International Journal of Innovative Research in Computer Science & Technology (IJIRCST)
ISSN: 2347-5552, Volume-10, Special Issue-7, July-2022
Innovative Projects 2022
Organized by Presidency University, Bangalore, India

A Study on Analysing Balanced Scorecard

Mr. Ram Srinivas
Assistant Professor, Masters In Business Administration (General Management), Presidency University, Bangalore, India,
Email Id-ramsrinivas@presidencyuniversity.in

ABSTRACT:

Since being introduced by Robert Kaplan and David Norton in the early 1990s, the Balanced Scorecard has become a very well-known strategic management tool. An overview of the Balanced Scorecard's history, essential elements, and function in coordinating organizational goals with tactical metrics are given in this abstract. The Balanced Scorecard provides a more complete picture of an organization's performance by using non-financial performance indicators in addition to standard financial measurements. The Balanced Scorecard offers a comprehensive framework for establishing and tracking strategic objectives by balancing the financial, customer, internal process, and learning and development perspectives. The usefulness of the Balanced Scorecard in promoting performance improvement and boosting decision-making in many sectors is explored in this abstract along with the advantages and difficulties of implementation. The Balanced Scorecard is still a useful tool for building strategy alignment, encouraging responsibility, and achieving long-term success as organisations traverse complex and changing settings.

KEYWORDS:

Balanced, Financial, Organisations, Performance, Strategic, Scorecard.

I. INTRODUCTION

Early in the 1990s, a solution to the shortcomings of conventional financial performance measurements in reflecting the complexity of contemporary organisations was developed: the balanced scorecard. The Balanced Scorecard, created by Harvard Business School professor Robert Kaplan and consultant David Norton, revolutionized how companies and organisations approach performance evaluation and strategic planning. In the past, the main criteria used to assess an organization's performance were financial ones like revenue, profitability, and shareholder returns. But by concentrating just on financial results, an organization's performance was not fully represented, and other important factors that contribute to long-term success were overlooked. The Balanced Scorecard was created to overcome this drawback by presenting a more impartial method of performance evaluation. It combines extra viewpoints that cover many facets of organizational effectiveness beyond financial measures. The client viewpoint, internal process perspective, and learning and development perspective are some of these views[1], [2].

1. **Customer Viewpoint:** The demands of clients and customers are the main emphasis of this viewpoint. It entails assessing customer happiness, loyalty, and other important metrics that reveal the organization's capacity to satisfy its target market.
2. **Perspective on Internal Processes:** This viewpoint entails evaluating the efficacy and efficiency of internal organizational activities and procedures. Organisations may improve their overall performance and better satisfy consumer needs by identifying and enhancing important processes.
3. **Growth and Learning Perspective:** This viewpoint emphasizes the value of spending money on organizational culture, technology, and human capital. It incorporates measurements for worker creativity, skill growth, and adaptation.

Including these viewpoints in the Balanced Scorecard framework enables organisations to define a distinct and comprehensive set of strategic goals. The Balanced Scorecard aids in the creation of a strategic roadmap that directs decision-making and resource allocation by lining up these goals with the organization's purpose and vision.The Balanced Scorecard has gained significant traction throughout time in a variety of sectors, including industry, government, healthcare, education, and non-profit organisations. Its adaptability and agility have made it an invaluable tool for organisations looking to boost productivity, synchronize operations with strategic objectives, and promote a continuous improvement culture. In this essay, we'll examine the Balanced Scorecard's essential elements, advantages, and implementation difficulties. We will also look at actual instances of businesses that have used the Balanced Scorecard to promote performance improvement and create long-term success. The Balanced Scorecard continues to be a strong and relevant strategic management tool for organisations as they traverse these difficulties and achieve long-term profitability in complex and changing circumstances[3], [4].

Strategic management underwent a paradigm change with the advent of the Balanced Scorecard, which posed new questions and opened the door for a more comprehensive view of organizational performance. Traditional financial measurements failed to adequately capture the nuances of organizational performance as competition increased and markets grew more volatile. This insight led to the need for a more complete framework that included crucial factors for future performance and sustainable development in addition to a focus on financial results. This need led to the development of the Balanced Scorecard, which provides a balanced perspective of an organization's strategy by tying financial goals to consumer requirements, internal operations, and the training and development of its employees. We go into more detail about the history of the Balanced Scorecard, its essential elements, and how it has revolutionized strategic decision-making across sectors in the parts that follow.

