <http://doi.org/10.1075/idj.9.1.08kin>
- Rowden, J., Lloyd, D. J. B., & Gilbert, N. (2014). A Model of Political Voting Behaviours across Different Countries, 1–22. Retrieved from http://personal.maths.surrey.ac.uk/st/D.J.Lloyd/voter_paper.pdf
- Rudner, M. (1970). The Malaysian General Political Election of 1969: A Political Analysis. *Modern Asian Studies*, 4(1), 1–21.
- Rustow, D. A. (1970). Transitions to Democracy: Toward a Dynamic Model. *Comparative Politics*, 2(3), 337–363.
- Said, E. W. (1993). *Culture and Imperialism*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Saifuddin Abdullah, . (2015, July 13). Awaiting the National Unity Plan. *The Edge Weekly*.

- Sanders, L. D. (2009). *Discovering Research Methods in Psychology: A Student's Guide*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Sanusi, O. (1989). *Ikatan Etnik dan Kelas Di Malaysia* (1st ed.). Bangi, Selangor: Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia.
- Schreiber, J. B., Nora, A., Stage, F. K., Barlow, E. A., & King, J. (2006). Reporting structural equation modeling and confirmatory factor analysis results: A review. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 6(99), 323–338. <http://doi.org/10.3200/JOER.99.6.323-338>
- Schriesheim, C. A., & Hill, D. H. (1981). Controlling Acquiescence Response Bias by Item Reversals: The Effect on Questionnaire Validity. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 41(4), 1101–1114. <http://doi.org/10.1177/001316448104100420>
- Schumacker, R. E., & Lomax, R. G. (2010). *A Beginner's Guide to Structural Equation Modeling* (Third Edit). New York: Routledge.
- Schumpeter, J. A. (1946). The Decade of the Twenties. *The American Economic Review*, 36(2), 1–10.
- Scott, J. (2000). Rational Choice Theory. In G. Browning, A. Halcli, & F. Webster (Eds.), *Understanding Contemporary Society: Theories of The Present* (First, pp. 1–15). London: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Segawa, N. (2015). Ethnic Politics and Consociationalism in the 2013 Malaysian Election. *Japanese Journal of Political Science*, 16(2), 177–194. <http://doi.org/10.1017/S1468109915000055>
- Sekaran, U. (2003). *Research Methods For Business: A Skill Building Approach*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Sekaran, U., & Bougie, R. (2013). *Research Methods for Business : A Skill-building Approach*. Wiley.
- Select Statistical Services Limited. (2017). Comparing Two Proportions - Sample Size. Retrieved March 1, 2017, from <https://select-statistics.co.uk/calculators/sample-size-calculator-two-proportions/>
- Seligson, M. A., & Caspi, D. (1983). Arabs in Israel: Political Tolerance and Ethnic Conflict. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 19(1), 55–66.
- Shamsul, A. B. (1998). Ethnicity, Class, Identity, Culture or Identity? Competing Paradigms in Malaysian Studies.pdf. *Akademika*, 53(Julai), 33–59.
- Shamsul, A. B. (2005). The Construction And Management Of Pluralism : Sharing The Malaysian Experience. *ICIP Journal*, 2(1), 1–14.

- Shamsul, A. B. (2008). *Hubungan Etnik di Malaysia: Mencari dan Mengekal Kejernihan dalam Kekeruhan* (1). Malaysia.
- Shamsul, A. B. (2013a). BN-PR Manifesto War: Different Platforms, Same School. *RSIS Commentaries*, April(71).
- Shamsul, A. B. (2013b). *Representation , perception and “ gladiatorism ” in Malaysian politics : A question of political literacy* (Malaysia & Singapore Update).
- Shamsul, A. B. (2015). Conceptualizing Diversity: Towards Managing Political and Religious Differences in Malaysia. In *Seminar On Government And Civilisation II (SOGOC II)* (pp. 1–10).
- Shamsul, A. B., & Fauzi, M. S. (2007). City as a Reflection of National Identities : Early Comparison between Jakarta and Kuala Lumpur. *Akademika*, 70(Januari), 3–19.
