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CSR AND ETHNICITY: A CASE STUDY OF MALAY MARGINALISATION
IN UNESCO GEORGE TOWN WORLD HERITAGE SITE,
PENANG, MALAYSIA

ABSTRACT

This thesis offers an analysis of Malay marginalisation in UNESCO George Town World Heritage Site, Penang, Malaysia (the Site). The present analysis towards the battles to conserve and promote the Site’s long-standing heritage have generally revolved around federal and state-level organisations; neglecting the voices of marginalised group. The community of concern here is the Malays. The objectives of this thesis are four-fold: (i) to investigate the patterns of ethnic marginalisation perceived by the Malay community in the Site, and to analyse, if at all, the meanings of ethnic marginalisation they are attached to; (ii) to construct the emergent typologies stemming from the meanings of ethnic marginalisation conveyed by Malay community; (iii) to examine the patterns of ethnic marginalisation occurring in ethnic composition of the organisations; as well as CSR projects in the Site; and (iv) to construct the emergent typologies stemming from the patterns of ethnic marginalisation in ethnic composition of the organisations; as well as CSR projects in the Site. Participants involved in this thesis are: (1) the Malay communities; as well as (2) CSR executives of federal, state and local-level organisations. This thesis employs qualitative method by applying semi-structured in-depth interviews. Based on the analysis, the findings indicate two main dimensions of ethnic marginalisation: (1) community marginalisation typology and (2) organisational marginalisation typology. Keywords: Malay, Heritage, UNESCO George Town, CSR, Ethnicity.
CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

1.1 An Overview of World Tourism

The tourism industry is among the largest and fastest growing service industries, worth US$ 7.6 trillion worldwide, generating 9.8 percent of global gross domestic product and providing one-eleventh of all jobs (Richard, 2017). Over the past six decades, the international tourist arrivals (ITA) have increased from twenty-five million in 1950, to sixty-nine million in 1960, followed by 160 million in 1970, 278 million in 1980, 440 million in 1990, 687 million in 2000 and 939 million in 2010 (UNWTO, 2015). United Nation World Tourism Organisation (UNWTO) forecast that the numbers of ITA worldwide are projected to reach 1,400 million (1.4 billion) by 2020 and 1800 million (1.8 billion) by the 2030 (UNWTO, 2018). In fact, 1.4 billion of ITA in 2018 marks two years ahead of forecast (UNWTO, 2019).

Diagram 1.1: The trend and forecast of international tourist arrivals 1950-2030
1.2 An Overview of Tourism in Malaysia

Like other countries, Malaysia too, is expanding its tourism industry. The tourism industry in Malaysia is not just one of the highest economic contributors to the country’s economy, but also the second leading source of foreign exchange (Musa & Thirumoorthy, 2016). Malaysia has become a popular travel destination, attracting both domestic and international tourists in recent years (Lim, 2017). Tourism activities in Malaysia started since the colonial era (Marzuki, 2010). Historically, Malaysia was built on the legacy of the Malay Sultanate of Malacca since early 1400 (Hassan, 2003; Reid, 1993; & Shahminan, 2008). It came to an abrupt end when the Portuguese occupied Malacca in 1511. Succession of colonial powers then took possession of the Malay Peninsular: the Portuguese (1511-1641), Dutch (1641-1795) and British (1795-1957). Today, the remains of their long-standing colonial architecture can still be found in most major cities such as George Town, Ipoh, Taiping, Melaka, Johor Bahru, Kuala Lumpur, Kota Kinabalu as well as Kuching. The colonial-style architecture became a significant role in the establishment of heritage cities throughout the nation. Heritage buildings usually provide significant physical characteristics to a city. They build a lucid image and distinct identity of a heritage city that differentiates it from other regular cities elsewhere. Urban conservation is a practice of urban planning and development whereby significant historical, architectural and accentuated as far as heritage tourism concerned. It is fast gaining momentum in Malaysia, particularly in cities with outstanding historical, architectural and cultural heritage (Abdullah, 2013).

In Malaysia, the government involvement in tourism development began when the Cultural Department established in 1964 (Marzuki, 2010). The tourism development began to rise when the government established the Tourism Development Corporation
(TDC) in 1972. In the 1990, the tourism industry received more attention from the government with the establishment of Ministry of Culture Arts and Tourism (MOTAC). The two-fold establishment of MOTAC include to expand and diversify the tourism base and to reduce country’s dependency on a narrow range of activities and markets. In order to achieve these objectives, MOTAC was responsible for assisting the states to promote distinctive identities so as to be more attractive to domestic tourists, and, encouraging states to promote their tourist attractions as well as assist through joint promotions at the state level. In 1992, the Malaysia Tourism Promotion Board (MTPB) was established. Widely known as Tourism Malaysia, it aims to promote and market Malaysia domestically and internationally (Tourism Malaysia, 2017).

