



# Social welfare development program among coastal community (SPKMP) in kuala Terengganu: a preliminary assessment on the performance of the program

Dara Aisyah<sup>1,\*</sup>, Khatijah Omar<sup>2</sup> and Noor Fadhiha Mokhtar<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Center of Society Development (CSD), Universiti Malaysia Terengganu.

<sup>2</sup>School of Maritime Business and Management), Universiti Malaysia Terengganu.

### ARTICLE INFO

#### Article history:

Received: 13 July 2014;

Received in revised form:

21 August 2014;

Accepted: 12 September 2014;

#### Keywords

SPKMP, Performance, Output evaluation, Management, Malpractices and Inefficiency.

### ABSTRACT

SPKMP is a public programme with the objective of uplifting the level of wellness among coastal community particularly the poor households. Since its inception in 2001, the programme has undergone several phases of improvement. However, until now living conditions of the coastal poor households remain unchanged. The present study aimed at assessing performance of SPKMP in terms of implementation of the program as well as the performance of the organizations that involved in the program, particularly looking into the mechanism used in managing the program with special reference to district of Kuala Terengganu. By using official records and reports from various agencies at the central level and district offices besides observation and in-depth interviews with households and officials at the agencies involved, the study discovered some interesting findings. Firstly, the principles serve as a guideline for the implementation of the program were not followed by the implementing agencies at the district level. Various malpractices were also detected. Secondly, the evaluation showed that most of the program outputs cannot help the fishermen to increase their household income and savings. Thirdly, the marine resources are depleting, therefore the fishermen are not able to increase their catch. Furthermore, coastal communities have not received sufficient assistance in the program so they do not get the necessary moral support. This study shows that the development agencies have not been able to implement the program properly because of weak and inefficient management. Policies, strategies and activities that are more suitable are needed to improve the program.

© 2014 Elixir All rights reserved.

### Introduction

Eradicating poverty is an important basis of Malaysia's development agenda as the aim of the New Economic Policy (NEP), from 1971 to 1990, is to reduce poverty rates from 49.3 percent in 1970 to 16.7 percent in 1990. Next, under the National Development Policy (DPN), 1991-2000, the goal was to reduce poverty rate to 7.2 percent and the rate of extreme poverty to 0.5 percent in 2000. Under the National Vision Policy (DWN), 2001-2010, poverty rate would be reduced to 0.5 percent by 2005. Malaysia has been able to achieve the goal of reducing poverty from 52.4 percent in 1970 to 3.8 percent in 2009. In 10<sup>th</sup> Malaysia Plan (2010-2015) Malaysia has targeted to increase the average income for 40 percent of the households from RM 1440 in 2009 to RM 2300, and the poverty rate would be reduced to 2.0 percent in 2015.

Although poverty has been reduced, the agriculture and fisheries sectors still has a high incidence of poverty. As for today, the problem of poverty is still considered as a formidable social disease. Variety of ways have been implemented to eliminate poverty such as providing programs that can increase revenue, providing training programs to enhance skills, morale and productivity, land clearance programs, education programs, agricultural subsidies and provision of micro-credit system. In addition, poverty mapping is made available in urban and rural areas as one of the ways to show government's serious effort to reduce poverty and eradicate hardcore poverty in the country, as

well as to improve the quality of life of the poor in rural areas in accordance to the government policies, which related to poverty alleviation and rural development.

The fisheries sector is important in the development of agriculture in this country which contributes 1.47 percent of Gross Domestic Product (KDNK). Although the percentage was small compared to other sectors fisheries still remains the main manufacturers' source of protein for people's diet for this country and provide employment opportunities to 82,200 fishermen (Report of the Social, Economic Fishermen 1998). In an effort to increase the income of poor households in the agricultural sector, the Skim Pembangunan Kesejahteraan Rakyat (SPKR) and specific programs with the objective to diversify the sources of income of farmers, breeders and fishermen has been widened to provide the benefit to a greater number of households (Rancangan Malaysia ke-9, 2006). Although the fisheries sector has undergone major changes in terms of technology and the number of landings, the economic status of fishing communities in the country is still relatively low (Salim Amin, 2012).

