Journal of Administrative Science
Vol.22, Issue 2, 2025, pp.267-291
Available online at *http:jas.uitm.edu.my*

Mapping Malaysia's Poverty Alleviation Strategy: A Typological Analysis of the Malaysia Plans

Iskandar Idris[1]*, Nooraini Othman[2] & Wan Normeza Wan Zakaria[3]

[1] *Faculty of Social Science and Humanities, Universiti Teknologi Malaysia (UTM)*
[2&3] *Faculty of Artificial Intelligence, Universiti Teknologi Malaysia (UTM)*

Corresponding Author: iskandar.arn@gmail.com

Abstract

Poverty eradication remains a central priority in Malaysia's development planning, with poverty alleviation programmes embedded in national strategies since the inception of the New Economic Policy in the 1970s. Examining how these interventions are framed within long-term planning documents is vital to understanding the strategic priorities that shape Malaysia's evolving response to poverty. However, research on Malaysia's poverty strategy lacks a systematic classification of programme types, limiting the ability to assess coherence, evolution, and institutional adaptation over time. This study aims to develop a typology of Malaysia's poverty alleviation programmes by examining their representation in national development plans. The study identifies eight strategic categories and nineteen codes based on qualitative content analysis of 216 excerpts from the Second to Twelfth Malaysia Plans and their Mid-Term Reviews. These categories are analysed to reveal how Malaysia's poverty response has shifted from structuralist models toward more individualised and empowerment-based interventions. Findings show that while infrastructure and human capital development remain dominant, recent strategies have begun incorporating microfinance, livelihood insurance, and limited social protection. Critical gaps remain, particularly in market integration, risk protection, and policy integration. The analysis also reveals strong institutional path dependency, with legacy agencies and rural-biased interventions persisting across policy eras. The typology provides a foundational lens to analyse how Malaysia's poverty alleviation strategies have evolved across policy eras. It offers critical insights for rebalancing long-standing structural interventions with emerging needs, guiding more responsive, inclusive, and context-sensitive poverty policy development.

***Keywords**: Poverty alleviation, Programme typology, Institutional frameworks, Malaysia Plans, Poverty governance*

INTRODUCTION

Received: 1 August 2025
Accepted: 1 September 2025
Published: 31 October 2025

Poverty continues to be a global challenge that undermines economic growth, social stability, and human well-being. Governments worldwide have implemented various poverty alleviation programmes to address this issue. While the proportion of people in extreme poverty declined significantly from 36% in 1990 to below 10% in 2018 (Gu et al., 2022), recent global crises, notably the COVID-19 pandemic, have reversed much of this progress, pushing an additional 75 to 95 million people into poverty in 2022 relative to pre-pandemic forecasts (Mahler et al., 2022). Although poverty fell by 13 million in 2023, the reduction was uneven, with poverty levels remaining elevated in low-income regions (UN, 2024). Crespo Cuaresma

Journal of Administrative Science
Vol.22, Issue 2, 2025, pp.267-291
Available online at *http:jas.uitm.edu.my*

et al. (2018) project that over 300 million people may still live in extreme poverty by 2030 if policy responses remain inadequate. These persistent and uneven trends underscore the urgency of inclusive and equitable strategies that promote economic growth and enhance resilience among vulnerable populations.

Malaysia is similarly affected by these global disruptions. The COVID-19 crisis revealed the fragility of its poverty reduction gains, particularly for urban and informal sector workers (Harith & Jamil, 2021; Khudaykulova et al., 2022; UNICEF Malaysia, 2024). Rahman et al. (2022) projected that poverty incidence could rise from 6.4% to 8.4%, potentially adding 670,000 poor households by 2025. In response, successive national development plans, from the New Economic Policy (1971–1990) to the Shared Prosperity Vision 2030, have incorporated various poverty alleviation programmes (Karim, 1995; EPU, 2021; Ministry of Economy, 2023). Earlier Malaysian Plans primarily focused on rural development and socioeconomic restructuring, whereas more recent strategies have increasingly incorporated inclusive growth and social protection elements (Koutronas, 2020). However, despite this breadth of interventions, a pressing need remains to classify these programmes systematically to trace patterns, identify thematic gaps, and assess long-term policy continuity (Siwar, 2006; Mohd Nor & Khelghat-Doost, 2019; Sabran, 2023).

This article addresses that need by conducting a typological analysis of Malaysia's poverty alleviation programmes based on the Malaysia Plans (MP), the country's primary development policy documents. The Malaysia Plan, which was introduced in 1966 (Government of Malaysia, 1965), is a key government document that outlines national development policies and strategies for five years. These plans have been crucial in shaping Malaysia's economic and social development. Over time, they have adapted to meet emerging national priorities, including poverty eradication, while aligning with long-term development visions. The strategies outlined in the MP are incorporated into the annual budget presented by the Finance Minister. Using qualitative content analysis, the study identifies distinct programme typologies to track shifts in strategic focus, thematic priorities, and institutional approaches. The typology provides a structured lens to assess coherence across programme types, monitor shifts in strategic focus, and highlight overlooked areas in poverty policy planning. Such classification enables policymakers to evaluate alignment with policy objectives, reduce redundancy, and design more adaptive and targeted interventions.

eISSN 2600-9374

Journal of Administrative Science
Vol.22, Issue 2, 2025, pp.267-291
Available online at *http:jas.uitm.edu.my*

LITERATURE REVIEW

Poverty alleviation programmes are defined in various ways, reflecting differences in purpose and approach. The World Bank (2000) views them as crisis-response tools such as food aid, shelter, and cash transfers. Ravallion (2016) expands this to include redistributive policies that enhance access to basic services. Narayan and Petesch (2002) frame them as coordinated institutional efforts to address poverty systematically. Riddell and Robinson (1992) conceptualise poverty alleviation primarily through income growth and employment creation, reflecting a productivity-oriented approach to poverty reduction. These perspectives highlight the multidimensional nature of such programmes, spanning humanitarian relief, structural reform, and economic empowerment.

Malaysia's poverty intervention efforts began with the New Economic Policy (NEP) in the 1970s, introduced after the 1969 racial unrest to eradicate poverty and restructure society (Malaysia, 1971; Gomez & Jomo, 1999). The NEP prioritised rural development, agricultural support, and broader economic participation (Jomo, 2005; Yaakub et al., 2022). Over time, successive Malaysia Plans expanded this focus to include income-generating programmes, cash transfers, and housing schemes targeting the B40 group (EPU, 2010; Othman et al., 2023), reflecting the redistribution policies that Malaysia has implemented since gaining independence (Ravallion, 2016). These interventions helped reduce absolute poverty from 49.3% in 1970 to 6.2% in 2022 (DOSM, 2023), yet hardcore poverty and emerging vulnerabilities persist (Ridzuan et al., 2024). In response, the Twelfth Malaysia Plan adopts a multidimensional approach, through strategies focused on income, service access, and cost-of-living issues (EPU, 2021), aligning with SDG 1 to halve global poverty by 2030 (UN, 2015).