One of many national tourism policies is focusing on increasing tourist arrivals (Musa, 2016). In 1990, the Visit Malaysia Year (VMY) campaign was launched. VMY 1990 aims to further enhance the growth of the tourism industry in Malaysia. Through this campaign, the number of tourist arrivals to Malaysia surged from 4.8 million in 1989 to 7.4 million in 1990. The success of VMY 1990 spurred another VMY campaign in 1994. The VMY 1994 campaign successfully generated 10.22 million tourist arrivals to Malaysia. The third VMY campaign was launched in 2007 to commemorate Malaysia’s 50th Independence anniversary. As a result, VMY 2007 generated 20.97 million compared to seventeen million tourists in the previous year. In 2014, Malaysia celebrated the fourth VMY and successfully attracted twenty-eight million tourists to Malaysia. In 2015, Malaysia received 25.72 million tourists and 26.8 million tourists in 2016 (Tourism Malaysia, 2017).
In addition, another Tourism Malaysia’s campaign, namely ‘Malaysia Truly Asia’, was launched as a strategy to rebrand Malaysia as a cultural diversity destination that other countries lacked (Hussin, 2017). The campaign indicates the continent where it is located, Asia (Galí, 2016). Launched in year 1999 (Debora, 2017), the international tourism advertising campaign presents itself to be via its advertising appears to resonate with tourists, who keep arriving in ever-increasing numbers (Morais, 2013). The campaign has been very successful and has continued to be relevant even though two decades have passed since it was initiated. The campaign showcases country’s cultural heritage pluralism that strongly reflects the diversity in unity of all Malaysians.

### 1.3 An Overview of Tourism in Penang

Penang is one of the most developed states in Malaysia. In the past, Penang’s economy was dependent on trade but, since 1960s, industry and tourism have played a significant role in its economic growth (Khodami, 2017). In Penang, the first indication of ‘tourism’ was published in an 1834 travelogue. Hotel de L’Europe, Eastern & Oriental, Runnymede, and the Crag Hotel in Penang Hill, were the first few hotels established in the 19th century as a response to British and European expatriate demand (Omar, 2015). The name ‘Pearl of the Orient’ was given to Penang Island in the 1970s due to the state’s outstanding 3S tourism (Sun, Sea and Sand). Penang is well-known for its beaches, tropical weather and landscapes that makes it a popular holiday destination; especially for international tourists (Omar, 2015). Today, the island is widely recognized a state that vibrantly represents a microcosm of the multi-ethnic and multicultural characteristics of the country’s celebrated diversity (Gin, 2015).
1.3.1 An Overview of Multi-ethnic Community in Penang

A contemporary in 1802 described the early multi-ethnic, multi-cultural and multi-religious character of Penang. Penang's diverse socio-cultural traits traced their origin prior to the establishment of British trading port in 1786 by Sir Francis Light. There were many traders flocked to Penang for trades. After completing their commercial activities, the traders would return to their homeland. Subsequently, many of these traders established businesses in George Town and settled down, either with local women, or they had wives brought from their home countries.

Besides native Malay settlements on the island, the bulk of the settlers in Penang were immigrants from neighbouring countries. Islam bonded the local Malays, Indonesian descendants, Arab descendants and other Muslim communities (Gin, 2015). In Penang, the Muslims came from all over the world particularly Southeast Asia, such as India, Arab and Kedah (Nagata, 2012). The earliest settlement was found at Batu Uban, where the oldest mosque, Batu Uban mosque was built by Haji Mohammad Salleh (also known as Nakhoda Intan) in 1734. Nakhoda Intan came from Sumatera. His real name was Nakhoda Nan Intan ibni Almarhum Tengku Pateh Sebatang. He was from the Minangkabau royal family (Musa, 2015).

