



Full Length Research

Gender-responsive budgeting in local government: A study of Majlis Perbandaran Pulau Pinang

Jacqueline Liza Fernandez

School of Social Sciences, Universiti Sains Malaysia, 11800 Minden, Penang, Malaysia. E-mail: lfjacq@usm.my. Tel: 604- 653 3427 (O); 012-265 6658 (H/P).

Received April, 2015; Accepted May, 2015

This is an exploratory study on the initiative to introduce Gender-Responsive Budgeting (GRB) at the local government level in Malaysia, based on the case of the Penang city council or Majlis Perbandaran Pulau Pinang (MPPP). The GRB approach emphasises that government expenditure and policies affect women and men in society (i.e. in terms of the gender impact of government expenditure on public goods and services) as well as the government sector itself (i.e. in terms of the adherence to the principle of equal employment opportunity for government employees). This study focuses on two issues: firstly, to map the availability of sex-disaggregated data in MPPP as well as the extent to which gender issues are incorporated in budget planning and secondly, to do a gender analysis for selected services that are provided by MPPP by using the public expenditure benefit incidence analysis (BIA) method. The findings of this study are used as a basis to suggest ways in which MPPP can move forward in implementing GRB in terms of improving its data collection and performing gender analysis.

Key words: Gender-responsive budgeting, local government, benefit incidence analysis

INTRODUCTION

One vital area of government policies is the budget. The budget is the government's most important economic policy tool that reflects the public sector's socio-economic priorities. A budget appears to be a gender-neutral policy instrument when it has no explicit positive or negative impact on gender relations or gender gaps. However, a budget is actually gender-blind in so far that it ignores the different socially determined roles, responsibilities and capabilities of men and women which prevents women and girls from gaining access to their fair share of resources and services. Therefore, it is argued that a gender-neutral or gender-blind budget is unable to eliminate gender inequality in society (Sen, 2000; Reddy and Gangle, 2014).

The limitations of a gender-neutral budget has given rise to gender budgeting or otherwise known as *gender-responsive budgeting* (GRB) initiatives. What is GRB? Chakroborty (2014) describes GRB as a fiscal innovation that translates

gender commitments into fiscal commitments by applying a "gender lens" to the identified processes, resources and institutional mechanisms of the budget process in order to achieve a desirable benefit incidence. As such, GRB is viewed as an important tool for gender mainstreaming. GRB does not involve the creation of a separate budget for women and girls at the expense of men and boys, although GRB initiatives are likely to focus more on the fairer sex since women and girls tend to be disproportionately represented amongst the marginalised groups in society. GRB is an approach that provides analytical tools for the integration of a gender perspective into government budgets (with an emphasis on public expenditure) to allocate government resources in an equitable manner in order to address the different needs of women and men, girls and boys in the society to achieve the goal of gender equality. GRB also provides a means of examining the impact of government revenue and expenditure

policies on the economic and social opportunities of women and men. The inclusion of other considerations such as ethnicity, marital status, age, disability, class and location will certainly add value to GRB efforts. However, because gender relations pervade all spheres of life, gender analysis is the primary focus in GRB.

Many countries around the world have undertaken to incorporate GRB in their development plans. There are examples of GRB initiatives at the central government level (e.g. Australia, Armenia and South Korea) as well as at the level of local government, mostly in the form of pilot projects (e.g. Mexico City, Canton, Berlin Lichtenberg District, Andalusian State and several cities and regions in Italy) (Yucel and Senesen, 2014). It is noted that GRB initiatives which are undertaken by governments may differ in terms of the tools utilised and the scope of the budget. The following discussion outlines the various tools formulated by Elson (1997) that are available for performing gender-sensitive analysis in government budgets:

