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INTRODUCTION

Since the early 1970s most countries of the Third World have considered tourism as an important avenue for socio-economic development. This widespread optimism about the remedial role of tourism, especially as regards its ability to solve problems relating to balance of payment deficits, unemployment and regional disparities, has to do with the nature of tourism itself, and the manner in which its role is perceived by politicians, planners and the ordinary citizen of the host community. That tourism does confer benefits with little problem to certain established destinations is just as unassailable as the frequent accusation against the industry in other destinations where tourism happens to deliver more problems than solutions.

A careful study of the literature on the impact of tourism however suggests that what matters, in the final analysis, is whether the consequences of tourism are fully appreciated within the specific context of the host destinations. Unfortunately, because mass tourism is a recent phenomenon, and owing to the general lack of understanding of the breadth and complexity of the subject itself, critical commentaries on the relevant issues are slow in coming, and consequently, viewpoints on the role of tourism tend to be dominated by industry insiders and their advisors, many of whom come from outside the country.

The central question usually addressed by professional advisors, is not on whether tourism should be promoted or otherwise. The main concern, closely in line with the client’s terms of reference, is rather in what forms might tourism be developed. With such a tendency in the planning process, it seems pertinent at the outset, to look back at the basics, and to consider the relevance of tourism to the socio-economic development of the host society. I propose to do this by first
locating the role of tourism in socio-economic development, and then proceed to compare this with the real situation in Sarawak. This chapter, therefore, addresses the following set of questions.

1) Conceptually, what should be the role of tourism within the development context of a host society?
2) What are the main features of the tourist industry in Sarawak?
3) With respect to the first question, is Sarawak heading in the right direction? If not, what are the obstacles and what can be done to overcome them?

Given the paucity of information available, especially on issues beyond the numerics, these questions are admittedly raised with some trepidation, but with a hope that they can serve as food for thought, for those who are concerned with the future development of the industry in the state.

THE ROLE OF TOURISM IN SOCIO-ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Definitions

To avoid confusion the two key terms, 'tourism' and 'development' are used as follows. 'Tourism' refers to an amalgam of activities which directly or indirectly serve the needs of the tourists. 'Tourists' in turn are visitors (domestic and international), who arrive and stay overnight or longer at the destination. The term 'development' implies both growth and distribution of benefits. By socio-economic development we consider not only development of the economy in the narrow aggregate-quantitative sense, but at a broader level to also include the non-economic dimensions (cf., Dahlan: 1990).

Tourism Component of Socio-Economic Development

in any developmental context there are at least four basic components which interact and to some degree overlap with one another. These are: developmental ideology, resource capability, technology, and economic structure. These four components provide the milieu for, and certainly have a bearing on the structure and the operational behaviour of every sub-component (or sector) of the economy of which tourism is one. As to whether tourism is significant or relevant within the context of this overall framework, depends on the magnitude of its contribution to the economy. At the global scale tourism is certainly a dominant sector whose contribution to the world economy is expected to surpass all other sectors beyond the year 2000. But within the boundaries of particular nations and
regions, contributions from tourism may be important or trivial, depending on the number of visitor arrivals, and the amount of money spent, in comparison to contributions from other sectors in the local economy.

In structural terms, tourism is usually regarded as a tertiary activity which is consequent upon the primary activities (agriculture, fishing, mining, forestry, etc.), and secondary activities (manufacturing, construction, etc.). There are nonetheless situations where tourism appears as a basic or staple sector of the economy. In countries such as the Maldives, Morocco, Cyprus and Spain, tourism is clearly a leading income earner. Similarly, the booms and busts of the economies of cities such as Las Vegas, Atlantic City, Acapulco and Cancun, can be readily traced to the trends in visitor arrivals. Scholars of the dependency persuasion are strongly critical of such association because it leads peripheral economies to a vulnerable position subject to the dictates of metropolitan influence. However, no matter which perspective one takes, and whichever the scale of analysis adopted (local, regional or international), the truth of the matter is that tourism always brings a mixture of impacts, positive and negative. It is inextricably linked to other sectors of the economy, and without its supporting role, other sectors of the economy may not be able to function at full capacity.

The Role of Tourism

The complex relationships between the tourism sub-component and other sectors of the economy can be seen albeit partially, from the inter-industry input-output tables. Inter-industry linkages give a macro-level view of the extent to which tourism activities penetrate the national economy. Another way of looking at these linkages is through tracing the economic transactions which result from tourist purchases. As shown in Figure 1, the arrival of tourists gives rise to demand for goods and services required by them. At the barest minimum, tourists need transport, food and accommodation. Beyond this, depending on what in the first place motivates them to take the trip, they may also need facilities for recreation and entertainment, shopping, companionship, security and information services, plus a multitude of other services, which altogether, provide them with a certain experience of being away from home.

