

# INTERNATIONAL COMPARATIVE STUDY OF HOUSING PROVISION: An Initial Study of the Position of Malaysia

**Noralfishah Sulaiman, David Baldry and Prof Les Ruddock**

Research Institute for the Built & Human Environment (BuHu), University of Salford,  
Salford Greater Manchester, M7 9NU

E-mail: [n.sulaiman@pgr.salford.ac.uk](mailto:n.sulaiman@pgr.salford.ac.uk), [d.baldry@salford.ac.uk](mailto:d.baldry@salford.ac.uk), [l.ruddock@salford.ac.uk](mailto:l.ruddock@salford.ac.uk)

**ABSTRACT:** Housing provision is a physical process of creating and transferring a dwelling to its occupiers, its subsequent use and physical reproduction and at the same time, a social process of dominated by the economic interests involved. Government intervention through good housing policies is needed to deliver the housing provision for the nation, either by private sector or public sector means. What is needed in housing policies and their implementing mechanisms is to make a fundamental switch from a concern about housing as an *output* to housing *inputs*. Meanwhile, to achieve an understanding of current housing policy, it is necessary to analyse and comprehend policy historically. The objective of this research is to review the housing provision and policies in three countries which comprises Malaysia, United Kingdom and Australia. The structure of housing provision (SHP) and different combination of social agents will be determined for each country in the process of delivering housing provision. Past, present and future housing needs will also be reviewed from the various government policies and documents. This position paper examines the history of housing provision in Malaysia. Further papers will examine and compare the general differences between housing provisions in these countries.

**Keywords** – *Housing, Housing Provision and Housing Policies*

## 1.0 INTRODUCTION

Housing is both a product and a process (Mandelker, 1973; Turner, 1976). The product is not only the shell or structure of a dwelling but the design, built in equipment, the amount and allocation of space, the heating, lighting, sanitary and similar facilities. It is also the layout and equipment of the neighbourhood open space, play space, streets, walks, utilities, nursery and elementary schools, shops and other neighbourhood facilities provided by a housing developer (Mandelker, 1973). It is not only a physical product but is also described as a process (Turner, 1976).

Housing is also a physical entity that can last for a long time if it is adequately built and maintained, and continues to serve a useful economic and social role (Ball and Harloe, 1986). It has social and symbolic meaning attached because it is not only a physical artifact but also provides a residence for people in which family nurturing and most activities related to social reproduction take place (Bourne and Bunting, 1993). It involves many diverse social processes (Ball and Harloe, 1992). Due to the compatibility of housing provision with various situations and wider societal processes, this research framework seems to be an empirically useful strategy to examine and compare the general differences between housing provisions in Malaysia, United Kingdom and Australia (Hahn, 1998).

## 2.0 THE STRUCTURE OF HOUSING PROVISION (SHP)

The term 'housing provision' has not been clearly conceptualised and it has been actually used in a confusing manner (Ball and Harloe, 1992). It is derived from the notion that there are combinations of social agents involved in housing provision that relate to each other in an

empirically observable way. The term “provision” not only refers to the process of housing production but also to the entire process of housing production, exchange and consumption (Dickens et.al.,1985; Ball and Harloe,1992; Tsenkova, 1998).

Hence, housing provision is a physical process of creating and transferring a dwelling to its occupiers, its subsequent use and physical reproduction and at the same time, a social process dominated by the economic interests involved (Ball,1987). Conclusively, housing provision means to makes housing available for consumption in the same way as building a stock of food in a larder. It is not to say that consumption lies outside the provision process- provision is a means to an end called consumption (Ball and Harloe, 1992).

The concept of a combination between physical and social processes in housing provision is continuous and usually changes over time and is known as a Structure of Housing Provision (SHP). It is then asserted that understanding the relation of those social agents to each other and to the physical aspect of provision associated with many issues in housing (Ball and Harloe, 1992). All of the stages in housing provision are interrelated, for example housing consumption is an outcome and the starting point for housing production and exchange (Hahn,1998). Undoubtedly, many actors and institutions are involved in the production, allocation and consumption of housing. The most significant ones in the process are the developers (public and private institutions or individuals), the landowners, the financial institutions, the building industry (state, municipal and private), the local housing and planning authorities and the consumers (Tsenkova,1998).

What determines the nature of a structure of housing provision is how the various social agents intervene in the physical process of production, consumption and allocation of housing. A social relation is part of a SHP if it is a component of the physical process of production, allocation, consumption and reproduction of housing (Ball,1987). It appears that, a SHP via a specific tenure form, is the product of particular, historically determined, social relations associated with the physical process of land development, building production, the transfer of complete dwellings to the final user and their subsequent use (Ball, 1983).

### **3.0 THE STRUCTURE OF HOUSING PROVISION IN MALAYSIA**

SHP is specific to individual countries, though similarities exist between countries based on similarities in social organisation and on mutual development of institutional forms (Tsenkova,1998). SHP instead arises out of the historical development of social relations and the class struggles associated with them. It is specific to individual countries but there may be strong similarities between countries at particular points in time resulting from their social organisation and from mutual developments in institutional forms. They will never be static and are continually subject to pressure for change (Ball,1987).Therefore, the definition of structure of housing provision cannot be defined accurately prior to empirical analysis and there can exist many different sets of provision structure for different types of housing in different places (Hahn,1998).

