

Insight of Poverty Income Line as a Determinant of Prudent Home Ownership in the 10th Malaysian Plan

Mohammed Yahaya Ubale, Prof. David Martin & Dr. Seow Ta Wee
Department of Real Estate Management, Faculty of Technology Management & Business
University Tun Hussein Onn Malaysia (UTHM)

* E-mail of the corresponding author: hp110058@siswa.uthm.edu.my

Abstract

Purpose – This paper will evaluate income line and relate same to housing affordability by the low income earners and the Malaysian vision 2020 mission of attaining a fully developed nation status vide sustainable development indices in the 10th Malaysian housing policy plan. The number of slum dwellers in the world has increased from 715 million in 1991 to 913 million in 2001, and to 998 million in 2005. Projections to 2020 suggest that the world will have up to 1.4 billion slum dwellers. Certainly, if the number of slum dwellers is increasing annually, it seems rather that **best** practiced housing policy is still **deficient** (United Nations Human development program 2006, p.16). Government officials are limited in the policy supported actions they are able to take in supporting the housing needs and aspirations of their citizenry.

Design/Approach – This paper analyses and sieve ideas from housing programs and sustainable developments. It equally draws criteria which shall be used as an interim assessment of the policy proposals that will pave way for the low income earners to own their homes.

Findings - The plan reserve policy programs for home ownership, strategies and programs that shall enable the country to emerge as a high-income nation. The development programs were tuned to the six National Key Results Areas, outlined in the Government Transformation Program, the National Key Economic program Areas of the Economic Transformation Program and the strategic economic reforms in the New Economic Model. The Plan details strategies towards a more focused role for the Government as a regulator and a catalyst for home ownership while upholding the principles of 1 Malaysia: People First, Performance Now to ensure effective delivery of service. But the poverty level has shoot from 3.8 to about 31% as suggested by Jayanath Appundurai. Equally, the RM800 set as the transition line from poverty is not sufficient; RM1886 is proposed to be more reasonable to meet the eight basic necessities.

Keywords: Malaysia, Home ownership, Poverty income line and the new economic model

1. Introduction

Malaysian housing programs have focused largely on the eradication of poverty and restructuring of the society through integration of the various ethnic communities. The government has provided a settlement policy to keep pace with Malaysia's rapid economic growth "to eradicate hard-core poverty, to bring a better quality life to her people and to conserve her forest eco-system for future generations (*Malaysia 2020, 1988*). Over the last three decades, the scope of development prospects undertaken by developers has increased from encompassing traditional housing projects to condominiums, townships, towering commercial complexes, shopping malls, state-of-the art golf courses, hospitals, theme parks and industrial estates. As the population increased, housing programs in urban areas were further accelerated with Vision 2020, an idea introduced in 1998 by the Prime minister, Dr. Mahathir Mohammad. The vision portrays an ambitious master plan, which forecasts that Malaysia would qualify as one of the fully developed nations by the year 2020. The present literacy level is about 88.7 per cent of the total population in Malaysia. This high literacy level has given the Prime Minister confidence to lay emphasis on the vision so that it will become a reality, (*Abdul Hamid, 1991*). It is also worth knowing that Malaysia got independence on 31st day of August, 1957.

2. Definition of 'Policy'

Policy means Plan of action, statement of aim and ideas, especially one made by a Government, political party, business company, etc. It also means a written statement of the terms of a contract of insurance, fire insurance, etc. (*Advanced Learners Dictionary of Current English*).

3. Methodology

This study implores qualitative methodology approach where inductive reasoning from specific observations to broader generalizations and theories are adopted. This bottom-up approach evaluated the relationship between policy and its implementation, housing delivery and its sustainability, correlation between housing and the factors impeding housing delivery, affordability of the housing units by the LIGs, policy forecasts for the accentuating population, opportunities, hitches and achievements of the policies, interplay of socio-economic elements, sustainability of the housing policies (among others). Physical indicators include the location of the housing units, its design that display aesthetics, accessibility and road thoroughfares or network, quality and frequency or availability of facilities, utilities, and services. Other Socio-economic indicators are income level, the extent of literacy level, dependency level of the beneficiaries, family ties, ethnicity and race, etc.

