



Acceptance of BR1M: Is it a sincere act or political motive?

Rohana Kamaruddin^{1*}, Akmal Aini Othman², Zarina Denan¹

¹ Faculty of Business Management,
Universiti Teknologi MARA, Shah Alam, Selangor Darul Ehsan

² Faculty of Business Management,
Universiti Teknologi MARA, Segamat, Johor Darul Ta'zim

rohana070@salam.uitm.edu.my

Abstract

This study is to examine the socio-economic background and consumption pattern of rural and urban recipients of 1Malaysia Peoples' Aid (BRIM) and behavioural response towards acceptances and perception towards government sincere act and political motives. A survey was conducted in Klang Valley and Kedah, where 250 respondents were interviewed via structured questionnaires and analyzed using structural equation modeling (SEM). Finding revealed that the main consumption of both rural and urban was necessity goods and indicated a positive significant relationship between acceptances and government sincere act, and otherwise for political motives. The study concludes that people accept BRIM as a sincere government act rather than a political agenda.

Keywords: government, sincere, political motives

eISSN 2514-7528 © 2018. The Authors. Published for AMER ABRA cE-Bs by e-International Publishing House, Ltd., UK. This is an open-access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>). Peer-review under responsibility of AMER (Association of Malaysian Environment-Behaviour Researchers), ABRA (Association of Behavioural Researchers on Asians) and cE-Bs (Centre for Environment-Behaviour Studies), Faculty of Architecture, Planning & Surveying, Universiti Teknologi MARA, Malaysia.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.21834/jabs.v4i17.73>

1.0 Introduction

The Bantuan Rakyat 1 Malaysia (BR1M) is one of the initiatives through Government Transformation Program or GTP. The idea of BR1M assistance came from the rise in the cost of living in Malaysia. The Prime Minister of Malaysia, Dato' Sri Najib Tun Razak (2012) said in the process of giving BR1M, the revenue of MYR26 Billions of tax from the Inland Board of Revenue for this year allowed the government to give out MYR500 of BR1M. With the slogan People First Performance Now, in 2010, the government of Malaysia under the Prime Minister Dato' Sri Najib bin Tun Razak announced the initiative of government giving people the cash aid. In his speech in the 2011 Budget, Dato' Sri Najib allocated RM2.6 Billion to be given to lower and middle income group. Each household will be rewarded RM500 cash voucher through one-pay off method. Based on Ministry of Finance (2012) press releases, the government allocated RM2.6 billion for issuance the RM500 cash voucher per household. The first BR1M application started from December 10th 2011 till January 10th 2012. The payment of BR1M had been issued from January 15th 2012 until March 15th 2012. However, its period had been extended till July (Ahmad Husni Hanadzlah, 2012). The eligible applicants of BR1M are any household who earns RM3, 000 and below per month and those in the e-Kasih program. Data gathered by Ministry of Finance 4,123,713 application forms were registered by the ministry since 10 January 2012. 3,850,668 numbers of applications were registered. However, only 3,102,054 applications were approved. The first phase of BR1M aid had benefited 5.2 million households or 79.5% of overall Malaysian household.

According to Lumanaj and Hasi (2012), many studies have been carried out to study the performance of welfare program yet studies on recipients' perceptions are still lacking. Hence, the aim of this study is to explore the perception of BR1M recipients on the cash benefits whether it is government sincere act or political motivated. This study also aims to investigate the consumption pattern of BRIM recipients in rural and urban area in Malaysia.

2.0 Literature Review

Lagarde, Haines & Palmer (2009) defines cash transfer as the provision of cash assistance to increase the household income. In Latin America, it called Conditional Cash Transfer (CCT). Such program was to help families living in extreme poverty. Cash aid or cash assistance is different with monetization, microfinance, insurance, budget support and waivers of school fees (Harvey, 2005). He added where cash assistance is alternative to food aid, agricultural and non-food items. He also included the several labels use in calling the cash incentives. Those labels are cash grants, cash relief, repatriation grants, and cash for work, employment, public works, conditional cash transfers, demobilization programs and voucher programs. According to Brautigam (2000), any aid that could help people in their standard of living could help the countries to achieve their government objectives in reducing the percentage of poverty, for instance cash aid for poor in Kenya (Mwega, 2009), cash for work in Afghanistan (Harvey, 2005), and cash transfer for poor in Malawi (Davies & Davey, 2008). In India, its government provides cash assistance for poor pregnant women to minimize maternal death (Devadasan, Elias, John, Grahacharya & Ralte, 2008). It was because of 20 percent of pregnant women died during maternity. The program is called

