A Study on the Perception of Community College Report Card by Employee

Shah Rol Hussain [1] and Marhaini Marhamin [2]
[1]Polytechnic Tuanku Sultanah Bahiyah, Ministry of Higher Education Malaysia
[2]Kuantan Community College, Ministry of Higher Education Malaysia

Abstract: College Community Report Card (CCRC) was launched by Community College Department in 2013, which functions to monitor the performance of Community College (CC). Nevertheless, some CC did not manage to pass and meet the criteria set to achieve the topline key performance indicator in CCRC. Thus, the aim of this study is to identify the perception of employees toward the implementation of CCRC. Factors like management support and reward were analyzed in this paper to unveil whether each of these variables perceived by employees as an important factor in the implementation of CCRC. A total of 370 respondents from Pioneering CC submitted questionnaires distributed to them, and only 346 samples were used after discarding 24 incomplete data. Two techniques of analysis were used in this paper, namely descriptive analysis and frequency analysis. Findings showed that management support and reward are perceived as high response elements among the employees. These results indicate that CC leverages the implementation of CCRC. In order to minimize the effect of several issues in this study, recommendation to improve them (CCRC) is highlighted.

<u>Key words:</u> *Perception, Community College Report Card, Employee, Management Support, Reward*

INTRODUCTION

Generally, a good performance measurement system may lead to performance improvement [1]. Recognizing this potential demand, in 2013, Community College Department (hereinafter referred to as JPKK), the Ministry of Education of Malaysia, launched a new strategy to strengthen the Community College (hereinafter refered to as CC) across the country known as "College Community Empowerment Program". Throughout this program, JPKK implemented CCRC as a tool to measure the performance of CC [2]. CCRC performance evaluation is based upon the capability and capacity which are categorized into four groups, namely: a Pioneering CC, Junior CC 1, Junior CC 2 and Buds CC. Evaluation is carried out twice a year [3]. It consists of six cores followed by topline key performance indicators (KPI) in which each CC is obliged to accomplish a specific target [2]. In order to focus on a specific dimension in this survey, this paper only choose the Pioneering CC. It consists of 29 colleges in Malaysia. Table 1 shows

six cores and topline KPI which have to be achieved by these colleges.

Table 1: A list of Six Cores and Topline KPI at CC

No	Core	Topline KPI
1	Empower Life-long Learning Aspect	Implement short courses to the local community
2	Mainstream and expand access to Technical and Vocational Education and Training (TVET)	Number of courses The Malaysian Qualifications Agency (MQA) Recognition [4], total student enrolment, and tournament award.
3	Improve organizational effectiveness	Institutions image based on student enrollment and the number of community taking part of the course offered. Student marketability and administrative efficiency, and star rating
4	Increase the capacity and competitiveness of the community	The number of students who take part in the program of entrepreneurial culture
5	Strengthen strategic alliances with industry	Number of agencies that collaborate with CC for mutual benefit

Corresponding Author: Shah Rol Hussain, Jabatan Perdagangan, Politeknik Tuanku Sultanah Bahiyah, Hi-Tech Park, 09000, Kulim, Kedah. 0129539448 / 044033333

	partners and agencies	
6	Increase the capacity and talent	Enhance and preserve the quality of human capital

Performance analysis on CCRC against Pioneering CC in 2013 showed that only 9 out of 29 colleges in this category have managed to pass and met the set standards, while the remaining colleges did not [5]. If these colleges cannot accomplish the minimum requirement set by CCRC, they will considered as not outstanding CC. In the long run, the possibility for these organizations to reach the vision to be champion technical and vocational education and training and become a Hub for life-leaning by 2015 will be interfered [6]. Yee-Ching and Chan [7] highlighted that employees play a significant role to carry out the measurement tool successfully. Hrebiniak [8] also argued that employees are the implementers of organizational strategy developed by their top management. Employees determine the company's performance [9]. Without them, the organizations may have significant disruptive consequences [10]. However, their study did not focus on employees' perceptions of RC. Meanwhile, this paper will focus on this issue. On top of that, there is a shortage of discussion concerning how employees look at the RC as a performance measurement and management system, and its implementation. That is why; this study attempts to fill the gap in the literature by exploring this topic by looking at the employees' perception through some case studies by considering two following parts: 1) Management support, 2) Reward.

