



Corruption and integrity issues in governance involving indigenous minorities in Malaysia: Identifying the risk areas

Izawati Wook¹ Hasnah Hj Haron² Arif Fahmi Md Yusof, Zulkiple Abd Ghani³, Abd Hakim Mohad⁴ and Rosli Shaari⁵

¹Universiti Sains Islam, Malaysia

² Universiti Sains Islam, Malaysia

³Universiti Sains Islam, Malaysia

⁴ Universiti Sains Islam, Malaysia

⁵ Universiti Sains Islam, Malaysia

⁶Universiti Sains Islam, Malaysia

Abstract. This paper presents the findings from a study that identifies the risk areas in corruption and integrity issues in governance involving indigenous minorities in Peninsular Malaysia. Risk refers to the likelihood or probability of an adverse effect resulting from a completed action. Failure to manage corruption risk in an organization will increase the number of corruption cases. This research applied a qualitative approach using interviews and focus group discussions involving stakeholders including the related governmental bodies; non-governmental bodies; and selected community representatives. Relevant research reports and audits were also examined. The conduct of the research had been granted permission from the Research Ethics Committee of the university to which the authors are affiliated, and the conduct of the data collection adhered to the ethical guidelines approved by the committee. The study found that the areas in which corruption cases are seen as probable include the procurement of supplies and services especially in stages of planning, execution, monitoring, and complaint enforcement; provision of goods and cash benefits to the communities; and execution of development projects or activities involving indigenous settlements. The determination of corruption risk areas is important in the development or assessment of the relevant policy to address the issues on integrity and corruption in an organisation.

Keywords: Corruption and integrity, indigenous minorities, risk areas, public policy.

1 Introduction

This paper presents the findings from research that identifies the corruption risk areas in governance involving indigenous minorities in Peninsular Malaysia. Risk refers to the likelihood or probability of an adverse effect resulting from a completed action. Failure to manage corruption risk in an organization will increase the number of corruption cases. Meanwhile, risk areas refer to aspects with a high probability of corruption.

The focus of the study is on the governance involving the indigenous minority communities in Peninsular Malaysia which constitute less than 1% of the overall population of Malaysian citizens. The administration of the indigenous community is specially placed under a specific department at the federal level (referred to as ‘the department’). The department fundamentally operates with multiple functions, aimed at designing strategies and programs towards implementing policies involving the communities. To address the governance and corruption risk in the department, a specific Organizational Integrity Plan was established which includes transforming the department administration to be efficient, disciplined, and full of integrity. The plan also sought to increase awareness of high integrity working culture through leaflets or article distribution, motivational courses, or religious talk organizations, as well as updating asset ownership information and asset declaration status reports.

2 Problem statement

Upon analysing the findings of past studies on the general perception of the corruption rate in Malaysia, the public perceives the corruption happening within the government as still unresolved and an enormous problem, especially in the law enforcement sector, public procurements, and land administration (Duasa, 2008; Budhi, 2018; Noraida Harun 2017).

This is consistent with the score of the country in the Corruption Perception Index conducted by Transparency International which indicated the perception of corruption of 180 countries. On a scale of 0 (highly corrupt) to 100 (very clean), Malaysia scored 47 in the 2022 report, which fell each year from the score of 53 in 2018. Besides, the 10th Edition Global Corruption Barometer Asia Report 2020 observed that 72% of the people viewed the corruption happening within the government as a serious problem.

Specific to the governance involving indigenous minority communities, several past studies suggested that the indigenous peoples are more vulnerable to various forms of corruption/abuse of power (Hand 2005; Wong 2012). The factors to this include the small number of community members, low education level of community members; the form of political organization in the community – organization at kinship/tribal community level; unacknowledged land status – assumed as unoccupied which opens doors to land applicants to apply for ownership for these lands.

Location is also a contributing factor as many of the indigenous communities are living at the periphery and rural areas, distant from developed cities, and areas that are rich in natural resources. Further, the a clash between land use patterns (commercial

demands on resources and government's will towards development) and the indigenous peoples' will to preserve their customary lands, their land use pattern, and the value of these lands. Apart from that, affirmative action policy on behalf of the indigenous peoples being associated with public office power for personal gain could also be a factor (Hand, 2005; Wong 2012). Besides, another factor for the vulnerability is economic deprivation. Wong (2012) explained a low Human Development Index which encompasses health, education, and income is associated with a high Corruption Perception Index.

