Gender and Ethnic Disparities in Receiving Socio-Enviromental Support for Enhancing Urban Survival Skills

Mohd Ariffuddin Kamari¹, Abdul Razaq Ahmad², Mastura Kamarudin³

¹Faculty of Education, Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia ²Faculty of Education, UniversitiKebangsaan Malaysia ³Tampin Education Office,Negeri Sembilan Malaysia

ABSTRACT

This study aims to identify differences in social ecological support (institutions, families, local communities and virtual platforms) based on gender and ethnicity. In addition, this study also determines the predictors of social ecological support predictors (institutions, families, local communities and virtual platforms) on the survival (knowledge, skills, lifelong learning as well as values and creativity) of youth in the urban. This study uses stratified random sampling involving 2400 youths of various ethnicities in 6 zones of Kuala Lumpur City. The pilot study conducted showed that all items were at a high level of reliability with Cronbach Alpha values of 0.834 to 0.929 and eligible for use in the actual study. Study data were analyzed using Bilateral MANOVA analysis and multiple regressions. The findings of the study indicate that there are significant differences overall aspects in social ecological support based on gender. In addition, this study also found a significant interaction effect between gender and ethnicity in aspects of social ecological support. From the multiple regression analysis, this study found a significant contribution of several aspects in social ecological support to the survival of multi-ethnic youth in the Urban.

Keywords: Social Ecological Support, Survival, Gender, Ethnicity, Youth, Urban

Introduction

Over the past three decades, the development of urban life and the challenges of urban life have become one of the issues that occur in Malaysia. Previously, the activities of the residents were concentrated in the village and rural areas (Abd Samad Hadi, 2010). Urbanization is a process of developing a small town into a city that is the focus due to various economic activities and infrastructure facilities to emerge as a Metropolitan City. Urbanization has taken place since the beginning of the construction of Civilization during the existence of urban planning in the Industrial Valley then the emergence of cities during the era of the Industrial Revolution in Europe, until the existence of wealthy entrepreneurs and willing to sponsor urban development activities as tourist attractions, economic activities, activity centers culture even became the hub of foreign investment and the center of educational excellence as happened in the history of the urbanization of Florence and Venice in Italy.

Like most emerging and developing cities in the world, a similar situation occurs in Malaysia when urban life becomes a symbol of modern life and a focus on youth to change lives assuming all the facilities available in urban areas and the opportunities offered can be filled for the purpose of self-development and obtaining a better lifestyle. The dynamic life that takes place in the city develops thinking ability and changes many patterns of action due to the support of a more sustainable ecological environment with more competitive cultural values while giving exposure to the youth to improve their self-efficacy in dealing with more challenging urban living conditions.

It is common knowledge that life in the city for migrants coming from the village or from outside causes cultural shock if not prepared mentally, emotionally and physically because life in the city is very fast changing, dynamic, full of competition and very productive. Only those who work hard and strive with knowledge and skills will be able to survive in the city and be able to overcome various pressures and challenges. The most notable surprise is the cost of living which all require money as well as social change that can trigger dilemmas and self-conflict that can affect character and personality.

Settlement in complex urban areas and the diversity of social status of its inhabitants, creating a diversity of settlement areas based on social status thus creating a significant gap between elite, medium and poor areas. This situation also affects the way of life of the population and the well-being index they enjoy. Usually in elite areas, facilities, infrastructure, support services and sustainable development areas are more significant than in the middle and poor areas that are vulnerable to various disturbances and security threats. In a profile study conducted by the Department of Social Welfare in 2012 on 1,378 people, the main factor of homelessness is the lack of employment which shows a total of 646 people or 46.6%. The second factor is due to poverty and low income (245 people). Most homeless people found on the streets and lodge are those aged 30-60 years. Relatively most of them are unable to continue living normally due to the high rental cost to choose to live a homeless life.

Previous researchers have found that social support can prevent and reduce stress (Sharma & Kaushik, 2016). Extensive social networks can help an individual in coping with adverse conditions and will be more resilient to stressful situations (Sharma & Kaushik, 2016). High social support can reduce problems in youth life (Lakey& Cohen, 2000). A study by Eskin (2003) found that lack of social support is closely related to psychological problems such as depression, loneliness and even fear. According to Steese, et al. (2006) social support is a protective factor and will reduce problems among youth such as stress problems. High social support from family and friends will reduce problems among urban youth (Calvete& Connor-Smith, 2006) and have an impact on survival among youth.

The studies that have been presented focus more on the concept of city governance and the impact of the urbanization process on the population and social change of society. However, studies involving social support in creating the survival of the population in the city, especially the youths who face the challenges of city life are still limited. Specific studies looking at youth survival based on ethnic variables, income and employment are still lacking. Therefore, encourage researchers to carry out this study to fill the vacancies that exist so that the collection of studies involving social support in the city on survival increases and can be used as a reference by stakeholders. This study also highlights the key constructs measured for city survival.

This study aims to identify differences in social ecological support (institutions, families, local communities and virtual platforms) based on gender and ethnicity. In addition, this study also determines the predictors of social ecological support predictors (institutions, families, local communities and virtual platforms) on the survival (knowledge, skills, lifelong learning as well as values and creativity) of youth in the Urban.

Literature Review

Theory of Social Ecology

The ecological theory of Bronfenbrenner (2005) considers human development to be the result of interactions or transactions between internal (internal) forces and environmental influences (external). Interaction is the basis of human development because through this interaction every individual in the family, among peers, at school or in the local community learns something, makes imitations, gets guidance, gets reprimands and advice and the higher level is able to learn knowledge new, skills and self-confidence through experience built throughout the ongoing process of interaction and communication. At the same time it forms the values, thoughts and perceptions of the individual about himself and his environment.



