

THE MALAYSIAN FARMERS AND AGRICULTURAL ENTREPRENEURSHIP DEVELOPMENT

Muhammad Firos

Universiti Malaya, Malaysia

Corresponding Email: phdum2020@gmail.com

Fadhilah Adibah Ismail

Universiti Teknologi MARA, Malaysia

Sharon Goh

Universiti Malaysia Sabah

Abstract: *Land can be recognized as economic space created by farming communities and situated mainly in rural areas. The introduction of new methods in the manufacture of agricultural products has largely been influenced by industrial agriculture. There is a world agriculture trend that demands more agronomy to conduct economics at a high level of growth. Often farming operations linked to appropriate manpower and modern technological machinery. However, a small-scale agriculture in the area has demonstrated that the economy is not influenced by agriculture without innovations. To understand agriculture development, knowledge of the distribution market areas to the level of the farm field is required. However, the poverty is still connected to the farmers due to the shortage of wasted energy. This situation is due to farming activities, distance from the market and not a complex agricultural environment. Therefore, creativity required to shift the paradigm of economic development on farming agriculture. Transmission of networks and exchange of information, such as machinery for new equipment and technology. Consequently, in fact, the lack of creativity has a clear potential to fail in agricultural production. Modernization may involve and the path to resolve these problems always seems to be penetrating the world agricultural farmer. Therefore, the growth of entrepreneurship was initiated by many developing countries to address poverty in this society. In small business enterprise start-up, it is not only based on agricultural commodity but is commonly practiced in production, service, food and beverage. Required of agro-entrepreneurship, farming inventions and multiple entrepreneurships by the community of this farmer for better future economic development.*

Keywords: *Agricultural; Farmers; Entrepreneurship development*

2020 JGBSE

1. Introduction

Agriculture operations that are more directly linked to function, usage of sufficient equipment and sustainable farming practices in order to improve agricultural productivity. The 'Third Country' is the main commercial distribution field of farming production in the World (UNFAO, 1973). Ashley and Maxwell (2001) have attempted to take farming, community, area and the environment from various levels of development for economic development. Norton & Smit (1977) research on

small scale farming found that agriculture without creativity has little economic effect. According to Morgan and Munton (1971), in the sense of broad economic growth the agricultural productivity must be analyzed, it is necessary to consider how the relationship to the numerous levels of scale contributing to the growth factor. The market areas at farm level should be understood in order to recognize agricultural development (Haggett et al., 1965). The poverty is still connected to the farmer by loss of resource (Rondinelli, 1983). This is attributed to farming activities, business inaccessibility and not a composite agricultural condition. Innovation needed to shift the trend of economic development on agriculture sectors. However, the transmission of network and knowledge distribution such as new equipment and machinery technology are obviously and significant impact the agriculture sectors. This leads to the increasing of creativity and innovation. However, lack of skills addresses real problems of stagnant of agriculture developing. Modernization in terms of technology and sufficient training might be important because the farmers always find themselves left behind.

2. Global Agriculture Sector

Peet (1969) formulated and progressively generated ideas about a global agricultural structure of zonal systems. The adjustments in internal supply, output mechanism demand, easy land farm layout and organized efficiency distributions of the industry business relate to the whole agricultural sector, and these structures trends extend for the whole agricultural sector. The farmer essentially consumed the commodity and based on the cash crop income. Increased agricultural output not only raises the amount of selling, but also by intensifying cultivation and also followed by reduced agricultural field. Increase the agricultural field in 1966 with higher productivity through further development in planting the large yields of wheat, rice and, less specifically, soybeans and Minotaur plant (Abele & Frohberg, 2003). Increased production of new seeds have been added and dissemination is changed by regional with environmental factor changes (Hayami & Ruttan, 1970). In general, there is still disagreement amongst government authority over the shortage of agriculture product in market in purpose to boost economic in the Country (McPherson, 1968).

