

**FACTORS TO THE SUCCESSFULNESS OF
CORPORATIZATION**

STUDY CASE OF MARA LINER SDN BHD

MOHD HANIF BIN IBRAHIM

MASTER OF SCIENCE (MANAGEMENT)

UNIVERSITI UTARA MALAYSIA

APRIL 2015

PERMISSION TO USE

This project paper submitted to meet the requirements of a Master of Science Graduation Program Management, Universiti Utara Malaysia (UUM). I agree to allow the Library UUM posting as general reference material. I also agree that any copy of either the whole or part of this project paper for academic purposes is allowed with the permission of the supervisor of the research project paper or Dean Othman Yeop Abdullah Graduate School Of Business, UUM. Any copy or print form for non-academic purposes without prior written permission is strictly prohibited researchers. Statement reference to researchers and authors of this paper and the UUM must specify as a reference of this research paper.

Permission to copy or use this research paper either in whole or in part shall be applied through:

**DEKAN
OTHMAN YEOP ABDULLAH GRADUATE SCHOOL OF BUSINESS
UNIVERSITI UTARA MALAYSIA
06010 SINTOK
KEDAH DARUL AMAN**

ABSTRACT

Kenderaan Bas MARA (KBM) is a government entity that is managed exclusively by the Transport Division of MARA (BKN) is one of the major operators in the transport industry for Malaysia, especially in rural areas. In 2009-2011 KBM suffered significant losses in terms of financial implications of the process of rationalization of diesel subsidy by the government, which is 40% of the cost of operating the Kenderaan Bas MARA (KBM) finally proposed by management MARA to be corporatized. Apart from the limited research conducted in Malaysia to focus on recovery strategies involving the public sector, the aim of this study is to explore the key factors that influence the success of corporatization. For related information, it is done with the interview process to get the required data. The interview is informal and open, and run in a conversational style. It also tries to assess chains factor for the success of the corporatization. This is done by using SPSS from collecting data from internal sources operating employee Kenderaan Bas MARA (KBM), now known as MARA Liner Sdn Bhd (a wholly owned subsidiary MARA).

Keywords: Successful factors; Corporatization Successfulness; MARA Liner corporatization.

ABSTRAK

Kenderaan Bas MARA (KBM) merupakan entiti kerajaan yang diurus secara khusus oleh Bahagian Pengangkutan MARA (BKN) adalah merupakan salah satu daripada pengendali utama dalam industri pengangkutan awam bagi Malaysia khususnya di kawasan luar bandar. Pada tahun 2009-2011 KBM mengalami kerugian yang besar daripada segi kewangan implikasi daripada proses rasionalisasi subsidi diesel oleh kerajaan yang merupakan 40% daripada kos utama operasi Kenderaan Bas MARA, Kenderaan Bas MARA (KBM) akhirnya dicadangkan oleh pengurusan MARA untuk dikorporatkan. Selain daripada kajian terhad dijalankan di Malaysia memfokuskan kepada strategi pemulihan yang melibatkan sektor awam, tujuan kajian ini adalah untuk meneroka faktor-faktor utama yang mempengaruhi kejayaan pengkorporatan tersebut. Bagi mendapatkan maklumat berkaitan, ia dilakukan dengan proses temubual untuk mendapatkan data yang diperlukan. Wawancara itu adalah tidak rasmi dan terbuka, dan dijalankan dalam gaya perbualan. Kajian ini juga cuba menilai rangkaian faktor untuk kejayaan sesuatu pengkorporatan tersebut. Ini dilakukan dengan menggunakan SPSS daripada pengumpulan data daripada sumber dalaman pekerja operasi Kenderaan Bas MARA (KBM) yang kini dikenali sebagai MARA Liner Sdn Bhd (anak syarikat milik penuh MARA)

Kata kunci: Faktor-faktor kejayaan; kejayaan pengkorporatan; pengkorporatan MARA

Liner

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Alhamdulillah, with His grace and mercy, I can prepare a research paper on schedule to meet the requirements for graduation Master of Science in Management.

First of all my heartfelt thanks and appreciation to Mrs. Nor Pujawati Bt Md Said, supervisors paper of this research project which seeks a consistent guide me to solve this challenging task.

Furthermore, I am grateful to the former Director of the MARA Transport Industry, Tuan Hj Ramli Sudin, Chief Operating Officer MARA Liner Sdn Bhd En Zahrail Affenday Bin Mohamed in giving permission to carry out research projects in the company. Not forgetting heartfelt gratitude to the entire staff of MARA Liner Sdn Bhd which has helped me to complete this task.

