

**SCHOLARLY PUBLICATION KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATOR
DIAGNOSTIC MODEL USING VIABLE SYSTEM AND
SOCIAL COGNITIVE THEORY**

SHARANJIT KAUR A/P BHATHAL SINGH

UNIVERSITI TEKNOLOGI MALAYSIA

SCHOLARLY PUBLICATION KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATOR
DIAGNOSTIC MODEL USING VIABLE SYSTEM AND
SOCIAL COGNITIVE THEORY

SHARANJIT KAUR A/P BHATHAL SINGH

A thesis submitted in fulfilment of the
requirements for the award of the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy (Information Systems)

Faculty of Computing
Universiti Teknologi Malaysia

MAY 2016

TO MY LOVING HUSBAND,
FATHER, MOTHER, SIBLINGS
DR. ROLIANA IBRAHIM AND PROF. ALI SELAMAT,
FAMILY MEMBERS, AND
BEST FRIENDS
THANKS FOR ALL YOU SUPPORT.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

First and foremost, I would like to thank God for giving me the determination and will to complete this study.

I would like to express my sincere thanks and appreciation to my supervisor Dr. Roliana Ibrahim and my co-supervisor Prof. Dr. Ali Selamat for their continuous advice, guidance, support, and patience to guide me through the steps of my research. I thank them for being supervisors, advisors and teachers.

I am also grateful to the The Ministry of Higher Education, Malaysia, for giving me the opportunity to conduct my research by funding my studies.

Special thanks to my colleagues, friends, staff, and lecturers in the Faculty of Computing and Research Management Centre, UTM for their help, facilities, and for providing me the fullest cooperation and encouragement.

I can never forget the valuable encouragement of my husband, parents, siblings and other family members who had given to me at every walk of life and their moral and undivided support which helped me to carry on this research.

Last but not least, my sincere thanks to my friends for their encouragement and endless support during my course in this Faculty.

ABSTRACT

Scholarly Publications (SP) are almost certainly the most significant resources by which researchers at universities are appraised. It is part of the requirements for obtaining a Research University (RU) status. In the aspiration of these, to strategically improve and maintain their status, a series of performance measurement interventions were initiated, such as the use of Key Performance Indicators (KPI) delivery. The aim of this study is to propose a diagnostic model for SP productivity involving various stakeholders in monitoring a complex KPI delivery ecosystem for Malaysian university. This study employs Viable System Model (VSM) and Social Cognitive Theory (SCT) factors to develop a research model based on a comprehensive literature review. Following an interpretive paradigm this research applies qualitative method triangulated with quantitative method. VSM was applied as a diagnostic tool to diagnose process of KPI delivery for monitoring four recursion levels involving Deputy Vice Chancellor of Research and Innovation (DVCRI), Research Alliances (RAs), Research Groups (RGs) and lastly the academic staffs of the chosen institution which is, Universiti Teknologi Malaysia (UTM). Three strategies which are strategic, tactical and operational in achieving the SP KPI to maintain RU status for the institution were recommended to assist all pertinent stakeholders in monitoring the KPI delivery. Besides, to complement the results, a survey was designed and the data from the institutional repository involving UTM faculty members were analyzed to investigate the SCT factors involving human factor which is lacking in VSM tool. The findings show that the most influential factors for the SP of UTM are age, gender, experience, rank, teaching load, collaboration, funding, resource, discipline and skill. The model was evaluated for the SP KPI monitoring process, which further can be used by public and private universities to improve the performance of their institution's publication.

ABSTRAK

Penerbitan Ilmiah (SP) merupakan satu-satunya sumber yang paling penting di mana para penyelidik di universiti dinilai. Ia merupakan sebahagian daripada syarat untuk mendapatkan status Universiti Penyelidikan (RU). Dalam aspirasi ini, untuk meningkatkan strategik dan membantu dalam mengekalkan status, satu siri pengukuran prestasi telah diperkenalkan, seperti Petunjuk Prestasi Utama (KPI). Tujuan kajian ini adalah untuk mencadangkan model diagnostik untuk produktiviti SP yang melibatkan pelbagai pihak berkepentingan dalam memantau ekosistem penghantaran KPI yang kompleks untuk universiti di Malaysia. Kajian ini menggunakan Model Sistem Lestari (VSM) dan Teori Kognitif Sosial (SCT) untuk membangunkan satu model penyelidikan berdasarkan kajian literatur yang komprehensif. Berikutan paradigma interpretif, kajian ini menggunakan kaedah kuantitatif dan kualitatif. VSM digunakan sebagai alat diagnostik bagi diagnos proses penyampaian KPI untuk memantau empat tahap rekursi yang melibatkan Timbalan Naib Canselor Penyelidikan dan Inovasi (DVCRI), Perikatan Penyelidikan (RA), Kumpulan Penyelidikan (RG) dan ahli-ahli akademik bagi institusi yang dipilih, iaitu Universiti Teknologi Malaysia (UTM). Tiga strategi iaitu strategik, taktikal dan operasi dalam mencapai KPI SP bagi mengekalkan status RU bagi institusi telah disyorkan untuk membantu kesemua pihak berkepentingan yang berkaitan untuk memantau penyampaian KPI. Selain itu, satu kaji selidik telah direka untuk menyokong penemuan dan data dari pangkalan data institusi yang melibatkan ahli-ahli fakulti UTM dianalisis untuk menyiasat faktor SCT yang berkurangan dalam alatan VSM. Hasil kajian menunjukkan faktor paling berpengaruh untuk SP di UTM adalah umur, jantina, pengalaman, pangkat, sumber, pembiayaan, kerjasama, beban mengajar, bidang dan kemahiran. Model kajian telah dinilai untuk pemantauan proses KPI SP yang dicadangkan dan boleh diguna oleh universiti awam dan swasta lain bagi meningkatkan pencapaian penerbitan institusi masing-masing.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| CHAPTER | TITLE | PAGE |
|----------|---|----------|
| | DECLARATION | ii |
| | DEDICATION | iii |
| | ACKNOWLEDGEMENT | iv |
| | ABSTRACT | v |
| | ABSTRAK | vi |
| | TABLE OF CONTENTS | vii |
| | LIST OF TABLES | xxvi |
| | LIST OF FIGURES | xxiv |
| | LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS | xxvi |
| | LIST OF APPENDIXES | xxviii |
| 1 | INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| | 1.1 Overview | 1 |
| | 1.2 Problem Background | 2 |
| | 1.2.1 Key Performance Indicator (KPI) Delivery in Performance Measurement (PM)Context | 3 |
| | 1.2.2 Key Performance Indicator (KPI) Delivery Process in Malaysian Higher Learning Institutions (HLIs) | 4 |
| | 1.3 Problem Statement | 5 |
| | 1.4 Research Questions | 7 |
| | 1.5 Research Objectives | 7 |
| | 1.6 Research Scope | 8 |
| | 1.7 Research Importance | 8 |
| | 1.8 Organization of Thesis | 9 |

| | | |
|----------|--|-----------|
| 1.9 | Summary | 10 |
| 2 | LITERATURE REVIEW | 11 |
| 2.1 | Introduction | 11 |
| 2.2 | Organizational Background | 11 |
| 2.2.1 | Transformation as Research University (RU) | 13 |
| 2.2.2 | Requirement to Maintain Research University (RU) Status | 14 |
| 2.3 | Strategy Implementation | 15 |
| 2.3.1 | Balanced Scorecard (BSC) for Strategic Implementation Control System | 18 |
| 2.3.2 | Balanced Scorecard (BSC) As Strategy In Univerisiti Teknologi Malaysia (UTM) | 21 |
| 2.3.3 | Summary of Balanced Scorecard (BSC) Pros and Cons | 22 |
| 2.3.4 | Balanced Scorecard (BSC) in Educational Context | 23 |
| 2.4 | Performance Measurement (PM) | 24 |
| 2.4.1 | Performance Indicators | 25 |
| 2.4.2 | Performance Measurement (PM) in Malaysian Public Sectors and Higher Learning Institutions (HLIs) | 27 |
| 2.4.3 | Scholarly Publication (SP) | 29 |
| 2.4.4 | Use of Scholarly Publication (SP) to Measure Key Performance Indicator (KPI) | 32 |
| 2.4.5 | Previous Studies on Scholarly Publication (SP) Productivity | 36 |
| 2.4.6 | Universiti Teknologi Malaysia's (UTM's) Current Strategies to Achieve Scholarly Publication (SP) Targets | 37 |

| | | |
|----------|--|-----------|
| 2.4.7 | Limitations in Current Strategies in Scholarly Publication (SP) in Universiti Teknologi Malaysia (UTM) | 39 |
| 2.4.8 | Universiti Teknologi Malaysia (UTM) Policy on Scholarly Publication (SP) | 43 |
| 2.5 | Mixed Method | 44 |
| 2.6 | Theories | 46 |
| 2.6.1 | Organizational Analysis Tools | 47 |
| 2.6.2 | Viable System Model (VSM) as Organizational Diagnostic Tool | 50 |
| 2.6.3 | Five System in Viable System Model (VSM) | 52 |
| 2.6.4 | Cybernetic Concept | 55 |
| 2.6.5 | Law of Recursion | 57 |
| 2.6.6 | Ashby Law of Requisite Variety | 60 |
| 2.6.7 | Viable System Model (VSM) Applications and Concepts | 61 |
| 2.6.8 | Viable System Model (VSM) Usage in Key Performance Indicator (KPI) Delivery Process | 64 |
| 2.6.9 | Viable System Model (VSM) Advantages and Disadvantages | 66 |
| 2.7 | Supporting Theory | 68 |
| 2.7.1 | Social Cognitive Theory (SCT) | 68 |
| 2.7.2 | Social Cognitive Theory (SCT) in Performance Measurement (PM) | 71 |
| 2.8 | Theoretical Model | 73 |
| 2.9 | Summary | 79 |
| 3 | RESEARCH METHODOLOGY | 80 |
| 3.1 | Introduction | 80 |
| 3.2 | Research Paradigm | 80 |
| 3.3 | Research Approaches | 82 |

| | | |
|----------|---|------------|
| 3.4 | Research Design | 84 |
| 3.4.1 | Descriptive and Correlation Research | 89 |
| 3.4.3 | Triangulation | 93 |
| 3.5 | Qualitative Approach using Content Analysis | 96 |
| 3.6 | Quantitative Approach using Survey | 100 |
| 3.7 | Sampling | 102 |
| 3.7.1 | Survey | 103 |
| 3.7.2 | Interview | 105 |
| 3.8 | Secondary Data | 107 |
| 3.9 | Explanatory Case Study | 108 |
| 3.10 | Diagnosing Viable System Model (VSM) and Evaluating Proposed Model | 109 |
| 3.11 | Summary | 111 |
| 4 | CASE STUDY | 112 |
| 4.1 | Introduction | 112 |
| 4.2 | Universiti Teknologi Malaysia (UTM) as Case Study | 113 |
| 4.3 | Preliminary Study | 113 |
| 4.3.1 | Discussion on Survey Analysis | 119 |
| 4.4 | Interview Analysis | 120 |
| 4.5 | Secondary Data | 125 |
| 4.6 | Summary | 129 |
| 5 | ANALYSIS ON CURRENT FACTORS ASSOCIATED WITH SCHOLARLY PUBLICATION PRODUCTIVITY | 130 |
| 5.1 | Introduction | 130 |
| 5.2 | Data Analysis | 131 |
| 5.2.1 | Hypothesis 1 Testing | 133 |
| 5.2.2 | Hypothesis 2 Testing | 138 |
| 5.2.3 | Hypothesis 3 Testing | 142 |
| 5.3 | Concluding Analysis For All Hypothesis | 147 |