### **4.0 HOUSING POLICY**

The term ‘housing policy’ is used in different ways and covers a multitude of activities. However, the word ‘policy’ is notoriously difficult to define with any precision (Hill and Bramley, 1986). It is also used in a more static way, to describe how things are done as a matter of routine. Specifically, ‘housing policy’ can be defined in terms of measures designed to modify the quantity, quality, price and ownership and control of housing. These four elements cover the scope of policy as represented in the very general statements (Malpass and

Murie, 1994). The role of housing policy draws attention to the need to look at both central government level and the local level in housing industry. The role of the centre is to make policy and to provide a framework of powers and opportunities for policy to be implemented. It is at the local level that implementation takes place: local authorities, housing associations, building societies, builders and others constitute the plethora of organisations through which policy is implemented (Malpass and Murie, 1994).

Housing policies must set overall objectives and define responsibilities and broad general direction for the nation. It is never complete, but always evolving (Van Huyck, 1986 p.8). Housing policies also must be adjusted to reflect the new concern with decentralised urban growth which will mean decentralising housing institution. It means de-emphasising the public sector role in housing construction and moving this responsibility to the private sector, both formal and informal (Van Huyck, 1986 p.7). The social relationships between actors and institutions in the development process are mediated by policy component (Tsenkova,1998). As a whole what is needed in housing policies and their implementing mechanisms is to make a fundamental switch from a concern about housing as an *output* to housing *inputs* (Van Huyck, 1986). For this reason, to achieve an understanding of current housing policy, it is necessary to analyse and comprehend policy historically (Balchin and Rhoden, 2002).

## **5.0 THE EVOLUTION OF HOUSING POLICIES IN MALAYSIA**

The main objective of the housing policies in Malaysia is to provide adequate, affordable and accessible shelter with basic amenities with special emphasis for housing the low income groups (Housing Statistics Bulletin, 1995). This recognition has led to the formulation of policies and programmes aimed so that Malaysians, particularly the urban poor, have access to adequate shelter and related facilities. Policy makers since colonial administration until the creation of Vision 2020 were assured that the intention of delivering higher quality of living is always taken into account. The Malaysia government has launched a range of policies since colonial administration until the latest Eighth National Plan (2001-2005) as federal government's efforts to encourage and give higher priority in housing development programme for the nation. **Table 4** shows a summary of Malaysia housing policies until year 2005.

### *5.1 Housing policy during the colonial administration, before and after independence*

From the historical perspective, the colonial British administration accelerated community and economic development in Malaya under British 'divide and rule' policy among the three main races which consisted of Malay, Chinese and Indian (Keith, 1995). During the colonial administration, housing problems were associated with squatter dwellings and overcrowded accommodation (Agus, 1997). Before independence, the concept of public housing was associated with the institutional quarters. The British administration had provided housing facilities for its employees in public institutions such as schools, police stations, hospitals and district offices (Tan and Hamzah Sendut,1979). The only programme aimed at providing housing for the Malaysian people was the resettlement of Chinese residents in the New Villages during the emergency period (1948-1960) (Agus, 1986). There were two types of housing needing attention for improvement which were squatter type dwellings which were classified as hovels and overcrowded cubicles (Agus 1997).

## 5.2 *First and Second Malaya Plan (1955-1964)*

Since its introduction into the Federated Malay States in 1921, by Charles Reade, urban planning in Malaysia has evolved into a well-structured system (Goh, 1988). Government had introduced the 5 year plan to ensure that the development of urban areas are guided and coordinated, consisting of master, regional, structure and local plans. These regional plans and master plans were written statements, replete with map and diagrams, showing the government's policies regarding future development of the areas and proposals for specific projects to achieve the policies. See **Table 1**. Independent government then set up its first Malaya Plan in 1957 and implemented a system of development to expand and extend the road network to promote trade and development.

**Table 1: Hierarchy of Development Plans in Malaysia**

Plans	Average of coverage	Prepared by
5 year plan	Whole country	Federal government
Regional /master plan	Region/state	Regional development authority or state government
Structure plan	Local authority area	Local authority
Local plan	Local authority area	Local authority

Source: Goh (1988)

Government established the Federal Land Development Authority (Felda) in 1956 to open up new land and settlement schemes for Malaysia. Laquian (1982) has defined Felda as;

“Felda schemes are country unique programmes; they can be regarded as typical of two basic approaches to planned population distribution. These approaches may be called ‘subsistence’ and ‘productive’ programme types. The subsistence programme attempts to redistribute population with minimal inputs. This often means that the programmes relies on the efforts of the settlers themselves, in such tasks as clearing forest, building houses, constructing roads, producing crops and providing themselves with services and amenities. Main crops planted are those which a family can easily subsist on (rice, corn, root crops etc). The main attraction to the settler is land. It is hoped that the chance to till one’s own land is a strong enough incentive for the settler to leave his home village, pioneer in a new area and stay there...”