- Shyryn, U., Assem, B., & Zhanat, B. (2013). Tolerance Features in the Structure of Worldview Culture (Based on the Current State Analysis of the Issue). *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 82, 921–932. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.06.373>
- Sidel, J. T. (2012). The Fate of Nationalism in the New States : Southeast Asia in Comparative Historical Perspective. *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 54(1), 114–144. <http://doi.org/10.1017/S0010417511000612>
- Sigel, R., & Hoskin, M. (1981). *Political Involvement of Adolescence*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Sigelman, L., & Welch, S. (1993). The Contact Hypothesis Revisited: Black-White Interaction and Positive Racial Attitudes. *Social Forces*, 71(3), 781. <http://doi.org/10.2307/2579895>
- Sijuwade, P. O. (2011). Ethnic Tolerance in Urban Nigeria: The Case of Lagos. <http://doi.org/10.3923/sscience.2011.34.39>
- Simon, H. A. (1952). A Behavioral Model of Rational Choice. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 99–118.
- Simpson, R. A. (2005). *Government Intervention In The Malaysian Economy , 1970-1990 : Lessons For South Africa*. University of the Western Cape.
- Singh, K., Leong, S. M., Tan, C. T., & Wong, K. C. (1995). A Theory of Reasoned Action Perspective of Voting Behavior : Model and Empiric ... *Psychology & Marketing*, 12(1), 37.
- Smith, A. D. (1986). *The Ethnic Origins of Nations*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

- Sniderman, P. M. (1975). *Personality and Democratic Politics*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Sniderman, P. M., Tetlock, P. E., Glaser, J. M., & Green, D. P. (1989). Principled Tolerance and the American Mass Public. *British Journal of Political Science*, 19(1), 25–45.
- Sokhey, A. E., & McClurg, S. D. (2012). Social Networks and Correct Voting. *The Journal of Politics*, 74(3), 751–764. <http://doi.org/10.1017/S0022381612000461>
- Soldatova, G., Kravtsova, O. A., Khukhlaev, O. Y., & Schajgerova., L. (2008). *Psychodiagnostics of personality tolerance*. (G. Soldatova & L. Schaigerova., Eds.). Moscow: Smysl.
- Soon Chuan Yean, . (2013). GE13 : Class divide or clash of ethos ?
- Soper, D. . (2014). A-priori Sample Size Calculator for Structural Equation Models. Retrieved from <http://www.danielsoper.com/statcalc>
- Statistics New Zealand. (2011). *New Zealand General Social Survey : 2010*. New Zealand.
- Stephan, W. G., & Stephan, C. W. (2000). An Intergrated Threat Theory of Prejudice. In S. Oskamp (Ed.), *Reducing Prejudice and Discrimination*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Stouffer, S. A. (1955). *Communism, Conformity, and Civil Liberties*. Garden City, New York: Doubleday.
- Streb, M. J. (2008). *Rethinking American Electoral Democracy*. New York: Routledge.
- Sullivan, J. L., Marcus, G. E., Feldman, S., & Piereson, J. E. (1981). The Sources of Political Tolerance : A Multivariate Analysis. *The American Political Science Reivew*, 75(1), 92–106. <http://doi.org/10.2307/1962161>
- Sullivan, J. L., Piereson, James, & Marcus, George E. (1982). *Political Tolerance & American Democracy* (Paperback). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Sullivan, J. L., Piereson, James, & Marcus, G. E. (1979). An Alternative Conceptualization of Political Tolerance : Illusory Increases 1950s-1970s. *The American Political Science Review*, 73(3), 781–794.