Therefore, to address the issue of integrity and corruption affecting governance involving the affairs of the indigenous minorities, identifying the corruption risk areas is important in the development of, or assessment of the existing, relevant government policy.

2.1 Research question and objective

Based on the above context, the research question posed in the study is: What are the corruption risk areas involving governance of the administrative institutions involving the affairs of the indigenous minority community? On this basis, this study explores the corruption risk areas involving the governance or administration involving the affairs of the indigenous minority communities in Peninsular Malaysia. Identification of risk areas in corruption is important in analysing the adequacy of the corruption and integrity policy provided in the relevant government department.

3 Research methodology

The research applied a qualitative approach through interviews and focus group discussions conducted from February to July 2021 involving the relevant stakeholders including the governmental and non-governmental bodies, and selected community representatives. There are 8 representatives from governmental institutions including the Malaysian Anti-corruption Commission, National Audit Department, and Institute of Integrity Malaysia; 7 representatives from the indigenous community; two representatives from two non-governmental organisations, and two academics in social studies on indigenous affairs.

This research was granted permission from the Research Ethics Committee of the university to which the authors are affiliated. The conduct of the data collection adhered to the ethical guidelines approved by the committee. Consent of the participants was obtained in writing and their identities are protected. Reference to the information given by the respondents is marked by 'R' followed by an identifying number. The audio from the interviews and focus group discussion, which are in the Malay Language, was recorded, transcribed, and analysed. For the purpose of this paper, parts of the relevant information by the respondents are translated in English, and some are rephrased with cautions taken to retain the meaning.

Other reports relevant, including the audit reports by the Auditor-General's reports and news, are also examined to corroborate the data that were found in the study.

4 Findings

Findings from the interviews and focus group discussion carried out, most respondents viewed that corruption and flaws in terms of integrity persist in various aspects involving the administration and service delivery to the indigenous community. Some respondents, especially those from non-governmental bodies, viewed the corruption rate in the government sector which involves the indigenous community's development as serious. Leakage of government money is seen as a common practice in the management of supplies and services procurement to the indigenous community.

Corruption can potentially happen among civil servants who use their power, practice cronyism, and wield influence to secure supplying projects, for example, or to personally benefit from such projects. This includes direct corruption practices, including receiving or soliciting bribes in the form of cash.

However, corruption is also perceived to occur in situations in which commitment, work performance, and service delivery are problematic. Many respondents (R1, R2 - activists, R15, R16, R17 - indigenous representatives) associate the condition of indigenous community villages with integrity and corruption issues. Many villages are seen as lacking in terms of basic amenities and economic development in comparison to the amount of money allocated annually by the government to the communities. Further, the poverty rate in the community is still at a high level compared to other groups in the society.

However, it must be acknowledged that there is no clear evidence on the perceived corruption. There is no case proven in the court of law although there are cases of the relevant officers being charged. A media report survey found that only 2 reports on corruption involving the administration related to the community were lodged. One is a police report made by an indigenous community that they were offered gratification to prevent a protest against logging activity near their settlements (Bernama 2015, Manjit 2019). Another is a complaint made by an indigenous community in Gua Musang, Kelantan to the Malaysian Anti-Corruption Commission (SPRM) on an alleged corruption or abuse of power (Sharifah 2019).

4.1 Corruption risk areas

The study identified three main areas of corruption risk with respect to governance involving the affairs of the indigenous communities. Risk refers to the chance of something happening that will have an impact on the objectives of the organisation. Failure to manage the risk of corruption in an organisation will increase the number of corruption cases. In this paper, corruption areas refer to areas with a high probability of corruption. Risk of corruption will further explain in detail the risk of corruption that could potentially occur in the corruption area.

Supplies and services procurement is an area that holds a high risk of corruption practices. Efficient management and compliance with procedures are fundamental to reducing corruption risk. Weak management will increase the likelihood of corruption

practices. The flaws in the legal and judicial system also open avenues for civil servants to commit a lack of integrity behaviours.

In Auditor General's Report 2017 (Series 2) on the Activities of the Ministries/Federal Government Departments and Federal Statutory Bodies, results from the audit assessment of the water treatment project at indigenous settlements in Pahang found that the project has yet to improve the level of health and living quality of the indigenous villagers. The audit report highlights problems including:

- a. procurements made without the department's authorisation; and
- b. weakness in monitoring by the project manager resulting in contract payment wastage and loss to the Government.