1. Gender-aware policy appraisal: This tool questions the assumption that policies are gender-neutral in their effects. It is an analytical approach which involves scrutinising implicit and explicit gender issues in government policies and programmes by asking the question 'in what ways are the policies/programmes and their associated resource allocations likely to reduce or increase gender inequalities and reflect women's as well as men's different needs.
2. Gender-disaggregated beneficiary assessment: The assessment is based on qualitative information obtained by opinion polls, focus group discussions, surveys etc. asking actual or potential beneficiaries from both sexes about the extent to which government policies and programmes match their priorities and needs.
3. Gender-disaggregated public expenditure benefit incidence analysis: This is a quantitative tool which measures the unit cost of public services and compares how public expenditure is distributed between women and men on the basis of their respective consumption of the services. It involves computing the unit cost of a service and determining how many women and men benefit from that service.
4. Gender-disaggregated tax incidence analysis: This technique examines the impact of direct taxes, indirect taxes and user fees on different categories of individuals or households.
5. Gender-disaggregated analysis of the impact of the budget on time use: This looks at the relationship between the government budget and unpaid work. The objective is to show the distribution of unpaid work between women and men, and to take this into account in the budgetary policy analysis.
6. Gender-aware medium term economic policy framework: Current medium term macroeconomic policy frameworks are void of gender analysis. Incorporating gender analysis can be accomplished by either disaggregating variables by sex, where possible, or by constructing new models that are gender-

sensitive.

7. Gender-aware budget statement: This tool is the government report that reviews the budget using some of the above tools, and summarises its implications for gender equality with different indicators such as share of expenditure targeted at gender equality, the gender balance in government jobs, contracts or training or the share of public service expenditure used mainly by women.

These tools do not constitute a GRB blueprint and do not have to be used all together. The GRB literature normally presents the above tools in a listing that follows no particular order to offer the opportunity to governments to select and apply any number of tools that may prove practical.

In the last few decades, there have been various initiatives in Malaysia to reduce the gender gap and the time is nigh for Malaysia to implement GRB at the federal, state and local government levels to hasten the success in bridging the gap between women and men. The Ministry of Women, Family and Community Development (2005) outlines the rationale for GRB as follows: GRB work aims to utilise the country's human resources fully by promoting women's participation in, and contribution to, economic and social life; GRB helps to use the country's financial resources by matching budgets to plans, priority programmes, and projects to ensure the use of people and resources of the country to their full potential so that Malaysia will be able to achieve the goals of Vision 2020; GRB helps the government to improve prioritisation, planning, management of implementation, monitoring, evaluation and impact assessment.

This article reports the findings of a pilot study which was undertaken at the inception of GRB at the local government level in one particular state in Malaysia, i.e. Penang. There are two municipal councils in the state of Penang, i.e. Majlis Perbandaran Pulau Pinang (MPPP) which serves Penangites who reside in the island of Penang and Majlis Perbandaran Seberang Perai (MPSP) which serves Penangites who reside in the mainland (Seberang Perai); this article focuses on the former. The objectives of this study are as follows:

1. Identifying the availability of data in MPPP to implement GRB, particularly the number of individuals (women/girls and men/boys) using public services provided by MPPP.
2. Performing gender analysis with data provided by MPPP and applying one of the GRB tools, i.e. the benefit incidence analysis (BIA) method, for selected services provided by MPPP.
3. Providing suggestions on improvements in MPPP's data collection for the purpose of GRB.

METHODOLOGY

This is an exploratory study of the initial phase of GRB that is being undertaken by MPPP and it employs both qualitative data (survey data) and quantitative data (budget data and number of

individuals using public facilities provided by MPPP). In this study, the survey data was collected by carrying out interviews in 2012 involving two groups of respondents, i.e. (i) heads of department in MPPP and (ii) users of facilities and services provided by MPPP (The questionnaire for the first and second group are shown in Appendices 1 and 2(A and B), respectively). The first group of respondents was interviewed to garner information regarding data collection by each department to ascertain whether it fulfilled basic GRB requirements while the second group was interviewed to get consumers feedback regarding the services provided by MPPP. The researcher also obtained the following quantitative data from MPPP: sex-disaggregated data on the number of users of selected public services and the budget data (particularly, operating budget) for these facilities.

Two sampling methods were used in the surveys, i.e. purposive sampling and convenience sampling. The purposive sampling method was used to select the first group of respondents, i.e. a total of 13 MPPP officials. In-depth interviews were carried out with the director of each department, and if the director of a particular department was unavailable, the researcher interviewed the next highest ranking official. The convenience sampling method was used during field trips to the selected public facilities such as hawker centres, swimming pools and gymnasiums located in parks. A total of 50 individuals who use these various public facilities were interviewed in this pilot study.

