THE APPLICAE ANCE MEASUREMENT SYSTEM FOR SMALL AND MEDIUM ENTERPRISES IN MALAYSIA

NOR FILIANIE BINTI AZIZ

Thesis submitted in fulfillment of the requirements
for the award of the degree of
Master of Technology Management (Operation Management)

Faculty of Industrial Technology Management
UNIVERSITI MALAYSIA PAHANG

NOVEMBER 2016

TABLE OF CONTENT

DECLARATION

TITLE PAGE

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS ii

ABSTRAK iii

ABSTRACT iv

TABLE OF CONTENT v

LIST OF TABLES ix

LIST OF FIGURES x

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS xi

CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTIO] 1

1.1 Introduction 1

1.2 Background of Study 1

1.3 Problem Statement 2

1.4 Research Question 5

1.5 Research Objective 5

1.6 Research Scope 6

1.7 Significance of Study 6

1.8 Organisation of Study 7

1.9 Research Motivation 8

1.10 Operational Definition 9

CHAPTER 2 LITERATURE REVIEW 11

2.1 Introduction 11

2.2 Small and Medium Enterprises 11

2.2.1 Malaysian SMEs Scenario and Background 13

2.2.2 SMEs Evolution 15

2.3 Performance Measurement 16

2.3.1 Definition of Performance Measurement System 16

2.3.2 Overview of Performance Measurement System 17
2.4 Performance Measurement System Model 18
2.4.1 Theory of Constraints 19
2.4.2 Performance Measurement Matrix 21
2.4.3 Result and Determinant Framework 22
2.4.4 European Foundation for Quality Management Business Excellence 23
2.4.5 SMART Performance Pyramid 25
2.4.6 Balanced Scorecard 26
2.4.7 Integrated Performance Measurement System for Small Firms 29
2.4.8 Integrated Performance Measurement System 29
2.4.9 Integrated Dynamic Performance Measurement System 30
2.4.10 Kanji Business Excellence Model 32
2.4.11 Performance Prism 33
2.4.12 Organizational Performance Measurement 34
2.4.13 Medori and Steeple Framework 35
2.4.14 Dynamic Multidimensional Performance Framework 37
2.4.15 Holistic Performance Management Framework 39
2.5 Performance Measurement System in Small and Medium Enterprises 40
2.6 Criteria of Performance Measurement System 42
2.7 Summary 43

CHAPTER 3 METHODOLOGY **45**

3.1 Introduction 45
3.2 Research Procedure 45
3.3 Data Collection Technique 48
3.4 Experts Panel 49
3.4.1 Respondent Population 50
3.4.2 Sample Size of Respondents 51
3.4.3 Criteria of Respondent 52
3.5 Pilot Study/ Pre- Data Collection 53
3.6 Data Analysis Method 53
3.6.1 Analytic Hierarchy Process 54

3.7 Reliability and Validity 60
3.8 Summary 61

CHAPTER 4 RESULT AND FINDINGS 62

4.1 Introduction 62
4.2 Respondent Demography 62
4.3 Hierarchical Structure 63
4.4 Analysis of Analytic Hierarchy Process 65
4.4.1 Group Decision Making 66
4.4.2 Pair-wise Comparison Matrices 66
4.4.3 Normalized Matrix 77
4.4.4 Priority Vector 86
4.4.5 Overall Priority Vector 98
4.5 Consistency analysis 100
4.6 Summary 101

CHAPTER 5 CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS 103

5.1 Introduction 103
5.2 Discussion 103
5.3 Limitation 107
5.4 Conclusion 107
5.5 Recommendation 108

REFERENCES 111

APPENDIX A 126

APPENDIX B 127

APPENDIX C 154

APPENDIX D 155

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2.1	SME Definition in Terms of Annual Sales Turnover and SME Definition in Terms of Full- Time Employees	11
Table 2.2	SMEs Definition by Size of Operation	12
Table 2.3	The Previous Definition and Effective 1st January 2014 of Malaysian New SMEs Definition	13
Table 2.4	Percentages of Distributions of SMEs by Sector	14
Table 2.5	Performance Measurement System Model	18
Table 2.6	Perspective of Performance Measurement Matrix	21
Table 2.7	Dimension of the Results and Determinants Model	22
Table 2.8	The Six Stage of Plan Outline	36
Table 2.9	The potential Baseline Measures based on Five Dimensions	38
Table 3.1	Schedule of Questionnaire Handed Out	49
Table 3.2	Evaluation Scales of Pairwise Comparison	56
Table 3.3	AHP Reference Conceptually of Criteria for Selecting Alternative	57
Table 3.4	The Random Consistency Index	60
Table 4.1	Respondent Demographic	63
Table 4.2	Conceptually of Criteria for Selecting Alternative	64
Table 4.3	Preference Scale Rating of AHP Questionnaire	66
Table 4.4	Pair-wise Comparison Matrices of Criteria versus Criteria	67
Table 4.5	Pair- wise Comparison Matrices of Alternative versus Alternative (Strategy derived)	68
Table 4.6	Pair- wise Comparison Matrices of Alternative versus Alternative (Alignment operation of strategy vision)	69
Table 4.7	Pair- wise Comparison Matrices of Alternative versus Alternative (Construct purpose/ objective clearly)	69
Table 4.8	Pair- wise Comparison Matrices of Alternative versus Alternative (Stimulate continuous improvement)	70
Table 4.9	Pair- wise Comparison Matrices of Alternative versus Alternative (Relevant and easier maintainable)	71
Table 4.10	Pair- wise Comparison Matrices of Alternative versus Alternative (Provide accurate and faster feedback)	72