Malaysia is one of the countries identified by the World Bank as having a successful economic community. However, there are still farmers, breeders and fishermen who have yet to enjoy the outgrowth of development as if they remained on the sidelines development process (Muhyiddin, 2004). Malaysia focuses on human capital development, especially among the

Tele:

E-mail addresses: [d.aisyah@umt.edu.my](mailto:d.aisyah@umt.edu.my)

fishermen community. Coastal fishing provinces are community who live in coastal regions. Coastal provinces are transition regions, which marks the shift between land and sea territory or otherwise by Dahuri et.al. (2001). Most of living communities in coastal provinces activity is managing coastal resources and seas, either directly or indirectly. According to Kusnadi (2006) most of the communities work as fishermen, and these group of fishermen acts as the most important element for the existence of coastal communities. The catches from fishing activities were either for household need or sold as a whole.

The number of fishermen working on licensed fishing vessels in Peninsular Malaysia in 2009 was 83,873. Bumiputera fishermen comprised the highest number of 40,987 that involve in fishery sector. In Peninsular Malaysia, especially in the east coast of Malaysia, fishermen are among the groups facing high poverty rate. Based on available statistics, it shows that the number of extreme poor household heads in Terengganu is 7,038, 9,391 in Kelantan, and 13,837 in Sabah. In Terengganu itself, the number of fishermen in Besut in 2009 was the highest which comprised 2,356 fishermen (22.6%) followed by South Kuala Terengganu 2,135 fishermen (20.5%), Kemaman 1,874 fishermen (17.9%), Marang, 1,224 fishermen (11.7%), Dungun 1,196 fishermen (11.4%), Kuala Terengganu North 876 fishermen (8.4%), and Setiu 760 fishermen (7.3%). In Terengganu, the fishermen that were categorized as poor were those with income RM 529 or below (Shaladdin 2007). Recently, those with monthly income of RM750 or below are considered poor and in poverty group.

To overcome the poverty problem among the fishermen, the government has undertaken several development programs in fishery sector starting with Fisherman Development Area Program (1982), followed by Eradication Program for the Extreme Poor (1987 – 1994) and other programs such as extensive use of capital through subsidies, extension services and training, establishment of fisheries institutions to carry out research ; pricing and marketing, and provision of management expertise for specific projects. However, it was found that on the average, these development programs were less successful (Siwar & Nor Aini, 1996)

Due to the inefficiency of the program, in 1982, the government through the Fisheries Development Authority of Malaysia (LKIM) launched the 'Skim Pembangunan Kesejahteraan Rakyat (SPKR)' with the aim to assist the targeted fishermen to improve their socio-economic status. To evaluate the efficiency of the program, a study was carried out in several areas in Kuala Terengganu that involved in SPKR program. The study aimed to identify the fishermen that could be placed under the SPKR program particularly to improve their revenue or household income, identifying any appropriate and necessary programs that could be implemented among these fishermen that could fulfill the objectives of this SPKR poverty eradication program.

#### **Past studies of poverty and poverty alleviation program coastal communities**

There are various factors that relate to poverty and universal social problems. These problems too have become important issues in most developing countries. In order to overcome these problems, various initiatives and programs have been addressed and implemented. Eradication of poverty is one of the main development strategies that has been given attention by the government. At the initial stage (1970 – 1985), most of poverty eradication program emphasized on indirect long-term assistance. The program was legislated based on overflowing-down theory which assumed the benefits from the development

will ultimately be enjoyed by the lower income groups (UPS 1989).

Provisions of the anti-poverty programs were given to sectors and areas that were considered poor, such as agriculture, fisheries, rural areas, and special regional development areas. Implementation of poverty eradication programs were expected to promote and develop the sector in various areas. The goal is to improve or increase the basic income of the population concerned. However, the programs still could not help the poor; they were still found to be isolated, marginalized and farther behind economically.

Poverty is still prevalent among fishermen despite various efforts taken by government, including the KPN program and PPRT programs. A study by Abdul Malik et. al. (1996) on the KPN integrated development program conducted by the Fisheries Development Authority of Malaysia (LKIM) indicated that the issue of poverty among fishermen was still a major problem in the fisheries sector, particularly on the East Coast. To further explore, a study was conducted at three areas in the east coast that implemented KPN programs with the objective to improve the socio-economic conditions among fishermen. The study found that even though many programs by KPN have been conducted, serious poverty remains a major problem in the fisheries sector. Among the identified poverty factors were household size and large dependent, low level of education, household conditions, and a lack of ownership of capital assets, with little or no basic amenities and enjoy little or no savings. Overall, this study found that KPN programs were less effective. This is said so because the programs failed to bring any significant differences in standard of living between fishermen who involved in KPN programs and fishermen who did not. . Similarly, Tengku Mahmud who conducted a study for 10 years in Setiu, Terengganu starting in 1996, found that efforts made by KPN to reduce poverty among fishermen were less successful.