The interviews were based on semi-structured questionnaires which provided the researcher with the flexibility to pose additional questions when necessary. The questionnaire for MPPP officials comprised four sections, i.e. background of the department, data collection, use of data and gender equality issues within the department. The questionnaire for individuals who use public facilities was also divided into four sections, i.e. profile of the respondent, respondent's views on accessibility of the service provided, individual's use (in terms of frequency) of a particular public facility and its supporting services, evaluation of the services (in terms of consumer satisfaction and complaints about the facilities). Given the varying nature of each public facility, the questionnaire was modified accordingly for users of parks and hawker centres. It is noted that only selected findings of the surveys (i.e. results pertaining to the objectives listed in Section 1) are reported in this article.

The researcher opted to apply one GRB tool, i.e. the benefit incidence analysis (BIA) method for selected public facilities. Benefit incidence is computed by combining information about the unit costs of providing public facilities with information on the number of users of these facilities. The formula shown in Equation (1) is used in the BIA method (Chakraborty, 2010).

$$X_j \equiv \sum_i U_{ij}(S_i/U_i) \equiv \sum_i (U_{ij}/U_i)S_i \equiv \sum_i e_{ij}S_i \quad (1)$$

where X_j = subsidy enjoyed by group j ; U_{ij} = utilisation of service i by group j ; U_i = utilisation of service i by all groups

combined; S_i = government expenditure on service i ; e_{ij} = group j 's share of utilisation of service i .

The purpose of this analysis is to compare how public expenditure is distributed between women and men on the basis of their respective consumption. The results of the computation are used to identify how well public services are targeted to particular groups (e.g. gender groups) in the population, i.e. it reflects how much women and men benefit from a particular public service.

RESULTS

A good starting point at the inception of GRB is to examine the availability or lack of data for gender analysis and the inclusion of gender considerations (if any) in an organisation's budget. This will enable the organisation to determine the data and gender issues that it needs to take into account to perform GRB. In the interview with each department official, the researcher inquired about the types of data as well as variables/information that are included in their data collection and the inclusion/omission of gender issues in budget planning. Table 1 summarises the responses to these questions for each department in MPPP.

Most of the data that is collected by MPPP does not contain the sex variable, except in the case of the Human Resource and Public Relations sections in the Corporate department, Licensing section in the Urban Services department, the Traffic Control and Public Transport section in the Engineering department and the Recreation, Tourism and International Relations department. Generally, the departments in MPPP do not place emphasis on gender considerations in their budget planning, even in the case of departments that have the sex variable in their data base. However, sex is taken into account in particular cases; i.e. separate budget allocations for men and women's uniforms in the Enforcement division (Corporate department) and separate budget allocations for men and women's gymnasium facilities provided by the Recreation, Tourism and International Relations Department.

In this study, we illustrate how gender analysis can be carried out by applying the BIA method for several important services/facilities provided by MPPP, i.e. hawker centres and recreational facilities, namely swimming pools and gymnasiums. The hawker centres are managed by the Licensing Unit in the Urban Services Department while the swimming pools and gymnasiums are some of the facilities provided by the Department of Recreation.

Hawker centres

The Licensing Unit is responsible for processing applications and issuing licenses to petty traders and hawkers who trade in markets, hawkers complexes and temporary hawker sites; this unit is also given the task of maintaining and upgrading the

Table 1. Variables/information in data base and gender considerations in planning.

Department (Section/Unit)	Type of data	Variables/information in data base	Gender Issues in budget planning
Corporate (human resources)	Data on staff	Name, sex, ethnicity, age, disability, marital status, education, service record	No
Corporate (public relations)	Complaints about MPPP services	Name, sex, age, address/residence	No
Corporate (information system)	Data on vendors	Name of vendor, Project and contract details	No
Corporate (enforcement)	Data on summons/fines	Name, ethnicity, age, disability, address/residence	No (except for budget allocation to provide different uniforms for women and men officers)
Treasury	Revenue and expenditure	Name, amount of money disbursed/received	No
Urban Services, public health and licensing (licensing)	Data on hawker sites	Name, sex, ethnicity, marital status, disability	No
Urban Services, public health and licensing (urban services)	Data on garbage disposal	Location	No
Building	Data on building projects	Particulars of developer	
Engineering (traffic control and public transport)	Data on traffic, public transport and customer satisfaction, mechanical operations, tenders/contracts,	Location, routes, sex, ethnicity,	No
Development planning	Development plans	Local plan, special area plan	No
Valuation and property management	Data on assessment	Name, ethnicity, age, type of property	No
Recreation, tourism and International Relations	Complaints, reservations	Sex, ethnicity, age, disability, residence/address	No (except for budget allocations for women's gymnasium)
Building commissioner	Management of multi-storey buildings	Particulars of Joint Management Body and Management Corporation	No