The remainder of this paper will provide an overview of the RC as a strategic performance management model, highlight previous studies concerning its implementation and implications on organizational performance, and focus on discussion from previous papers that explore and examine issues related to the perception of CCRC from the employees.

Research Objectives
The objectives of this research are to identify the perception of employees on management support and reward towards the implementation of CCRC.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Report Card and Empirical Studies.
An "organizational report card" refers to a regular effort by an organization to collect data on two or more other organizations, transform the data to assess performance, and transmit the information to an external audience [11]. From 1845 until today, there have been many studies concerning RC. Initially, a uniform test to elementary school students was conducted to measure

performance [11]. In terms of academic, RC can measure the student performance as well [12]. Also, RCs enable performance measurement system to be more effective for local government [13]. However, based on a finding from [14], RCs are still causing some administrative challenges on how RCs can be an integral part of providing, measuring, and reporting quality of service. Despite this voluminous body of literature, there is a lack of studies exploring factors affecting employees' perception on RC, which is considered as a tool for measure organizational performance related to management practices and employees' involvement [15].

Factor Affecting the RC Implementation Process
RC is a tool to measure organizational performance. It transforms the data to assess performance [16]. In so doing, it is important to understand what are the factors affecting the implementation process of performance management system like RC. Management support is considered as a sufficient factor in achieving successful performance [17]. They contribute to the process of strategic change and the achievement of organizational performance [18] because leaders seek to make effective organizational change [19]. Barnett and Storey [20] added that support from top management should be on going and delivered in a practical manner. Such support can then be transformed into concerted effort that will contribute to the success of RC implementation. The greater extent of funding support by middle management, the better employees consider the organization as strong in terms of leadership [21].

Another significant issue in the implementation of RC is to understand employees' perception towards organizational reward system. As argued by Ittner, Larcker, and Meyer [22], the organizational performance will improve when there are an allocation for performance bonus and right measurement. Private sector scores well on creativity around benefits, but public organization are quickly catching up in developing total rewards [23]. One factor that appears to influence employee attitudes is the perception of the benefits offered by the organization [24]. Employees perceived reward to be their rights that are owned to them by the company. They will not committed to organizational goal if their organizations do not treat them well [25].

Significance of Employee in the Implementation of RC
RC is useful for everyone in the organization [26]. Employees are recognized as the most significant asset to ensure that the organization will achieve its vision. If they are not trained the with the performance system, the target will be difficult to accomplish [27]. If employees have a positive perception and involvement in the

organization, their performance will be positive [15]. In order to be able to achieve high performance in the organization, every employee must think smarter, rather than simply work harder [28].

METHODOLOGY

This research focuses on top and middle management level and lecturer from Pioneering CC in Malaysia. Only Higher Education Officer (PPPT) under DH scheme will be chosen. We use considerable sampling strategy, which involves 1960 employees under DH scheme [29]. A total of 370 respondents submitted the questionnaire, however only 346 samples were used for the analysis, after discarding 24 incomplete questionnaires. In this research, the appropriate sampling strategy to be used is probability sampling or cluster sampling. Barron [30] stated that probability sampling is a method of survey sampling which selects some groups defined by area of residence, organizational membership, or other characteristics. With cluster sampling, we divide the population into a separate category known as a cluster. Thereafter, a simple random sample of clusters is chosen from the population. Analysis is conducted on data of sampled clusters. Each participant in the select cluster has the same chance to become a respondent for this research. Table 2 outlines a guide to the different minimum sample sizes needed for different sizes of population given a 95% confidence level for different margins of error.

