HUMAN CAPİTAL ANALYSIS AT SME DEVELOPMENT AGENCY IN MALAYSIA: SKILLS, KNOWLEDGE, ATTITUDE, AND PERFORMANCE (SKAP) PERSPECTIVES

Lokman Effendi Ramli[1]
AAhad M. Osman-Gani[2]

Abstract
The vision of one of the prominent SME development agency in Malaysia is to become a premier organization in developing local SMEs to grow to be more innovative, resilient, and competitive to compete locally and globally. To achieve these, the agency had conducted an assessment exercise identifying the current levels of SKAP. This paper is to highlight the findings of this study which conducted from November 2011 to February 2012. The study uses the technique of 360° Assessment Feedback and the survey approach to collect the required data and analyzed by using AHP technique.

Keywords: Skills, Knowledge, Attitude, Performance, 360° Assessment Feedback, AHP

Introduction

In 2004, the Government of Malaysia established National small and medium enterprise (SME) Development Council (NSDC), which is the highest policy-making body in formulating the strategies for SME development across all economic sectors. NSDC is also responsible task coordination among related Ministries and Agencies, partnership development among public and private sectors, as well as for ensuring effective implementation of the overall SME development programs in Malaysia.

In 2007, the NSDC decided to appoint a single dedicated agency to formulate the overall policies and strategies for SMEs, and to coordinate programs across all related Ministries and Agencies. As a result, one of the prominent agencies was established on 2nd October 2009, under the Small and Medium Enterprises Corporation Malaysia Act 1995, to look after the development of SME in Malaysia. The vision of this agency is to become a premier organization in developing the SMEs for being competitive, innovative, resilient, and be able to compete locally and globally. By doing so, SMEs would be able to enhance wealth creation and social well-being of the nation (SME Corp., 2012).

In order to achieve this vision, the agency executed several strategies by stages. The strategies are based on three (3) strategic thrusts:

    i.   Strengthening the enabling infrastructure:
        Formulate, enact, review, revisit and amend current guidelines, standards, requirements, incentives and activities related to SMEs and entrepreneurs.

---

[1] Graduate School of Management, IIU, Malaysia.
Email:lerzlokman@gmail.com
[2] Faculty of Economics & Management Sciences, IIU, Malaysia.
Email: aosmangani@gmail.com

ii. Building the capacity and capability of domestic SMEs:
Formulate and introduce policies and programs in order to enhance the knowledge, skills and ability of SMEs and their employees towards improving their performance, for sustaining growth and competitiveness.

iii. Enhancing access to financing by SMEs:
Formulate and introduce policies and programs to ensure adequate access in financing the support for growth and development of SMEs across all sectors (SME Corp. 2012).

The agency believes that the human capital is the most important element for this organization in order to achieve its goals. Due to this, the agency has taken pro-active approach to assess and analyze "Where They Are?" from SKAP perspectives in identifying the possible areas for growth and achieve sustainable advantage.

Objectives

The main objectives of this study were:

i. To identify human capital capabilities from SKAP perspectives and rank employees within the divisions.
ii. To assess the current level of SKAP among middle management employees.
iii. To propose the recommendations to the agency towards sustainable improvement.
iv.

Significance of the study

Findings of this study will provide significant inputs for the agency in the following ways. The management of organization will be able to:
i. Measure the individual level of SKAP and produce intra-division ranking.
ii. Identify the strength and shortcomings among management personnel for each division based on SKAP assessment.
iii. Recommend human capital enhancement/development area to the agency for sustainable improvement.

Review of Literature

During the Conference of the U.S. Office of Personnel Management (OPM) National Performance Management in 1995, a psychologist's research team from the Naval Air Warfare Center (NAWC) Training Systems Division in Orlando, Florida, described their investigation concerning how teams or organizations grow to be effective. They have further specifically discussed the knowledge requirements, skill dimensions, and attitudinal factors that prevalent for effective teamwork and organization. The findings are illustrated below:
Skills

Skills are defined as expertness, practiced ability and facility in doing something (Glendon & McKenna, 2010) Skill is more than just the following of rule-based actions. However, in the absence of knowledge and attitudes, a "skilled" person may have no ability or capacity to react to situations outside the normal condition.