Apart from Sumatrans in Batu Uban, there were also Achenese occupied the island. It is believed that Tunku Sayyid Hussain Al-Adid, together with his family, followers and servants settled in George Town in 1791. He was the patron of the Malay, Sumatran and Arab community along Acheen Street. Many of them involved in the pepper trade between Acheh and George Town. Tunku Sayyid Hussain was a wealthy spice trader of Arab descendant who was from the Acheh royal family. He was the
pioneer to establish the Muslim urban enclave and the earliest centre of spice traders and Malay entrepreneurs on the island. In 1808, he built the Acheen Street Malay Mosque, named after the community, the Acheen Street (Adnan, 2011). Subsequently, within one, two or three generations, both Acehnese and Arab descendants were almost completely assimilated into the predominant Malay community through commercial ties and inter-marriages. Other Sumatrans here were Batak, Batu Bara, Malay, Mandailing, Minang and Rawa.

In the late 1780s, the Indians were brought into Penang. They consisted of Southern Indian Muslims and Hindus (Dossier, 2007). The Southern Indian Muslims, also known as the Chuliahs, were among the earliest settlers in George Town. The Chuliahs have long been inhabitants of Kedah and some of them were born there. They had settled in Penang since 1788 (Nagata, 2012). They were shopkeepers, coolies, hack carriage runners, gharry drivers as well as boatmen. The Chuliahs dominated the street named after them, the Chulia Street (Gin, 2015). The Indian Muslim leader, Kapitan Keling (Cauder Mohudeen), built the Kapitan Kling mosque in 1801 as a significant landmark of the Indian Muslim community in Penang. The Kapitan Keling was an influential Indian Muslim figure in Penang. He was born in Pondicherry, South India in 1759 from the family of Marakayyar. Kapitan Keling was believed to have trade relations with Kedah (besides Nagore and Nagapatinam) and Sumatera since the founding of Penang. In 1801, he was appointed Kapitan (Captain) for the Chuliahs, hence he was called Kapitan Keling (Musa, 2015). The street boasts a few Indian Muslim mosques representing various groups of Indian Muslims, including Nagore shrine (early 1800s) as well as the Noordin tomb (1870s).
Like the Chuliahs, the Hindus have long been inhabitants of Malacca (now Melaka). They began to arrive in Penang in the 1780s as chetties, traders, labourers, merchants and also shipbuilders. The Hindus established their lodge at Penang Road. Also widely known as the Chettiars, they also marked their presence by building Hindu temples for their daily worship. In the early 1883, one of the Hindu leaders, Bette Lingam Chetty, marked their presence by setting up the Sri Mahamariamman temple. Other Indian community comprises Malabaris, Parsees, Bengalis, Punjabis, Gujeratis and Sindhis (Gin, 2015).

The next group of community that rapidly outnumbered the Malay community in Penang were the Chinese. In 1786, the earliest group of Chinese arrivals originated from neighbouring states and countries such as Kedah; Melaka; southern Thailand; and northern Sumatra. Subsequently, there evolved a sub-group within the Chinese community known as Baba Nyonya (Straits Chinese). They represented a syncretic amalgamation of Sino-Malay culture. In the late 1820s to 1830s, the new arrivals of Chinese landed in Penang. The latter group originated from Guangdong and Fujian, China. Originating from different districts within the same province, and divided along dialect lines, the Chinese population exhibited schism and clannishness. Hokkiens and Teochews were the ascendant dialect communities in terms of numbers and socio-economic standing. Real estate, trading, retail shopkeeping and large plantation-scale commercial agriculture were the forte of Hokkiens and, to a lesser extent, Teochews. The Cantonese were less numerous but considered more hardy and robust for it was them, together with Malays, that were employed in clearing the dense tropical jungle and thick undergrowth and preparing the land for cultivation (Gin, 2015). Cantonese predominated as carpenters, blacksmiths, shoemakers and trades. Other Chinese
dialect groups were Hakkas, who arrived after the mid-19th century and the Hainanese from Hainan Island that specialised in food industry as cooks and as proprietors of beverage outlets.

Other than Malay, British, Acehnese, Arabs, Indians and Chinese; there were also a number of other minority ethnic groups, such as Siamese, Burmese, Eurasians, Armenians, Jewish and Japanese. Some of them arrived in Penang during the formative years while others settled later. Not only was Penang's population from its very beginning colourful and variegated but also multi-ethnicity, multiculturalism and cosmopolitanism were readily embraced (Gin, 2015).