facilities of MPPP hawker centres in Penang. According to the statistics provided by the Licensing Unit, a total of 5,650 individuals have been issued with a license to operate as hawkers in Penang. The Licensing Unit was unable to furnish the researcher

with sex-disaggregated data of license holders for all the hawker centres in the state. The Licensing Unit only provided the data for 5 of the 9 hawker centres that were selected for the purpose of field work, namely (i) Batu Lancang Market, (ii) Taman Tun

Sardon Market, (iii) Bayan Baru Complex, (iv) Medan Renong Complex and (v) Chowrasta Complex. A gender analysis based on the BIA method is performed to estimate the extent to which men and women hawkers benefit from public expenditure (i.e. operating

Table 2. Distribution of license holders by sex: selected hawkker centres in Penang

Hawker Centre	License holders		Total number of license holders (%)
	Men (%)	Women (%)	
Batu Lancang market	135 (65)	74 (35)	209 (100)
Taman Tun Sardon market	66 (68)	31 (32)	97 (100)
Bayan Baru complex	84 (60)	56 (40)	140 (100)
Medan Renong complex	42 (81)	10 (19)	52 (100)
Chowrasta complex	46 (77)	14 (23)	60 (100)

Table 3. Benefit incidence for men and women hawkkers: selected hawkker centres in Penang.

Hawker Centre	Operational costs (RM)	Operational costs per capita (RM)	Public expenditure benefit incidence	
			Men	Women
Batu Lancang market	16,412.98	78.53	10,601.55	5,811.22
Taman Tun Sardon market	26,115.91	269.24	17,769.84	8,346.44
Bayan Baru complex	190,849.54	1363.21	114,509.64	76,339.76
Medan Renong complex	18,062.99	347.37	14,589.54	3,473.70
Chowrasta complex	19,643.65	327.39	15,059.94	4,583.46

budget) which is spent on these hawkker centres. Equation (2) shows the formula to calculate the average amount of MPPP's operational cost per hawkker at a given location (hawkker centre)

while Equations (3a) and (3b) show the benefit incidence for men and women hawkkers, respectively.

Table 2 shows the number of men and women license holder

$$\text{Per capita expenditure (location } i) = \frac{\text{Operating budget of hawkker centre (location } i)}{\text{Number of hawkkers (location } i)} \quad (2)$$

$$\text{Benefit for men (location } i) = \text{Per capita expenditure} \times \text{No. men hawkkers} \quad (3a)$$

$$\text{Benefit for women (location } i) = \text{Per capita expenditure} \times \text{No. women hawkkers} \quad (3b)$$

holders for each hawkker centre. The majority of individuals who possess a hawkker's license are men, i.e. no less than 60% of license holders are men. Table 3 shows the operational cost incurred by MPPP for each hawkker centre and the benefit incidence for men and women hawkkers, respectively. Table 3 shows that MPPP spends different amounts of money for each hawkker centre subject to the type of maintenance or upgrading work that is required at each location. The BIA results show that a greater share of the benefit of public expenditure on hawkker centres is enjoyed by men hawkkers; i.e. men gain about twice as much than women from MPPP's expenditure on hawkker centres.

In this study, a survey was also carried out at five hawkker centres. The profile of the 25 hawkkers who were interviewed is summarised in Table 4. The majority of the respondents, i.e. 17 (68%) are men and 8 (32%) are women. More than 70% of male and female hawkkers are above the age of 40. The respondents were queried about license holding; 15 of the 17

men hawkkers (88%) who were interviewed were license holders while only 3 of the 8 women hawkkers (38%) were license holders. This implies that the majority of women hawkkers were operating a stall on behalf of another family member who was issued the license to trade. This finding raises the question of whether the majority of women hawkkers in Penang are not license holders themselves and if so, what are the reasons and implications of women operating the business on behalf of a household member?