II. DISCUSSION

Early in the 1990s, David Norton and Robert S. Kaplan, a professor at Harvard Business School, created the balanced scorecard (BSC). It was a strategic performance measuring system that balanced financial and operational aspects in its earlier iterations. Non-financial indicators and the short term vs the long term. The system's goal was to make sure that rather than simply concentrating on financial results, examine the drivers of value creation in an organisations. This occurred at a time when many organisations began to place a higher value on human and intellectual capital than on tangible assets. The original scorecard had four dimensions: financial, customer, internal business processes, and learning and growth. It has developed from its early origins in 1992 into a tool for the strategy implementation process. A number of corporate disciplines innovation, information systems, leadership, marketing and customer value generation, strategy, and learning intersect with the balanced scorecard. The scoreboard now revolves around the strategic map. This is a schematic representation of the value creation process that links the organization's essential processes and capital, particularly its intellectual capital, in a cause-and-effect connection. The evolution of the balanced scorecard since its origin and the key components of a modern balanced scorecard are discussed in the Fundamentals section that follows. The Importance section describes the benefits and drawbacks of using the scorecard[5], [6].

Fundamentals

The balanced scorecard is based on the idea that performance metrics have a significant impact on an organization's employees, especially if they are linked to incentives, either intrinsic or extrinsic. The term "balanced scorecard" first appears in a footnote to the Harvard case study Analogue Devices from 1989, which discussed a business that had created a "Blue Book" containing a variety of financial and nonfinancial measurements. Early scorecards were of a range of metrics that compared financial success to nonfinancial performance and ledger indicators that predicted future performance to trailing indicators. It was a response to the financial markets' constant demand for ever-increasing returns and its emphasis on elements that would affect continuous profitability, such as increased internal efficiency and customer happiness.

The four scorecard dimensions, which are as follows, were known to be related to one another:

1. **Financial:** All businesses that operate for profit must produce a profit for their investors as determined by a variety of measures, including return on capital, net profit margin, and other factors increase in sales.
2. **Client:** It is generally a good thing.Reaction from the consumer that boosts the organization's worth via successful sales. The KPIs might include sales penetration as well as the degree of client loyalty and satisfaction.
3. **Internal Business Procedures:** Operating procedures will be continuously enhanced to boost flexibility and quality while lowering costs in order to improve the quality of the customer connection. Cycle time, asset utilization, and quality metrics are a few examples of measurements.
4. **Learning and Development:** The intellectual capital, ideas, and innovation that result in new goods and services as well as processes, often with fast discontinuous innovation, are the driving forces behind value creation. The advancement of human potential, the introduction of fresh goods, and the expansion of strategic relationships may all be used as indicators.

The organisations determined the main strategic goals for each dimension, followed by the metrics that would show if the goal had been accomplished. Targets were established and efforts were created to accomplish the goals for each metric. Clarifying the organization's vision was necessary in order to make it the focal point of the balanced scorecard. The scorecard's learning and development component was the most challenging. In spite of the fact that intellectual capital and innovation are at the core of future competitive advantage, identifying the drivers has proven to be quite challenging for BSC implementation teams.While some businesses found the four dimensions to be effective, other businesses added more dimensions. There were established social and environmental fifth dimensions, among others[7], [8].

The financial viewpoint was no longer the organization's main purpose when the BSC moved into the nonprofit sector and government, and the mission needed to be presented as the ultimate conclusion. Cases created by Robert Kaplan and David Norton, like Boston Lyric Opera, demonstrate this. But due of the strong institutional demands and political backdrop, there are specific problems with implementation in the nonprofit and governmental sectors.

When a BSC is implemented from the center of a major public sector organisations, there may be serious conflicts between local demands and the BSC's criteria. The BSC has changed throughout time, and a number of books have been published under names like "The Organization that is "Strategy-Focused," "Alignment," and "Strategy Execution Premium." The description of strategy maps, the maps that show cause-and-effect links, was one of the significant advances. Although these connections may evolve over time, managers are thought to benefit from knowing how performance factors are related. A "working hypothesis" of how the organisations generates value for its important stakeholders is formed from the strategy map. Typically, the map moves higher as a consequence of learning and development, which led to better company operations, which in turn enhanced customer happiness and improved financial performance[9], [10].