Table 3.2: Table for Determining Sample Size from a Given Population. Sources: Krejcie & Morgan [31]

Population	Margin of error			
	5%	3%	2%	1%
500	217	340	414	475
750	254	440	571	696
1000	278	516	706	906
2000	322	696	1091	1655
5000	357	879	1622	3288

The most significant facet of a probability sample is the representation the select population. Researchers normally work up to a 95% degree of certainty. To meet this percentage, this paper selected 370 respondents from participating 29 CC. The number of respondents should reach 322 people, as recommended by Krejcie & Morgan [31].

Questionnaires are divided into two sections. In Section One, items concerning respondents' gender, age, highest education level, position, and length of employment were selected to be included in the demographic factors (i.e. correspondents' profile). Meanwhile, Section Two focused on two factors influencing the overall perception of employees towards CCRC. There are 20 questions in this Section. Questionaire items for this study emulate those developed by [1]. We modified the questions a little bit for the purpose of compliance with this study. Basically, respondents were required to indicate their answer based on 5-point likert scale ranging from "strongly disagree" (1) to strongly agree (5). The Cronbach's alpha for each section in the survey instrument was measured with the use of Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS) version 22.0 and all of them scored above 0.889. The ideal Cronbach Alpha coefficient of a scale should be above 0.70 as this indicates high internal consistency [32-33]. Besides, this paper used two techniques of analysis in these tests, namely descriptive analysis and frequency analysis.

RESULT

Descriptive Analysis: Analysis of Respondents Profile
The analysis of respondens profile has shown that the majority of respondents work at middle management (88.2%) and the rest are top management (11.8%). Almost one third (26.6%) of the respondent has master education and above and majority have a degree and below (73.4%). This percentage is considered as normal and reasonable because the top management has a limited position in organization compare to middle management [34]. More than half of the respondents were female (65.9%) and the rest are male (34.1%). In terms of age and length of employment, more response were received from the younger cohort (34 years old and below; 56.4%) and the senior (35 years old and above) cohort were reported as 43.6%. The majority of them have eight years or less of working experience (57.2%) and for the nine year and above equal to 42.8%.

Frequency Analysis: Management Support
The majority of respondents agree that management was highly involved (87.5%) in implementing the CCRC as well as formulating its target (87.3%). The finding also shows that respondents very agreed that management already increased the tendency of employees to participate in achieving the KPI (88.1%) and to motivate them seriously (85.9%). In order to make sure the successful implementation of CCRC, employees showed a high rate of agreement concerning management's support to CCRC initiative (84.4%) and management's strong leadership commitment to employees (85.5%). Other items which received high percentage of agreement from respondents of this study are management's commitment to provide all required resources to implement CCRC system (81.7%) and effective steps undertaken by the management to demonstrate their support (81.2%). When asked about the communication aspect, more than half of

respondents (75.7%) agreed that management communicates CCRCS clearly and concisely to employees. However, 16.8% were not sure and 2.3% disagreed. To achieve the CCRC target, training is considered as an important aspect for employee. 70.6% of respondents agreed that the management is committed to providing training for them, while some 10.4% disagreed and 19.1% were not sure. Moreover, the "mean" score for communications aspect and providing training by management received the lowest scores within the range 3.78 to 3.85, whereas other aspects got 4.0 and above. Respondents from a previous study conducted by Ayoup et al. [1] perceived a low level of management commitment and leadership in the implementation of the Balance Score Card in Malaysia GLCs. This is in contrast with the finding in this study. However, there is a similarity between this paper and that findings that is respondents' opinion that the management involved in setting the BSC target.