- Suruhanjaya Pilihan Raya Malaysia. (2013a). Senarai bahagian-bahagian pilihan raya parlimen dan DUN untuk setiap negeri-negeri. Retrieved from http://www.spr.gov.my/images/stories/pdf/list_parlimendun.pdf

- Suruhanjaya Pilihan Raya Malaysia. (2013b). Sistem Pengurusan Maklumat Pilihan Umum. Retrieved April 20, 2015, from http://resultpru13.spr.gov.my/module/keputusan/paparan/paparan_laporan.php
- Sutter, J. a., & McCaul, E. J. (1993). Issues in cross-cultural counseling: An examination of the meaning and dimensions of tolerance. *International Journal for the Advancement of Counselling*, 16, 3–18. <http://doi.org/10.1007/BF01418179>
- Syed Arabi Idid, ., Mohamad Sahari, ., & Nik A Hisham, . (2007). General Election 2004: Empirical Validation of Voting Pattern in Malaysia. *Intellectual Discourse*, 15(1), 1–14.
- Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2001). Tabachnick, Fidell_2001.pdf. In *Using Multivariate Statistics* (p. 1008). Retrieved from <http://scholar.google.com/scholar?hl=en&btnG=Search&q=intitle:Cleaning+up+your+act:+Screening+Data+Prior+to+Analysis#0>
- Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2007). *Using Multivariate Statistics* (5th ed.). Boston: Pearson/Allyn & Bacon.
- Tajfel, H. (1974). Social Identity and Intergroup Behaviour. *Social Science Information*, 13(2), 65–93. <http://doi.org/10.1177/053901847401300204>
- Talib, A. T., & Gill, S. S. (2012). Socio-Religious Tolerance: Exploring the Malaysian Experience. *Global Journal of Human Social Science*, 12(8).
- Thijs, J., & Verkuyten, M. (2013). School ethnic diversity and students' interethnic relations. *The British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 1–21. <http://doi.org/10.1111/bjep.12032>
- Tomarken, A. J., & Serlin, R. C. (1986). Comparison of ANOVA alternatives under variance heterogeneity and specific noncentrality structures. *Psychological Bulletin*, 99(1), 90–99. <http://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.99.1.90>
- Tonidandel, S., Williams, E. B., & LeBreton, J. M. (2015). Size Matters...Just Not in the Way That You Think. In C. E. Lance & R. J. Vandenberg (Eds.), *More Statistical and Methodological Myths and Urban Legends* (p. 162-). New York: Routledge.
- Torney-Purta, J. (1990). Youth in Relation to Social Institutions. In S. Feldman & E. G (Eds.), *At the Threshold: The Developing Adolescent* (pp. 457–477). Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Triandafyllidou, A., & The Accept Pluralism Project. (2013). *Pluralism and Social Cohesion: The Accept Pluralism Tolerance Indicators. Tolerance, Pluralism and Social Cohesion : Responding to the Challenges of the 21st Century in Europe*. San Domenico di Fiesole, Italy.

- Ullman, J. B. (2006). Structural equation modeling: reviewing the basics and moving forward. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 87(1), 35–50. http://doi.org/10.1207/s15327752jpa8701_03
- UNESCO. (1985). Declaration Of Principles On Tolerance. Retrieved from http://www.unesco.org/webworld/peace_library/UNESCO/HRIGHTS/124-129.HTM
- Usman Yaakob, ., Tarmiji Masron, ., & Masami, F. (2010). Ninety Years of Urbanization in Malaysia : A Geographical Investigation of Its Trends and Characteristics. *Ritsumeikan Soc Sci Humanity*, 4, 79–101. Retrieved from www.ritsumei.ac.jp/acd/re/k-rsc/hss/book/pdf/vol04_05.pdf
- Utusan Online. (2013). Pilihan Raya Umum ke 13.