| | | |
|----------|---|------------|
| 5.4 | Summary | 149 |
| 6 | SCHOLARLY PUBLICATION DIAGNOSIS USING VIABLE SYSTEM MODEL | 151 |
| 6.1 | Introduction | 151 |
| 6.2 | Diagnosis | 152 |
| 6.3 | The Approach | 154 |
| 6.4 | Levels of Recursion Explanation | 155 |
| 6.4.1 | Recursion Level Zero (RL0) | 156 |
| 6.4.1.1 | Recursion Level Zero; System One (RL0; S1) | 157 |
| 6.4.1.2 | Implementation Activities (Recursion Level 0; System One; RL0; S1)) | 159 |
| 6.4.1.3 | Recursion Level 0; System Two (RL0; S2) | 159 |
| 6.4.1.4 | Coordination Activities (Recursion Level 0; System Two (RL0; S2)) | 161 |
| 6.4.1.5 | Recursion Level 0; System Three (RL0; S3) | 161 |
| 6.4.1.6 | Monitoring and Control Activities (Recursion Level 0; System 3 (RL0; S3)) | 162 |
| 6.4.1.7 | Recursion Level 0; System 3-4 Homeostat (RL0; S3-S4 Homeostat) | 162 |
| 6.4.1.8 | Recursion Level 0; System Three Star (RL0; S3*) | 163 |
| 6.4.1.9 | Auditing Activities (Recursion Level 0; System Three * (RL0; S3*)) | 163 |

| | | |
|----------|---|-----|
| 6.4.1.10 | Recursion Level 0; System Four (RL0;S4) | 164 |
| 6.4.1.11 | Intelligence Activities (Recursion Level 0;System Four (RL0;S4) | 164 |
| 6.4.1.12 | Recursion Level 0; System Five (RL0;S5) | 165 |
| 6.4.1.13 | Policy Activities (Recursion Level 0;System Five (RL0;S5) | 165 |
| 6.4.1.14 | Findings from Viable System Model (VSM) Diagnosis at RL0 | 165 |
| 6.4.1.15 | Summary of Recursion Level Zero (RL0) | 166 |
| 6.4.2 | Recursion Level One (RL1) | 167 |
| 6.4.2.1 | Key Performance Indicator (KPI) Delivery Structure at Recursion Level 1 (RL1) | 168 |
| 6.4.2.2 | Recursion Level One; System One (RL1; S1) | 168 |
| 6.4.2.3 | Implementation Activities (Recursion Level1;System One; RL1; S1)) | 169 |
| 6.4.2.4 | Recursion Level 1; System Two (RL1; S2) | 170 |
| 6.4.2.5 | Coordination Activities (Recursion Level1; System Two (RL1; S2)) | 171 |
| 6.4.2.6 | Recursion Level1;System Three (RL1; S3) | 171 |
| 6.4.2.7 | Monitoring and Control Activities (Recursion Level 1; System 3 (RL1; S3)) | 172 |

| | | |
|----------|---|-----|
| 6.4.2.8 | Recursion Level 1 ; System 3-4 Homeostat (RL1 ;S3-S4 Homeostat) | 172 |
| 6.4.2.9 | Recursion Level 1; System Three Star (RL1; S3*) | 173 |
| 6.4.2.10 | Auditing Activities (Recursion Level 1; System Three * (RL1; S3*)) | 173 |
| 6.4.2.11 | Recursion Level 1;System Four (RL1;S4) | 174 |
| 6.4.2.12 | Intelligence Activities (Recursion Level 1; System Four (RL1; S4) | 174 |
| 6.4.2.13 | Recursion Level 1; System Five (RL1; S5) | 174 |
| 6.4.2.14 | Findings from Viable System Model (VSM) Diagnosis at RL1 | 175 |
| 6.4.2.15 | Summary of Recursion Level One (RL1) | 175 |
| 6.4.3 | Recursion Level Two (RL2) | 176 |
| 6.4.3.1 | Key Performance Indicator (KPI) Delivery Structure at Recursion Level 2 (RL2) | 177 |
| 6.4.3.2 | Recursion Level Two; System One (RL2; S1) | 178 |
| 6.4.3.3 | Implementation Activities (Recursion Level2;System One; RL2; S1)) | 179 |
| 6.4.3.4 | Recursion Level2; System Two (RL2; S2) | 180 |
| 6.4.3.5 | Coordination Activities (Recursion Level2; System Two(RL2;S2)) | 180 |

| | | |
|-----------|---|-----|
| 6.4.3.6 | Recursion Level2;System Three (RL2; S3) | 181 |
| 6.4.3.7 | Monitoring and Control Activities (Recursion Level 2; System 3 (RL2;S3)) | 181 |
| 6.4.3.8 | Recursion Level 2; System Three Star (RL2; S3*) | 182 |
| 6.4.3.9 | Auditing Activities (Recursion Level 1; System Three * (RL2; S3*)) | 182 |
| 6.4.3.10 | Recursion Level 2; System Four (RL2;S4) | 182 |
| 6.4.2.11 | Recursion Level 2 ; System 3-4 Homeostat (RL2 ;S3-S4 Homeostat) | 183 |
| 6.4.3.12 | Intelligence Activities (Recursion Level 2;System Four (RL2;S4) | 183 |
| 6.4.3.13 | Recursion Level 2; System Five (RL2;S5) | 183 |
| 6.4.3.14 | Findings from Viable System Model (VSM) Diagnosis at RL2 | 184 |
| 6.4. 3.15 | Summary of Recursion Level Two (RL2) | 184 |
| 6.4.4 | Recursion Level Three (RL3) | 185 |
| 6.4.4.1 | Key Performance Indicator (KPI) Delivery Structure at Recursion Level 3 (RL3) | 186 |
| 6.4.4.2 | Recursion Level Three; System One (RL3; S1) | 186 |
| 6.4.4.3 | Implementation Activities (Recursion Level3; System One; RL3; S1)) | 186 |

| | | |
|----------|--|-----|
| 6.4.4.4 | Recursion Level 3; System Two (RL3; S2) | 187 |
| 6.4.4.5 | Coordination Activities (Recursion Level3; System Two(RL3;S2)) | 187 |
| 6.4.4.6 | Recursion Level3 ;System Three (RL3; S3) | 187 |
| 6.4.4.6 | Monitoring and Control Activities (Recursion Level 3; System 3 (RL3;S3)) | 188 |
| 6.4.4.8 | Recursion Level 3; System Three Star (RL3; S3*) | 188 |
| 6.4.4.9 | Auditing Activities (Recursion Level 3; System Three * (RL3; S3*)) | 188 |
| 6.4.4.10 | Recursion Level 3; System Four (RL3;S4) | 189 |
| 6.4.4.7 | Recursion Level 3; System 3-4 Homeostat (RL3;S3-S4 Homeostat) | 189 |
| 6.4.4.11 | Intelligence Activities (Recursion Level 3; System Four (RL3;S4) | 189 |
| 6.4.4.12 | Recursion Level 3; System Five (RL3;S5) | 189 |
| 6.4.3.14 | Findings from Viable System Model (VSM) Diagnosis at RL3 | 190 |
| 6.4.3.15 | Summary of Recursion Level Three (RL3) | 190 |
| 6.5 | Recursion Levels With Social Cognitive Theory Variables | 191 |
| 6.6 | Summary of Viable System Model Diagnosis | 192 |

| | | |
|----------|---|------------|
| 7 | EVALUATION OF KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATOR MONITORING MODEL | 195 |
| | 7.1 Introduction | 195 |
| | 7.2 Evaluation of Proposed Model | 195 |
| | 7.3 Key Performance Indicator (KPI) Monitoring Module As An Amplifier | 200 |
| | 7.4 Acceptance Test | 202 |
| | 7.4.1 Acceptance Test Instrument and Participants | 203 |
| | 7.5 Stakeholders at Recursion Levels View | 204 |
| | 7.5.1 Level 0- Deputy Vice Chancellor of Research and Innovation (DVCRI), Research Management Centre (RMC) and Perpustakaan Sultanah Zanariah (PSZ) | 204 |
| | 7.5.2 Level 1-Research Alliance (RA) Dean | 206 |
| | 7.5.3 Level 2-Research Group (RG) Head/ Faculty Dean | 207 |
| | 7.5.4 Level 3-Academic Staff | 208 |
| | 7.5 Usability | 209 |
| | 7.6 Summary | 210 |
| 8 | DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION | 212 |
| | 8.1 Introduction | 212 |
| | 8.2 Research Achievements | 212 |
| | 8.3 Research Contributions | 214 |
| | 8.3.1 Theoretical Contributions | 214 |
| | 8.3.2 Practical Contributions | 215 |
| | 8.4 Limitations | 216 |
| | 8.5 Future Directions | 217 |
| | REFERENCES | 218 |
| | Appendices A-H | 238-309 |

LIST OF TABLES

| TABLE NO. | TITLE | PAGE |
|------------------|--|-------------|
| 2.1 | RU Marks for Section B | 14 |
| 2.2 | Pros and Cons of Balanced Scorecard | 22 |
| 2.3 | Western Universities Promotion Criteria | 34 |
| 2.4 | Balanced Scorecard and Viable System Model Comparison | 42 |
| 2.5 | Percentages of UTM's Annual Appraisal For Academic Staff Criteria. | 45 |
| 2.6 | Comparison of Existing Organizational Analysis Approaches Features by (Rodina, 2006) with VSM | 49 |
| 2.7 | VSM Practitioners and Application Areas | 63 |
| 2.8 | Methods of Applying VSM | 64 |
| 2.9 | VSM Advantages and Disadvantages | 66 |
| 2.10 | Issues and Factors Associated with Publication Productivity | 74 |
| 2.11 | Factors Associated with Publication Productivity | 76 |
| 3.1 | Mapping and Description of the Research Phase | 86 |
| 3.2 | Summary of the Research Questions Contributors and Methodological Design | 92 |
| 3.3 | Participants for Phase 1 Interview | 106 |
| 3.4 | Participants for Phase 2 Interview | 107 |
| 4.1 | Discussion on Preliminary Survey | 119 |
| 4.2 | SP KPI Delivery Interview Analysis | 124 |
| 4.3 | Documents Published with Collaborating Affiliations (Scopus, 2013) | 127 |
| 5.1 | Demographic Profile | 132 |

| | | |
|------|---|-----|
| 5.2 | Gender and Age Crosstabulation | 133 |
| 5.3 | Gender and Qualification Crosstabulation | 133 |
| 5.4 | Top 10 authors (Data as of Dec 2, 2014- SCOPUS) | 134 |
| 5.5 | Rank and Experience Crosstabulation | 134 |
| 5.6 | Age and Qualification Crosstabulation | 135 |
| 5.7 | PhD Training Undergone | 135 |
| 5.8 | Regression Statistic on Age, Gender and Experience on Articles in Web of Science | 136 |
| 5.9 | Age and Publication Crosstabulation | 137 |
| 5.10 | Gender and Publication Crosstabulation | 137 |
| 5.11 | Promotion Frequencies | 139 |
| 5.12 | Mean for Rank and Skill | 139 |
| 5.13 | Regression Statistic on Rank and Skill on Articles in Web of Science | 140 |
| 5.14 | Top 10 Collaborating Institutions (Data as of Dec 2, 2014) | 143 |
| 5.15 | Top 10 authors (Data as of Dec 2, 2014- SCOPUS) | 144 |
| 5.16 | Funding Channels | 145 |
| 5.17 | Type of Publications | 148 |
| 6.1 | VSM Subsystem Representation | 193 |
| 7.1 | Mapping of VSM Diagnosis with the Prototype System | 197 |
| 7.2 | Level 0 Evaluation Activities | 205 |
| 7.3 | Level 1 Evaluation Activities | 207 |
| 7.4 | Level 2 Evaluation Activities | 208 |
| 7.5 | Level 3 Evaluation Activities | 209 |