A million appreciation also to my parent, Hj Ibrahim Taha and Hjh Badariah, who always pray for my success, my wife Mazitah Hamzah, my lovely daughters Putri Nadhirah, Putri Najihah and Putri Nabila that sacrifice a lot for my successfulness during the study period to complete of this thesis.

MOHD HANIF BIN IBRAHIM
810215, MSc

TABLE OF CONTENT

TITLE PAGE	PAGE
CERTIFICATION OF THESIS WORK	
PERMISSION TO USE	iii
ABSTRACT	iv
ABSTRAK	v
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	vi
TABLE OF CONTENTS	vii
LIST OF TABLES	xi
LIST OF FIGURES	xii
CHAPTER ONE - INTRODUCTION	
1.1 Introduction	1
1.2 Background of the Study	6
1.3 Problems Statement	13
1.4 Research Questions	14

1.5	Research Objectives	15
1.6	Significant of the Study	16
1.7	Scope and Limitations of the Study	17
1.8	Organization of Thesis	17

CHAPTER TWO - LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1	Introduction	19
2.2	Corporatization Process	19
2.3	Communication	28
2.4	Engagement	24
2.5	Participation	30
2.6	Rewards	32
2.7	Chapter Summary	35

CHAPTER THREE - METHODOLOGY

3.1	Introduction	36
3.2	Research Framework	36
3.3	Proposition and Hypothesis Development	37
3.4	Research Design	38

3.5	Operational Definition	39
3.6	Instrumentation	40
3.7	Data Collection	40
3.8	Population	41
3.9	Sampling	41
3.10	Data Collection Procedure	42
3.11	Techniques of Data Analysis	42
3.12	Chapter Summary	54

CHAPTER FOUR : FINDINGS

4.1	Introduction	48
4.2	Qualitative Analysis	48
4.2.1	Corporatization Process Success	49
4.2.2	Communication	51
4.2.3	Engagement	53
4.2.4	Participation	56
4.2.5	Reward	58
4.2.6	Change Acceptance	60

4.3	Quantitative Analysis	61
-----	-----------------------	----

4.4	Chapter Summary	66
-----	-----------------	----

CHAPTER FIVE

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1	Introduction	67
-----	--------------	----

5.2	Conclusion on communication & corporatization successfulness	67
-----	--	----

5.3	Conclusion on engagement & corporatization successfulness	68
-----	---	----

5.4	Conclusion on participation & corporatization successfulness	68
-----	--	----

5.5	Conclusion on rewards & corporatization successfulness	68
-----	--	----

5.6	Conclusion on change acceptance & corporatization successfulness	70
-----	---	----

5.7	Recommendation	70
-----	----------------	----

REFERENCES

QUESTIONAIRES

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
Table 3.1 - Total staff by division	41
Table 4.1 - Qualitative Comments on Corporatization Process Success	49
Table 4.2 - Qualitative Comments on Communication	52
Table 4.3 - Qualitative Comments on Engagement	54
Table 4.4 - Qualitative Comments on Participation	56
Table 4.5 - Qualitative Comments on Reward	58
Table 4.6 - Qualitative Comments on Change Acceptance	60
Table 4.7 - Background of Respondents	61
Table 4.8 - Correlation Analysis	63
Table 4.9 - Correlation of Overall Independent Variable and Corporatization Success.	64
Table 4.8 - Correlation of Overall Independent Variable	64
Table 4.10 - Summary of Correlation Analysis	65
Table 4.11 - Regression Analysis	66

LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURE	PAGE
Figure 1.1 - Corporatization and privatization flow	4
Figure 2.1 - Turnaround Process Model	26
Figure 2.2 - Particular romantic relationships between communication	32
Figure 3.1 - Research Framework	36

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 INTRODUCTION

The main objective of a re-engineered is to rebound the firm's decline and return it to positive situation. The turnaround systems have been looked into broadly in the private area as a feature of the organizational study zone. Then, just a few of methods or strategies have been explored in the public sector for this purposed. Public organization traditionally linked with social role in the society and should be interesting to see whether they can make profit at the same time not eliminating the social commitment after corporatized.