4. Theoretical Framework

Figure 1 shows the theoretical framework of this study, the essence of the study is as a result of the non affordability of housing units by the low income earners upon which they have RIGHT to adequate and affordable housing. This is connected with their low earnings plus high dependency ratio marred with family ties, ethics and race. For this problem to be solved, decent housing policy elements for sustainable home ownership shall be adopted. This can be achieved by increasing the supply of housing units by new constructions at suitable location, ensuring accessibility and availability of facilities, utilities and services, and allowing the LIGs to participate in the design for their future destinies. This physical elements should be supported by socio-economic elements like making the housing more affordable, provide basis for household improvement and make loans readily available. Achieving these parameters will result to prudent home ownership.

5. An overview of Malaysian Housing Policy Plans

Table 1 gives summary of the whole policy plans. Malaysia is further employing condominium-housing structure to achieve a settlement pattern that will accommodate all its racial groups as an indivisible multi-ethnic society. Politics - pertaining the public policy, concerned in the administration of government (*Webster's Encyclopaedic, 1996*). The vision of Malaysian Government is directed towards providing balanced and harmonious community living through the production and provision of affordable and quality housing units for the people that include the participation of the private sector developers in its development plans. It is this strategy of a mutually supporting working relationship between the public and private sectors that will propel Malaysia to the next quantum leap of development and progress. Economics relates to production, development and management of material wealth (*American Heritage Dictionary, 1996*). As the economy began to bounce back in the early 90's, a period, which saw a growing maturity in terms of new building concepts and quality, the private developers were successful in implementing and achieving the targeted housing units of low-cost houses on the basis that no ethnic group would experience any sense of absolute deprivation, as the middle-income class would find a good quality and affordable accommodation, so also, the low-income earners and high-income group will basically enjoy same.

5.1 Malaysian Housing Policy Plans (First – Fifth plans)

The first policy plan was implemented in 1966-1970 with the initial objective being to provide housing units as a component of social services. *World Power Dictionary* describe social as living in an organized group or community, (*World Power Dictionary, 2002*). The Second Housing Plan (1971-1975), the Third (1976-1980), Fourth (1981-1985) and the Fifth Housing (1986-1990) Plans were meant to improve Malaysia's socio-economy especially in poverty alleviation and the restructuring of the society. It was during this time that the first formal and well-structured housing programs were undertaken to provide low-cost housing to meet the needs and aspirations of the poor. With parallel advancement in the telecommunications and modern transport systems, the growth of urban and rural boundaries have expanded dramatically such that property developments are no longer centralized in one specific area, New townships have been emerged where it did not exist before. Nonetheless, the outcomes of housing policy at local and national level in Malaysia have contributed towards rural integration, harmony, joy and peace for its population as well as enhancing its Federal Republic unity.

5.2 Housing Development and Delivery (Sixth-Tenth Plans)

Housing and social services continue to be a priority of Malaysian development programs aimed at improving the quality of life and contributing towards a harmonious and caring society. The Sixth (1991-1995) and Seven (1996-2000) Malaysia housing policy Plans were intended to provide a balanced and equitable development for Malaysia. During the seventh plan period, however, various programs for the development of housing were implemented in the urban and rural areas. The overall performance of the Malaysian housing programs was encouraging, with achievement and successes surpassing the plan target. This is because both the public and the private sectors undertook various housing projects. While the private sector focused more specifically on the overall market demand, the public sector continues to provide houses for sale or rent to the low-income group and public sector employees. Housing programs continued to be implemented based on the human settlement concept, whereby housing estates were provided with communal and recreational facilities. The implementation of other social services, programs, like services in the local authorities, fire and rescue operations and services, library services, information and broadcasting, sports and culture as well as family and community development contributed towards improving the general welfare of the people and creating a well-informed, harmonious and a caring society.