According to Agus (1997), Felda’s objectives are to achieve;

- economical utilisation and development of sizeable area of unused or underdeveloped land thus ensuring minimum costs and maximum returns.
- settlement of deserving and qualified landless families on the land thus developed.
- establishment of infrastructural services such as transport and communication facilities in the various settlements schemes.
- establishment of social and public amenities such as schools, clinics and water supplies to the settlers.
- modernisation of the processing and marketing facilities to ensure efficient production and fair prices for the settlers.
- provision of training and extension services for promotion of good husbandry and social development.

## 5.3 *First Malaysia Plan 1965-1970*

Formal and structured housing programmes were started through the First Malaysia Plan in 1966. The main idea in introducing this plan was to review the social and economic needs of Malaysia every five years. In line with this plan, it also emphasised the fostering

of national unity for Malaysia focusing on the three main races which consisted of Malays, Chinese and Indian after the May 1969 riots in Kuala Lumpur. These riots took place because of poverty issues, irrespective of race and the differences of race with economic function and geographical location (Second Malaysia Plan, 1971-1975). **Table 2** below shows the evidence of imbalanced poverty level at the time of the May 1969 riot.

**Table 2 : Poverty Level in Race Category in 1969**

Race	Poverty Level %	Average Income per/month (RM)	Average Income per/month (€)
Malay	64.8	172.00	35.31
Chinese	26.0	394.00	80.90
Indian	39.2	304.00	62.42
Others	44.8	813.00	166.94

Source: New Economic Policy (2004) \* 1 € is equal to RM4.87.

Government's intervention in the housing market at this period also started to focus on low-cost housing to meet the needs of the poor especially the Malays which are considered as *Bumiputera (indigenous people of Malaysia)* (Rehda,2002). At the same time, private sector developers had began to purchase and develop properties with active participation by state governments through their development corporations.

#### 5.4 Second Malaysia Plan 1971-1975

Since the early 1970s Malaysia has undergone rapid urbanisation and industrialization. The construction industry showed a healthy rate growth at 8.1% annually from 1971 to 1975 (Goh,1980). However, the incidence of poverty cut across racial lines, meaning there were poor Malays, Chinese, Indian and others. Taken as a whole, it is highest among the Malays and other indigenous people. This plan was drawn up within the context of the New Economic Policy (NEP) in which strategies was initiated to foster national unity and nation building through eradication of poverty, employment opportunity irrespective of race, and to eliminate identification of race with economic function (New Economic Policy, 2004). According to Agus (1997), NEP was conceived to prevent further perpetuation of this imbalance with specific restructuring objectives as below:

- Increasing the share of Malays in employment in the modern sector and within this sector, improving the income of Malays by upgrading their skills;
- Increasing the number of Malay share in corporate ownership, including housing and property;
- Increasing the number of Malay businessmen or entrepreneurs and the degree of Malay managerial control.

Government also introduced a quota system in housing development in which is at least 30 percent of houses to be built were allocated to *Bumiputeras* (Agus, 1997). Several public enterprises and corporation were engaged in various undertakings to form and formulate national housing developments. Bank Bumiputera was hired to provide housing finance facilities. Council of Trust for the Indigenous People (MARA) helped the Malays to participate in commercial activities, and provided training facilities and consultancy services. Federal Land Development Authority (Felda) established in 1956 was also engaged to open up new land and settlement schemes under this period. In summary, the majority of institutional housing and 95% of housing produced by private developers was constructed in urban areas (Johnstone, 1980).

### 5.5 *Third Malaysia Plan 1976-1980*

Federal government had also set a target of 500,000 acres during the Third Malaysia Plan. Government was counting on Fel'da to implement land development of housing for rural immigrants in the regional development areas of more than 42%. A total of 109,300 families have been resettled by Fel'da (Goh,1980), approximately 710,450 people or about 4% of the total population in Malaysia (Agus,1997). The role of private developers during the Third Plan Malaysia Plan period was significantly enlarged. In urban areas, strategies to achieve the NEP were supported by increasing industrial development and the provision of low cost housing and other public services (Goh,1980). During this decade 1970-80, both Second Malaysia Plan and Third Malaysia Plan, 774,000 units of houses were built in both urban and rural areas. The public sector accounted for 207,590 units and the private sector the remaining 536,410 units (Monerasinghe, 1985).