The main issue of a turnaround is to end the company from negative condition and change towards positive condition (Hopkin, H.D. p.3). Beerli (2006) states turnaround strategies have been researched widely in the private sector as part of the organizational study area. These types of tactics recently are already examined in the government sector. The goal of corporatization would be to results in different agencies that perform seeing that federal government hyperlink business using preventing under any ministry. Corporatization always given to of alter the particular ordinarily federal government

The contents of
the thesis is for
internal user
only

REFERENCES

- Ahmed, P. K., & Rafiq, M. (2003). Internal marketing issues and challenges. *European Journal of marketing*, 37(9), 1177-1186.
- Aivazian, V., Ge, Y. & Qiu, J.,(2005). Can corporatization improve the performance of state-owned enterprises even without privatization? *Journal of Corporate Finance* 11 (2005) 791– 808
- Allen, K (2011) “Say 'Corporatization,' Not 'Privatization’” <http://www.huffingtonpost.com>
- Andrews, W. A. and Dowling, M. J. (1998). ‘Explaining performance changes in newly privatised firms’. *Journal of Management Studies*, 35, 601–17.
- Baron, A. (2013), What do engagement measures really mean? *Strategic HR review* VOL. 12
- Beeri, I. (2006). Recovering Failing local authorities - Is There a Need for Turnaround Management Strategies?
- Benita Steyn, (2003), From strategy to corporate communication strategy :A conceptualization *Journal of Communication Management* Vol. 8
- Berry, L. L. (1981). The employee as customer. *Journal of Retail Banking*, 3(1), 33-40.

Bert Enserink and JoopKoppenjan. (2007). Public participation in China: sustainable urbanization and governance, *Management of Environmental Quality: An International Journal*, Vol. 18 No. 4 pp. 459-474

Bilodeau, Laurin, Vining (2007) “Choice of Organizational Form Makes a Real difference”: The Impact of corporatization on Government Agencies in Canada *Journal of Public Admin Research and Theory* 17 (1): 119-147.

Boyne, G. (2002). ‘Public and private management. What’s the difference?’ *Journal of Management Studies*, **39**, 1, 97–122.

Boyne, G. (2006). Strategies for public service turnaround: Lessons from the private sector? *Administration and Society*.38:365–88

Buchanan, D.A. and Badham, R. (1999), “Politics and organisational change: the lived experience”, *Human Relations*, Vol. 52 No. 5, pp. 609-29.

Buchanan, D.A. and Boddy, D. (1992), *The Expertise of the Change Agent*, Prentice-Hall,London.

Burbank, R. K. (2005). The classic five-step turnaround process: case study of ProdiGene, Inc. *The Journal of Private Equity*, 8(2), 53-58.

Charbonnier-Voirin, A., El Akremi, A., & Vandenberghe, C. (2010). A multilevel model of transformational leadership and adaptive performance and the moderating role of climate for innovation. *Group & Organization Management*, 35(6), 699-726.

Chilton, Barbara (2010). Employee change readiness and the success of planned change: Pepperdine University, ProQuest, UMI Dissertations Publishing.

David, M. & Sutton C.D. (2004). *Social Research the Basics*. London: SAGE Publications.

Stephen, N. D., & Penman, H. (2001), Ratio Analysis and Equity Valuation: From Research to Practice, *Review of Accounting Studies*, 6, 109–154, 2001

Duncan, T., & Moriarty, S. E. (1998). A communication-based marketing model for managing relationships. *The journal of marketing*, 1-13.

Francis, J. D., & Desai, A. B. (2005). Situational and organizational determinants of turnaround. *Management Decision*, 43(9), 1203-1224.

Ghosn, C. (2002), "Saving the business without losing the company", Harvard Business Review, Vol. 80 No. 1, pp. 37-46.

Glenn A. Bowen, (2009) "Document Analysis as a Qualitative Research Method", Qualitative Research Journal, Vol. 9 Iss: 2, pp.27 – 40

Govindarajulu, N. & Daily, B. F. (2004). Motivating employees for environmental improvement. *Industrial Management & Data Systems*, 104(4), 364-372.

Graeme D. Hutcheson, (2011) "Data coding, management and manipulation", *Journal of Modelling in Management*, Vol. 6 Iss: 1, pp. –

Gurram Gopal, Steve Cline, (2007), "Driving towards sustainable profitability: transportation service providers and customer relationship management", *Supply Chain Management: An International Journal*, Vol. 12 Iss: 2 pp. 85 – 87

Guru Prakash Prabhakar, (2011) "Leading Indian Railways: corporatization initiatives and challenges", *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, Vol. 24 Iss: 3, pp.

H. Donald Hopkins, (2008), "Successful turnaround strategies", *Strategic Direction*, Vol. 24 Iss: 8 pp. 3 – 5

Hart, S.L. and Dowell, G. (2011), "A natural resource-based view of the firm: fifteen years later", *Journal of Management*, Vol. 37 No. 5, pp. 1464-79.

HeeradSabeti (2009) "spotlight on the good economy" *Harvard Business Review*, November 2009 p-99.

