International Journal of Business, Management and Visuals (IJBMV), ISSN: 3006-2705
Volume 7, Issue 2, July-December, 2024, Available online at: https://ijbmv.com

Effectiveness of Balanced Scorecard in Modern Economy

Dr. Rakesh

Assistant Professor "Dept. of Management Studies" Pondicherry University

ABSTRACT

Performance indicators are linked in this balanced scorecard study report. The purpose of this research paper is to determine the effectiveness of the balancing scorecard in the modern economy. The researcher explains how performance measurements are linked via the balance scorecard. What you receive is what you measure. Senior executives are aware that their company's measurement system has a big influence on the behavior of managers and employees. Additionally, executives understand that traditional financial accounting measures, such earnings per share and return on investment, may provide erroneous signals for continued innovation and growth, which are essential in the present competitive environment. Although the traditional financial performance measures worked well throughout the industrial era, they no longer reflect the competencies and capabilities that companies are now seeking to develop.

Keywords: Balance Scorecard, Business Performance, Performance Metrics, Including Operational Measures.

INTRODUCTION

In an effort to overcome the limitations of the current performance evaluation techniques, several managers and researchers have focused on making financial measures more meaningful. Some have said, "Forget the monetary measures," Improve operational measures like defect rates and cycle times, and the financial results will follow. Managers shouldn't be given to choose between financial as well as operational KPIs, however. After observing and working with several companies, we have found that senior executives do not give preference to one set of KPIs over another. They are aware that no one statistic can adequately specify a performance objective or draw focus on the most crucial elements of the business. Managers believe that operational and financial KPIs should be presented in a balanced manner.

Over the course of a year-long research project with 12 companies at the vanguard of performance evaluation, we created a "balanced scorecard"—a set of measures that provide top managers a concise but comprehensive view of the organization. The balanced scorecard's financial measurements demonstrate the results of earlier initiatives. Additionally, it adds operational indicators—like internal processes, customer satisfaction, and the company's innovation and development initiatives—to the financial measurements, which are the main drivers of future economic achievement.

Think of the scoring system as the dials and indicators in the cockpit. To accomplish the complex task of navigating and flying an aircraft, pilots need a thorough understanding of a number of flight-related subjects. It is required to have fuel, air speed, altitude, direction, destination, and other indicators that provide an overview of the current and expected environment. Reliance on one instrument might be fatal. Similarly, the complexity of running a business today requires managers to be able to evaluate performance across several domains simultaneously.

Objectives:

- The main objective of the study is to determine the effectiveness of the balancing scorecard in the modern economy.
- To study the balanced scorecard allows manager Effectiveness of Balanced Scorecard in Modern Economy s to look at the business from four important perspectives.

The Balanced Scorecard Connects Performance Measures:

- How do customers see us? (From the client's perspective)
- Where do we need to be the best? (From the inside)
- Can we continue to improve and contribute? (A method for learning and invention)
- How do investors see us? (from an economic perspective)

The balanced scorecard gives senior managers information from four different perspectives while decreasing information overload by using fewer metrics. Businesses seldom suffer as a result of inadequate safeguards. further often than not, once a consultant or employee makes a useful suggestion, they go on to add further steps. Executives are forced by the balanced scorecard to focus on the few most crucial metrics, and one manager called his organization's growth of extra measures its "kill additional forest program."

Numerous companies have already adopted the balanced scorecard. According to their first experiences, the scorecard meets certain managerial needs. First, by emphasizing cooperation, lowering reaction times, increasing quality, concentrating on the customer, speeding up the introduction of new goods, and long-term management, the scorecard combines many of the apparently disparate elements of a company's competitive strategy into a single management report.