Meanwhile, the Annual Report of the Audit Division in the Prime Minister's Department 2019 revealed that the procurement management at the relevant government department was less than satisfactory. Some of the prevailing issues include:

- a. construction of extended work without the department's authorisation
- b. procurement divided into small lots; and
- c. procurement planning was not properly studied.

Moreover, the report also stated that there is non-compliance with contract clauses involving 30 contracts at the department's headquarters, Selangor, and Pahang offices. There are also issues such as payment beyond approved allocation, dubious supporting documents, and unreasonable pricing in the purchase of goods for the aid of the indigenous communities. An audit assessment carried out on an ICT system managed by the department was also unsatisfactory with the non-compliance to the system management.

The views of the research participants are also consistent with the audit reports. The forms of corrupt wrongdoings highlighted by the participants include rent-seeking activity from government senior officials or involvement from politicians to reach an agreement for supplying purposes. This is illustrated by a government officer (R9) interviewed,

At the procurement stage, (the officer) will make sure the company of his choice is selected, and he'll get a certain percentage.

We are well informed, that on many occasions that this one (a high-profile officer) did direct a few projects, but it was all verbal. When someone didn't want to do it, he'd be transferred immediately.

One government officer (R11) stated that there was a maintenance contract for a machine, but the machine was not functioning.

They keep doing maintenance of the machine. But the machine actually does not work. They did everything, it's just that the machine is not functioning. The machine was maintained but not functioning.

Shedding light on issues related to supplies and procurement management for the indigenous community, weakness in the management can be observed in 3 areas: planning, execution, monitoring, and law enforcement.

Planning The respondents (R1, R3, R15 – indigenous representatives; R11 – government officer) observed that the decision-making for supplies of goods and services was not according to the community's needs and suitability of the location.

Example 1:

A few respondents mentioned that treated water supply projects in their villages are not needed since their villages are already equipped with clean water supply. Whereas there are other nearby villages that are in dire need of the supply of treated water. For instance, an indigenous community member (R14) stated,

In my village, there is a lot of river water, a lot. They were doing a water pipe project. They stretched the pipes from I don't know, 1, 2 kilometres away, to supply water to this village when there are many small rivers nearby where we can take water.

They want to carry out this project because they have the budget. When there's a budget, you guess it. A lot of things like this can happen. Sometimes, there's no need at all but they still do the project. I think this is a waste of the country's money. It should've been used for more important things.

In the same line, a government official (R11) stated,

Most (of the villages) already have water supply, ... instead of making new ones, they should just improve, ... upgrade. Much cheaper cost.

For the Indigenous communities, there are new projects coming, whilst the current projects here are not even done.

Example 2:

An indigenous activist (R15) gave an example of a rubber plantation project in the indigenous community areas that the villagers owned and managed with their own funds and assisted by a non-governmental organisation. However, to the villager's regret, their rubber fields were cleared to give way to a new rubber plantation project suggested by a government agency.

A government officer came over to the village and told the villagers, he would cut all the rubber trees for replantation. But the villagers opposed the idea ... But it was to no avail because of the position of the officer ... In the end, the rubber trees were cleared, and new rubber trees were planted. Now they've all (the old trees) gone to waste. For me, this is about integrity, power abuse ... R15 (Indigenous representative)

The same issue was brought up by the department's own staff through an open-ended comment in a survey conducted through the research. Among the mentioned issues include:

- a. Wastage in the projects or programs without prior examination of the local indigenous community's needs.
- b. Project allocation concentrates towards certain politicians' areas, their own hometown, or relatives and not according to priorities or current needs.
- c. Tender management or department projects are given to interested parties and do not adhere to the outlined criteria causing the project execution to be less than satisfactory.
- d. Officers giving orders to report on project progress done by contractors as abiding by the contract even though the progress is unsatisfactory.
- e. Officers having "overly good" rapport with the contractors.

Implementation and work quality of goods or service delivery. Work quality was highlighted repeatedly by many respondents (R3, R5, R15, R16, R18 – indigenous representatives; R2 – activist). This pertains to the very poor quality of work compared to project value, non-compliance to specifications, delayed projects, and abandoned projects. Examples of the projects mentioned are water supply, construction of roads, community hall, and houses at the indigenous settlements.

