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ABSTRACT

This thesis reports a study of performance measurement practices in Malaysian public sector. The focus are on to what extent does performance measurement is designed to reflect the strategy and balanced to respond to the needs of multiple stakeholders, how has it been implemented and to what extent has it been used. These variables are then analysed to determine the level of alignment and sustainability of the performance measurement system towards becoming an effective adoption. A survey was conducted to senior civil servants and the result reveals that the design, implementation and use of public sector performance measurement system are moderately well developed, executed and adopted. It also highlights a key implementation issue such as the lack of specific analysis methodology on results. Finally, the result shows that the effectiveness of adoption of PMS is positively and strongly contributed by the extent of user using the performance measurement results, the extent of analysis carried out on the performance measurement results and the degree of balanced KPIs chosen in the design and structure of the performance measurement system.

The study addresses the characteristics related to performance measurement in private as well as in the public sector and then followed by a specific discussion on the balanced scorecard and how it has been adapted into and adopted by public sectors. Then it follows with the survey planning and results discussion. Finally, the conclusion will summarise on the extent of adoption of performance measurement in Malaysian public sector as well as some suggestions on future research focus areas.
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