The NAWC has developed the following list of skills that characterize effective teams or organization. Members of effective team or employees of effective organization should have ability to:

    i.   Assess and monitor the performance of the team/organization or other members/employees;
    ii.   Be flexible and adapt rapidly to events;
    iii.   Step in to correct and/or strengthen the actions of others;
    iv.   Exchange complete, timely, and accurate information;
    v.   Encourage and build the morale of other team members;
    vi.   Resolve conflicts with mutual satisfaction;
    vii.   Express themselves clearly and appropriately to others;
    viii.   Plan, cooperate, and share in approaches to solving problems; and
    ix.   See problems or issues in their context and be sensitive to the environment of the situation.

Knowledge

Drucker (1977) and Toffler (1990) chose to equate knowledge to information, and used the terms interchangeably. Other scholars like Nonaka and Takeuchi (1995), argued that knowledge has two components namely, explicit knowledge and tacit knowledge. In the latter sense, knowledge can appear to edge into the areas of skills and attitudes. Normally, employees will accumulate knowledge through formal and informal leanings, trainings and experiences.

In terms of knowledge, NAWC (1995), believe that members of effective team or employees of dynamic organizations should:

    i.   Possess knowledge of the team's or organization's mission, objectives, norms, and resources;
    ii.   Understand the task and the indicators of what needs to be done;
    iii.   Understand the logical order to perform tasks;
    iv.   Agree on a logical way for dividing tasks;
    v.   Understand how to perform specific tasks;
    vi.   Know their role in exchanging information, handing off tasks, and other interaction patterns;
    vii.   Have accurate knowledge and a realistic assessment of the problem to be solved; and
    viii.   Understand various teamwork skills that members need to be effective.

Attitude

Attitude defines as a learned tendency to act in a consistent way to a particular object or situation (Fishbein & Ajzan, 1975). Attitudes have affective, cognitive and behavioral intention components. A competent person must have the capacity to sense and recognize a situation, the tendency to act in a controlled and predictable manner and an ability to be consistent in acting in a manner relevant to the situation. Attitudes can be changed through persuasion as well as a response to communication. According to NAWC (1995), such attitudes can be nurtured and developed. Members of effective teams or employees of effective organization should also have:

    i.   A team orientation, where thinking of teams is a natural way to approach issues;

   ii.   A shared vision where there is an agreement on what is the ideal state;

  iii.   Team or organization cohesion, with a strong sense of the collective "we";

  iv.   Mutual trust and confidence in each other's integrity, loyalty, and character; and

   v.   Trust in the teams or organizations collective effectiveness.

Performance

Performance or job performance is considering one of the most the most important construct in industrial and organizational (I/O) psychology and human capital management (HCM). Campbell (1990) proposed a general model of individual differences in performance, which became very influential in I/O and HCM later on.

In his model, Campbell (1990) differentiated performance components, determinants of job performance components and predictors of these determinants. Campbell describes the performance components as a function of three determinants (1) declarative knowledge, (2) procedural knowledge and skills, and (3) motivation.

According to Campbell (1990), declarative knowledge includes knowledge about facts, principles, goals, and the self. It is assumed a function of a person's abilities, personality, interests, education, training, experience, and aptitude-treatment interactions. Then, procedural knowledge and skills include cognitive and psychomotor skills, physical skill, self-management skill, and interpersonal skill. Finally, Motivation comprises choice to perform, level of effort, and persistence of effort

Measuring organization performance is very crucial for achieving organizational goals. Kaplan and Anderson (2007) introduced balanced scorecard tools to measure individual and organization performance. Regarding this matter, agency should identify a set of objective indicators that help in measuring the performance as accurately as possible. According Herman and Rentz (1998), mission statement and a strategic plan usually used to measure organizational performance in balanced scorecard. However, in this study, individual job performances of respondents are measured by using agency's standard annual appraisal form, which was completed by their immediate superiors.