LIST OF FIGURES

| FIGURE NO. | TITLE | PAGE |
|-------------------|---|-------------|
| 2.1 | BSC Strategy Map (Kaplan, 1996b) | 19 |
| 2.2 | UTM's Strategic Map (Ujang, 2012) | 38 |
| 2.3 | UTM Global Plan Targets (Ujang, 2012) | 39 |
| 2.4 | The Deductive Type of Mixed-methods Design (Morse, 2003) | 45 |
| 2.5 | Basic VSM Diagram | 52 |
| 2.6 | The Five Systems | 53 |
| 2.7 | Organization and its environment | 56 |
| 2.8 | The Recursion Levels | 59 |
| 2.9 | Social Cognitive Theory (Bandura, 1986) | 69 |
| 2.10 | Integration of SCT with VSM | 78 |
| 2.11 | Theoretical Model | 79 |
| 3.1 | Operational Framework | 85 |
| 3.2 | Hypothesis of Study | 92 |
| 3.3 | Triangulation Technique | 94 |
| 3.4 | Iterative Mixed Method Approach | 95 |
| 3.5 | Flow of Content Analysis | 97 |
| 3.6 | Survey Instrument Design Flow (Radhakrishna, 2007) | 100 |
| 3.7 | Activities for Evaluation of VSM Diagnosis | 110 |
| 4.1 | Survey Respondents | 114 |
| 4.2 | Age range of respondents | 114 |
| 4.3 | Years of Service | 115 |
| 4.4 | Staff Category | 115 |
| 4.5 | Local/International Journal Options | 116 |
| 4.6 | Submitting for High IF | 116 |

| | | |
|------|--|-----|
| 4.7 | Writing for Career Prospects | 116 |
| 4.8 | Familiar With SP KPI | 117 |
| 4.9 | KPI Align With Career | 117 |
| 4.10 | Satisfied with SP KPI | 117 |
| 4.11 | SP KPI Can Be Met | 117 |
| 4.12 | Need or More Rewards and Incentives | 118 |
| 4.13 | Training for Improving Writing Skills | 118 |
| 4.14 | Review is Time Consuming | 118 |
| 4.15 | Limited Journals to Submit | 118 |
| 4.16 | Documents published from 2005-2012 by UTM (Scopus, 2013) | 126 |
| 4.17 | Publications based on Subject Areas for UTM (Scopus, 2013) | 126 |
| 4.18 | Current Organization Scenario | 128 |
| 5.1 | Part A Analysis | 131 |
| 5.2 | Publication Based on Disciplines (Data as of Dec 2, 2014 -SCOPUS) | 144 |
| 6.1 | Part B Analysis | 152 |
| 6.2 | Recursion levels without the SCT variables | 154 |
| 6.3 | RMC and PSZ Data Collection | 155 |
| 6.4 | VSM Recursion Level 0 | 156 |
| 6.5 | SP KPI monitoring at RL1. | 167 |
| 6.6 | Recursion Level 2 | 177 |
| 6.7 | KPI Delivery System on SP in UTM. | 178 |
| 6.8 | Recursion Level 3 (RL3) | 185 |
| 6.9 | Recursion levels with the SCT variables | 192 |
| 7.1 | Amplifier in the form of Prototype | 202 |
| 7.2 | Benefits of the module | 209 |
| 7.3 | Provide updated information on SP | 209 |
| 7.4 | Pop-up menu benefit and user friendly module | 210 |
| 7.5 | Recommend the module to other academic staffs | 210 |

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

| | | |
|-------|---|---|
| BSC | - | Balanced Scorecard |
| CICT | - | Center of Information & Communication Technology |
| CIF | - | Cumulative Impact Factor |
| COE | - | Center of Excellence |
| DVCRI | - | Deputy Vice Chancellor of Research and Innovation |
| EAS | - | Electronic Appraisal System |
| ELPPT | - | Annual Appraisal and Evaluation System |
| HLI | - | Higher Learning Institution |
| HOD | - | Head of Department |
| IF | - | Impact Factor |
| ISRD | - | Information Services and Research Division |
| KAI | - | Key Amal Indicators |
| KPI | - | Key Performance Indicator |
| MOHE | - | Ministry of Higher Education |
| MyRA | - | Malaysian Research Assessment |
| NPM | - | New Public Management |
| PAS | - | Performance Appraisal System |
| PM | - | Performance Measurement |
| PSZ | - | Perpustakaan Sultanah Zanariah |
| QS | - | Quacquarelli Symonds |
| RA | - | Research Alliance |
| RADIS | - | Research and Development Information System |
| RG | - | Research Group |
| RL | - | Recursion Level |
| RMC | - | Research Management Center |
| RPC | - | Research and Publication Center |
| RU | - | Research University |

| | | |
|-------|---|-----------------------------------|
| S1-S5 | - | System1-System5 |
| SCT | - | Social Cognitive Theory |
| SP | - | Scholarly Publication |
| THE | - | Times Higher Education |
| THES | - | Times Higher Education Supplement |
| UKM | - | Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia |
| UM | - | Universiti Malaya |
| UPM | - | Universiti Putra Malaysia |
| USM | - | Universiti Sains Malaysia |
| UTM | - | Universiti Teknologi Malaysia |
| VSM | - | Viable System Model |
| WOS | - | Web of Science |

LIST OF APPENDICES

| APPENDIX | TITLE | PAGE |
|-----------------|--|-------------|
| A (I) | Interview Questions | 238 |
| A (II) | Atlas.ti Network Diagram of Interview Analysis | 248 |
| B (I) | Preliminary Survey Form | 251 |
| B (II) | Survey Form | 257 |
| C | Reporting Form Types | 264 |
| D (I) | Universiti Teknologi Malaysia Publication Policy | 274 |
| D (II) | Role Categorization of Staffs in Universiti Teknologi Malaysia | 280 |
| E (I) | Pearson Co-Relation Table | 286 |
| E (II) | Second Phase Survey Data Analysis | 288 |
| F | Executive Summary of Key Performance Indicator For The Governance of Public Universities In Malaysia | 294 |
| G | User Acceptance Test | 301 |
| H | Screenshots of The KPI Monitoring Module | 309 |

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Overview

This chapter begins with the introduction of the study concept and highlights the significance of the study. Strategy implementation provides a high contribution in judging organizational performance. In an academic world, it is important to expand a research “track record”, a key indicator of which is the publication list. This can manipulate job satisfaction, promotion plus success in getting grants. The most important aspect seen in getting publications counts in a university is to attain the Research University (RU) status and also to sustain the status.

Publications are most likely the only most noteworthy assets by which researchers in institutions are evaluated. Publishing research results drives a sign to possible research funders and also employers that the researcher is capable of getting a research project to an end and, can produce a substantial result. Publications are additionally a premier perspective in exchange of innovation – for example, most recent procedures and new comprehension of system behavior and management techniques – to the potential users.

Mainly, when grant funding has been achieved, publication is foreseen, likewise, is the essential for further funding. Writing papers are a noteworthy task for researchers, furthermore for the academic staffs. Writing is some expand of a matter of culture and habit. As an accomplishment in research is to a large extent a matter of determination and dedication, various strategies may be utilized to help productivity in scholarly publication writing.

1.2 Problem Background

The use of key performance indicators (KPIs) in organizational performance measurement (PM) is aspired to create and enhance targeted objectives that will incorporate most significance to the organization, yet such focused goals are not generally accomplished as a result of some leading factors distressing their understanding (Metawe, 2005). This happens because the targeted objectives require high productivity of the staffs.

The understanding procedure that staffs in an organization experiences to accomplish such targets is called KPI delivery process. A KPI delivery process in organizations is maybe a standout amongst the most difficult issues with PM in higher learning institutions (HLIs) (Martin, 2011). Even though with complexity that revolves around the various levels, the figures of KPI targets are continuously expanding in numerous HLIs. This rising point of the target values has been fundamentally inclined by the aspiration to congregate with international standards on RU status as well as funding from government. For instance, in Malaysia, public universities received financial allocation derived from the accomplishment of their KPI targets (10th Malaysia Plan, 2010).

Part of the requirements for obtaining RU status with international standard focused on publication production or else known as scholarly publication (SP). In the aspiration by these HLI to strategically improve and assist in maintaining their status, a series of PM interventions were initiated, such as use of KPI delivery as a foundation for promotion and other incentives. The KPI delivery process for SP is one of the foremost reasons for achievement or breakdown of organizational objectives (Bourne, 2002). In many HLIs, the KPI delivery process is assumed to be unclear, incoherent and current issues of great concern with regard to future sustainability (Langston, 2013).

KPI delivery in HLI habitually creates frustration amongst academic staffs (Gholizadeh, 2014). For instance, KPI of SP has been apparent by the academic staffs to carry the burden connected with applying for grants, training postgraduate

students to do improved research, research and publications and acknowledgment of their works to the system in place. They observe several of these activities as additional tasks to their planned tasks (Zhou, 2010).

1.2.1 Key Performance Indicator (KPI) Delivery in Performance Measurement (PM) Context

The KPI delivery for SP focuses on one of the KPIs assigned to achieve the institutional goals or objectives by all applicable stakeholders (Ujang, 2012). It is to align with the targets to achieve for the global knowledge economy agenda set by the Ministry of Higher Education (MOHE) in Malaysia to visualize the goal of being one of the top universities in the world ranking. Deliverables in the SP focuses on the publication production that are indexed in internationally recognized databases is the main concern of the institutional goals (Ujang, 2012).

Target values might require quantitative or qualitative, that can be measured and determined whether they are attainable. Therefore, the KPI delivery process is an essential division of organizational enhancement consisting of many stakeholders in the PM perspective. KPI delivery process can take several forms, typically concerning those accountable for providing the data or information required and those collecting and reporting the result (Amir, 2011).

Various SP reporting tools are used in gathering the KPI for SP production using online or offline methods in HLIs. Those responsible for the collection and reporting of the academic staff research output, depends on the outcome from the academic staffs that is provided either through subscribed journals, current appraisal systems or directly through emails and phone calls. These are bound to the quantity of publication production of the academic staffs. Hence, the SP KPI delivery process might fundamentally signify the joint endeavor in meeting overall organizational objectives. The data and information providers readily provide the collectors with the necessary SP related data within the particular time (Ong, 2013).

1.2.2 Key Performance Indicator (KPI) Delivery Process in Malaysian Higher Learning Institutions (HLIs)

KPI delivery is among the key activity put into practice by the Malaysian HLIs to advance the general execution of the academic staffs towards accomplishing the institution's strategy. The SP KPI delivery process is derived from the objectives that are placed to be accomplished by all pertinent stakeholders, namely; the Deputy Vice Chancellor of Research and Innovation also known as DVCRI, Research Management Center (RMC), Research Alliance (RA), Research Group (RG), Faculties, the Library, also known as PSZ, and the individual academic staffs themselves. While the SP KPI delivery process is straightforward in its objectives, its usage and execution needs a mixture of endeavors from a diverse group of actors. This group of actors has their own potentials, targets and standpoint in order to accomplish the SP targets set by the university management.

Moreover, the actor's input to the essential target in the SP KPI delivery process changes in diverse level of the organization. In Universiti Teknologi Malaysia (UTM) itself, at the present time, for three consecutive years (2012, 2013, 2014), the KPI target on SP have not been achieved (UTM, 2013). The complexity of the SP KPI monitoring involving various stakeholders requires different approaches in reporting the KPI delivery of SP. Therefore, SP KPI delivery process that draws in all the aforementioned players involves an information system that will help the spread of data, correspondence of the appraisal processes. Electronic Appraisal System (EAS) is an example of the information system utilized in organizational appraisal procedures to assess the SP KPI delivery of the employees in UTM.

In a recent development, Times Higher Education Supplement (THES) just uses the ISI information in its university ranking system. Malaysian RUs, for example, Universiti Malaya (UM), Universiti Putra Malaysia (UPM), Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia (UKM), Universiti Sains Malaysia (USM) and Universiti Teknologi Malaysia (UTM) takes after this progression as to its academic staffs works published in the ISI database. The work published in journals recorded in different databases convey no weightage. Current advancement gives evidence that these universities endeavors have yielded an ideal result despite the fact that this was

executed just a couple of years prior. On the other hand, Malaysian RUs are attempting to accomplish the most elevated number of records in ISI Web of Science (WoS).