Also, the scorecard prevents suboptimization from happening. By forcing senior managers to consider all of the important operational measures at once, the balanced scorecard allows them to assess if advancements in one area may have come at the expense of another. Even the best-laid plans may go horribly wrong. For example, companies may reduce time to market in two very different ways: either by introducing just slightly different products from what they already have, or by better managing the introduction of new products. Increasing batch sizes or shortening setup times are two strategies to lower setup expenses. The product mix may be moving toward lower-margin, more uniform, and simpler-to-produce goods, which might lead to improvements in manufacturing production and first-pass yields.

To illustrate how companies may create their own balanced scorecard, we will utilize the experiences of one semiconductor company, let's name it Electronic Circuits Inc. ECI saw the scorecard as a tool for operationalizing the organization's overarching goal once it had been made clear and straightforward. The ECI scorecard was developed to highlight a few key performance indicators, both current and prospective, to top executives.

The Customer's Perspective:
Many companies have a customer-oriented corporate purpose these days. Senior management now places a higher priority on how a company operates from the perspective of its customers since a typical goal objective is "to be the premier organization in delivering benefit to customers." The balanced scorecard requires managers to translate their overall mission statement for customer service into specific measurements that reflect the aspects that customers appreciate most.

Customer concerns are often divided into four groups: time, quality, performance and service, and price. Lead time is the length of time required for the company to meet customer needs. The waiting period for current products is the amount of time that passes between an order being received by the business and the customer actually receiving the commodity or service. The time required to move new products from the item definition phase to the start of shipments—also referred to as the time to market—is called the lead time. Quality measures the extent of defects in delivered items as determined and evaluated by the customer. Other measures of quality include the accuracy of the company's delivery forecasts and on-time delivery. Together, performance and service indicators evaluate how the company's goods and services supply value for its customers.

To use the balanced scorecard, businesses should establish goals for time, quality, performance, as well as service, then translate these objectives into accurate measures. Senior management at ECI, for example, established broad goals for customer performance, including: accelerating the delivery of standard goods; improving customers' speed to market; cultivating relationships with customers to turn into their preferred supplier; and developing distinctive products that satisfy their needs. The managers transformed these broad aims into four more specific goals and chose an appropriate statistic for each. (See "ECI's Balanced Scorecard" on the screen.)

ECI's Balanced Business Scorecard:
To keep an eye on the specific goal of providing a consistent flow of enticing solutions, ECI tracked the proportion of sales from both new goods and unique products. That information was available internally. However, further steps forced the company to get data from other sources. In order to determine if the company was fulfilling its goal of providing a reliable and responsive supply, ECI turned to its customers. As a consequence of the shift to external performance measurements, ECI redefined "on time" to satisfy customer expectations and created a database of the criteria as stated by each of its key customers, finding that each had a different meaning of "reliable, responsive supply." A nine-day window was used by some customers to define "on-time," while others used any cargo that arrived within five days of the scheduled delivery date. ECI had failed to satisfy a number of its customers while excelling at others since it had been working on a seven-day basis. ECI also asked its top ten customers to evaluate the company as a whole.

When a company relies a portion of its performance measurements on customer evaluations, it is compelled to see its success through the perspective of its customers. When some companies hire third parties to perform anonymous consumer surveys, the result is a customer-driven report card. As an example, the J.D. Although the Department of Transportation's monitoring of misplaced baggage and on-time arrivals provides airlines with external standards, Powers quality evaluation has become the industry standard for the automobile sector. Businesses also utilize benchmarking techniques to evaluate their performance in comparison to their competitors' best practices. Many companies have adopted "best of breed" comparison programs to set performance goals for themselves. In these programs, the company looks to one industry for the best distribution system, to another for the least expensive payroll process, and then builds a composite of those best practices.

Companies must consider their product prices in addition to time, quality, performance, and service KPIs. However, price is just one part of the expenses that customers must deal with when dealing with their suppliers. Additional supplier-driven costs include ordering, scheduling, and paying for the materials; receiving, inspecting, handling, and storing the materials; obsolescence, rework, and scrap caused by the materials; and schedule disruptions (expediting and value of lost output) as a result of incorrect deliveries. An excellent supplier may charge a higher unit price for its goods than other vendors, but it will still be a lower cost supplier because it can deliver perfect products in precisely the right quantities at precisely the right times directly to the production process and eliminate the administrative burden of ordering, billing, and paying for materials through electronic data interchange.