3. Malaysian Farmers in Agriculture

The rubber planting is the greatest contribution to the Malaysians economic development (Jackson 1964). Other technical crops included oil palm, tea, pepper, coconut, pineapples and tree fruit. In the context of farmers, the ethnic potion is made up of Malay (83.0%), Indian (8.0%), Chinese (6.0 %) and Indigenous group (4.0 %) (MoA, 2018). The farmer's well-being authority is the Rubber Industry Smallholder Development Authority (RISDA). The upland places that conflict with the right root under wet equatorial conditions, high ground water level, really stunted the agricultural operation (Barlow & Wu, 1978). There are approximately 838, 800 hectares in Peninsular Malaysia, 805 000 hectares in Sabah and 865 000 hectares in Sarawak for agricultural products to being develop (Feder & Noronha, 1987). In the late 1969 agricultural plantation, foreigner owned plantation development was mainly due to the majority of farmers giving their land for tenant and lease (Dorward et al. 2004). In Peninsular Malaysia, due to low incomes, the evolution of rubber smallholding is decreased rapidly. Their business interest in rubber plantation was seen on a wide scale and called a 'cluster' but stunted by lack of financial capital (Gaiha, 1987). Also, a major issue has been highlight was transportation, networking facilities and fertilizer. Consequently,

federated Malay reported that it revised government rules and policies against the well-being of farmer's community in typical rural areas. Improving the strategy of large-scale plantation toward well-being followed by farmers training plans to enrich the skills in agriculture production. As a result, in Peninsular Malaysia produce 542,000 tons of rubber which benefiting 182,500 farmers (MRB, 2018). The government intervention was given to the group of farmers to replant, open new land areas, and also to improve the production latex quality for suitable tapping methods. The quality of rubber has been upgraded and also increased the price in the markets (RISDA, 2010).

Malaysian agriculture sectors is usually split into two groups, which are industrial crops and food crops. The rubber smallholding landscape is changing highly as global price declines in 2008. This phenomenon is closely linked to the problem of poverty among farmers in rural areas. The skillful farmers keep continuing increased rubber production for survival. Cash crops planted such as durian, jackfruit, mangosteen, rambutan, papaya, banana, melons, pineapple, chili, groundnut, sweet potatoes, '*mata kuching*' and rose-apple fruit tree implement quick results to overcome the low income in rubber and others commodities price. This led to cash crop production of agro eco-systems progressing whitely and well (Marra et al, 2003). Nevertheless, at the same time, rubber plantations expand in hopes of having high market demand as soon as possible. Rubber tree usually grown low as the nutrient period stunted in Malaysia due to inconsistency of weather conditions. The Agricultural Architecture Entrepreneurship Model in 2008 and the pilot test in rural areas of Pahang State consists of 200 farmers on entrepreneurship development in multiplicity was carried out (RISDA, 2016). In fact, by that time, the number of farmers is growing with highest poverty rate as well. The success rate is around 2.0-8.0 percent in multiplicity entrepreneurship and this effort is considered reasonably successful. All cash crop plants grown by farmers knows as small-scale entrepreneurs and raise household income in late 2008. In order to maintain the income received by these farmers' communities for their life quality balance, the farm transportation and processing system expects the government to offer given priority (RISDA, 2010).

4. Transformation of Entrepreneurship

The entrepreneurship developments for second generation of farmer's participation in agriculture sectors in developing countries have been widely discussed, as agriculture has also contributed to economic development. In Africa and the Netherlands, agriculture becomes the employment of professionals where it reflects economic development dimensions of policies and information (Johnston & Mellor, 1961). Agricultural fields are required to bring in ideas from young professionals on ICT to improve economic growth in the nations (Toffler & Alvin, 1980). Technologies may deliver huge opportunities for job development and agro-chain enhancement that specifically draw second generation of farmers involved in agri-business with high return. The exchange of agricultural business information via social media will develop second generation of farmer's skills and knowledge (Cecchini & Scott, 2003). The e-knowledge based and e-agriculture techniques are becoming a new forum for farmers forming their own economic scale. The government from India, Kenya, Philippines, Uganda and Indonesia exchanged their strategies to draw second generation of farmers into agriculture by investing more money in new technology (Fan et al., 2011). The entrepreneurship growth is now going forward, not just centered on agricultural goods but almost in diversified products. The farmers moving to several different fields such as operation, development and food and beverage (RISDA, 2010). Starting from

multiplicity enterprises established this farmers need more protection on these farmers financial security guarantees. For the better future of food engaged by second generation of farmers in the agricultural industry, agro-entrepreneurship and farming developments are required to be priorities by the authority (YPARD, 2016).