Janani Suraksha Yojana (JSY). Under this program, the government wants to encourage poor women to go to antenatal checkups and deliver in a health facility. The aim of the program was also to increase the institutional deliveries as well as to reduce financial barriers and thereby reduce maternal and neonatal death. The study reported on the cash assistance program in terms of the knowledge of the scheme, the amount of money received, time delay, documents required, unofficial payment and suggestions for improvements. The advantages of the scheme are to promote the institutional delivery, to reduce maternal and infant deaths and to serve poor people to buy medicine. European Commission (2009) defines cash aid or cash voucher as the cash or the voucher given to people that include individuals, households, or communities. The cash voucher could also be called as the cash transfer where the cash relief tends to help people to buy the basic needs such as food or non-food, services or other essential assets. The transfer of cash to needy recipients possibly will be used for emergency motive, nutritional needs, food complement, shelter usage and other basic services. Harvey (2005) explored the use of cash and vouchers in emergencies and found some people who support the approaches because both are cost-effective and timely, extend the choice and dignity of recipients and have an effect on local economic activity. Several responses argue the approaches because both will incur the risk and corruption and will be more difficult than commodities. He also added that cash has been used in the West for welfare payments and part of relief action in emergencies. In the United States, the family who has children and unemployed are eligible to get temporary cash assistance under a scheme called Temporary Assistance for Needy Family (TANF) (Zedlewski, Loprest & Huber, 2011) with each household who has child but lack of consistent income because of unemployed, are eligible to get temporary cash assistance. De Mesquita and Smith (2009) investigated on the economic aid given by Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) nations. They argued that OECD nations' objective in giving aid is more than helping to alleviate poverty. Their study revealed that OECD nations have little humanitarian motivation for aid giving. Thus, this study is inspired to investigate further government's motives on giving out the cash benefits from the perspective of the BRIM recipients in urban and rural area Malaysia. Evidence suggested that aid is allocated to meet the need of the recipients particularly in the sectors such as education, energy and food. Based on the above argument, this study explores the factors that influence the acceptance of the recipients on the BRIM in terms of importance, government sincere act and political motives.

In view of the above research context, we strongly believe that the proposed hypothesized model is novel as it attempts to explain the effect of acceptance of BRIM and in turn, its subsequent effect on importance, government sincere incentives and political motives. The hypothesized model is depicted in Figure 1.

The hypotheses model is as follows:

- H1: Importance of BRIM has a positive effect on acceptance of BRIM
- H2: Acceptance of BRIM has a positive effect on government sincere act
- H3: Acceptance of BRIM has a positive effect on political motives

3.0 Methodology

A structured questionnaire was used based on the attributes derived from previous research. The survey was pre-tested with 100 recipients of BRIM for content validity before the survey was carried out. Consequently, the final survey was conducted at two states which are Kedah and Klang Valley. A five-point scale was used to describe the items listed in the dimensions ranging from “very strongly disagree” to “very strongly agree” for all the questions involved in the study. Two hundred fifty questionnaires were distributed; 40% of the respondents were female and 60% were males. The age of the overall majority of respondents was between 26-30 years old (23.2%), 31-35 (17.2%), 51-60 (11.6%). Most of them was with high school certificate SPM and lower (70.8%) and worked in the private sectors (36.8%) and public sector (15.2%), majority of respondents are Malay (91%), Chinese (3.2%), India (3.65) and Bumiputra Sabah and Sarawak (2%).

4.0 Results and Discussion

From Table 1, the overall spending behaviour of BR1M recipients are more on necessity goods which consisted of food (51%), clothing (9%), maintenance (7%) and others (33%).

The range of the main spending is between RM 240 to RM400. The mean of the main spending is RM287.32. The finding in Table 1 reflects the high cost of living for urban as it shows a higher percentage of spending for food (5.5%) and transportation (3.5%), maintenance (2.9%) from the rural recipients. As for the rural their spending is more normal goods for example clothing (6%), furnishing (7.4%). The analysis was conducted similarly as the study was done by Kamaruddin, R et.al (2011) using structural equation modeling. Consequently, the sequence of analysis took the following order: firstly, exploratory factor analysis (EFA) was performed on each measurement model to assess unidimensionality in terms of the parameter estimates, the statistical significance of the parameter estimates and overall fit. Upon inspecting the results, at this point the researcher then decided whether to retain or delete any ill-fitting item. Secondly, CFA was performed on those measurement models that were comprised of purified measures derived from the first step. The result indicates that all items loadings are statistically significant and the magnitude for most of the variables and their indicators are above reasonable benchmark. With regards to the score for the composite reliability, the construct indicators indicate the latent constructs range from 0.774 to 0.844. These signify that the results of composite reliability for all latent constructs exceeded recommended level of 0.7 (Gefen, Straub & Bourdreau, 2000). On top of that, analysis of the average variance extracted indicates that the scores are within the range of 0.33 to 0.72. Overall, the value of both reliability and convergence validity tests imply reliable scores for those latent constructs used in this study.