The concept of cascading down the organisations was a result of another BSC development. This included connecting all departments and maybe all workers to the corporate scorecard so that everyone in the organisations would be focused on and working towards the plan. Every employee might have a scorecard that represented how they contributed to the overall organizational plan. The Strategy-Focused Organization, written by Robert Kaplan and David Norton in 2001, made this its central tenet.This was followed by the notion of alignment. It was suggested that by using the scorecard, all organizational components could be brought together around strategic objectives. The BSC would serve as an organizing structure that would make it possible to design a cogent plan that would be conveyed to all organizational parts and provide feedback on goal attainment across the organisations.Although the BSC seems to be based on the planned school of strategy, some "emergent" strategy is permitted since staff members would be searching for fresh chances to advance the strategy. The BSC has now been included to Robert Kaplan and David Norton's model as a key component of the strategy execution process.

Importance

The BSC is now widely used and has had a significant influence on both practice and research. After 1992, the concept spread to bigger organisations and came to be seen as a crucial component of corporate governance procedures. At least at the level of the whole organisations, even tiny organisations now have a balanced scorecard. Despite the fact that the concept was developed in the United States, there are currently case studies and surveys of BSC uses across Asia and Europe. According to polls conducted in Europe, usage is present in Germany and has spread to Scandinavia. The tableau de bord, which the French have traditionally employed, has been compared to the BSC while yet being distinct from it in terms of its conception of a balanced framework of measuring. There is mounting evidence that the BSC is being used across Asia, including Taiwan and Singapore, and by 2010, there had been over 100 instances of adoption in Chinese hospitals alone, only one area of the country's economy. The BSC is currently present in numerous sorts of organisations, but the early articles focused mostly on the for-profit industry. There are several publications explaining the BSC's potential applications in government and charitable organisations; Kaplan and Norton show how these applications might change when the purpose is prioritized before financial results. Academics have shown a great deal of interest in the BSC for their research, and there is an active discussion among practitioners. Robert Chenhall created the term "strategic performance measurement systems" to refer to any systems created to convert strategy into measurements and connect operations to the corporate vision since there are alternatives to the BSC.

The efficacy of using BSC has been the subject of conflicting study findings. bad implementations are often held accountable for bad outcomes, as is common with most management systems. Instead of concentrating on implementation issues, its critics contend that it is difficult to adopt, does not provide the expected advantages, is more restrictive than enabling, and will lessen rather than increase creativity and innovation. Although the factors that affect financial success are of great interest to all organisations, the financial results often take centre stage on the corporate agenda. Even with the BSC present, the board seems to still be quite concerned about the short-term financial performance. In fact, some academics contend that the BSC is a poor stand-in for financial success.One author who has criticised the BSC for being oversold and without empirical data to support its claim that it would lead to improved performance is Andre de Waal. KEN MERCER, a renowned management control systems author voiced his opinion that claims made by the BSC is appropriate and useful in every organisation are harmful, and there is not enough data to back up such assertions. Even when there is a link between BSC usage and high performance, it is possible that high-performing organisations utilise the BSC to bring together important performance concerns rather than having the BSC be the primary factor in performance. Others contend that the BSC's four perspectives have been utilised as a measuring "straitjacket," which may actually hurt businesses by limiting the scope for innovation and creativity.

The scorecard should be seen as a fundamental framework with lots of flexibility, according to Kaplan and Norton, and measures in the area of innovation should encourage rather than restrain.The fundamental idea of the cause-and-effect connection has come under intense scrutiny. This is thought to be a challenging procedure. More than three-quarters of implementers, according to studies from Austria, Germany, Malaysia, and the US, failed to forge these connections. It has been seen to be quite challenging to assert causal links between views. These connections could be flimsy theories that shift quickly. It is not surprising that there is a connection between consumers and financial results, but it is unclear how much of a lag there is. The connections were thought to be logical rather than causative.

The BSC is created to promote external involvement and concentrate on possibilities as they present themselves. The explanation of Mobil employees' prospective perceptions of distribution locations by Kaplan and Norton serves as an example. Due to all of this, researchers have hypothesised that there may not always be enough resources available to make the scorecard active, which might result in it being too inwardly oriented, stagnant, and not paying enough attention to the external world. Some academics have discovered that in practise, managers struggle to develop ways to help staff members think out reactions to the external environment, as opposed to assisting with plan execution. Researchers have highlighted the significant expansion of the literature on intellectual capital and contrasted it with the BSC's learning-and-growth approach, which is often seen as its weakest point. The body of knowledge on intellectual capital and intangible assets is expanding, and it is becoming clear that they are far more complicated than the BSC literature may have one to believe. A management approach called the BSC seems to be here to stay. Coordination of strategy creation, implementation, and progress monitoring is a useful technique that is used by many organisations, whether at the board level or across the whole organisations. Less often used are detailed scorecards that cascade down the organisations to the departmental and individual levels. It is yet unclear if organisations will see the BSC as a key instrument in the implementation of their strategies.