Thus, a host of activities operate in concert to cater for the needs of the visitor. In this manner tourism creates employment and income which help to increase government revenue. Part of the income leaks out from the economy through imports, remittances, profit repatriation and, to some extent, through capital flight. The direct earnings retained locally are reactivated through subsequent rounds of spending which give rise to the so-called multiplier effect. Thus from the demand side of the equation, tourism becomes a contributor to economic growth. From the supply side, resources (capital, utilities, material and manpower) are mobilized at cost in response to the needs for
to the community includes any extra cost involved in foregone opportunities, effect of inflation, and capital/labour shortages in other sectors. The benefits, including income, are partly retained and partly leaked out of the economy. The costs and benefits are almost always distributed inequitably, from the point of view of local residents and ethnic groups.

It is only when both the patterns of growth plus distribution, and the balance of costs and benefits, are taken into consideration, that we can truly speak of the role of tourism in socio-economic development. Very often the elements of costs are not fully accounted for, although, to be sure, the benefit side of the equation, is also seldom fully appreciated. The task of evaluation becomes more confounding if one tries to present the whole tourism equation which also includes the socio-cultural dimension, where most of the intangible consequences are to be found. For this reason the polemics surrounding the tourism development still remain unsettled, although current discussion has come to a more balanced position compared to the 1960s and 1970s when the initial optimism was gradually superseded by widespread scepticism of the tourist industry.

During this period (1960s-1980s) three strands of ideas concerning tourism development appeared in the literature. In line with the earlier options, the first was the idea articulated in the 1960s, which suggests that tourism could be used as an instrument to develop resource-poor areas. It avoids mentioning the negative aspects but often exaggerates the benefits and opportunities that tourism can bring. The second set of ideas which incorporates evolutionary notions, came in the 1970s. Briefly, the evolutionary perspective offers some caution - tourism is likened to the life cycle of a product which has its stages of rise and fall. Implicit in this concept is the gloomy idea that unless some deliberate measures are undertaken, tourism will produce more problems after the 'stage of maturity'. This perspective, which anticipates increasing social costs, is consonant with the dependency perspective of the early 1980s which saw the character of contemporary tourism as a clear example of Western domination of the economies of the Third World.

The persistence of these competing viewpoints, each with its own merit, suggests that the role of tourism, viewed from a wider angle, is quite complicated. There does not seem to be a clear blanket approach which could provide a sure recipe for long-term success. This is not to suggest that tourism development is beyond control and planning, especially in view of the progress made through government control (licensing, TOBTAB, EQA etc.) over the last five years. The concern here is that there does not seem to be enough discussion on policy matters; and certainly much less interest in research, apart from those farmed out to consultants, plus the routine collection of statistics on visitors, hotels and travel agents. In this respect Sarawak could take advantage of its somewhat delayed
involvement; the latecomer in theory, should be able to draw some guidance from the mistakes and problems experienced elsewhere.

Figure 1
Tourism Component of Socio-Economic Development
THE TOURIST INDUSTRY IN SARAWAK

The Past

Since early times (circa 700 A.D.) the landscape of Sarawak has witnessed trickles of travellers who came and left, mainly for trade and other economic pursuits. Among the Sarawakians themselves there was no shortage of movements from the coast into the interior jungles and mines. Indeed, one notable feature of the Iban tradition, 'bejalai', suggests the practical and symbolic significance attested to travel among the local population. Despite this high proclivity for travel, both inbound and within Sarawak, there was no corresponding growth in businesses associated with travel. This can be explained by the fact that in the earlier transit situations which involved immigrants, explorers, adventurers and social visitors, the immediate needs of the travellers were well taken care of, either by the sponsors or the host community. Whereas the early explorers and country traders sailed in vessels which were adequately provisioned with victuals to last for an entire journey, local travellers, including indentured labourers, sought hospitality through reciprocal arrangements with the local residents. As in the case of the former, and partly owing to the small volume of travellers in those days, internal travel also did not give rise to commercial activities associated with it.

The need for catering and accommodation facilities was however greatly felt during the colonial days when government officers were required to travel for administrative purposes. While this had led to the establishment of various forms of government resthouses, the influx of immigrant labour during the later part of the 19th century also created a parallel demand for lodging houses. Remnants of these two categories of accommodation facilities are common features of contemporary Malaysian towns.