Poverty Alleviation Strategies in Developing Countries

Most developing countries adopted five main strategies: stimulating economic growth, economic and institutional reforms, promoting microfinance institutions and programmes, improving the marketing systems, and cash or income transfer programmes (Ayoo, 2022). Stimulating economic growth remains vital for poverty reduction, especially in agriculture-dependent developing countries. Agricultural development enhances income and food security (Narayan & Petesch, 2002; de Janvry

eISSN 2600-9374

& Sadoulet, 2010; World Bank, 2017). Countries like Ethiopia and Kenya have adopted irrigation and intensification to combat rural poverty, though high costs limit access for poor households (Republic of Kenya, 2010; World Bank, 2017; Adebayo et al., 2018; Adetoro et al., 2022). Tailored support, such as microfinance, facilitates the adoption of productive technologies (Mariyono, 2019; Glover, 2022), with initiatives like Bangladesh's Grameen Bank and Bangladesh Rural Development Board (BRDB) improving income and employment (Khandker et al., 1998). Infrastructure investments such as roads, electricity, and services boost rural productivity and market access (Wang & Sun, 2016; Page & Pande, 2018), while Xiao et al. (2022) arguing that electrification improves income distribution. These efforts must, however, be embedded in broader development strategies to maximise impact (Kaiser & Barstow, 2022).

Economic and institutional reforms are crucial for removing the structural barriers that hinder poverty reduction. Such reforms promote growth, improve governance, and enhance accountability, expanding opportunities for low-income populations (Arndt et al., 2016; Page & Pande, 2018). Priority areas include land tenure reform, curbing resource mismanagement, and promoting inclusive decision-making (World Bank Group, 2015). For example, systemic change is critical for sustainable agricultural development (Clark, 2002) in regions like Sub-Saharan Africa. Similarly, Indonesia's experience with decentralisation and local-level reform demonstrates how enhanced governance can improve service delivery and responsiveness to the needs of poor communities (World Bank, 2001). Empowered local governments can better identify poor households and tailor poverty strategies (Narayan, 2002). In parallel, fiscal reforms such as tax restructuring are needed to expand pro-poor fiscal space and ensure sustainable social spending (Ayoo, 2022).

Microfinance institutions play a vital role in poverty reduction, especially in rural and underserved areas with limited access to formal banking (Vatta, 2003; Imai et al., 2010). Small loans and financial services to low-income households enable small-scale entrepreneurs and farmers to sustain and expand their livelihoods (Boltana et al., 2023; Kayongo & Mathiassen, 2023). Beyond financial access, microfinance supports grassroots entrepreneurship by offering minimal collateral requirements, flexible repayment terms, and reduced transaction costs (Ojong & Simba, 2019; Liu et al., 2021; Ayoo, 2022). A prominent example is Bangladesh's Grameen Bank, which has helped raise household incomes and empower rural women through targeted microcredit initiatives (Sachs, 2005). Over time, increased access to microfinance has also been

eISSN 2600-9374

Journal of Administrative Science
Vol.22, Issue 2, 2025, pp.267-291
Available online at *http:jas.uitm.edu.my*

associated with a decline in income inequality, highlighting its long-term value in promoting inclusive economic development (Miled et al., 2022).

Effective marketing systems are crucial for enabling low-income producers in developing countries to expand output and increase earnings. Karnani (2017) and Ranjan (2017) show that smallholders frequently lose income due to weak bargaining power and exploitative intermediaries. In addition, Ayoo (2022) highlights how poor infrastructure and inefficient markets deepen rural poverty. To address this, Vatta (2003) argues that rural road development can enhance market access and allow farmers to command better prices. However, infrastructure alone is insufficient, as productivity gains must be paired with redistributive mechanisms to ensure that low-income households benefit more equitably from market participation (Page & Pande, 2018). Moreover, Sachs (2005) and the World Bank (2015) underscore that resolving market inefficiencies is central to poverty alleviation, while Otsuka and Ali (2020) stress that sustained government investment is required to catalyse change.

In addition, market access interventions, including contract farming and output price information, demonstrate substantial socioeconomic and food security benefits (Villar et al., 2023; Marion et al., 2024). Online platforms further expand farmers' market reach and income potential (Ma et al., 2024). Similarly, collective action is critical; producer groups help African smallholders tap into new value chains and overcome market distortions (Markelova & Mwangi, 2010). When empowered with accurate market information, small-scale farmers can make informed decisions and improve their market positioning (Van Crowder, 1997).

Cash transfer programmes are widely adopted in developing countries to reduce poverty and vulnerability, particularly among children and low-income families. In Sri Lanka, they have significantly reduced child poverty and improved school attendance (Kumara & Pfau, 2011), with similar positive impacts reported in South Africa, Brazil, Mexico, and Chile (World Bank Group, 2015; Hanna & Olken, 2018; Page & Pande, 2018). Beyond short-term benefits, long-term outcomes include enhanced resilience in Jamaica and reduced child mortality in Brazil (Neves et al., 2022; Oconnor, 2024). Nonetheless, concerns about their fiscal sustainability and potential effects on business incentives remain (Baird et al., 2024; Grimm et al., 2024). However, Bangladesh demonstrates the feasibility of domestically funded cash transfer programs (Ayoo, 2022). Therefore, with adequate financial and institutional support, cash transfers are vital to effective social protection systems.

eISSN 2600-9374

Journal of Administrative Science
Vol.22, Issue 2, 2025, pp.267-291
Available online at *http:jas.uitm.edu.my*

MATERIALS AND METHODS

This paper employed qualitative content analysis to examine how poverty alleviation programmes are represented in Malaysia's primary national development policy documents, specifically the Second to Twelfth Malaysia Plans and their respective Mid-term Review Reports. The analysis focused on poverty eradication, following the NEP's original objective, and excluded the restructuring of society. Guided by Krippendorff's (2004) content analysis methodology and the directed content analysis approach of Hsieh and Shannon (2005), the unit of analysis was the excerpt for any sentence, paragraph, or segment that explicitly or implicitly referenced a poverty alleviation initiative. Excerpts were selected based on contextual integrity and thematic relevance. These units were coded to identify recurring strategies, implementation approaches, and programme typologies across policy cycles.

Following Krippendorff's (2004, p. 111) guidelines, the study applied stratified and purposive sampling to ensure relevance and representativeness. Stratified sampling organised documents by edition, and only sections referencing poverty were analysed to capture longitudinal change. Purposive sampling then targeted text segments detailing specific interventions, institutional mechanisms, or policy strategies, aligned with the study's research questions (Krippendorff, 2004, p. 111). The coding began with five predefined categories (Ayoo, 2022), with four new ones added inductively as the analysis progressed, following Krippendorff's rule-guided but reflexive approach. Additionally, one of the predefined categories was excluded from the inductive process, resulting in a final total of eight categories. Each excerpt was assigned a code and strategic category, forming a structured typology that enabled a systematic, empirical interpretation of Malaysia's evolving poverty programme landscape.

