

AN APPROPRIATE FINANCIAL PERSPECTIVE FOR A BALANCED SCORECARD

ABSTRACT

The balanced scorecard has proved itself as a valuable strategic tool in measuring, not only the financial performance, but also the customer focus, internal business processes and the learning and growth of a company. To date, very little has been done to incorporate new breakthroughs in financial management in the financial perspective of the balanced scorecard. In this study, new trends in financial management research are recognized in suggesting a 'balanced financial scorecard' consisting of only five specifically selected measures of financial performance. The statistical technique, principal component analysis, is used to test the ability of these five measures to predict the market value added (MVA) of a company, compared to the predictive power of a range of accounting ratios. The results show that over the long term, the five measures suggested actually out-perform the traditional accounting ratios, thus lending support to the contention that the five measures suggested represents the drivers of shareholder value better than the traditional accounting ratios do. The search for a balanced financial perspective is an ongoing process, but the measures suggested could make a constructive contribution in taking this process forward.

AN APPROPRIATE FINANCIAL PERSPECTIVE FOR A BALANCED SCORECARD

INTRODUCTION

The concept of a balanced scorecard, introduced by Kaplan and Norton (1992:71) constitutes one of the major contributions towards improved corporate performance measurement during the last few decades. Research evidence cited in the next section indicates that the majority of leading companies in the USA have adopted some version of the balanced scorecard and institutions worldwide are catching up fast by following their example.

The financial perspective is frequently referred to as an important component of the balanced scorecard; yet it seems as if the development of the financial portion of the balanced scorecard has not moved much beyond the original suggestions of Kaplan and Norton. The latest research in financial management, especially the concepts of value creation and value management, necessitates adjustments to the suggested financial framework.

The purpose of this paper is to suggest a new balanced financial scorecard based on the latest developments in financial management. The approach taken will be to investigate the literature on financial management and to identify the latest trends. A balanced financial scorecard based on the results of our research will then be suggested, after which the usefulness of that balanced financial scorecard will be tested empirically. Based on the results of the research and empirical tests it will then be concluded whether or not certain adjustments to the original financial component of the balanced scorecard are justified.

The paper is set out as follows:

- Theoretical background on the balanced scorecard
- The financial perspective
- A suggested balanced financial scorecard
- Research methodology
- Research results
- Conclusion and recommendations

THEORETICAL BACKGROUND ON THE BALANCED SCORECARD


According to Kaplan and Norton (1992:71) “the balanced scorecard is like the dials in an airline cockpit: it gives managers complex information at a glance”. Not only did it move away from a narrow focus on traditional financial accounting measures of performance, but it integrated the vision and strategy with the operations of the organization in such a way that in the words of Kaplan and Norton (1992:79) it “keeps companies looking – and moving – forward instead of backward”.

Kaplan and Norton (1992:72) suggested four different perspectives for managers to look at and evaluate the company, namely:

- the financial perspective;
- the customer perspective;
- the internal business process perspective; and
- the innovation and learning perspective.

In addition to financial measures that reflect what has happened in the past (lagging measures), operational measures affecting future financial performance (leading measures), and specifically customer satisfaction, internal processes and innovation and improvement, were included in the balanced scorecard. The balanced scorecard is presented in Figure 1.

Figure 1: The balanced scorecard



Source: Kaplan and Norton (1996a:76)

Kaplan and Norton followed up their initial work on the balanced scorecard with a number of books and articles, expanding their initial theories and integrating performance with strategy (Kaplan & Norton, 1996b; Kaplan, 1998:10; Kaplan & Norton, 2001a:87; Kaplan & Norton, 2001b, Kaplan, 2005:41 and Kaplan & Norton, 2006). From the initial introduction of the balanced scorecard model, various aspects relating to the weightings, the linkages between the drivers of performance and the alignment of strategy, people and performance measures have been elaborated on by different researchers including Ittner, Larcker and Meyer (2003:725), Banker, Chang and Pizzini (2004:22), Cokins (2004:67), Brewer (2004:59), Dilla and Steinbert (2005:51) and Dent (2005:25). Some commentators suggested combining the balanced scorecard with other vital management information not reflected in the balanced scorecard. Bukh, Johansen and Mouritsen, (2002:21) proposed combining the balanced scorecard with an intellectual capital statement and Beasley, Chen, Nunez and Wright (2006:54) suggested combining the balanced scorecard with an enterprise risk management report.