The Present

Sarawak has the biggest number (16) of resthouses in 1976. Besides the resthouses there were 87 lodging houses, 24 hotels and 5 longhouses in 1979 with a combined room capacity of 2,278 rooms. The hotel industry and other activities in Sarawak are expected to provide employment for some 600 persons. The number of resthouses in Sarawak reflects the expanse of its area which is the largest in the country. Also, for administrative reasons, especially in the remote areas where accessibility is poor, resthouses are still needed since there is not enough market to make investment in the accommodation sector profitable. Statistics from the Tourist Development Corporation (TDC) suggests that in 1986 Sarawak had a total of 2,682 rooms, lock, stock and barrel. Although this is a significant percentage (7 per cent of the national total), Sarawak's tourism
intensity falls from the sixth position among the 14 states to the lowest, when the population and areal parameters are taken into account (Table I). In 1985, 185,482 visitors arrived in Sarawak. Of this total 40 per cent originated from Peninsular Malaysia and Sabah while 60 per cent came from abroad with about two-thirds from the ASEAN countries. Of the ASEAN contingent some 75 per cent originated from Brunei and 20 per cent from Singapore, being the segments which were not targets for our promotional campaigns.

There is no conclusive figures on the pecuniary impacts of tourism, since available estimates do not include the domestic segment and are based on length of stay estimates which varies from 4 nights to 8.4 nights, and the estimates of daily expenditure pattern which varies from M$74 to M$109. Similarly, the multiplier effects are assessed from a rather out-dated (1978) set of input-output figures. The high output multiplier figure of 1.89 for hotels etc., given in a recent estimate, however does not include direct leakage simply because the input-output table does not contain estimates on import content of the tourism sector. One estimate suggests that the total tourist expenditure, calculated from an average stay of 7.4 days with an average expenditure of M$63.86 per day, was M$59.6 million in 1985. This is about 1.25 per cent of Sarawak’s GDP, as compared to a corresponding figure of 2.6 per cent for the whole country, which again affirms the insignificant contribution from the tourist sector.

Though insignificant at present, an estimate from the state suggests that tourism in Sarawak will grow marginally faster (at over 6 per cent per year) than growth rates for the rest of the country. This optimism is also evident in the per cent per annum. A 1987 survey by the TDC however, indicates that Sarawak has the least prospect of growing compared to other regions in the country, both in the medium and the long term. These conflicting scenarios suggest that there is a great deal of uncertainty in regard to the future trend of tourism in Sarawak. Part of this confusion may be attributed to the lack of insight into the tourism market itself, a problem which is closely related to the paucity of quality information upon which reliable extrapolation can be made.

The irony which continues to baffle observers is that while there is always a general agreement on the attractiveness of Sarawak as a destination, with its host of attractions - cultural, historic, monuments of nature etc. - Sarawak persists in being a sleepy and reluctant destination. Many have quickly linked this slow drag to Sarawak’s lack of connectivity to the outside world. But if Sarawak is truly attractive, and its attractiveness is known to the outside world, one really wonders as to whether the potential visitors, especially the adventure-explorer type, would choose to bypass Sarawak despite its remoteness. This remark is clearly speculative, but is deliberately so for three reasons. First, if one assumes that the trend obtaining elsewhere would also affect Sarawak’s future, there are indications which suggest that the tourist market is gradually changing from the upmarket (recreationist-hedonist) taste to the budget adventure-experiential type
of tourism. Sarawak certainly has a lot in store for the latter type of tourists (Ferrario, 1988; Poon, 1988).

The second reason concerns the exposure of Sarawak to the outside world. From available studies, very few of the tourists learn about the destination from promotional materials. Indeed a good proportion of them obtain information brochures only after the decision has been made to visit a particular destination. For the majority, the initial factor which prompts them to such a decision is the information through word-of-mouth, either through relatives, work-mates, or other friends. This suggests that a conventional approach to marketing needs to be reconsidered to ensure a more effective mode of promoting the state. I would suggest that decision-makers put more effort to identify, not only the right motifs, but perhaps more importantly, the right channel and target groups.