Figure 1 Theory of Social Ecology

Based on the description and discussion of the above theory, this study is to use the theory to identify social ecological support related to institutional support, family support, local community support as well as add an aspect or component related to virtual platform support and this is a new component that added value to test the whole aspect. Does it also contribute to the survival of youths of various ethnicities in the city of Kuala Lumpur.

Studies related to the support of social environment or social ecology are also studied by Dubois et al., (1996) as one dimension in the construct of self-esteem because every day individuals in the neighborhood will interact with neighbors who can be considered as one family, if the relationship takes place in a harmonious atmosphere, it certainly affects the sense of appreciation and joy of being in the neighborhood but otherwise it will have a negative impact on one's life. Similarly, the study of Darling et.al. (2005) and Gilman (2001) on environmental factors such as experience with neighbors and involvement in recreational and sports activities are significant contributors to life satisfaction.

Several previous studies have also been conducted to identify differences in social ecological support based on gender and ethnicity. This research found significant differences in social ecological support based on ethnic gender (Brookmeyer et al, 2011; Johari Hassan, 2012; Reynolds &Crea, 2016). However, a study conducted by Dasimah et al., (2016) showed that there was no significant difference in social ecological support based on gender and ethnicity.

Theory of Survival

The change of society from homogeneous and moderate groups to more complex levels of modern society requires high self-adjustment and adaptation in order to understand the different contexts of society. Spencer (1976) applied the concept that those who are strong will win while those who are weak will fail to compete for survival. He is of the view that agile, efficient and productive individuals will be able to overcome the challenges and continue the struggle of life while those who are lazy, weak and quickly break the foundation will be excluded and will not be able to compete in a very challenging living environment in urban and urban areas.

	Survival Needs	Betterment Needs
Individual Goal	Existence	Happiness (to feel good about being alive)
Individual Needs	 Physical well-being Mental well-being	More respect from othersMore Self Esteem
Species Goal	Survival of the species	Contentment (and ongoing survival of the species)
Species Needs	 A safe and healthy environment Reproduction or limiting reproduction 	 Appreaciation of "life" and all that you have Doing good deeds (helping others to satisfy their unmet needs)

Table 1Matrix of Survival / Survival Needs(Simon Herthnon, 2005)

The latest study on survival by Simon Hertnon (2005) in *Theory of Universal Human Needs* explains that human needs lead to two things, survival and better life.

Methodology

Sample

The study design used in this study is quantitative. The sample of this study involved a total of 2400 youths divided into six zones in Kuala Lumpur City. In addition, this study also involved a total of 1123 male and female youths. In terms of ethnicity, the study involved a total of 1133 ethnic Malays and non-Malays in 1267. The sampling method used in this study is a simple stratified random sampling method.

Instrument

Cresswell (2002) explains that research instruments that can be used are existing research instruments, modified research instruments, combined research instruments or self-built research instruments. The instrument used in this study is an instrument built through expert reference to assess the validity of the content and obtain the reliability coefficient through a pilot study conducted, namely with a Cronbach Alpha value of 0.834 to 0.929. The questionnaire used is called the Study Questionnaire which contains four parts namely: Demographics (9 Items), Social Ecological Support (31 Items) and Survival (31 Items).

Data Analysis

Data analysis of this study uses inferential statistics, namely bilateral manova analysis and multiple regression. Bilateral manova analysis aims to identify differences in social ecological support based on gender and ethnicity. While multiple regression analysis determines the predictors of social ecological support predictors (institutions, families, local communities and virtual platforms) on the survival (knowledge, skills, lifelong learning as well as values and creativity) of youth in the City.

Findings

Differences in Social Ecological Support Based on Gender and Ethnicity

Social ecological support consists of four aspects or sub-constructs namely institutional support, family support, local community support and virtual platform support. Comparisons of these four variables based on gender and ethnicity were made using the Two-Way MANOVA test.

Prior to the two-way MANOVA analysis, the researchers first determined and confirmed whether there were multivariate outliers on the data based on the value of Mahalanobis Distances. Value Mahalanobis Distances maximum obtained is 53.21. According to Pallant (2003), the

maximum value of Mahalanobis Distances for three independent variables must not exceed 18.47. Thus, it was found that there are 29 respondents belong to multivariate outliers and released in this study. The actual analysis involved 2371 respondents.

Researchers also first determine the homogeneity of the variance-covariance matrics using the Box's M test. This Box's M test is important to determine whether the variance-covariance among the dependent variables is the same or vice versa, across all independent variables. This is an important pre-requisite for the MANOVA test. The MANOVA test assumes that the variance-covariance among the dependent variables is the same, across all independent variables (Hair et al. 1995; Green et al. 1997). Table 2 shows the results of Box's M test.

Table 2 Box's M Test						
Box's M Value-F Degree of Freedom 1 Degree of Freedom 2 Significant Le						
58.699	1.951	30	14565113.477	0.001**		

Based on Table 2, it was found that there were significant variance-covariance differences among the dependent variables for all levels of the independent variables (F = 1.951, p = 0.001) (p <0.05). This means, the covariant variant-covariance of non-homogeneous variables across all independent variables. In this regard, Stevens (1986) asserts that although the variance-covariance homogeneity matrix (Box's M test) is significant, it is not a problem for MANOVA test if the sample size is large and almost the same (largest sample / smallest sample <1.5) due to the effect type I error (type I error) is very small. In this study, the number of samples is large and almost the same, therefore testing of the above hypothesis can be done using MANOVA test. The results of the Two-Way MANOVA analysis are as in Table 3.