Internal Business Perspective:
consumer needs-based measures are important, but they must be transformed into metrics that show what the company has to do internally to meet consumer requirements. After all, outstanding customer performance is the result of decisions, actions, and processes made across an organization. Managers need to focus on the essential internal procedures that enable them to satisfy their customers' needs. The second part of the balanced scorecard gives managers access to this internal perspective.

The internal measurements for the balanced scorecard should come from the company processes that have the most impacts on customer satisfaction, such as those that affect cycle time, quality, employee skills, and productivity. Companies should also try to determine and evaluate their core competencies, which are the key technologies needed to stay at the top of the industry. Companies should identify the processes and competencies in which they must excel and establish objectives for each.

The management of ECI came to the conclusion that the company's ability to exploit submicron technology was critical to its ability to compete. They also concluded that they needed to focus on manufacturing quality, design productivity, and the introduction of new items. The company developed operational metrics for each of these four internal business goals.

To satisfy cycle time, quality, productivity, and cost goals, management must create measures that are influenced by employee behavior. Since a lot of activity takes place at the department and workstation levels, managers must break down overall cycle time, quality, product, and cost data to local levels. In this way, the views of upper management about critical internal processes and skills are connected to the actions of individuals that affect the company's overarching objectives. This relationship ensures that employees at lower organizational levels have clear objectives for decisions, activities, and training programs that complement the organization's overall purpose.

Managers may utilize information systems to break into the summary metrics. To determine the reason for an unexpected signal on the balanced scorecard, executives might run queries via their information system. For example, if the overall metric for on-time delivery is poor, executives with a robust information system may quickly identify daily late deliveries by a particular factory to a particular customer.

On the other side, if the information system is not responsive, performance measurement could suffer. The absence of an operational information system of this kind now places limitations on ECI's management. Their main concern is the lack of timeliness in the scorecard data; reports sometimes come a week after the company's regular management meetings, and the metrics have not yet been linked to measures for lower-level managers and employees. The company is now developing a more responsive information system in order to circumvent this limitation.

A Perspective on Learning and Innovation:
The balanced scorecard's internal and customer-based business process measures identify the parameters that the company considers most important for competitive performance. But the objectives for success are always changing. Due to intense

global rivalry, companies need to continuously improve their present procedures and goods while also being able to provide whole new products with more capabilities.

The ability of a company to innovate, develop, and learn is directly tied to its value. In other words, a company can only provide new products, offer value for customers, and continually improve operational efficiency if it wants to grow into new markets, increase sales and profits, and eventually increase shareholder value.

The primary emphasis of ECI's innovation projects is its ability to swiftly develop and introduce standard items, which are those that the company believes will make up the bulk of its future sales. Its manufacturing improvement measure focuses on new goods and seeks to stabilize the production of new products rather than enhancing the manufacture of existing items. Like many other companies, ECI uses the proportion of sales from new products as one of their innovation and improvement KPIs. If sales of new goods are down, managers may look into whether there have been problems with the design or introduction of new things.

In addition to measurements on product and process innovation, several companies set specific improvement goals for their existing processes. For example, Analog Devices, a Massachusetts-based manufacturer of specialized semiconductors, expects managers to continuously improve the performance of their internal business processes and consumers. For yield, cycle time, defect rate, and on-time delivery, the company estimates exact rates of progress.

Some companies, like Milliken & Co., require managers to make adjustments within a certain amount of time. Milliken did not want its "associates," as he refers to its employees, to relax and have fun after winning the Baldridge Award. Chairman and CEO Roger Milliken directed each facility to implement a "ten-four" improvement program, which aimed to reduce process failures, missed deliveries, and scrap by a factor of 10 over the next four years. These objectives emphasize the need of continual improvements to internal business processes and customer satisfaction.