Thirdly, while one can agree that promotional literature should not emphasize deceptive images about Sarawak, such a perspective, however, must be pursued in earnest, meaning one should not encourage ill-advised conservatism in image-mongering. In particular, I would suggest that instead of adopting a protectionist attitude with respect to the longhouse (a policy highly recommended in the Master Plan), Sarawak should ‘exploit’ its legend to the full. Such utilization of cultural resources need not necessarily be counterproductive, if planners are prepared to work out programs in a bottom-up fashion in close collaboration with the longhouse dwellers themselves. One possible form that can be considered is a Dayak theme park which may be orchestrated incrementally along the model of the Polynesian Cultural Centre in Hawaii. To adopt a short-cut benevolent stand may lead to a clear denial of the interest of the longhouse communities who have repeatedly expressed interest to participate in the tourist industry, preferably on their own terms (Kedit, 1980; Ah Kiong, 1986).

Besides an appropriate marketing strategy, which should not be determined solely through passing the responsibility to market consultants, there is a need for concerted efforts from various government departments to explore new areas for collaboration. The Chief Minister once commented on the reluctance of the private sector to be more aggressive in promoting tourism in the state (People’s Mirror, 27.10.86). The same remarks can also be directed to other government departments. Until recently, there is precious little input from forestry, wildlife, agriculture, education, police, army, and many other departments which are directly or indirectly related to tourism. As shown in Table 1, Sarawak suffers from a state of underdevelopment in many areas. These include the state of poor accessibility, and the problems associated with quality and availability of facilities which include roads, transport, water and power supplies, for which Sarawak occupies the lowest position in the country. Clearly, more efforts are required in these areas as well if the state desires to build up its tourist industry.

One final feature which needs mentioning is the pattern of involvement in the industry with respect to participation among ethnic groups. This subject may not
be important at the beginning but in the long run the tourism planners must address this since tourism ultimately depends on the goodwill of the public. In a plural society such as Sarawak the general friendliness of the host society may be difficult to sustain, if the visible effects are such that the benefits of tourism are dominated by only one or two groups in the community. Local resentment has surfaced in many situations where those excluded from the opportunities brought in by tourism, happen to be the source of attraction for tourists. Before long the latter group will begin to demand with increasing fervour for a change in status, from the position of mere attraction, to that of the beneficiaries. To avoid such eventualities, which is already beginning to creep into Sarawak, some attention and respect should be accorded to the spirit of the New Economic Policy, which all the Master Plans have conspicuously avoided so far.

In order to ensure that Sarawak can continue to attract visitors on account of the friendliness of the Sarawakians themselves, some deliberate anticipatory measures would have to be taken to this end. In this connection, it may be equally important to promote tourism, not only in the market abroad, but also locally. Citizens must be made aware of the usefulness of tourism to the society; at the same time the attractions and virtues of Sarawak must also be exposed to the locals. Malaysians cannot afford to dislike tourists and the tourist industry, if the society is intent on developing this sector. After all public relations effort in the country may also help to beef up the domestic segment, and the benefits from such an exercise may even support other efforts towards national integration, as is frequently exhorted by politicians. As it is, the general awareness of Sarawak as a destination among the Malaysians themselves still leaves much to be desired.

As regards the impact of tourism on Sarawak, the general impression is that there have been some positive benefits in terms of income, employment, infrastructure, historic preservation, cultural enrichment, and the promotion of handicrafts and the positioning of a certain image of Sarawak in the international scene. But viewed in isolation there have also been problems; these include the lack of local access to, and control over, employment opportunities which have been reported, for example, among the longhouse dwellers and those directly affected by the Damai Resort Project and Niah Park Projects. In the socio-cultural sphere, there have been observations made on the erosion of the symbolic significance of cultural events such as ngajat, ngayap, gawai etc. Iban women seem to have appeared as permissive (prone to prostitution for example in Sibu, Limbang), subjects of misconstrued immodesty; these are some of the sensitive issues associated with modern day encounters with the outsider who arrives with certain preconceptions.

Although the negative impacts of tourism, given its stage of inception, is quite minimal at present, it is relevant to be aware of the kinds of impacts which have taken place in other more established destinations. As shown in Table II, the list of impacts, both positive and negative, can be long, and its incidence usually
corresponds with the intensity of tourism development. Although tourism in the state is still in its infancy, it is not difficult to trace examples of the factors listed in the above Table, in the Sarawak scene. The implication here is that for a healthy growth and development, the state authorities have to work towards maximizing the positive while minimizing the negative possibilities. Only then will Sarawak as a destination be acceptable to both the host and the guest.

The Future

The futurist, Herman Kahn, wrote in 1980,

There is no doubt in my mind that the tourist industry has a bright future, in part because it is intrinsic growth, and in part because there is a general shift from what we call primary, secondary, tertiary industries to quaternary (p. 14).