1.3 Problem Statement

The research problem revolves around the challenges in implementing the organizational strategies for achieving SP KPI targets in a selected RU in Malaysia. In the publication ecosystem of a RU, monitoring KPI for SP can be a complex task because it involves different stakeholders monitoring different perspectives of the KPI delivery. Within RUs, concern arose about the complexity of KPI delivery on SP. Moreover, with regard to the issues identified during the preliminary study conducted by the researcher, different perspectives for the complex SP KPI delivery in the organization was known. This apprehension is worth mentioning given the elevated requirement to uphold the RU status in the existing government economic growth agenda and has arisen because of a number of factors:

- i. For the academic staff's perspective, the people problem is identified where the ever changing requirements from MOHE on the Malaysian Research Assessment or MyRA tool have caused confusion and left the staffs demotivated in achieving the SP target with the new policies introduced. The elevated requirement from the MOHE has increased from MyRAI to MyRAII (Universiti Teknologi Malaysia, 2013) and soon to be introduced MyRAIII targets. The number of KPI target values is reported to be increasing, while the previous set targets were not achieved
- ii. From the organizational perspective, in order to uphold the RU status, different guidelines are being designed and introduced to the academic staff. The authorized personnel in the organization are also responsible to see the KPI for SP are met as targeted or not.
- iii. As for the analysis perspective, currently the office of DVCRI uses the Balanced Scorecard (BSC) while the academic staffs use Research and Development Information System (RADIS) to monitor the SP KPI

performances. Therefore, different needs to cater the targets of SP KPI are identified as a problem for the unachievable SP targets.

- iv. An appropriate model to analyze the complexity revolving the academic, organizational, and analytical perspective is needed to minimize the complexity in SP KPI targets achievement in an organization. Since it revolves around the involvement of the various stakeholders and a dynamic KPI delivery process for SP.

Since the problem revolves around diagnosing different stakeholder perspectives, therefore an appropriate diagnostic tool is required to monitor the SP KPI delivery. The inadequacy in the present structure of the institution requires a more systemic and comprehensive model. In this study, the researcher views the institution from the systems perspective. So far, there is no model that can provide the foundation for diagnosing several functions within a RU (Adham, 2015).

Therefore, an appropriate methodology to maintain KPI delivery in attaining institutional objectives is needed to achieve the SP KPI as proposed by the university management. The proposed model should be able to diagnose the SP KPI delivery at different perspectives to monitor the KPI target achievements. Moreover, a system with the features to cater requirements of different stakeholders in diagnosing the organizational scenario is essential.

Hence, in this study, the researcher identifies that there is a need for a KPI monitoring model that can facilitate the strategy implementation formulation in the organizational context. Besides that, the identification of key actors who influences the strategy implementation success; amongst the top and middle level management, Ministry of Higher Education (MOHE), and academic staffs as stakeholders is also included in this model. In addition, the proposed model will provide the analysis of an organizational situation as the reflection of the strategy implementation process.

1.4 Research Questions

The following are the questions being addressed by this study to provide answers to the problem statement.

MAIN: How to improve SP KPI delivery involving various stakeholders in a complex publication monitoring ecosystem in RU?

- i. What are the current factors influencing SP KPI delivery among the RU stakeholders?
- ii. What strategies are effective to diagnose the monitoring of the SP KPI among the RU stakeholders?
- iii. What is the appropriate model for diagnosis in the monitoring of the SP KPI within Malaysian RU context?
- iv. What tool is appropriate to diagnose the SP performances?

1.5 Research Objectives

The development of the research questions leads to the following set of research objectives:

AIM: To propose a diagnostic model for SP KPI involving various stakeholders in monitoring a complex KPI delivery ecosystem for Malaysian university.

- i. To investigate current factors that influence on SP KPI among the RU stakeholders.
- ii. To propose a theoretical model for SP KPI delivery.
- iii. To propose an appropriate tool to monitor the SP KPI performances.
- iv. To evaluate the model for effective SP KPI delivery.

1.6 Research Scope

The scope of this study focuses on the strategy implementation stage and disregards the strategy formulation stage. For field observation, it is confined to a public university in Malaysia with the RU status, Universiti Teknologi Malaysia (UTM). As a limitation, this research does not include other public universities and private institutions of higher education in Malaysia. In addition, this study provides conceptual analysis of an organizational situation based on the outcome of strategy implementation using VSM which is incorporated with SCT.

The scope of the study is to get first hand information related to SP issue. Therefore, multiple stakeholders are identified to fulfil the study outcome. The stakeholder involvement will be considered as follows:

| Stakeholder(s) | Boundary |
|-----------------------|---|
| DVCRI | Research related activities specifically on SP |
| RA | SP activities without considering research grant elements |
| RG | SP activities without considering research grant elements |
| Academic Staffs | SP activities without considering other research or service activities. |

1.7 Research Importance

The importance of this research is it provides an insight on the complexity on SP targets achievement in an organization. This study analyzes different stakeholder perspective in a dynamic KPI delivery process for monitoring SP ecosystem in RU. The stakeholders involved comprised of DVCRI, RA Deans, RG Heads, Perpustakaan Sultanah Zanariah (PSZ) or UTM library and academic staffs. This research proposes a diagnostic model for improvement in SP KPI delivery among the RU academic staffs that can be seen in different angles of SP ecosystem with many stakeholders handling it.

The achievement of strategy implementation success is through the significance of stakeholders' involvement in solving the strategy implementation problems. The link between a strategy implementation using the proposed diagnostic model and stakeholders' involvement in the KPI delivery process will give a contribution to the HLI SP ecosystem. Besides that, the approach will help organization to analyze the situation at both angles, namely the system (which is seen as an organization) as well as the stakeholder perspective.

Furthermore, this model raises the importance of human factors to lead into the achievement of KPI monitoring success at multiple recursion levels. This can increase the effectiveness and efficiency of organizational SP performance by monitoring the process at each level described in Chapter 6. The importance of stakeholders' involvement in strategy implementation will directly or indirectly affect the management level to increase their knowledge and ability in achieving the success. This triggers the organizational culture to change towards the innovation in organizational performance. Practically, this model can be applied in the diverse fields, particularly organization areas such as, government universities as well as private universities for KPI delivery purposes.

1.8 Organization of Thesis

This thesis is organized into eight (8) chapters. The chapters are connected and complimentary to each other. Part 1 (Chapter 1) begins with the background and significance of the study by covering the problem statement identified, as well as the research question and research objectives to be achieved. The scope and the importance of the study is also discussed in this part. Part 2 (Chapter 2, and 3) points up the ideas and construct a theoretical basis for understanding the density of this subject and methodology applied in this study. In Chapter 2, researcher conducted an intensive literature review on the current scenario and strategies being applied in the research related environment. The suitable theoretical foundation was determined after studying the theories related to the success of the study. Chapter 3 discusses the

research design and operational framework step -by-step and explains the methods applied to seek the answers to the research questions.

Part 3 (Chapter 4 and 5) incorporates the theoretical findings and constructed incorporated model derived from the objectives of this study. The organizational analysis in the form of a case study was analyzed to determine the advantages of the proposed model for the organization chosen. Then, data collected from the preliminary and main survey as well as interview sessions were analyzed using numerous software to report the results. Finally, Part 4 (Chapter 6,7, and 8) relates the practicality of strategy management into a KPI monitoring tool. In Chapter 6, the VSM approach was used to diagnose the organizational situation related to SP KPI monitoring process. Various stakeholder involvement was discussed at the recursion levels reported. The results of the diagnosis of VSM with SCT were then applied to the KPI monitoring tool in Chapter 7 to map the recursion levels in answering the research objectives. Finally, in Chapter 8 the outcomes and achievements of the study conclude the research work.

1.9 Summary

As summarized in brief, Chapter 1 began with the overview of the research topic. Next, the problem background was discussed. The discussion included the importance of the research and on the KPI delivery process which is applied to achieve what has been set up as the target values for a particular KPI with the intention of monitoring and achieving an organizational strategic objective by all applicable stakeholders. Besides that, the discussion was to establish the focus of the study that directs the research questions and the research objectives. Subsequently, the scope of the study was detailed to focus on the particular area. Finally, this chapter presented the research importance, followed by the thesis organization structure.

REFERENCES

- 10th Malaysia Plan. (2010). *Tenth Malaysia Plan (2011-2015)*. Kuala Lumpur.
- Aaltonen, P., Ikavalko, H. (2002a). Implementing Strategies Successfully. *Journal of Integrated Manufacturing System*, 13, 415-418.
- Aaltonen, P., Ikavalko, H. (2002b). Implementing Strategies Successfully. *Journal of Integrated Manufacturing System*, 13 (6), 415-418.
- Abraham, B.-J., Ricardo, Tejeida-Padilla., Isaías, Badillo-Pina., Oswaldo, Morales-Matamoros. (2010). *Viable System Model and Quality of Hospitality Services*. 54th Meeting of the International Society for the Systems Sciences, Waterloo, Canada, 1-17.
- Adair, J. G. (1995). The Research Environment in Developing Countries: Contributions to the National Development of the Discipline. *International Journal of Psychology*, 30 (6), 643-662.
- Adham, K. A., Kasimin, H., Isa, R.M., Othman, F., Ahmad, F. (2015). Developing a Framework for a Viable Research University. *System Practice Action Research*, 28, 503-525.
- Ajzen, I. (1991). The Theory of Planned Behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 50 (2), 179-221.
- Ajzen, I., Fishbein, M. (1985). *From Intentions To Actions: A Theory of Planned Behavior*. Heidelberg: Springer.
- Ajzen, I., Fishbein, M. (1980). *Understanding Attitudes and Predicting Social Behavior*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Aksnes, W. D. (2006). Citation Rates and Perceptions of Scientific Contribution. *Journal Of The American Society For Information Science and Technology*, 57 (2), 169-185.
- Albers, S. (2013). *What Drives Publication Productivity in German Business Faculties?* German: Kuhne Logistics University.

- Alexander, F. (2000). The changing face of accountability. *Journal of Higher Education, 71* (4), 411-431.
- Amir, H., Sahak, M. D. (2011, 2-4 July 2012). *Discovering The Right Key Performance Indicators In Libraries : A Review of Literatures*. International Conference on Libraries: "Transformation to Humanize Libraries", Renaissance Hotel Kota Bharu, Kelantan. 1-18.
- Armstrong, M., Baron, A. (1998). *Performance Management: The New Realistic*. London: Institute of Personnel and Development,.
- Ashby, W. R. (1965). *Introduction to Cybernetics*. London: Chapman and Hall.
- Atkinson, H. (2006). Strategy Implementation: A Role for the Balance Scorecard. *Management Decision Journal, 44* (10), 1441-1460.
- Babbie, E. (2007). *The Practice Of Social Research*. United States: Thomson.
- Balasundaram, N. (2009). Determinants of Key Performance Indicators (KPIS) Of Private Sector Banks In Sri Lanka: An Application of Exploratory Factor Analysis. *Fascicle of The Faculty of Economics and Public Administration, 9* (2), 9-17.
- Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review, 84* (2), 191-215.
- Bandura, A. (1982). Self-efficacy mechanism in human agency. *American Psychologist, 37* (2), 122-147.
- Bandura, A. (1986). Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory. In E. Cliffs (Eds.)
- Bandura, A. (2004). Health Promotion by Social Cognitive Means. *Health Education and Behavior, 31* (2), 143-164.
- Barlett, C. A., and Goshal, S. (1987). Managing Across Borders: New Strategic Requirements. *Sloan Management Review, 28* (2), 7-17.
- Bartol, K. M., Durham, C. C., Poon, J. M. L. (2001). Influence of Performance Evaluation Rating Segmentation on Motivation and Fairness Perceptions. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*, 1106-1119.
- Beer, S. (1979). *The Heart of a Firm*. Chichester: John Wiley and Sons.
- Beer, S. (1979). *The Heart Of The Firm*. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons.
- Beer, S. (1981). *Brain of a Firm*. Chichester: John Wiley and Sons.
- Beer, S. (1985). *Diagnosing The System For Organizations*. Chichester, John Wiley & Sons.