### 5.6 *Fourth Malaysia Plan 1981-1985*

Overall goal during this period was to ensure that all Malaysians have access to adequate housing. Emphasis was given to increasing the supply of low cost houses in urban area, while in the rural areas priority was accorded to the provision of basic amenities such as water and electricity supplies as well as the rehabilitation of dilapidated houses in existing traditional villages (Mid Term Review of Fourth Malaysia Plan, 1983). Monerasinghe (1985) discovered that during the Fourth Malaysia Plan period, it is estimated that about 923,300 unit of housing had been required. Approximately 70% of this programme is directed towards the urban centres. Houses were constructed by the private sector and primarily oriented towards the middle and higher income groups. Private sector houses include those of private developers, Cooperative Societies and those provided for employees on the larger rubber and palm oil estates and tin mines. Programmes for the rehabilitation of dilapidated houses in the rural area, as well as the provision of basic infrastructure to existing traditional villages, were also given emphasis (Mid Term Review of Fourth Malaysia Plan, 1983). Overall responsibility for the low cost housing programme was vested with the Ministry of Housing and Local Government (MHLG) (Monerasinghe,1985). According to Agus (1997), from this period Malaysia government introduced and implemented a concept of low cost housing incorporating the following characteristics;

- Selling price: not exceeding RM25,000 (€ 5133.00) per unit;
- Target groups: households with a monthly income does not exceeding RM750 (€150.00);
- House type: flats, single storey terrace or detached houses;
- Minimum design: standard built up area of 550-600 square feet, two bedrooms, a living room, a kitchen a bathroom-cum-toilet.
- Two major housing programmes known as public low cost housing programmes and site and services housing scheme had been implemented.

### 5.7 *Fifth Malaysia Plan 1986-1990*

Under this period of Malaysia's plan, housing programmes began to be implemented along the concept of human settlement (Agus,1997). The provision of social facilities such as schools, clinics and community halls was emphasised alongside the provision of

housing. The integrated human settlement programme was first introduced and implemented in Kuala Lumpur's New Growth Areas (NGAs) located at the fringes of the city. It was designed to meet the need for quality living and equipped with social facilities and modern infrastructure. Public facilities such as schools, a mosque, surau/madrasah (*small room for prayer*), a community hall, a public library, a clinic, a playground, shop-lots and a hawker's centre have been provided for the residential area. In 1981, the federal government encouraged the private sector to lead in providing the stimulus for economic growth and to spearhead further development in public housing programmes. Both the public and private sectors have participated actively in constructing the low income housing programmes. In line with this, government encouraged private developers to fulfill their 30% social obligation to build low income housing by giving low premium for housing development (Agus, 1997). Housing developments were geared towards the concept of human settlement and the public sector contributed with the lowest quantity of houses, while private sector contributed almost 80% of housing market (Mid Term Review of Sixth Malaysia Plan, 1987).

#### 5.8 *Sixth Malaysia Plan 1991-1995*

During this period the main focus of housing development was to provide adequate, decent and affordable housing units for enhancing the quality of life, social cohesion and national unity among various levels and ethnic groups in the country (Housing Statistics Bulletin, 1995). One of the strategies was to build a sufficient number of low and low medium costs houses where the housing shortage is acute. Housing policy in the Sixth Plan was geared towards attaining the objectives of the National Development Plan (1991-2000) and at the same time maintain the basic strategies of NEP which aimed to eradicate poverty and restructure society to correct social, economic and regional imbalances and thereby contribute towards national unity (Agus, 1997). Government realised that private sector participation in the development of low cost housing was very much needed. Therefore, additional incentive facilities to support the low cost housing development activities were provided. States governments, on their own as well as through cooperation with private developers, undertook low cost housing developments. The strategies in this period also emphasised subsidised housing for the very poor, low interest housing loans, element of cross subsidies in mixed developments and intensifying research and development activities (Housing Statistics Bulletin, 1995). Housing Statistics Bulletin 1995 reported that about 60% of the total housing targets constitute low cost units. The private sector was expected to deliver 70% of the total, 63% of which constituted low cost units (Housing Statistics Bulletin, 1995). To encompass larger beneficiaries from the low cost housing developments, various housing schemes were formulated. These include the site and services schemes and redevelopment and improvement of the squatter areas in urban areas. These schemes promoted the provision of housing while allowing individual initiatives for improved conditions.

#### 5.9 *Seventh Malaysia Plan 1996-2000*

During the Seventh Plan period various housing programme were undertaken by both the public and private sectors. While the private sector focused more on overall market demand, the public sector continued to provide house for sale or rent to the low income group and housing for public sector employees. Housing programmes continued to be

implemented based on the human settlement concept, whereby housing estates were provided with communal and recreational facilities. A total of 800,000 units of houses were planned for construction to meet housing needs. 859,480 units or 107.4 percent of the plan target was completed. Several measures were undertaken by the government to accelerate the implementation of housing programmes, particularly low cost housing. These included the extension of the Low Cost Housing Revolving Fund (LCHRF) to the private sector to implement new projects, and establishment of National Housing Corporation Ltd (*Syarikat Perumahan Negara Berhad-SPNB*) in 1997 as public sector housing developer. Government has limited the price of low cost houses from RM25,000 (€ 5,133) to RM42,000 (€ 8,264) depending on the location and type of houses in year 1998 (Guideline for The New Price of Low Cost Housing, 2002). See **Table 3** below. This was implemented as an incentive to housing developers to participate more actively in providing low cost houses for the public.