Penang had long commercial ties with Thailand and Burma. Siamese-Burmese enclave took place in Pulau Tikus. In early 1880s (Khoo, 2007), the Burmese village was known as Kampung Ava. The Siamese community settled here not long after the Burmese. The have long intermarried with the local Chinese. Siamese and Burmese settlers worked in commercial agricultural plantations and some involved in petty trade. Intermarriages were not uncommon between Siamese and Burmese with Chinese. Siamese and Burmese Buddhist temples were established in the Burmah Road and Perak Road area.

Following the European War (1914–1918), the boom years of rubber and tin attracted Japanese entrepreneurs to settle in Penang. They functioned as traders, financiers, photographers and dentists. Female Japanese were brought in to work in the numerous brothels of George Town (Tan, 2013). These early Japanese residents kept within their own self-contained community having its own distinct social and cultural
organisations including associations and schools. The Japanese community, however, remained small.

Even much smaller than the Japanese community were the Armenians. In 1800s, the existing Malay Lane in George Town was renamed Armenian Lane, where the entrepreneurs and traders from Armenia (the southern present-day Russia), ventured to Southeast Asia settled here. The Armenian community in 1821 were first to provide themselves with a centre for worship by founding St. Gregory’s Church in 1822 (Roxborough, 1990). However, in 1937, the land was sold and additionally, all the graves were transferred to Western Road cemetery (Khoo, 2007). A prominent Armenian community was the Arratoon Anthony family (after whom Arratoon Road was named). Another prominent Armenian figure was the Sarkies siblings, Tigran and Martin, who was the hoteliers of Eastern and Oriental Hotel (E&O), located in George Town. Established in 1885, the E&O enjoyed a sustained reputation as one of the most prominent and prestigious hotels east of the Suez Canal (Sharp, 2008). By 1920s, most of the Armenians had emigrated to Singapore, Hong Kong and Sydney, where there are significant Armenians live (Khoo, 2007).

It is believed that the significant arrival of East European Jewish, whom the locals called orang Yahudi, may be dated in 1830. The community mainly engaged in the tertiary sectors of the local economy, by posing as bankers and financiers (money-lenders and money-changers) (Sowell 1996) (Ché-Ross & Barton, 2002). The Jewish Cemetery at Zainal Abidin Road in George Town with many tombstones with Hebrew inscriptions testified to a once prosperous community.
Intermarriages between Asians and Europeans shaped the Eurasian community (Goh, 2002). The mixed ancestries comprised on the one hand Malay, Chinese, Indian, Burmese and Siamese, while on the other, English, Dutch, Irish, Scots, French, Italian and German. In the mid of 19th century (Khoo, 2007), the Eurasian community settled in China Street and Bishop Street. The first Catholic Church was built on Church Street. In 1910s another community of Eurasians from Phuket settled in Pulau Tikus in what subsequently became Eurasian Village. The Eurasians in Penang subscribed to the English-medium mission schools. Their educational background enabled Eurasians to serve in clerical positions in the colonial bureaucracy, European businesses, and the professions. Penang Eurasians converse in an English patois with traces of Malay and Siamese elements.

1.3.2 An Overview of Cultural Heritage Tourism in Penang

Penang is renowned as a state with multi-ethnic, multi-cultural and multi-religious community. According to a survey conducted by Penang Global Tourism (PGT) in 2016, the three main purposes for visiting Penang are for leisure (65.3 percent), culture and heritage (14.2 percent), and visiting friends or relatives (VFR) - 9.2 percent (Penang Monthly, 2017).

Penang’s tourism industry became more successful with the listing of George Town in 2008, as a Cultural World Heritage Site by the UNESCO (Connolly, 2017). The prestigious inscription was granted due to the success of the preservation efforts of George Town’s long-standing heritage values, and at the same time, further elevates the state to global status with regards to cultural heritage tourism (Mohamed, 2015 & Abdullah, 2013). Ever since George Town was granted the prestigious status, Penang’s