- Beer, S. (1989). *The Viable System Model: Its Provenance, Development, Methodology and Pathology*: John Wiley and Sons.
- Beer, S. (1989b). *The Evolution of a Management Cybernetics Process*. New York: John Wiley.
- Bentley, P. (2012). Gender Differences and Factors Affecting Publication Productivity among Australian University Academics. *Journal of Sociology*, 48 (1), 85-103.
- Berg, B. (2001). *Qualitative Research Methods For The Social Sciences*. Boston.
- Berg, B. L. (2001). *Qualitative Research Methods for the Social Sciences*. (4th Ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Bititci, U. S., Carrie, A. S., McDevitt, L. G. (1997). Integrated Performance Measurement Systems: A Development Guide. *International Journal of Operations and Production Management*, 17 (6), 522-535.
- Bjork, A. R., M. Lauri. (2009). Scientific journals publishing: yearly volumes and open access availability. *Research Information*, 14 (1), 391-404.
- Blahova, M., Knapkova, A. (2010). Effective Strategic Action: From Formulation to Implementation. *International Conference on Economics, Business and Management*, 2, 61-65.
- Bland, C., Ruffin, MT. (1992). Characteristics of a Productive Research Environment: Literature Review. *Acad Med*, 67 (6), 385-397.
- Boardman, C., Corleyb, E. (2008). University Research Centers and the Composition of Research Collaborations. *Research Policy*, 37, 900–913.
- Bolman, L. G., Deal, T.E. (2013). *Reframing Organizations: Artistry, Choice, and Leadership* (5th Ed.): Jossey-Bass.
- Bourne, M., Ken, P., Mills, J. (2002). The Success and Failure of Performance Measurement Initiatives Perceptions of Participating Managers. *International Journal of Operating and Production Management*, 22 (22), 1288-1310.
- Bowen, J. L., John, K., Chamerlain, E. (2005). Changing Habits of Practice. *Journal of General Internal Medicine*, 20, 1181–1187.
- Bozeman, B., Monica Gaughan. (2007). Impacts of Grants and Contracts on Academic Researchers' Interactions with Industry. *Research Policy*, 36, 694-707.
- Brocklesby, J., Cummings, S. (1996). Designing a Viable Organization Structure. *Long Range Planning*, 29(1), 49-57.

- Brocklesby, J., Cummings, S., Davies, J. . (1995). Demystifying The Viable Systems Model as a Tool for Organisational Analysis. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Operational Research*, 12, 65-86.
- Brown, S. D., Lent, R. W., Ryan N. E., McPartland, E. B. (1996). Self-Efficacy as an Intervening Mechanism Between Research Training Environments and Scholarly Productivity: A Theoretical and Methodological Extension. *The Counseling Psychology*, 24, 535-544.
- Bryman, A., Cramer, D. . (1997). *Quantitative Data Analysis with SPSS for Windows*. Routledge, London.
- Buckl, S., Matthes, F., Schweda, C. M. (2009, 11-14 October). *A Viable System Perspective on Enterprise Architecture Management*. IEEE International Conference on Systems, Man and Cybernetics, San Antonio, TX, USA. 1483-1488.
- Burrell, G. a. M., G. . (1979). *Sociological Paradigms and Organizational Analysis*. London: Heinemann.
- Castro, A., Santos, L. (2013). *Refurbishment Informational School Architecture: A Base to an Educational Information Service*. Germany: Springer.
- Cave, M., Hanney, S. (2006). The Use of Performance Indicators in Higher Education. *The Challenge of Quality Movement, Jessice Kingsley*.
- Chan, A. P., Chan, L.P. (2004). Key performance indicators for measuring construction success. *Benchmarking: An International Journal*, 11 (2), 203-216.
- Checkland, P. (1981). *System Thinking System Practice*. Chicester: Wiley & Sons.
- Checkland, P., Howell, S. (1997). *Information Systems, and Inofrmation Systems*: Wiley & Sons.
- Chen, W. S., Hirschheim, R. (2004). A Paradigmatic and Methodological Examination Of Information Systems Research From 1991 To 2001. *Information Systems Journal*, 14, 197-235.
- Chong, H. Y. (2006). *Philosophical Foundations of Quantitative Research Methodology*. Laham: University of Press America.
- Corley, E. A. (2005). How Do Career Strategies, Gender, and Work Environment Affect Faculty Productivity Levels in University- Based Science Centers? *Review of Policy Research*, 22 (5), 637-655.

- Creswell, J. W. (2003). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative and Mixed Methods Approach* (2nd Ed.). London: Sage.
- Creswell, J. W. (2007). *Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design: Choosing Among Five Traditions*. London, Sage.
- Dahan, H., Fook, C. Y., Jelas, Z., Sidhu, G., Singh, P., Omar, S. (2007). *Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) for Governance of Public Universities in Malaysia* ACRELeT.
- Damanpour, F., M. E. William. (1984). Organizational Innovation and Performance: The Problem of "Organizational Lag". *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 29 (3), 392-409.
- David, M., Sutton, C.D. (2004). *Social Research: The Basics*. London: Sage.
- De Boer, H., Ender, J., Leisyte L. (2007). Public Sector Reform In Dutch Higher Education: The Organizational Transformation of the University. *Public Administration*, 85 (1), 27-46.
- De Lancer J. P., H., M. (2001). Promoting the Utilization of Performance Measures in Public Organizations: An Empirical Study of Factors Affecting Adoption and Implementation. *Public Administration Review*, 61, 693–708.
- De Vaus. (2001). *Research Design In Social Research*. London: Sage Publications.
- De Waal, A. A., and Gerritsen-Medema, G. (2006). Performance Management Analysis: A Case Study at a Dutch Municipality. *International Journal of Productivity & Performance Management*, 55 (1), 26-39.
- Decoene, V., and Bruggeman, W. (2006). Strategic Alignment and Middle-Level Managers' Motivation in a Balanced Scorecard Setting. *International Journal of Operations & Production Management*. , 26(4), 429-448.
- Denton, G. A., and White, B. (2000). Implementing the Balanced Scorecard Approach to Managing Hotel Operations. *Cornell HRA Quarterly* (February), 47-107.
- Dhillon, S. K., Ibrahim, R., Selamat, A. (2013). Strategy Identification For Sustainable Key Performance Indicators Delivery Process For Scholarly Publication and Citation. *International Journal of Management & Information Technology*, 3 (3), 103-113.
- Diana, M., Alin, O., Marian, P. (2010). Efficiency, Effectiveness and Performance of The Public Sector. *Romanian Journal of Economic Forecasting*. 132-147.
- Dobni, B. (2003). Creating a Strategy Implementation. *Business Horizons*, 46, 43-46.

- Drucker, P. F. (1994). *Managing in Turbulence Time*. Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann Ltd.
- Elsevier. (2013). Sciverse Open to Accelerate Science: About Scopus. Retrieved 7 March, 2013, from <http://www.info.sciverse.com/scopus/about>.
- Espejo, R. (1989). *A Method To Study Organizations. The Viable System Model: Interpretations and Applications of Stafford Beer's VSM*. Chichester: Wiley.
- Espejo, R. (2003). *The Viable System Model: A Briefing About Organizational Structure*. Chichester. Sage.
- Espejo, R., Antonia, Gill. (2000). The Viable System Model as a Framework for Understanding Organizations. Sage.
- Espejo, R., Bowling, D., Hoverstadt, P. (1999). The Viable System Model and the Viplan Software. *Kybernetes*, 28 (6/7), 661-678.
- Espejo, R., Reyes, A. (2011). *Organizational Systems: Managing Complexity with the Viable System Model*: Springer Science and Business Media.
- Espinosa, A., Walker, J. (2013). Complexity Management in Practice: A Viable System Model Intervention in an Irish Eco-Community. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 225, 118-129.
- Faculty, R. O. (2014). *Promotion and Tenure Guideline*. Canada: Western University.
- Fawcett, J., Downs, F.S. (1986). *The Relationship of Theory and Research*. United States: Appleton-Century-Crofts.
- Fishbein, M., Ajzen, I. (1975). *Belief, Attitude, Intention, and Behavior: An Introduction to Theory and Research*. Ontario: Addison-Wesley Pub. Co.
- Flamholtz, E. G., Das, T. K. , Tsui, A. S. (1985). Toward an Integrative Framework of Organizational Control. *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, 10 (1), 35-50.
- Franceschini, F., Maurizio, G., Domenico, M., Luciano, V. (2006). The Condition of Uniqueness in Manufacturing Process Representation by Performance/Quality Indicators. *Quality and Reliability Engineering International*, 22 (5), 567-580.
- Francis, H., Patrick,K., Micheal,F. (2008). Supporting Crime Detection And Operational Planning With SSM And VSM. *Journal Of System Research And Behavioral Science*, 26, 3-14.

- Frank, J. R., Laurens, K. H. (2010). Factors Associated with Disciplinary and Interdisciplinary Research Collaboration. *Research Policy*, 40, 463–472.
- Garbarino, S., Holland, J. (2009). *Quantitative and Qualitative Methods in Impact Evaluation and Measuring Results* United Kingdom: Governance and Social Development Resource Centre.
- Garfield, E. (2006). The History and Meaning Of The Journal Impact Factor. *American Medical Association*, 295 (1), 90-93.
- Garicano, L., Wu, Yanhui. (2012). Knowledge, Communication, and Organizational Capabilities. *Organization Science*, 1-16.
- Gholizadeh, H., Salehi, Hadi., Embi, Mohamed, Amin., Danaee, Mahmoud., Ordi, Ali., Tanha, Farid, Habibi., Ebrahim, Nader Ale ., Osman, Noor Azuan Abu. (2014). Economic Growth and Internet Usage Impact on Publication Productivity among ASEAN's and World's Best Universities. *Modern Applied Science*, 8, 169-178.
- Giovanni, A., Ciriaco, Andrea., Alessandro, Caprasecca. (2008). The Contribution of Star Scientists to Overall Sex Differences in Research Productivity *Scientometrics*.
- Godin, G., Gravel, A.B., Eccles, M., Grimshaw, J. (2008). Healthcare Professionals' Intentions and Behaviors: A Systematic Review of Studies Based on Social Cognitive Theories. *Implementation Science*, 3 (36), 1-12.
- Goldsmith, M., Bankhead, Clare., Austoker, Joan. (2007). Synthesising Quantitative and Qualitative Research in Evidence-Based Patient Information. *Epidemiol Community Health* 61, 262-270.
- Gopikuttan, A., Swathy, S. (2014). Publication Productivity of University of Kerela: A Scientometric View. *Journal of Library and Information Technology*, 34 (2), 131-139.
- Granello, D., Wheaton, J. (2004). Online Data Collection: Strategies for Research. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, 82 (4), 387-393.
- Green, P., Tull,D.,Albaum,G. (1993). *Research Methods For Marketing Decisions* (5 Ed.): Prentice Hall.
- Greenberg, J. (1999). *Managing Behavior in Organization* (2nd Ed.). New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