As mentioned before, a number of development plans were conducted by Malaysian Government in addressing the poverty problems, especially among coastal communities in east coast of Malaysia.. In the early stage, planning and implementation of poverty alleviation programs such as the program for the extremely poor (PPRT) were conducted through existing public organizations. However the organization and management aspects of the programs conducted were not clearly explained. Thus the objectives of the programs were not achieved. PPRT is a special development program in terms of concept and purpose. In the beginning, the implementation of the programs was left to the existing public organizations, whereby by doing so, it was expected to reduce management cost. However it was found that the operations were complicated and the programs could not be carried out effectively. The implementation should have been supported by the formation of a suitable system, appropriate information technology assistance as well as dedication shown by the agencies involved.

Nik Hashim (2011) in the study of an economic analysis on fishery development policies in Malaysia discussed that the fishery sector is a traditional sector that often associated with two major problems, namely low productivity and employment problems. Low productivity leads to the notion that investment in the fisheries sector is still lagging behind and cannot guarantee sufficient income to fishermen's' family. Nik's study was similar to other eight studies conducted in Bangladesh, Canada, India, Malawi, Mauritania, Morocco, Pacific Islands and Thailand which examined the efforts made by various bodies in handling economic growth and poverty among

fishermen which the results of studies agreed that there was a need for appropriate choice of technology to be applied by fishermen if they were to improve their income (www.dfid.gov.uk.)

A study by Firth (1966) and Isaac (1990) specifically focused on the economic issues among fishing communities that led to the importance of fishing and the production of capital to improve the standard of living. Generally, their research showed that coastal communities in that era had a homogeneous socio-economic characteristics, namely job as a fisherman provided the main source of income. Lack of human capital or good social capital, skills and technology were among the underlying causes of the fishermen's low living standards.

Studies on poverty among coastal communities also often associated with socio-cultural aspects. Several studies that had been conducted in Kuala Besut, Malaysia found that the community thinking patterns continue to stress on daily activities, whereby they just think of how they can earn money for their expenses on daily meals, clothing, and some other expenses including school fees for their children. They did not think of how they could make extra income and improve their standard of living. Due to insufficient income and far from leading a comfort life, most heads of the fishermen families prefer their children not to inherit their profession.

Many scholars and researchers revealed that the concept of quality of life or well-being also links to poverty (Mohd Shaladdin et. al., 2007; Renwick 2006; Fadhil 2003; Norizan 2003; Pollnac et. al., 2001; Binkley 2002 Nieboer et. al., 2005). Several researchers have conducted studies to analyze the determinants of the well-being of the coastal fishermen. As example, Mohd Shaladdin et. al., 2007 conducted special studies in Kuala Terengganu, in which the study focused on four key aspects of fishermen well-being profiles; fishermen attribute fishermen, the role of government, the role of community and demographics. Fishermen attribute was a key determinant of fishermen well-being which consist of income, expenses, savings, home ownership, land, vehicles, fishing equipment and facilities, health and education. The role of government was also a component of well-being determinants of fishermen in the aspects of infrastructure, training courses, consultancy, marketing, enforcement, as well as research and development. Meanwhile the role of the community was measured by the peace and harmony of society, the spirit of cooperation, social problems and welfare work undertaken by the local community. Community role was considered as a moderator in this study of fishermen well-being. Correlation test in that particular study also showed a large number of factors were significant determinants of the well-being of fishermen.

Mohd Anwar (2007) conducted a study to identify the activities carried out to earn income among fishermen in coastal fishing communities in Kuala Dungun, Terengganu on fishing activities carried out for their income. Activities include the aspects of the use of the equipment, knowledge, skills, and marketing. Results showed that only 25.5 percent of the fishermen in coastal fishing communities were interested joining activities that can increase their income. The study also found that only a small portion of the fishing community applied what had been thought to them through special program in their effort to improve their earnings.

One of the weaknesses of the strategies used in poverty eradication programs was that the target group was not clearly identified, the benefit of the implemented programs did not fully reach the target group. Beside, most of the benefits were enjoyed by those who were not entitled; the non-poor (Siwar &

Idris 1996). In order to overcome this problem, the target group should be identified accurately and irregularities in the identification of target groups should be avoided so that programs and plans aimed for development could be enjoyed by the actual target group. Aisyah (2009) in her study on PEMP program evaluation in North Jakarta in 2007 found that there was no clear determination of the target group in Coastal Community Economic Empowerment program in Indonesia. Among the key findings in the study included: (1) generally there was no significant increment of household income after joining the PEMP program, (2) no significant differences in expenses and net monthly household income between participants and non-participants PEMP, and finally (3) there was no significant effects of PEMP program on household income in coastal areas of Cilincing district, North Jakarta (Aisyah, 2009). Statistical test showed that the existence of environmental problems, the rise in fuel prices and the absence of basic facilities to assist their efforts had caused the ineffectiveness of PEMP program in efforts put to increase the participants' income.