We expect tourism to top out at any point in the next 50 years for almost any country (p. 16).

He also warns that,

In some ways tourism is a lot more annoying than nuclear reactors ... Tourism generally spoils an area for the people who live in it unless they make a living or money at it (p. 15).

Kahn's prognosis might sound overly optimistic especially to many of those who oppose tourism. But in the case of Malaysia if one looks back before the 1960s, tourist arrivals, which now exceed 3 million, was less than 30,000 per year, i.e. within less than 20 years tourism has grown by more than a hundred times. Similarly, whereas the 1975 Master Plan predicted 36,400 international arrivals in Sarawak in 1980, the actual arrival for the year was probably more than double the expected figure (in 1982 for instance Sarawak received 145,485 international tourists). The main determinants of this growth are improvements in transport technology especially in regard to the widespread use of faster and larger jet aircraft which, over the past two decades, has helped to cut travelling time by at least one-half that of the propeller era. In addition to this, the increase in standards of living, together with more leisure time (owing to shorter working hours) in the metropolitan countries, plus improvements in media and telecommunications technology, have also facilitated long distance travel. Beside these factors, a host of other facilities such as the availability of travel loan schemes, health insurance, cheap package deals, credit card facilities etc., also contribute towards reducing the financial and psychological barriers to travel.

The above factors are external determinants (Figure 1) which are beyond the control of a specific destination which has to compete with other destinations as
well. In particular contexts the key factors which lend themselves to manipulation are: information, accessibility, currency exchange rate, quality and cost of facilities and attractions, and perhaps the most important of all, the availability of cheap and convenient flights from the source regions. With the exception of exchange rate, and to some degree the availability of direct flights, all of these factors are theoretically controllable. The crucial variable here is ‘business intelligence’ associated with each factor. Planners must give due consideration to the need for quality information which can only come from continuous research. Even at this nascent stage I would strongly recommend that the State Ministry of Tourism and Environment give priority to research efforts in addressing all the above controllable factors. The broad questions that should not be taken for granted, but must be persistently addressed are:

a. Is Sarawak making the best use of its natural, cultural and historic attractions?

b. Can Sarawak compete or collaborate successfully in the tourist market?

c. Are there better alternatives for resource utilization, and for tourism development?

The above-mentioned factors will determine the growth trend of the future. Some of these no doubt also have bearing on the issue of distribution which is the other side of development. As Herman Kahn warns us, unless the benefits of tourism are spread out among the host community, there is bound to be some degree of annoyance and resentment among the local population, as tourism grows to maturity. Quite apart from a desire to ensure that community resources be used for the general welfare of the public, tourism itself thrives on friendliness and hospitality of the host society. In this respect, there is a notion in the literature that the attitude of the host community changes in parallel with the growth in tourism.

The ‘irridex’ or irritation index for instance, indicates the changing level of public acceptance or rejection, which begins with euphoria and proceeds through the stages of apathy, indifference, irritation, antagonism, resentment and outward hostility. These levels of acceptance correspond with the stage at which tourism grows, and the extent to which local decision-making has been usurped by outsiders. Empirically, this concept of an acceptance-rejection cycle is far from conclusive, partly owing to the difficulties in studying tourist behaviour. My own work in Peninsular Malaysian destinations indicates that local residents who do not benefit from tourism tend to express disapproval or at least ambivalence toward the tourist industry.

The issues associated with moral decadence always come to the fore, but these are usually felt among industry outsiders. The problems during the encounter situation are usually exacerbated by the gulf of differences between the host-guest situational roles. Whereas the hosts are mostly at work and not rich, the guests
are on holiday, perhaps on their annual short splurge, free from their normal social sanctions to which they comply in their home situations.

The problems associated with the incongruence between the behaviour of the hosts and that of the guests have been well addressed in the literature to need no further emphasis. Sarawak planners might like to take note of the suggestion which Gray (1967:169) made more than twenty years ago:

Equally, it is important that any government desirous of developing a travel industry face squarely the important, potentially negative aspect of a travel industry. The development of a travel industry ... runs the risk of creating an enclave industry in which affluent foreigners are catered to and use resources which are not available to the mass of the people. The luxury required ... may exacerbate any feelings of resentment ...

This potential difficulty can be a vital one and must ... be combatted by the host government's travel organization with some thorough-going education program.

