

**SOCIO-ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT OF THE
MALAYS: CASE OF KAMPONG SEBUYAU,
SARAWAK.**



**INSTITUTE OF RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT AND COMMERCIALIZATION
MARA UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY
40450 SHAH ALAM, SELANGOR**

PREPARED BY :

**JELANI BIN RAZALI
ABDUL JABBAR BIN ABDULLAH
MOHD SAPAWI BIN JAMAIN**

26 SEPTEMBER 2008

Acknowledgement

All praise to Allah SWT who has given us the guidance and strength to be steadfast in pursuit of knowledge amidst trails and challenges. We would like to express our sincere appreciation and gratitude to the following individuals and organization for their encouragement and assistance during the conduct of this research.

Associate Professor Dr. Jamil Hamali, Campus Director of UiTM Sarawak, Associate Professor Dr. Fatimah Bujang, Assistant Director Academic Affair UiTM Sarawak, Associate Professor Dr. Rosita Suhaimi, Head of Research Management Unit UiTM Sarawak for their encouragement and support in this research.

All UiTM Sarawak students who participated as enumerators during the student community project at Kampong Sebuyau, Sarawak for their time and effort in interviewing the respondents. The editors of this research, Puan Serah Hj Jaya, Puan Lucy Batchy and Encik Mikail Tan Abdullah who spent time and effort to edit this research.

Staff of Resident Office Kota Samarahan, District Officer of District office Simunjan, Sarawak Administrative Officer of Sub-District office Sebuyau and the residents of Kampong Sebuyau who had provided us with useful information on the development of Samarahan division.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1 : BACKGROUND AND INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Economic Development Concept and Rural Development	1
1.2 Sebuyau	2
1.3 Problem Statement	3
1.4 Objectives of Study	4
1.5 Data Collection	5
1.6 Instrumentation	5
1.7 Data Analysis	6
1.8 Limitation of The Study	6
1.8.1 Data and Sampling Method	6
1.8.2 Inference	6
CHAPTER 2 : LITERATURE REVIEW	7
2.1 Malaysia Development Plans	7
2.2 Malaysian Economic Development Achievements	8
2.2.1 Employment	10
2.2.2 Quality of Live	10
2.3 Malaysia Rural Development	12
2.4 Poverty	13
2.4.1 Definition and Measurement	13
2.4.2 The Malaysian Poverty Line Income	15
2.4.3 Rural Poverty	17
2.4.4 Poverty Eradication Through Public Expenditure	17
2.5 Rural Development Strategies and Plans	18
2.5.1 Agrarian Reform	18
2.5.2 Integrated Rural Development	19
2.5.3 Rural Growth Centre	20
2.6 Monthly Household and Poverty Incidence in Malaysia	21
2.7 Studies on The Economy of Sarawak	24
2.8 Samarahan Division Profile and Development	27
2.8.1 Population Breakdown and Growth	27
2.8.2 Population Distribution by Stratum	27
2.8.3 Public Health Service	28
2.8.4 Samarahan Economic Structure	28
2.8.5 Banking anf Finance	28
2.8.6 Industrial Areas	29
2.8.7 Roads Infrastructure	29
2.8.8 Telephone Services	29
2.8.9 Education Services	30
2.8.10 Tertiary Education	30
2.8.11 Recreation and Sport Facilities	31
2.8.12 Water Supply	31
2.8.13 Electricity	31

Executive summary

Rural development and rural poverty eradication have always been a priority in the Malaysian government development programmes as evidenced by all the previous Malaysian plans. The income gap between rural and urban population still exist as reflected by the incidence of poverty. The rate of rural poverty is still high as compared to urban areas. Though the poverty rate had declined significantly since 1970, rural poverty rate stands at 10% in 2002 as compared to 1.9% in urban area in the same year.

In kampong Sebuyau, only 27.31% of the household have income above RM600. Another 72.69 % of households have income between below RM600 per month, which is below the poverty line income for Sarawak. This also indicates that more than 70 % of the households in Kampong Sebuyau were living below the poverty line income.

Most of the households in Kpg. Sebuyau do not have agriculture land. Only 38.72% (103) owned agriculture land. This landless problem had jeopardized government effort to uplift the income and economic status of the residents through its land development policy.

Looking at the employment pattern, more than 50% of the households have no permanent or regular employment. They work as odd jobs laborers, van operators, boatmen and others. These pattern of employments engaged by the households are mostly low value-added and low income activities and has little impact in uplifting their social economic status.

A total of 103 families reported having family members who have migrated to the town areas. This accounted 36.9% of the number of respondents in the survey. Further analysis indicates most of them have one to five family members who have migrated to the town.

The available local resources have not been fully utilized. It is suggested that the government, in its effort to improve the socio-economic status of the residents, should take into account factors such as existing skills, experience and preference of the people, the resources endowment in the area, the value-added potentials that could be promoted and the employment creation potential for the people.

CHAPTER 1

BACKGROUND AND INTRODUCTION

1.1 ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT CONCEPT AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT

The term "economic development," typically refers to improvements in a variety of indicators such as literacy rates, life expectancy, and poverty rates. Gross Domestic Product is a specific measure of economic welfare that does not take into account important aspects such as leisure time, environmental quality, freedom, or social justice. Economic growth of any specific measure is not a sufficient definition of economic development.

About 36 per cent of the total population of Malaysia is concentrated in the rural area.. The urban expansion has not been so much as a result of planned urbanization. A major reason for urban expansion has been rural to urban migration, inspired by both pull and push factors. Rural development is, therefore essential in order to enable the rural population to improve their living conditions. This will indirectly discourage rural to urban migration, thereby facilitating planned urban development. The need for rural development is further supported as statistic shows that Malaysia's the income gap between rural and urban is still wide. In 1999, the per capita income of the urban household was RM3103 compared to RM1718 for rural household. The income gap continued to exist in 2004 where the per capita income of urban household was RM3956 but the rural household income was RM1875. This trend continue in 2007 whereby urban household per capita income was RM4325 but rural household per capita income was