Even though the Department of Marine and Fisheries successfully implemented the PEMP program (measured based on the amount of loans distributed and the involvement of various implementing agencies), the overall performance still could be considered as weak and incompetent. Thus the PEMP program failed to achieve its objective (Aisyah 2010; 2011). Aisyah (2010; 2011) added that there were a lot of agencies involved in the PEMP programs that led to the redundancy of functions among agencies involved. Due to that, the overall management and administrative process became complex (Aisyah, 2010; 2011). Aisyah (2010; 2011) highlighted that functions of the agencies that involved in fisheries sector should be well coordinated in order to avoid wasteful duplication of functions and high cost.

The next issue that closely related to the poverty problem was the livelihood of the poor among coastal fishing communities. A study was conducted by Salagrama (2006) to identify the lifestyle of coastal fishing communities in Orissa State of India by using the Sustainable Livelihoods Approach (SLA). It was found that there was a relationship between life and poverty in developing indicators for monitoring the relationship from time to time, such as the problem of natural life, physical, social, human and financial. These conditions include a shift in the method of fishing from subsistence-traditional based activities, fishermen become labor which from poor that still using traditional skills, and at the same time increase the risk of dependency to financial resources (where some of these fishermen involved with the middlemen which these middlemen play a key role in marketing the catches from the fishermen) that caused fishermen live in poverty.

Several steps can be taken to improve the income level and the future of the fishermen. Poverty problem should address not only in terms of material but also poverty of spiritual (soul). Poverty can lead to moral and ethical violations, negligence and nuisance mind. It affects family, community and country. Multi-disciplinary approaches through the multi-factor development are essential in the studies. A multi-factor study involves three main components; the community, the nation, and the economy in explaining the social mobility and fishermen development using historical methods (Nor Hayati Sa'at, 2011) should be continued so that the coastal and island communities get special places in their history especially in Peninsular Malaysia.

### Methodology and study area

This study was conducted in in Kuala Terengganu. The district is one of 10 areas that implement SPKR Income Enhancement Program in year 2007-2010. Kuala Terengganu had the most number of SPKR recipients that was 58 recipients (40 percent), Marang district 27 recipients (18 percent), Kemaman 20 recipients (14 percent), Setiu 14 recipients (10 percent), Dungun 9 recipients (6 percent), Paka 8 recipients (5 percent), Besut 5 recipients (3 percent), Kijal 2 recipients (1 percent), while Kemasik and Kertih both had one recipient (1 percent) respectively.

This study applied qualitative and quantitative methods. Quantitatively, the data collected using questionnaires whereby the respondents were interviewed in person. To meet the needs of this study, data from various sources was used. The main source of data was obtained from official reports from LKIM agencies, particularly agencies that implemented SPKR programs. In addition to primary data, secondary data was also used. Primary data was obtained through interviews with key respondents by using a survey distributed to the fishing community, and conversation recording and reviewing based on information obtained from various LKIM agencies. The number of SPKR program participants in Terengganu was 147, but this study only focused on Kuala Terengganu district with the total of program participants was 53. Kuala Terengganu was chosen as the location of the study because Kuala Terengganu has the highest number of fishermen. Purposive sampling was used in selecting respondents. Out of 53 potential participants, four respondents were disqualified leaving the final total of 49 participants. The researcher had arranged interview appointments with each of fisheries officer in each of SPKR program in Kuala Terengganu. The appointments were made to explain to the participants the purpose of conducting the study. Besides, the discussion also aimed to gain an insight of fishermen's daily activities so that the data obtained was relevant and timely. The researcher also obtained cooperation from LKIM that provided personal information (address of participants) that enabled the researcher meeting those fishermen.