RESULTS

The Malaysia Plans were analysed and organised into 19 codes, which were further grouped into eight topical categories: basic infrastructure and amenities, human capital development, stimulating economic growth, agricultural and land development, promoting microfinance schemes, cash and income transfer programmes, improving marketing systems, and social protection. Categories were developed through analysing 216 excerpts from the Second to Twelfth Malaysia Plans, based on the orientation of poverty alleviation programs. The resulting typology was then examined concerning

eISSN 2600-9374

Journal of Administrative Science
Vol.22, Issue 2, 2025, pp.267-291
Available online at *http:jas.uitm.edu.my*

both individual Malaysia Plans and broader policy eras (see Table 1 and Table 2). The distribution of excerpts across the eight categories is are basic infrastructure and amenities (56, 25.9%); human capital development (51, 23.6%); stimulating economic growth (39, 18.1%); agricultural and land development (27, 12.5%); promoting microfinance schemes (25, 11.6%); cash and income transfer programmes (9, 4.2%); improving marketing systems (5, 2.3%); and social protection (4, 1.9%).

Table 1:
Frequency of Programme Categories Across the Malaysia Plan

Programme Category	Total	Excerpt according to Malaysia Plan (n = 216 excerpts)										
		2nd	3rd	4th	5th	6th	7th	8th	9th	10th	11th	12th
Basic Infrastructure and Amenities	56	6	2	3	15	1	3	5	4	2	4	11
Human Capital Development	51	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	4	13	1	25
Stimulating Economic Growth	39	1	0	2	1	0	4	6	4	5	0	16
Agricultural and Land Development	27	3	1	5	12	0	0	0	1	4	0	1
Promoting Microfinance Scheme	25	3	0	0	2	0	3	6	4	1	1	5
Cash/ Income Transfer Programme	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	8
Improving the Marketing Systems	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	3
Social Protection	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

Table 2:
Frequency of Programme Categories Across Policy Era

Programme Category	Excerpt		Excerpt according to policy era (n = 216 excerpt)				
	Total	Percent (%)	NEP	NDP	NVP	NEM	SPV
Basic Infrastructure and Amenities	56	25.9	26	4	9	6	11
Human Capital Development	51	23.6	1	0	11	14	25
Stimulating Economic Growth	39	18.1	4	4	10	5	16
Agricultural and Land Development	27	12.5	21	0	1	4	2
Promoting Microfinance Scheme	25	11.6	5	3	10	2	5
Cash/ Income Transfer Programme	9	4.2	0	0	0	1	8
Improving the Marketing Systems	5	2.3	0	0	0	2	3
Social Protection	4	1.9	0	0	0	0	4

Note: NEP (New Economic Policy), NDP (National Development Policy), NVP (National Vision Policy), NEM (New Economic Model), and SPV (Shared Prosperity Vision)

eISSN 2600-9374

Journal of Administrative Science
Vol.22, Issue 2, 2025, pp.267-291
Available online at *http:jas.uitm.edu.my*

Basic Infrastructure and Amenities

The basic infrastructure and amenities category includes codes related to poverty alleviation through housing repair, affordable housing, and expanded access to utilities and public services. This category accounts for 56 excerpts, representing 25.9% of the 216 excerpts coded. Table 3 shows that the most frequently observed codes within this category were affordable housing and living conditions (28 excerpts, 50.0% of this category) and utilities and public service access (28 excerpts, 50.0% of this category). These programmes were most commonly cited during the Fifth Malaysia Plan (15, 6.9%), followed by the Twelfth Malaysia Plan (11, 5.1%). At the level of the policy era, the category appeared most frequently under the NEM period (26, 12.0%).

Table 3:
Codes under Basic Infrastructure and Amenities

Codes	Total excerpt		Excerpt according to Malaysia Plan (n = 216 excerpt)										
	Count	Percent (%)	2nd	3rd	4th	5th	6th	7th	8th	9th	10th	11th	12th
Affordable housing and living conditions	28	50.0	3	1	1	5	1	1	2	2	1	4	7
Utilities and public service access	28	50.0	3	1	2	10	0	2	3	2	1	0	4

Human Capital Development

The human capital development category includes codes describing poverty alleviation programmes relevant to education and capacity enhancement, such as skills training, post-training startup capital, and mentor-mentee entrepreneurship schemes. This category was represented by 51 excerpts, accounting for 23.6% of the 216 excerpts. Table 4 demonstrates that the most frequently observed codes within this category were skills and entrepreneurship (26, 51.0%) and inclusive educational access (25, 49.0%). These codes were most commonly cited during the Twelfth Malaysia Plan (25, 11.6%), followed by the Tenth Malaysia Plan (13, 6.0%). By policy era, references appeared most frequently under the SPV period (25, 11.6%), followed by the NEM period (14, 6.5%).

eISSN 2600-9374

Journal of Administrative Science
Vol.22, Issue 2, 2025, pp.267-291
Available online at *http:jas.uitm.edu.my*

Table 4:
Codes under Human Capital Development

Codes	Total excerpt		Excerpt according to Malaysia Plan (n = 216 excerpt)										
	Count	Percent (%)	2nd	3rd	4th	5th	6th	7th	8th	9th	10th	11th	12th
Skills and entrepreneurship	26	51.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	9	0	12
Inclusive education access	25	49.0	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	1	4	1	13

Stimulating Economic Growth

The stimulating economic growth category includes codes describing poverty alleviation programmes that enhance low-income individuals' employment opportunities and income generation. This category was represented by 39 excerpts, accounting for 18.1% of the total 216 excerpts. Table 5 shows that the most frequently observed codes within this category were income-generating programmes (31, 79.5%) and employment creation (8, 20.5%). These codes were most commonly cited during the Twelfth Malaysia Plan (16, 7.4%). By policy era, this category appeared most frequently under the SPV era (16, 7.4%) and followed by the NVP era (10, 4.6%).

Table 5:
Stimulating Economic Growth

Codes	Total excerpt		Excerpt according to Malaysia Plan (n = 216 excerpt)										
	Count	Percent (%)	2nd	3rd	4th	5th	6th	7th	8th	9th	10th	11th	12th
Income-generating programme	31	79.5	0	0	0	1	0	4	6	3	3	0	14
Employment creation	8	20.5	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	2

Agricultural and Land Development

The agricultural and land development category includes codes for poverty alleviation programmes that modernise agriculture and improve access to land and infrastructure. This category was represented by 27 excerpts, accounting for 12.5% of the 216 excerpts. Table 6 shows that the most frequently observed codes in this category were rural transformation (12, 44.4%), integrated farm development (8, 29.6%), rubber planting initiatives (5, 18.5%), and agricultural infrastructure (2, 7.4%).

eISSN 2600-9374

Journal of Administrative Science
Vol.22, Issue 2, 2025, pp.267-291
Available online at *http:jas.uitm.edu.my*

These codes were most commonly cited during the Fifth Malaysia Plan (12, 5.6%) and followed by the Fourth Malaysia Plan (5, 2.3%). By policy era, references appeared most frequently under the NEM period (21, 9.7%).