**Table 3: Proposed New Pricing Schedule for Low Cost Houses Based On Location, Target Group and Types of Houses (Peninsular Malaysia)**

Cost per Unit (RM)	Cost per Unit (€)	Location/area * (cost of land per m <sup>2</sup> )	Monthly Income of Target Group (RM/€)	Type of Houses **
42,000	8,624	<b>Area A</b> City and largest towns (RM 45/€ 9.24 and above)	RM1,200 – 1,500 € 246.40-308.00	Flat, 5 storey or more
35,000	7,186	<b>Area B</b> Larger towns and urban periphery (RM 15/€ 3.08-RM44/€ 9.03)	1,000 – 1,350 € 205.33-277.20	Flat, 5 storey
30,000	6,160	<b>Area C</b> Small towns and urban periphery (RM10/€ 2.05-RM14/€ 2.87)	850 – 1,200 €174.53-246.40	Terrace and cluster
25,000	5,133	<b>Area D</b> Rural areas (Less than RM10/€ 3.08)	750-1,000 € 154.00-205.33	Terrace and cluster

(Source: Guideline for The New Price of Low Cost Housing, 2002). \* 1 € is equal to RM4.87

\* Location/area is determined based on the current value of the land for residential purposes.

\*\* Proposed type of houses on a cost effective consideration. This however, does not prohibit the building of different types of houses but the selling prices are subject to location/area and prices as recommended.

### 5.10 Eighth Malaysia Plan 2001-2005

During the Eighth Malaysia Plan period, efforts continue to be undertaken to expedite housing development in order to meet the increasing demand of the population, particularly of the low and low medium income cost houses. Emphasis will also be given to improving the quality of houses built as well as provide suitable locations and a conducive living environment. With regard to other social services, the focus of development will be to continuously improve the quality of services to enhance the well being of the population. The policy thrusts in the Eighth Malaysia Plan (2004) for housing and other social services will be as follows:

- Providing adequate, affordable and quality houses for all income groups with emphasis on the development of low and low medium cost houses;
- Improving the delivery and quality as well as expanding the coverage of urban services;
- Fostering harmonious living among the various communities as well as building strong and resilient families towards creating a caring society; and
- Enhancing the aesthetic aspects of life through greater participation in sports and recreation as well as the arts and cultural activities.

During the plan period, housing needs are estimated to reach a total of 782,300 units due to the growing of population, formation of new households and the replacement of



existing houses. Of the total, 93.6 percent will be for new requirements and the balance will be for replacement. Mid Term Review of the Eighth Malaysia Plan 2001-2005 (2004) reviewed the achievement of Eighth Malaysia Plan in 2003. During the review period, housing development programmes continued to be implemented to provide adequate, affordable and quality housing to Malaysians of all income levels, particularly, the low income group. Housing development projects were planned based on the human settlement concept, where housing areas were provided with basic infrastructure and social amenities as well as landscape surroundings.

## **6.0 CONCLUSION**

The objective of the ongoing research is to compare the structure of housing provision in three countries. The conceptual definition of SHP will be identified after examining the SHP in Malaysia, United Kingdom and Australia. Throughout a more detailed examination and comprehensive literature review, the role of the public sector, private sector developer and other social agents in the SHP for these three countries will identified by utilising the structure and agency approach as its basic methodological tools. Hence, the differences of SHP for these three countries can be identified within their own different contexts. The strengths, weaknesses and threats in the SHP for these three countries can be explained later. This analysis then has been in addition to the requirements for national policy formulation and management of the sectors concerned such as ministries and their other social agents in housing development process.

This paper presents an initial study of the Malaysia position. A structure of housing provision in Malaysia shows the similarities that have existed in social organisation and in mutual development of institutional forms in the process of delivering housing provision. In short, two types of developer have been determined for the whole physical process of land development, building production, the transfer of complete dwellings to the final user and their subsequent use in Malaysia. Other social agent such as landowners, financial institutions, government bodies (federal, state, municipal), local housing and planning authorities, building societies, legislative bodies have intervened in the physical process of production, consumption and allocation of housing in Malaysia. Historically, housing policies in Malaysia were always evolving and it seems that not all the policies have achieved their target. Nevertheless, all of these social agents made many efforts to implement a range of policies since colonial administration until the latest Eighth National Plan (2001-2005). Government and the policy makers need to continue provide an excellent framework of powers and opportunities for housing policy to be implemented especially for the purchaser as an ultimate user.