### Findings and discussion

#### Background of SPKR Program Area

SPKR program was a fishermen development program conducted by the LKIM agency. The objectives of this program were to improve and strengthen socio-economic of the fishing communities, particularly in participation of enhancement revenue program (PPP). The Fisheries Development Authority of Malaysia (LKIM) played a key role in implementing this program. Programs and projects conducted by this agency were placed under the Eradication Department (BPK), under the Ministry of Rural and Regional Development (KKLW). Eradication Department allocated RM 156 070 million to implement eradication poverty programs under the People's Livelihood Development Scheme (SPKR) in year 2007. Until December 31, 2007, RM 139 569 million or 89.21 percent of the allocation was spent to implement six (6) SPKR programs. Those programs were:

1. Income Enhancement Program (PPP) to help to increase the income of the target group through the implementation of economic projects. The provided assistance were divided into four (4) scopes; agri-business resources, small business, agriculture and service activities. In 2007, RM 71,452,349.00 million was spent under the Income Enhancement Program (PPP). A total of 6,823 participants benefited from 6,505 PPP projects implemented across the state.

2. Career and Skills Training Program (PLKK) assisted the target groups pursuing training to help them gain employment or to start their own business. The training provided were sewing, culinary, computer repair, mechanical, electrical, handicrafts, manufacturing fiber glass boats, repair of mobile phones and others. A total of RM 35.44 million was spent to implement a total of 185 projects / PLKK training courses in 2007. It benefited 6,156 participants

3. Educational Excellence Program (MCP) helped the children to improve academic achievement. The program offered assistance in learning techniques courses / answering the exam questions / motivation / building personality camp and tuition classes for lower secondary assessment (PMR), Sijil Pelajaran Malaysia (SPM) and Sijil Tinggi Pelajaran Malaysia (STPM). A total of 700 motivational programs / tuition were implemented in 2007 at a cost of RM 11,811,398,000.00 million. It benefited 28,000 students across the state.

4. TASKA Building Program provided childcare facilities to the children of extremely poor families aged 1-4 years. The assistance provided includes new construction of a childcare center, childcare center equipment and repair and maintenance of buildings and replacement of old equipment. Overall, the implementation of projects under the SPKR in 2007 benefited 63.126 people. The implementation of projects had successfully increased the quality of life of the recipients.

5. Dietary Food Supplement Program (PTMS) provided additional food to the needy families with children under the age of 12 years to stimulate physical growth and learning ability. Selected families received five (5) year of food supply. A total of 19,307 extremely poor families benefited from PTMS assistance in 2007. RM 926,992,000.00 million was spent to run this program.

6. ASB Sejahtera program provided financial assistance grants for the acquisition of shares in ASB by participants. Benefit to be received by the participants was in the form of annual dividend. The assistance of RM 5,000 was given to eligible participants who then would receive dividends (MRRD Annual Report 2007).

Under the Income Enhancement Program (PPP), assistance was also provided to aborigines in the forms of agriculture machineries, agriculture inputs, fishing equipment, and others. The application to participate in this program was submitted to the Office of Aboriginal Affairs in each district. The qualified participants would be forwarded to the Secretariat in ministry level for certification.

LKIM was responsible to manage and monitor the development projects in each district. The Income Enhancement Programs (PPP) focused on four (4) main scopes including enterprise-based economic projects of agro economic, projects on processing of agricultural raw materials, a small scale business and economic projects, projects related to activities that provide services.

#### Poverty Incidence

This study was conducted in areas that carried out SPKR programs in Kuala Terengganu. In Terengganu State itself, a total of 147 fishermen received aids, which consist of areas such as Kuala Terengganu, Marang, Dungun, Setiu, Besut, Dungun, Kemasik, Kerteh, Kijal, Merchang, and Paka. Overall it was found that 41 percent of fishermen involved in the program earned about RM 500 monthly, 29 percent earned between RM 200-400, 25 percent earned between RM 600-800 and 6 percent earned between RM 1000 – 1200. Recipients from Kuala Terengganu covered the largest number of recipients that received aids under SPKR program. The majority of the

recipients were those with an average income of RM400-500 (31 percent), followed by Marang, Kemaman and Setiu.

Nearly 51 percent of the fishermen who involved in the program stated that the current level of employment and the level of satisfaction compared to five years ago, before receiving SPKR assistance, was the same. It showed that the fishermen did not experience any increase of income after participating in the aid program (31 percent of average income of RM 500). This situation occurred due to resources extinction (before and after the availability of assistance program). The fishermen indicated that their catches were decreased to 47 percent which previously was 51 percent; thus led to a decrease of income. In relations, it also affected the saving of these groups. It was found that almost 86 percent of the fishermen in SPKR areas could not do savings, 72 percent did not have savings at all, and 43 percent did not have sufficient income. Meanwhile, a number of fishermen faced problem with their monthly expenses that exceeded their income. On average, the fishermen spent their monthly expenses mostly on their basic need and medication (refer Table 1).