Table 6:
Agricultural and Land Development

Codes	Total excerpt		Excerpt according to Malaysia Plan (n = 216 excerpt)										
	Count	Percent (%)	2nd	3rd	4th	5th	6th	7th	8th	9th	10th	11th	12th
Rural land transformation	12	44.4%	1	1	3	4	0	0	0	1	2	0	0
Integrated farm development	8	29.6%	0	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	2	0	1
Rubber planting initiatives	5	18.5%	1	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Agricultural infrastructure	2	7.4%	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Promoting Microfinance Scheme

The promoting microfinance scheme category focuses on improving financial access for poor and marginalised communities through small-scale credit and institutional loans. This category was represented by 25 excerpts, accounting for 11.6% of the total 216 excerpts. Table 7 demonstrates that the most frequently observed codes within this category were access to micro-credit schemes (22, 88.0%), followed by financial inclusion and capital ownership (3, 12.0%). These codes were most commonly cited during the Eighth Malaysia Plan (6, 2.8%) and the Ninth Malaysia Plan (4, 1.9%). By policy era, references appeared most frequently under the NVP period (10, 4.6%), followed by the NEP and SPV (5, 2.3%).

Table 7:
Promoting Microfinance Scheme

Codes	Total excerpt		Excerpt according to Malaysia Plan (n = 216 excerpt)										
	Count	Percent (%)	2nd	3rd	4th	5th	6th	7th	8th	9th	10th	11th	12th
Access to micro-credit scheme	22	88.0%	3	0	0	2	0	2	5	3	1	1	5
Financial inclusion and capital ownership	3	12.0%	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0

eISSN 2600-9374

Journal of Administrative Science
Vol.22, Issue 2, 2025, pp.267-291
Available online at *http:jas.uitm.edu.my*

Cash/ Income Transfer Programme

The cash/ income transfer programme category includes codes for monetary assistance to supplement income for low-income households to alleviate poverty and reduce income inequality. This category was represented by nine excerpts, accounting for 4.2% of the 216 excerpts. Table 8 shows that the most frequently observed codes within this category were basic need support (5, 55.6%) and targeted assistance (4, 44.4%). These codes were most commonly cited during the Twelfth Malaysia Plan (8, 3.7%), followed by the Eleventh Malaysia Plan (1, 0.5%). By the policy era, references appeared frequently during the SPV period (8, 3.7%).

Table 8:
Cash/Income Transfer Programme

Codes	Total excerpt		Excerpt according to Malaysia Plan (n = 216 excerpt)										
	Count	Percent (%)	2nd	3rd	4th	5th	6th	7th	8th	9th	10th	11th	12th
Basic need support	5	55.6%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Targeted assistance	4	44.4%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3

Improving the Marketing Systems

The improving marketing systems category includes codes that describe efforts to strengthen the infrastructure and mechanisms for efficient product distribution and sales. This category was represented by five excerpts, accounting for 2.3% of the 216 excerpts. Table 9 demonstrates that the most frequently observed codes within this category were enhanced market access (3, 60.0%), equally shared by inclusive market channels and digital market integration (1, 20.0%). These codes were most commonly cited during the Twelfth Malaysia Plan (3, 1.4%) and the Tenth Malaysia Plan (2, 0.9%). By policy era, references appeared most frequently under the SPV era (3, 1.4%) and followed by the NEM era (2, 0.9%).

Table 9:
Improving the Marketing Systems

Codes	Total excerpt		Excerpt according to Malaysia Plan (n = 216 excerpt)										
	Count	Percent (%)	2nd	3rd	4th	5th	6th	7th	8th	9th	10th	11th	12th
Enhanced market	3	60.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	1

eISSN 2600-9374

Journal of Administrative Science
Vol.22, Issue 2, 2025, pp.267-291
Available online at *http:jas.uitm.edu.my*

access												
Inclusive market channels	1	20.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Digital market integration	1	20.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Social Protection

The social protection category includes codes for initiatives designed to protect individuals and households from socio-economic vulnerabilities and poverty, especially among marginalised groups. This category included four excerpts, representing 1.9% of the total 216 excerpts. Table 10 shows that the most frequently observed codes within this category were insurance access (2, 50.0%) and voluntary protection (2, 50.0%). These codes were exclusively cited during the Twelfth Malaysia Plan (4, 1.9%). By policy era, this category only appeared under the SPV era (4, 1.9%).

Table 10:
Social Protection

Codes	Total excerpt		Excerpt according to Malaysia Plan (n = 216 excerpt)										
	Count	Percent (%)	2nd	3rd	4th	5th	6th	7th	8th	9th	10th	11th	12th
Insurance access	2	50.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Voluntary protection	2	50.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

DISCUSSION

This section discusses the typological patterns emerging from Malaysia's poverty alleviation programmes as identified through content analysis. It analyses key focus areas, strategic developments across policy eras, underrepresented program types, and institutional continuity trends. The analysis contextualises the findings within broader discussions on theory, policy, and global development to better understand Malaysia's anti-poverty strategies.

Dominant Programme Focus Areas: Infrastructure and Human Capital

The typology shows that Malaysia's poverty alleviation efforts have concentrated mainly on basic infrastructure and amenities, human capital development,

eISSN 2600-9374

Journal of Administrative Science
Vol.22, Issue 2, 2025, pp.267-291
Available online at *http:jas.uitm.edu.my*

and stimulating economic growth, accounting for over 65% of programme references. This reflects a structuralist logic that attributes poverty to limited access to services, employment, and education (Cotter, 2002; Calnitsky, 2018), consistent with the NEP's redistributive approach. Infrastructure initiatives such as rural roads, housing, electricity, and water have been central in reducing rural-urban disparities, particularly during the NEP and subsequent Malaysia Plans.

Parallel to this, investments in human capital, especially in education and skills, have aimed to foster social mobility, particularly among B40 households. These efforts were prominent under the NDP and NVP, focusing on expanding access to education, training, and healthcare. Such interventions support intergenerational mobility by improving long-term life outcomes for disadvantaged families. This focus aligns with global poverty literature, which identifies education and infrastructure as core enablers of opportunity and inclusive development (Foster et al., 2011; Berthod, 2018; Eryong & Xiuping, 2018; Akbar et al., 2022; Saadaoui Mallek et al., 2024).

Strategic Evolution and Thematic Shifts Across Policy Eras

Malaysia's poverty strategy has gradually shifted from broad structural interventions toward more targeted and empowerment-driven approaches, particularly under the NEM and the SPV era. While infrastructure and education continue to dominate programme portfolios, the growing inclusion of microfinance schemes (e.g., TEKUN, AIM), conditional cash transfers, and livelihood insurance reflects a shift toward addressing vulnerability and social inclusion. This signals a recognition that poverty is not solely a function of productivity deficits, but also exposure to risk and institutional exclusion. The COVID-19 pandemic served as a critical juncture, exposing the fragility of informal and low-income households and reinforcing the urgency of building robust social safety nets (Pak et al., 2020; Suryahadi et al., 2020; Harith & Jamil, 2021; World Bank, 2021; Khudaykulova et al., 2022; UNDP, 2022). Although modest in volume, these targeted interventions represent alignment with international good practices and Sustainable Development Goals (United Nations, 2015; Brickenstein, 2015; Ulriksen & Plagerson, 2016).