Despite the remarkable growth particularly since 1990, the tourism industry in Penang has experienced a number of declines as well. A number of major tourism incidents took place such as 1997 Asian financial crisis, 2003 SARS outbreaks, 2004 tsunami, 2005 terror bombings in Jakarta and Bali, Indonesia, 2013 Lahad Datu (Sabah, Malaysia) invasion as well as the 2014 twin tragedies of MH370 and MH17 that caused international tourists stay away from travelling to Malaysia and other neighbouring countries.
countries. Ooi (2013) suggests that tourism tragedies have delayed the progress of Malaysian tourism development in both short and long-run. The study of Habibi et al. (2009) and Hanafiah & Harun (2010) further suggest that tourism tragedies such as terrorism, disease outbreak and natural disasters affect Malaysia’s international tourism demand. Moreover, Penang Island is no longer attractive as a ‘sun, sea and sand’ (3S) destination. As Penang’s ‘3S’ attraction has been promoted in the 1990s, the island’s charm was slowly diminishing and fast losing out to other neighbouring countries such as Phuket (Thailand), Bali (Indonesia) that are considered as more attractive to the Western foreigners (Omar, 2015). Nevertheless, the inscription of George Town as a Heritage Site in 2008 has brought back tourists to the island. With the prestigious status, the heritage attractions of George Town have been the most significant factors of both domestic and international tourists for visiting the island in recent years (Yousefi & Marzuki, 2012). Multi-ethnic, multi-religious and multiculturalism is the major attractions of George Town.

1.4 Problem Statement and Research Significance

In July 2008, George Town and Melaka were jointly awarded UNESCO’s Cultural World Heritage status. The listing of both heritage cities is in accordance to UNESCO’s Outstanding Universal Values (OUVs), which represent these three criteria: Criteria (ii): Multicultural history; Criteria (iii): Living multicultural traditions; and Criteria (iv): Multicultural townscape (Ramli, 2017). Cultural diversity was the key component that secured the prestigious inscription. The importance of preserving the status was one of the few objectives that united most stakeholders, particularly the federal government, state government, heritage activists, local residents, hotels (Dossier, 2007) and other organisations (Connolly, 2017). In case of
George Town, the state government established the State Heritage Committee (SHC) to monitor the Site’s management (Abdullah, 2013). Established in 1996, the SHC include the federal, state, and local level representatives; as well as independent members comprising local community leaders and heritage experts (Dossier, 2007).

Table 1.1: Relevant organisations in managing heritage properties in the Site

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisations</th>
<th>Management Function</th>
<th>Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National Heritage Department</td>
<td>Protect, conserve and preserve cultural heritage through documentation, research and heritage awareness promotion</td>
<td>Federal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage Department</td>
<td>Physical management</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Town World Heritage Incorporated</td>
<td>Manage non-statutory matters</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penang State Museum</td>
<td>Management of both art gallery and museum</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penang State Islamic Religious Council</td>
<td>Management and development of Muslim community-owned properties</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindu Endowment Board</td>
<td>Managing Hindu temples and properties</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penang Heritage Trust (PHT)</td>
<td>Dealing in heritage and conservation</td>
<td>Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nanyang Folk Culture Group</td>
<td>Promoting heritage and arts</td>
<td>Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese Clans</td>
<td>Management their respective properties</td>
<td>Local</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Nomination Dossier of Historic Cities of the Straits of Malacca: Melaka and George Town (2007)

Referring to the Dossier (2007), the National Heritage Department is named as the main federal-level representative of the State Heritage Committee (SHC). The responsibilities of National Heritage Department include conserving, preserving and protecting natural and cultural heritage of the Site through research, documentation, enforcement and promotion of heritage awareness. The state-level representatives include George Town World Heritage Incorporated (GTWHI) and the Heritage Department of City Council of Penang Island. The Heritage Department is in charge in managing the physical heritage properties of the Site. This includes approving building plans, improving and enforcing the building guidelines, as well as redevelopment and managing the conservation of heritage buildings that are located within and outside of the Site. Additionally, the Department is also responsible for approving redevelopment plans and renovation of all heritage properties, particularly
within the Site. GTWHI is in charge in managing non-statutory issues for the Site. The organisation’s main responsibility including branding, promotion, tourism and liaison with state, federal, international organisations as well as local community that resides and work there. Other relevant state-level agencies are Penang State Museum, Penang State Islamic Religious Council (Majlis Agama Islam Pulau Pinang - MAINPP) and Hindu Endowment Board. The responsibilities of Penang State Museum include conducting research on heritage and history of Penang and its community for education, information and publications purposes; collecting heritage and history material of Penang, display of artefacts and history accordingly. The Council is responsible in managing and developing the community-owned properties in Penang.

Additionally, the State Heritage Committee (SHC) also includes the local-level representatives, such as Penang Heritage Trust (PHT), Nanyang Folk Culture Group, as well as Chinese Clans and Associations (Dossier, 2007). PHT focuses on specific heritage and conservation that linked to UNESCO regional office. Nanyang Folk Culture Group promotes Chinese arts and heritage. The Chinese Clans and Associations that own numerous heritage properties in the Site are responsible in managing and maintaining their respective properties.