- Valenty, L. O., & Sylvia, R. D. (2004). Thresholds for tolerance: The impact of racial and ethnic population composition on the vote for California propositions 187 and 209. *Social Science Journal*, 41, 433–446. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.soscij.2004.04.008>
- Valk, A., & Karu, K. (2001). Ethnic attitudes in relation to ethnic pride and ethnic differentiation. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 141(5), 583–601. <http://doi.org/10.1080/00224540109600573>
- van Amersfoort, H., & van der Wusten, H. (1981). Democratic stability and ethnic parties. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 4(4), 476–485. <http://doi.org/10.1080/01419870.1981.9993353>
- van der Noll, J., Poppe, E., & Verkuyten, M. (2010). Political Tolerance and Prejudice: Differential Reactions Toward Muslims in the Netherlands. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 32(1), 46–56. <http://doi.org/10.1080/01973530903540067>
- van Elsas, E. (2014). Political Trust as a Rational Attitude: A Comparison of the Nature of Political Trust across Different Levels of Education. *Political Studies*, 6(2), n/a-n/a. <http://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9248.12148>
- van Sonderen, E., Sanderman, R., & Coyne, J. C. (2013). Ineffectiveness of Reverse Wording of Questionnaire Items: Let's Learn from Cows in the Rain. *PLoS ONE*, 8(7), 1–7. <http://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0068967>
- Vasil, R. . (1971). *Politics in a Plural Society : A Study of Noncommunal Political Parties in West Malaysia* (Vol. 67). Kuala Lumpur: Oxford University Press.
- Vasil, R. K. (1965). The 1964 General Elections in Malaya. *International Studies*, 7(1), 20–65. <http://doi.org/10.1177/002088176500700102>
- Vejai Balasubramaniam, . (2005). The Politics of Locality and Temporality in the 2004 Malaysian Parliamentary Elections. *Contemporary Southeast Asia*, 27(1), 44–63.

- Verba, S., Schlozman, K. L., & Brady, H. E. (1995). *Voice and Equality: Civic Voluntarism in American Politics*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Verkuyten, M., Maliepaard, M., Martinovic, B., & Khoudja, Y. (2014). Political Tolerance among Muslim Minorities in Western Europe: The Role of Denomination and Religious and Host National Identification. *Politics and Religion*, (March), 1–22. <http://doi.org/10.1017/S1755048314000212>
- Wagner, U., Christ, O., Pettigrew, T. F., Stellmacher, J., & Wolf, C. (2006). Prejudice and Minority Proportion: Contact Instead of Threat Effects Published by: American Sociological Association content in a trusted digital archive . We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms Prejudi. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 69(4), 380–390.
- Wai, W. C. (2008, March 9). Winds of change sweep. *The Star*. Kuala Lumpur. Retrieved from <http://www.thestar.com.my/story.aspx/?file=/2008/3/9/nation/20592506&sec=nation#.U18wGb3SWXE.mendeley>
- Walzer, M. (1997). *On Toleration*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Wan Asna, W. M. N., & Zainon, H. (2013). Political Attitudes and Voting Behaviour. *International Journal of Humanities and Management Sciences*, 1(1), 126–129.
- Wang, T. . Y., & Chang, G. A. (2006). External Threats and Political Tolerance in Taiwan. *Political Research Quarterly*, 59(3), 377–388. <http://doi.org/10.1177/106591290605900305>
- Weber, L. (2003). Rugged Individuals And Social Butterflies: The Consequences Of Social And Individual Political Participation For Political Tolerance. *The Social Science Journal*, 40(2), 335–342. [http://doi.org/10.1016/S0362-3319\(03\)00014-4](http://doi.org/10.1016/S0362-3319(03)00014-4)
- Wei, J., Ng, J., Rangel, G. J., Vaithilingam, S., & Pi, S. S. (2015). The 2013 Malaysian Elections: Ethnic Politics or Urban Wave? *Journal of East Asian Studies*, 15, 167–198.
- Weiss, M. L. (2013). Malaysia's 13th General Elections: Same Result, Different Outcome. *Asian Survey*, 53(6), 1135–1158. <http://doi.org/10.1525/as.2013.53.6.1135>
- Weldon, S. A. (2006). The Institutional Context of Tolerance for Ethnic Minorities: A Comparative, Multilevel Analysis of Western Europe. *American Journal of Political Science*, 50(2), 331–349. <http://doi.org/DOI 10.1111/j.1540-5907.2006.00187.x>
- Welsh, B. (2008, March 12). Election Post-Mortem: Top 10 Factors. Retrieved January 12, 2014, from <https://www.malaysiakini.com/news/79677>

- Wessel, T. (2009). Does Diversity in Urban Space Enhance Intergroup Contact and Tolerance? *Geografiska Annaler: Series B, Human Geography*, 91(1), 5–17. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0467.2009.00303.x>
- Widmalm, S., & Oskarsson, S. (2008). *Tolerance and Democracy in Liberal and Authoritarian Market Economies*. Stockholm.