Nonetheless, the implementation of such targeted strategies reveals persistent institutional challenges. Eligibility is often determined through proxy means testing or community-based assessments, both of which risk exclusion errors and subjective bias

eISSN 2600-9374

(Alatas et al., 2012; Hanna & Olken, 2018; Shrider, 2024). Malaysia’s eKasih system balances efficiency and equity, yet concerns over leakage, accuracy, and transparency remain (Jamaluddin & Hanafiah, 2018, 2020; Mohd Nor & Khelghat-Doost, 2019). Malaysia's adoption of consolidated cash transfer frameworks remains cautious compared to more integrated systems in countries like Brazil and Mexico (Fiszbein et al., 2014). Although recent Malaysia Plans reflect rhetorical commitment to policy innovation, the limited institutional mainstreaming of these newer programmes suggests enduring path dependency. This tension between strategic ambition and structural inertia continues to constrain the realisation of more inclusive and adaptive poverty reduction models.

Low-Frequency Categories: Gaps or Strategic Oversight?

The underrepresentation of specific categories, namely, improving the marketing systems, cash/income transfer programme, and social protection, which account for only 8% of excerpts, raises important concerns about visibility and prioritisation. Limited attention to market access strategies such as cooperative marketing, price stabilisation, and post-harvest handling is notable, especially given persistent constraints faced by smallholders (Ranjan, 2017; Ola & Menapace, 2020; Ayoo, 2022). Although the Tenth and Twelfth Malaysia Plans show efforts to integrate B40 entrepreneurs into markets, initiatives remain fragmented. Attempts to bypass intermediaries and adopt inclusive supply chains signal intent but fall short of the structural transformation needed for agrarian resilience.

Similarly, cash transfers and social protection measures appear marginal in Malaysia’s policy discourse, likely due to productivity-focused preferences (Asmorowati & Yuda, 2024), fiscal caution (Slater, 2011; Hanna & Olken, 2018), and targeting challenges (Vadapalli, 2009; Cameron & Shah, 2014). Nonetheless, their growing presence in the Twelfth Malaysia Plan Mid-term Review suggests a gradual shift toward integrating short-term buffers with long-term goals. Social protection remains underreported despite operational relevance, limiting its policy traction (Fiszbein et al., 2014). While recent plans reflect evolving perspectives, greater integration of market systems and risk protection mechanisms is needed to build household resilience beyond income generation alone.

eISSN 2600-9374

Journal of Administrative Science
Vol.22, Issue 2, 2025, pp.267-291
Available online at *http:jas.uitm.edu.my*

Institutional Path Dependency and Policy Continuities

The typology highlights strong institutional path dependency in Malaysia's poverty alleviation efforts. Although policy narratives have shifted from the NEP's emphasis on structuralism to the SPV's focus on inclusivity, the core programme types have mainly remained consistent for over five decades. Programmes involving land development, agricultural expansion, infrastructure, and rural resettlement continue to feature prominently across the Malaysia Plans. This pattern reflects incremental adaptation rather than comprehensive transformation (Mahoney & Thelen, 2009). While such stability promotes coherence and administrative continuity, it may also entrench outdated models that are ill-suited to address emerging challenges, such as urban poverty, informal sector vulnerabilities, and gendered deprivation.

Institutional inertia is further reflected in the continued dominance of agencies like FELDA and RISDA, signalling deep roots in Malaysia's post-independence development structure (Hannan & Freeman, 1984). Although the New Economic Model (2011–2020) and Shared Prosperity Vision (2020–2030) have incorporated broader goals such as inclusivity and multidimensional well-being, they still rely on legacy programmes. Hodgson (2002) notes that institutions often reproduce prevailing assumptions unless disrupted by reformist movements or external shocks. Without agile and cross-sectoral policy instruments, Malaysia's poverty strategy risks falling behind in addressing the increasingly complex and urban nature of poverty.

CONCLUSION

This study examines the typology of poverty eradication programmes embodied in Malaysia's main national development planning policy documents. It uses qualitative content analysis of 216 excerpts from the Second to Twelfth Malaysia Plans and their Mid-Term Reviews. Eight strategic categories and 19 thematic areas were identified, providing a structured overview of the poverty alleviation programmes and their evolution.

The findings reveal that Malaysia's poverty reduction efforts remain primarily oriented towards structural interventions such as infrastructure development, education, and job creation, echoing the logic of redistributive growth. However, the content analysis also highlights an emerging shift towards more individualised and targeted

eISSN 2600-9374

Journal of Administrative Science
Vol.22, Issue 2, 2025, pp.267-291
Available online at *http:jas.uitm.edu.my*

approaches, including microfinance, entrepreneurship development, and limited social protection schemes. Several critical dimensions, notably market integration and direct income support, remain small in the programmatic landscape. This pattern indicates that while Malaysia's strategy has achieved significant progress, especially in rural development and reducing absolute poverty, there are thematic gaps that necessitate enhanced integration and innovation.

Despite its contribution to the clarity of the typology, this study has several limitations. First, it relies solely on specific national policy documents, particularly the Malaysia Plan, which reflect planned intentions rather than real-time implementation or outcomes. As a result, the study does not capture how programmes are implemented, whether they are delivered equitably, or how beneficiaries experience them. Second, the analysis may under-represent informal, local, or inter-agency programmes not explicitly documented in central planning texts. Third, content analysis of citation frequency does not convey information about the budgetary weight of programmes, geographic targeting, or administrative coordination.

Future research should complement this document-based typology with field-based investigations that examine how programmes are implemented on the ground. Interviews with policymakers, frontline implementers, and program beneficiaries can illuminate anti-poverty strategies' practical relevance, validity, and coherence. Longitudinal case studies and fiscal tracking analyses can help assess the alignment between planning intentions and program delivery. Comparative research across similar upper-middle-income contexts would also provide insights into institutional best practices, social protection innovations, and cross-sector coordination frameworks.

This typological study provides a significant diagnostic framework for evaluating Malaysia's poverty policy instrument. It emphasises the importance of balancing a legacy infrastructure-driven approach with more responsive, multidimensional, and inclusive interventions. As Malaysia navigates increasing socio-economic complexity, future policies must evolve to reduce poverty and build long-term resilience and equity.

eISSN 2600-9374

Journal of Administrative Science
Vol.22, Issue 2, 2025, pp.267-291
Available online at *http:jas.uitm.edu.my*

Acknowledgements

The authors gratefully acknowledge the reviewers for their insightful comments and constructive suggestions, that have improved the quality of this manuscript.

Funding

The paper has no source of funding.

Author contributions

The author conceptualised the study, designed the methodology, conducted the data collection and analysis, and wrote and revised the manuscript.