Methodology

Respondents

The target respondents for this study were a group of 94 middle management employees working in four main divisions. The organization had identified the respondents earlier before the study had taken place.

Data Collection

A survey was conducted in November 2011. This survey study used the technique of 360° Assessment Feedback, whereby the questionnaire was divided into three set (self-assessment, peers-evaluation and superior-evaluation).

The questionnaire's set number 1, (self-assessment form), was answered individually by each respondents, which consists of two sections. (A and B). Respondents have to declare their personnel information such as gender, age, level of education, and working experiences in

Section A, while in Section B they have to answer a set of questions that adapted from previous research, These areas reflects the expert usage of measuring employee's skills and attitude.

The questionnaire set number 2 (peers-evaluation form) was answered individually by selected respondents which were identified earlier by the agency as peers evaluation. Here, skills and attitude were measured from the peers' perspectives.

Finally, the questionnaire set number 3 (superior evaluation form) was also answered individually by immediate supervisor or head of division to measure skills and attitude of their subordinates.

Personal administration procedure was used to conduct the survey. A group of employee was brief about the objectives of the survey and the method to answer the questionnaire accordingly. The completed questionnaires then were collected and checked for its' consistency. Then the valid completed questionnaires were compute and analyzed using the AHP technique.

Analytic Hierarchy Process (AHP)

AHP is the most useful technique, where teams of people especially those with high stakes, solve complex problems that involve human perceptions and judgments, which the resolutions would have long-term repercussions (Bushan & Kanwal, 2004). Decision situations to which the AHP can be applied that include (Forman, Ernest & Saul, 2001):

i.   Choice - The selection of one alternative from a given set of alternatives, usually where there are multiple decision criteria involved.
ii. Ranking - Putting a set of alternatives in order from most to least desirable
iii. Prioritization - Determining the relative merit of members of a set of alternatives, as opposed to selecting a single one or merely ranking them
iv. Resource allocation - Apportioning resources among a set of alternatives
v.   Benchmarking - Comparing the processes in one's own organization with those of other best-of-breed organizations
vi. Quality management - Dealing with the multidimensional aspects of quality and quality improvement
vii. Conflict resolution - Settling disputes between parties with apparently incompatible goals or position. (Saaty, 2008)

The applications of AHP to complex decision situations have numbered in the thousands, (Steigue, Duberstein & Lopes, 2003) and have produced extensive results in problems, involving planning, resource allocation, priority setting, and selection among alternatives. Other areas have included forecasting, total quality management, business process re-engineering, quality function deployment, and the balanced scorecard. Many AHP applications are hardly reported to the world at large, because they take place at high levels of large organizations where security and privacy considerations prohibit their disclosure (Saaty, 2008).

In order to produce the systematic intra-division outputs as mentioned as above, a SKAP weighted (AHP Master Weighted) was calculated based on AHP technique. The AHP Master Weighted is shown as below:

Table 1: AHP Master Weighted

	Performance [0.328] (%) W	Knowledge [0.121] Level W	Experience 1 [0.073] Years W	Experience 2 [0.035] Years W	Experience 3 [0.035] Years W	Experience 4 [0.020] Years W	Skill [0.157] Cat. W	Attitude [0.231] Cat. W
Excellent (Exc.)	85-100 0.153	PhD 0.061	> 15 0.034	> 15 0.016	> 15 0.016	0.009	Exc. 0.077 85-100	Exc. 0.114 85-100
Above Average (AA)	75 to <85 0.087	M/B 0.031	>10 to 15 0.020	>5 to 10 0.009	>5 to 10 0.009	>5 to 10 0.005	AA 0.040 70 to <85	AA 0.059 70 to <85
Average (A)	65 to <75 0.047	B/Dip. 0.016	>5 to 10 0.010	>5 to 10 0.005	>5 to 10 0.005	>5 to 10 0.003	A 0.022 55 to <70	A 0.032 55 to <70
Below Average (B)	55 to <65 0.025	Dip. 0.008	2 to 5 0.006	2 to 5 0.003	2 to 5 0.003	2 to 5 0.002	BA 0.011 40 to <55	BA 0.002 40 to <55
Poor (P)	<55 0.016	Oth. 0.005	< 2 0.003	< 2 0.002	< 2 0.002	< 2 0.001	P 0.007 <40	P 0.010 <40