**Table 1: Family Economic Profile**

Family Economics	Frequency	Percentage
Could Saving		
Yes	4	8.2
No	42	85.7
Seldom	3	6.1
Sufficient income		
Yes	3	6.1
Not sure	25	51
No	21	42.9
Have Savings		
Yes	14	28.6
No	35	71.4
Monthly Spending		
<RM 500	12	24.5
RM501-RM1000	32	65.3
RM1001-RM1500	5	10.2
Medical Payments		
Incurred by Employers	1	2.0
Own	46	93.9
Government incurred	2	4.1

Poverty also can be determined based on specific characteristics. Poverty is often characterized by a low level of education, the unsatisfactory condition of the house, no skills, and lack of capital ownership, with little or no enjoy of their basic needs, spending more on basic needs, and no savings. The study found that the characteristics of the poor and the characteristics of the poorest in the study area were identical.

For the surveyed areas that were with SPKR programs, 61 percent of the poorest fishermen only had primary school education and 14 percent had never attended school. The fishermen did not have a side job, or no job other than fishing (88 percent). This showed that the fishermen have no skills, highly dependent on aids to improve their standard of living (43 percent) and no other options but to be fishermen because of hardship (76 percent). This has resulted in no increase of income for fishermen in Kuala Terengganu, followed by a problem that the totally functioned as housewives (90 percent).

### Empirical Results

Overall, the poverty problem still exist in the areas conducted SPKR program as the assistance given did not really identify the needs of the fishermen. These groups would appreciate the assistance given continuously (31 percent), identifying the additional needs of the fishermen such as GPS equipment and generator, the supply of tools that can help them

in the sea such as floating apparatus, polo, Panang, radar and catgut strings. In fact, the most important assistance that they really need was the moral support (68 percent) to be successful fishermen. Thus, the efficiency of the implementing agencies to carry out their duty and responsibility in the areas involved was highly needed (based on fishermen's view - refer Table 2). The implementing agencies should always interact with the participants monthly, to get to know the participants' needs, explain the function of SPKR in details, monthly supervision by implementing agencies, understand the causes and problems of poverty, and assist them through SPKR program to keep on progressing to improve themselves.

**Table 2: Institutional Skills Management in Socio-Economic Development Programme in Coastal Communities in North of Kuala Terengganu**

No	Research Questions	Min	Classification
1	Implementing agencies should always go to the ground	4.92	High
2	The interaction face to face with the implementing agency of each month	4.92	High
3	Recognize each member of the implementing agencies	4.94	High
4	Detailed explanation by the SPKR authorities	5.00	High
5	The need for supervision by implementing agencies each month	5.00	High
6	Information organized by the implementing agencies to participate in any program related	4.88	High
7	Understand the problem of poverty	4.90	High
8	Understand the causes of poverty	4.86	High

Most of the fishermen (head of household) with their wife and their children did not have education and skills. Nearly 74 percent of them stated that they learnt the fishing skills by themselves, and there was no other additional technical supports given by other parties in order to increase their catches. They did not experience the increase of income, besides the resources extinction has continuously occurred. The fishermen also did not have side jobs or part time jobs. They were full-time fishermen. The wives were unable to contribute for extra income to the families as they were full-time housewives and did not employ any skills.

### Addressing Poverty Strategy

To cater the issue of poverty, first and foremost the problems faced by the target group should be precisely identified. In the areas that have SPKR program, it was found that the participants knew about the direct assistance as the assistance already existed before even though the assistance maybe in different forms or terms (44 percent). Therefore, it is appropriate to identify the participants that faced such poverty problems and suggest the best way that can assist them to improve their level of income. The implementation of Income Enhancement Program (PPP) in Kuala Terengganu by SPKR should identify the interests and needs of the participants before deciding the agendas of such program.

The program should be explained in detail, so that the participants understand the requirements, objectives and provision of various assistances. Perhaps in the implementation of the program, there should be companion energy to continue to monitor the participants in the program to grow their interest,

motivate, and enhance their creativity. Furthermore, guidelines to implement, monitor and evaluate the programs must be provided to ensure the success of the programs.

To further ensure the success of the income enhancement programs (PPP), some control and rehabilitation of fisheries resources must be addressed, because poverty is closely related to the extinction of the fishery resources. Among the key factors contributed to the extinction of coastal fishery resources is intrusion. Therefore, there is a need to reform rules and regulations and enforcement policies so that the extinction of fishery resources can be controlled. It is the extinction of resources that was said to make the traditional fishermen feel that their efforts do not produce satisfactory returns.