Other than the establishment of SHC, heritage conservation and management initiatives can also be linked with Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR). The aims and objectives of CSR often include aspects such as social and economic development of local community and environmental protection and management, linking CSR to sustainable development (Munjal, 2013). Hence, CSR is an innovative way to engage
with social and environmental issues (Henderson, 2007). By practising CSR, corporations can be conscious of the kind of impact they are having on their stakeholders in various aspects of society, including economic, social and environmental. Numerous researchers have found that any sustainable development must corporate stakeholders. Stakeholders are those who affect and can be affected by corporations’ objectives and policies (Wells, Smith, Taheri, Manika & McCowlen, 2016).

The concept of the stakeholders has become increasingly significant in the management and planning of heritage sites (Peters, 1999). A heritage site has its specific values and concerns. In that case, it could become a push and pull factor to attract the public to pay a visit and appreciate it. Nonetheless, there are conflicts that occur between heritage and tourism (Peters, 1999). Although cultural heritage tourism could provide economic values for many sites, it might also bring about various threats for the local residents. So in order to reduce these threats, there was necessitating for collaboration, partnership and mutual agreement with a range of stakeholders concerned (Aas, 2005). In fact, community or stakeholders’ participation must be incorporated in any sustainable management of the heritage site and tourism projects so as to reduce conflict (Mohammadi, 2010). Their participations in both managing and planning process was found to be of paramount importance and was being utilized as a means to collect useful information and ideas, provide for more sustainable decision-making, improve bilateral communication, increase public sector or corporate status and request for wider stakeholders’ care or buy-in for projects (Engelhardt, 1997). Other studies have found that any sustainable development project must cooperate with conservation and other non-governmental organisations (NGOs),
management organisations, developers as well as the local stakeholders (Throsby, 2010). The involvement of stakeholders such as the local community would save time and money. The conflicts between communities and the conservation agencies have been found to be less pragmatic and more costly when relying solely on the law enforcement rather than involving the interest groups from the outset (Baral, 2008). Studies have shown that limited local input in the heritage site tourism management was ultimately more expensive and less productive, for example the ability to understand the stakeholder positions was found to delay or block projects. Thus, many heritage sites have now engaged with stakeholder groups to get their opinions and identify the problems to be considered jointly (Hajialikhani, 2008). Throughout such engagement, heritage site administration has been found to become familiar with the various stakeholders’ views regarding heritage tourism issues as well as actions that could have an impact on the heritage site. Engaging the stakeholders could enable the site managers to understand the local cultural differences (Baral, 2008). At the same time the researchers have shown that stakeholders could additionally assist in identifying problem areas that experts might have overlooked (Pimbert, 1996). The heart of any sustainable development agenda should be by engaging with the stakeholders. Many heritage projects should consult with all the stakeholder groups, regarding their needs, concerns, conflicts of interest and levels of influence. Hence, project managers and planners must need to identify who the stakeholders are, what motivates them and what their aspirations are.

However, CSR tourism research is under-developed (Coles, Fenclova, & Dinan, 2013), and lags behind mainstream CSR research (Ayuso, 2006). Inferences made about CSR in one organisation tend not to apply directly neither across similar
organisations, nor across industries (Dahlsrud, 2008). Furthermore, CSR research in industries other than tourism is unlikely to be relevant to tourism. Hence, more research to understand CSR’s role in the tourism industry is needed (Wells, Smith, Taheri, Manika & McCowlen, 2016). Nevertheless, both mainstream and tourism CSR research has focused on aspects of institutional (e.g., laws, standards) and organisational (macro boards and management), lacking ‘meso’ functional/departmental level aspects (Mason & Simmons, 2011) and the individual micro level stakeholders (e.g., employees; Aguinis & Glavas, 2012; Chun, Shin, Choi, & Kim, 2013; Hansen, Dunford, Boss & Angermeier, 2011).

While tourism CSR research has explored the micro level of tourists, employee behaviours remain unknown (Chou, 2014; Deery, Jago, & Stewart, 2007). This is despite employees being the core target for behaviour change in CSR initiatives (Coles, 2013), their role as ambassadors (Maon, 2009), their responsibility for implementation of CSR strategy (Costa & Menichini, 2013) and suggested vital role in CSR’s success (Bolton, Kim, & O’Gorman, 2011). Maon (2009) state the importance of engaging employees in CSR initiatives and communicating the organisation’s CSR approach and reasoning.