Results and Discussion

The respondents identified by organization were from management level group, that in the composition of Senior Managers, Managers, Assistant Managers, Senior Executive and Executive. The total numbers of the target respondents involved 10 persons from Economic Planning Division (EP), 27 persons from Business Development Division (BD), 13 persons from Coordination Division (C) and 44 persons from Business Support Division (BS).

The respond rates by divisions are varied. All respondents (100%) in EP and BD took part in the survey, however for C and BS, only 9 (69.2%) and 27 (61.4 %) respondents participated. Since one of the goals of this assignment is to identify human capital capability from SKAP perspectives and the division ranked of employees; by using 360° Degree Assessment Feedback, it is found that the actual intra-division ranking is inclusively appropriate, if 100% of the target respondents took part in the survey at their respective division. Due to these circumstances, only EP and BD were available for intra-division ranking. As a result, the next discussion will focus only on the findings of EP and BD.

In terms of the respondent's gender at EP, were 60% (6) females and 40% (4) males. However, at BD, 71% (17) were females and males respondents were only 29% (7).

The respondent's education background at EP shows that 20% (2) of them were master degree holders, 40% (4) bachelor holders and the remaining 40% (4) were diploma holders. At BD, 83% (20) respondents have bachelor degree and the rest 17% (4) are diploma holder.

Further, for the age item, at EP 10% (1) was below 30 years, 70% (7) were between 30 to 40 year olds and 20% (2) were 40 year olds and above. Whereby, at BD, 17% (4) were below 30 year olds, 54% (13) were between 30 to 40 year olds and 28% (7) were 40 year olds and above.

Findings from EP Division

Table 2: EP SKAP Assessment

Resp.	Skill	Knowledge	Attitude	Experience	Performance	Total	Rank
EP-1	AA 0.040	AA 0.031	AA 0.059	A 0.018	Exc. 0.153	0.301	2
EP-2	AA 0.040	A 0.016	Exc. 0.114	A 0.012	Exc. 0.153	0.335	1
EP-3	AA 0.040	A 0.016	AA 0.059	A 0.011	AA 0.087	0.213	7
EP-4	AA 0.040	AA 0.031	AA 0.059	A 0.011	AA 0.087	0.228	5
EP-5	A 0.022	A 0.016	AA 0.059	BA 0.008	AA 0.087	0.192	9
EP-6	AA 0.040	A 0.016	AA 0.059	A 0.011	BA 0.025	0.151	10
EP-7	A 0.022	A 0.016	AA 0.059	A 0.013	AA 0.087	0.197	8
EP-8	AA 0.040	A 0.016	AA 0.059	A 0.012	AA 0.087	0.214	6
EP-9	AA 0.040	A 0.016	Exc. 0.114	A 0.012	AA 0.087	0.269	4
EP-10	AA 0.040	A 0.016	Exc. 0.114	A 0.015	AA 0.087	0.272	3

Exc. = Excellence   AA = Above Average   A = Average   BA = Below Average   P = Poor

According to Table 2, the intra-division ranking of management personnel at EP based on SKAP assessment is shown in the last column. The bigger the number in total point (second column from right) the higher is the ranking. Respondent EP-2 with the total point of 0.335 turn out to be the first in the EP ranking, this followed by EP-1 (0.301) and EP-10 (0.272). The ranking for the remaining respondents are also shown in the Table 2.

The SKAP strengths and weaknesses among respondents are easily to be identified in Table 2. For example, the comparison between EP-2 (ranking number 1) and EP-6 (ranking number 10) show that they have two differences in SKAP assessment. The first element involved attitude; which EP-2 score is excellent, whereas EP-6 score is above average. The second element is performance, where EP-2 score is excellent, yet EP-6 score is only below average. These differences explain how EP-2 rank was higher than EP-6. In addition, the SKAP differences among them influenced their ranking in EP division.