Table 3 MANOVA Two	Way Analysis of Differences in	Social Ecological	Support Based on
	Gender and Ethnicit	tv	

Kesan	Wilks' Lambda	Value F	DFbetween group	DF between group	Level Sig.
Gender	0.996	2.580	4	2364	0.036*
Ethnic	0.997	1.500	4	2364	0.200
Gender*Ethnic	0.996	2.649	4	2364	0.032*

Based on Table 3, it is found that to compare the mean scores of institutional support, family support, local community support and virtual platform support based on gender, Wilks' $\lambda = 0.996$, F (4, 2364) = 2.580 and p = 0.036 (p <0.05). For comparison of mean scores of institutional support, family support, local community support and ethnic platform-based virtual platform support, Wilks' $\lambda = 0.997$, F (4, 2364) = 1,500 and p = 0.200 (p> 0.05). As for the effect of interaction between gender and ethnicity on social ecological support, survival and quality of life, Wilks' $\lambda = 0.996$, F (4, 2364) = 2.649 and p = 0.032 (p <0.05).

, multiple ANOVAs analysis (multiple ANOVAs) was performed to see the mean score differences for each dependent variable, namely institutional support, family support, local community support and virtual platform support based on gender and ethnicity as a continuation of the Two-Way MANOVA analysis. To control the type I error for this multiple test, the Bonferroni test was used and each ANOVA was tested at a significant level of 0.025 (Green et al. 1997). Tables 4 and 5, show the results of ANOVA analysis for the mean score differences of each dependent variable namely institutional support, family support, local community support and virtual platform support based on gender and ethnicity.