In Penang, much has been spoken in the recent years about efforts to conserve and promote George Town’s long-standing intangible and tangible heritage. The debate occurs not just between federal and state government; but also between civil society organisations. In the debates to conserve and promote George Town’s heritage, what tends to get lost are the voices of local residents that are affected by the site’s development and conservation projects. This makes it plain that the developments of
heritage conservation and promotion are, in many instances, elite enterprises (Lowenthal, 2000). A cursory survey of the literature suggests that much scholarship has been concerned largely about heritage conservation and promotion that neglects of the human and everyday experiences of the local communities. They are couched in generalities and vagueness leaving the reader to second guess whether these personae truly represent the actual views and anxieties on the ground (Ho, 2009).

UNESCO George Town, Penang (the Site) is well-known as a potpourri of diverse ethnic groups that have settled in Penang for the past 300 years. The Chinese community are the majority although Malays were the natives and once the majority. While the Indian Muslim community are doing well socio-economically, the same cannot be said of the Malays. This phenomenon has grave implications to the sustainability of the Malays (Abdullah, Azam & Bustami, 2013).

In problematizing this research, five conceptual vacuums have been identified:

1) CSR tourism research is under-developed (Coles, Fenclova, & Dinan, 2013), and lags behind mainstream CSR research (Ayuso, 2006).

2) CSR research in industries other than tourism is unlikely to be relevant to tourism. Thus, more needs to be done to understand CSR’s role in the tourism industry (Wells, Smith, Taheri, Manika & McCowlen, 2016).

3) Both mainstream and tourism CSR research has focused on the aspects of institutional and organisational lacking ‘meso’ functional/departmental level aspects (Mason & Simmons, 2011) and the individual micro level stakeholders (Hansen, Dunford, Boss & Angermeier, 2011; Aguinis & Glavas, 2012; Chun, Shin, Choi, & Kim, 2013).
4) In the debates to conserve and promote George Town’s heritage, what tends to get lost are the voices of local residents that are affected by the Site’s development and conservation projects (Aljuneid, 2012).

5) The Chinese community are the majority although Malays were the natives and once the majority. While the Indian Muslim community in Penang are doing rather well socio-economically, the same cannot be said of the Malays. This phenomenon has grave implications to the sustainability of the Malays (Abdullah, Azam & Bustami, 2013)

This research seeks to present how federal, state and local-level organisations conserve and promote George Town’s heritage in Penang, and how such efforts, if at all, can nonetheless be limited by a given community’s perceived marginality and the polarisation. In doing so, this research seeks to capture the responses from Malay community point of view towards the organisations’ heritage driven CSR projects in the Site.

1.5 Research Questions

In reference to the above research problem, this research seeks to answer these research questions:

1. What are the patterns of ethnic marginalisation perceived by the Malay community in the Site? What meanings do they attach to the ethnic marginalisation, if at all?

2. What are the emergent typologies stemming from the meanings of ethnic marginalisation conveyed by Malay community?
3. Are there patterns of ethnic marginalisation occurring in executive and management composition of the organisations; as well as CSR projects in the Site?

4. What are the emergent typologies stemming from the patterns of ethnic marginalisation in executive and management composition of the organisations; as well as CSR projects in the Site?

1.6 Research Objectives

The objectives of this research are essentially four-fold.

1. To investigate the patterns of ethnic marginalisation perceived by the Malay community in the Site, and to analyse, if at all, the meanings of ethnic marginalisation they are attached to.

2. To construct the emergent typologies stemming from the meanings of ethnic marginalisation conveyed by Malay community

3. To examine the patterns of ethnic marginalisation occurring in executive and management composition of the organisations; as well as CSR projects in the Site

4. To construct the emergent typologies stemming from the patterns of ethnic marginalisation in executive and management composition of the organisations; as well as CSR projects in the Site.
1.7  
**Operational definition**

1.7.1  **Ethnicity**

In Malaysia, identity formation takes place within two social reality contexts, namely, (1) the authority-defined social reality (ethnic group) and (2) the self-defined social reality (ethnic identity). There are only four categories of ethnic groups in Malaysia: (1) Malay, (2) Chinese, (3) Indian and (4) Others. The realities of social ethnic identities of *Peranakan* (mixed-blood) community and other minority ethnic groups that are excluded from the ‘Malay’, ‘Chinese’ and ‘Indian’ categories are categorized under ‘Others’. ‘Others’ is a catchall category assigned for other persons who do not fit into the three specific major ethnic groups of ‘Malay’, ‘Chinese’ or ‘Indian’.