- Greene, J. C., Caracelli, V.J., Graham, W.F. . (1989). Toward A Conceptual Framework for Mixed-Method Evaluation Designs. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 11 (3), 255-274.
- Grouzet, F. M. E., Ahuvia, A., Kim, Y., Ryan, R.M., Schmuck, P., Kasser, T., Dols, J.M., Lau, S., Saunders, S., Sheldon, K. (2005). The Structure of Goal Contents Across 15 Cultures. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 89 (5), 800–816.
- Guba, E. G. (1990). *The Paradigm Dialog*. London: Sage Publications.
- Hair, J. F., William, C.B., Barry, J.B., Rolph, E.A. (2010). *Multivariate Data Analysis* (7th Ed.). New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Hamidi, K., Delbahari, V. (2011). Formulating a Strategy for a University Using SWOT Technique: A Case Study. *Australian Journal of Basic and Applied Sciences*, 5 (12), 264-276.
- Hardre, P., Beesley, A., Raymond, M., Terry, P. (2011). Faculty Motivation to do Research: Across Disciplines in Research-Extensive Universities. *Journal of the Professoriate*, 5, 35-69.
- Harrison, A., Rainer, K., Hochwarter, A., Thompson, K. (1997). Testing the Self-Efficacy-Performance Linkage of Social-Cognitive Theory. *Journal of Sociat Psychotogy*, 137 (1), 79-87.
- Hauser, H., John, R, Gerry K. (1998). Metrics: You Are What You Measure! *European Management Journal*, 16 (5), 516-528.
- Hazadiah, M. D., Chan, Y.F., Sidhu, G.K. (2008). *Identifying Key Performance Indicators for the Governance of Public Universities in Malaysia: Issues and Considerations*. Pulau Pinang: Penerbit USM.
- Hirsch, J. E. (2005). An Index To Quantify An Individual's Scientific Research Output. *Physical Sciences - Physics*, 102, 1569-1572.
- Hirschheim, R. A. (1985). *Information Systems Epistemology: An Historical Perspective*. (2nd Ed.). Amsterdam: North-Holland.
- Hoekman, J., Frenken, K., Robert, J. W. (2010). Research collaboration at a distance: Changing spatial patterns of scientific collaboration within Europe. *Research Policy*, 39 (5), 662-673.
- Hrebiniak, G. L. (2005). *Making Strategy Work: Leading Effective Execution and Change*. New Jersey: Whorton School Publishing.

- Ittner, C. D., D. F. Larcker. (1998b). Innovations in Performance Measurement: Trends and Research Implications. *Journal of Management Accounting Research*, 10, 205-238.
- Jackson, M. (2000). *System Approaches To Management*. N.Y USA: Kluwer.
- Jing, J. (2012). Faculty Research Productivity in Hong Kong across Academic Discipline. *Higher Education Studies*, 2 (4), 1-13.
- Johnson, R. B., Onwuegbuzie, A.J. (2004). Mixed Methods Research: A Research Paradigm Whose Time Has Come. *Educational Researcher*, 33 (7), 14-26.
- Jonkers, K., Castro, L.C. (2013). Research Upon Return: The effect of International Mobility on Scientific Ties, Production and Impact. *Research Policy*, 42, 1366– 1377.
- Julie, M. N., Gill, M. (2012). Citation analysis as a measure of article quality, journal influence and individual researcher performance. *Radiology*, 18(2), 60-67.
- Jung, C. S., William K. Cummings. (2010). Multilevel Analysis of Academic Publishing Across Disciplines: Research Preference, Collaboration, and Time on research. *Scientometrics*, 85(2), 581-594.
- Jusoh, R., Ibrahim, D.N., Zainuddin, Y. (2008). The Performance Consequences of Multiple Performance Measures Usage: Evidence from the Malaysian Manufacturers. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, 57(2), 119-136.
- Kamaruzaman, J., Zaini, A., Siti, A. (2009). Moving Ahead for Academic Excellence through International Journal Publication. *International Education Studies*, 2(2), 31-36.
- Kaplan, R., Norton, D. (1996). *The Balanced Scorecard: Translating Strategy into Action*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Kaplan, R. S., and Norton, D.P. (1996a). Using the Balanced Scorecard as A Strategic Management System. *Harvard Business Review*, 74(1), 75-85.
- Kaplan, R. S., Norton, D.P. (1996b). *The Balanced Scorecard: Translating Strategy into Action*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Kaplan, R. S., Norton, D.P. (2004). *Strategy Maps: Converting Intangible Assets into Tangible Outcomes*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Kemper, E. A., Stringfield, S., Teddlie, S. (2003). *Handbook of Mixed Methods in Social & Behavioral Research*. London: Sage.

- Kennerley, M., and Neely, A. (2002). A Framework of the Factors Affecting the Evolution of Performance Measurement Systems. *International Journal of Operations & Production Management*, 22(1), 1222-1245.
- Kennerley, M., Neely, A. (2003). Measuring Performance in a Changing Business Environment. *International Journal of Operations and Production Management*, 23(2), 213-229.
- Kenny, G. (2003). Balanced Scorecard: Why It isn't Working. *New Zealand Management*, 50(2), 32-34.
- Kothari, C. R. (2004). *Research Methodology: Methods and Techniques*: New Age International.
- Krejcie, R., Morgan, Daryle. (1970). Determining Sample Size For Research Activities *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 30, 607-610.
- Langston, C. (2013). Development of Generic Key Performance Indicators for PMBOK using a 3D Project Integration Model. *Australasian Journal of Construction Economics and Building*, 13(4), 78-91.
- Leedy, P. D., Ormrod, J.E. (2010). *Practical Research*. New Jersey: Pearson.
- Leonard, J. (1993). *The Viable System Model: A More Adequate Tool for Practising Management?* Department of Management Systems and Sciences. Kingston, England. PhD, University of Hull
- Lewis, D., Terumasa, I., et al. (2001). On the Use of Performance Indicators in Japan's Higher Education Reform Agenda. *Nagoya Journal of Higher Education*, 1, 67-98.
- Lewis, E., Millar, G. (2009). *The Viable Governance Model - A Theoretical Model for the Governance of IT*. 42nd Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences, 2009. HICSS '09. 37-44.
- Li, J. (2010). *A System That Works: Building a Decentralized Global Political Economy Using the Viable System Model*. 54th Meeting of the International Society for the Systems Sciences. 1-25.
- Li, Y., Guohui, S., Eppler, J.M. (2008). Making Strategy Work: A Literature Review on the Factors influencing Strategy Implementation. In: PIETRO, M., FRANZ, W. K. (2nd ed.) *Handbook of Research on Strategy Process*. United Kingdom: Edward Elgar.

- Lodhi, A. S. (2012). A Pilot Study of Researching the Research Culture in Pakistani Public Universities: The Academics' Perspective *Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 31, 473 – 479.
- Luisa, C. S., Isabel, C. (2014). Qualitative and Quantitative Methods to Assess the Qualities of a Lecturer: What qualities are demanded by on-line and on-site students? *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 143, 106-111.
- Ma, W. (2012). *Factors Affecting The Motivation of TEFL Academics In Higher Education In China*. Queensland University of Technology, Brisbane.
- MacGregor, R., Rix, M., Aylward, D., Glynn, J. (2006). Factors Associated with Research Management in Australian Commerce and Business Faculties. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 28(1), 59-70.
- Mackenzie, N. K., S. (2006). Research Dilemmas: Paradigms, Methods and Methodology. *Issues in Educational Research*, 16, 193-205.
- MacRoberts, M. H., MacRoberts, B.R. (2010). Problems of citation analysis: A study of uncited and seldom-cited influences. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*, 61(1), 1-13.
- Malaysian Education Ministry. (2014). Pelan Strategik Pengajian Tinggi Negara (PSPTN). Retrieved Dec 12, 2014, from <http://www.moe.gov.my/v/pelan-strategik-pengajian-tinggi-negara>
- Marcos, M., G. (2012). *A Business Model for Mexican Organizations through Viable Systems Methodology*. Sage Publications.
- Marcus, Y., Wesley, M. S. (2011). Professional Networks, Scientific Collaboration, and Publication Productivity in Resource-Constrained Research Institutions in a Developing Country. *Research Policy*, 40, 204-216.
- Marshall, C., Rossman, G.B. (1999). *Designing Qualitative Research* (3rd ed.). CA: Sage Publications.
- Martin, M., Claude, S. (2011). *Constructing an indicator system or scorecard for higher education: A practical guide*. Paris, France: International Institute for Educational Planning.
- Mehdi, Z., Bayrami, H. (2010). *An Effective Factors Pattern Affecting Implementation of Strategic Plans*. Academic and Business Research Institute Conference. Retrieved from <http://www.aabri.com/LV2010Manuscripts/LV10116.pdf>. 17-24.

- Merriam, S. B. (1998a). *Qualitative Research and Case Study Application in Education*. San Fransisco: Jossey-Bass publishers.
- Merriam, S. B. (1998b). *Qualitative Research and Case Study Applications In Education*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Metawe, M. G., M. (2005, September 22-23, 2005). *Problems with the implications of performance measurement systems in the public sector where performance linked to pay: A literature review drown from UK*. Conference on Performance Measurement and Management Control, Nice, France.
- Miller, D. (2002). Successful Change Leaders: What Makes Them? What Do they Do That is Different? *Journal of Change Management*, 2(4), 359-368.
- Miller, J. S., Verbos, Amy. K., Goswami, Ashita. (2014). Employee Social Cognition and Performance Evaluation Process Reactions. *Personnel Review*, 43(4), 515 - 535.
- Mingers, J. (2001). Combining IS Research Methods: Towards a Pluralist Methodology. *Information Systems Research*, 12(3), 240-259.
- Mishra, S. K. (2009). Does the Journal Impact Factor Help Make a Good Indicator of Academic Performance? *Social Science Research Network*, 1- 13.
- Mishra, V., Smyth, R. (2012). Are More Senior Academics Really More Research Productive than Junior Academics? Evidence from Australian Law Schools.
- MOHE (2013). Blueprint on Enculturation of Lifelong Learning for Malaysia 2011-2020. Ministry of Higher Education. Putrajaya, Malaysia.
- Morse, J. M. (2003). *Principles of Mixed Methods and Multimethod Research Design*. London: Sage.
- Murray, R. (2009). *Writing for Academic Journals*. New York, USA: Open University Press.
- Musyoka, L. W. (2011). Challenges of Strategy Implementation in Jomo Kenyatta Foundation. *International Journal of Current Research*, 3(11), 301-308.
- Najib, T. R. (2009b). KPIs For All Government Matters. The Star. 2013. Retrieved 7 March 2013, from <http://thestar.com.my/news/story.asp?file=/2009/6/20/nation/4162443&sec=nation>. Kuala Lumpur.
- Neuman, W. L. (2003). *Social Research Methods*: Pearson.
- Newsted, P. R., Huff, S.L., Munro, M.C. . (1998). Survey Instruments in Information Systems. *MIS Quarterly*, 22 (4), 553-554.

- Neznanov, A., Ilvovsky, Dmitry., Parinov, Andrey. (2014). Advancing FCA Workflow in FCART System for Knowledge Discovery in Quantitative Data. *Procedia Computer Science*, 31, 201-210.
- Nicola, B., Nicholas, W. (2013). The Applicability of the Viable Systems Model as a Diagnostic for Small to Medium Sized Enterprises. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, 62 (1), 29-46.
- Nooreklit, H. (2000). The Balanced Scorecard: A Critical Analysis of Some of Its Assumptions. *Management Accounting Research*, 11 (1), 65-88.
- Norland, T. E. V. (1990). Controlling Error in Evaluation Instruments. *Journal of Extension*, 28 (2), 156-172.
- Norreklit, H. (2003). The Balanced Scorecard: What is the Score? A Rhetorical Analysis of the Balanced Scorecard. *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, 28 (6), 591-619.
- Nuranisah, A. (2012). *Performance Measurement in Malaysia's Higher Education*. PMA 2012 Conference. 139-146.
- Okiki, O. C. (2013). Research Productivity of Teaching Faculty Members in Nigerian Federal Universities: An Investigative Study. *Chinese Librarianship: an International Electronic Journal*, 36, 99-118.
- Okumus, F. (2001). Towards a Strategy Implementation Framework. *Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 13 (7), 327-338.
- Ong, M. Y., Balakrishnan, M., Ong, S. L., Tang, K. N., Phua, K. K. (2013). User Acceptance of Key Performance Indicators Management Systems in a Higher Education Institution in Malaysia: A Pilot Study. *International Online Journal of Educational Sciences*, 5 (1), 22-31.
- Ong, T. S., Teh, B.H., Chee, K.L., Lee, S.W. (2010). Adoption and Implementation of Balanced Scorecard in Malaysia. *Asia-Pacific Management Accounting Journal*, 5 (1), 21-40.
- Othman, R., Ahmad Domil, A.K., Cheenik, Z., Abdullah, N., Hamzah, N. . (2006). A Case Study of Balanced Scorecard Implementation in a Malaysian Company. *Journal of Asia-Pacif Business*, 7 (2), 55-72.
- Pajares, F. (1996). Self-efficacy beliefs in academic settings. . *Review of Educational Research*, 66 (4), 543-578.