Gender Ethnic Mean Deviation N Institution Support Male Malay 3.660 0.499 557 NonMalay 3.597 0.590 554 1111 Female Malay 3.677 0.533 567 NonMalay 3.771 0.517 693 Total 3.695 0.524 1260 Total Malay 3.664 0.516 1124 NonMalay 3.6664 0.516 1247 Total Malay 3.664 0.516 1247 NonMalay 3.664 0.516 1247 NonMalay 3.989 0.647 554 Total Malay 4.001 0.630 693 Total Malay 4.004 0.6663 567 NonMalay 4.012 0.637 1114 NonMalay 4.002 0.637 1247 Total Malay 3			Linnerty		Standard	
Institution Support Male Malay 3.660 0.499 557 NonMalay 3.597 0.590 554 Total 3.629 0.547 1111 Female Malay 3.677 0.533 567 NonMalay 3.711 0.517 693 Total 3.695 0.524 1260 Total Malay 3.664 0.516 1124 NonMalay 3.666 0.553 1247 Total Malay 4.060 0.536 2371 NonMalay 3.666 0.536 2371 Family Support Male Malay 4.012 0.614 557 NonMalay 3.989 0.647 554 Total 4.001 0.630 1111 Female Malay 4.094 0.663 567 NonMalay 4.012 0.630 693 Total Malay 4.021 0.630 693 Total 4.049 0.646 12260 Support Ma		Gender	Ethnic	Mean	Deviation	Ν
NonMalay 3.597 0.590 554 Total 3.629 0.547 1111 Female Malay 3.677 0.533 567 NonMalay 3.711 0.517 693 Total 3.695 0.524 1260 Total Malay 3.664 0.516 1124 NonMalay 3.664 0.536 2371 Family Support Male Malay 4.012 0.614 557 Family Support Male Malay 4.001 0.630 1111 Female Malay 4.001 0.663 567 NonMalay 3.980 0.646 1260 Total Malay 4.012 0.630 693 Total Malay 4.026 0.637 1247 Total Malay 4.026 0.639 2371 Local Community Male Malay 3.830 0.490 557 Support Male M	Institution Support	Male	Malay	3.660	0.499	557
Total 3.629 0.547 1111 Female Malay 3.677 0.533 567 NonMalay 3.711 0.517 693 Total 3.695 0.524 1260 Total Malay 3.664 0.516 1124 NonMalay 3.664 0.536 2371 Family Support Male Malay 4.012 0.614 557 NonMalay 3.989 0.647 554 1111 Family Support Male Malay 4.012 0.614 557 NonMalay 3.989 0.646 1260 1111 Female Malay 4.021 0.630 663 Total Malay 4.031 0.646 1260 Total Malay 4.020 0.637 1247 Total Malay 3.830 0.490 557 NonMalay 3.801 0.490 557 Support Male Malay 3.84			NonMalay	3.597	0.590	554
Female Malay 3.677 0.533 567 NonMalay 3.711 0.517 693 Total 3.695 0.524 1260 Total Malay 3.664 0.516 1124 NonMalay 3.664 0.533 1247 Total 3.664 0.536 2371 Family Support Male Malay 4.012 0.614 557 NonMalay 3.989 0.647 554 7 Total 4.001 0.630 1111 1 Female Malay 4.012 0.663 567 NonMalay 4.012 0.663 567 NonMalay 4.012 0.630 1124 NonMalay 4.004 0.663 567 NonMalay 4.002 0.637 1247 Total Malay 3.830 0.400 557 Support Malay 3.830 0.501 557 Support NonMalay			Total	3.629	0.547	1111
$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$		Female	Malay	3.677	0.533	567
$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$			NonMalav	3.711	0.517	693
$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$			Total	3.695	0.524	1260
NonMalay 3.660 0.553 1247 Total 3.664 0.536 2371 Family Support Male Malay 4.012 0.614 557 NonMalay 3.989 0.647 554 554 554 Total 4.001 0.630 1111 0.630 693 Female Malay 4.094 0.663 567 NonMalay 4.012 0.630 693 Total Malay 4.002 0.637 1247 Total Malay 4.053 0.640 1124 NonMalay 4.002 0.637 1247 Total Malay 4.053 0.640 1247 Total Malay 3.830 0.490 557 Support Male Malay 3.830 0.490 557 Support Male Malay 3.842 0.542 1111 Female Malay 3.850 0.591 567		Total	Malay	3.664	0.516	1124
$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$			NonMalay	3.660	0.553	1247
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $			Total	3 664	0.536	2371
$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	Family Support	Male	Malay	4.012	0.614	557
$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	i anni j sapport		NonMalay	3.989	0.647	554
$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$			Total	4.001	0.630	1111
Female Malay 4.094 0.663 567 NonMalay 4.012 0.630 693 Total 4.049 0.646 1260 Total Malay 4.053 0.640 1124 NonMalay 4.002 0.637 1247 Total Malay 4.002 0.637 1247 Total 4.026 0.639 2371 Local Community Male Malay 3.830 0.490 557 Support Male Malay 3.830 0.591 557 Support Female Malay 3.850 0.591 567 NonMalay 3.840 0.543 1114 Female Malay 3.840 0.543 1124 NonMalay 3.840 0.543 1124 NonMalay 3.843 0.540 1247 Total Malay 3.843 0.540 1247 Total 3.842 0.542 2371						
Female Malay 4.094 0.663 567 NonMalay 4.012 0.630 693 Total 4.049 0.646 1260 Total 4.049 0.646 1247 Total 4.022 0.637 1247 NonMalay 4.026 0.639 2371 Local Community Male Malay 3.830 0.490 557 Support Male Malay 3.830 0.490 557 Support Male Malay 3.830 0.490 557 Support Male Malay 3.830 0.591 567 NonMalay 3.841 0.556 544 1111 Female Malay 3.850 0.591 567 NonMalay 3.840 0.543 1124 NonMalay 3.840 0.543 1124 NonMalay 3.842 0.542 2371 Virtual Support Male Malay 3.						
$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$		Female	Malay	4.094	0.663	567
$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c c } \hline Total & Total & 4.049 & 0.646 & 1260 \\ \hline Total & Malay & 4.053 & 0.640 & 1124 \\ & NonMalay & 4.002 & 0.637 & 1247 \\ & Total & 4.026 & 0.639 & 2371 \\ \hline Local & Community & Male & Malay & 3.830 & 0.490 & 557 \\ Support & Male & Malay & 3.830 & 0.490 & 557 \\ \hline & Total & 3.822 & 0.524 & 1111 \\ \hline Female & Malay & 3.850 & 0.591 & 567 \\ & NonMalay & 3.867 & 0.526 & 693 \\ & Total & 3.859 & 0.556 & 1260 \\ \hline Total & Malay & 3.843 & 0.540 & 1247 \\ \hline & Total & 3.842 & 0.542 & 2371 \\ \hline Virtual Support & Male & Malay & 3.767 & 0.651 & 557 \\ \hline & NonMalay & 3.745 & 0.671 & 554 \\ \hline & Total & 3.756 & 0.661 & 1111 \\ \hline Female & Malay & 3.787 & 0.651 & 1247 \\ \hline & Total & 3.816 & 0.666 & 1260 \\ \hline Total & Malay & 3.787 & 0.651 & 1247 \\ \hline & Total & 3.788 & 0.664 & 2371 \\ \hline \end{tabular}$			NonMalay	4.012	0.630	693
$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$			Total	4.049	0.646	1260
$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$		Total	Malay	4.053	0.640	1124
$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$			NonMalay	4.002	0.637	1247
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$			Total	4.026	0.639	2371
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Local Community	Male	Malay	3.830	0.490	557
$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	Support		NonMalay	3.814	0.556	554
$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$			Total	3.822	0.524	1111
NonMalay 3.867 0.526 693 Total 3.859 0.556 1260 Total Malay 3.840 0.543 1124 NonMalay 3.840 0.543 1124 NonMalay 3.843 0.540 1247 Total Malay 3.842 0.542 2371 Virtual Support Male Malay 3.767 0.651 557 NonMalay 3.745 0.671 554 554 Total 3.756 0.661 1111 Female Malay 3.811 0.705 567 NonMalay 3.821 0.633 693 Total 3.816 0.6666 1260 Total Malay 3.787 0.651 1247 NonMalay 3.787 0.651 1247 Total Malay 3.787 0.651 1247 Total Malay 3.788 0.664 2371		Female	Malay	3.850	0.591	567
$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$			NonMalay	3.867	0.526	693
Total Malay 3.840 0.543 1124 NonMalay 3.843 0.540 1247 Total 3.842 0.542 2371 Virtual Support Male Malay 3.767 0.651 557 Virtual Support Male Malay 3.745 0.671 554 Total 3.756 0.661 1111 Female Malay 3.811 0.705 567 NonMalay 3.821 0.633 693 Total 3.816 0.666 1260 Total Malay 3.787 0.651 1247 NonMalay 3.787 0.651 1247 Total Malay 3.788 0.664 2371			Total	3.859	0.556	1260
NonMalay 3.843 0.540 1247 Total 3.842 0.542 2371 Virtual Support Male Malay 3.767 0.651 557 NonMalay 3.745 0.671 554 554 Total 3.756 0.661 1111 Female Malay 3.811 0.705 567 NonMalay 3.821 0.633 693 Total 3.816 0.666 1260 Total Malay 3.787 0.651 1247 NonMalay 3.787 0.651 1247 Total Malay 3.788 0.664 2371		Total	Malay	3.840	0.543	1124
Total 3.842 0.542 2371 Virtual Support Male Malay 3.767 0.651 557 NonMalay 3.745 0.671 554 Total 3.756 0.661 1111 Female Malay 3.811 0.705 567 NonMalay 3.821 0.633 693 Total 3.816 0.666 1260 Total Malay 3.787 0.651 1247 NonMalay 3.788 0.664 2371			NonMalay	3.843	0.540	1247
Virtual Support Male Malay 3.767 0.651 557 NonMalay 3.745 0.671 554 Total 3.756 0.661 1111 Female Malay 3.811 0.705 567 NonMalay 3.821 0.633 693 Total 3.816 0.666 1260 Total Malay 3.789 0.679 1124 NonMalay 3.787 0.651 1247 Total 3.788 0.664 2371	<u></u>		Total	3.842	0.542	2371
NonMalay 3.745 0.671 554 Total 3.756 0.661 1111 Female Malay 3.811 0.705 567 NonMalay 3.821 0.633 693 Total 3.816 0.666 1260 Total Malay 3.789 0.679 1124 NonMalay 3.787 0.651 1247 Total 3.788 0.664 2371	Virtual Support	Male	Malay	3.767	0.651	557
Total 3.756 0.661 1111 Female Malay 3.811 0.705 567 NonMalay 3.821 0.633 693 Total 3.816 0.666 1260 Total Malay 3.789 0.679 1124 NonMalay 3.787 0.651 1247 Total 3.788 0.664 2371			NonMalay	3.745	0.671	554
Female Malay 3.811 0.705 567 NonMalay 3.821 0.633 693 Total 3.816 0.666 1260 Total Malay 3.789 0.679 1124 NonMalay 3.787 0.651 1247 Total 3.788 0.664 2371			Total	3.756	0.661	1111
NonMalay 3.821 0.633 693 Total 3.816 0.666 1260 Total Malay 3.789 0.679 1124 NonMalay 3.787 0.651 1247 Total 3.788 0.664 2371		Female	Malay	3.811	0.705	567
Total 3.816 0.666 1260 Total Malay 3.789 0.679 1124 NonMalay 3.787 0.651 1247 Total Jona 3.788 0.664 2371			NonMalay	3.821	0.633	693
Total Malay 3.789 0.679 1124 NonMalay 3.787 0.651 1247 Total 3.788 0.664 2371			Total	3.816	0.666	1260
NonMalay3.7870.6511247Total3.7880.6642371		Total	Malay	3.789	0.679	1124
Total 3.788 0.664 2371			NonMalay	3.787	0.651	1247
			Total	3.788	0.664	2371