**Table 4: A Summary of Malaysia Housing Policies until year 2005**

Plan Period	Focus of Attention	Types of Housing Scheme	Housing Provider	Number of Units	Policy Analysis
1. Colonial administration and pre-independence	Economic development is following 'divide and rule' policy introduced by colonial British administration. British administration started to provide housing facilities for its employees in public institutions such as schools, police station, hospitals and district offices. The only programme aimed at providing housing for the Malaysian people was the resettlement of Chinese resident (communist sympathisers and supporters) in the New Villages in 1946. Felda was established in 1956 to open up new land and settlement.	Squatter type dwellings which were classified as hovels and overcrowded cubicles.	Government and privately developed houses.	No precise information available. About 600 new families were resettled under New Villages programme.	Government was the key player in housing provision
2. First and Second Malaya Plan (1955-1964)	Government started with 5 year national development plan. Most of housing continued with squatter type dwellings classified as hovels and overcrowded cubicles. Felda was started to open up of land and resettling people.	Squatter type dwellings which were classified as hovels and overcrowded cubicles. Felda scheme let people open up their own land and develop their homes under resettlements scheme.	Government, FELDA and privately developed houses.	No precise information available. 15,000 acres were targeted under FELDA scheme allocated for about 3,522 families.	Government was the key player in housing provision and FELDA.
3. First Malaysia Plan (1965-1970)	Formal and structured housing programmes were started. Main agenda is to foster national unity for Malaysia in the three races consists of Malays, Chinese and Indians after the May 1969 riots. Government also started to focus on low cost housing to meet the needs of the poor especially the Bumiputeras. Private sector developers had begun to purchase and develop properties with active participation by state governments through their development corporations.	Low cost housing units developed by public sectors developers or through MARA and Felda. Private sector developers were started to develop new housing estate focusing on medium and high cost housing.	Public sectors and public sectors through federal agencies.  Private sectors and private sectors cooperation with state government.	No precise information available.	Private sector started to purchase and develop properties with state governments.
4. Second Malaysia Plan (1971-1975)	This plan was drawn up within the context of the New Economic Policy (NEP), since 1971 to foster national unity and nation through eradication of poverty, employment opportunity, irrespective of race and to eliminate identification of race with economic function. Government start introduced a quota system in housing which at least 30% were allocated to Bumiputeras. Several public enterprises and corporations were engaged to form and formulate national housing development.	Public sector developers started to develop institutional housing scheme and joint venture with state government. Private sector developers were started to develop new housing estate focusing on medium and high cost housing.	Public sectors and public sectors with state government corporation and federal agencies. Private sectors and private sectors cooperation with state government.	260,000 units of houses have been developed for the nation. 67% came from private sector and 33% came from public sector.	Public sectors started to develop institutional housing and joint venture with state government. Private sectors started to cooperate with institutions.
5. Third Malaysia Plan (1976-1980)	Government was counting on Felda to implement land development of housing for rural immigrants in the regional development areas. Government had targeted for a total 109,300 families to be resettled by Felda or approximately 4% of total population in Malaysia. Role of private sector was significant. Nation still implements strategies to achieve NEP and supported by increasing industrial development.	Public sector developers started to develop institutional housing scheme and joint venture with state government. Private sector developers started to develop new housing estate focusing on medium and high cost housing. 30% of houses to be built must be allocated to Bumiputeras.	Public and private sector developers	Of total 774,000 units, the public sector accounted for 207,509 units of houses and private sector the remaining 536,410 units.	Public sectors started to develop institutional housing and joint venture with state government. Private sector started to cooperate with institutions.

Plan Period	Focus of Attention	Types of Housing Scheme	Housing Provider	Number of Units	Policy Analysis
6. Fourth Malaysia Plan (1981-1985)	Overall goal of housing development is to ensure that all Malaysians have access to adequate housing. To meet this objective, emphasis was given to increasing the supply of low cost houses in urban area, while in the rural areas priority was accorded to the provision of basic amenities. 60 agencies in the public and private sector were started to involve in the implementation of housing construction programme. 70% of programme is towards urban centre. Government introduced and implemented a concept of low cost housing.	Public sector developers started to develop medium and high price of housing scheme. In urban areas low cost walk –up and high rise flats were constructed and rented out.	Public and private sector developer	Estimated that about 923,300 units of housing have been required. Of this total, 398,570 were developed by public sector developer and 524,730 were developed by private sector developer.	Public and private sector developers started making cooperation with federal and state agencies. Low cost housing was actively developed in the urban areas.
7. Fifth Malaysia Plan (1986-1990)	Housing programme began to be implemented along the concept of human settlement. Government emphasised private sector to stimulate housing development. The provision of social facilities was emphasised alongside the provision of housing. Government and private sector gradually accepted the national development strategies to upgrade the quality of life and promote national unity. Integrated human settlement programme known as New Growth Areas (NGAs) was first introduced in Kuala Lumpur. Village regrouping programmes was launched in rural areas. Special Low Cost Housing Programme (SLCHP) was launched in 1986.	New Growth Areas (NGAs) have been developed. New village under regrouping programme has been introduced. Government has launched SLCHP. Public sector developers started to develop medium and high price of housing scheme and special incentives will be given to the fulfilment of 30% Bumiputera's quota.	Public and private sector developers	701,500 units of houses were required during this period. Private sector constructed about 552,500 units of houses. Public sector has developed approximately 21% or 149,000 units of houses.	Housing developments were geared towards the concept of human settlement. Public sector contributed the lowest quantity of houses, while private sector has contributed almost 80% of housing market.
8. Sixth Malaysia Plan (1986-1990)	During this period the main focus of housing development was to provide the adequate, decent and affordable housing units for enhancing the quality of life, social cohesion and national unity among various levels and ethnic groups in the country. The policy was geared towards attaining the objectives of the National Development Plan (1991-2000) which aimed to eradicate poverty and restructure society to correct social, economic and regional imbalances and thereby towards national unity. Government also emphasised subsidised housing for the very poor, low interest housing loans, element of cross subsidies in mixed development and intensifying research and development activities. Various programme of housing development was well prepared for the nation during this period.	Public Low Cost Housing (PLCH), Site and Services Scheme, Housing Loan Scheme, Housing Underland and Regional Development, Economic Development Agencies Housing Programme, Institutional Quarters and other Staff Accommodation was developed by public sector.  Private sector constructed development activities including Special Low Cost Housing Programme, Cooperatives Societies Housing also managed to develop houses for individual and small group of people.	Public and private sector developers.	About 573,000 housing units have been planned to be delivered. Of this total 60% were targeted to constitute low cost units. Public sector is expected to deliver 70% of the total, 63% of which constitute low cost units	Various housing schemes were trying to be implemented during this period. Government realised that private sector participation is very much needed for national housing development.