Table 2 also provides the information regarding current level of SKAP for each management personnel in EP. This information will help human capital manager to develop Human Capital Development Program (HCDP) for each individual in EP division accordingly.

Base on the example above, the human capital manager would be able to transform EP-6 to become as good as EP-2 by developing and improving EP-6 attitude and performance. For instance, the human capital manager should nominate EP-6 to attend intrinsic-motivation development training programs or courses.

Findings from BD Division

Table 3: BD SKAP Assessment

Resp.	Skill	Knowledge	Attitude	Experience	Performance	Total	Rank
BD-1	AA 0.040	A 0.016	Exc. 0.114	A 0.010	AA 0.087	0.267	8
BD-2	AA 0.040	A 0.016	AA 0.059	AA 0.032	Exc. 0.153	0.300	4
BD-3	AA 0.040	A 0.016	Exc. 0.114	A 0.011	Exc. 0.153	0.334	3
BD-4	A 0.022	A 0.016	Exc. 0.114	A 0.015	A 0.047	0.214	12
BD-5	AA 0.040	A 0.016	Exc. 0.114	A 0.013	Exc. 0.153	0.336	2
BD-6	A 0.022	A 0.016	AA 0.059	A 0.014	AA 0.087	0.198	15
BD-7	AA 0.040	A 0.016	Exc. 0.114	A 0.018	AA 0.087	0.275	7
BD-8	AA 0.040	A 0.016	AA 0.059	A 0.015	AA 0.087	0.217	11
BD-9	AA 0.040	A 0.016	Exc. 0.114	A 0.018	Exc. 0.153	0.341	1
BD-10	AA 0.040	A 0.016	AA 0.059	A 0.012	BA 0.025	0.152	20
BD-11	AA 0.040	A 0.016	AA 0.059	A 0.016	AA 0.087	0.218	10
BD-12	BA 0.011	A 0.016	A 0.032	A 0.011	A 0.047	0.117	22
BD-13	A 0.022	A 0.016	Exc. 0.114	A 0.011	AA 0.087	0.250	9
BD-14	AA 0.040	A 0.016	AA 0.059	A 0.011	AA 0.087	0.213	13
BD-15	AA 0.040	A 0.016	AA 0.059	A 0.012	A 0.047	0.174	17
BD-16	BA 0.011	A 0.016	A 0.032	A 0.011	A 0.047	0.117	22

Exc. = Excellence   AA = Above Average   A = Average   BA = Below Average   P = Poor

According to Table 3 and 4, the intra-division ranking of management personnel at BD based on SKAP assessment is shown in the last column. The bigger the number in total point (second column from right) the higher is the ranking. Respondent BD-9 with the total point of 0.341 became the first of the rank, this followed by BD-5 (0.336) and BD-3 (0.334). The ranking for other respondents can also be identified from the Table 3 and 4.

The SKAP strengths and weaknesses among respondents are easily marked in Table 3 and 4. For example, the comparison between BD-9 (ranking number 1) and BD-12, BD-16 and BD-27 (ranking number 22) show that they have some dissimilarity in SKAP assessment. The first element is attitude, which BD-9 score is excellent, whereas BD-12, BD-16 and BD-27 were average and below average respectively. The second element is skills, where BD-9 score was above average. In contrast, BD-12 and BD-16 scores were average and BD-27 score was below average. Finally, the third element is performance, which BD-9 scores is excellent, while BD-12, BD-16 and BD-27 scores were average. These differences explain how BD-9 rank is higher than BD-12, BD-16 and BD-27 and dissimilarities in the level of SKAP among them influenced their ranking in BD division.

Table 3 and 4 depict the current level of SKAP for each management personnel in BD. This information will help human capital manager to develop Human Capital Development Program (HCDP) for each individual in BD division accordingly.