Conflict of interest

There is no conflict of interest associated with this publication.

References

Abdelatti, H., Elhadary, Y., & Samat, N. (2016). Addressing Poverty in Sudan and Malaysia: A Story of Success and Constraints. *Journal of Sustainable Development*, *9*(2), 206. https://doi.org/10.5539/jsd.v9n2p206

Adebayo, O., Bolarin, O., Oyewale, A., & Kehinde, O. (2018). Impact of irrigation technology use on crop yield, crop income and household food security in Nigeria: A treatment effect approach. *AIMS Agriculture and Food*, *3*(2), 154–171. https://doi.org/10.3934/agrfood.2018.2.154

Adetoro, A. A., Ngidi, M. S. C., Danso-Abbeam, G., Ojo, T. O., & Ogundeji, A. A. (2022). Impact of irrigation on welfare and vulnerability to poverty in South African farming households. *Scientific African*, *16*, e01177. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sciaf.2022.e01177

Akbar, M., Abdullah, Naveed, A., & Syed, S. H. (2022). Does an Improvement in Rural Infrastructure Contribute to Alleviate Poverty in Pakistan? A Spatial Econometric Analysis. *Social Indicators Research*, *162*(1), 475–499. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-021-02851-z

Alatas, V., Banerjee, A., Hanna, R., Olken, B. A., & Tobias, J. (2012). Targeting the

eISSN 2600-9374

Poor: Evidence from a Field Experiment in Indonesia. *American Economic Review*, *102*(4), 1206–1240. https://doi.org/10.1257/aer.102.4.1206

Arndt, C., McKay, A., & Tarp, F. (Eds.). (2016). *Growth and Poverty in Sub-Saharan Africa*. Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780198744795.001.0001

Asmorowati, S., & Yuda, T. K. (2024). How can child assistance policy supporting familisation be supported? *International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy*, *44*(11/12), 991–999. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJSSP-03-2024-0118

Ayoo, C. (2022). Poverty Reduction Strategies in Developing Countries. In *Rural Development - Education, Sustainability, Multifunctionality*. IntechOpen. https://doi.org/10.5772/intechopen.101472

Baird, S., McIntosh, C., Özler, B., & Pape, U. (2024). Asset transfers and anti-poverty programs: Experimental evidence from Tanzania. *Journal of Development Economics*, *166*, 103182. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jdeveco.2023.103182

Berthod, O. (2018). Institutional Theory of Organizations. In *Global Encyclopedia of Public Administration, Public Policy, and Governance* (pp. 3306–3310). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-20928-9_63

Boltana, A., Tafesse, A., Belay, A., Recha, J. W., & M.Osano, P. (2023). Impact of credit on household food security: The case of Omo microfinance institution in southern Ethiopia. *Journal of Agriculture and Food Research*, *14*, 100903. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jafr.2023.100903

Brickenstein, C. (2015). Social protection of foreign seasonal workers: from state to best practice. *Comparative Migration Studies*, *3*(1), 2. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40878-015-0004-9

Calnitsky, D. (2018). Structural and individualistic theories of poverty. *Sociology Compass*, *12*(12). https://doi.org/10.1111/soc4.12640

Cameron, L., & Shah, M. (2014). Can Mistargeting Destroy Social Capital and Stimulate Crime? Evidence from a Cash Transfer Program in Indonesia. *Economic Development and Cultural Change*, *62*(2), 381–415. https://doi.org/10.1086/674102

Clark, N. (2002). Innovation Systems, Institutional Change And The New Knowledge Market: Implications For Third World Agricultural Development. *Economics of Innovation and New Technology*, *11*(4–5), 353–368. https://doi.org/10.1080/10438590200000004

Cotter, D. A. (2002). Poor People in Poor Places: Local Opportunity Structures and Household Poverty. *Rural Sociology*, *67*(4), 534–555.

eISSN 2600-9374

Journal of Administrative Science
Vol.22, Issue 2, 2025, pp.267-291
Available online at *http:jas.uitm.edu.my*

https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1549-0831.2002.tb00118.x

Crespo Cuaresma, J., Fengler, W., Kharas, H., Bekhtiar, K., Brottrager, M., & Hofer, M. (2018). Will the Sustainable Development Goals be fulfilled? Assessing present and future global poverty. *Palgrave Communications*, *4*(1), 29. https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-018-0083-y

de Janvry, A., & Sadoulet, E. (2010). Agricultural Growth and Poverty Reduction: Additional Evidence. *The World Bank Research Observer*, *25*(1), 1–20. https://doi.org/10.1093/wbro/lkp015

DOSM. (2023). *Malaysian Poverty Report 2022*.

Economic Planning Unit. (2010). *Tenth Malaysia Plan 2011 - 2015*.

Economic Planning Unit. (2021). *Twelfth Malaysia Plan, 2021-2025*.

Eryong, X., & Xiuping, Z. (2018). Education and anti-poverty: Policy theory and strategy of poverty alleviation through education in China. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, *50*(12), 1101–1112. https://doi.org/10.1080/00131857.2018.1438889

Fiszbein, A., Kanbur, R., & Yemtsov, R. (2014). Social Protection and Poverty Reduction: Global Patterns and Some Targets. *World Development*, *61*, 167–177. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2014.04.010

Foster, W., Valdés, A., Davis, B., & Anríquez, G. (2011). The Constraints to Escaping Rural Poverty: An Analysis of the Complementarities of Assets in Developing Countries. *Applied Economic Perspectives and Policy*, *33*(4), 528–565. https://doi.org/10.1093/aepp/ppr031

Glover, D. (2022). Affordances and agricultural technology. *Journal of Rural Studies*, *94*, 73–82. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrurstud.2022.05.007

Gomez, E. T., & Jomo, K. S. (1999). *Malaysia's Political Economy: Politics, Patronage and Profits* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.

Government of Malaysia. (1965). *First Malaysia Plan (1966 - 1970)*.

Grimm, M., Soubeiga, S., & Weber, M. (2024). Supporting small firms in a fragile context: Comparing matching and cash grants in Burkina Faso. *Journal of Development Economics*, *171*, 103344. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jdeveco.2024.103344

Gu, Y., Guo, S., Qin, X., Wang, Z., Zhang, C., & Zhang, T. (2022). Global Justice Index Report 2021. *Chinese Political Science Review*, *7*(3), 322–465. https://doi.org/10.1007/s41111-022-00220-w

Hanna, R., & Olken, B. A. (2018). Universal Basic Incomes versus Targeted Transfers: Anti-Poverty Programs in Developing Countries. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, *32*(4), 201–226. https://doi.org/10.1257/jep.32.4.201

eISSN 2600-9374

Hannan, M. T., & Freeman, J. (1984). Structural Inertia and Organizational Change. *American Sociological Review*, *49*(2), 149. https://doi.org/10.2307/2095567

Harith, N. H. M., & Jamil, N. F. A. (2021). Realities of Economic Livelihood Strategies of Urban Poor Malay Families During Covid-19 Pandemic. *E-Proceeding of the 8th International Conference on Public Policy and Social Science (ICoPS) 2021*, *1*(October), 47–52.

Hodgson, G. M. (2002). The Evolution of Institutions: An Agenda for Future Theoretical Research. *Constitutional Political Economy*, *13*(2), 111–127. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1015301101712

Hsieh, H.-F., & Shannon, S. E. (2005). Three Approaches to Qualitative Content Analysis. *Qualitative Health Research*, *15*(9), 1277–1288. https://doi.org/10.1177/1049732305276687

Imai, K., Arun, T., & Annim, S. K. (2010). *Microfinance and Household Poverty Reduction: New evidence from India* (No. 1008; EDP).

Jamaluddin, Z., & Hanafiah, N. M. A. (2018). Poverty Eradication through Productive Welfare Approach in Malaysia. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, *8*(9). https://doi.org/10.6007/ijarbss/v8-i9/4690

Jamaluddin, Z., & Hanafiah, N. M. A. (2020). Poverty and Productive Welfare in Malaysia. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, *10*(8). https://doi.org/10.6007/ijarbss/v10-i8/7661

Jomo, K. S. (2005). Malaysia's New Economic Policy and 'National Unity. In *Racism and Public Policy* (pp. 182–214). Palgrave Macmillan UK. https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230554986_8

Kaiser, N., & Barstow, C. K. (2022). Rural Transportation Infrastructure in Low- and Middle-Income Countries: A Review of Impacts, Implications, and Interventions. *Sustainability*, *14*(4), 2149. https://doi.org/10.3390/su14042149

Karim, M. R. B. A. (1995). Improving the Efficiency of the Public Sector: A Case-Study of Malaysia. *Twelfth Meeting of Experts on the United Nations Program in Public Administration and Finance*.

Karnani, A. (2017). Marketing and Poverty Alleviation: The Perspective of the Poor. *Markets, Globalization & Development Review*, *2*(1). https://doi.org/10.23860/MGDR-2017-02-01-05

Kayongo, S., & Mathiassen, L. (2023). Improving agricultural relations and innovation: financial inclusion through microfinancing. *Journal of Business & Industrial Marketing*, *38*(11), 2460–2470. https://doi.org/10.1108/JBIM-10-2022-0459

Khandker, S. R., Samad, H. A., & Khan, Z. H. (1998). Income and employment effects

eISSN 2600-9374

of micro-credit programmes: Village-level evidence from Bangladesh. *Journal of Development Studies*, *35*(2), 96–124. https://doi.org/10.1080/00220389808422566

Khudaykulova, M., Yuanqiong, H., & Khudaykulov, A. (2022). Economic Consequences and Implications of the Ukraine-Russia War. *The International Journal of Management Science and Business Administration*, *8*(4), 44–52. https://doi.org/10.18775/ijmsba.1849-5664-5419.2014.84.1005

Koutronas, E. (2020). Social Protection for All: The Next Step for the Malaysian Welfare. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3633760

Krippendorff, K. (2004). *Content Analysis: An Introduction to Its Methodology*. SAGE Publications.

Kumara, A. S., & Pfau, W. D. (2011). Impact of Cash Transfer Programmes on School Attendance and Child Poverty: An Ex Ante Simulation for Sri Lanka. *Journal of Development Studies*, *47*(11), 1699–1720. https://doi.org/10.1080/00220388.2010.536223

Liu, T., He, G., & Turvey, C. G. (2021). Inclusive Finance, Farm Households Entrepreneurship, and Inclusive Rural Transformation in Rural Poverty-stricken Areas in China. *Emerging Markets Finance and Trade*, *57*(7), 1929–1958. https://doi.org/10.1080/1540496X.2019.1694506

Ma, W., Rahut, D. B., Sonobe, T., & Gong, B. (2024). Linking farmers to markets: Barriers, solutions, and policy options. *Economic Analysis and Policy*, *82*, 1102–1112. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eap.2024.05.005

Mahler, D. G., Yonzan, N., & Lakner, L. (2022). *The Impact of COVID-19 on Global Inequality and Poverty*.

Mahoney, J., & Thelen, K. (Eds.). (2009). A Theory of Gradual Institutional Change. In *Explaining Institutional Change: Ambiguity, Agency, and Power* (pp. 1–37). Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/DOI: 10.1017/CBO9780511806414.003

Malaysia. (1971). *Second Malaysia Plan, 1971-1975*.

Marion, P., Lwamba, E., Floridi, A., Pande, S., Bhattacharyya, M., Young, S., Villar, P. F., & Shisler, S. (2024). The effects of agricultural output market access interventions on agricultural, socio-economic, food security, and nutrition outcomes in low- and middle-income countries: A systematic review. *Campbell Systematic Reviews*, *20*(2). https://doi.org/10.1002/cl2.1411

Mariyono, J. (2019). Microcredit and technology adoption. *Agricultural Finance Review*, *79*(1), 85–106. https://doi.org/10.1108/AFR-05-2017-0033

Markelova, H., & Mwangi, E. (2010). Collective Action for Smallholder Market

eISSN 2600-9374

Access: Evidence and Implications for Africa. *Review of Policy Research*, *27*(5), 621–640. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1541-1338.2010.00462.x

Miled, K. B. H., Younsi, M., & Landolsi, M. (2022). Does microfinance program innovation reduce income inequality? Cross-country and panel data analysis. *Journal of Innovation and Entrepreneurship*, *11*(1), 7. https://doi.org/10.1186/s13731-022-00195-7

Ministry of Economy. (2023). *Mid-term Review of the Twelfth Malaysia Plan 2021-2025*. https://www.ekonomi.gov.my

Mohd Nor, R., & Khelghat-Doost, H. (2019). 1AZAM Programme: The Challenges and Prospects of Poverty Eradication in Malaysia. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, *9*(1). https://doi.org/10.6007/ijarbss/v9-i1/5420

Narayan, D. (2002). Empowerment and Poverty Reduction: A Sourcebook. In *Empowerment and Poverty Reduction*. World Bank. https://doi.org/10.1596/0-8213-5166-4

Narayan, D., & Petesch, P. (2002). *Voice from the Poor: From Many land* (D. Narayan & P. Petesch (Eds.)). Oxford University Press.

Neves, J. A., Vasconcelos, F. de A. G. de, Machado, M. L., Recine, E., Garcia, G. S., & Medeiros, M. A. T. de. (2022). The Brazilian cash transfer program (Bolsa Família): A tool for reducing inequalities and achieving social rights in Brazil. *Global Public Health*, *17*(1), 26–42. https://doi.org/10.1080/17441692.2020.1850828

Oconnor, C. (2024). Do conditional cash transfers create resilience against poverty? Long-run evidence from Jamaica. *World Development*, *176*, 106513. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2023.106513

Ojong, N., & Simba, A. (2019). Fostering micro-entrepreneurs' structural and relational social capital through microfinance. *Journal of Small Business & Entrepreneurship*, *31*(1), 1–20. https://doi.org/10.1080/08276331.2017.1423161

Ola, O., & Menapace, L. (2020). Revisiting constraints to smallholder participation in high-value markets: A best-worst scaling approach. *Agricultural Economics*, *51*(4), 595–608. https://doi.org/10.1111/agec.12574

Othman, A., Mohd Noor, A. H., & Abdul Rasool, M. S. (2023). Being Poor or Feeling Poor: Multifaceted Poverty Among Low Income Households (B40) in Malaysia. *Russian Law Journal*, *11*(4s). https://doi.org/10.52783/rlj.v11i4s.864

Otsuka, K., & Ali, M. (2020). Strategy for the development of agro-based clusters. *World Development Perspectives*, *20*, 100257.

eISSN 2600-9374

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wdp.2020.100257

Page, L., & Pande, R. (2018). Ending Global Poverty: Why Money Isn't Enough. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, *32*(4), 173–200. https://doi.org/10.1257/jep.32.4.173

Pak, A., Adegboye, O. A., Adekunle, A. I., Rahman, K. M., McBryde, E. S., & Eisen, D. P. (2020). Economic Consequences of the COVID-19 Outbreak: The Need for Epidemic Preparedness. *Frontiers in Public Health*, *8*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2020.00241

Rahman, M. H. A., Zubairi, Y. Z., & Othman, A. (2022). REASSESSING POVERTY INCIDENCE BROUGHT BY THE COVID-19 PANDEMIC IN MALAYSIA. *Journal of Southeast Asian Studies*, *27*(1), 88–110. https://doi.org/10.22452/jati.vol27no1.5

Ranjan, R. (2017). Challenges to Farm Produce Marketing: A Model of Bargaining between Farmers and Middlemen under Risk. *Journal of Agricultural and Resource Economics, 42*(3). https://doi.org/10.22004/ag.econ.264068

Ravallion, M. (2016). *The Economics of Poverty: History, Measurement and policy*. Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780190212766.001.0001

Republic of Kenya. (2010). *First Medium Term Plan 2008 - 2012*.

Riddell, R., & Robinson, M. (1992). *The Impact of NGO Poverty Alleviation Projects: Results of the Case Study Evaluations* (No. 68).

Ridzuan, M. I. M., Morshidi, A. Bin, Zakaria, N. S., Idris, R. Z., & Jambol, D. J. A. (2024). Unraveling the nexus: Exploring Malaysia's research trends in advancing UN SDG 1. *Multidisciplinary Reviews*, *8*(2), 2025050. https://doi.org/10.31893/multirev.2025050

Saadaoui Mallek, R., Awad, A., Ozturk, I., & ben Douissa, I. (2024). Infrastructure development and poverty eradication in sub-Saharan Africa; Its effect and transmission channels. *Cities*, *144*, 104658. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cities.2023.104658

Sabran, M. S. (2023). Model Pembangunan Komuniti. *Pertanika Journal of Social Sciences & Humanities*, *112*, 135–145.

Sachs, J. D. (2005). *The End of Poverty: The Economic Possibilities for Our Time*. Penguin Press.

Shrider, E. A. (2024). *Poverty in the United States: 2023*.

Siwar, C. (2006). Good Governance for Poverty Alleviation: the Case of Malaysia. *Chinese Public Administration Review*, *3*. https://doi.org/10.22140/cpar.v3i3.4.57

eISSN 2600-9374

Slater, R. (2011). Cash transfers, social protection and poverty reduction. *International Journal of Social Welfare*, *20*(3), 250–259. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2397.2011.00801.x

Suryahadi, A., Al Izzati, R., & Suryadarma, D. (2020). Estimating the Impact of Covid-19 on Poverty in Indonesia. *Bulletin of Indonesian Economic Studies*, *56*(2), 175–192. https://doi.org/10.1080/00074918.2020.1779390

Ulriksen, M. S., & Plagerson, S. (2016). The principles and practice of social protection. *Global Social Policy*, *16*(2), 127–131. https://doi.org/10.1177/1468018116646034

UN. (2024). *World Economic Situation and Prospects 2024*. https://www.un.org/development/desa/dpad/publication/world-economic-situation-and-prospects-2024/

UNDP. (2022). *Human Development Report 2021/2022: Uncertain Times, Unsettled Lives: Shaping Our Future in a Transforming World*. https://hdr.undp.org/content/human-development-report-2021-22

UNICEF Malaysia. (2024). *The Living on the Edge Key Findings*.

United Nations. (2015). *Transforming Our World: The 2030 Agenda For Sustainable Development United Nations United Nations*. https://sdgs.un.org/2030agenda

Vadapalli, D. K. (2009). Barriers and challenges in accessing social transfers and role of social welfare services in improving targeting efficiency: A study of conditional cash transfers. *Vulnerable Children and Youth Studies*, *4*(sup1), 41–54. https://doi.org/10.1080/17450120903111883

Van Crowder, L. (1997). Marketing Information Systems for Small-Scale Farmers. *Information Development*, *13*(4), 179–183. https://doi.org/10.1177/0266666974238861

Vatta, K. (2003). Microfinance and Poverty Alleviation. *Economic and Political Weekly*, *38*(5), 342–433. http://www.jstor.org/stable/4413155

Villar, P. F., Kozakiewicz, T., Bachina, V., Young, S., & Shisler, S. (2023). PROTOCOL: The effects of agricultural output market access interventions on agricultural, socio-economic and food and nutrition security outcomes in low- and middle-income countries: A systematic review. *Campbell Systematic Reviews*, *19*(3). https://doi.org/10.1002/cl2.1348

Wang, Z., & Sun, S. (2016). Transportation infrastructure and rural development in China. *China Agricultural Economic Review*, *8*(3), 516–525. https://doi.org/10.1108/CAER-09-2015-0115

World Bank. (2000). *World Development Report 2000/2001 (UN): Attacking Poverty*.

eISSN 2600-9374

Oxford University Press.

World Bank. (2001). *Poverty Reduction in Indonesia: Constructing a New Strategy*.

World Bank. (2017). *Growing the Rural Non-Farm Economy to Alleviate Poverty: An Evaluation of the Contribution of the World Bank Group*.

World Bank. (2021). *Poverty and shared prosperity 2020: Reversals of fortune*.

World Bank Group. (2015). *Global Monitoring Report 2014/2015: Ending Poverty and Sharing Prosperity*. The World Bank. https://doi.org/10.1596/978-1-4648-0336-9

Xiao, H., Zheng, X., & Xie, L. (2022). Promoting pro-poor growth through infrastructure investment: Evidence from the Targeted Poverty Alleviation program in China. *China Economic Review*, *71*, 101729. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chieco.2021.101729

Yaakub, N. F., Masron, T., Marzuki, A., & Soda, R. (2022). GIS-Based Spatial Correlation Analysis: Sustainable Development and Two Generations of Demographic Changes. *Sustainability*, *14*(3), 1490. https://doi.org/10.3390/su14031490

eISSN 2600-9374