9.	Plan Period	Focus of Attention	Types of Housing Scheme	Housing Provider	Number of Units	Policy Analysis
	Seventh Malaysia Plan (1996-2000)	Various housing programme were undertaken by both the public and private sectors developers. Private sector focused more on overall market demand, the public sector continued to provide house for sale or rent to the low income group and housing for public sector employees. Housing programmes continued to be implemented based on the human settlement concept, whereby housing estates were provided with communal and recreational facilities.	<p>Public sector developers continue to develop PLCH, focused on Housing Rehabilitation Scheme, Site and Services Scheme, cooperate with Commercial Agencies, Housing by Land Schemes and delivered Institutional Quarters &amp; Staff Accommodation.</p> <p>Private sector constructed development activities including Special Low Cost Housing Programme and joint venture with Cooperatives Societies.</p>	Public and private sector developers.	800,000 units of houses have been developed for the nation.570, 000 or 71% came from private sector and 29% came from public sector.	Various housing schemes were trying to be implemented during this period. Government realised that private sector participation is very much needed for national housing development but private sector developers started to focus on cooperation with Cooperative Societies in housing development.
9.	Eighth Malaysia Plan (2001-2005)	During this period, efforts will continue to be undertaken to expedite housing development in order to meet the increasing demand of the population, particularly of the low/medium income cost houses. The policy thrusts in this period are to provide adequate, affordable and quality houses for all income groups with emphasis on the development of low and low medium cost income. Government also seeks to improve the delivery and quality of houses and fostering harmonious living among the various communities as well as trying to enhance the aesthetic aspects of life through greater participation in sports, recreation and cultural activities.	<p>Public sector developers continue to develop PLCH, focused on Housing Rehabilitation Scheme, Site and Services Scheme, cooperate with Commercial Agencies, Housing by Land Schemes and delivered Institutional Quarters &amp; Staff Accommodation.</p> <p>Private sector constructed development activities including Special Low Cost Housing Programme and joint venture with Cooperatives Societies.</p>	Public and private sector developers.	615,000 units have been developed for the nation. 312,000 or 51% came from public sector and 49% came from private sector.	Types of housing schemes were to be implemented during this period. There is a balanced amount of housing units to be developed by both developers.