Frequency Analysis: Reward
As outlined in findings, it has reported that 76.0% of respondents agreed that their performance were determined by achieving the KPI as set in the CCRC. They also realized that reward and compensation are important for their performance (68.5%). However, 21.4% respondents were not sure and 10.1% respondents disagreed with this statement. About 73.4% agreed that CCRC affects reward and compensation, which eventually will increase their productivity. More than half of respondents agreed with the statement that reward package make them feel motivated to be better in achieving good results in the CCRC (69.7%) and 72.9% respondents agree that they are stimulated to improve performance through the CCRC. Moreover, 66.7% respondents expressed their satisfaction with the CCRC feedbacks given by their superiors, whereas 25.1% were not sure and 8.1% disagreed. Two-third (65.6%) of respondents agreed that the information in a CCRC influenced their reward. They agreed with the statement that they do not consider the CCRC as a threat for their reward (61.0%). By contrast, 24.9% respondents considered CCRC as a threat and 14.2% respondents disagreed. On top of that, the data reveals that more than half of the respondents (57.8%) agreed that their CCRC-related jobs are in line with the reward. Meanwhile, only 26.6% of them were not sure about it. Regarding time to complete assigned CCRC tasks, 58.7% agreed that they have enough time. The remaining 25.7% respondents were not sure and 15.6% respondents disagreed. It can be concluded from the data some respondents thought that they did not have enough time to perform their tasks because they have to complete some KPIs simultaneously. Other respondents considered CCRC as a threat for their reward. Meanwhile, the question regarding the relation among CCRC, reward, and respondents' job scope received

moderate response from respondents. Based on findings above, the overall mean score for this section was moderate, within the range 3.50 to 3.88. No item scores more than 4.0.

DISCUSSION

Employees Perception on the Implementation of CCRC
In order to identify the perception of employees on the factors influencing the implementation of CCRC, brief and precise findings in relation to this factor are elaborated in the section. The factors are management support and reward

Management Support
It was revealed that management support is vital for the successful implementation of CCRC. It was considered as the factor of success [17]. As a result, this part received positive perception and considered as the highest mean score of both factors in this paper. Management has highly involved and motivate employees to participate in achieving KPI seriously by demonstrating a strong leadership commitment during the implementation of CCRC.

However, due to the limitation of study, it can be argued that there is still a bit unclarity about several things on this matter. There is a lack of proper communication between management, JPKK, and employees regarding CCRC. About 7.5% respondents disagreed that management communicates clearly and concisely to them about CCRC and 16.8% of them were not sure. The management might think that they already gave their best efforts to communicate how the system work to employees as clearly as possible. However, that is not what employees believe [1]. In terms of trainings, some respondents expressed their agreement by giving a moderate score to measure on the level of management committed to provide training. A total of 9.4% respondents disagrees and 19.1% were not sure. Given these percentage, issues on lacking of communications and the needs of trainings must be addressed in order to ensure the proper implementation of CCRC. Clear communications will improve employees' perception of their management [35].

Reward
Based on findings, more than two-third (69.7%) of respondents shared the same opinion that reward package provided in the CC system will motivate them to perform better in achieving good results in the implementation of CCRC. However, there is still an unclear relation between CCRC and reward, which also relates to the communications issue [1]. Consequently, nearly 40% of respondents considered CCRC as a threat for their reward. As mentioned in early stage of this

paper, CCRC has six KPIs to achieve. In this regard, some respondents expressed their feelings they did not have sufficient time to perform their tasks related to CCRC because the same person has many positions in different organizations. They consider this as burdens. With regards to compensation, generally, employees agreed that reward can increase their productivity pertinent to the implementation of CCRC. This opinion bears a similarity with the previous study showing that reward can increase employees' productivity [36].

