

*Full Length Research Paper*

# Agriculture project as an economic development tool to boost socio-economic level of the poor community: The case of Agropolitan project in Malaysia

Hayrol Azril Mohamed Shaffril<sup>1\*</sup>, Ahmad Faiz Abdul Nasir<sup>2</sup>, Khairuddin Idris<sup>3</sup>, Jegak Uli<sup>1</sup> and Jeffrey Lawrence D'Silva<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Laboratory of Rural Advancement and Agriculture Extension, Institute for Social Science Studies, Universiti Putra Malaysia, Malaysia.

<sup>2</sup>Department of Agriculture Sciences, Faculty of Agriculture and Biotechnology, Universiti Sultan Zainal Abidin, Malaysia.

<sup>3</sup>Department of Professional Development and Continuing Education, Faculty of Educational Studies, Universiti Putra Malaysia, Malaysia.

Accepted 14 August, 2019

This paper is regarding Agropolitan projects and its potential in uplifting the community socio-economic level at Gahai Agropolitan project in Kuala Lipis, Pahang. The Agropolitan Programme were the Malaysian Government initiative to eradicate poverty in Malaysia. Regarding to this study, it is important to look at the planning of the programme before its potential can be clearly seen. The research approach for this study was a qualitative case study that provided in-depth descriptions of Agropolitan planning process in Malaysia. Data were gained through four in-depth interviews with the help of an interview guide with the officers who are related directly to the program planning of Agropolitan projects. The questions served as a guide, but allowed respondents freedom and flexibility in their answers. Data from the interviews were transcribed verbatim and subsequently analyzed by identifying similarities and consistent themes. The Ministry of Rural and Regional Development and the National Implementation Directorate are the backbone of this project. The project was then implemented by Land and Regional Development Unit, Ministry of Rural and Regional Development with an appointed organizer, Rubber Industry Smallholder Development Authority. Close relationship between the planner, implementer, organizer, and also the project participants would develop a power to strengthen the project and success in the future.

**Key words:** Agropolitan, program development, planning, implementation, evaluation.

## INTRODUCTION

Doubtlessly agriculture can be the main medium for poverty eradication. Similarly, agriculture has the ability to overcome employment problems and enhance the community socio-economic level. Malaysia is one of the countries that gain benefits from agriculture. Hence, in order to ensure that agriculture will continue to benefit this country, a number of high impact agricultural programs

have been initiated; the programs are TKPM (Permanent Food Production Parks), HIP-ZIA (High Impact Project-Aquaculture Industrial Zone), and Agropolitan.

Recently, the Malaysian government has announced a new Agropolitan project that will be programmed in Mukah, Sarawak. Almost USD 8 million will be spent to begin the respective project. Mukah Agropolitan project will become the forth Agropolitan project after Agropolitan Banggi Island in Sabah, and Agropolitan Gahai and Agropolitan Chemomoi in Pahang. The Agropolitan Chemomoi is currently under the development progress. All of the Agropolitan projects were currently progressing

\*Corresponding author. E-mail: [hayrol82@gmail.com](mailto:hayrol82@gmail.com). Tel: 603-89468599. Fax: 603-89412970.

under the supervision of Land and Regional Development Unit, Ministry of Rural and Regional Development (MRRD). All of these great agricultural programs without a doubt provide a great impact especially in bringing changes to the local community but the questions that can be raised; are all of these high impact agriculture programs well developed? How the programs are planned? Are these programs planned systematically? Answer for these questions will drive us to understand the program planning process in one of high impact agriculture programs in Malaysia.

Program planning is indeed an important component for agricultural development. It is a decision-making process that defines a set of related activities that produce an educational program design specific to one or more clientele. Planning model is important to put the complex decision-making process into a systematic way of implementation. This is important in order to achieve the goal of a new and innovative program. In fulfilling one of the objectives for this paper, there is a need to understand the philosophy and principles of program planning.

## Program planning

Sork and Caffarella (1990) suggested that proper program planning is the key for a program success. Program planning can be understood as a series of planned activity in a specific time and one of its objective is to bring change to the community. Program planning requires planners who are highly skilled, knowledgeable and have the expertise to guide the process. The existing literatures found have proved that a successful program planning usually requires two sets of players: 1) the planners and 2) the client system. These sets of players can be either individuals or organisations.