In the eight-plan period (2001-2005), the objectives of the housing development programs were focused to increase accessibility to adequate, affordable and quality houses for all income groups. Priority was given to the development of low-and low medium-cost houses. Both the public and the private sectors have intensified their efforts in the implementation of the housing programs to meet the accentuating and increasing demand. The provision of other social services were continued and expanded with a view towards improving the quality of life, inculcating positive values and encouraging self-reliance. During the plan period, a total of 800, 000 units of houses were planned for construction to meet the housing needs. But interestingly, a total of 859, 480 units or 107.4 per cent of the plan target was completed. The private sector targeted to build 570,000 units but completed 737,856 units or 129.4 per cent of the target. However, the distribution based on the type of houses was not in line with the target set whereby the private sector mainly built medium-and high cost houses. This was reflected by the completion of a total of 554.458 units of medium and high-cost houses or 291.8 per cent of the plan target. In the area of Low-Cost housing category, the performance of both the public and private sectors was encouraging with a total of 190,597 units completed or 95.3 per cent of the target. Of this, 129,598 units were constructed by the private sector with the balance by the public sector including State Governments and State Economic Development Corporations (SEDCs). In an effort to increase the quality of low-cost houses, new designs with a floor area of 60 square meters incorporating three bedrooms as well as washing and drying areas especially in high-rise buildings were introduced. In the Low-Medium cost housing category, a total of 72,582 units or 20.7 per cent of the target set was achieved. The low performance was due to cautious Investment decision by housing developers.

The Ninth Malaysian Plan (2006-2010), was consistent to build a country with an advanced economy, balanced social development and a population which is united, cultured, honorable, skilled, progressive and far-sighted. To deliver this plan, they said we need to multiply our efforts towards achieving greater success in order to build a civilization that will elevate the nation's welfare and dignity.

Accordingly, the Tenth Malaysia Plan (2011-2015), houses the aspirations of both the Government Transformation Program and the New Economic Model, premised on high income, inclusiveness and sustainability. It dictates and charts the development of the nation for the next five years, anchored on delivering the desired outcomes for all Malaysians. The plan contains new policy directions, strategies and program that shall enable the country to emerge as a high-income nation. The development program were tuned to the six National Key Results Areas, outlined in the Government Transformation Program, the National Key Economic program Areas of the Economic Transformation Program and the strategic economic reforms in the New Economic Model. The Plan details strategies towards a more focused role for the Government as a regulator and a catalyst while upholding the principles of 1 Malaysia: **People First, Performance Now to ensure effective delivery of service.** Condominium building subjugate a large space of land, layout garden, roads with side-way shrubs and flowers planted on the tracks, car park, recreational facilities, swimming pool, tennis play court, squash, indoor badminton hall, gymnasium halls, and daily (24 hour) security guards etc. Condominiums are built up to 23-24 storeys or more and each level having a block of flats and each of the flats has the following components : 1 master bedroom and 2 bedrooms, a dining hall, kitchen, two-toilet system.

Some condominiums are built in such a way that from 01---07 level is car park and from 0-7 to 0-23 upwards are block of flats and each block contain up to 12 flats. About 210 flats are found in each condominium which is expected to house up to 500 to 1000 households. Some flats building have attractive setting, good verges landscaping, lay out gardens, roads, trees and floras lodged on the paths, two to three bedrooms and a dining hall, kitchen and toilet facilities. **The pattern of housing plan and development in Malaysia can be compared with that of any developed country. The facilities found in a condominium or apartments are also found in a bungalow building. In fact, there is no difference in terms of facilities, utilities and amenities. Indeed, up till today, construction is an on-going activity in Malaysia.** Malaysia bungalow has well layout lawn and roads and it contains 5 bedrooms, 4 baths, 2 utilities and domestic maid rooms.

6. Income Level versus Poverty Trend in the Malaysia Tenth Policy Plan

The Tenth Malaysian Plan (10th MP), acclaims that hard core poverty was condensed from 1.2% in 2004 to 0.7% in 2009 and that the rate of total scarcity deck from 5.7% in 2004 to 3.8% in 2009 (See Table 2 below). These assertions are uncertain because of the basic methodology hired in deriving them. Primarily, there is no sign as to how the Poverty Lines were drowned. Assuming that the methodology used indices that were used in the 9th Policy Plan, the bar to define poverty is set at a very low level (Jayanath Appudurai, 2010). Furthermore, the use of “households” rather than “persons” distorts the measurement. On the flawed basis, 228,400 households were considered as poor. It is most important that of these 99,100 were in Sabah with another 27,100 in Sarawak. Thus, there were an uneven number of the poor in these two states underlining gross desertion by the Federal government. Changing the number of households to a “persons” basis, (228,400 households X 6.4 persons per household) the number in poverty is amazing 1,462,000 persons signifying 5.2%. However, after nearly four decades of the NEP, poverty still survives. This can accordingly throw light upon emphasis that HOUSE ownership is still apparent among the Low income earners (Jayanath Appudurai, 2010). Sequel to this, a new economic policy is needed to address the issue of poverty; the internationally accepted concepts and methodology should be employed to develop the poverty Line Income (PLI). The present methods were deeply flawed; they fundamentally affect the assertions and conclusions. In both the 9th and 10th Plan, the concept of HARDCORE poverty was defined as Income less than the food PLI which is based on nutritionally based diet. World Bank and UNDP use “Absolute” and “Relative” poverty contrary to the ‘hard core’ by Malaysia.