Table 4: BD SKAP Assessment (Continue)

Resp.	Skill	Knowledge	Attitude	Experience	Performance	Total	Rank
BD-17,18							
BD-19	AA 0.040	A 0.016	AA 0.059	A 0.017	Exc. 0.153	0.285	6
BD-20	A 0.022	AA 0.031	AA 0.059	A 0.011	A 0.047	0.170	18
BD-21	A 0.022	AA 0.031	AA 0.059	BA 0.008	AA 0.087	0.207	14
BD-22	A 0.022	AA 0.031	A 0.032	A 0.012	A 0.047	0.144	21
BD-23							
BD-24	AA 0.040	A 0.016	AA 0.059	BA 0.008	A 0.047	0.170	18
BD-25	AA 0.040	A 0.016	AA 0.059	A 0.012	A 0.047	0.174	17
BD-26	AA 0.040	AA 0.031	AA 0.059	A 0.011	Exc. 0.153	0.294	5
BD-27	A 0.022	A 0.016	BA 0.017	A 0.015	A 0.047	0.117	22

Exc. = Excellence   AA = Above Average   A = Average   BA = Below Average   P = Poor

Base on the example in BD above, the human capital manager would be able to transform BD-12, BD-16 and BD-27 to become as good as BD-9 by developing and improving BD-12, BD-16 and BD-27. For instance, the human capital manager should nominate BD-12, BD-16 and BD-27 to attend intrinsic-motivation, skills and performances development training programs.

The findings in Tables 3 and 4 show that management personnel in BD in term of level of skills, knowledge, attitude and performance varied. These variations contribute and influence the individual ranking at BD. In order to transform BD-12, BD-16 and BD-27 to become as good as BD-9, then BD-12, BD-16 and BD-27 need to be improved gradually through HCDP. They ought to be nominated for intrinsic-motivation development program courses or activities. Beside they also should be selected for high impact courses to increase the related skills and performances. In the nutshell, based on Table 3 and 4, the human capital manager also would be able to better plan for the future HCDP for each individual in BD accordingly.

Conclusions and Recommendations

Conclusions

Skills : At approximately 80% of the EP management personnel possess level of skills needed above average and the remaining or 20% are at average skills level. At the same time, around 63% of management personnel at BD obtain level of skills needed above average, 29% are at average and 8% are in below average category.

Knowledge : Only 20% of management personnel at EP have level of skills needed above average and the remaining or 80% are at average. At the same time, just about 17% of management personnel at BD acquire level of knowledge needed above average and the balance or 83% belong to the average category.

Attitude : Roughly, 30 % of management personnel at EP are at excellence needed attitude and the remaining or 70% are at the above average category. Furthermore, around 29% of management personnel at BD have excellent

attitude, while 54% are above average, 13% are average and the rest are about 4% which belong to the below average category.

Performance : In particular, approximately 20% of the management personnel at EP belong to the excellence category, 70% at above average and 10% fall into the below average category. On the other camp, about 25% of the management personnel at BD obtain excellence level of performance, 33% at above average, 38% at average and the balance of about 4% belong to the below average category.

Based on Table 2, 3 and 4, there are differences exist among management personnel in EP and BD in term of the level of skills, knowledge, attitude and performance. These dissimilarities contribute and influence an individual ranking at EP and BD. The individual ranking also indicated that the room for improvement is needed for each management personnel in the organization. Meanwhile, this essential information shows the human capital manager how to develop a good HCDP for the organization and where to start with.

Potential Benefits to be Implemented by the Agency

Based on the Intra-division of SKAP Assessment, some potential benefits can be adopted and implemented by the agency as shown in the Table 5:

Table 5: Potential Benefits to be Implemented by the Agency

Sources	Potential Benefits to be Implemented
Intra-division Ranking of Management Personnel	Identify and Select the best employees for award and recognition Identify the suitable candidates for Promotion Exercise Identify candidates for Leadership/Talent Development Program Identify and select the suitable people for Succession Plan Exercise
Intra-division SKAP Assessment Table	Identify individual strength and shortcoming Identify individual Human Capital Development Program (HCDP) Candidates selection for Intrinsic-Motivation Development program Ideas to formulate Individual Roadmap/Career Development Plan Identify and select the suitable candidates for Job Rotation Exercise

Recommendations for the Agency

Immediate Action for Below Average Category

Based on the Intra-division SKAP Assessment, the study has identified the respondents who are categorized in the score of below average. Prompt action need to be taken in order to reveal the root cause of this phenomenon. The sooner the action takes place, the better results will yield for the agency. Otherwise, it will demoralize the subjects, leading to unproductiveness, and further portray slothful behavior.