Table 4.11	Pair- wise Comparison Matrices of Alternative versus Alternative (Balanced Multi- dimensional)	72
Table 4.12	Pair- wise Comparison Matrices of Alternative versus Alternative Managerial past performance)	73
Table 4.13	Pair- wise Comparison Matrices of Alternative versus Alternative (Planning future performance)	74
Table 4.14	Pair- wise Comparison Matrices of Alternative versus Alternative (Stakeholder consideration)	74
Table 4.15	Pair- wise Comparison Matrices of Alternative versus Alternative (Promote integration)	75
Table 4.16	Pair- wise Comparison Matrices of Alternative versus Alternative (Determinate formulae and source)	76
Table 4.17	Pair- wise Comparison Matrices of Alternative versus Alternative (Easier to understand and develop)	77
Table 4.18	Normalized Matrix of Criterion versus Criteria	78
Table 4.19	Normalized Matrix of Alternative versus Alternative for (Strategy derived)	78
Table 4.20	Normalized Matrix of Alternative versus Alternative for (Alignment operation of strategy vision)	79
Table 4.21	Normalized Matrix of Alternative versus Alternative for (Construct purpose/ objective clearly)	79
Table 4.22	Normalized Matrix of Alternative versus Alternative for (Stimulate continuous improvement)	80
Table 4.23	Normalized Matrix of Alternative versus Alternative for (Relevant and easier maintainable)	81
Table 4.24	Normalized Matrix of Alternative versus Alternative for (Provide accurate and faster feedback)	81
Table 4.25	Normalized Matrix of Alternative versus Alternative for (Balanced / multi-dimensional)	82
Table 4.26	Normalized Matrix of Alternative versus Alternative for (Managerial past performance)	83
Table 4.27	Normalized Matrix of Alternative versus Alternative for (Planning future performance)	83

Table 4.28	Normalized Matrix of Alternative versus Alternative for (Stakeholder consideration)	84
Table 4.29	Normalized Matrix of Alternative versus Alternative for (Promote integration)	85
Table 4.30	Normalized Matrix of Alternative versus Alternative for (Determinate formulae and source)	85
Table 4.31	Normalized Matrix of Alternative versus Alternative for (Easier to understand and develop)	86
Table 4.32	Priority Vector of Criteria	87
Table 4.33	Priority Vector of Alternatives (Strategy Derived)	88
Table 4.34	Priority Vector of Alternative (Alignment Operation of Strategy Vision)	89
Table 4.35	Priority Vector of Alternative (Construct Purpose/ Objective Clearly)	89
Table 4.36	Priority Vector of Alternative (Stimulate Continuous Improvement)	90
Table 4.37	Priority Vector of Alternative (Relevant and Easier Maintainable)	91
Table 4.38	Priority Vector of Alternative (Provide Accurate and Faster Feedback)	92
Table 4.39	Priority Vector of Alternative (Balanced/ Multi-dimensional)	93
Table 4.40	Priority Vector of Alternative (Managerial Past Performance)	93
Table 4.41	Priority Vector of Alternative (Planning Future Performance)	94
Table 4.42	Priority Vector of Alternative (Stakeholder Consideration)	95
Table 4.43	Priority Vector of Alternative (Promote Integration)	96
Table 4.44	Priority Vector of Alternative (Determinate Formulae and Source)	97
Table 4.45	Priority Vector of Alternative (Easier to Understand and Develop)	97
Table 4.46	Analysis of Overall Priorities Vector	99
Table 4.47	Consistency Analysis Alternative versus Alternative based on Criteria's	101

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 3.1	Research Procedure	48
Figure 3.2	Example Contribution of Structure Hierarchy for AHP	55
Figure 4.1	The Hierarchical Structure of Performance Measurement System for Malaysian SME's	64
Figure 4.2	The Graph of Overall Priority Vector	100

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

PMS	Performance Measurement System
SMEs	Small and Medium Enterprises
MPC	Malaysia Productivity Corporation
MCDM	Multi-Criteria Decision Making
MADM	Multi Attribute Decision Method
MODM	Multi Objective Decision Method
AHP	Analytic Hierarchy Process
SD	Strategy Derived
AOSV	Alignment Operation of Strategy Vision
CPOC	Construct Purpose/ Objective Clearly
SCI	Stimulate Continuous Improvement
REM	Relevant and Easier Maintainable
PAFF	Provide Accurate and Faster Feedback
DM-D	Balanced (Multi-Dimensional)
MPF	Managerial Past Performance
PFP	Planning Future Performance
SC	Stakeholder Consideration
PI	Promote Integration
DFS	Determinate Formulae and Source
EUD	Easier to Understand and Develop
TOC	Theory of Constraints
PMM	Performance Measurement Matrix
RDF	Result and Determinant Framework
EFQM	European Foundation for Quality Management
SPMM	SMART Performance Pyramid
BSC	Balanced Scorecard
IPMSSF	Integrated Performance Measurement System for Small Firms
IPMS	Integrated Performance Measurement System
IDPMS	Integrated Dynamic Performance Measurement System
KBEM	Kanji's Business Excellence Model
PP	Performance Prism
OPM	Organizational Performance Measurement
MSF	Medori & Steeple's Framework
DMPF	Dynamic Multi-Dimensional Performance Framework