At many Indigenous settlements, water supply couldn't provide water because of unsuitable, non-functioning infrastructure. No water in the tanks. R2 (Activist)

The Indigenous villages in Pahang received quite a lot of tube wells but it's the same, the project is no use. When the auditors came over the villagers would tell them "Ma'am if you'd like to see another one of those you can go to a nearby school." R11 (Government officer)

The most obvious is the water project. When we go to Indigenous villages in the hinterland there are tanks, there are pipes but still, there's no water flowing out. R5 (Indigenous)

Road projects in the hinterland, PPRT housing projects with low quality. We can see sometimes after 3, or 4 years the PPRT homes are already damaged, even when the houses were made of bricks and supposedly can last for at least 10 years. Sometimes within 3, or 4 years, the sidewalks are already damaged, sand coming out of the floor tiles. These are all projects from the department. R17 (Indigenous)

The project itself does not follow the outlined specifications; we can see homes being built in smaller sizes than the original

plan. There are homes built just 3 months ago, but there are visible cracks here and there. R3 (Indigenous)

The houses, when you see them, they just don't make sense. Why would the officers approve the project with such poor conditions? R18 (Indigenous representative & government officer)

The quality is lower than satisfactory, there are cracked walls, and some can even fall and endanger someone. R16

The quality of roads is extremely below par, not following the standards. R16

A few respondents assumed that a factor to the prevailing problems is due to the leakage of money in the project management.

The amount of money received by the contractors is way lower than the original tender price. R14

Maybe because of leakage, the budget becomes insufficient so when it comes to delivery, the project becomes incomplete. The project is just to set up the water tanks and that's it. They don't care if the tanks are functioning or not, as long as the tanks are there. R15

The money has been in several stops and mismanaged along its way so in the end what's left for the project is inadequate. R9

The most common thing that the people do is kaw tim (collusion). R9

(Corruption) causes cost overruns... to the contractors and executives. When there is a cost overrun and they cannot claim, it will affect the quality of the project. The ones who would feel the impact are the project recipients. R14

Selecting unsuitable contractors also results in low-quality, delayed, or even abandoned projects. For example, it was believed that even contractors with bad records were still granted contracts for the next project.

Maybe because of the issue in the selection of the contractor. R19

The contractor's previous housing project has been abandoned, how is he still getting projects? R18 (Indigenous representative & government officer)

The (contractor's) performance was poor under Ministry (A) but he's still working on a different project under Ministry (B). R11

Regardless, there were respondents who highlighted that location could be a factor that could result in project delays or abandonment of projects. The indigenous settlements are often located deep in rural areas resulting in relatively higher costs. One participant (R17) explained that,

Sometimes there are other factors that need to be considered. For example, in rural areas, delivery of fertilizer, seeds, and others would be costly as special vehicles such as 4-wheeled drive vehicles would have to be used.

Monitoring. Poor monitoring of the projects opens more avenues for corruption. Many observed that the relevant officers were not equipped with the necessary skills and technical knowledge to monitor the management of projects (R14, R16 – indigenous representatives); R1 - activist). Another factor is the difficulty of monitoring projects in rural areas.

The department doesn't have any engineers, so they would have to appoint engineers from another department. R16 (Indigenous)

The department needs engineers to monitor the infrastructure projects in indigenous villages. For example, in Pahang, which is a vast state, you need at least one engineer. R16 (Indigenous leader)

The officers didn't monitor the projects well. R18 (Indigenous representative & government officer)

It is also suggested that participation of the communities in the project monitoring could, to certain extent, address location issues. One indigenous activist (R15) suggested,

They should discuss with them, welcome the community to get involved, guide them. When they are out of this place, and this problem happens, you can do this, this, like what they've taught. At least, the community can survive on their own. Meaning they can repair something, or anything, but that's not the case. They didn't teach us. So, in the end the money for Indigenous development has gone to waste. The project fails, there is no benefit to the communities.

Enforcement. Complaints on the low work quality are not adequately dealt with. Interviewees mentioned,

I already referred to (the department), many times, ... but there's no response It's not easy to travel from the village to town to go to the office, and the project is now abandoned. R15 (Indigenous)

Before this he (an officer) said, we need to speak up (about corruption happening in the department) but no one is taking any action. R16 (Indigenous)

From a different angle, the public is often reluctant to lodge reports on corruption involving government servants even when it involves their own community members.