Table 4 also shows other details about the businesses that are carried out by the respondents. The respondents were asked about their working hours and almost all of them work full time. Three questions regarding finances were posed to the hawkkers, i.e. the initial capital invested in the business, business loan (if any) taken by the hawkkers and profits earned. Given that most of the hawkkers operate a small scale business, the amount of capital invested is not high and usually in the range of RM1000-RM2000. Hence, most hawkkers do not

Table 4. Profile of Sample of Penang hawkers.

No.	Sex	Age	License holder	Working		Capital (RM)	Loan	Profit (RM)
				Hours	Days			
1	Male	50+	Self	9	7	2000	Yes	>2000
2	Male	20+	Boss	8	7	--	--	--
3	Male	50+	Wife	5½	7	1000	No	1000-2000
4	Male	50+	Self	5½	7	500	No	1000-2000
5	Male	40+	Self	6	6	1000	No	1000-2000
6	Male	40+	Self	5	6	1000	No	<1000
7	Male	30+	Self	6	7	1000	No	1000-2000
8	Male	40+	Self	7	5	1000	No	1000-2000
9	Male	>50	Self	8	6	1000	No	1000-2000
10	Male	>50	Self	7	6	5000	Yes	<1000
11	Male	40+	Self	5	6	2000	No	1000-2000
12	Male	30+	Self	6	5	1000	No	<1000
13	Male	30+	Self	4	3-4	1000	No	<1000
14	Male	50+	Self	4	1	3000	No	1000-2000
15	Male	50+	Self	4	1	5000	No	<1000
16	Male	30+	Self	5	5	1000	No	1000-2000
17	Male	40+	Self	9	7	2000	No	1000-2000
18	Female	40+	Self	8	7	1000	No	1000-2000
19	Female	40+	Husband	5½	7	2000	No	Normal Profit
20	Female	30+	Self	9	6	1000	No	<1000
21	Female	30+	Husband	10	5	1000	No	<1000
22	Female	40+	Husband	9	7	1000	No	<1000
23	Female	50+	Son	5	7	1000	Yes	<1000
24	Female	50+	Father	4	3	4000	No	<1000
25	Female	50+	Self	4	6	5000	No	<1000

require a loan to start the business. Most respondents report earnings of less than RM2000 per month. A total of 11 hawkers earn low profits; i.e. 5 of the 17 men hawkers (i.e. about 30%) and 6 of the 8 women hawkers (75%) earn less than RM1000 monthly. Further investigation is needed to establish if the majority of women hawkers in Penang earn low profits and if so, why?

Recreational facilities in parks (swimming pools and gymnasiums)

MPPP provides various recreational facilities in Penang such as parks, community halls and stadiums. This study focuses on the facilities provided in parks, specifically the swimming pools and gymnasiums in Youth Park (also known as *Taman Perbandaran*) which is located in the north eastern part of Penang. According to MPPP, the total operational budget for the Youth Park amounted to RM435, 540 in 2011 and RM475, 650 in 2012. Among the facilities in Youth Park are two

gymnasiums (i.e. one for men and another for women) and two swimming pools (i.e. a children's pool and a family pool). MPPP has taken account of the needs of the disabled by equipping the pool with a ramp to make the pool accessible to those who are physically handicapped; however, gender needs have not yet been addressed by providing a separate pool for women or allocating special swimming times for women. In the case of gymnasiums, MPPP has taken into account gender needs but not the needs of the disabled, especially individuals who are wheel-chair bound; i.e. there is a men's and women's gymnasium in the Youth Park but both are located on the upper floor, a two-storey building that has no elevator.

Table 5 shows the number of men and women who use the gymnasium and swimming pool in Youth Park. Table 6 shows the operational budget of these facilities and the public expenditure benefit incidence of each group of users. The men's gymnasium is larger than the women's gymnasium and gymnasium membership for 2012 stood at 809 for men and 325 women. MPPP does not keep a record of the number of pool

Table 5. Number of gymnasium and pool users by sex.