Other steps that can be taken to increase the income of fishermen in the SPKR areas is to encourage the fishermen to engage themselves in aquaculture. In addition, fishermen can also be encouraged to undertake recycling management jobs offshore. Their participation in the utilization of waste fishery products can help transforming the environment into a healthy coastal area. The same role should be played by university whereby universities can knowledge transfer programs to fishermen to improve their knowledge and skills which then can contribute to the improvement of income and standards of living.

Economically, the government should facilitate the scheme for credit facilities without interest, without sureties, and without service charge. In addition, special savings scheme can be introduced to fisherman's children. For example, the scheme can be implemented through schools and universities for better future of fishermen young generation.

Socio-economic development of fishermen is not necessarily be emphasized on efforts to improve their income alone, but also to increase the strength and sustainability of the endeavor. The fishing communities need moral support from all parties involved. The need of moral support through education and employment training focuses on nurturing, appreciation and practice of values to produce a fishing community who are knowledgeable, honorable, and willing and able to serve the community and nation. More programs should be provided to guide them to be more meaningful and respected individuals so that fishermen would be no longer seen as low class citizens.

### Conclusion

Poverty among the fishing community is still a major problem in the fisheries sector. To overcome this problem, various development plans in the fisheries sector have been carried out. But overall, the plan is less successful and less effective. Thus, the government, through the Ministry of Rural and Regional Development (MRRD) has launched a program specifically for component of SPKR which is known as Revenue Enhancement Program (PPP) with its implementing agencies; LKIM in year of 2007 until 2011. The aims of this project were to develop fisheries sector for socio-economic upliftment of fishermen and to identify the effectiveness of this SPKR. Thus, this case study was carried out.

This study found that the level of income, education, health, energy, spending, saving, and basic skills coastal fishing in the district still need be given serious consideration. The poverty still affected by poverty factors that have been identified in the last few years. This item indicated that the cause of poverty in the past still unresolved until now, despite the various plans or programs were implemented, including SPKR programs.

In summary, this study found that the management of SPKR programs was less effective and less efficient. Hence, the improvement and corrective actions should be highly considered

through the completion of the program guidelines and regulatory control by implementing agencies. The government needs to re-evaluate the whole program so that the next phase of the program will be more systematic and well organized.

### References

1. Abdul Malik Ismail, Chamhuri Siwar, Basri Abdul Talib dan Nik Hashim Mustapa, Kemiskinan Nelayan di Kawasan Pembangunan Nelayan, Pantai Timur Semenanjung Malaysia. Dalam *Kemiskinan dalam Arus Pembangunan Ekonomi Malaysia*, eds. Chamhuri Siwar dan Nor Aini Hj. Idris, Bangi: Penerbit Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia., 203-220, (1996)
2. Binkley, M., Set adrift: Fishing Families, Toronto: University of Toronto Press, (2002)
3. Dahuri, Rokhmin. et.al., Pengelolaan Sumber Daya Wilayah Pesisir dan Lautan. Secara Terpadu, Pradnya Paramita. Jakarta, (2001)
4. Dara Aisyah, Katiman Roestam dan Hair Awang, Pemberdayaan Ekonomi Masyarakat Pesisir Di Indonesia: Suatu Kajian Di Kecamatan Cilincing, Jakarta Utara, Indonesia, *Jurnal Kebijakan Dan Administras Publik*, Volume 13, Nombor 2 ISSN:0852-9213, (2009)
5. Dara Aisyah et. al., Pemberdayaan Ekonomi Masyarakat Pesisir Di Indonesia: Suatu Penilaian Awal Prestasi, *Geografia Online tm Malaysian Journal of Society and Space* 6 Issue 3, ISSN 2180-2491, 13 – 29, (2010)
6. Dara Aisyah, Katiman Roestam dan Hair Awang, Keberkesanan Program Pemberdayaan Masyarakat Ekonomi Pesisir (PEMP) dalam Meningkatkan Pendapatan Isi Rumah Pesisir Pantai Indonesia: Kes Kecamatan Cilincing Jakarta Utara: e-Bangi, *Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, Vol.6, No.2, ISSN:1823-884x, 359-374, (2011)
7. Firth, R., Malay Fishermen: Their peasant economy, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, (1966)
8. Ibrahim Mamat dan Nor Hayati Sa'at, Budaya dan perubahan sosiobudaya komuniti. Dalam Ekspedisi Komuniti Nelayan Kuala Besut: Isu dan Perspektif Penyelidikan. Eds. Nik Fuad Nik Mohd Kamil, Mohd Shaladdin Muda dan Muhammad Najib Suhaimi, Kuala Terengganu: Universiti Malaysia Terengganu, 11-23, (2007)
9. Ishak Shari, Ekonomi Nelayan: Pengumpulan Modal, Perubahan Teknologi dan pembezaan ekonomi, Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka, (1990)
10. Kusnadi, Filosofi Pemberdayaan Masyarakat Pesisir. Bandung: Humaniora, (2006)
11. Malaysia, Rancangan Malaysia Kesepuluh 2010-2015. Kuala Lumpur: Jabatan Percetakan Negara, (2010)
12. Malaysia, Rancangan Malaysia Keempat 1981-1985. Kuala Lumpur: Jabatan Percetakan Negara, (1996)
13. Malaysia, Rancangan Malaysia Kelapan 2001-2005. Kuala Lumpur: Jabatan Percetakan Negara, (2001)
14. Malaysia, Rancangan Malaysia Kesembilan 2006-2010. Kuala Lumpur: Jabatan Percetakan Negara, (2001)
15. Mohd Anwar, Tanggapan Komuniti Nelayan Pantai di Kuala Dungun Terengganu Terhadap Aktiviti Penangkapan Ikan Yang Dijalankan Dalam Meningkatkan Pendapatan. *Skudai: Universiti Teknologi Malaysia*, (2007)
16. Mohd Shaladdin et. al., Analisis Kesejahteraan Hidup Nelayan Pesisir. *www.myjurnal.my/public/article*, Volume 10, (2007)
17. Muhamad Fadhil Nurdin, Penilaian Dampak Pembangunan ke arah Kesejahteraan Masyarakat; Penilaian dampak sosial, Kuala Lumpur: Utusan Publication & Distributor, (2003)
18. Muhyiddin Mohd Yassin, Ucaptama YB Menteri Pertanian dan Industri Asas Tani, Persidangan Halatuju Sektor Pertanian