Following the annoyance-acceptance model, Sarawak's position is, arguably, at the 'euphoria' stage where the host-guest relationship is still congenial. From available reports by travellers this congeniality appears to be one of the most important assets at present. This must be sustained at all costs especially in view of some cautionary and adverse reports both from the host and the guests (Appendix 1, see also Kedit, 1980; Ah Kiong, 1986). Space does not allow for an extended discussion on these, but the following points deserve careful consideration:

1. Both the guest (customer) and host are always right. In any conflict situation it is better to listen to the host for an amicable solution. The original custodian has more right.

2. Everything that matters, including the environment has a price tag. Compensation either through conservation measures or payment must be made equitably.

3. When a tourism project involves the local population, their input in the decision-making process must be sought. Where possible, the benefits should accrue to them and they must never be left as bystanders in the development of their homeland. The whole community is the host and should be treated as such.

CONCLUSION

Sarawak has a congeries of potentially exploitable resources to develop its tourism industry. Properly handled, tourism can be rewarding both for the state and the country. Although the contribution from tourism is insignificant at the moment, there is good prospects for future development, which at the present stage requires preparatory efforts towards identifying the appropriate approach
for long term development. Initial investment, especially in research, is a necessary prerequisite to be followed by incremental development. In this process, the key ingredients of Sarawak tourism, its people, culture and environment, must be carefully managed to avoid any of the major pitfalls experienced elsewhere. The main emphasis should be given to the distributive aspects of both benefits and costs, and towards ensuring a careful husbandry of the symbolic, and where possible, also the commercial values of Sarawak’s cultural and historic heritage. To this end it is important that the local community be included in the planning process. In order to ensure sustainable development in the long run, it would be prudent to adopt a gradual approach, paying attention not only to the familiar enclave resort development models, but also other alternatives some of which (such as accommodation concepts *a la* the longhouse), might help to retain the integrity of the host community.

Although tourism is not important at this stage, it has a greater role for the future development of Sarawak, especially in view of its vast resources, and the fact that contributions from its traditional sources of development (timber and petroleum), are rapidly depleting. Its familiar rustic and off-beat offerings seem promising, given current market trends which point to the direction of future popularity of the experiential and adventure-type destinations. If Sarawak can sustain its traditional friendly attitude to outsiders, the long term prospect is promising. What seems critically needed, are efforts to improve the Sarawakian hospitality, both inside and outside. From the inside, there is a need for policy instruments to make the local community accept tourism as something beneficial to the society. This internal promotion must complement efforts to disseminate information and to build tourism facilities for the consumption of outsiders.
### TABLE I

Indices of Selected Tourism Correlates, 1985

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Room Capacity(^1)</th>
<th>Room/Pop/Area</th>
<th>Urban Population</th>
<th>Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Johor</td>
<td>0.058</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.094</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kedah</td>
<td>0.029</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.026</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelantan</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.097</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melaka</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.046</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.Sembilan</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pahang</td>
<td>0.109</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perak</td>
<td>0.064</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.073</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perlis</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Pinang</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.149</td>
<td>7.53</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabah</td>
<td>0.224</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.087</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.60(^2)</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarawak</td>
<td>0.377</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selangor</td>
<td>0.024</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.029</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terengganu</td>
<td>0.039</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.028</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. Lumpur</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(FT)</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.249</td>
<td>34.10</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>2.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National base</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Road</th>
<th>Tar Roads</th>
<th>Vehicles/1000 Pop.</th>
<th>Rural Water Supply</th>
<th>Power Supply</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Johor</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kedah</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelantan</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melaka</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.Sembilan</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pahang</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perak</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perlis</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Pinang</td>
<td>9.85</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabah</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.66(^c)</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarawak</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selangor</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>1.27(^2)</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terengganu</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. Lumpur</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(FT)</td>
<td>23.38</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National base</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:
1. As at December, 1986.
2. Includes Federal Territory

Source:
Table II
The Nature of Socio-economic Impacts of Tourism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Positive Factor</th>
<th>Negative Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ownership</td>
<td>Local, corporate</td>
<td>Tycoons, outsiders, monopoloes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutrition</td>
<td>Positive to all elements. Better allocation of funds.</td>
<td>Diverted to serve others. Subsidy to capital owners. Polarization and backwash effects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welfare</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution pattern</td>
<td>Serve poor regions. Serve poor groups.</td>
<td>Serve rich region at expense of poor. Serve rich groups at expense of poor. Serve entrepreneurs at expense of identity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX I

A dozen examples of public concern on consequences from tourism


4. Bring in tourists only when you are ready. *Star* 13.5.1986.

5. MAS under fire from James Wong. *Sarawak Tribune* 17.5.1986.
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