In terms of money:
Metrics of financial success indicate if a company's strategy, execution, and execution are increasing its profitability. Financial goals usually center on growth, profitability, and shareholder value. ECI's financial goals are, in short, to survive, grow, and prosper. Survival was measured by cash flow, success by operating income and quarterly sales growth by division, and prosperity by return on equity and increasing market share by segment.

But given the state of the economy, should senior managers even take the company's financial status into account? Do they have to concentrate on short-term financial indicators like quarterly sales and operational income? Because of their well-known flaws, antiquated perspective, and inability to account for activities that add value in the contemporary world, financial metrics have come under fire. Shareholder value analysis (SVA) forecasts future cash flows and discounts them back to a rough estimate of present value in an attempt to make financial analysis more forward-looking. SVA is still based on cash flow, not the procedures and actions that produce it, however.

Some opponents go even further in their criticism of financial measures. They argue that traditional financial measurements don't improve cycle time, staff motivation, quality, or customer pleasure, and that the nature of competition has changed. They contend that financial performance is determined by operational activities and that financial success should follow naturally from learning the principles. In other words, companies shouldn't depend only on financial indicators anymore.

The claim is that the financial numbers will take care of themselves if they make simple adjustments to their business practices.

Claims that financial measures are unnecessary are false for at least two reasons. A well-designed financial control system may help, not hurt, an organization's entire quality management program. (Refer to the supplement, "How One Company Used a Daily Financial Report to Improve Quality.") More importantly, however, the supposed link between improved financial success and improved operational performance is really fairly tenuous and ambiguous. Let's demonstrate this problem rather than debate it.

How a Daily Financial Report Helped One Company Improve Quality. A chemicals company committed to a comprehensive quality control program in the 1980s and began to…..

A NYSE electronics company had an order-of-magnitude improvement in quality and on-time delivery performance over the three years from 1987 to 1990. The yield climbed from 26% to 51%, the on-time delivery rate rose from 70% to 96%,

and the outgoing defect rate decreased from 500 parts per million to 50. Did the business reap significant benefits from these ground-breaking improvements in quality, efficiency, and customer service? Regretfully, no. The company's stock price fell to one-third of its July 1987 value within the same three-year period, and its financial performance showed no improvement. The significant gains in production capacity have not translated into higher profitability. Slow product launches and a lack of marketing outreach to new, maybe pickier consumers kept the business from reaping the rewards of its manufacturing successes. The company has failed to take advantage of the actual operational accomplishments.

Top executives are irritated by the disparity between improved operational performance and subpar financial metrics. This annoyance is sometimes directed at anonymous Wall Street analysts who are said to be unable to look beyond short-term fluctuations in financial performance to the long-term ideals that top executives really believe their companies are cultivating. However, the sad reality is that executives should reevaluate the fundamental tenets of their strategy and objective if improved performance is not mirrored in the bottom line. Not every long-term plan will be profitable.

Customer satisfaction, internal business performance, and innovation and improvement metrics are derived from the company's unique worldview and perspective on key success factors. Such an opinion isn't necessarily true, however. A great collection of balanced scorecard measures does not guarantee a successful strategy. The balanced scorecard can only be used to translate a company's strategy into specific, measurable objectives. If executives are unable to convert enhanced operational success—as shown by the scorecard—into better financial performance, they should review the company's strategy or implementation plans.

For instance, when companies don't follow up on their operational gains with another set of activities, they may end up with unsatisfactory financial metrics. Improvements in cycle speed and quality might result in excess capacity. Managers need to be ready to either use the excess capacity or dispose of it. If operational advantages are to be transferred to the bottom line, the excess capacity must either be minimized by lowering expenses or used by increasing revenues.