- Widmalm, S., & Oskarsson, S. (2013). Political Tolerance in India Descriptions and Explanations from the Heartland. *Asian Survey*, 53(3), 533–558.
- Wike, R., & Grim, B. J. (2010). Western Views Toward Muslims: Evidence From A 2006 Cross-National Survey. *International Journal of Public Opinion Research*, 22(1), 4–25.
- Wildmalm, S., Oskarsson, S., & Hulterstrom, K. (2010). Tolerance in Challenging Political Environments in Uganda , Kenya , India and Pakistan. *Statsvetenskaplig Tidskrift*, 112(1), 105–112.
- Williams, L. J., Vandenberg, R. J., & Edwards, J. R. (2009). Structural Equation Modeling in Management Research: A Guide for Improved Analysis. *The Academy of Management Annals*, 3(1), 543–604. <http://doi.org/10.1080/19416520903065683>
- Wilson, W. J. (1999). When Work Disappears: New Implications for Race and Urban Poverty in the Global Economy. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 22(3), 479–499. <http://doi.org/10.1080/014198799329396>
- World Public Opinion.Org. (2009). *World Public Opinion on Political Tolerance A Study of 24 Nations*. Washington DC.
- Yap Tzu Ging, .. (2015, July 27). After Dyana Sofya and Pak Samad, Malay traders join DAP's ranks. Retrieved August 1, 2015, from <http://www.themalaymailonline.com/print/malaysia/after-dyana-sofya-and-pak-samad-malay-traders-join-daps-ranks>
- Yasmin Ahmad, ., & Najeemah Mohd Yusof, . (2010). Ethnic boundary among students in Malaysian primary schools and social interaction: A conceptual framework. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 7(2), 82–91. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2010.10.013>
- Yinger, J. M. (1985). Ethnicity. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 11(1985), 151–180.
- Yong, A. G., & Pearce, S. (2013). A Beginner's Guide to Factor Analysis : Focusing on Exploratory Factor Analysis. *Tutorials in Quantitative Methods for Psychology*, 9(2), 79–94.
- Yusaku Horiuchi. (2004). Malapportionment and Income Inequality: A Cross-National Analysis on JSTOR. *British Journal of Political Science*, 34(1), 179–183. Retrieved from https://www.jstor.org/stable/4092407?seq=1#page_scan_tab_contents

- Zahara Aziz, ., Amla Salleh, ., & Hardiana Ema Ribu, . (2010). A Study of National Integration: Impact of Multicultural Values. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 7(C), 691–700. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2010.10.094>
- Zainal, K., Abu, D. T., & Mohamad, Z. (2010). The effect of ethnic relations course on the students perceptions towards ethnic relations among first year students of one public university in Malaysia. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 2(2), 3596–3599. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2010.03.558>
- Zainudin Awang, . (2014). *A Handbook on SEM For Academicians and Practitioners*. Bandar Baru Bangi: MPWS Rich Resources.
- Zakaria, .Hj Ahmad. (1989). Malaysia: Quasi Democracy in a Divided Society. In L. Diamond, J. J. Linz, & S. M. Lipset (Eds.), *Democracy in Developing Countries* (3rd ed., pp. 347–382). Colorado: Lynne Rienner Publishers.
- Zamalia Mahmud, . (2015). *Handbook of Research Methodology* (4th ed.). Shah Alam: UiTM Press.
- Zholdsbekova, A. N. (2011). A Review of Theoretical and Methodological Aspects of Tolerance. *International Politics*, 4(Vii), 91–110.
- Zingher, J. N., & Thomas, M. S. (2012). Patterns of Immigrant Political Behaviour in Australia: An Analysis of Immigrant Voting in Ethnic Context. *Australian Journal of Political Science*, 47(March 2015), 377–397. <http://doi.org/10.1080/10361146.2012.704000>