HPMF	Holistic Performance Measurement Framework
MBEF	Malaysian Business Excellence Framework
GDP	Gross Domestic Product

THE APPLICAE ANCE MEASUREMENT SYSTEM FOR SMALL AND MEDIUM ENTERPRISES IN MALAYSIA

NOR FILIANIE BINTI AZIZ

Thesis submitted in fulfillment of the requirements
for the award of the degree of
Master of Technology Management (Operation Management)

Faculty of Industrial Technology Management
UNIVERSITI MALAYSIA PAHANG

NOVEMBER 2016

ABSTRAK

Pengukuran Pengurusan Prestasi (PPP) dilihat sebagai faktor kejayaan dan kegagalan syarikat; terutama di dalam perniagaan kecil dan sederhana (PKS) dibandingkan dengan perniagaan besar. PPP sebagai sistem penting untuk membangunkan dan mengekal orientasi perniagaan. Peranan PPP dalam PKS adalah berterusan dan bertindakbalas untuk mencapai matlamat. Walau bagaimanapun pengurusan PKS tidak semudah yang dijangkakan; dan PKS boleh gagal dan bankrap dengan mudah. Sementara itu PKS mempunyai potensi untuk meramal kegagalan dan digunakan sebagai panduan untuk mengembangkan syarikat dalam sector PKS. Batasan kedua-dua PKS dan PPP mendorong penyelidik menjalankan kajian ini; dengan tiga objektif kajian telah dibina. Objektifnya adalah untuk menganalisis PPP paling sesuai untuk PKS Malaysia berdasarkan kesesuaian. Oleh itu, kajian ini dijalan untuk mengenalpasti PPP utama yang sedia ada dan untuk menentukan kriteria yang paling berkenaan dengan PPP untuk PKS. Dalam kaedah ini, pengkaji telah menggunakan reka bentuk penyelidikan kuantitatif. Manakala reka bentuk kuantitatif telah dibangunkan dengan menggunakan "Analytic Hierarchy Process (AHP)" sebagai kaedah analysis. Seperti yang dinyatakan, pakar panel telah dipilih daripada pengamal dan ahli akademik dikaitkan dengan PPP dan SME di Malaysia. Hasil dan dapatan menunjukkan Balanced Scorecard (BSC) sebagai kedudukan pertama PPP dalam PKS. Model PPP yang berkaitan dan sesuai telah menunjukkan kepentingan masa depan untuk pembangunan PKS di Malaysia. Pada akhir kajian, penyelidik membuat perbincangan dan kesimpulan; ia juga berkongsi had dan cadangan untuk memperbaiki dan melaksanakan model sesuai yang terbaik dalam PKS di Malaysia, kemudian kepada ahli akademik pada masa depan.

ABSTRACT

The Performance Measurement Systems (PMSs) seen as part of a factor that indicates the successful and un-successful company; especially in the Small and Medium Enterprises (SME's) compared with a large company. PMS is an important tool to develop and maintain the company orientation. The roles of PMSs in the SME's business are continuously and responsiveness to achieve the goals. However SMEs management is not as easy as expected and SMEs can fail and bankrupt easily. Meanwhile, PMSs have the potential to predict failure and used as a guide for the survival of companies in the SME sector. The limitations both of SMEs and PMSs makes researcher interested to conduct this study; with three research objectives was developed. The main objective is to determine most preferred PMSs for Malaysian SMEs based on applicability; thus the study was carried out to identify main existing PMSs and to determine the most applicable criteria of PMSs for SMEs. In the methodology, the researcher was used quantitative research design. Whereas quantitative design had been applied with the Analytic Hierarchy Process (AHP) as method analysis. As pointed, experts panel were selected from practitioners and academicians linked with PMSs and SME's in Malaysia. The result and findings show the Balanced Scorecard (BSC) as first ranked of PMS in SMEs. The relevant and suitable PMS model has been future significance guide for Malaysian SMEs development. At the end of the study, the researcher makes the discussion and conclusion; it is also shared the limitation and recommendation to improve and implement the great suitable model in the Malaysian SME's then to academics in future.

REFERENCES

Abouzeedan. A, and Busler, M. 2006. Information Technology (IT) and Small –Sized Enterprises (SMEs) Management. The concept of 'Firm Impact Sphere', *Global Business Review*, 7: 243

Acaps. 2012. Qualitative and Quantitative Research Techniques for Humanitarian Needs Assessment: An Introductory Brief. 1-14.

Ahmad, N. A. and Seet, P. S. 2009. Dissecting Behaviour Associated with Business Failure: A Qualitative Study of SME Owners in Malaysia and Australia. *Asian Social Science*, Vol.5, No. 9.

Alam, M. N; Jebran, J. K; and Hossain, M. A. 2012. Analytical Hierarchy Process (AHP) Approach on consumer's preferences for selecting telecom operators in Bagladesh. *Information and Knowledge Management*, Vol 2, No.4, p. 7-19.

Amir, A. M., Auzair, S. MD., and Ismail, Z. 2014. Integrated Performance Measurement System in Small and Medium Enterprises: The Role of Leadership and Decision Making Style. *Asian Journal of Accounting and Governance 5*, 47-56.

Andersen, H., Cobbold, L., and Lawrie, G. 2001. Balanced Scorecard implementation in SMEs: reflection in literature and practice. 2GC Conference Paper, 1-12.

Andersen, B. and Aarseth, B. H. W. 2006. Holistic performance management: an integrated framework. *International Journal of Productivityand Performance Management*, 55(1), 61 – 78.

Ansah, R. H., Sorooshian, S. and Mustafa, S. 2015. Analytic Hierarchy Process Decision Making Algorithm. *Global Journal of Pure and Applied Mathematics ISSN 0973 1768*, Volume 11, Number 4 (2015), Pp. 2403-2410.

Bakri, M. M. 2015. *Performance Measurement System in Malaysian Small and Medium Enterprises (SMEs).Malaysia Productivity Corporation*. Interview: 15 May.

Bauml, M. 2014. The impact of strategic performance management on SME performance. Dissertation no. 4326.

Bashirudin, M. 2015. *Performance Measurement System in Malaysian Small and Medium Enterprises (SMEs). SMEs Corporation, Pahang.* Interview: 13 May.

Bayo-Moriones, A., Javier, M. D. d. C., and Sergio, A. E. d. L. 2011. The impact of ISO 9000 and EFQM on the use of flexible work practice. *International Journal Production Economics*, 130, 33-42.

Boerrigter, S. 2015. The use of the sustainability balanced scorecard framework for Dutch SMEs as a tool for measuring the performance of their sustainability strategy. 5th IBA Bachelor Thesis Conference, July 2nd 2015.

Bourne, M., Neely, A., Mills, J., and Plantts, K. 2013. Implementing performance measurement systems: A literature review. *International Journal Business Performance Management*, vol. 5, No. 1, pp. 1-24.

Cabala, P. 2010. Using the Analytic Hierarchy Process in evaluating decision alternatives. *Operations Research and Decision.* No.1, 5-23.

Cassel, A., Windig, J., Nylin, S., and Wiklind, C. 2001. Effects of Population Size and Food stress on fitness- Related characters in the source health, a rare butterfly in Western Europe. *Conservation Biology*, Vol. 15, No. 6, December 2001, pp. 1667-1673.

Caterino, N., Iervolino, I., Manfredi, G., and Cosenzo, E. 2008. A comparative analysis ofdecision making methods for the seismic retrofit of RC buildings. *The 14th World Conference on Earthquake Engineering*, 1-8.

Cengic, M and Fazlic, D. 2008. Balanced scorecard vs. Performance prism, *12th International Research/ Expert Conference "Trends in the Development of Machinery and Associated Technology"*, 1-4

Chavan, M. 2009. The balanced scorecard: A new challenge. *Journal of Management Development*, Vol. 28, No. 5, 2009, pp. 393-406.

Chearskul, P. 2010. An empirical investigation of performance measurement system use and organizational performance. *Dissertation Submitted to The Faculty of The Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University in Partial Fulfillment of The Requirement for The Degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Industrial and Systems Engineering.*

Chen, C. K., Songsithipornchai, S., & Jang, J. Y. 2012. Does Kanji's Business Excellence Model work well? A study from the measurement aspect. *Proceedings of the Asia Pacific Industrial Engineering & Management Systems Conference* 2012, 991-1002.

Chennell, A. F., Dransfield, S. B., Field, J. B., Fisher, N. I., Saunders, I. W., and Shaw, D. E. 2000. OPM: A system for organisational performance measurement. *Presented at "Performance Measurement- Past, Present, and Future", University of Cambridge,* 19-21.

Chmelikova, G. 2013. Performance Factors of Czech Brewing Industry Companies. *ACTA Universitatis Agruculture Et Silviculture Mendelianae Brunensis*, Vol. LXI, No. 2, 353-366.

Cocca, P. and Alberti, M. 2009. A framework to assess performance measurement systems in SMEs. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management* Vol. 59 No. 2, 2010 pp. 186-200

Dato' Sri Mohd Najib, T. A. R. 2015. Ucapan Bajet Tahun 2016, Rang Undang- undang Perbekalan 2016.

David, Medori, Derek, Steeple. 2000. A framework for auditing and enhancing performance measurement systems. *International Journal of Operations & Production Management*, 20(5), 520 – 533.

Dilantai, M. G. S. 2015. Review on the suitability of conceptual performance measurement systems for lean manufacturing. *International Journal of Scientific Engineering and Technology.* Vol. 4, Issue 10, Pp. 498-501.

Dixon, J. R, Nanni, A. J. and Vollmann, T. E. 1990. The new performance Challenge_ Measuring Operation for World Class Competition, Dow Jones- Irwin, Homewood, IL.

Dolalah, D., AL-Oqla, F., and Hayajneh, M. 2010. Application of the Analytic Hierarchy Process (AHP) in Multi- criteria Analysis of the selection of cranes. *Jordan Journal of Mechanical and Industrial Engineering*. Vol. 4, No. 5, 567 578.

Drehman, M. and Nikolaou, K. 2009. Funding liquidity risk definition and measurement. *Working Paper*. Series No. 1024.

Dusanjh, D. 2009. Small and Medium Enterprises (SME) in Malaysia- Overview and Analysis,

Economic Census. 2011. Profile of SMEs, Section III: Special Highlights, SME Annual Report 2011/ 12 National SME Development Council.

Elder, S. 2009. ILO school-to-work transition survey: A methodological guide. *International Labour Office*, ISBN 978-92-2-121419-9.

Fitzgerald, L., Johnston, R., Brignall, T. J., Silvestro, R. and Voss, C. 1991. Performance Measurement in Service Businesses, CIMA, London.

Folan, P. and Browne, J. 2005. A review of performance measurement: towards performance management. Computers in Industry. 56(2005) pp. 663-680.

Frederico and Francisco, G. 2009. The measurement of organizational performance with a focus on stakeholder: A performance prism approach. 011-0471. 1-17.

Frutuoso Braz, R. G., Scavarda, L.F., & Martins, R. A. 2011. Reviewing and improving performance measurement systems: An action research. *Int. J. Production Economics* 133(2011), 751-760.

GAO, 1991. Using Structured Interviewing Techniques, Program Evaluation and Methodology Division, United Stated General Accounting Office. 1-105.

Garengo, P., Biazzo, S., and Bititci, U. S. 2005. Performance measurement systems in SMEs: A review for a research agenda. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 7(1), 25-47.

Giannopoulos, G., Holt, A., Khansalar, E., and Cleanthous, S. 2013. The use of balanced scorecard in small companies. *International Journal of Business and Management,* Vol. 8. No. 14.

Gibson, T. and Vaart, H. J. V. D. 2008. Defining SMEs: A less imperfect way of defining small and medium enterprises in developing countries. *Brookings Global Economy and Development*, 1-29.

Goldratt, E. M., and Fox, R. F. 1986. The Race Croton-on-Hudson, NY: North River Press.

Gomez, J. G., Costa, M. M., and Lorente, A. R. M. 2011. A critical evaluation of the EFQM model. *International Journal of Quality & Reliability Management,* 28(5), 484-502.

Granlund, H. 2012. Measuring effects of strategic utilization of social media in business to- business marketing: Case Green lux Finland. *Master Thesis; Lappeenranta University of Technology.*

Halir, Z. 2012. Different perspectives on business performance and impact on performance system design. *European Financial and Accounting Journal*, Vol. 7, No. 2, Pp. 56-81.

Harrison, J. A., Rourse, P., and Charl, J. 2012. Accountability and performance measurement: A stakeholder perspective. *The Business and EconomicsResearch Journal,* vol. 5, issue. 2, pp. 243-258.

Hashim, H. 2013. Overview of SME sector in Malaysia, Malaysia- India SME Forum, Mandarin Oriental Hotel, 1-56.

Hashim, H. 2014. Developing competitive women- owned SMEs through coordinated programmes, SME Corp. Malaysia.

Hudson, M., Smart, A., & Bourne, M. 2001. Theory and practice in SME performance measurement systems. *International Journal of Operations & Production Management*, 21, 1067-1115.

Ibrahim, M. 2015. *Performance Measurement System in Malaysian Small and Medium Enterprises (SMEs). SMEs Corporation, Terengganu.* Interview: 19 May.

Illmer, S. J. 2011. Success through excellence Illmer investment performance consulting AG. Slide 1.

Ismail, A. W., Zarina, S., and Siti, Z. B. 2008. Budaya keusahawanan Panduan Memulakan Perniagaan. Arah Pendidikan Sdn. Bhd, Selangor. Edition 1.

Jebna, A. K. K. and Baharudin, A. S. 2013. Factor affecting small and medium enterprises success: An exploratory study. *Jurnal Teknologi (Social Sciences)*, 69-72.

Johansson, A. 2013. The Link between Performance Measurement and HRM Systems in SMEs- Using Swedish Case Studies in the Trade Show Industry. *Bachelor Thesis within Business Administration.*

John, D. 2008. Integration: is it the key to effective implementation of the EFQM Excellence Model? *International Journal of Quality & Reliability Management*, 25(4), 383-399.

Jungman, H., Okkonen, J. Rasila, T., and Seppa, M. 2004. Use of Performance in V2C activity. Benchmarking: An International Journal. Vol. 11: Issue. 2: Pp. 175 189.

Kaplan, R.S. & Norton, D.P. 1992. The Balanced Scorecard-measures that drive performance. *Harvard Business Review*, January-February, 71-9.

Kaplan, R.S. and Norton, D.P. 1996. The Balanced Scorecard – Translating Strategy into Action, Harvard Business School Press, Boston, MA.

Karami, A. 2011. Utilization and comparison of multi-attribute decision making and techniques to rank Bayesian network options. *Master Degree Project in Informatics, One Year Level ECTS 30*, 1-51.

Kekkonen, E. 2014. Designing of Balanced Performance Measurement System to Purchasing Process. Master's Thesis, Lappeenranta University of Technology.

Kemmerer, F., and Thiagarajan, S. 1992. "Incentive System" In H. Stolovitch and E. Keeps (Eds.), Handbook of Human Performance Technology: A Comprehensive Guide for Analyzing and Solving Performance Problems in Organizations (pp. 312-330) San Francisco: Jossey- Bass, 1992.

Khalique, M., Md. Isa, A. H., Shaari, J. A. N., and Ageel, A. 2011. Challenges faced by the Small and Medium Enterprises (SMEs) in Malaysia: An intellectual capital perspective. *International Journal of Current Research*, Vol. 33, Issue, 6, pp. 398 401.

Khan, M. W. J. and Khalique, M. 2014. An Overview of Small and Medium Enterprises in Malaysia and Pakistan: Past, Present, and Future Scenario. *Business and Management Horizons,* Vol. 2, No. 2.

Kim, D. Y., Vinod, K., & Steven, A. M. 2010. European foundation for quality management business excellence model. *International Journal of Quality & Reliability Management*, 27, 684-701.

Kurien. G. P, Qureshi. M. N. 2011. Study of performance measurement practices in supply chain management. *International Journal of Business, Management and Social Sciences*, 2(4), 19-34.

Kushnir, K., Mirmulstein, M. L., and Ramalho, R. 2010. Micro, small, and medium enterprises. Around the world: How many are there, and what affects the count? *World Bank/ IFC MSME Country Indicator*, 1-9.

Laitinen, E. K. and Chong, G. 2006. How do Small Companies Measure Their Performance? *Problems and Perspectives in Measurement*, Vol. 4, Issue 3, 49 68.

Langwerden, E. F. 2015. Performance Measurement System Development in SMEs: Testing & Defining the Circular Methodology. *5th IBA Bachelor Thesis Conference, Enscheda, the Netherlands.*

Lascelles, D. and Peacock, R. 1996.Quality in Action: Self Assement for Business Excellence, Berkshire, McGraww-Hill, UK.

Lisiecka, K. and Czyz- Gwiazda, E. 2013. Performance Measurement Models Comparative Review. *Quality Renaissance- Co- creating Viable Future, 57th EOQ Congress*.

Lonbani, M., Sofian, S., Bambang, M., and Barato 2014. Review of using balanced scorecard among SMEs. *International Management Accounting Conference 7,* pg. 1-10.

Maltz A.C, Shenhar A.J and Reilly R.R. 2003. Beyond the balance scorecard: refining the search for organizational success measures. Long Range Planning, 36, 187 204.

Mamman, A., Aminu, K. S., and Adah, A. 2013. Effect of Vertical Integration on Performance of Small and Medium Enterprises (SMEs) in Kaduna State, Nigeria. *International Journal of Accounting, Banking and Management* Vol. 1, No. 2, PP. 14-20.

Martello, M., Watson, J. G., and Fischer, M. J. 2008. Implementing A Balanced Scorecard In A Not- For- Profit. *Organization Journal of Business & Economics Research*. Vol. 6, No. 9, 67-80.

Martinez Lorento, A. R. and Martine z-Costa, M. 2004. "ISO 9000 and TQM: substitutes or complementary". *International of quality and Reliability Management*, Vol. 21, No. 3, pp. 260-276.

Marton, M. and Paulova, I. 2010. Applying the Theory of Constraints in the course of process improvement. *Research papers, Faculty of Materials Science and Technology in Trnava, Slovak University of Technology in Bratislava*. No. 29.

Matlay, H. and Westhead, P. 2005. virtual teams and the rise of e-entrepreneurship in Europe, *International Small Business Journal*, Vol. 23(3): 279-302.

McLEOD, J. 2001. Qualitative Research in Counselling and Psychotherapy, London: Sage Publication.

Metawie, M. and Gilman, M. 2005. Problem with the implementation of performance measurement systems in the public sector where performance is linked to pay: A literature review drawn from the UK. *3rd Conference on Performance Measurements and Management Control.*

Meyer, M. W. 2002. Rethinking performance measurement: Beyond the balanced scorecard, in Cambridge University Press, pp. 81-113.

M.Go, F., and Robert, G. 2000. Integrated quality management for tourist destination: a European perspective on achieving competitiveness. Tourism Management, 21, 79-88.

Mohammad, F. A. 2012. Sizing Up Manufacturing SMEs- Definitional Implications. *Journal of Statistical Modelling and Analytics*, Vol. 3, No. 1, 37-45.

Mohd Harif, M. A. A., Osman, H. and Chee. H. H. 2010. Financial Management Practices: An In- Depth Study among the CEOs of Small and Medium Enterprises (SME's). *International Review Business Research Papers*, Vol. 6, No. 6. Pp. 13 35.

Moullin, M. 2002. Delivering Excellence in Health and Social Care. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Moullin, M. 2003. 'Defining performance measurement', in perspectives on performance, 2(2):3

Mu, E., Wormer, S. Barkon, B., Foizey, R., and Vehec, M. 2009. A case study of using AHP Group Decision Making for ePortfolio Selection. *Proceeding of the International Symposium on the Analytic Hierarchy Process.*

Muhammad Jamil, C. Z., and Mohamed R. 2011. Performance measurement system (PMS) in small medium enterprise (SMES): A practical modified framework. *World Journal of Social Sciences.* 1(3).200-212.

Najib, M. 2014. Message from YAB Prime Minister, SME Annual Report 2013/14, 2 3.

National Economic Advisory Council. 2010. New economic model for Malaysia part 1: strategic policy directions.

Naude, D. 2007. The degree of organisational performance measurement in SMEs- A focus on ICT enterprises. Research Report 7079-238-0, 1-107.

Nawi, D. M. 2015. *Performance Measurement System in Malaysian Small and Medium Enterprises (SMEs).Pejabat Wilayah Timur Perbadanan Usahawan Nasional Berhad.* Interview: 13 May.

Neely, A., Adams, C., & Kennerley, M. 2002. The performance prism: The scorecard formeasuring and managing business success. *Cranfield School of Management*, 377 pages, 1-13.

Neely, A., Gregory, M., and Plantts, Ken. 1995. Performance measurement system design; a literature review and research agenda. *International Journal of Operations and Production Management*, vol. 15, issue. 4, pp. 80-116.

Nieminen, J. 2014. Using Theory of Constraints to increase control in a complex manufacturing environment- Case CandyCo: Make-to-Stock production with a broad product offering and hundreds of components. *Department of Information and Service Economy Aalto University School of Business.*

Onwumere, J. 2000. The nature and relevance of SMEs in Economic Development. *Journal of the Institute of Bankers of Nigeria*, p. 14.

Olve. N. And Wetter, M. 1999. Performance Drivers: A Practical Guide to using Balance Scorecard, John Wiley and Sons, New York. NY.

Pavlov, A., Bourne, M. 2011. Explaining the effects of performance measurement on performance, *International Journal of Operations & Production Management*, 31(1), 101 – 122

Powell, D. and Netland, T. 2010. Towards an Integrated Performance Measurement System for Cellular Manufacturing: Insights from the Case of Volvo Aero Norway. *POMS 21st Annual Conference, Vancouver Abstract Number* 015 0158.

Radcliffe, L. L. and Schniederjans, M. J. 2003. Trust evaluation: an AHP and multi objective programming approach. *Management Decision*, Vol.41, Iss. 6, Pp. 587 595.

Ratte, S. 2015. SME's and Growth: Challenges and Winning Strategies. *Business Development Bank of Canada*, Pp. 1-27.

Rompho, N. 2011. Why the Balanced Scorecard Fails in SME's: A Case Study. *International Journal of Business and Management*, Vol. 6, No.11, 39-46.

Salem, M. A., Hasnan, N., & Osman, N.H. 2012. Balanced scorecard: Weaknesses, strengths, and its ability as performance management system versus other performance management system. *Journal of Environment and Earth Science*, Vol 2, No.9, 1-10.

Salloum, M. 2010. Towards dynamic performance measurement systems. Master Thesis Work, Innovation and Product Realization 30HP, advanced level.

Saaty, T. L. and Ozdemir, M. S. 2015. How many judges should there be in a group? Ann. Data. Sci.

Sato, Y. 2003. Questionnaire design for survey research. Employing weighting method ISAHP 2005, Honolulu, Hawaii, July 8-10, 2003.

Saunila, M. and Ukko, J. 2013. Facilitating innovation capability through performance measurement, a study of Finnish SMEs. *Management Research Review*, Vol. 36 No. 10, 2013, pp. 991-1010.

Sehra, S. K., Brar, Y. S., and Kaur, N. 2012. Multi criteria decision making approach for selecting effort estimation model. *International Journal of Computer Application*, Vol.39, No.1, 1-8.

Self, J. and Tolsor, D. 2008. Successfully implementing the balanced scorecard. Library Assessment Conference Seattle, WA.

Simsit, Z. T., Gunay, N. S., and Vayvay. O. 2014. Theory of Constraints: A Literature Review. *Procedia- Social and Behavioural Sciences 150* (2014) 930-936.

Sin, K. C. 2010. The Success of Malaysian SMEs in Promoting and Penetrating Global Markets through Business Competitiveness Strategies. *Asian Research Centre, CBS, Copenhagen Papers* 2010-33

SME annual report. 2013/14. Success Stories. 98-112

SME annual report. 2013/14. Chapter 1: The Malaysian Economy. 7-14

SME Corp. Malaysia. 2013. Guideline for new SME definition. Secretariat to the National SME Development Council. 1-12.

Sorooshian, S. 2014. Study on Unbalanceness of the Balanced Scorecard, *Applied Mathematical Sciences*, Vol. 8, 2014, no.84, 4163-4169.

Sorooshian, S. and Anvari, A. 2012. Performance Analysis: lack of Research in Asian Small and Medium Enterprise Sector, *Advances in Asian Social Science*, 1(3):312.

Srdevic, Z. Blagojevic, B. and Srdevic, B. 2011. AHP based Group Decision Making in Ranking Loan Applicants for Purchasing Irrigation Equipment: A case study. *Bulgarism Journal of Agricultural Science*, 17 (No 4) 2011, 531-543.

Sriwidadi, T. 2012. Integrated Performance Measurement System for SME and Management Control System.

Stefanescu, D. and Silivestru, M. 2012. Balanced Scorecard instrument of strategic planning. Romanian Statistical Review. 2/ 2012, 24-39.

Striteska, M., and Spickova, M. 2012. Review and comparison of performance measurement systems, *Journal of Organizational Management Studies*, 2012(2012), 1-12.

Suprapto, B., Wahab, H. A., Wibowo, A. J. 2009. The implementation of balanced score card for performance measurement in small and medium enterprises: Evidence from Malaysia health care service. *The Asian Journal of Management*, Vol.2, No.2, 37-49

Susilawati, A., Tan, J., Bell, D., and Sarwar, M. 2013. Develop a framework of performance measurement and improvement system for lean manufacturing activity. *International Journal of Lean Thinking*. Vol. 4, Issue 1.

Taha, R. A. and Daim, T. 2013. Multi- criteria application in renewable energy analysis, a literature review. *Research and Technology Management in the Electricity Industry, Green Energy and Technology*. 17- 30.

Tangen. S. 2004. Performance measurement: from philosophy to practice. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, 53(8), 726 – 737.

Taticchi, P. and Balachandran, K.R. 2008. Forward performance measurement and management frameworks. *International Journal of Accounting Information Management*, 16 (2), 104-154.

Taticchi, P., Tonelli, F., and Cagnozzo, L. 2010. Performance measurement and management: A literature review and a research agenda. *Measuring Business Excellence*, Vol. 14, No. 1 2010, pp. 4-18.

Taticchi, P., Cagnazzo, L., and Botarelli, M. 2008. Performance Measurement and Management (PMM) for SMEs: A literature review and a reference framework for PMM design. *POMS 19th Annual Conference La Jolla, California, U. S. A*, 008-0321.

Tewksbury, R. 2009. Qualitative versus Quantitative Methods: Understanding why qualitative methods are superior for criminology and criminal justice. *Journal of Theoretical and Philosophical Criminology*, Vol. 1 (1) 2009.

The European Foundation for Quality Management (EFQM). 1996. Self-Assessment 1996 Guidelines, EFQM, Brussels, Belgium.

The European Foundation for Quality Management (EFQM). 1999. The Case Study of European Communication S.S, EFQM, Brusseles, Belgium.

The European Foundation for Quality Management (EFQM). 1999. Broucher of European Foundation for Quality Management 2001 [online], EFQM, Brusseles, Belgium.

Thomson, S. B. 2011. Sample size and grounded theory. *JOAAG*, Vol. 5, No.1

Ucal, I. and Oztayze, B. 2009. ANP in performance measurement and its application in a manufacturing system. *Proceeding of the International Symposium on the Analytic Hierarchy Process*, 1-8.

Ukko, J., Tenhunen, J. and Rantanen, H. 2008. "The impacts of performance measurement on the quality of working life", *International Journal Business Performance Management*, Vol. 10 No. 1, pp. 86-98.

Ustun, P. 2010. Application of the Theory of Constraints to an elective course registration system. *A thesis submitted to the graduate school of social sciences of Middle East technical university*, 96 pages.

Vansteenbrugge, C. 2014. The use of performance measurement system to realize strategic alignment within the business architecture. *Thesis Presented to Obtain the Degree of Master of Science in Business Economics, Faculty of Economics and Business Administration, Ghent University.*

Volmohammadi, C. and Servati, A. 2011. Performance measurement system implementation using balanced scorecard and statistical methods. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, Vol. 60, No. 5, 2011, pp. 493-511.

Watts, T. and McNair-Connolly, C. J. 2012. New performance measurement and management control systems. *Journal of Applied Accounting Research*, 13 (3), 226-241

Williamsburg. 2007. The Analytic Hierarchy Process Methodologies and application with customers and management at blue cross blue shield of Florida. *The 19th International Symposium on QFD*, P. 137-149

Wu, D. 2009. Measuring performance in small and medium enterprises in the information & communication technology industries. *A Thesis Submitted in Fulfilment of the Requirements for the Degree of Doctorate of Philosophy*, 1 209.

Wong, J. K. W and Li, H. 2006. Application of the analytic process (AHP) in multi criteria analysis of the selection of intelligent building systems. *Science direct*, 1-18

Wong, Kuek, and Ong. 2013. Strategic planning and business performance. A study of SMEs in Malaysia. *Proceeding of 3rd Asian Pacific business research conference* 25-26 February 2013, KL, Malaysia 1-12

Wongrassamee, S., Gardiner, P. D., and Simmons, J. E. L. 2003. Performance measurement tools: the Balanced Scorecard and the EFQM Excellence Model. Measuring Business Excellence, 7(1), 14-29.

Yadav, N., Sushil, and Sagar, M. 2013. Performance measurement and management frameworks research trends of the last two decades. *Business Process Management Journal*, Vol. 19, No. 6, Pp. 947-970.

Yang, J. and Lee, H. 1997. An AHP decision model for facility location selection. Facilities, Vol. 15, No. 9/10, Pp. 241-254.

Yunoh, M. N. M. and Ali, K. A. M. 2015. Total quality management approach for Malaysia SMEs: Conceptual framework. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*. Vol. 6, No. 1.

Zamani, R. and Yousefi, P. 2013. Optimal decision making approach for selecting effort estimation model. *International Journal of Machine Learning and Computing*, Vol.3, No.4, 1-

Zeglat, D., AlRawabdeh, W., Almadi, F., and Shrafat, F. 2012. Performance Measurement Systems: Stages of Development Leading to Success. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business*. Vol. 4, No. 7.