Organizations may reduce the need to develop, examine, and rework goods that are not in compliance or to reschedule and expedite delayed orders by improving their quality and reaction time. If these occupations are discontinued, some of the people who do them will no longer be needed. Employers' reluctance to terminate employees makes logical, especially when those employees may have provided the ideas that led to higher quality and faster turnaround times. Layoffs are a poor reward for prior accomplishment since they might diminish the morale of current workers and restrict future advancement. However, until their personnel and facilities are functioning at maximum capacity or until they have to endure the pain of downsizing to pay for the newly created excess capacity, firms will not be able to completely benefit financially from their renovations.

If executives were fully aware of the consequences of their efforts to enhance cycle time and quality, they may exploit the newly generated capacity more aggressively. To use this self-created increased capacity, however, businesses must increase sales to existing customers, sell existing goods to entirely new customers (who are now accessible because of the improved quality and delivery performance), and increase the flow of new products to the market. These actions might lead to more revenue with little changes in operating expenses. If marketing, sales, and R&D fail to generate the increased volume, the operational gains will remain as additional capacity, redundancy, and untapped potential. Periodic financial statements serve as a reminder to executives that improvements in quality, productivity, response time, or new products only benefit the company when they are translated into higher market share and revenues, fewer operating expenses, or improved asset turnover.

Enhancements to quality, cycle time, claimed lead times, delivery, and the introduction of new goods should ideally be described by businesses in terms of how they would improve market share, operational profits, asset turnover, or cut operating costs. It might be challenging to learn how to clearly link finance and operations. In order to investigate the complex dynamics, cost modeling and simulation will most likely be required.

Steps to Help Businesses Grow:

We've begun to see that the balanced scorecard represents a fundamental change in the underlying assumptions around performance assessment as companies have begun using it. Since senior managers have the most thorough knowledge of the company's goals and objectives, the project participants found that they needed their assistance in implementing the balanced scorecard after the controllers and finance vice presidents from the research project returned to their organizations with the idea. This was enlightening since most of the existing performance monitoring systems were developed and run by financial professionals. It is rare for senior managers to have to worry so much about controllers.

The finance function is probably the source of the control bias in traditional measurement systems. To put it another way, traditional performance evaluation methods specify the precise tasks they anticipate employees to do before determining whether or not they have actually completed them. In this way, the systems try to control behavior. The engineering mentality of the Industrial Age was consistent with these measurement techniques.

However, the balanced scorecard aligns nicely with the organisational model that many companies are striving for. The scorecard gives strategy and vision precedence over control. Even though it establishes goals, it assumes that people will develop the behaviors and carry out the tasks necessary to achieve them. The measures are attracting people to the overall objective. Senior managers may know what they want to achieve, but due of the constantly shifting nature of their workplace, they are unable to provide employees clear directions on how to get there.

Findgings: The Balanced Scorecard (BSC) is a strategic management tool used to measure an organization's performance across multiple perspectives.

- **Holistic View of Performance**: The BSC integrates financial and non-financial metrics, allowing organizations to assess performance comprehensively. It balances short-term financial goals with long-term strategic objectives.
- **Alignment of Goals**: The BSC facilitates alignment between departmental goals and overall organizational strategy, promoting coherence across different areas of the business.
- **Strategic Feedback**: It provides a framework for continuous feedback and learning, helping organizations adapt their strategies based on performance data.
- **Communication Tool**: The BSC serves as an effective communication tool, helping convey the strategic vision and priorities of the organization to all stakeholders.
- **Improved Decision-Making**: By providing a broad view of performance metrics, the BSC enhances decision-making capabilities, enabling managers to make informed choices that align with strategic goals.

Suggestions: The Balanced Scorecard is a strategic management tool that helps organizations translate their vision and strategy into actionable objectives across four perspectives: Financial, Customer, Internal Processes, and Learning & Growth. Here are some suggestions for each perspective.