Table4 Mean And Standard Deviation Of Social Ecological Support Based On Gender And Ethnicity

Dependent					Value-		Eta
Variable	Main Effect	J.K.D.	D.K.	M.K.D.]	Sig.	Square
InstitutionSupport	Gender	2.496	1	2.496	8.711	0.003*	0.004
	Ethnic	0.121	1	0.121	0.423	0.515	0.000
	Interaction						
	Gender* Ethnic	1.350	1	1.350	4.713	0.024*	0.002
	Error	678.274	2367	0.287			
	Total	682.336	2370				
Family Support	Gender	1.620	1	1.620	3.969	0.046	0.002
	Ethnic	1.589	1	1.589	3.893	0.049	0.002
	Interaction						
	Gender* Ethnic	0.519	1	0.519	1.272	0.259	0.000
	Error	966.156	2367	0.408			
	Total	969.759	2370				
Local	Gender	0.782	1	0.782	2.661	0.103	0.001
CommunitySuppo	Ethnic	0.000	1	0.000	0.000	0.983	0.000
rt	Interaction						
	Gender*Ethnic	0.153	1	0.153	0.521	0.471	0.001
	Error	695.622	2367	0.294			
	Total	696.598	2370				
VirtualSupport	Gender	2.087	1	2.087	4.728	0.024*	0.002
	Ethnic	0.021	1	0.021	0.047	0.828	0.000
	Interaction						
	Gender*Ethnic	0.154104	1	0.154	0.349	0.555	0.000
	Error	40.881	2367	0.441			
	Total	1047.180	2370				

Table 5 ANOVA Test Comparisonoff Social Ecological Support Based On Gender And
Ethnicity

Based on Table 5, there are significant differences in terms of institutional support (F (1, 2367) = 8.711, p = 0.003; p < 0.025) based on gender. Institutional support among female youth (mean = 3.695) was higher than male youth (mean = 3.629). However, the influence of gender on institutional support variance was small (Eta Square = 0.004).

However, there was no significant difference in terms of institutional support (F (1, 2367) = 0.423, p = 0.515) based on ethnicity. This means that institutional support among the youth of Malay and non-Malay youths are at the same level of moderate level (mean Malay = 3,664; mean not wither = 3.660).

Comparisons of family support based on gender, however, showed that there was no significant difference in terms of family support based on gender (F (1,2367) = 0.969, p = 0.046; p> 0.25)). This means that family support among male and female youths is at the same level which is at a high level (mean male = 4.001; mean female = 4.049).

Comparison of family support based on race as well, showed that there was no significant difference in terms of survival based on ethnicity (F (1, 2367) = 3.893, p = 0.049; p> 0.025). This means that family support among the youth of Malay and non-Malay youths are at the same level which is at a high level (mean malay = 4,053; mean non malay = 4,026).

In terms of local community support, it was found that there was no significant difference in terms of local community support based on gender (F (1,2367) = 2.661, p = 0.103). This means that the support of the local community among male and female youths is also at the same level which is at a high level (mean male = 3.822; mean female = 3.859).

In terms of ethnicity, there was also no significant difference in terms of local community support (F (1,2367) = 0.000, p = 0.983) based on ethnicity. This means that local community support among Malay youths and youth non-Malays too are at the same level which is at a high level (mean malay = 3.840; mean non malay = 3.843).

In terms of virtual platform support, there are significant differences in terms of virtual platform support based on gender (F (1,2367) = 4.728, p = 0.024; p <0.025). This means the support of virtual platforms among female youth (mean female = 3.816) and is higher than female youth (mean male = 3.756). However, the influence of gender on the support aspect of virtual platforms is small (eta square = 0.002)

In terms of ethnicity, there is no significant difference in terms of virtual platform support (F (1,2367) = 0.828, p = 0.823) based on ethnicity. This means that virtual platform support among the youth of Malay and non-Malay youths are at the same level which is at a high level (mean malay = 3789; mean non malay = 3,787).