Numerous authors like Atkinson and Epstein (2000:28), DeFeo (2000:33), Albrecht, Stice, Stice and Skousen (2002:525), Hilton (2002:456), Hansen and Mowen (2003:404), Horngren, Datar and Foster (2003:449), Davis and Albright (2004:150), Drury (2004:999), Garg and Ma (2005:266) and Garrison, Noreen and Brewer (2006:449) have acknowledged the importance and impact of the balanced financial scorecard in modern-day management. However, despite the widespread support for the balanced scorecard, some criticisms have been aired, notably by Gering and Mntambo (2000:19) who stated that the balanced scorecard failed to balance the interests of the stakeholders and by Angel and Rampersad (2005:33) who pointed out that there has been little evidence indicating that adoption of the balanced scorecard results in improved financial performance.

Even after considering the criticisms in the previous paragraph, the impact of the balanced scorecard on modern-day management is indisputable. This is backed up by reports on the practical implementation of the balanced scorecard that include comments by Bean and Jarnagin (2002:55), quoting a survey finding that about 60 percent of Fortune 1000 companies either use some kind of scorecard system or are experimenting with it. Case studies highlighting the successful implementation of the balanced scorecard approach by different organizations were published by Sim and Koh (2001:19) and Gumbus, Lyons and Bellhouse (2002:50). Gumbus (2005:617)

reported a survey finding that more than 50 percent of Fortune 500 companies used the balanced financial scorecard as a strategic management tool.

From the reports of the wide-spread implementation of the balanced scorecard mentioned in the previous paragraph, as well as evidence of the continued refinement of the balanced scorecard cited on page four, one can conclude that it cannot be seen as a passing fad, but that it is indeed a valuable contribution towards strategic performance management. The next section focuses on the financial perspective.


THE FINANCIAL PERSPECTIVE

In their first article on the balanced scorecard, Kaplan and Norton (1992:76) mention the following measures as being important from a financial perspective:

- cash flow;
- sales growth;
- operating income;
- market share; and
- ROE (return on equity)

It is worth noting that two of the five measures mentioned above, namely sales growth and market share, link directly to the customer perspective. Various developments in financial management research and practice just before and since 1992 have resulted in new thinking and refinements to the initial model. The most important of these developments are the shareholder value analysis (SVA) model of Rappaport (1986:76) and the economic value added (EVA) and market value added (MVA) concepts popularized by Stewart (1991:153) and Stern (1993:36). The SVA model of Rappaport (1986:76) is presented in Figure 2.

Figure 2: Shareholder value analysis model of Rappaport



Source: Rappaport (1986:76)

Rappaport’s model indicated that shareholder value is driven by seven factors, namely sales growth, the operating profit margin, the cash tax rate, investment in working capital, investment in fixed assets, the cost of capital and the planning period (the length of time over which the future cash flow projections are made). Support for using the SVA model to measure corporate financial performance came from Barsky and Bremser (1999:4) and Barfield (1999:33). Two limitations of the SVA model are the difficulty in estimating future cash flows and the absence of one performance measure to which remuneration can be linked.


The EVA model is based on the assertion that economic profits (EVA) have the greatest impact on shareholder value as measured by the MVA and therefore EVA should be maximized. EVA is a better performance measure than net profit because it is calculated after taking into account the full

cost of capital, including an opportunity cost for using equity. The biggest limitation of EVA (and also its strength) is the fact that it is a single measure of performance. In spite of early reports of good correlation between EVA and MVA (r^2 of 50%) by Stern (1993:36), research to date has not proved conclusively that EVA correlates better with shareholder wealth than other traditional accounting measures. Support for using the EVA along with, or as part of the balanced scorecard, came from Cates (1997:21), Skyrme and Amidon (1998:23) and Cates (1998:60).

The financial strategy matrix by Hawawini and Viallet (1999:507) is a noteworthy financial innovation in the context of finding an appropriate financial perspective. Two variables, namely wealth creation (EVA) and cash management, are used to evaluate a company and to place it in a certain quadrant on the financial strategy matrix. A relative measure of wealth creation, the return spread, is used instead of EVA and the cash management is measured by the difference between sales growth and the sustainable growth rate.