Program planning theory argues that to become effective, there must be reasonable agreement among stakeholders upon what to accomplish and how to achieve it. To reach the complete harmony may be it takes months. Therefore, Lentz (2006) concluded that this goal is frequently eliminated from the process. The process of the entire programme planning is a complex task; the steps are related. Agricultural development also experienced the same process. Jagdish (1996, in Olejunyo, 2006, p. 215), has stated "in looking at the programme for agriculture development, the most crucial and complex action is to plan and implement". Therefore, many planning models have been developed to assist in these complex tasks and these models are used to represent the most significant characteristics of planning. Tyler (1949) was responsible in introducing the basic concept of program development in the late 1940s. Tyler (1949) suggested four basic questions that should be answered in developing curriculum and plan of instruction:

1. What education objectives are the students to be helped to attain?  
That is, what are they to be helped to learn? What ways of thinking, feeling, and acting are they to be helped to develop in this educational programme?
2. What learning experiences can be provided that will enable the students to attain the objectives?  
That is, how will the students be helped to learn what is proposed?
3. How will the learning experiences be organised to minimize their cumulative effect?  
That is, what sequence of learning and what plan of integration of learning experiences will be worked out to enable students to internalize what they are learning and apply it in appropriate situations that they encounter?
4. How will the effectiveness of the programme be evaluated?  
That is, what procedure will be followed to provide a continuing check to the extent to which the desired learning is taking place?

In extension work, the program planning concept covers the social action within the context of rural extension work (Beal et al., 1966). The model is a social system that exhorts the systematic social action activities. The model includes analysis of existing social systems, contact with "initiating sets" and "diffusion sets", needs definition, commitment to action, formulation of objectives, plan of action, mobilisation of resources, and action steps. Freire (1974) is different with Tyler (1949), Freire (1974) tries to focus specifically on educational aim. An example, consciousness rising where learners begin to question, analyse, and act upon their world, the end result being liberation from oppression.

Boyle (1981) demonstrates fifteen relevant concepts of a series of actions and discussions upon which he believes can construct the best program planning process. The process includes identifying needs and problems; establishing priorities; identifying appropriate solutions and outcomes as well as a plan of action; designing an instructional plan; implementing it; evaluating it; and communicating the values of the program to financial decision-makers, target audiences and interest groups.

Boone (1985) has other view, where he clarifies the program planning as a process that covers all of the planned, coordinated, and collaborative activities of change agents, lay leaders, learners, leaner groups, and the social system. Conversely, Cervero and Wilson (1994) view program planning as a social activity. They concluded that successful planners must be alert to the complexities of actual planning practice.

From the above discussion, it can be concluded that program planning need four key factors to success which are planning, organising, implementing, and evaluation. Active involvement from the community as the main beneficiaries in all stages of the program formulation is vital in ensuring the program success. More importantly,

the planning process itself is a social activity where learning takes place.

## Planning

Planning is generally viewed as a process to achieve success and how to achieve it. Without a doubt, planning is important to make people to accept changes and coping with uncertainty by formulating future courses of action (Stoner and Freeman, 1990). It drives the community or organisation towards a direction where they can achieve their goals and this according to Boone (1985) will create a great commitment among the group members concerning the way they will utilize the resources and to set priorities. This is important especially in agricultural development, which has to coordinate the actions of many individuals and agencies. Without a good planning, the organisation will not be able to organize people and resources. The worst is that they may not even have a clear idea and direction of what they need to organize.

## WHY PLANNING?

Planning enable each of the resources to be allocated specifically to each goals and objectives. Secondly, the organization members implement activities that consistent with the chosen objectives. Finally, progress towards the objective is monitored and measured so that corrective actions or plans can be taken if the progress is not satisfied or need some improvement. Similarly, in extension program according to Mortiss (1993), extension planning is a process which helps planners in deciding what to do (objectives), how to do it (methods), and how to measure results or outputs (evaluation).

Gerhman (cited in Kreitner, 1989:143) gives a relevant insight to planning as:

1. Forces analytical thinking and evaluation of alternatives, thus, improving decisions.
2. Orients people to action instead of reaction.
3. Helps avoid crisis management and provides decision-making flexibility.
4. Provides a basis for measuring organisational and individual performance.
5. Increases employees' involvement or peoples' participation and improves communication.

Along with the practical reasons for planning listed above, two conceptual reasons for planning explored by Kreitner (1989) are limited resources and an uncertain environment. Resource scarcity may refer to even human resources, because an uneducated or untrained person can contribute little to a productive organisation or to the economy as a whole. The uncertainties of what will happen to the organisation and what will be the outcome

of the decisions, all call for the organisation to gauge the nature and degree of major environmental uncertainties, and to develop appropriate plans.

Kowalski (1988) suggests that the first task in creating programs is to plan. He affirms that program planning provides the organization with numerous benefits. Some of the more pertinent benefits are as follows:

1. Provides a master plan for the future.
2. Ensures that adult education is not in conflict with the overall mission(s) of the parent organization.
3. Attempts to reduce potential conflict between adult education and other functions of the organization.
4. Identifies critical components which should be infused into the development programs.
5. Increases the likelihood that all needs and desires receive appropriate review.

Kowalski (1988) claims that two aspects which cannot be ignored and constant, are the keys for a good planning. Without plans, planners are unclear on how they should organize people and resources. In addition, Stoner and Freeman (1992) stress that planning is an important factors for effective organization leadership. Also, chances of achieving goals and objectives become slimmer and the most important is to know when and where they stray from their paths.

## Program planning steps

As been mentioned earlier, there are four main processes in the development of a program. The processes include:

- 1) planning; 2) organizing; 3) implementing; and 4) evaluating. However, the rising literatures associated to the program planning models are very vast. As cited in Lentz (2006), Merriam and Cunningham (1989) relying on a six step model that defines program planning generally. The model is defined broadly which is effective for basic participation in programming. The model is defined as: 1) analyze planning context and client system; 2) perform needs assessment; 3) develop program objectives; 4) formulate instructional plans; 5) formulate an administrative plan; and 6) design a program evaluation plan.

Analyze planning context and client system: Within this process, the important internal and external factors that are needed in the planning process can be identified.

Assess needs: The literature defines need assessments in two interchangeable definitions. First, it defines determining the priority of gaps between the present and desired capabilities, proficiencies, outcomes, etc. In the other hand, it described as having the focus of the assessment be on finding solutions or means of altering the situation of the learner.

Develop program objectives: This is an important step and it acts as the pillar for further program development.

There are two main type of objectives that should be taken into consideration, first is the educational objectives that focus on the participants' learning and second is the organizational or operational objectives that relate to the maintenance and improvement of the educational function.

**Formulate instructional plans:** The key person in this step must be someone who are knowledgeable in the field. This is important to make everybody involve in the program is clear on their tasks. The development of instructional plan always involves preparing instructional objectives, selecting and ordering content, designing the instructional process, selecting appropriate resources, and determining evaluation procedures. There are three basic categories of learning outcomes: 1) knowledge acquisition, 2) skill building, and 3) a change in the attitudes or values of a person. The final component of an instructional plan is determining the evaluation procedures which the component is used to find out how well the learners have achieved the learning objectives.

**Formulate an administrative plan:** Things such as publicity, finance, obtaining facilities and equipment, and arranging for meals, lodging and transportation are included in this step.

**Design a program evaluation plan:** This is where we can determine whether the program has achieved its objective or not. It is important to decide on : 1) a happiness indicator-whether or not people enjoyed a program; 2) observation of gains in knowledge or skill level; 3) observation of changes in performance; and 4) to make judgements about the value of a program. The evaluation can be in the form of quantitative, qualitative or both and one must determine what to evaluate, the design process, the means of data collection and the process of data analysis.

From the mentioned literatures, this study has a number of objectives to be achieved which are:

1. To identify the planning process of the Agropolitan project in Malaysia
2. To reveal the implementation process of the Agropolitan project in Malaysia
3. To identify the socio-economic benefits in term of social, economic and educational development of the implemented Agropolitan project in Malaysia.

## **MATERIALS AND METHODS**

The research approach for this study was a qualitative case study that provided in-depth descriptions of Agropolitan planning process in Malaysia, The implementation process of the Agropolitan project in Malaysia, and social, economic and educational development of the implemented Agropolitan Project in Malaysia. The data presented were gained through four in-depth interviews with the help of an interview guide. The interviews were conducted with the officers who are related directly to the program planning of Agropolitan projects. The questions served as a guide, but allowed

respondents freedom and flexibility in their answers. Data from the interviews was transcribed verbatim and subsequently analyzed by identifying similarities and consistent themes. The findings were in descriptive analysis.

## **RESULTS**

### **The planning process**

Agropolitan projects throughout Malaysia was initiated under "Program Lonjakan Mega Luar Bandar" (PLMLB) Scheme; one of high impact programs in Malaysia; supervised by Land and Regional Development Unit, MRRD. Originally, the Agropolitan projects were initiated under a government body from the Prime Minister Department (PMD) which was known as NITF (National Implementation Task Force). During the time (2006/2007), 44,000 absolute poor were identified all over Malaysia; including Peninsular Malaysia, Sabah, and Sarawak. Four ministries including MRRD have been given a mandate to overcome the problems. MRRD was responsible to eradicate 10,000 absolute poor. At the same time, the government has initiated another project known as The Malaysian Corridors (Northern, East Coast, Southern or locally known as "Iskandar", Sabah and Sarawak) mainly made to enhance the socio-economic level of local community. Regarding this, from 10,000 absolute poor that MRRD responsible, 4,400 absolute poor were given to the Corridors and the remaining 5,600 absolute poor were MRRD responsibility.

Proposals for Agropolitan projects were prepared by the related agencies under the ministry. In the case of Gahai Agropolitan Project (GAP), the proposal was prepared by Rubber Industry Smallholder Development Authority (RISDA) . The proposal was submitted to MRRD followed by NITF for project approval especially on the project plans and budgets. During the project development, RISDA acts as the right hand man for MRRD. In the proposal, RISDA has suggested the type of crops to be planted, the number of houses for settlement development, access road for transportations, and others that are appropriate for the project development. Decisions were MRRDs' responsibility, while RISDA became the project organizer. At the earlier stages, Strategic Planning Unit of MRRD was assigned to take care of the Agropolitan planning process. Today, every unit in MRRD has been given specific tasks in planning for the development of Agropolitan projects throughout Malaysia. For example, the Public Welfare Unit is responsible to look after the absolute poor, while the Rural Economy Unit is responsible for entrepreneurship development. The concept of GAP is based on MRRDs' first Agropolitan project at Banggi Island, Sabah.

GAP was developed based on three main components. First, the settlement area for the participants will be provided with basic infrastructures and amenities such as

houses, a community hall, a kindergarten, a mosque, shop lots, electricity and water supply, and others. Second, the Prosperous Farm or locally known as "Ladang Sejahtera", RISDA has developed 500 acres of rubber estate. The third component is the Commercial Farm where 14.2 ha of pineapples were planted by the participants with help from Malaysian Pineapple Industry Board (LPNM) and RISDA. Regarding to human development of the participants, they are needed to attend pre-placement courses such as courses on house management, individual, and family management as well as self-motivation and team binding. Then, they are also needed to attend technical courses related to rubber planting, commercial farming, and farm management. These courses were organized by RISDA and related agencies with support from MRRD.

Agropolitan projects aim to reduce the number of absolute poor in Malaysia. All participants were targeted to gain household income to at least 2,000 Malaysian Ringgit (USD 680). MRRD refers to a standard rate that prepared by Economic Planning Unit (EPU) of PMD to identify the absolute poor. All Malaysians who are categorized under absolute poor must register to e-kasih program before they are eligible to apply and participate in the Agropolitan projects. E-kasih is a program conducted by the PMD to overcome the absolute poor problems.

In the case of GAP, it was known that, the project has two farms; Prosperous Farm, and Commercial Farm. According to RISDA, the Prosperous Farm will take about four years before the first harvest period. Therefore, the participants need to wait for quite a long period to gain some cash. With this regard, RISDA has proposed to MRRD to develop a Commercial Farm. In the Commercial Farm, they have proposed to plant it with pineapples which have the ability to harvest in short-term period. The development of Commercial Farm is RISDA responsibility with help from other related agricultural agencies.

### **The implementation process**

MRRD is the main planner while RISDA was elected as the organizer for GAP. RISDA's responsibility is to manage two main farms as well as the participants' settlement area. An agreement with State Governments to gazette suitable land for Agropolitan is the main key for this project to success. According to MRRD, the State Governments indeed have helped the ministry a lot in many aspects regarding to land availability, and other process and progress that need its participations.

The implementation of GAP especially on Prosperous Farm, much collaboration was gained from the related agricultural agencies. RISDA leads the planning and development processes; assisted by related ministries, agencies, and departments such as LPNM, Federal

Agriculture Marketing Authority (FAMA), District Office, as well as the Ministry of Tourism Malaysia (MTM). RISDA's main responsibility is for the development of commodity crops in the GAP while MRRD prepare the basic needs such as houses, mosque, community hall, shop lots, and others. All the basic amenities prepared were completed with sufficient electricity and water supplies that were provided and maintained by Tenaga Nasional Berhad (TNB) and Jabatan Bekalan Air (JBA); Malaysia's electricity and water supply company. A study of land and soil suitability was conducted to know the type of crops can be planted at GAP. Socio-economic study was also conducted by RISDA, MRRD, and EPU.

TPC or Technical Project Committee programmed its meeting every month. The TPC members are among MRRD and RISDA officers. In the meeting, they trashed out all problems that consider small and easily solved at Agropolitan projects. The problems and issues that have been discussed were endorsed during the meeting and will be presented at MRRD main committee meeting. The main committee is represented by representatives from MRRD, RISDA, State Governments, District Offices, and related agricultural agencies including FAMA and Department of Agriculture Malaysia (DOA). The GAP participants also have their own committee known as Project Development Committee (PDC). RISDA act as the middle man to connect the participants and MRRD.

Selection of GAP participants was made by Public Welfare Unit of MRRD, with the State Governments' close collaboration. It was known that RISDA was totally not involved in the selection processes. A number of interviews were conducted to identify the suitable participants. After the interview sessions, a process called reality check will be conducted. The main purpose of this reality check is to proof that the participants are the real absolute poor that really need the government assistance.

### **The evaluation process**

Three parties; EPU, MRRD, and RISDA are responsible in evaluating the performance of GAP. According to officers' in-charge, the performance of the project is based on participants' monthly income. A report about participants' income is prepared by RISDA and reported to MRRD monthly. MRRD will conduct a meeting quarterly where reports regarding the participants' income will be presented to the top management.

Dedicated Team was assigned by MRRD to specifically to tackle on-site issues in all Agropolitan projects. Dedicated Team focuses on issues pertinent to participants and monitoring the implementation processes as well as the program evaluation. Through the Dedicated Teams, MRRD will have a bigger view on things happening on Agropolitan Project *in-situ*.

Agropolitan projects proposed by Malaysian government

has its own power to eradicate poverty throughout Malaysia. All participants who were selected to participate in the Agropolitan projects were given a house free of charge. In addition, two farms were developed in the Agropolitan projects that are known as Prosperous Farm and Commercial Farm. In the case of GAP, the participant planted pineapples in the Commercial Farm that would help them to generate additional income and profits in a short-term period. In term of marketing, FAMA take its responsibility in educating the participants regarding to agricultural marketing strategies.

The Commercial Farm indeed provides additional income for the participants while they are waiting for their main commodity which is rubber to harvest at the Prosperous Farm. The idea was that return profits for the Prosperous Farm takes at least four years before precede to the first harvest. Hence, the Commercial Farm is expected to increase and stabilize the participants' income. In addition, the participants empower themselves through their housewives when they are able to produce their own pineapple jam and pineapple juice from the Commercial Farm which can provide them with another additional income; The participants selected for Agropolitan projects were those who are categorized as absolute poor, this program according to planners indeed has very high potential in uplifting their socio-economic level as well as quality of life.

In Agropolitan settlements, accommodations are provided at no charge to all the participants. Other facilities provided are a community hall, shop lots, a mosque, a kindergarten, and many others. These facilities will ease them to socialize among them. A good and established leadership organization is needed in the Agropolitan settlement; therefore a village administrator committee in Agropolitan was established. Those who are appointed in the organizations are responsible to become the Chairman, Secretary, Vice Secretary, Bureau of Economic, Bureau of Religious, Bureau of People's Welfare and Purity, and Chairman of Women Development Group (WDG) or locally known as "Kumpulan Pembangunan Wanita (KPW)". Establishment of the respective administrative body is needed to prove that besides focusing on strengthening and increasing the participants' income, the project also aims to enhance the participants' social life in term of leadership, religious, settlements' purity, and women development.

## **DISCUSSION**

### **The Agropolitan development process**

Agropolitan development process needs close collaboration between ministry, agricultural agencies, and State Governments. The process also needs active participation from the project participants especially in the project implementation process to make sure the smoothness

of the process as well as the project success. The most crucial and complex action in agricultural development is to plan and implement (Jagdish, 1996, in Olejunyo, 2006, p. 215), therefore close and active participation within these parties as mentioned above would help the project to success. As program planning theory argues that to become effective, there is a need to have a reasonable agreement among stakeholders upon what to accomplish and how to achieve it.

In the case of GAP, the project seems to structure likely a pre-determined type of planning, meaning that the whole development process was prepared by the ministry and related agencies. The idea was that the project was planned to eradicate poverty among absolute poor. Therefore, the need of pre-determined the project due to the absolute poor have no power to initiate the project in the beginning. Regarding this, during the implementation process, active participation among the participants is needed in the process. At GAP, all the participants are needed to attend various courses and seminars. These courses and seminars are developed to increase their knowledge, credibility and ability, motivation, also team bindings.

As RISDA was appointed as the organizer for GAP, it is good to say that RISDA's management is the best as an organizer. RISDA specialized at rubber planting. Therefore, RISDA was really committed on GAP rubber planting which was at the Prosperous Farm; the participants would probably manage to gain their farm's share earlier. Hopefully, the other ongoing Agropolitan projects throughout Malaysia should follow what RISDA did for the Prosperous Farm management.

Evaluation is very crucial for every programs or projects. Evaluation is meant to show the overall process of the program or project; to make adjustment regarding any lacking in the development process. GAP is not exempted for this process. What have been done at GAP should be continued to make any improvements for better changes in implementing the project.

### **Development of social, economic and education through Agropolitan project**

Regarding their social life, with all basic amenities and facilities provided, they are able to socialize well with each other. Through all of these, they are able to do activities related to religious, education, sports, festive seasons and birthday party celebrations. Furthermore, the free houses and the commercial farm given to the participants is a starting point for them to gain a better quality of life. It shows that MRRD and RISDA have done an appropriate approach with these basic amenities and facilities provided in enhancing their social life.

The Prosperous Farm and the Commercial Farm have assisted the participants social development. First, the participants are working together in the farms. Women are

working on the Commercial Farm while men are working on the Prosperous Farm. This arrangement will strengthen their family and the community relationship. Husband and wife are encouraged to work together in uplifting their household economic level. While they are spending most of their time in the farms, the education of their children are not abandoned. RISDA has helped the education development of their children by providing tuition classes, exam preparation classes and pre-school education.

Conversely, the participants are taught on how to manage the farms and market the products hence their confidence, self esteem, mutual cooperation and motivations have been strengthened. They have proved their success of managing and marketing the products when the first batch of pineapples recently have been promoted at the Malaysian Parliament and got praised by the parliament members. The pineapples have gifted them their first income after one year in the project. As a result, the minister of MRRD has gazette the pineapples as an icon of GAP.

The main evaluation of the Agropolitan project success is depends on the participants' household income. This is related to one of the main objectives of the project which is to eradicate 10,000 out of 50,000 absolute poor in year 2010. Regarding to this, the Ministry has come out with a strategy that bring a short term and long term economic impact to the participants. The Commercial Farm will provide short term economic impact to the participants while the Prosperous Farm will provide long term economic impact to the participants. In the case of GAP, pineapple is the crop for the Commercial Farm while rubber is the crop for the Prosperous Farm. To ensure the economic impact is continuously received by the participants, Federal Agricultural Marketing Authority (FAMA) has been assigned to market the participants commercial farm products. Interestingly, instead of fresh fruits produced, the participants have able to come out with their own agro-based products produced from the Commercial Farm such as pineapple jam and pineapple juice. These two products have been marketed by the participants at the surrounding areas. Doubtlessly, they have gained extra income from these two products. The Prosperous Farm is planted with a total of 202 ha of rubber trees, and this will bring a huge economic impact to the participants. The profits of the Prosperous Farm will be shared with RISDA.