Based on Table 5 as well, there is no significant effect of interaction between gender and ethnicity on family support (F (1,2367) = 1.272, p = 0.259), local community support (F (1,2367) = 0.521, p = 0.471) and virtual platform support (F (1,2367) = 0.349, p = 0.555) among youths in Kuala Lumpur City.

However, there was a significant effect of interaction between gender and ethnicity on institutional support (F (1,2367) = 4.713, p = 0.024; p < 0.025). This finding clearly shows that among Malay youths, the level of institutional support for young males (mean = 3.660) is at the same level with young women (mean = 3,677), while for youth non-Malays, the level of institutional support young women (mean = 3.711) was higher than male youth (mean = 3.597).

The Contribution of Social Ecology to Survival

Multiple regression analysis was used to determine the significance of the relationship and the contribution of the variance aspects of the independent variables of social ecological support namely institutional support, family support, local community and virtual platform support for youth survival in Kuala Lumpur.

Before multiple regression analyzes were performed, the researchers first determined and confirmed whether there were multivariate outliers on the data based on the value of Mahalanobis Distances. The maximum value of Mahalanobis Distances obtained is 33.642. According to Pallant (2003), the maximum value of Mahalanobis Distances for four independent variables must not exceed 18.47. Thus, it was found that there are 9 respondents belong to multivariate outliers and released in this study. The actual analysis involved 2391 respondents.

Researchers also first determine and confirm whether the distribution of questionnaire scores is normal and linear or vice versa. This is done by obtaining a scatter plot residue graph and normal plot regression that can be obtained from the Linear Regression: Plots subprogram found in the SPSS program. Based on the distribution plot, it was found that the distribution of questionnaire scores in this study is normal and linear.

Apart from that, the researcher also first looked at the correlation between independent variables and independent variables to determine whether or not multikolenearance exists and it was found that there are no independent variables in this study that have multikolenings. Tolerance values are large at 0.872, 0.738 and 0.660.

Tables 6 and 7 show the results of a stepwise regression analysis involving four independent variables on the dependent variable i.e. quality of life. All four variables showed significant correlations and contributions (p < 0.05) on total survival variance.

(Ctomuine)for

Multiple

Table o Mult	ipie	Regressi	UII	Analysis)	(Stepwise)Ior
Independen Survival of Y	tVariableSu Youth	ipportIns	titutionT	hat Co	ntribute	s to the
		Beta				Contributio
Variable(X)	В	(β)	Value-	Sigt	R ²	ns (%)
			t			
Virtual Support	0.367	0.415	21.107	0.000	0.373	37.3
Family Support	0.164	0.178	9.174	0.000	0.417	4.3
Local Community Support	0.193	0.180	8.764	0.000	0.435	1.8
Konstant	0.789		11.289	0.000		
Value R	0.660					
Square Value R K	0.435					
Modified SquareValue R 0.4	434					
Nilai Error Piawai	0.070					

Degradion

Amalyzaia

Modified Squa Nilai Error Pia	areValue R awai	0.434 0.070			
Source	Total Squared Value	Table 7Va Degree of Freedom	ariants Analysis Squared Value Mean	Value-F	Significan Level (p)
Regression Residul	364.309 473.187	3 2387	121.436 .198	612.587	0.001**

Stepwise regression analysis in tables 6 and 7 shows that the independent variables of virtual platform support, family support, and local community support have a significant correlation and contribution (43.5%) (p < 0.05) on survival among youth in Kuala Mud.

2390

The main and highest predictors of survival among youths in Kuala Lumpur are the support of virtual platforms ($\beta = .415$, t = 21.107 and p = 0.000) and its contribution of 37.3 percent. A second important predictor that contributes 4.3 percent to survival among youths is family support ($\beta = .178$, t = 9.174 and p = 0.000). The third predictor that affects and contributes 3.7 percent to youth survival is local community support ($\beta = .180$, t = 8.764 and p = 0.000).

Variance analysis found that the value of F (3, 2387) = 612.587; p <0.05) was significant. The R value of Squared (R² = 0.435) shows that the total contribution of the three independent variables observed is 43.5 percent to the survival of youth in Kuala Lumpur, namely virtual platform support of 37.3 percent, family support of 4.3 percent, and local community support of 3.7 percent.

Discussions

Total

837.496

Table

6

Differences in Social Ecological Support Based on Gender and Ethnicity

Based on the findings of the analysis it can be concluded that there is a difference between institutional support for gender. In the early stages, youths need a lot of support from the school because they are experiencing a change from childhood to adolescence. In this situation, teachers are able to motivate students and control learning in school and are able to increase engagement and academic achievement. Past studies have shown that social support is a strategy capable of supporting students' academic achievement. Girls and young women get more support than boys. Even when analyzing each particular resource, female students generally get more support from peers, classmates, parents and teachers than male students (Brookmeyer et al., 2011).

In addition, the findings of the study show the difference between the support of virtual platforms for male and female youth. Female youths show higher support than male youths for virtual platform support. This shows that young women generally use virtual platforms in their daily lives. According to Johari Hassan (2012), young men and women have different perceptions in gaining social support. Female youths report using social networks frequently and widely because they are more likely to communicate and find more new acquaintances than male youths. This is in contrast to young men less looking for new contacts in social networks instead more to the use of applications in social networks.

Based on the Post Hoc test, family support showed no differences between the sexes. The findings of this study are in line with the study of Reynolds and Crea (2016) who stated that social support from parents is able to have a direct impact on pro social behavior among urban youth. This study was conducted among parents and youth in the city of Boston, USA. The results also show that there is no significant difference between male and female youths in obtaining support from the family, namely mothers and fathers. They show a positive attitude and mental health in social life. This shows that male and female youths receive equal support from parents both mentally and physically who are important in the life of youth.