Extend Intra-division SKAP Assessment Exercise to the Whole Organization

The scope of this study is only limited to the core divisions that was identified earlier by the agency. However, due to the employees' constraint on time and commitment, complete data collections were only available for EP and BD. It is strongly recommended that the agency should extend the SKAP Assessment exercise to all divisions, so that a broader and fair view of its employees could be captured and understood. This contributes to the enhancement of the agency's ability in determining the needed areas of improvement and to further plan a comprehensive and effective HCDP.

Verify the Intra-division SKAP Assessment through Training Need Analysis (TNA) and Task Analysis (TA)

Information given by the Intra-division SKAP Assessment portrayed the current level of SKAP among management personnel at EP and BD. However, to be more précised and detailed, it is highly recommended that more in-depth and rigorous analysis be carried out for each employee, especially for those who belong to the category of below average. In this case, it is equally highly recommended that a depth analysis approach such as individual TNA or individual TA based on SKAP Assessment findings be conducted in addressing specific shortcoming for each employee.

Comprehensive Employees Training Program/Road-Map/Strategic Career Development Plan

Based on the Intra-division SKAP Assessment carried out at EP and BD, the strengths and shortcomings of each management personnel at respective division were identified accordingly. Primarily, human capital manager could easily discover the areas needed to be focused on each of them. On top of that, he/she may also use the information from Intra-division SKAP Assessment to effectively design and propose for the Employee Training Program/Road-Map/Strategic Career Development Plan.

Recommendations for Future Research
Examine the relationships between Skill, Knowledge, Attitude, Experience and Performance

Based on Intra-division SKAP Assessment done at EP and BD, the findings depict a positive link between the level of skill, knowledge and attitude of management personnel and the performance. This implies the higher the level of one's SKAP, the higher is the performance. Besides, it also influences the intra-division ranking. However, the significant relationship among skill, knowledge, attitude, experience, performance and ranking has not yet been measured by AHP technique.

Future research is highly recommended to measure the correlation between these variables. The significant relationship between each variable will definitely be able to give the right ideas to the agency and other similar organizations out there; such as 'which' and 'what' elements or variables that have the strongest relationship with performance? Then, those elements should be given the highest priority to be developed, in order to create a higher impact on the organization's performance.

Employee Task Analysis (ETA)

Based on the Intra-division SKAP Assessment exercise, the agency has identified the strengths and shortcomings of elements among the employees. However, in relation to the level of difficulties, the urgency and the frequency of the tasks executed by the employees are not yet measured.

ETA is another important exercise that should be done in future; this may evaluate the level of difficulties, the urgency of the tasks and the frequency of the tasks executed by the employee. Next, the agency would be able to focus and design the precise courses/programs for each of employees to optimally enhance their SKAP capabilities.

Furthermore, ETA findings will identify the level of employee's competencies, by using techniques such as the critical incident technique, work diaries, and work sampling (Noe, 2008). Finally, the agency would be able to achieve high performance, and develop knowledgeable, skillful and highly motivated employees.

REFERENCES

Atthirawong, W., & McCarthy, Bart. (2002). An application of the Analytical Hierarchy Process to international location decision-making. In Gregory, M., *Proceedings of The 7th Annual Cambridge International Manufacturing Symposium: Restructuring Global Manufacturing.* (pp. 1–18). Cambridge, England: University of Cambridge.

Berrittella, M., Certa, A., Enea, M., & Zito, P. (2007). *An Analytic Hierarchy Process for the evaluation of transport policies to reduce climate change impacts.* Milano: *Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei.*

Bhushan, N. & Kanwal. R. (2004). *Strategic decision-making: applying the Analytic Hierarchy process.* London: Springer-Verlag.