1.7.2  **UNESCO Heritage Site**

The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) is an organisation that seeks to encourage the identification, protection and preservation of cultural and natural heritage around the world considered to be of outstanding value to humanity. This is embodied in an international treaty called the Convention concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage, adopted by UNESCO in 1972.

1.7.3  **CSR**

There is a natural fit between the idea of CSR and an organisation’s stakeholders. CSR is a set of obligations with regards to society including economic, legal, ethical and philanthropic. In addition, CSR incorporated the notion of stakeholders, in terms of which economic responsibility contains the admonition to do what is required by
global capitalism, legal responsibility holds that companies do what is required by
global stakeholders, ethical responsibility means to do what is expected by global
stakeholders, and philanthropic responsibility means to do what is desired by global
stakeholders.

1.8 Thesis Organisation

In order to achieve the research objectives, this research will be organised into six
chapters. Chapter One comprises introduction, problems and the four-fold research
objectives. Chapter Two outlines a systematic literature review of organisations’
Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) vis-à-vis Malay community in the Site. Chapter
Three provides the methodology, outlining the research philosophy, approach, method,
strategy, case study selection, sampling selection, techniques and procedures in
collecting and analysing data; as well as ethical issues in conducting this research.
Chapter Four provides the analysis, findings and discussions of ethnic marginalisation
conveyed by Malay participants. Chapter Five offers the analysis, findings and
discussions of organisations’ CSR vis-à-vis Malay community derived from the
interviews with CSR Executives. Chapter Six provides further analysis and conclusion
of the research by revisiting the community and organisational marginalisation
typologies.
CHAPTER TWO
LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

2.1 Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to critically review previous studies pertaining to the Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) vis-à-vis Malay community in UNESCO George Town World Heritage Site, Penang (the Site). Discussions about the definitions and key concepts heritage, ethnicity and CSR are outlined in Section 2.2, 2.3 and 2.4. Section 2.5 provides a comprehensive review of previous studies on CSR vis-à-vis Malay community in the Site using Systematic Literature Review (SLR). Section 2.6 focuses mainly on theoretical constructs and followed by concluding remarks for the chapter.

2.2 First Key Area: Key Concepts and Definitions of Heritage

There have been many conservation guidelines in the form of charters, recommendations and resolutions that have been introduced. One of the most significant guidelines was the International Charter for the Conservation and Restoration of Monuments and Sites, also acknowledged as the Venice Charter 1964. These guidelines set a remarkable benchmark for principles governing architectural restoration and conservation. The Venice Charter 1964 has helped to broaden the concept of heritage buildings, the application of modern technology in conservation works and international cooperation and has provided a set of principles for the protection of architectural heritage and sites. Since their acceptance internationally in 1964, the guidelines have been applied as a reference by international heritage-related organisations such as UNESCO and the International Council on Monuments and Sites.
(ICOMOS), just to name a couple. One of the major concerns of these guidelines was in establishing the definitions and scopes of heritage (Ahmad, 2006). UNESCO and ICOMOS have been at the forefront in defining and establishing heritage terminology since the 1960s.

In 1964, the Venice Charter used the term ‘historic monument’ to define heritage. The Charter neither addressed the question of what constitutes an historic monument nor did it discuss the characteristics of urban and rural settings and the definition of sites. Consequently, in 1965, ICOMOS redefined the heritage scope as ‘monuments’ and ‘sites’:

“The term monument shall include all real property...whether they contain buildings or not, having archaeological, architectural, historic or ethnographical interest and may include besides the furnishing preserved within them. The term site shall be defined as a group of elements, either natural or man-made, or combinations of the two, which it is in the public interest to conserve” (ICOMOS, 1965)

However, the heritage definition as ‘monuments’ and ‘sites’ established by ICOMOS in 1965 was not taken up by UNESCO as a whole; instead, in 1968, the organisation regrouped and redefined the term cultural property as movable and immovable. Movable cultural property referred to ‘museum collections’ and immovable cultural property referred to ‘architectural heritage’. Immovable cultural property was defined to include not only historic sites and features but, more importantly, it recognised the need to include groups of traditional structures and historic quarters in urban and rural areas:

“Archaeological and historic or scientific sites, structures or other features of historic, scientific, artistic or architectural value, whether religious or secular, including groups of traditional structures, historic quarters in urban or rural built-up areas and the ethnological structures