Furthermore, this study found that the support of the local community also shows that there is no difference between male and female youth. Past studies have shown that the level of youth involvement in neighborhood communities is not encouraging, especially during discussion and assembly programs (Dasimah et al., 2016). The results of the respondents' statement stated that most youths are less interested in spending their time in social conversations. They prefer physical activity. In addition, the results of the study found that youth participation in social activities such as neighborhood activities is influenced by the characteristics of the local population. The development process of youth participation should begin with positive cultural values and norms. The involvement of all parents, teachers and community members is encouraged to attract the participation of youths. The results of data analysis show that society needs to show positive characteristics in attracting active youth participation in neighborhood community programs (Dasimah et al., 2016). Therefore, the support of the local community is important to attract the participation of youth in social and neighborhood activities.

The Contribution of Social Ecology to Survival

The main and highest predictor of survival among youths in Kuala Lumpur is the support of virtual platforms and its contribution of 37.3 percent. This is contrary to a study conducted by Wan Norina et al., (2013) who found that virtual platforms are one of the factors that cause the moral collapse of adolescents today. This finding is also supported by the findings of a study of some researchers who found that the majority of youths only browse websites in the form of entertainment compared to the discourse of knowledge that can improve their social life (Ab Halim Tamuri et al., 2006). However, overseas studies have found that virtual platforms can be used to obtain the latest information as well as learning resources that can improve youth survival (Hamat, et al., 2012; Yin, et al., 2014). According to Denef et al., (2012), the use of virtual platforms has had a positive and negative impact on the survival of youth. Youths who can use it well can make this opportunity to interact and work together to obtain the latest information and knowledge that can help for their survival (Denef, et al., 2012). Mohd Mahzan et al., (2013) also agreed that youths who have the desire to learn can improve their survival.

A second important predictor that contributes 4.3 percent to survival among youths is family support. This finding is supported by a study conducted by several researchers who found that the majority of youths who have problems in survival come from families who also have similar problems (Dunn et al., 2004; Rumberger, 2011; Baba et al., 2018). Zulkifly et al., (2011) also found a positive relationship between families in determining the direction of youth life. This is also supported by the study of Abdul Aziz Abdul Rahman et al., (2016) who found that the majority of parents in the city always focus on the survival of their children. Families need to play a role in providing support for

their survival through several elements of support such as discussion, communication and inclusive family involvement in youth social life.

The third predictor that affects and contributes 3.7 percent to the survival of youth is the support of the local community. Blyth (2000) also thinks that the local community needs to provide a program that can build a positive attitude among youths. In addition, the local community needs to provide support in providing opportunities to help youth to build their skills (Collaborative for Academic, Social and Emotional Learning, 2003; Catalanoet al., 2002; National Research Council & Institute of Medicine, 2002; Pittman et al. , 2003). Scales (2001) argues that the local community should encourage youths to engage in community activities as well as appreciate their talents and potential to improve the survival of youth in the city.

Conclusion

Based on the discussion of this study, it is clear that social ecological support is important in determining the survival of multi-ethnic youth in Kuala Lumpur City. In addition, there are significant differences overall aspects in social ecological support based on gender. In addition, this study also found a significant interaction effect between gender and ethnicity in aspects of social ecological support. From the multiple regression analysis, this study found a significant contribution of several aspects in social ecological support to the survival of multi-ethnic youth in the City.

The results of this study can give impact and implications to various parties whether direct or indirect applications that can be used in improving the strategy and Planning for the development of various ethnic youth in various cities in Malaysia. For the Ministry of Towns and Territories, the findings show that social ecological support, especially from the institutional aspect, namely physical facilities and programs organized by the ministries of cities and regions also dbkl still have not had a significant impact on youth of various ethnicities in improving survival. In order to improve the survival of youth, the program held needs to be more comprehensive and innovative in the form of long-term, short-term and medium-term to ensure that the goals of the program reach the target and meet the needs of today's youth. For local communities and NGOs, they need to play a direct role by planning various activities and programs in increasing social support in determining the survival of urban youth, especially in terms of family, local and virtual community support.

REFERENCES

- Ab. Halim T., &Zarin., I.(2006). Hubungan Media Massa DenganPeganganAkhlak dan Pengajaran Pendidikan Islam: Satu Kajian Remaja di SabakBernam. ProsidingWacana Pendidikan Islam siri ke-5; 1-8. UKM. Bangi: Fakulti Pendidikan.
- Abd Samad Hadi, 2010. Urbanisasi di Malaysia MengaitkanKepelbagaian Proses keBentukPembandaran, Malaysian Journal of Environmental Management 11 (2) : 21-31.
- Abdul Aziz Rahman, Abdul Razaq Ahmad, Jalaluddin Abdul Malek & MohdMahzan Awang. (2016). Social Involvement and Good Values Inculcation Through Informal Learning in the Putrajaya Urban Residents. Kajian Malaysia. 34(2). 75-100. ISSN: 2180-4273.
- Alexander, K.C. 1994. The Process of Development of Societies. Sage: London.
- Baba, R., Muhammad Nor, N., & Fikri Hamzah, M. (2018). Kerjaseparuh masa: Faktor, status pelajardan kesankeataspencapaianakademikpelajarInstitutionpengajiantinggi. Journal of Business Innovation 3(1), 86-94.