Bracken, D.W., Timmereck, C.W., & Church, A.H. (2001). *The handbook of multisource feedback.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bracken, D.W., Dalton, M.A., Jako, R.A., McCauley, C.D., & Pollman, V.A. (1997). *Should 360-degree feedback be used only for developmental purposes?* Greensboro, NC: Center for Creative Leadership.

Campbell, J. P. (1990). Modeling the performance prediction problem in industrial and organizational psychology. In M. D. Dunnette & L. M. Hough (Eds.), *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology,* (2nd Ed., Vol. 1, pp. 687-732). Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Dey, P.K. (2003). Analytic Hierarchy Process analyzes risk of operating cross-country petroleum pipelines in India. *Natural Hazards Review,* 4 (4), 213–221.

Druker, P.F. (1977). *People and performance: The best of Peter Drucker on management*, New York: Harper's College Press

Fishbein, M. & Ajzan, I. (1975). *Belief attitude intention and behavior: An introduction to theory and research.* Reading, Ma: Addison-Wesley.

Fleenor, J. W., & Prince, J. M. (1997). *Using 360-degree feedback in organizations: An annotated bibliography.* Greensboro, NC: Center for Creative Leadership.

Forman, E. & Saul, I.G. (2001). The Analytical Hierarchy Process: An exposition. *Operations Research,* 49 (4). 469–487.

Glendon, I.A. & McKenna, E.F. (1995). *Human safety and risk management,* New York: Chapman and Hale.

Grandzol, J.R. (2005). Improving the faculty selection process in higher education: A case for the Analytic Hierarchy Process, *IR Applications* 6.

Hazucha, J. F., Hezlett, S. A., & Schneider, R. J. (1993). The impact of 360-degree feedback on management skills development. *Human Resource Management, 32*(2–3), 325–351.

Kaplan, R.S., & Anderson, S.R., (2007). *Time-Driven Activity-Based Costing: A simpler and more powerful path to higher profits*, Boston, Ma: Harvard Business School Publishing.

McCaffrey, J. (2005). Test Run: The Analytic Hierarchy Process. Retrieved from http://msdn2.com/en-us/megazine/cc163785.aspx

Noe, R.A. (2008). *Employee training & development.* Fourth Edition. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Nonaka, I. & Takeuchi, H. (1995. *The knowledge creating company. U.K.:* Oxford University Press.

Saaty, T. L. (2008). *Group decision making Drawing out and reconciling differences.* Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania: RWS Publications.

Saaty, T. L. (2008-06). Relative measurement and its generalization in decision-making: Why pairwise comparisons are central in mathematics for the measurement of intangible factors – The Analytic Hierarchy Process. *RACSAM (Review of* the *Royal Spanish Academy of Sciences, Series A, Mathematics)* 102 (2), 251–318.

Small And Medium Industries Development Corporation Act. (2006). Kuala Lumpur: Pencetakan Nasional Malaysia Bhd.

SMECorp. (2012). About Us. Retrieve from http://www.smecorp.gov.my/v4/node/12

SMECorp. (2012).Vision, mission and functions. Retrieve from http://www.smecorp.gov.my/v4/node/294

Smither, J.W., London, M., & Reilly, R.R. (2005). Does performance improve following multisource feedback? A theoretical model, meta-analysis and review of empirical findings. *Personnel Psychology*, 58, 33–66.

Steiguer, J.E., Duberstein, J., Lopes, V. (2003). The Analytic Hierarchy Process as a Means for Integrated Watershed Management. In Renard, Kenneth G. *First Interagency Conference on Research on the Watersheds.* Benson, Arizona: U.S. pp. 736–740.

Toffler, A. (1990). *Powershift: Knowledge, Wealth and Violence at the Edge of the 21st Century,* NY: Bantam Books

Walker, A., & Smither, J.W. (1999). A five-year study of upward feedback: What managers do with their results matters? *Personnel Psychology, 52*(2), 393–423