Type of recreational facility (youth park)	Male	Female	Total
Gymnasium	809	325	1134
Swimming Pool	182,000	78,000	260,000

Table 6. Benefit incidence for men and women gymnasium and pool users.

Type of recreational facility (youth park)	Operational costs (RM)	Operational costs per capita (RM)	Public expenditure benefit incidence	
			Men	Women
Gymnasium	8100	7.14	5,778.57	2,320.50
Swimming Pool	122,320.33	0.47	78,960.00	33,840.00

users in Youth Park. A Youth Park officer estimated that about 5000 individuals use the pool each week (i.e. 1,500 swimmers from Monday-Friday and 3,500 swimmers on Saturday and Sunday) and therefore the total number of users in a year (52 weeks) is approximately 260,000. The male-female ratio of pool users is approximately 70:30.

The data in Table 6 show a substantial gender gap in the public expenditure benefit incidence that favours men. The question that begs to be answered is why are the pools and gymnasiums in Youth Park less used by women? The answer to this question would facilitate MPPP in making its recreational facilities more gender friendly and appealing to the fairer sex.

Conclusion

Until its recent efforts to introduce GRB, MPPP did not incorporate gender issues in the budget planning. Even in departments that have the sex variable in their data set, there is no gender analysis in budget planning except in certain instances such as providing separate allocations for men's and women's uniforms and gymnasiums. Some MPPP officials suggest that the use of names and/or identity card numbers in their databank would suffice for the purpose of identifying the sex of individuals. This somewhat lackadaisical attitude regarding the necessity to include the sex variable in data collection is not surprising since GRB is still in its infancy in MPPP and all officials have to be enlightened on the importance of GRB as well as its data requirements.

One convincing way of illustrating the importance of GRB is to provide evidence of gender gaps in society. In this study, we employed the BIA method to show the extent to which men and women benefit from the local government's expenditure on public facilities, particularly the hawkers centres and recreational services. It is noted that the BIA results reported in this study only provide an estimate of the gender disaggregated public expenditure benefit incidence of these facilities due to the lack of sex-disaggregated data. In order to assess gender

disparities accurately, MPPP needs to collect sex-disaggregated data.

It is recommended that MPPP also collects data on other relevant socio-economic and demographic variables. This would enable MPPP to develop GRB further by analysing intersections between gender, class, location, disability, ethnicity, marital status and age when assessing gender gaps and impacts of budgets. A multivariate analysis of gender gaps would allow policy makers to address the specific deprivation faced by women from various demographic and socio-economically disadvantaged groups. This approach ensures that public policies take into account intra- and inter-group diversity, identifies vulnerable groups who are at the intersections of different inequalities and accordingly attempt to remove such inequalities through targeted planning and budget allocations.

Acknowledgments

The author thanks MPPP for supplying the data used in this study and acknowledges the contribution of the Penang Women's Development Corporation (PWDC) in funding this project.

Conflict of interest

Author have none to declare.

REFERENCES

- Budlender D, Sharp R, Allen K (1998). How to Do a Gender Sensitive Budget Analysis: Contemporary Research and Practice. London: Australian Agency for International Development.
- Chakraborty L (2010). Gender-Sensitive Fiscal Policies: Experience of Ex-Post and Ex-Ante Gender Budgets in Asia-Pacific. New York: UNDP.
- Chakraborty L (2014). Gender-Responsive Budgeting as Fiscal Innovation: Evidence from India on "Processes". Working Paper No. 797. New York: Levy Economics Institute, Bard College.

- Elson D (1997). Tools for Gender Integration into Macroeconomic Policy. Link into Gender Dev. 2:12-14.
- Ministry of Women, Family and Community Development (2005). Gender Budgeting in Malaysia. Kuala Lumpur: MWFC.
- Reddy, P and Gangle, R (2014). Gender Budgeting to Gain as a Tool for Empowering Women. Global Journal for Research Analysis. 3(8):9-11.
- Sen, G (2000). Gender Mainstreaming in Finance Ministries. World Dev. 28(7):1379-90.
- UNDP (2008). Investing in Gender Equality: Global Evidence and the Asia-Pacific Setting. Discussion Paper. Asia Pacific Gender Mainstreaming Programme. Colombo: UNDP Asia-Pacific Regional Centre.
- Yucel Y, Senesen G (2014). A Methodological Approach to Well-Being Gender Budgeting: Findings for Turkey through Capabilities Matrices. Conference paper presented at International Conference of Gender Responsive Budgeting: Theory and Practice in Perspective, November 6-18, 2014. Available at: http://wu.ac.at/fileadmin/wu/d/i/vw3/Session_2_Gunluk_Senesen__Yucel.pdf.