The second generation of farmers under the age of 25 in Sub-Saharan Africa have a wide network and partnership with farmers' cooperatives (GEM, 2018). The youth businesses in Angola produced an agricultural commodity of 78.0 percent based on new technologies and procedures (Auld et al., 2009). The agriculture sector, however, remains very small contribution followed by forestry and fishing in Asian countries by about 10.0 percent on GDP (Rani & Corley, 2011). In addition, second generation of farmers especially women are less involved in any entrepreneurial agricultural activity in South West (Wilson, Kickul & Marlino, 2007). According to Hampwaye and Hapunda (2016), South Africa's slowing in food network and asking the government for grassroots programmes to engage second generation of farmers involved actively in agriculture. South Africa's small-scale farmers who work in food demonstrated needed the value of patience when interacting with the agriculture developing as it takes time to grow (Lyson, 2012). Some scholars argued that the agriculture can be established and activities organized with cultures and traditions reviving at the local level towards second generation of farmers (Woolcock & Narayan, 2000). Initiatives must therefore be placed in place to return second generation of farmers to dominant profession in the agriculture sector. The dairy firm Friesland Company has been active in implementing cooperative impact processes through young farmer's ideas (Rapsomanikis & George, 2015). The programmes in Ghana and Uganda discussed cognitive constraints needed for youth participation in agriculture that bring about changes in the distributional economics (Inglehart & Welzel, 2005). The significant key criteria for success in the agricultural sector are entrepreneurial attitudes and freedom from psychological stigmatization. A variety of farming technique left behind by farmers who are synonymous with poverty and low income (Tickamyer & Duncan, 1990). On the other hand, the agricultural industries have demanded a more desirable approach to attracting second generation of farmers by contributing to these industries by changing particular initiatives aimed at changing viewpoints and attitudes. To enhance their psychological and cognitive status, the strategy must be acceptable and suitable packages for second generation of farmers.

5. Conclusion

The changes from the traditional approach to the modern technologies-based approach are important for the agricultural phase of growth. Small scale farmers need to modernize and make improvements to boost living standards, agricultural productivity and industrial development. By attracting second generation of farmers and other infrastructure capital, the economic situation in developing countries plays a vital role in rising productivity. Market trade dominance will increase the opportunity for small scale farmers to enter rural areas business. In other words, the burden of living cost may be minimized. There is a need for government positions in policy making to draw second generation of farmers with some advantage in agricultural enterprises. Services such as transport, marketing and supply of equipment, seeds, fertilizers, machinery and agricultural knowledge (training) must also be given prioritize to enable subsistence farmers to increase the production of new crops and income. Development must be synchronized with the global changes

from time to time because, due to lack of awareness, the propensity of farmers to fail is highly correlated. Rural and urban area accessibility must have linkages to selling and marketing their goods and products. The new technology embraced by farmers must also be applied by providing them with continuity and technical training to keep competitive in the market. In order to avoid them being stuck again in the poverty line index, adequate and healthy equilibrium system must be given to the typical rural agriculture sector for the farmers' communities. The system design must be adequate to ensure and enable poor farmers to demonstrate an interest in the new revenue-enhancing entrepreneurial development programmed. The transition from entrepreneurial agriculture to the multiplicity diversified entrepreneurial would ensure economic development for this group. Changes in perspective and mindset therefore have wanted the farmer's communities to enter different business sector for their well-being and income increased.

References

- Abele, S., & Frohberg, K. (2003). Subsistence agriculture in Central and Eastern Europe: How to break the vicious circle?. *Agricultural Europe Journal*, 32(2), 44-63.
- Ashley, C. & Maxwell, S. (2001). Rethinking rural development. *Development Policy Review Journal*, 19(4), 395-425.
- Auld, G., Balboa, C., Bernstein, S., Cashore, N., Delmas, M. & Young, O. (2009). The emergence of non-state market-driven (NSDM) global environmental governance. *Governance Environment Management Perspectives Journal*, 183(2), 144-161.
- Barlow, R. E. & Wu, A. S. (1978). Coherent systems with multi-state components. *Operations, Research Journal*, 3(4), 275-281.
- Cecchini, S., & Scott, C. (2003). Can information and communications technology applications contribute to poverty reduction?: Lessons from rural India. *Technology Development Journal*, 10(2), 73-84.
- Dorward, A., Fan, S., Kydd, J., Lofgren, H., Morrison, J., Poulton, C., & Urey, I. (2004). Rethinking agricultural policies. *Natural Perspectives Journal*, 94 (3), 1-4.
- Fan, S., Yu, B. & Saurkar, A. (2011). Public spending in developing countries: Trends, determination and impact. Public Expenditures. *Poverty Growth Journal*, 14(2), 20-55.
- Feder, G. & Noronha, R. (1987). Land rights systems and agricultural development in sub-Saharan Africa. *The World Bank Research Observer*, 2(2), 143-169.
- Gaiha, R. (1987). Impoverishment, technology and growth in rural India. *Cambridge Journal of Economics*, 11(1), 23-46.
- GEM (2018) Retrieved Mac 17, 2018, from <http://www.gem.org/> global entrepreneurship monitor
- Haggett, P., Chorley, R. J., & Stoddart, D. R. (1965). Scale standards in geographical research: A new measure of areal magnitude. *Nature Journal*, 205(4), 823-844.
- Hampwaye, G., & Hapunda, M. K. (May, 2016). Tracking the performance of food processing sub-sector firms in Zambia, Presented to the SAFIC International Conference, Copenhagen, Denmark.
- Hayami, Y., & Ruttan, V. W. (1971). Agricultural development: An international perspective. *Baltimore, Md/London, The Johns Hopkins Press Publishing*.
- Inglehart, R., & Welzel, C. (2005). Modernization, cultural change, and democracy: The human development sequence. *Cambridge University Press Publishing*.
- Isham, J. (2001). The social foundations of poor economic growth in resource-Rich Countries. *Resource Abundance and Economic Development*, 76(2), 24-40.
- Jackson, H. H. T. (1961). Agriculture effectiveness. *University of Wisconsin Press Publishing*.
- Jazairy, I., Alamgir, M., Stanier, J., & Panuccio, T. (1992). The state of world rural poverty: An inquiry into its causes and consequences. *New York United Press Publishing*.

- Johnston, B. F. & Mellor, J. W. (1961). The role of agriculture in economic development, *The American Economic Review*, 51(4), 566-593.
- Lyson, T. A. (2012). Civic agriculture: Reconnecting farm, food, and community. *UPNE Press Publishing*.
- Marra, M., Pannell, D. J. & Ghadim, A. A. (2003). The economics of risk, uncertainty and learning of new agricultural technologies. *Agricultural Systems Journal*, 75(2), 215-234.
- McPherson, B. F. (1968). Status of tropical agriculture, Economics Development of Tropical Agriculture. *Gainesville Journal*, 11(2), 308-321.
- MoA (2018) Retrieved January 14, 2018, from http://www.moa.gov.my/ministry_of_agriculture_Malaysia
- Morgan, W. B. & Munton, R. J. C. (1971). Agricultural geography. *Inaugural lecture, London Publishing*.
- MRB (2016) Retrieved February 14, 2016, from http://www.mrb.gov.my/malaysia_rubber_board/natural_rubber_statistics/MRB
- Norton, W., & Smit, D. P. (1977). Rural Settlement Surface Evolution: Cape Province, 1865–1970, *Geographical Annaler: Series B. Human Geography*, 59(1), 43-50.
- Peet, J. R. (1969). The spatial expansion of commercial agriculture in the nineteenth century: A Von Thunen interpretation. *Economic Geography*, 45(4), 283-301.
- Pimentel, D., Hurd, L. E., Bellotti, A. C., Forster, M. J., Oka, I. N., Sholes, O. D. & Whitman, R. J. (1973). Food production and the energy crisis. *Journal of Science*, 182(4), 443-449.
- Rani, U., & Corley, C. M. (2011). Investing in food security as a driver of better jobs. *World of Work Report*, 2011(1), 75-96.
- Rapsomanikis and George (2015). *The economic lives of smallholder farmers*: Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. *Nagayets Oksana Press Publishing*.
- RISDA (2006). *Rubber Industry Smallholder Development Authority Annual Report 2005*. RISDA Kuala Lumpur.
- RISDA (2010). *Rubber Industry Smallholder Development Authority Annual Report 2009*. RISDA Kuala Lumpur.
- Rondinelli, D. A. (1983). Towns and small cities in developing countries. *Geographical Review*, 14(2), 379-395.
- Tickamyer, A. R., & Duncan, C. M. (1990). Poverty and opportunity structure in rural America. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 16(1), 67-86.
- Toffler, A., & Alvin, T. (1980). The third wave-volume 484, *New York, Bantam Books Publishing*.
- Wilson, F., Kickul, J., & Marlino, D. (2007). Gender, entrepreneurial self-efficacy, and entrepreneurial career intentions: Implications for entrepreneurship education. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 31(3), 387-406.
- Woolcock, M., & Narayan, D. (2000). Social capital: Implications for development theory, research, and policy. *The World Bank research observer*, 15(2), 225-249.
- YPARD (2016) Retrieved February 19, 2018 from http://www.ypard.net/young_professionals_for_agricultural_development_Malaysia.