III. CONCLUSION

Organisations now assess and monitor performance using the Balanced Scorecard, which has become a key strategic management tool. A holistic picture of an organization's health and progress towards strategic objectives is provided by its holistic approach, which incorporates both financial and non-financial viewpoints. The capacity of the Balanced Scorecard to unite all levels of an organisation, from top management to frontline personnel, under a shared set of goals is one of its main advantages. The Balanced Scorecard enhances strategic communication and makes sure everyone is aware of their part in attaining organisational success by transforming the organization's vision and strategy into concrete, measurable, attainable, relevant, and time-bound (SMART) objectives. Additionally, the Balanced Scorecard encourages placing equal emphasis on long-term sustainability and immediate financial gains. Organisations are advised to balance their performance indicators and avoid placing an excessive emphasis on short-term financial gains that might jeopardise long-term survival by including non-financial metrics linked to customer satisfaction, internal procedures, learning, and development.

The Balanced Scorecard's applicability too many sectors and organisational situations is a key additional benefit. It has been effectively used in for-profit companies as well as government, healthcare, educational, and non-profit institutions. This adaptability highlights the framework's applicability to all situations and its efficiency in dealing with different performance issues.The Balanced Scorecard implementation is not without difficulties, however. Change may be difficult for organisations, especially when moving from a solely financial strategy to a balanced one. To make sure they accurately represent the organization's strategic aims, it is also necessary to give serious thought to the design and selection of relevant performance indicators.

Organisations need to promote a culture of data-driven decision-making and continual improvement if they want to fully benefit from the Balanced Scorecard. It's essential to regularly gather and evaluate performance data in order to pinpoint areas that need work, monitor advancement, and make educated strategic plan revisions. By providing a thorough and balanced approach to performance evaluation and management, the Balanced Scorecard has revolutionised strategic management. Organisations may better connect their activities with their strategic goals, promote performance improvement, and increase long-term success thanks to the combination of financial and non-financial viewpoints. Organisations may negotiate the complexity of the contemporary business environment and maintain a path of sustainable development and success by using the power of the balanced scorecard.

REFERENCES

[1] P. L. Chong, T. S. Onga, A. Abdullah, and W. C. Choo, “Internationalisation and innovation on balanced scorecard (BSC) among Malaysian small and medium enterprises (SMEs),” *Manag. Sci. Lett.*, 2019, doi: 10.5267/j.msl.2019.5.025.

[2] I. Kefe, “The determination of performance measures by using a balanced scorecard framework,” *Found. Manag.*, 2019, doi: 10.2478/fman-2019-0004.

[3] H. C. Oliveira, L. Lima-Rodrigues, and R. Craig, “The presence of bureaucracy in the balanced scorecard,” *Revista de Contabilidad-Spanish Accounting Review*. 2019. doi: 10.6018/rcsar.382271.

[4] L. Alvarez, A. Soler, L. Guiñón, and A. Mira, “A balanced scorecard for assessing a strategic

plan in a clinical laboratory," *Biochemia Medica*. 2019. doi: 10.11613/BM.2019.020601.

[5] X. Wu, S. Li, N. Xu, D. Wu, and X. Zhang, "Establishing a balanced scorecard measurement system for integrated care organizations in China," *Int. J. Health Plann. Manage.*, 2019, doi: 10.1002/hpm.2726.

[6] L. E. Quezada, E. A. Reinao, P. I. Palominos, and A. M. Oddershede, "Measuring performance using SWOT analysis and balanced scorecard," in *Procedia Manufacturing*, 2019. doi: 10.1016/j.promfg.2020.01.430.

[7] M. Sartor, "The balanced scorecard," in *Quality Management: Tools, Methods and Standards*, 2019. doi: 10.1108/978-1-78769-801-720191004.

[8] V. Macián, B. Tormos, and J. Herrero, "Maintenance management balanced scorecard approach for urban transport fleets," *Eksploat. i Niezawodn.*, 2019, doi: 10.17531/ein.2019.2.6.

[9] B. B. Wiyono, D. E. Kusumaningrum, I. Gunawan, and M. Ardiansyah, "Implementation of school management based on a balanced scorecard and its relationship with headmaster attributes in Indonesia," *Int. J. Innov. Creat. Chang.*, 2019.

[10] S. Khalid, C. Beattie, J. Sands, and V. Hampson, "Incorporating the environmental dimension into the balanced scorecard: A case study in health care," *Meditari Account. Res.*, 2019, doi: 10.1108/MEDAR-06-2018-0360.