- **Rural poverty rate** is defined as the percentage of the rural population living below the national rural poverty line.
- **Urban poverty rate** is the percentage of the urban population living below the national urban poverty line.
- **National poverty rate** is the percentage of the population living below the national poverty line. National estimates are based on population-weighted subgroup estimates from households.
- **Populace earning below US\$1 a day or below US\$2/day** are considered poor at 1993 international prices. (Jayanath Appudurai, 2010).

7. Future Trend of Malaysian Poverty & the multiple factors of Home ownership

Proposal on poverty in the 10th Plan is a fraction of the whole Plan. The reality for the poor is that subsidies are likely to be removed and new levies smeared to funding splendid projects such as roads, facilities, utilities and services. The authorities are obsessed with creating more infrastructures even though much of what has been created rests underutilized. The issue of restructuring employment has been a long chased policy from the 1970s. However, this is the responsibility of the public sector. It must be noted that the public sector continues to be the largest single employer with almost 1.2 million workers. However, the policy of reducing **ethnicity** as criteria in employment in the public sector is still questionable. The Plan is silent on the issue of balanced employment in the public sector. It is paramount for the Government to state in categorical terms that it will take steps to correct the imbalance in the employment pattern in the public sector and dispense its resources judiciously, (Jayanath Appudurai, 2010). The resolutions to the issue of income disparities between groups cannot be resolved through setting targets and postulating restructuring and broad notions of human capital development in the manner proposed. There can be no denying of the fact that reform of the educational system at all levels is a first and fundamental step. The Plan throws out some tentative proposals which are insufficient. Our institutions of tertiary learning need to be urgently restructured. The focus on quantity must be replaced by quality. It must be recognized that upgrading the educational system demands more than money because throwing money at the problems will not solve matters. There is an urgent need to move resolutely towards reforms that will improve the quality of the system, produce graduates that are more equipped to meet the challenges of a harshly

competitive world. (Jayanath Appudurai, 2010).

The one open victory that is shouted out to show how far we have come since Merdeka (Sheridan Mahavera, July 21st 2010). The line is familiar: “In 1970, 49.7 % of households were living in poverty. Now it is only 3.8%”, only 228,400 can be classified as poor. These 228,400 are households that earn an average of RM800 a month and below. RM800 is not sufficient because if a household of four earns RM900, RM1,000, or even RM1,500 a month, they cannot be considered poor. If that is the case, then why are there more and more media reports of families complaining that they cannot make ends meet even when they earn RM2,000? How did the government calculate and decide that RM800 is the poverty line? Jayanath Appudurai, who writes extensively on poverty for the Centre for Policy Initiatives, believes that the government’s calculations are unrealistic. Here, he argues that we need a new standard to measure poverty, one that represents the cost of food, clothing, rent and other basic necessities, and how much it takes for an average family of four to keep themselves floating in today’s Malaysia. Jayanath’s assessment was based on government data in its 10th Malaysia Plan (10th MP) report released in June, and the New Economic Model (NEM) that was out in April. The Poverty Income Level (PLI) is defined as: “An income that is necessary to buy a group of foods that would meet the nutritional needs of the members of a household. The income is also to meet other basic necessities such as clothing, rent, fuel and utilities, transport and communications, medical expenses, education and recreation.” Plainly speaking, the PLI is how much money in a month a Malaysian household needs to meet these eight components and accordingly have prudent access to personal house.

7.1 The Basic Poverty Income Line (PLI) Components

The RM800 set in the 10th plan will no longer cater for a family of 4.4 in the Malaysian context. RM800 will not apprehend the eight basic components as food, clothing, education, medical expenses, housing, transport, furniture and recreation. Unless these components are catered for, a family is still in the poverty trap (See Table 3). Though the Government calculates different PLIs for Malaysia’s three regions, the total average PLI is RM800. For this parade, Jayanath uses the Peninsula PLI of RM763. A household living in the peninsula is considered poor only if its monthly income is below RM763. “The government claims that it uses a World Bank standard to measure PLI. But they do not reveal the actual methodology of how they arrive at RM763,” says Jayanath. The World Bank standard, Jayanath says, recommends that medium-income countries should calculate PLI based on US\$2 (RM6.20) per individual per day. Meaning one person would need US\$2 per day in order to meet both food and non-food necessities. If that figure were used for Malaysia, a theoretical household of 4.4 people would then need RM858 a month to not be declared poor. The government considers a household as comprising an average of 4.4 members, says Jayanath. (Total number of households divided by total population = 4.4). The PLI of RM763, therefore, is translated into a daily income of RM25.45 that a household needs to meet the eight components such as food, rent, clothing and fuel. “Or, that if a member of a household earns RM5.80 a day, they cannot be considered poor. Since, according to the government, you are able to live on RM5.80 a day. In other words, Jayanath explains: “RM5.80 is supposed to pay for three meals, transport costs, rent, recreation and the other components for ONE person in ONE day. Can a Malaysian in the Peninsula even buy three meals a day on RM5.80 talkless of dreaming to own a house? “In fact, I challenge our government ministers to try that,” said Jayanath.

Jayanath says countries such as Britain and Australia calculate PLIs based on the median income of its households. **The median income is a country’s total income divided by half.** The PLI is two-thirds of the median income. In Malaysia, the median income is RM2,830. Using this method, the PLI would then be RM1,886. In effect, this translates into RM14.20 per day for an individual to meet all their eight needs. “Compared to RM5.80, is not RM14.20 a more realistic figure in terms of how much one needs per day in Malaysia?” A former finance minister had once said, repeatedly, that if we were to revise how we measure poverty, our poverty rate would not be the vaunted 3.8 per cent. He is right, technically.

7.2 Alternative Poverty Income Line that can apparently be sufficient for households

Table 4 gives the proposed amount that may be able to cater for the eight basic needs as presumed by Jayanath. His calculations would put Malaysia’s poverty rate at somewhere between 31 to 32 per cent. “Our poverty level looks good on paper but unhappily ignores reality. We are so obsessed with selling this story that we are a success.” Statistics are supposed to accurately measure our economic environment, so that in this case, pin-point policies to

deal with poverty can be fashioned. The government has begun scaling back subsidies so that they would only benefit those they are meant for i.e. the poor. How is it supposed to do this if we cannot even accurately measure who the poor people are. It is pertinent to note from the Jayanath suggestions using an average income line of RM800 for Malaysia; the poverty level now shoots from 3.8 about 31% using the current indices and market forces to measure the poverty line for households. However, Article 25 of the General Declaration of Human Rights stipulates that adequate housing is a basic human **right**. In the declaration issued in connection with the UN's Habitat sessions in Istanbul in 1996 and New York in 2000, the following provisions were added: **'Equal access to adequate, accessible housing must gradually be ensured for all citizens and their families'** (See Table 5.). Supporting instruments as presented in table 6 below have been designed for the acquisition of residential units available on the market. The gradual liberation of the market in existing rented flats paves the way for a situation where citizens who, for whatever reason, opt to remain in rented accommodation rather than take on an ownership or co-ownership form of housing will be able to draw on a similar range. Here, supply should reflect the possibility of luxury accommodation for the wealthy and dignified housing for citizens in lower-income brackets.

House prices as shown in table 7 are steep and beyond the reach of young adults, House Builders Association secretary-general, Chang Kim Loong told The Malaysian Insider last year. "The price increases are not commensurate with salary increases. How are young adults going to catch up (with house prices)?" It's a simple arithmetic. The combined income between me and my husband does not even amount to RM3, 000 ... the realistic choice is to live with my family. Cheaper costs. "For me, I will vote for a government that will continue to provide aid, to help us. It's difficult living when everything has a price," Yanti, a cook from Sekinchan concludes. Malaysia is not experiencing a property bubble and a price increase of up to 20 per cent per year, said Deputy Finance Minister Datuk Donald Lim. This comes as increasing numbers of Malaysians, especially city dwellers, have become concerned over the affordability of housing. Lim said the government wanted to ensure healthy growth in the property market which would give better returns **than money parked in fixed deposit accounts**. "An average increase in house price of 10-15 % per annum is healthy as compared to fixed deposits in the bank," Lim said in a press conference. "For areas like KL, a 20 per cent increase is quite acceptable." When asked whether such a high annual increase in property prices is commensurate with annual income increases, Lim said that KL is still cheap compared to some of its Asian neighbours. "We know at the moment that prices are low compared to Thailand and Singapore," he said. "We are talking about the coming 3 to 5 years (for house price increases) after which there is a stabilising period." Lim said they will intervene when they find the figure (for property) has shot up too high. He said, however, that one of the measures introduced last year to combat rampant property speculation i.e. the increase of the real property gains tax (RPGT) from 5-10% for houses sold within two years had not met with firm resistance. Property prices in urban areas such as Penang and Kuala Lumpur rose by up to 40 % in 2010 driven by low interest rates and a surge in speculative buying, prices grew slower last year due to tightening measures such as a hike in the real property gains tax for early disposals.

Wen Jiabao (Chinese Premier) was also saying on March 14 that home prices in the world's second largest economy were still far too unreasonable and the Chinese government could not relax controls on the property market as it could result in "chaos". Wen also said that reasonable housing prices should reflect personal income, investment and reasonable profits. HBA Secretary General Chang Kim Loong said in October last year that the increase of RPGT from five to 10 per cent for houses sold within two years of purchase would be meaningless to short-term speculators looking to flip houses for profit. He pointed out that properties are naturally not allowed to be sold during the construction stage, which takes two to three years, and therefore, raising the RPGT from five to 10 per cent for properties sold within two years would have little impact. Chang said that under the revised RPGT, speculators could purchase properties from developers during a launch and flip the properties on completion after two years and would have to pay only the same existing five per cent up to the fifth year, after which all profits are not taxable. The debate on the RM1mil price tag for foreign buyers is only relevant in the capital city of Kuala Lumpur and some of the more affluent Selangor neighborhoods, parts of Penang and small parts of Iskandar. The rest of the country is attractive much stuck in the RM300, 000 RM600, 000 category.

8. Conclusion

It is pertinent to note from the Jayanath suggestions using an average income line of RM800 for Malaysia; the poverty level now shoots from 3.8 about 31% using the current indices and market forces to measure the poverty line

for households. In order to achieve government aim of providing adequate and decent housing for all, therefore, something need to be done especially at the implementation stage. Special attention must be given to low - medium cost housing since majority of the populace of Malaysia are still in this category. The need for speedy action becomes paramount for Malaysia to achieve 'Developed' nation status by the year 2020 bearing the consensus of the UNDP that BEST housing policy is still not in place. The following set of actions for harnessing Home Ownership through effective Housing Policies may be employed by Malaysia:

- Government can build residential units and rent same at full or subsidised rates or give them to recipients.
- Government can take steps to lower and or subsidised the price of housing, making it more affordable to the residents.
- Governments can improve the workings of the market to facilitate home ownership among citizens through steps as making mortgages and other home loans more readily available or through improvements to the access to residential land.

Future policies designed to achieve sustainable development and prudent house ownership should necessarily be aimed to meet the following primary principles:

- Policies must give this lower segment of the urban society a feeling of self-worth.
- Future policies must provide the basis for household improvement.
- Policies which could result in prudent home ownership and sustainable development is concerned with the improvement of poor people. At least 50% of the urban population in the developing world has been marginalised. Not only they must be heard by urban decision makers, they must also have influence on matters that affect their future destinies.

9. References

- Abdul Aziz, W. (2007). *Low-cost housing policy in Malaysia: a challenge in delivery*. Unpublished Ph. D thesis University of Dundee.
- Andrew, C.E. (2004). Malaysian Housing Policy: Prospects and Obstacles of National Vision 2020.
- Baken, R., & van der Linden, J. (1993). Getting the incentives right. *Third World Planning Review*, 15, 1-22.
- Choguill, C. L. (2007). The search for policies to support sustainable housing. *Habitat International*, 31, 143-149.
- Guardian online. (2010, April 21st). Bank reform crippling real estate sector, says REDAN. *Guardian online*.
- Harris, R. (2003). Learning from the past: international housing policy since 1945- an introduction. *Habitat International*, 27, 163-166.
- Jayanath A. (2010). Independent Public Policy Professional, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia.
- Keivani, R., & Werner, E. (2001b). Modes of housing provision in developing countries. *Progress in Planning* 55, 65-118.
- Keivani, R., & Werner, E. (2001a). Refocusing the housing debate in developing countries from a pluralist perspective. *Habitat International*, 25: 191- 208.
- Malpezzi, S. (1994). Getting the incentives right- a reply to Robert-Jan Baken and Jan van der Linden. *Third World Planning Review*, 16, 451-466.
- Mukhija, V. (2001). Enabling slum redevelopment in Mumbai: policy paradox in practice, *Housing Studies*, 16, 791-806.
- Mukhija, V. (2004). The contradictions in enabling private developers of affordable housing: a cautionary case from Ahmedabad, India. *Urban Studies*, Vol. 41 (11), 2231-2244.
- NBF Topics online. (2009, September 28th). REDAN wades into FMBN, estate developers' debt imbroglio. *NBF Topics*.
- OPEC. (2009). *Organization of petroleum exporting countries: annual report, 2008*. Vienna: OPEC.
- Ortiz, E. (1996). Housing for all: the challenges for world's governments. *Environment Impact Assessment*, 16, 439-442.
- Pugh, C. (1994a). Housing policy development in developing countries: the World Bank and internationalization, 1972-1993. *Cities*, 11 (6), 357-371.
- Sale, A. G. (2008). Neighborhood factors in private low-cost housing in Malaysia. *Habitat International*, 32, 485-493.
- Sadhus, R. S., & Aldrich, B. C. (1998). Third world housing: the future is now. *Habitat International*, 22 (3),

209-213.

Sengupta, U., & Tipple, A. G. (2007). The performance of public-sector housing in Kolkata, India, in the Poster form Milieu. *Urban Studies, Vol. 44, No. 10*, 2009–2027.

Sinai, I. (1998). Using the home for income- generation: the case of Kumasi, Ghana. *Cities, 15 (6)*, 417-427.

Struck, R. J., & Roman, I. (2008). Home purchase in nascent mortgage markets: determinants of who borrow and who pay cash in Cairo. *Habitat International, 32 (4)*, 411-423.

Tecco, N. (2008). Financially sustainable investments in developing countries water sectors: what conditions could promote private sector involvement? *International Environment Agreements, 8*, 129–142.

UNCHS. (1990). *Global strategy for shelter to the year 2000*. Nairobi: UNCHS.

UN-Habitat. (2005). *financing urban shelter: global report on human settlements*. London: Earth scan.

UN-Habitat. (2008). *State of African cities 2008: a framework for addressing urban challenges in Africa*. Nairobi: UN-Habitat.

Watson, A. (2009). The planned city sweeps the poor away: urban planning and 21st century urbanization. *Progress in Planning, 72*, 151-193.

W.B. (2010). *World Development Report 2010: Development and Climate Change*. Washington DC: World Bank.

First A. Author (M’76–SM’81–F’87) Mohammed Yahaya Ubale born in Bauchi local government area of Bauchi State, Nigeria on the 13th day of June; 1973. He is a member, Nigeria Institute of Town Planners (NITP). He obtained a Bachelor of Technology in Urban & Regional Planning at ATBU Bauchi, Nigeria in 2001. He is a post graduate student at UTHM, Parit Raja, Batu Pahat, Johor, Malaysia.




Figure 1. Theoretical Framework

Table 1. Summary of Malaysian Housing Policy Plan and Programs

S/no	Housing Policy	Period	Plan of Action
1.	First, Second, Third, Fourth & Fifth	1966 – 1990	Provide housing units & transport systems Improve socio-economy Alleviate poverty
2.	Sixth and Seventh	1991 – 2000	Provide equitable development Housing estates were provided Housing programs implemented in urban & rural areas
3.	Eight	2001 – 2005	7.4% houses were provided beyond the plan target
4.	Ninth	2006 – 2010	Efforts were doubled to elevate the nation
5.	Tenth	2011 – 2015	New economic model, New economic policy High income & Sustainability Upholds the principle of 1 Malaysia

Table 2. Indices of Poverty in the 10th Malaysian Plan

Region	Percentage	No. of Poor Households
Malaysia	3.8	228,400

Source: Statistics & Data from the 10th MP, NEM & Jayanath Appudurai

Table 3. Government Poverty Income Line for Households

S/no	Region	RM/Month	RM/Day	Average
1.	Peninsula	763	25.00	5.80
2.	Sabah	1048	33.00	7.50
3.	Sarawak	912	31.00	6.55
4.	Malaysia	800	27.00	6.15

Source: Statistics & Data from the 10th MP, NEM & Jayanath Appudurai

Table 4. Alternative Household Income In Malaysian Ringgit (RM)

S/no	Region	RM/Month	RM/Daily	Average
1.	Peninsula	750	25.00	5.70
2.	Malaysia	1886	62.86	14.28
3.	Sabah	1000	33.00	7.50
4.	Sarawak	1500	50.00	11.40

Source: Jayanath Appudurai suggestions

Table 5. Summary of Relevant Literatures on Housing Policies Issues

S/no	Authors	Year of Publication	Findings
1.	United Nation Human Development Programme	Page 16, 2006	Best practiced Housing Policy is still deficient
2.	UN Habitat sessions in Istanbul, New York	1996, 2000	Equal access to adequate, accessible housing must be ensured for all citizens & their families
3.	Malaysia 2020	1988	Provide settlement policy to keep pace with the rapid economic growth & eradicate hard core poverty

Table 6. Basic framework Instruments for Housing Provision

S/no	Income Level	Instrument Available	Type of Housing Unit
1.	Above – Average	Mortgage facility	Owner – Occupier
2.	Middle – Income	Building Saving Scheme	Rented Flats
3.	Low – Income	Non-Profit Housing Scheme	Municipal Flats
4.	Low-income on peripheries	Ministry for Rural Development	Municipal Flats

Table 7. House Price Pursuant to Location Size and Type

S/no	Location	Price (RM)	Size (sq.)	Type	Remark
1.	Taman Dea Juru Indah	355,000	1,200	3 Bedroom Semidetached	Unfurnished
2.	Bagan Lallan, Butterworth	850,000	1,800	3Bedroom Semidetached	Partly furnished
3.	Taman Sri Rambai Bukit, Mertajau	230,000		3Bedroom Semidetached	Unfurnished
4.	Taman Alma Indah Alma	425,000	1,344	3Bedroom Bungalow	Unfurnished
5.	Sungai, Nipong	1,100,000		4Bedroom Semidetached	Partly furnished
6.	Tempinis, Bangsar	3,740,000	5,000	5Bedroom Semidetached	Partly furnished
7.	Damansara Heights Bukit Daman	4,650,000	3,500	5Bedroom Bungalow	Partly furnished
8.	Polo Club, Kota Damansara	5,500,000	9,200	7Bedroom Bungalow	Partly furnished
9.	Palma Kumning Utama, SEMI	950,000	2,678	5Bedroom Semidetached	Partly furnished
10.	Villa Avenue, Equire Park	1,050,000	3,000	5Bedroom Semidetached	Unfurnished

Source: Home Financing Solutions, June, 2012

This academic article was published by The International Institute for Science, Technology and Education (IISTE). The IISTE is a pioneer in the Open Access Publishing service based in the U.S. and Europe. The aim of the institute is Accelerating Global Knowledge Sharing.

More information about the publisher can be found in the IISTE's homepage:

<http://www.iiste.org>

The IISTE is currently hosting more than 30 peer-reviewed academic journals and collaborating with academic institutions around the world. **Prospective authors of IISTE journals can find the submission instruction on the following page:**

<http://www.iiste.org/Journals/>

The IISTE editorial team promises to review and publish all the qualified submissions in a fast manner. All the journals articles are available online to the readers all over the world without financial, legal, or technical barriers other than those inseparable from gaining access to the internet itself. Printed version of the journals is also available upon request of readers and authors.

IISTE Knowledge Sharing Partners

EBSCO, Index Copernicus, Ulrich's Periodicals Directory, JournalTOCS, PKP Open Archives Harvester, Bielefeld Academic Search Engine, Elektronische Zeitschriftenbibliothek EZB, Open J-Gate, OCLC WorldCat, Universe Digital Library, NewJour, Google Scholar