## 7.0 REFERENCES

- Agus, MR (1986). Politics of Housing. Gateway Publishing House. Kuala Lumpur.
- Agus, MR (1987). The Role of the State in Distributing Low-Cost Housing in Malaysia: A Comparative Study. Association of Social Science Malaysia, Kuala Lumpur.
- Agus, MR (1989). Public Sector Low Cost Housing in Malaysia. Habitat International Vol. 13 No. 1.105-115. Pergamon Press. UK.
- Agus, MR (1997). Housing the Nation: A Definitive (Study Historical Perspective on Housing Development). Cagamas Berhad, Kuala Lumpur.
- Balchin, P and Rhoden, M (2002). Housing Policy. 4<sup>th</sup> Edition. Routledge, Taylor and Francis Group. London.
- Ball, M (1983). Housing Policy and Economic Power: The Political Economy of Owner Occupation, London: Macmillan.
- Ball, M (1987). Housing Analysis: Time for a theoretical refocus ? Housing Studies (1), No.3. 147-165.
- Ball, M and Harloe, M (1992). Rhetorical Barriers to Understanding Housing Provision: What the 'Provision Thesis' is and is not. Housing Studies (7), No 1. 3-15.
- Bauer, R.A and Gergen, KJ (1968). The Study of Policy Formation. New York. The Free Press, 1968.
- Bourne, Larry.S and T. Bunting (1993). Housing Market, Community Development, and Neighborhood Change in L.S. Bourne and D. Leys, eds., The Changing Social Geography of Canadian Cities. McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Dickens, P.et al. (1985) Housing, States and Localities, London and New York: Methuen.
- Eighth Malaysia Plan (2001).Eighth Malaysia Plan, 2001-2005, Kuala Lumpur: The Government Press, 2001.
- Goh Ban Lee (1980). A Review of Land Policy and Policy Measures in Malaysia.. Habitat International. Vol. No.4. Nos 4/5/6, pp 471-483. Pergamon Press. UK.
- Goh, Ban Lee (1988). Future of Urban Planning in Malaysia. Habitat International Vol.12. No.4 pp 5-12. Pergamon Press. UK.
- Hahn, J (1998). Residential Differentiation and The Structure of Housing Provision: A Case Study of Seoul, Korea, 1960-1990. Doctor of Philosophy Dissertation, Graduate School of the University of Wisconsin-Madison. Wisconsin.
- Hill, M and Bramley, G (1986). Analysing Social Policy. Oxford. Blackwell.
- Housing Statistics Bulletin (1995). Research and Development Division, National Housing Department, Ministry of Housing and Local Government, Malaysia.
- Karn, V (1991). Targeting support to those with special needs Race and Housing: current and potential responses. Billing & Sons Ltd: Worcester.
- Laquian, A.A (1982). Planned Population Redistribution: Lessons from Indonesia and Malaysia. Habitat International. Vol.6, No.1/2,pp. 39-52, 1982. Pergamon Press. UK.
- Malpas, P and Murie, A (1994). Housing Policy and Practice.4<sup>th</sup> Edition Macmillan: London.
- Mandelker, D.R. (1973), Housing In America. Problems and Perspectives. The Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc. United States of America. 1973
- Mid Term Review (2003) Mid Term Review of the Eighth Malaysia Plan, 2001-2005, Kuala Lumpur: The Government Press, 2003.
- Monerasinghe, N (1985). Research Needs and Priorities Housing and Construction in Malaysia. Habitat International Vol. No. 9, No.2 , pp. 37-35. Pergamon Press.UK.
- Tan, Soo Hai and Hamzah Sendut (1979). Public and Private Housing in Malaysia. Heinemann Educational Books (Asia) Ltd. Kuala Lumpur.
- Tsenkova, Shasha (1998). Private Housebuilding and Housing Market in Transitional Economies: The Case of Bulgaria. Doctor of Philosophy Dissertation. Graduate Department of Geography, University of Toronto, Canada.
- Turner, John F. C., (1976), Housing By People: Towards Autonomy in Building Environments, New York: Pantheon Books.
- Van Huyck, A.P (1986). New Directions in Asian Housing Policies. Habitat International Vol. No. 10. 1/2, pp 5-10. Pergamon Press. UK.
- Webpages:*
- Department of Statistics Malaysia (2004). *Population Clock Malaysia*. [Internet]. Kuala Lumpur. Available from [http://www.statistics.gov.my/English/frameset\\_popclock.php?file=malaysia](http://www.statistics.gov.my/English/frameset_popclock.php?file=malaysia) [3 December 2004].
- Keith, KW (1995).*Official Social Culture of Malaysia*. [Internet].Kuala Lumpur. Available from: <http://www.ecst.csuchico.edu/~ong/SCM/scm-faq2.htm> [14 December 2004].

- Mid Term Review of Fourth Malaysia Plan (1981-1985). *Mid Term Review of Fourth Malaysia Plan. Prime Minister's Office*. [Internet]. Kuala Lumpur. Available from: <http://eppublic1.pmo.gov.my/onepage/servlet/FWControllerServlet?mvcapp=FWMyOnePage&command=myonepage&rid=1&b=i&sid=048110X138931E0312193&b=i&tabset=1&temp=3&p=1&taborder=1&fp=1> [8 December 2004].
- Mid Term Review of Fifth Malaysia Plan (1986-1990). *Mid Term Review of Fifth Malaysia Plan. Prime Minister's Office*, [Internet]. Kuala Lumpur. Available from: <http://eppublic1.pmo.gov.my/onepage/servlet/FWControllerServlet?mvcapp=FWMyOnePage&command=myonepage&rid=1&b=i&sid=048110X138931E0312193&b=i&tabset=1&temp=3&p=1&taborder=1&fp=1> [8 December 2004].
- Mid Term Review of Sixth Malaysia Plan (1990-1995). *Mid Term Review of Sixth Malaysia Plan. Prime Minister's Office*, [Internet]. Kuala Lumpur. Available from: <http://eppublic1.pmo.gov.my/onepage/servlet/FWControllerServlet?mvcapp=FWMyOnePage&command=myonepage&rid=1&b=i&sid=048110X138931E0312193&b=i&tabset=1&temp=3&p=1&taborder=1&fp=1> [8 December 2004].
- New Economic Policy (2004). *Rancangan Web: Office of the Prime Minister of Malaysia*. [Internet]. Kuala Lumpur. Available from: <http://www.pmo.gov.my/RancanganWeb/Rancangan.nsf/> [10 December 2004].
- Rehda (2002). *Housing A Nation. Real Estate Housing Developer Association (Rehda)*. [Internet]. Kuala Lumpur. Available from: <http://www.rehda.com/> [15 December 2004]