APPENDIX 1: QUESTIONNAIRE FOR MPPP OFFICIALS

DEPARTMENT: _____

UNIT : _____

BACKGROUND OF THE DEPARTMENT

1. What services does this department provide?

2. Are any of the services outsourced? If yes, please give details of the contractor:
Name of Company:_____ Sex of Company Owner: _____

DATA COLLECTION

1. Does this department/unit collect data routinely? YES/ NO
2. Who is responsible for determining the data that is required for the department?
 Head of Department Deputy Head of Department Head of Section
 Head of Unit Lower Rank Officer Others
3. Who determines the format/type of data to be collected? _____
4. Who collects the data? _____
5. Data is collected from: Households Individuals Businesses Others

6. Please list the type, method used and frequency of data collected.

No.	Type	Method (forms/internet/counter)	Frequency
1			
2			
3			

7. Data is categorized by:

- Sex
 Ethnicity
 Age
 Marital Status
 Education Level
 Occupation
 Location
 Income
 Physical Disability
 Others

USE OF DATA

1. How is the data stored?

- Microsoft Excel
 Other software (name) _____

2. When did this department initially digitalize its data? _____

3. Who analyses the data?
 Individual
 Unit
 Department
 Organization

4. State the reasons and times when data is collected. Is it in line with the budget cycle? _____

5. Does the department summarize the data in the form of statistics (totals, percentages, tables etc.)?

6. Who presents the data and in what context is it presented?

Individual (Position)	Venue (in/outside the department/organization)	Type of Activity (Seminar/ Meeting etc.)

7. Is there collaboration between the department/units in terms of data collection and the use of data?
If yes, please state the nature of collaboration.

8. Is gender considered in the planning and preparation of the budget of this unit or department? If Yes/No, please give examples/reasons.

9. Please give suggestions how the data can be used more effectively for designing policy, planning and preparing the budget.

GENDER EQUALITY IN EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING

1. How many men and women are employed in this department? _____

2. Is data collected with regard to allocations for human capital development (training/courses)? _____

3. Is there data on sex, age, marital status etc.? _____
4. Who analyses the data and how is it used? _____

APPENDIX 2A: QUESTIONNAIRE FOR HAWKERS AT HAWKER SITES

Profile of Respondent					
Age		Sex		Ethnicity	
<21	21-30	Male	Female	Malay	Chinese
31-40	31-40	Physical Condition		Indian	Others
41-50	>50	Disabled	Normal	Non-Malaysian	
Marital Status			Education Level		
Single		Married		Primary	Secondary
Divorced		Widowed		Tertiary	Informal education

A. Access of Information and Location

1. Is the information about the availability vacant lots at MPPP hawker centres easily available? Yes/No
2. How is this information accessed?
 Mass media Telephone Internet Friends Others _____
3. Distance of hawker centre from your residence:
 <1km 1-3 km 3-5 km >5 km
4. What mode of transport do you frequently use to travel to the hawker centre?
 Motorcycle Car Bus Bicycle Others _____

B. Details of Business

1. Who is the license holder for this stall? Self Spouse Others_____
2. What do you sell? Fresh food Dried food Others _____
3. Did you obtain your business license easily? Yes/No. If No, why? _____
4. What type of stall are you operating?
 - Seasonal stall Roadside stall Stall on private premise
 - Stall at temporary hawker site Stall in a side lane
 - Stall in hawkers complex Stall in wet market
5. How long do you operate your stall? _____hours/day _____days/week
6. How long have you been operating your stall here?
 - < 1 year 1 – 4 years 5 years and above
7. Are you assisted by others in this business? Yes/No

If yes, who helps you?

 - Family (children/spouse) Domestic helper
 - Hired worker Others _____
8. How much did you spend to start this business?

Capital expenditure (van, other equipment) RM _____
9. Did you obtain a loan from any agency/institution? Yes/ No. RM_____
10. Do you earn a profit in this business? YES/NO
11. What is the estimated monthly profit?
 - Below RM1000 RM 1000-2000 More than RM2000

C. Complaints

1. What problems do you encounter in running this business?

- Traffic congestion Lack of parking space
- Safety issues Hygiene (toilets, garbage disposal)
- Non-strategic location Strict enforcement of laws by MPPP staff
- Problems with infrastructure (pipes/taps, lighting, toilets, small space, etc)
- Other problems, please state _____

2. Have you made a formal complaint about the facilities /services? If yes, please state the channel used to make the complaint?

- Telephone Complaint window Bureau of Public Complaints
- Letter to Member of City Council E-mail
- MPPP counter Complaints portal Others_____

3. If you answered 'Yes' to the above question, what complaint did you make and are you satisfied with the action taken by the authorities? Yes/No. Please explain

4. Give suggestions about how to improve the quality of service provided.

APPENDIX 2B: QUESTIONNAIRE FOR PARK USERS

Profile of Respondent					
Age		Sex		Ethnicity	
<21	21-30	Male	Female	Malay	Chinese
31-40	31-40	Physical Condition		Indian	Others
41-50	>50	Disabled	Normal	Non-Malaysian	
Marital Status			Education Level		
Single		Married		Primary	Secondary
Divorced		Widowed		Tertiary	Informal education

A. Access to Information and Location

1. Is the information about the park and its facilities easily available? Yes/No
2. How is this information accessed?
 Mass media Telephone Internet Friends Others _____
3. Distance of park from residence <1 km 1-3 km 3-5 km >5 km
4. What mode of transport do you frequently use to visit the park?
 Motorcycle Car Bus Bicycle Walk Others _____

B. Use of Park

1. How often do you visit this park?
 ___ times per week ___ times per month ___ times per year
2. What facilities do you frequently use in this park?
 (You may choose more than one answer)

- Gym: Men's/Women's Swimming pool Outdoor fitness equipment
 Field (aerobics, *tai chi* etc) Archery range Others_____

3. Are you satisfied with the facilities provided in terms of the following:

Cost/ Charges Yes No

Access in terms of location Yes No

Wait time to use facilities Yes No

Operating hours Yes No

4. What is your evaluation of the following?

- | | | | |
|---------------------------------|---|----------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Reading materials: | <input type="checkbox"/> Unsatisfactory | <input type="checkbox"/> Average | <input type="checkbox"/> Good |
| Equipment: | <input type="checkbox"/> Unsatisfactory | <input type="checkbox"/> Average | <input type="checkbox"/> Good |
| Hygiene: | <input type="checkbox"/> Unsatisfactory | <input type="checkbox"/> Average | <input type="checkbox"/> Good |
| Safety: | <input type="checkbox"/> Unsatisfactory | <input type="checkbox"/> Average | <input type="checkbox"/> Good |
| Comfort: | <input type="checkbox"/> Unsatisfactory | <input type="checkbox"/> Average | <input type="checkbox"/> Good |
| Standard of service: | <input type="checkbox"/> Unsatisfactory | <input type="checkbox"/> Average | <input type="checkbox"/> Good |
| Toilets: | <input type="checkbox"/> Unsatisfactory | <input type="checkbox"/> Average | <input type="checkbox"/> Good |
| Facilities for disabled/elderly | <input type="checkbox"/> Unsatisfactory | <input type="checkbox"/> Average | <input type="checkbox"/> Good |

5. For gym users: Do the equipment suit your needs? Yes/No. Explain.

6. Is there adequate equipment to cater for all gym users needs? Yes/No. Explain

C. Complaints

1. Have you made a formal complaint about the facilities /services? If yes, please state the channel used to make the complaint?

- Telephone Complaint window Bureau of Public Complaints
- Letter to Member of City Council E-mail
- MPPP counter Complaints portal Others_____

2. If you answered ‘Yes’ to the above question, what complaint did you make and are you satisfied with the action taken by the authorities? Yes/No. Explain

3. Give suggestions about how to improve the quality of service provided.