John A. Pearce II (2007)“The Value of Corporate Financial Measures in Monitoring downturn and Managing Turnaround: An Exploratory Study” *JOURNAL OF MANAGERIAL ISSUES*, *Vot. XIX Number 2 Summer 2007: 253-270*

JuhaniVaivio, (2008) "Qualitative management accounting research: rationale, pitfalls and potential", *Qualitative Research in Accounting & Management*, Vol. 5 Iss: 1, pp.64 – 86

JyotiChoudrie (2005), Understanding the role of communication and conflict on reengineering team development, *The Journal of Enterprise Information Management*, Vol. 18 No. 1, 2005 pp. 64-78

Kelemen, M., &Papasolomou, I. (2007). Internal marketing: a qualitative study of culture change in the UK banking sector. *Journal of Marketing Management*,23(7-8), 746-768.

Kotter, J. (1995), “Leading change: why transformation efforts fail”, *Harvard Business Review*,Vol. 73 No. 2, pp. 59-67.

Kumar P.S.S. and Srinivasa Krishna K (2010) “Corporate Social Responsibility-Public Sensitivity” *Advance in management*, Vol. 3 (12) Dec. (2010)

Kumar P.S.S. and Srinivasa Krishna K (2010) “Corporate Social Responsibility-Public Sensitivity” *Advance in management*, Vol. 3 (12) Dec. (2010)

Krejcie, R., and Morgan, D. 1970, 'Determining sample size for research activities'.
Educational and Psychological Measurement 30, 607-10

Linstone, H.A. and Mitroff, I.I. (1994), *The Challenges of the 21st Century*, State University of
New York Press, New York, NY.

M. E. Bradbury (1999) Government ownership and financial performance in a competitive
environment: Evidence from the corporatization of the New Zealand Government
Computing Services, ASIA PACIFIC JOURNAL OF MANAGEMENT, VOL. 16, 157-
172

Martins, L. P. (2007).A holistic framework for the strategic management of first tier
managers. *Management decision*, 45(3), 616-641.

Mazlina Mustapha, AyoibChe Ahmad, (2011),"Agency theory and managerial ownership:
evidence from Malaysia", *Managerial Auditing Journal*, Vol. 26 Iss: 5 pp. 419 – 436

McLagan, P.A. (2002), "Success with change", *TpD*, Vol. 56 No. 12, pp. 44-53.

NANDINI GUPTA (2005) Partial Privatization and Firm Performance *The Journal of Finance*
60 (2) , 987–1015

O'Leary, A. (2004). *The Essential Guide to Doing Research*. London: SAGE Publications.

Pearce, J. A. II and D. K. Robbins. (1993). "Toward Improved Theory and Research on Business Turnaround." *Jurnalof Management* 19 (3): 613-636.

Ray Baumruk, (2006), Why managers are crucial to increasing engagement, Melcrum Publishing Ltd

Risher, H. (1999), "Are public employers ready for a 'New Pay' program?", *Public Personnel Management*, Vol. 28 No. 3, pp. 323-43

Robert J. Thomas, Peter Cheese, (2005), "Leadership: experience is the best teacher", *Strategy & Leadership*, Vol. 33 Issue: 3 pp. 24 – 29

Robinson, W.S., & Buntrock, L. M. (2011). Turnaround Necessities. *School Administrator*, 68(3), 22-27.

Ross, Michelle T. Capella (2006). Communication effectiveness: A correlation study between CEO perceived self-effectiveness and subordinate perceived effectiveness. University, ProQuest, UMI Dissertations Publishing.

Sadri, G., Weber, T. J., & Gentry, W. A. (2011). Empathic emotion and leadership performance: An empirical analysis across 38 countries. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 22, 818-830

Schwahn, C. and Spady, W. (1998), "Why change doesn't happen and how to make sure it does", *Educational Leadership*, Vol. 55 No. 7, pp. 45-7.

Shrestha, Tumla (2011). *Industry Perceptions on Reward Issues of Construction Workers to Improve Productivity*. University of Calgary (Canada), ProQuest, UMI Dissertations Publishing. MR81382.

Smith M, Grave C (2005) Corporate turnaround and financial distress, *Managerial Auditing Journal* Vol. 20 No. 3, pp. 304-320

Thomas, R. J., & Cheese, P. (2005). Leadership: Experience is the best teacher. *Strategy & Leadership*, 33(3), 24-29.

Toan Tran, Brian H. Kleiner, (2005),"Managing for excellence in public transportation", *Management Research News*, Vol. 28 Issue: 11 pp. 154 – 163

Wanberg, C.R. and Banas, J.T. (2000), "Predictors and outcomes of openness to changes in a reorganizing workplace", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 85 No. 1, pp. 132-42.

Willems, I., Janvier, R., & Henderickx, E. (2006). New pay in European civil services: is the psychological contract changing?. *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, 19(6), 609-621.

Yukl, G. (1998), *Leadership in Organisations*, Prentice-Hall, Sydney