dan Industri Berasaskan Pertanian, <http://agrolink.moa.my/darimejamenteri/exco520pertanian> pada 31/12/2005, WismaTani, Kuala Lumpur, (2004)

19. Nik Fuad Nik Mohd Kamil, Mohd Shaladdin Muda dan Muhammad Najib Suhaimi. Ekspedisi Komuniti Nelayan Kuala Besut: Isu dan Perspektif Penyelidikan. *Kuala Terengganu: Penerbit Universiti Malaysia Terengganu*, (2007)

20. Nieboer, A., Lindenberg, S., Boomsma, A. and Van Bruggen, A.C., Dimensions of well-being and their measurement. *The spf-II scale, Social Indicators Research*, 73(3): 313-353, (2005)

21. Nor Hayati Sa'at, Mobiliti Sosial dalam Kalangan Komuniti Pesisir Pantai: Kajian Kes di Kuala Terengganu, *Kajian Malaysia*, Vol. 29, Supp. 1, 95-123, (2011)

22. Norizan Abdul Ghani, Kualiti Hidup Penduduk Pulau Negeri Terengganu: Satu Kajian di Pulau Redang dan Pulau Perhentian, *Tesis Ph.D, Kolej Universiti Sains dan Teknologi Malaysia*, (2003)

23. Pollnac, R.B, Pomeroy, R.S, and Harkes, I.H.T., Fishery Policy and Job Satisfaction in Three Southeast Asian Fisheries.,

*Ocean and Coastal Management.*, Volume 44, Number 7, 2001, pp.531-544, (2001)

24. Renwick, R., The Quality Life Model, <http://www.utoronto.ca/qol/concepts.htm>, pada 25/1/2006, (2006)

25. Salagrama, V., Trends in poverty and livelihoods in coastal fishing communities of Orissa State, India. *FAO Fisheries Technical Paper*. No.490. Rome. FAO.2006. ISBN 92-5-105566-1, p. 111, (2006)

26. Samir Muhazzab Amin, and Sara Shakilla Mohd.Salim, Pembasmian Kemiskinan di Malaysia: Keperluan Kemahiran Pekerja Komuniti. *AKADEMIKA*, 82 (1). pp. 81-89. ISSN 0126-5008, (2012)

27. Unit Penyelidikan Sosio Ekonomi (UPS), 1989a. Draf Kajian Sosio Ekonomi Rakyat: Kemiskinan (Bachok), *Jabatan Perdana Menteri: Kuala Lumpur. www.dfid.gov.uk. Department for International Development (DFID) Project*, (2007)