LIMITATION AND RECOMMENDATION FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

There are some limitations in this study which can be analyzed through future researches on the same topic. First, participants of this study belong to only one category of CC (Pioneering CC). Thus, generalization of this result to all CCs in implementing CCRC should be done cautiously. In addition, it is difficult to generalize results from a single research site. Bearing in mind this study limitation, this paper recommend that a comparative study among four categories of CC (Pioneering CC, Junior CC 1, Junior CC 2 and Buds CC) is conducted for the further studies. Collecting a large body of research and richer source of data will enrich the generality of outcomes. Another limitation is the fact that only two independent variables, namely management support and reward were used in this current study. During the process of conducting this research, this research found that "communications", CCRC education and understanding of employees and organizational culture were considered as an essential factor affecting employees' perception, particularly in the implementation of CCRC. Therefore, this paper propose those factors can be included in future studies.

CONCLUSION

In summary, the current study is conducted to investigate employees' perception of CCRC. There are two objectives proposed in this research. Both of them are attainable. Main findings of this study are shown that management support and reward are perceived as an important factor in the implementation of CCRC. This study also provides some suggestions to address the issues mentioned in the beginning of this research. The limitation and recommendation for further research are discussed as well.

REFERENCES

[1] Ayoup, H., Omar, N. H., & Rahman, I. K. A. (2010). Implementation of Balanced Scorecard (BSC) in a Malaysian GLC : Perceptions of Middle Managers. *Asia-Pasific Management Accounting Journal*, 100-126.

[2] Ahmad, Z., Zulkifli, R., Mohd Nor, N., & Abdul Jalil, C. F. (2012). *Pemerkasaan Kolej Komuniti 2013-2015.* Putrajaya: Percetakan Nasional Malaysia Berhad.

[3] *Annual Report 2013.(2013).* Putrajaya: Jabatan Pengajian Kolej Komuniti.

[4] *Malaysian Qualifications Agency*. (2015). Retrieved April 15, 2015, from *http://www.mqa.gov.my*

[5] *CCRC Achievement Analysis 2013.* (2014). Bahagian Dasar. Putrajaya: Jabatan Pengajian Kolej Komuniti

[6] *Community College Report Card (CCRC).* (2015, March 14). Retrieved March 14, 2015, from http://online.jpkk.edu.my/eccrc/login/default.asp

[7] Yee-Ching & Chan, L. (2004). Performance Measurement and Adoption of Balanced Scorecard; A survey of Municipal Governments in the USA and Canada . *The International Jurnal of Public Sector Management; Vol 17 No 3*, 204 - 221.

[8] Hrebiniak, L. G. (2008). *Making Strategy Work. Leading Effective Execution and Change,* New Jersey: Pearson Education.

[9] Ginsburg, L. S. (2003). Factors that Influence Line Managers' Perceptions of Hospital Performance Data. *HSR: Health Services Research 38:1*, 261 - 286.

[10] Shi, W., Markoczy, L., & Dess, G. G. (2009). The Role of Middle Management in the Strategy Process: Group Affiliation, Structural Holes, and Tertius Iungens. *Journal of Management*, *35*, 1453–1480. doi:10.1177/0149206309346338

[11] Gormley, W. T., & Weimer, D. (1999). *Organizational Report Cards.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

[12] Friedman, S. J., & Frisbie, D. A. (1995). The Influence of Report Cards on the Validity of Grades Reported to Parents. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*. doi:10.1177/0013164495055001001

[13] Heritage, C. (1997). *Issues Report Card Good Governance*. *The Urban Governance Initiative (TUGI)*. Retrieved from www.gdvc.org/heritage/tugi-culturalheritage.pdf

[14] Joyce, S. (1996). *Doctors give report cards low marks, but who's grading whom?* Physician's Pract[14] Joyce, S. (1996). *Doctors give report cards low marks, but who's grading whom?* Physician's Practice Digest.

[15] Baharin, N. L. (2011) *The Impact of Management Practices and Employee Involvement on Organization Financial Performance: The Cases of GLCs in Malaysia.* Masters thesis, Universiti Utara Malaysia. Malaysia

[16] Gormley, W. T. (2003). Using Organizational Report Cards. *National Public management research Conference*

[17] Young, R., & Poon, S. (2013). Top Management Support - Almost Always Necessaryand sometimes Sufficient for Success: Finding from a Fuzzy Set Analysis. *International Journal of Project Management*, 943-957.