- Pasupathy, R. (2014). An investigation of research self-efficacy beliefs and research productivity among faculty members at an emerging research university in the USA. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 33 (4), 728-741
- Patrick, H. (2009). *The Fractal Organization: Creating Sustainable Organization With The Viable System Model*. Wiley.
- Pedro, A., Javier, R. C. (2011). References made and citations received by scientific articles. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*, 62 (1), 40-49.
- Peter, C., Lawrence, S. (1999). *Academic Work In The Twenty-First Century: Changing Roles and Policies*. Australia: Department of Education, Training and Youth Affairs.
- Pfiffner, M. (2010). Five experiences with the viable system model. *Kybernetes*, 39 (9/10), 1615 - 1626.
- Pidun, T., Felden, C. (2011). *A Performance Assessment System Incorporating Indirect Indicators and Semantics*. AMCIS 2011 Proceedings. 1-9.
- Pinsonneault, A., Kraemer, K.K. (1992). Survey Research Methodology in Management Information Systems: An Assessment. *Journal of Management Information Systems*, 10 (2), 75-106.
- Pitsoulis, A., Schnellenbachb, J. (2012). On Property Rights and Incentives in Academic Publishing. *Research Policy*, 41, 1440– 1447.
- Platts, K. W., Tan, K. H. (2002). *Designing Linked Performance Measures - A Connectance Based Approach*. Innsbruck, Austria.
- Provost, O. (2014). *Faculty Evaluation, Promotion and Tenure Memo from Provost McConnell, Calendar and Policies & Procedures*. West Virginia. West Virginia University Publishing.
- Provost, O. (2014). *West Lafayette Campus Promotion and Tenure Policy*. Indiana: Purdue University, Purdue Publishing.
- Rabaa'i, A. A. (2012). *Evaluating the Success of Large-scale Integrated Information Systems through the Lens of IS-Impact and IS-Support*. PhD. Queensland University of Technology, Brisbane.
- Radhakrishna, R. B. (2007). Tips for Developing and Testing Questionnaires/Instruments. *Journal of Extension*, 45 (1), 1-21.

- Raj, M., Sivadas, Eugene. (1995). Comparing Response Rates and Response Content in Mail versus Electronic Mail Surveys. *Journal of the Market Research Society*, 37 (4), 429-439.
- Ramsden, P. (1994). Describing and Explaining Research Productivity. *Higher Education* 28 (2), 207-226
- Reh, F. (2013). Key Performance Indicators (KPI) How an organization defines and measures progress toward its goals. Retrieved 7 March, 2013, from <http://management.about.com/cs/generalmanagement/a/keyperfindic.htm>
- Reissberg, A. C. (2010). *A Cybernetic Approach to Hurricane Hazard Management on O'ahu*. Hawaii: ISSS.
- Reynolds, M., Holwell, S. (2010). Systems Approaches to Managing Change: A Practical Guide. In: MARTIN REYNOLDS, S. H. (Ed.) 1st Ed. London: Springer-Verlag.
- Reza, A. (2013). Modelling Viable Business Process For Information Technology Policy Management. PhD, Universiti Teknologi Malaysia.
- Rocco, T. S., Bliss, L.A., Gallagher, S., Perez-Prado, A. . (2003). Taking The Next Step: Mixed Methods Research in Organizational Systems. *Information Technology, Learning, and Performance Journal*, 21(1), 19-26.
- Rodina, A., Yussof, M.B. (2006). A Viable Approach To Tackle Complex Enterprise Situation for SISP. *Malaysian Journal of Computer Science*, 19 (16), 87-103.
- Rogelberg, S. G., Stanton, J. M. (2007). Introduction: Understanding and Dealing With Organizational Survey Nonresponse. *Organizational Research Methods*, 10, 195-209.
- Rozhana, O., Ahmad, Khairy Ahmad Domilb., Zizah, Che Senikc., Nor, Liza Abdullahc., Noradiva, Hamzahc. (2006). A Case Study of Balanced Scorecard Implementation in a Malaysian Company. *Journal of Asia Pacific Business*, 7 (2), 55-72.
- Rubin, H. J., Rubin, I.S. . (1995). *Qualitative Interviewing: The Art of Hearing Data*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Sabarinah , S. A. (2012). Performance Indicators for the Advancement of Malaysian Research with Focus on Social Science and Humanities. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 68, 16-28.
- Salkind, N. J. (2000). *Exploring Research* (4th Ed.). New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

- Sani, S. I. (2012). *A Framework For Improving Key Performance Indicators Delivery Process Using Viable System Model*. Msc, Universiti Teknologi Malaysia, Skudai, Johor.
- Shadish, W. R., Cook, T. D., Campbell, D. T. (2002). *Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs for generalized causal inference*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Sheehan, K. B., McMillan, S. J. (1999). Response variation in e-mail surveys: An exploration. *Journal of Advertising Research*, 39 (4), 45-54.
- Shu, L. W., Lin, S. J. (2007). The Application of Social Cognitive Theory to Web-Based Learning Through NetPorts. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 38 (4), 600-612.
- Simons, R. (1990). The Role of Management Control Systems in Creating Competitive Advantage: New Perspectives. *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, 15 (1/2), 127-143.
- Singleton, R., Straits, B., Straits, M. (1993). *Approaches to Social Research*: Oxford University Press.
- Smith, E. A. (2005). Communities Of Competence: New Resources in the Workplace. *Journal of Workplace Learning*, 17 (1/2), 7-23.
- Sooryamoorthy, R. (2013). Publication productivity and collaboration of researchers in South Africa: new empirical evidence. *Scientometrics*.
- Sorooshian, S., Norzima, Z., Yusof, I., Rosnah, Y. (2010). Effect Analysis on Strategy Implementation Drivers. *World Applied Sciences Journal*, 11 (10), 1255-1261.
- Sowa, J. E., Sandfort, J.R. (2004). No longer unmeasurable? A Multidimensional Integrated Model of nonprofit Organizational Effectiveness. *Nonprofit Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 33, 711-728.
- Stake, R. E. (2003). *Case Studies*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Stamatovic, M., Zakic, N. (2010). Effects Of The Global Economic Crisis On Small and Medium Entreprises in Serbia. *Serbian Journal of Management*, 5 (1), 151-162.
- Sulo, T., Kendagor, R., Kosgei, D., Tuitoek, D., Chelangat S. (2012). Factors Affecting Research Productivity in Public Universities of Kenya: The Case of Moi University, Eldoret. *Journal of Emerging Trends in Economics and Management Sciences*, 3 (5), 475-484.

- Summers, D. (2005). *Quality Management*. London: Pearson Education.
- Sung, D., You, Y. Song, J.H. (2008). *The Conceptual Mechanism for Viable Organizational Learning Based on Complex System Theory and the Viable System Model*. Academy of Human Resource Development International Research Conference. 96-102.
- Suraya, H., Yu, May Leen., Soo, Hsaio Pei., Mohamad, Taha Ijab. (2008). *Using E-Balanced Scorecard in Managing the Performance and Excellence of Academicians*. Pacific Asia Conference on Information Systems. Retrieved from http://www.pacis-net.org/file/2008/PACIS2008_Camera-Ready_Paper_256.pdf. 53-60
- Taleb, B., Sterrit, R., Ag L., Kenan, F. (2005). *Model-Based Self-Managing Systems Engineering*. Proceedings Of Software Engineering Workshop. 43-49.
- Thomas, R. M. (2003). *Blending Qualitative and Quantitative Research Methods in Theses and Dissertations*. United States: Sage Publications.
- Ujang, Z. (2012). *New Academia. UTM As A Global Brand (The 2012 New Year Address by the Vice Chancellor)*: Penerbit UTM Press.
- UM, D. O. (2007, 12 Dec 2014). Research University: Reshaping UM Research. *IPPP Research Bulletin*.
- Umashankar, V., Dutta, Kirti. (2007). Balanced Scorecard in Managing Higher Education Institutions: An Indian Perspective. *Journal of Educational Management*, 21 (1), 54 - 67.
- University of North Carolina (2011). Guidelines for Tenure and Promotion. Kenan-Flagler. North Carolina, The University of North Carolina.
- Universiti Teknologi Malaysia (2013). *Implementation of the 2013 Yearly Performance Appraisal (e-LPPT 2013) based on MyRA II*. Skudai: Universiti Teknologi Malaysia.
- UTM. (2013). Research Alliance. Retrieved 12 April, 2013, from <http://rmc.utm.my/research-alliance/>
- UTM. (2014). About Universiti Teknologi Malaysia. Retrieved 27 September, 2014, from <http://www.utm.my/about/introduction-about-utm/>
- UTM (2014). Research Partnership. Retrieved Dec 2014, 2014, from <http://www.utm.my/research/research-partnership/>

- Venkatesh, V. M., Michael G.; Davis, Gordon B.; and Davis, Fred D. (2003). User Acceptance of Information Technology: Toward a Unified View. *MIS Quarterly*, 27 (3), 425-478.
- Vinkler, P. (2010). *The Evaluation of Research By Scientometric Indicators*. Chandos Publishing.
- Voce, A. (2004). Introduction to Research Paradigm. *Mendeley*, 27 (2), 122-128.
- Voelpel, S. C., Leibold, M., and Eckhoff, R.A. . (2006). The Tyranny of the Balanced Scorecard in the Innovation Economy. *Journal of Intellectual Capital*, 7 (1), 43-60.
- Walker, J., Espinosa, A. (2011). The Viable System Model. Retrieved 14 August, 2014, from http://www.esrad.org.uk/resources/vsmg_3/screen.php?page=recursion
- Waltman, L., Eck, N., Leeuwen, T., Visser, M., Raan, A. (2011). Towards A New Crown Indicator: An Empirical Analysis. *Scientometrics*, 87 (3), 467–481.
- Waltman, L., Eck, N.J., Thed, N., Visser, M., Raan, A. (2010). Towards A New Crown Indicator: Some Theoretical Considerations. *Physics and Society*. 5, 37-47.
- Wang, X. (2010). *Performance Measurement in Universities: Managerial Perspective*: Msc. University of Twente.
- Watson, T., Noble, Paul. (2014). *Evaluating Public Relations: A Guide to Planning, Research and Measurement* (3 Ed.): Kogan Page Publishers.
- Wendy, P. (2000). Scholarly journals in the late 20th century. *Elsevier*, 24 (2), 239-250.
- Western, K. U. (2007). *Promotion and Tenure Guidelines*. Kentucky, US: Western Kentucky University.
- Winston, J. A. (1999). Performance Indicators - Promises Unmet: A Response to Perrin. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 20 (1), 95-99.
- Wood, F. (1990). Factors Influencing Research Performance of University Academic Staff. *Higher Education*, 19, 81-100.
- Wood, F. (1990b). Factors Influencing Research Performance of University Academic Staffs. *Higher Education Journal*, 19 (1), 81-100.
- Wood, R., Bandura, A. (1989a). Social Cognitive Theory of Organization Management. *Academy of Management Review*, 14 (3), 361–384.