In term of education impact, while waiting for the first harvest of the Prosperous Farm, the participants are provided with persistent trainings, courses and exposures in rubber and pineapple planting. This provides a lot of valuable information to the participants and doubtlessly this will create knowledgeable participants. It is good to have knowledgeable participants as MRRD and RISDA encourage the participants to share and disseminate their knowledge with their colleagues, thus, it will create knowledgeable community. For the participants' children, they

are provided with a kindergarten, tuition classes and exam preparation classes. All of these are free and funded by RISDA.

## Conclusion

The study has shown that, the Agropolitan project has a lot of potentials for the society especially the absolute poor community. The development of Agropolitan projects throughout Malaysia was an acknowledgement from the Malaysian government that rural, poor, and so called neglected people has their own power to uplift their socio-economic level as well as increasing their quality of life. The improvement of the program in the future Agropolitan projects can be the main catalyst to overcome the absolute poor problem in Malaysia.

Similarly, the ministry and responsible agencies including State Governments should have a mechanism to create more systematic planning to help the absolute poor. Without a doubt, the program has a great planning with involvement from many government agencies. The program shows that, Malaysian government really wants to help the absolute poor in uplifting their socio-economic level at least slightly similar to the other communities in Malaysia; to have a great, harmony people. Hopefully with this program concurrently increase the Malaysian economy.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The study was funded by the Fundamental Research Grant Scheme (FRGS) and the authors would like to express their sincere appreciation for all of the support provided.

**Abbreviations:** MRRD, Ministry of Rural and Regional Development; NID, National Implementation Directorate; HIP-ZIA, High Impact Project-Aquaculture Industrial Zone; TKPM, Permanent Food Production Parks; PLMLB, Program Lonjakan Mega Luar Bandar; NITF, National Implementation Task Force; GAP, Gahai Agropolitan Project, RISDA, Rubber Industry Smallholder Development Authority; FAMA, Federal Agriculture Marketing Agency; DOA, Department of Agriculture Malaysia, PDC, Project Development Committee, EPU, Economy Planning Unit LPNM, Malaysian Pineapple Industry Board; PMD, Prime Minister Department; MTM, Ministry of Tourism Malaysia; TNB, Tenaga Nasional Berhad; JBA, Jabatan Bekalan Air; PDC, Project Development Committee; WDG, Women Development Group; TPC, Technical Project Committee.

## REFERENCES

Beal GM, Blount RC, Powers RC, Johnson WJ (1966). Social Process and Interaction in Program Planning. Ames: Iowa State University

Press.

Boone EJ (1985). *Developing Programs in Adult Education*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Boyle PG (1981). *Planning Better Programs*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co.

Cervero RM, Wilson AL (1994). The politics of responsibility: A theory of program planning practices for adult education. *J. Adult. Educ. Q.* 45(1): 249-268.

Kowalski T (1988). *Program planning. The Organization and Planning of Adult Education*, Albany: State University of New York Press. pp. 87-107.

Kreitner R (1989). *Management*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Lentz W (2006). *An investigation of the program planning process for athletic training curriculum education programs*. PhD Dissertation, University of Oklahoma.

Mortiss P (1993). *Extension for Rural Change*. Brisbane: Queensland Department of Primary Industry.

Olujenyo FO (2006). Impact of Agricultural Development Programme (ADP) on the quality of social existence of rural dwellers in developing economies: the Ondo State (Nigeria) Agricultural Development Programme experience. *Int. J. Rural. Manage.*, 2(2): 213-226.

Sork TJ, Caffarella RS (1990). Planning programs for adults. In S.B. Merriam & P.M. Cunningham (Eds.). *Handbook of Adult and Continuing Education*, San Francisco: Josey-Bass. pp. 223-245.

Stoner AF, Freeman RE (1992). *Management*. (5<sup>th</sup> Edition). Eaglewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall Inc.

Tyler RW (1949/1971). *Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction*. Chicago, University of Chicago Press.