Coming from myself, from personal experience, if I feel unsatisfied with the quality of a certain project, I feel somewhat hesitant to make a report.. R18 (Indigenous representative & government officer)

One thing about the Indigenous community is that when it comes to making reports on anything good or bad relating to any misconduct or involvement inside their community, it becomes very difficult for them to do so. Chances are the reports are only made verbally but never written. R16 (Indigenous)

The most difficult part in this situation is when the Indigenous themselves are involved. ... They know this guy is corrupt, this guy did wrong ... but they will not report it, they will not make a mess and noise out of it. Because of the culture, they will not go against their leader. R1 (Activist)

Besides, the punishment and action taken after the auditing process are not adequate compared to the loss incurred. One government officer stated that contractors with bad performance are still given contracts. Moreover, on an occasion, as mentioned by a government officer (R9), contracts for the maintenance of a failed project were given to the same contractor who failed to perform in the original contract.

In one water-supplying project for Indigenous community settlements in Pahang, the weaknesses in terms of planning, execution, and monitoring were seen in a few areas:

- a. Selection of the project site was done without detailed research. On the other hand, some of the selections are made by local leaders like the people's representatives.
- b. There are a few similar projects in the same village done by different government agencies. This reflects the possibility of a lack of integrated planning between the government departments.

- c. Selection of the water supplying system used in the projects was found to be unsuitable with the location and needs. The system used is much more expensive from a more suitable system.
- d. Feasibility research for a more suitable system selection was not carried out.
- e. Procurement execution was carried out through direct negotiation managed by the related Ministries.
- f. When there is a problem with the execution, the project is handed over to the departments related to procurement execution including contractor assignment for the project to proceed.
- g. The tools used in the project execution are hard to find in the market and there is no local expertise to repair, and the spare parts are hard to find.

This case should serve as a lesson that the weakness in each of the processes reflects the weakness of the procurement management. This opens doors and avenues for corruption to occur. The project did not achieve its objective of supplying water to the villagers even though the total cost of the project was immense.

Provision of goods and cash benefits. Integrity issue in the provision of goods and cash to the indigenous community was raised by a few respondents. This includes:

- a. The value of delivered goods being lower than the original value as allocated;
- b. Cash or goods not delivered to the rightful recipients.

The classic case for the institutional one is during MCO last year when the food baskets (were distributed). 5000 families were supposed to get RM100 with the food basket. ... We calculated the value was RM58, the other one was RM38, so it was too obvious. As I said there is no audit, it just went through. R1 (Activist)

Sometimes the project is at maximum cost, but the impact to the community receiving goods from a project, let's say food baskets cost about RM100, but when the food baskets reach the community, the value has fallen 40%, 50% lower. R16 (Indigenous representative)

The villagers didn't receive some of the cash promised to be given – R1 (Activist)

Development involving the indigenous settlements for the benefit of the indigenous community. The respondents (R16, R1, R14, R15) also mentioned that there are development projects involving indigenous settlements that failed to achieve the objectives, especially to bring the villagers out of poverty. Instances of such projects include the Resettlement Plan Scheme (RPS), agriculture land development programme, and

other development projects such as commercial replanting project which takes place all around the peninsular. Two indigenous representatives stated,

RPS started more than 30 years ago ... it's been so long since it started ... But, if you see the result and impact on the communities in terms of development, some are still lagging behind and we can say that the projects have failed ... from the initial planning ... (which was) to bring them out from poverty by providing road infrastructure, and electric, water supply and others, including land development where the government opens rubber or oil palm plantations. But in the end, after so many years ... RPS had been a failure and ended. (R16)

Later, a new project named Commercial Replanting in Indigenous villages was run by (certain government agencies). The aim was to provide higher incomes to the Indigenous and bring them out of hardcore poverty, not the poverty line ..., But, in the end, it was also a failure. (R16)

Projects that only bring failure, no benefit to the community, certainly we see them as a form of corruption. It's our perception of looking at corruption. (R17)

For such projects, issues of management highlighted were:

- a. Many projects carried out did not bring good outcomes to the project participants.

In the end, the people didn't get any dividends. If there are some, sometimes (the amount is) RM20 a month, RM100 a month. Some would make it, and some won't. However, only 20% of those made it, while 80% didn't. R16 (Indigenous)

In 2019, data from the department shows that of all the programs, the income for participants per month from all the rubber plantations managed by the agency, the highest was RM800 per month to as low as RM200 per month. In some areas, it is RM0 per month. For 6 months, the people do not get any income. R1 (Activist)

At the same time, in those kampungs where they managed to get the control of the plantation scheme back, in Bekok and Johor and so on, if you have 6 acres and 4 and half acres, you can earn up to RM1,200 ringgit to RM1,600 per month. The people themselves are managing their own resources. Here you get a

big government agency in an economic scale - something is missing, something is wrong. R1 (Activist)

I also want to touch on this issue on the project ...there are layers after layers and eventually what they get is almost a very small profit or very small dividend ... the question is why we need the layers, who created the layers, how we came up with these layers ... why there (are) so many sub-contractors. R2 (Activist)

The same has also been documented in many research reports (Man, Hamid, & Samah, 2013; Saifullah, Kari, & Othman, 2018; Abdullah, Sayuti, Arshad, & Embong, 2016). It was observed that, although such projects had been carried out for so long, most of the communities involved were still living below the poverty line. The monthly dividends received by the program participants were extremely lower compared to the amount they should have received in a particular land size. The comparison with the amount of profit received by the participants who cultivated their own lands also sets a huge disparity. As a result, the majority of the participants still relied on their traditional economic system which they had practiced before the programs were carried out (Man, Hamid, & Samah, 2013; Saifullah, Kari, & Othman, 2018; Abdullah, Sayuti, Arshad, & Embong, 2016).

In most projects, the system used did not benefit the indigenous communities, but incurred losses instead. The people were named as participants and were paid dividends. Whereas the dividends received were low and did not provide sufficient benefits to the communities (R14 and R15 – indigenous representatives).

- b. Lack of transparency in the management which includes unclear reporting to the participants.

The agreement was made between the government agencies. The people actually knew nothing about the agreement. And they didn't even know the terms and how long the lands were handed over to the contractor for the projects. They didn't know how long that would take, 30 years, 50 years, they just didn't know. And they also didn't know when they were going to get the dividends. And even if they knew, there was more to the tip of the iceberg. R16 (Indigenous)

Reports on the total size, and how much yield products were handed to the ministry but not to the state government or the Indigenous community. Definitely none. In the meetings with the villagers, I never once saw the expenses or balance sheets. So, for me, the villagers certainly knew nothing. But what's most important to me, is we must disclose to the villagers and then they'd know what's happening, about the progress of the lands in their villages. R16 (Indigenous representative)

There is no audit. As far as I know, there is no audit sent to the government department as an office project. R1 (Activist)

- c. **Planning:** The community representation in the decision-making process for the project executions and to gain the villagers' approval was brought up by several respondents. The government department is usually regarded as representing the Indigenous in the decision-making process on behalf of the Indigenous villagers.

Any issues related to Indigenous are usually handled or managed by the department. The department is the one that deals with the people and outside parties, other government agencies or private companies, and others. Everything goes through the department. They determine the people's fate. R14 (Indigenous)

The department is the one making decisions for the people. R15 (Indigenous)

We negotiate with them, we don't want them to manage, we want to manage on our own, how to plant, how to administer the profit, loss, and others. But they were adamant in saying no. They want to handle it, asking the people to just become the participants and wait at home for monthly dividends. R15 (Indigenous)

The point is that at the meeting, no community members attended, only the officer from the department attended, and they made decisions for the community. R1 (Activist)

They don't speak to the community; they speak to one person and they think that one person will get the community to engage in the project. R2 (Activist)

The same issues were also reported in the Report of the National Inquiry into the Land Rights of Indigenous Peoples issued by the National Human Rights Commission of Malaysia (*Suruhanjaya Hak Asasi Manusia Malaysia*) in 2013. It was revealed that the cooperative networking or relations of the department with other parties (like government agencies, corporations, and individuals) in any memorandum of understanding or agreements were usually made without prior agreements or negotiations with the Indigenous community. Even when there were negotiations on the development projects, these negotiations only involved the government department and the village chiefs.

Therefore, a meaningful consultation needs to be arranged with the community and all decisions need the agreement of the Indigenous before reaching a consensus.

The failures of projects in meeting the objectives provide an insight to the possibility of corruption or integrity related issues in the management and execution of the projects through the agencies and also the assigned contractors.

5 Conclusion and recommendations

To sum up, there are three main areas in which corruption risks were identified in the study: first, the corruption risks in the procurement of supplies and services; second, provision of goods and benefits or services to the communities; and third, execution of development projects or activities in indigenous settlements for the community's benefit.