[18] Hornsby, J. S., Kuratko, D. F., & Zahra, S. A. (2002). Middle Managers' perception of the Interval Environment for Corporate Entrepreneurship: Assessing a Measurement Scale. *Journal of business Venturing 17*, 253 - 273.

[19] Academic Medicine Gets a Poor Report Card - What Are We Going To Do? (2002, October). *Academic Medicine vol 77*, pp. 1062 - 1066.

[20] Barnett, E., & Storey, J. (2000). Knowledge Management Initiatives: Learning From Failure. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 145 - 156.

[21] Sakilarides, S. (2012). *Effects of Middle Management Support for Improvement on Perceived Organizational Performance Capabilities.* Retrieved from http://scholarworks.sjsu.edu/etd_theses/4170

[22] Ittner, C. D., Larcker, D. F., & Meyer, M. W. (1997). Performance, Compensation and Balanced Scorecard. Working Paper. University of Pennsylvania.

[23] Total Reward - Public V. Private: Perks Aren't so Private. (2007). Employee Benefits, Retrieved from http://search.proquest.com/docview/224687961?accountid=27932

[24] Balkin, D. B., & Griffeth, R. W. (1993). The determinants of employee benefits satisfaction. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, *7*(3), 323–339. doi:10.1007/BF01015758

[25] Weathington, B. L., & Tetrick, L. E. (2000). Compensation or right : An analysis of employee " fringe " benefit perception. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, *12*, 142–162. doi:10.1023/a:1011153710102

[26] Cynthia, S., & Miles, S. (1997). The risk report card : A risk management tool at Freddie Mac. *TMA Jurnal*, *17*(3), 26. Retrieved from http://search.proquest.com/docview/225978034?accounid=27932

[27] Ahmad, R., & Bujang, S. (2013). Issues and Challenges in the Practice of Performance Appraisal Activities in the 21 st Century . *International Journal of Education and Research*, *1*(4), 1–8.

[28] Robson, I. (2005). Implementing a performance measurement system capable of creating a culture of high performance. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, *54*(2), 137–145. doi:10.1108/17410400510576621

[29] *Laporan Pengisian Jawatan Kolej Komuniti Induk.* (2015). Bahagian Khidmat Pengurusan, Jabatan Pengajian Kolej Komuniti.

[30] Barron, L. (2006). *The Sage Dictionary of Social Research Methods,* London: Sage. 163-164. Doi:10.4135/9780857020116

[31] Krejcie, R. V, & Morgan, D. W. (1970). Determining sample size for research activities. *Education and Psychological Measurement*, *30*, 607–610. doi:10.1177/001316447003000308

[32] Hair, J., Money A., Samouel, P., & Page, M. (2007*). Research Methods for Business*. England: John Wiley

[33] Pallant, J. (2005). *SPSS Survival Manual: A Step-by-Step Guide to Data Analysis Using Spss for Windows (2nd ed.).* Berkshire, England: McGraw-Hill.

[34] *Community College Information Collection.* (2013). Putrajaya: Jabatan Pengajian Kolej Komuniti.

[35] Hancott, D. E. (2005). The Relationship between Transformational Leadership and Organizational Performance in the Largest Public Companies in Canada (3159704). Available from ABI/INFORM Complete; ProQuest Central; ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (305357835). Retrieved from http://search.proquest.com/docview/305357835?accountid=27932

[36] Wasiu, B. O., & Adebajo, A. A. (2014). Reward System and Employees Performance in Lagos State (A Study of Selected Public Secondary Schools). Kuwait Chapter of the Arabian. *Jurnal of Business and Management Review*, *3*(8), 14–29. Retrieved from http://search.proquest.com/docview/1527308089?accountid=27932