The effect of importance and acceptance, acceptance with government sincere act and political incentives were performed. Results of the standardized parameter estimates of the proposed model were depicted in Table 2 respectively. The results showed that RMSEA = 0.074, CMIN/DF 2.354, IFI 0.931, TLI 0.914, CFI .930, indicating a good fit between the data and the proposed model.

It was found that all the hypotheses were supported except for the relationships between

acceptance and political motives.




Figure 1: The hypothesized model




Figure 2: Result of the path model relationship

Table 1: Urban and Rural Main Consumption Pattern

Types of spending	Urban (%)	Rural (%)
Food	53.9	48.4
Transportation	10.9	7.4
Clothing	3.1	9.0
Furnishing	0.8	8.2
Maintenance	8.6	5.7
Communication	1.6	5.7
Recreation	3.1	4.9
Education	4.7	4.9
Utility bill	5.5	2.5
Start a business	3.9	0.8
Investment	2.3	0.0
Others	1.6	2.5
Total	128 (100%)	122 (100%)

Table 2: Overall standardized parameter estimates for the structural model

H	Path relationships	Significance level	Parameter Estimates	p-values (<0.05)	Significance (yes/no)
H1	Importance–Acceptance	0.05	0.79	0.01	Yes
H2	Acceptance - Government Act	0.05	0.98	0.01	Yes
H3	Acceptance–Political Motives	0.05	-0.41	0.01	Yes

5.0 Conclusion

Referring to Dato’ Seri Najib Razak statement, dated Jan 16 2012, in his article “Bantuan Rakyat 1Malaysia: Pemberian Ikhlas Kerajaan”, he wrote that “ Many people think that 1Malaysia People’s Aid as a ploy to garner votes and actions that the government has never done and considered this as a clear indicator that the 13 General Elections is very close”. He also added “the question that needs an answer is whether the grant was politically motivated and for me: "Of course, it may be said there is a political element, but that is the second issue, because it is appropriate assistance in situations where the cost of living rising”. From this study, we can conclude and support the statement made by the Prime Minister that people generally agreed that BRIM is a government sincere act rather than political motives. It is further justified that the main consumption basically towards the need of the public on necessity goods such as food, clothing and transport show clearly on the rising on the cost of living. Although BRIM is a one off assistance but people in general are happy with the government sincere initiatives.

In Malaysia, BRIM is the first cash benefits that have been widely and nationally announced since Barisan National became the government. One of the main concerns of this study is the efficiency of the cash benefits program because Lumanaj and Hasi (2012) highlighted their concern on the recipients’ dependency on the economic aid given by the government. They also added that inefficiency of economic aid program sometimes leading people to unethical behaviour such as corruption. This study also recommends that future study should be carried out on how to make economic aid more effective and focusing on substantial sectors of aid (in terms of projects and dollar spent) in Malaysia.

References

- Ahmad Husni Hanadzlah. (2012). Online December 4th 2012. http://www.pemandu.gov.my/gtp/Media_Coverage_@-May_disburse_2nd_BR1M,_2nd_Finance_Minister.aspx.
- Brautigam, D. (2000). Aid Dependence and Governance. Almqvist&Wiksell International: Washington. Department of Statistics (2012). Household Expenditure Trend 1993/1994-2009/2010.

Devadasan, N., Elias, M.A., John, D., Grahacharya, S. & Ralte, L. (2008). A Conditional Cash Assistance Programme for Promoting Institutional Deliveries Among the Poor in India: Process Evaluation Results. Institute of Public Health: Bangalore.

De Mesquita, B.B. & Smith, A. (2009). A Political Economy of Aid. *International Organization*, Vol 63(2), pp 309-340.

Davies, S & Davey, J. (2007). A regional multiplier approach to estimating the impact of cash transfers: The case of cash aid in rural Malawi, MPRA paper 4463.

European Commission (2009). *The Use of Cash and Vouchers in Humanitarian Crisis*.

Gefen, Straub, & Boudreau, (2000): *Structural Equation Modeling and Regression: Guidelines for Research Practice*, Communications of AIS (1: 7, August), 2000.

Harvey, P. (2005). *Cash Vouchers and Emergencies*. Humanitarian Policy Group: London.

Kamaruddin, R, Osman, I & Che Pei, C.A (2012). Customer Expectations and its Relationship towards Public Transport in Klang Valley. *Journal of ASIAN Behavioral Studies*, 2(5).

Lumanaj, B. & Hasi, S. (2012). Evaluating Low Income Families' Self Perception of the Economic Aid Program: The Albanian Case. *Journal of Educational and Social Research*. 2(2), 273-284.

Lagarde, M., Haines, A., Palmer, N. (2009) .The impact of conditional cash transfers on health outcomes and use of health services in low and middle income countries. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*, Issue 4.