Therefore, the delivery system of government agencies involved with the indigenous communities needs to be improved. This includes upgrading the level, skills, and capabilities of the staff of the relevant department; improving the management of the supplies and services procurement (planning, execution, and monitoring) by the government department and other agencies; carrying out detailed research before deciding a project; appointing contractors with high integrity and skills; and ensuring that the officers responsible for project monitoring is capable to monitor the projects effectively.

Besides it is also important to establish a mechanism to ensure the participation of the affected communities in the planning, execution, and monitoring of a development project. Public participation is a crucial element of good governance. When it is done in a meaningful way, public participation can provide two distinct benefits: first, providing/sponsoring agencies will make decisions that reflect the needs of the targeted communities; and second, the community builds a long-term ability to resolve and manage challenging social issues, putting differences and previous misunderstandings aside.

Further, upgrading a clear and effective complaint channel is also important so that the communities would be able to lodge complaints related to a procurement project. It is also recommended that the contractors from the local indigenous community are given priority whenever relevant.

The findings are useful to assess the existing organizational integrity plan of the department and to determine a specific action plan to address risk areas of corruption in the management of the department and ultimately achieve its objectives.

6 Acknowledgement

The authors would like to express appreciation to the National Centre for Governance, Integrity & Anti-Corruption (GIACC), the Prime Minister Department, the Government of Malaysia which funded the research, and the Universiti Sains Islam Malaysia for valuable assistance in this research under Grant Code: USIM/JPM-GIACC/FSU/LUAR K/41520. This paper is also partly funded by Grant Code: USIM/IKE-UKM/FSU/LUAR-K/40422.

References

1. Abdullah, J., Sayuti, N. M., Arshad, A. A., & Embong, M. R. (2016). Living Conditions in Orang Asli Resettlement Project (PROSDET) of Pantos, Pahang, Malaysia., *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 143-150.
2. Bernama, 15 Oktober 2019, Kerajaan Perak menyerahkan kepada SPRM untuk menyiasat dakwaan rasuah yang diberikan kepada Indigenous, <https://www.malaysiakini.com/news/495879>;
3. Budhi, W. S. (2018). A Nexus of Migration and Corruption: Irregular Indonesian Migrants in Malaysia. *The Global Studies Journal*.
4. Duasa, J. (2008). Tendency Of Corruption And Its Determinants Among Public Servants: A Study On Malaysia. MPRA Paper No. 11562.
5. Hand, J. (2005). Government Corruption and Exploitation of Indigenous Peoples. *Santa Clara Journal of International Law*, 3(2), 262.
6. Man, N., Hamid, H., & Samah, A. A. (2013). The impact of agriculture land development programme (ALDP) of Orang Asli resettlement plan scheme (RPS) in Pahang, Malaysia. *Pertanika Journal of Social Science & Humanities*, 21, 63-78
7. Manjit Kaur, 2019 Wakil Indigenous membuat laporan SPRM dakwaan menerima rasuah daripada syarikat pembalakan, *The Star*, 9 Oktober 2019 <https://www.thestar.com.my/news/nation/2019/10/09/orang-asli-reps-lodge-macc-report-over-allegations-of-receiving-money-from-logging-firm>
8. Noraida Harun, Z. H. (2017). Rasuah Dalam Pentadbiran Tanah: Penyelesaian Menurut Islam. *Jurnal Islam dan Masyarakat Kontemporari*.
9. Saifullah, M. K., Kari, F. b., & Othman, A. (2018). Poverty among the small-scale plantation holders: Indigenous communities in Peninsular Malaysia. *International Journal of Social Economics*, 45, 230-245
10. Sharifah Mahsinah, SPRM terima laporan rasuah di penempatan Indigenous Kuala Koh, *New Straits Times*, 11 Julai 2019 <https://www.nst.com.my/news/nation/2019/07/503508/macc-has-received-report-corruption-kuala-koh-orang-asli-settlement>
11. Wong, A. (2012). Socio-economic aspects of corruption in aboriginal communities. *Journal of Administration and Governance*, 7(1).

Open Access This chapter is licensed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>), which permits any noncommercial use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons license and indicate if changes were made.

The images or other third party material in this chapter are included in the chapter's Creative Commons license, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the chapter's Creative Commons license and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder.