- Wood, R., Bandura, A. (1989b). Social Cognitive Theory of Organizational Management. *Academy of Management Review*, 14 (3), 361-384.
- Wright, A. B., Holttum, S. (2012). Gender identity, research self-efficacy and research intention in trainee clinical psychologists in the UK. *Clinical Psychology and Psychotherapy*, 19 (1), 46-56.
- Wu, C. S., Chen, J. C. (2012). *A study on Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) for Basic Education in Taiwan*. International Conference: Innovative Research in a Changing and Challenging World. 21-26.
- Wu, C. S., Lin, T. Y. (2008). Key Performance Indicators. *Journal of Education Research*, 16, 31-63.
- Yin, R. (1999). Enhancing The Quality of Case Studies in Health Services Research. *Health Services Research*, 34, 1209-1224.
- Yin, R. (2003). *Applications of Case Study Research* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Yin, R. (2003). *Case Study Research Design and Methods*. CA: Sage Publications.
- Ynalveza, M. A., Wesley M.S. (2011). Professional networks, scientific collaboration, and publication productivity in resource-constrained research institutions in a developing country. *Research Policy* 40, 204–216.
- Yousef, H., Jaleh, B. (2011). Study of Factors Influencing Research Productivity of Agriculture Faculty Members in Iran. *High Educ* (62), 635–647.
- Yu, J., Cooper, H. (1983). A Quantitative Review of Research Design Effects on Response Rates to Questionnaires. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 36-44.
- Yu, J. E. (2009). Problematizing Problem-Solving Methods For Exploring The Management Of Social Enterprises. *Systemic Practice And Action Research*, 24, 1-14.
- Zaherawati, Z., Mahazril, A. Y., Zuraini, Y., Nazni, N., Sawal, M.Z., Zuriawati, Z. (2011). Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) in the Public Sector: A Study in Malaysia. *Asian Social Science*, 7 (7), 102-107.
- Zainab, A. N., Sanni, S.A., Edzan, N.N., Koh, A.P. (2012). Auditing Scholarly Journals Published in Malaysia and Assessing Their Visibility. *Malaysian Journal of Library and Information Science*, 17 (1), 65-92.
- Zhang, Q., Zhu, Weihong. (2008). Exploring Emotion in Teaching: Emotional Labor, Burnout, and Satisfaction in Chinese Higher Education. *Communication Education*, 57(1), 105-122.

Zhou, N., Wang, H., Han, X., Zhang, X. (2010). *Constructing Performance Management Information System for Academic Staff: A Model for Research-intensive Universities*. International Conference on E-Business and E-Government. 161-168.

APPENDIX A (I)

(INTERVIEW QUESTIONS)

Invitation Letter For Interview Participants

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing to seek your interest for participating in the interview for a research project entitled “**Strategy Implementation For Scholarly Publication Among Research University Academic Staffs**”. This interview is part of a Ph.D research at the University Teknologi Malaysia (UTM), Johor, Malaysia. We believe that the results of the interviews will be useful for university management in formulating strategies for KPI improvement in scholarly publications.

The participants from your organization will involve in approximately 1 hour interview session. The research student undertaking the project, Mrs. Sharanjit Kaur Dhillon, will contact you in the near future and can discuss details with you. Mrs. Sharanjit Kaur Dhillon is a PhD candidate supervised by Dr. Roliana Ibrahim and Professor Dr. Ali Selamat at the Faculty of Computing at UTM.

We will send formal interview information such as consent form and interview scripts prior to conducting the interview. Your anonymity will be ensured and your responses will be kept confidential. For interview the results will be recorded in a form which has no reference to you or your organization. Whilst your participation in this interview is obviously voluntary we would value your contributions. If you have any questions or concerns about participating in this interview please contact Mrs. Sharanjit Kaur Dhillon via email skdhillon84@gmail.com or phone 012-5391504.

Yours sincerely,

Roliana Ibrahim, Dr.

Senior Lecturer,

Faculty of Computing, University Teknologi Malaysia, Johor, Malaysia.

Phone: +607- 5538727

Ali Selamat, Prof. Dr.

Professor

Faculty of Computing, University Teknologi Malaysia, Johor, Malaysia.

Phone: +607- 5531008

Sharanjit Kaur Dhillon

PhD student,

Faculty of Computing, University Teknologi Malaysia, Johor, Malaysia.

Phone +6012-5391504

CONSENT FORM FOR INTERVIEWS

I _____ agree to participate in the research entitled “**Strategy Implementation For Scholarly Publication Among Research University Academic Staffs**” being conducted by Sharanjit Kaur (Faculty of Computing, skdhillon84@gmail.com, contact no. +6012 5391 504).

I understand that the purpose of this study is to investigate the current strategies in KPI improvement for scholarly publication among the academic staffs in order to sustain the research university status.

I understand that my participation in this research will involve 1 hour of participation in interview questionnaire and would be recorded (audio-taped) if required. I also understand that there will be no harm or risk for me in this research.

I am aware that I can contact Dr. Roliana Ibrahim (roliana@utm.my), Professor Dr. Ali Selamat (aselamat@utm.my) or Mrs. Sharanjit Kaur (skdhillon84@gmail.com) if I have any concerns about the research. I also understand that I am free to withdraw my participation from this research at any time and without giving any reason, if I feel uncomfortable of the questions asked on the questionnaires.

I agree that the research data gathered from this project may be published in a form that does not identify me in any way.

_____/_____/_____
Signed by

_____/_____/_____
Witnessed by

Strategy Implementation For Scholarly Publication Among Research University Academic Staffs

Brief Introduction of Research

The application of key performance indicators (KPIs) in organizational performance measurement is aspired to develop and improve targeted objectives that will include most significance to the organization, yet such targeted objectives are not always achieved as a result of some leading factors distressing their understanding. This on average happens because the targeted objectives require high productivity of the academic staffs. Despite many implementations in delivering the KPIs for scholarly publication, the academic staffs are still unable to perform. The requirements to have the publications published in well known and established databases like ISI and WoS are among the requirements need to be fulfilled by the academic staffs. This research would involve investigating the current strategies undertaken by the university management on how they deliver KPIs to academic staffs in RUs. This research aims to investigate the problems of non-achieving KPI targets among academic staffs of RUs. It also aims to highlight the strategy implementation that can be developed to deliver improved publication outcomes for the targets set. The research problem revolves around the challenges in implementing the strategies, which is caused unachievable target in scholarly publication in selected RUs in Malaysia. Within RUs concern has arisen about the complication of KPI delivery on scholarly publication. This apprehension is worth mentioning given the elevated requirement to uphold the RU status in the existing government economic growth agenda. Hence there is a need for a model that can facilitate the strategy implementation in this context. Moreover, the identification of key actors who influence the strategy implementation success amongst the top management as stakeholders is also included in this model. In addition, this measurement will provide the analysis of an organizational situation as the reflection of the strategy implementation process.

Read to participants:

This research is targeted at University Management personnel whom are involved in setting the requirement of scholarly publication targets of the university and R.A. members whom are responsible to fulfill the requirements set by the university management for their KPIs in publication. The focus of our interviews are to observe current strategies applied in achieving the scholarly publication targets and to identify the problems and issues while adopting to strategies that are imposed for better improvement in publication for the university targets.

Interview Questions - Top Level Management

1. According to former VC, Blue Ocean Strategy and Balanced Scorecard are used in UTM to achieve the UTM Global Plan. Specifically, what are the strategies concerned for publication productivity?
2. What are the limitations identified for current strategies?
3. What are the steps proposed to achieve the strategies imposed?
4. Are there any difficulties identified for implementing the strategies imposed?
 - The cooperation among the academic staffs
 - The timeframe to implement it
 - The requirement is getting more and more though
 - Other(Specify)
5. Does UTM management encourage academic staffs in placing priority on publishing in High Impact Factor journals rather than local journals?
 - Priority is for high impact factor journals only.
 - Local journals are acceptable
 - Both are acceptable
 - Other(Specify)
6. What are the steps taken to embed research culture among the academic staffs?
 - Workshops
 - Seminars
 - Co-authoring with senior staffs
 - Collaboration with other university staffs
 - Collaboration with industry
 - Other (Specify)
7. How frequent are workshops being conducted in writing high impact factor journals?
 - Weekly
 - Monthly
 - 2 Months Once
 - Others (Specify)
8. Are the Thomson ISI journal papers related seminars conducted in each RA in UTM?

9. The current incentive/reward scheme for academic staffs and postgraduates fulfilling their effort shown in publishing papers in ISI publications? Are there any plans to increase the incentives/rewards?
10. What is your idea of getting requirements for Tier Type in ISI journal publication as implied by UM since UM is holding the top rank among the RU universities currently.
11. UTM has collaborative programs with universities from US, Japan and etc. So, do UTM take the initiative to get collaboration with these universities to produce high impact factor journals?
12. Postgraduate students can be mobilized for publication. They should produce papers related to the areas of topic for research/dissertation. Is there any requirements for Postgraduate students in publications currently in the UTM policy?
13. A recent count shows 1500 for Indexed Publication (SCOPUS) and 1500 for ISI impact factor as of ISI impact factor, it shows an increment from 1200 as estimated in New Academia book but scored 1500. But for Indexed Publication, was estimated 2500 but only 1500 was accomplished, what are the issues pertaining this unachievable target?
14. MyRA1 --> What is the overall view and also highlights for publication in it?
15. Is there any difference in measuring the promotion criteria among the science/non-science background academic staffs?
16. KPI targets set on scholarly publication are always mutually agreed upon between relevant stakeholders among the top management before applying it officially?
Who are among the stakeholders involved in this activity?
17. Are KPI targets being revised based on changing needs of the university from time to time?
 - Again, who are among the stakeholders involved in this activity?
 - What are the criteria outlined before getting the decision framed?

----THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION----

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS - MIDDLE LEVEL MANAGEMENT

1. According to former VC, Blue Ocean Strategy and Balanced Scorecard are used in UTM to achieve the UTM Global Plan.
Specifically, what are the strategies concerned for publication productivity?
2. What are the limitations identified for current strategies?
3. What are the steps proposed to achieve the strategies imposed?
4. Are there any difficulties identified for implementing the strategies imposed?
 - The cooperation among the academic staffs
 - The timeframe to implement it
 - The requirement is getting more and more though
 - Other(Specify)
5. Does UTM management encourage academic staffs in placing priority on publishing in High Impact Factor journals rather than local journals?
 - Priority is for high impact factor journals only.
 - Local journals are acceptable
 - Both are acceptable
 - Other(Specify)
6. What are the steps taken to embed research culture among the academic staffs?
 - Workshops
 - Seminars
 - Co-authoring with senior staffs
 - Collaboration with other university staffs
 - Collaboration with industry
 - Other(Specify)
7. How frequent are workshops being conducted in writing high impact factor journals?
 - Weekly
 - Monthly
 - 2 Months Once

8. Are the Thomson ISI journal papers related seminars conducted in each RA in UTM?
9. Are KPI targets being revised based on changing needs of the university from time to time?
 - Again, who are among the stakeholders involved in this activity?
 - What are the criteria outlined before getting the decision framed?
10. The current incentive/reward scheme for academic staffs and postgraduates fulfilling their effort shown in publishing papers in ISI publications? Are there any plans to increase the incentives/rewards?
11. What is your idea in getting requirements for Tier Type in ISI journal publication as implied by UM since UM is holding the top rank among the RU universities currently.
12. UTM has collaborative programs with universities from US, Japan and etc. So, do UTM take the initiative to get collaboration with these universities to produce high impact factor journals?
13. Postgraduate students can be mobilized for publication. They should produce papers related to the areas of topic for research/dissertation. Is there any requirements for Postgraduate students in publications currently in the UTM policy?

----THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION----