

7	Organisational Structure	100%	4.74	Strategic Management
8	Delivery Assess	97%	4.74	Core Function
9	Resources Utilization	100%	4.71	Core Function
10	Mass Production	94%	4.71	Core Function
11	Strategy Formulation	100%	4.68	Strategic Management
12	Vision Development	82%	4.41	Strategic Management
13	Educational and Training	100%	4.06	Support Elemental
14	Operation Excellence	97%	4.03	Support Elemental
15	Significant Improvement	100%	4.00	Support Elemental
16	Human Resource Competencies	97%	4.00	Support Elemental
17	Competitive Aggressiveness	97%	3.97	Core Function
18	Sales and Marketing Orientation	82%	3.88	Core Function
19	Quality Assess	85%	3.85	Core Function
20	Efficiency Level	82%	3.85	Core Function
21	Leadership Proficiency	85%	3.82	Strategic Management
22	Customer Orientation	82%	3.82	Core Function

The ten most significant indicators of the SME business performance were ‘Process Orientation’, ‘Time Utilization’, ‘Strategic Partner Relationship’, ‘Financial Management’, ‘Future Excellence’, ‘Government Program Support’, ‘Organisational Structure’, ‘Delivery Assess’, ‘Resources Utilization’, ‘Mass Production’, respectively. One of the most interesting insights that emerged from these findings was the relative importance of not just the individual ranked indicators, but that of the indicators from which SME strategic activities themselves. Of the three strategic activities, core function is the most domain activities, followed by support elemental, and strategic management perspective.

4.3. Consensus levels

As indicated by Von Der Gracht (2012), the determination of agreement by level of agreement is notably significant if ordinal data, for example, the utilized of Likert scales for the level of understanding, as embraced in the present study. The consensus was considered achieved when the level of concession on a practice turns out to be majority, that is, more noteworthy than half (Olawale & Sun, 2015). Table 5 demonstrated the change of consensus between Delphi Round 1 and Delphi Round 2.

Table 5: Improvement of Consensus between the Delphi Rounds

Level of Agreement Amongst Experts	Number of Indicators	
	Delphi Round 1	Delphi Round 2
<50%	-	-
50%- 60%	4	4(included 1†)
60%- 70%	4	5
70%- 80%	4	0
80%- 90%	5	6
>90%	10	16 (including 3†)
Total number of indicators	N=27	N=31(including 4†)
Kendall's Coefficient of Concordance	W=0.428	W=0.602

†New indicator(s). The Kendall's Coefficient of Concordance was calculated based on $N = 27$ for both rounds.

After just two rounds of Delphi process, consensus is achieved as prescribed by panels. It is a decent sign that all the selected indicators were pertinent in tending to the issue that disclosed in this study. Moreover, a literature review was conducted for developing a structured questionnaire to replace the typical Round 1 survey. Thus, a two-round modified Delphi survey technique was acceptable. It was consistent with study of Sheng-Hshung Tsaur et. Al (2016). Therefore, after the second round, the cycle was discontinued as there would be no further advantage obtained from more Delphi rounds because of consensus have achieved. Moreover, the Kendall's coefficient of concordance, W was positively significant ($p < 0.05$) and increased from .428 in the first round to .602 in the second round. The interpretation of the Kendall's coefficient of concordance, W is based on the guidelines of Schmidt (1997) as indicated in Table 6. This outcome indicates that the significance of the selected indicators was not particularly disputable.

Table 6: Interpretation of the Kendall's Coefficient of Concordance, W (Schmidt, 1997)

W	Interpretation	Confidence in ranks
0.1	Very weak agreement	None
0.3	Weak agreement	Low
0.5	Moderate agreement	Fair
0.7	Strong agreement	High
0.9	Unusually strong agreement	Very high

Despite the fact that the outcome demonstrates the moderate-to-strong level of consensus ($W = 0.602$, $p < 0.05$) reached by the Delphi panel lists, in any case, it was not the consequences of sharp disagreements over the positioning of the indicators. Indeed, to achieved the Kendall's coefficient of concordance, W more than 0.9 is rarely in consensus study (Schmidt, 1997). To iterate, the current study was planned to limit to two circles of the Delphi process exclusively. Thus, the achievement by moderate-to-strong level of consensus has provided a rational degree of confidence in the outcomes of the present study. It was consistent with the works of Pierre, Cassivi, and Chalabi (2012) who also found the moderate-to-strong level of consensus ($W = 0.615$, $p < 0.05$) in their Delphi study to identify the most prominent IT project management resources and capacities.

5. Results

In fact, there have many methods, approaches, and systems to enable organization to access their performance in order to improve. But, are all these tools available for SMEs? Will the result be normal and accurate when using one or multiple tools? Does the enterprise have someone who specializes in using such tools or strategies? Therefore, this paper describes the establishment of a relevant performance indicator list using the practical method of Delphi Method as shown in Table 7. To get the right indicators, the first recognition process is to get the right people to engage with the study. Who is the right person? The right person is the person who not only has deep knowledge in an activity, but also has clear knowledge about the organization (Muehlen & Recker, 2013).

Table 7: The List of Relevant Performance Indicator for SMEs.

Perspectives	Performance Indicators
SMEs Strategic Management	Leadership Proficiency
	Strategy Formation
	Vision Development
	Future Excellence
	Organizational Structure
SMEs Core Function	Customer Orientation
	Mass production
	Strategic Partner Relationship
	Resources Utilization
	Process-Orientation

	Quality Assess
	Competitive Aggressiveness
	Delivery Assess
	Efficiency Level
	Marketing Competencies
SMEs Support Elemental	Financial Management
	Time Utilization
	Human Resource Competencies
	Educational and Training
	Significant Improvement
	Government Program Support
	Operation Excellence

This is a specially designed framework by combining and arranging the best knowledge of performance measurement based on past literature and those twenty-two indicators has been confirmed by panel of experts in Malaysia. The SME's strategic activities performance indicators framework has been set up to allow SME to assess their company's performance through a proper process and thus facilitate them to develop for the future. Furthermore, this model can also be used as a reference to build a set of plans that include useful activity activities that can improve the company's performance, according to the predetermined rules. Which is important comes first. The relevant list of performance indicator was built using the Delphi method using expertise and knowledge from thirty-seven Malaysian experts representing SME's organization. This Delphi method has been made two rounds to identify the importance of performance indicators, and to prioritize the critical indicators according to perspectives of strategic activities.

6. Conclusion

This study has provided to the existing state of the art linked to converging the function and application of performance measurement based on strategic activities making them well balanced operate through the betterment process. To get extends on this, this task utilized the Delphi method, which is more useful in interactional data assortment approach and concentrating on Malaysian SME business. The list contributes a performance indicator involving the flow of strategic activities and practical point of view through the three important stages of activities. The current study employ of Malaysian experts is because of the curiosity to know the viewpoint from businesses activating in a growing nation.

Through our experience, working with Malaysian experts in the field of SMEs, they provide a clear view of the industry practically, which may be viewpoints in developing countries may differ from developed countries due to social behavior, industry or basic economic aspects. However, whether the study explorations in Malaysia take place in different countries or in cross-border businesses need to subsist further examined as this framework does not take into account global policy.

Further verification in real firms is highly suggested, as the verification process takes a considerable amount of time to assess and attainability of firms willing to allow researchers to study and evaluate their business performance. Based on our experience, two weeks are required to conduct an analysis and firms need to have sufficient records for their business dealings to prove the activity is genuineness in line with the requirements of model implementation.

Like other studies, this study also has some limitation. First, this model was built in Malaysia with Malaysian experts. The valid result if business organizations outside Malaysia apply this local model is unknown. Second, only twenty-seven indicators are taken into account in this study because of the limitation of time to implement it if more indicators and models are included. More performance indicators may be required to provide more suggestions to panel of experts and to support enhance confidence in the model. The last limitation is about interesting area for future investigations; to review the performance indicators based on the strategic activities of SMEs from developed

countries. This model was developed due to prior work in performance measurement models were made for any type of organization. An important contribution in this study is the combination of previous performance indicators with an appropriate approach to build business performance indicators framework by following the flow of strategic activities or business processes such the executives can determine the action plan for development. Therefore, this framework can be used as a reference tool to determine improvements to achieve higher business performance.

Acknowledgement

The author would like to thank all the experts involved in the two stages of the study and the Prince Sultan University for sponsoring this research.

References

- Bulger, Sean M., and Lynn D. Housner. *Modified Delphi investigation of exercise science in physical education teacher education*. Journal of Teaching in Physical Education 26.1 (2007): 57-80.
- Uphoff, E. P. M. M., Wennekes, L., Punt, C. J. A., Grol, R. P. T. M., Wollersheim, H. C. H., Hermens, R. P. M. G., & Ottevanger, P. B. (2012). *Development of generic quality indicators for patient-centered cancer care by using a RAND modified Delphi method*. Cancer Nursing, 35(1), 29-37. doi: 10.1097/NCC.0b013e318210e3a2
- Wilson, S., Hauck, Y., Bremner, A., & Finn, J. (2012). *Quality nursing care in Australian paediatric hospitals: a Delphi approach to identifying indicators*. Journal of Clinical Nursing, 21(11/12), 1594-1605. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2702.2011.04004.x
- Ruth Jiang, Robin Kleer, Frank T. Piller (2017). *Predicting the future of additive manufacturing: A Delphi study on economic and societal implications of 3D printing for 2030*. Journal of Technological Forecasting & Social Change 117, 84–97. Doi:10.1016/j.techfore.2017.01.006
- Heap-Yih Chong, Chee Kheng Oon, (2016). *A practical approach in clarifying legal drafting: Delphi and case study in Malaysia*, Engineering, Construction and Architectural Management, Vol. 23 Issue: 5, pp.610-621, doi: 10.1108/ECAM-04-2015-0059
- HOLLANDER, M., WOLFE, D. A. & CHICKEN, E. 2013. *Nonparametric statistical methods*, John Wiley & Sons.
- Đỗ Thị Ngọc Quyên (2014) *Developing university governance indicators and their weighting system using a modified Delphi method*. Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences 141, 828 – 833, doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.05.144
- Heiko A. von der Gracht. *Consensus measurement in Delphi studies (2012). Review and implications for future quality assurance* Journal of Technology Forecasting & Social Change 70, 1525-1536, doi:10.1016/j.techfore.2012.04.013
- GEORGE, D. & MALLERY, P. 2010. *SPSS for Windows step by step. A simple study guide and reference* (10. Baskı). Boston, MA: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Sheng-Hshiang Tsaor, Chang-Hua Yen & Pi-Shen Ku (2016): *An evaluation framework for the sustainable operation of leisure farms*, Leisure Studies, DOI: 10.1080/02614367.2016.1246589
- SME CORPORATION, M. 2013. *Annual Report 2012/2013*. SME Corp. Malaysia
- Ian Dallas and Moe Thandar Wynn (2014), *Business Process Management in Small Business: A Case Study*, Journal of Information Systems for Small and Medium-sized Enterprises, Progress in IS, Doi: 10.1007/978-3-642-38244-4_2
- Linstone, H. A., & Turroff, M. (2002). *The Delphi method: Techniques and Applications* H. A. Linstone (Ed.) Retrieved from <http://is.njit.edu/pubs/delphibook/>

- Boulkedid, R., Abdoul, H., Loustau, M., Sibony, O., & Alberti, C. (2011). *Using and Reporting the Delphi Method for Selecting Healthcare Quality Indicators: A Systematic Review*. PLoS ONE, 6(6), 1-9. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0020476.
- Hasson F, Keeney S, McKenna H. (2000). *Research Guidelines for the Delphi survey technique*, Journal of Advanced Nursing 32 (4), 1008-1015, Doi:10.1046/j.1365-2648.2000.t01-1-01567.x
- Olawale, Y., & Sun, M. (2015). *Construction project control in the UK: current practice, existing problems and recommendations for future improvement*. International Journal of Project Management, 33(3), 623-637. DOI: 10.1016/j.ijproman.2014.10.003
- Roy C. Schmidt (1997). *Managing Delphi Surveys Using Nonparametric Statistical Techniques*. Journal of Decision Sciences 28(3), 763-774. DOI: 10.1111/j.1540-5915.1997.tb01330.x
- Pierre Hadaya, Luc Cassivi, Chahinaze Chalabi (2012). *IT project management resources and capabilities: a Delphi study*. International Journal of managing Projects in Business, Vol.5 Issue 2, 216-229. DOI: 10.1108/17538371211214914
- Michael Zur Muehlen, Jan Recker (2013) *How much language is enough? Theoretical and practical use of the business process modelling notation*. Seminal Contributions to Information Systems Engineering 429-443 Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg
- Bjørn Andersen Bjørnar Henriksen Wenche Aarseth, (2006). *Holistic performance management: an integrated framework*. International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management, Vol. 55 Iss 1, pp. 61 – 78. DOI: 10.1108/17410400610635507
- European Quality Award Model (1989), Policy Document, Montreux, 19 October 1989, European Foundation for Quality Management, Brussels, available at: www.efqm.org.
- Sushil (2010). *Flexible strategy game-card*, Global Journal of Flexible Systems Management, Vol. 11 Nos 1/2, pp. 3-4.
- Neetu Yadav Sushil - Mahim Sagar (2015). *Modeling strategic performance management of automobile manufacturing enterprises*, Journal of Modelling in Management, Vol. 10 Iss 2 pp. 198 - 225. DOI: 10.1108/JM2-12-2012-0041
- Kaplan and Norton's. *The Balanced Scorecard – Measures that Drive Performance*. HBR, Jan/Feb 1992.
- Rampersad, H.K. (2003) *Total Performance Scorecard; Redefining Management to Achieve Performance with Integrity*, Butterworth Heinemann Business Books, Elsevier Science, Massachusetts
- Anca Șerban, & Oana Dumitrașcu, Sea - *Practical Application of Science*, Volume I, Issue 1 (1), 2013
- Zahidy, A. H., Azizan, N. A. & Sorooshian, S. 2018. *A Methodology Review: Investigation of Entrepreneurship Success*. *Calitatea*, 19, 82-91.

Biographies

Nor Mahirah Mustapha is Ph.D of Management, Universiti Malaysia Pahang. She Masters in Business Administration (Executive) from Universiti Malaysia Pahang. She has published journal and conference papers.

Shahryar Sorooshian is PhD of industrial engineering; he is currently with School of Business Economics and Law, University of Gothenburg. He published many journals, books and conference papers. He is an accredited management consultant.

Noor Azlinna Azizan is PhD of finance and currently a Professor of finance and entrepreneurship at College of Business Administration, Prince Sultan University in Saudi Arabia. She has published many journals, books and conference papers.