

## How Can We Improve the Balanced Scorecard?

Davood Askarany\*

Business School, Department of Accounting and Finance, The University of Auckland, Auckland, New Zealand

\*Corresponding author: Davood Askarany, Business School, Department of Accounting and Finance, The University of Auckland, Private Bag: 92019, Auckland, New Zealand, Tel: 64-9-9235785; E-mail: d.askarany@auckland.ac.nz

Rec date: Dec 19, 2016; Acc date: Dec 27, 2016; Pub date: Jan 10, 2017

Copyright: © 2017 Askarany D. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

Citation: Askarany D (2017) How Can We Improve the Balanced Scorecard?. Global J Technol Optim 7: 202. doi:10.4172/2229-8711.1000202

**Keywords:** Balanced scorecard; Risk; Stakeholders rights; Performance measurement; Diffusion of innovation factors into four classic perspectives of the BSC to address its shortcomings.

### Description

#### How can we improve the Balanced Scorecard (BSC)?

Balanced Scorecard (BSC) is one of the most popular performance measurement tools of the past two decades. However, many current and potential adopters of the BSC are not convinced that the technique is able to present a comprehensive picture of organizations' performance. This commentary paper is aiming to address some of the shortcomings of the BSC in practice and provide some suggestions for its improvement. The BSC links non-financial measures with financial measures in four areas of performance concerned with financials, internal process, customers and innovation and learning [1,2]. The literature on the BSC has noticeably highlighted its effectiveness and its usefulness as performance measurement systems for the businesses [3-13]. The overall assessment is that the BSC can contribute to organizations' performance if fully implemented. It enables organizations to clarify their visions and strategies and translate them into actions. It provides feedback around both the internal business processes and external outcomes to (continuously) improve strategic performance and results. When fully deployed, the BSC transforms strategic planning from an academic exercise into the nerve centre of an enterprise [1,14,15]. Nonetheless, despite its suggested merits, research on the diffusion of the BSC indicates that its adoption rate is lower than those of other managerial tools such ABC [16,17]. So, it is unclear if the BSC suffer from any shortcoming/s that might have contributed to its slow adoption in the current ever-changing environment of the 21st century. To learn more about the issues related to the adoption and the implementation of BSC in practice, we have surveyed more 1000 practitioners in different studies in Australia, New Zealand and the UK over the past 10 years. In these studies, we have investigated the impact of a variety of contextual factors such as attributes of the BSC, characteristics of adopters, characteristics of society, etc. on the adoption of the BSC. We have also explored practitioners' views on the shortcomings of the BSC. While we have found many contextual factors are influencing managers' decisions regarding the adoption of the BSC in practice, according to our findings, ignoring the risks, environmental and sustainability factors as well as neglecting the concerns/rights of other relevant stakeholders (besides customers) are the key shortcomings of the BSC, which could undermine its diffusion in practice. Further studies are recommended to explore how we can develop a comprehensive BSC to incorporate additional parameters such as sustainability, risk and environment

### References

1. Kaplan R, Norton D (1992) The balanced scorecard: Measures that drive performance. Harvard Business Review 70: 71-79.
2. Rhodes A (2016) The relation between earnings-based measures in firm debt contracts and CEO pay sensitivity to earnings. J Accou Econ 61: 1-22.
3. Askarany D (2000) The impact of influencing factors on the diffusion of cost and management accounting innovations. In Sixth Interdisciplinary Perspectives on Accounting Conference (IPA) Colloquium Manchester, UK.
4. Askarany D (2003) An investigation into the diffusion of management accounting innovations. In Business School (pp. 343 pages). PhD Thesis, Adelaide: University of South Australia.
5. Askarany D (2003) An overview of the diffusion of advanced techniques. In B.F. Tan (Ed.), Advanced Topics in Global Information (pp. 225-250). London: IDEA Group Publishing.
6. Askarany D (2005) Diffusion of innovations in organizations. In M. Khosrow-Pour (Ed.), Encyclopedia of Information Science and Technology (pp. 853-857). Hershey, PA, USA: IDEA Group Publishing.
7. Askarany D (2006) Characteristics of adopters and organizational changes. Thunderbird International Business Review 48: 705-725.
8. Banker RD, Chang H, Pizzini M (2011) The judgmental effects of strategy maps in balanced scorecard performance evaluations. Int J Accou Information Systems 12: 259-279.
9. Creamer G, Freund Y, (2010) Learning a board balanced scorecard to improve corporate performance. Decision Support Systems 49: 365-385.
10. Dilla WN, Steinbart PJ (2005) The effects of alternative supplementary display formats on balanced scorecard judgments. Int J Accou Information Systems 6: 159-176.
11. Martinsons M, Davison R, Tse D (1999) The balanced scorecard: A foundation for the strategic management of information systems. Decision Support Systems 25: 71-88.
12. Wu IL, Chang CH (2012) Using the balanced scorecard in assessing the performance of e-SCM diffusion: A multi-stage perspective. Decision Support Systems 52: 474-485.
13. Yigitbasioglu OM, Velcu O (2012) A review of dashboards in performance management: Implications for design and research. Int J Accou Information Systems 13: 41-59.
14. Kaplan RS, Norton DP (2004) Strategy maps: Converting intangible assets into tangible outcomes Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
15. Moon T (2010) Organizational cultural intelligence: Dynamic capability perspective. Group & Organization Management 35: 456-493.
16. Chung LH, Gibbons PT (1997) Corporate entrepreneurship: The roles of ideology and social capital. Group & Organization Management 22: 10-30.
17. Yazdifar H, Askarany D (2009) A comparative investigation into the diffusion of management accounting innovations in the UK, Australia and New Zealand. Chartered Inst Management Accountant (CIMA) 5: 1-11.