- Blyth, D. A. (2000, Fall). Extension's role in community youth development for the 21st Century. The Center, 6-17.
- Bronfenbrenner, U, 2005. Developmental ecology through space and time: A future perspective. In P. Moen, G. H. Elder, Jr., K. Lüscher (Eds.), Examining livesin context: Perspectives on the ecology of human development (pp. 619-647). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Brookmeyer, K. A., Fanti, K. A., & Henrich, C. C. (2006). Schools, parents, and youth violence: A multilevel, ecological analysis. Journal of Clinical Child & Adolescent Psychology, 35(4), 504–514.
- Calvete, H. & Connor-Smith, J.K. (2006). Perceived social support, coping, and symptoms of distress in American and Spanish students. Anxiety, Stress, and Coping, 19(1), 47 65.
- Catalano, R. F., Berglund, M. L., Ryan, J. A., Lonczak, H. S., &Hawkins, D. (2002). Positive youth development in the UnitedStates: Research findings on evaluations of positive youthdevelopment programs. Prevention & Treatment, 5, Article 15.Retrieved July 14, 2004, from http://www.journals.apa.org/prevention/volume5/ pre0050015a.html.
- Cohen, J. 1988. Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences. Hillslade, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Collaborative for Academic, Social, Emotional Learning. (2003). Safeand sound: An educational leader's guide to evidence-basedsocial and emotional learning programs. Chicago, IL: Author.
- Creswell, J. W. 2002. Educational research: planning, conducting and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research. Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Merill Prentice Hall.
- Darling, Nancy; Caldwell, Linda L; Smith, R. 2005. Participation in School-Based Extracurricular Activities and Adolescent Adjustment - ProQuest. Journal of Leisure Research, 37(1), 51–76.
- Dasimah, O., KamarulAriff, O., Saberi O., &Zaharah M. Y. (2016). Youth Participation in Urban Neighbourhood Community. Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences, 234: 309 316.
- Denef, S., Kaptein, N., Bayerl, P. S., & Ramirez, L. (2012). Best practice in police social media adaptation COMPOSITE Project: European Commission.
- Dubois, D. L., Felner, R. D., Brandy, S., Phillips, R. S. C., & Lease, A. M. 1996. Early Adolescent Self-Esteem: A Developmental-Ecological Framework and Assessment Strategy. Journal of Research on Adolescence, 6(4), 543–579.
- Dunn, C., Dale, C., & Karen, R. (2004). Variables affecting students' decision to drop out of school. Remedial and special education, 314-323.
- Eskin, M. (2003). Self-reported assertiveness in Swedish and Turkish adolescents: A cross-cultural comparison. Scandinavian Journal of Psychology, 44, 7–12.
- Gilman, R. (2001). The relationship between life satisfaction, social interest, and frequency of extracurricular activities among adolescent students. Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 30(6), 749–767.
- Hamat, A., Embi, M. A., & Hassan, H. A. (2012). The use of social networking sites among Malaysian university students International education studies, 5(3), 56-66.

- Johari H. & Raja Shahrina, R. A. R. (2012). KetagihanPenggunaan Internet Di KalanganRemajaSekolahTingkatan 4 Di Bandaraya Johor Bahru, Journal of Technical, Vocational & Engineering Education, 6 : 23-43 / Issn: 2231-7376.
- Krejcie, R.V. & Morgan, D.W. 1970. Determining Sample Size for Research Activities. Educational AndPcychological Measurement 30: 607-610.
- Lakey, B., & Cohen, S. (2000). Social support theory and measurement. In Cohen, S., Underwood, L. G., & Gottlieb, B. H. (Eds.), Social support measurement and interventions: A guide for health and social scientists. New York: Oxford.
- Mohd. Mahzan Awang, Abdul Razaq Ahmad, Nora'asikin Abu Bakar, Sayuti Abd Ghani, Asyraf Nadia MohdYunus, MohdAsrulHery Ibrahim, Jaya Chitra Ramalu, Che Pee Saad and MohdJasmy Abd Rahman. 2013. Students' attitudes and their academic performance in nationhood education. International Education Studies 6(11): 21–28.
- National Research Council and Institute of Medicine. (2002).Community programs to promote youth development. Washing-ton, DC: National Academy Press.
- Pittman, K., Irby, M., Tolman, J., Yohalem, N., & Ferber, T. (2003).Preventing problems, promoting development, encouragingengagement: Competing priorities or inseparable goals? Basedupon Pittman, K. & Irby, M. (1996). Preventing problems orpromotingdevelopment? Washington, DC: The Forum for YouthInvestment, Impact Strategies, Inc.
- Reynolds, A. D. and Crea, T. M. (2016). Household stress and adolescent behaviours in urban families: the mediating roles of parent mental health and social supports. Child and Family Social Work, 21, 568–580. doi:10.1111/cfs.12181.
- Rumberger, R. W. 2011. Dropping Out. Harvard: Harvard University Press.
- Scales, P. C., Benson, P. L., Roehlkepartain, E. C., Hintz, N. R., Sullivan, T. K., & Mannes, M. (2001). The role of neighborhood community in building developmental assets for childrenand youth: A national study of social norms among Americanadults. Journal of Community Psychology, 29, 703–727.
- Sharma, M. & Kaushik, N. (2016). Parental involvement, psychological distress, perceived social support, coping strategy, and happiness of school going adolescent. International Journal of Social Impact, 1, 2455-670.
- Simon Hertnon, 2005. Theory of Universal Human Needs. http://simonhertnon.com/a-theory-ofuniversal-human-needs/.
- Spencer, H. 1976. Survival of the fittest. New York : Appleton.
- Steese, S., Dollete, M, Phillips, W. Hossfeld, E., Matthews, G. & Taormina, G. (2006). Understanding girls' circle as an intervention on perceived social support, body image, selfefficacy, locus of control and self-esteem. Adolescence, 41(161), 55-74.
- Ventagodt, Merrick dan Andersen, 2003. Quality of Life Theory I The IQOL Theory : An Integrative Theory of The Global Quality of Life Concept. The Scientific World Journal.
- Yin, J. L. S., Agostinho, S., Harper, B., & Chicaro, J. F. (2014). The engagement of social media technologies by undergraduate informatics students for academic purpose in Malaysia. Journal of information communication and ethics in society, 12(3), 177-194.