1. Financial Perspective:

- **Objectives**: Improve profitability, increase revenue growth, reduce costs.
- **KPIs**: Net profit margin, revenue growth rate, cost per unit.

2. Customer Perspective:

- **Objectives**: Enhance customer satisfaction, increase market share, improve customer retention.
- **KPIs**: Customer satisfaction score, Net Promoter Score (NPS), customer retention rate.

3. Internal Processes Perspective:

- **Objectives**: Streamline operations, improve product quality, enhance innovation.
- **KPIs**: Process efficiency rate, defect rates, time to market for new products.

4. Learning & Growth Perspective:

- **Objectives**: Foster a culture of continuous learning, improve employee engagement, enhance skill development.
- **KPIs**: Employee satisfaction index, training hours per employee, turnover rate

CONCLUSION

The efforts being implemented in many businesses, such as cross-functional integration, partnerships between suppliers and customers, global scale, continuous improvement, and team responsibility as opposed to individual accountability, align with this new approach to performance evaluation. The balanced scorecard assists managers in comprehending several interrelationships, at least implicitly, by integrating the viewpoints of internal process and innovation, customers, financial, and organizational learning. This knowledge may assist managers in going beyond conventional ideas about functional

boundaries, which will eventually result in better problem-solving and decision-making. Businesses are kept looking ahead rather than backward by the balanced scorecard.

REFERENCES

[1]. Abagissa, J. (2019). The assessment of balanced scorecard implementation in the commercial bank of Ethiopia : The case of three branches in East Addis Ababa Districts. International Journal of Financial Management and Economoics 2, 16–23.
[2]. Abdelrazek, A. F. (2019). Sustainability Balanced Scorecard : A Comperhensive Tool To Measure Sustainabilty Performance. International Journal of Social Science and Economic Research 02, 948–962.
[3]. Barnabè, F. (2011). A "system dynamics-based Balanced Scorecard" to support strategic decision making Insights from a case study. International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management. https://doi.org/10.1108/17410401111140383.
[4]. Colbran, R., Ramsden, R., Stagnitti, K., & Toumbourou, J. W. (2019). Advancing towards contemporary practice: A systematic review of organisational performance measures for non-acute health charities. BMC Health Services Research, 19(1), 1–12. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12913-019-3952-1
[5]. Corresponding, S. M. A. (2012). Designing a Balanced Scorecard to Measure a Bank's Performance: A Case Study. International Journal of Business Administration. 3(4), 44–53. https://doi.org/10.5430/ijba.v3n4p44
[6]. Dhamayantie, E., & Tanjungpura, U. (2018). Designing a balanced scorecard for cooperatives.
[7]. Fakhrina, Z. (2017). Evaluasi Implementasi Balanced Scorecard Pada Departemen Manajemen IPB Sebagai Program Studi Berbasis Kinerja dengan pendekatan Balanced Scorecard (BSC). Jurnal Manajement dan Organisasi. VIII(2), 103–118.
[8]. Hasan, R.U, and Chyi, T. . (2017). Practical Application of Balanced Scorecard. Journal of Strategy and Performance Management, 5(3), 87–103.
[9]. Nisha, N. (2017). An Empirical Study of the Balanced Scorecard Model: Evidence from Bangladesh. International Journal of Information Systems in the Service Sector,· February. https://doi.org/10.4018/IJISSS.2017010105.
[10]. Deepak, Dr. (2017c). Working and organisation of DRDA : A case Study. *International Journal for Research Publication & Seminar*, *8*(1), 161–169.
[11]. Deepak, D. (2023). Human Rights and right to education in India. *Innovative Research Thoughts*, *9*(3), 5–8.
[12]. Deepak, Dr. (2016a). District Planing Committee: An Overview. *Public Affairs and Goverence*, *4*(1), 49–58.
[13]. Deepak, Dr. (2017c). Working and organisation of DRDA : A case Study. *International Journal for Research Publication & Seminar*, *8*(1), 161–169.