Companies placed in Quadrant A are those that have positive EVAs and are generating positive cash flows (on the grounds that their sales growth rate is smaller than their sustainable growth rate). Quadrant B companies have a positive EVA, but are growing too fast and therefore are building up cash deficits. Quadrant C companies have negative EVAs and are generating cash surpluses, while Quadrant D companies have negative EVAs and are building up cash shortfalls. Quadrant A is the best quadrant to be in and Quadrant D the worst. The placement of any given company is used to determine a financial strategy that is appropriate in that situation and taking into account that the companies not in Quadrant A should aspire to move to Quadrant A. The financial strategy matrix is presented in Figure 3.

Figure 3: Financial strategy matrix



Source: Adapted from Hawawini and Viallet (1999:507)

The financial strategy matrix is a better proposition than using EVA alone, but its drawbacks lie in the fact that it is a single year model and that the sales growth minus sustainable growth rate can be a misleading indicator of the cash management of a company. When an increase in assets is financed by new issues of debt or equity, the sales growth rate can be much higher than the sustainable growth rate, without causing cash deficits. The search for a balanced view of the most important financial indicators at a glance therefore continues.

Putting forward a balanced financial perspective would need to take into account the original financial factors suggested by Kaplan and Norton (1992:72) and to add new measures from subsequent developments in the field of finance and strategy, like shareholder value analysis and EVA and MVA. Frigo and Krumwiede (2000:52) and Berkman (2002:3) stressed the importance of limiting the number of performance factors included in the scorecard. Their view is supported by Cleverley (2001:32) and Cleverley and Cleverley (2005:64) who commented on financial dashboard reporting in the hospital industry.

In order to develop an appropriate financial perspective, a few financial components considered to be most important and representing a balanced overall picture (dashboard), need to be included. Based on the theoretical analysis these could include:

- some traditional accounting measures, like operating income and ROE;
- some factors linking customer perspective to financial perspective, like sales growth and market share;
- some measure(s) of cash flows; and
- EVA and MVA.

The financial measures included in the financial perspective of the balanced scorecard should have the following characteristics:

- they must be small in number;
- they must be vital to the financial success of the company;
- they must be closely linked to the overall strategy of the firm;
- they must have a balance between leading and lagging indicators; and
- they must correlate well with value creation (Frigo & Litman 2002:11).

SUGGESTED BALANCED FINANCIAL SCORECARD

The emphasis on the creation of value for shareholders as a corporate goal is clear from our literature study. MVA is the variable that management must aim to maximize in order to deliver value to the shareholders (Stern 1993:36).

The goal of the study is to suggest a small number of financial measures that top management must keep track of and manage in order to maximize MVA. The process to select the five ratios to

be included in the balanced financial scorecard was loosely based on the results of the literature review (what ratios others found essential). The correlation matrix of the complete list of 65 ratios, judgment based on experience of accounting and the objective of using a particular ratio also played a role in the final selection process.

The different internal performance measures used as the five specifically chosen ratios/ the balanced financial scorecard ratios were:

- The performance spread, or “Spread”, which is standardised EVA (EVA/IC_{beg}).
- Invested capital at the beginning of the year, or “ IC_{beg} ”.
- Economic value added, or “EVA”.
- The cash flow from operations (after tax, but before interest and dividends) standardised as CFL/ IC_{beg} .
- The sales growth percentage from the previous period.

The justification for using the five variables above are the following: The first two, Spreads and IC_{beg} are the components that make up EVA. EVA in turn, is claimed by Stewart (1991:153) and Stern (1993:36) to be the best internal driver of MVA and therefore the one measure that should be maximized. A measure of cash flows, CFL/ IC_{beg} , is included because of the strong link between free cash flows and the value of an organization and also for the importance of cash flows for the ultimate survival of a company. The sales growth percentage is retained on the grounds that it is the important link between the customer focus and the financial perspective. The motive for selecting only five measures is ascribed to the ‘few in number’ requirement.

Based on the theoretical analysis, the main hypothesis to be tested can now be postulated. There is an expectation that the five measures suggested would have the same, or greater impact on shareholder value as indicated by the MVA, compared to the traditional accounting ratios. The empirical tests used to select appropriate financial measures are discussed in the next section.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The source of the information used in the study was McGregor BFA, based at the University of Pretoria. McGregor BFA is a major provider of information for the financial analysis of South African listed and de-listed companies. Their Station product is a fundamental analysis tool, which contains information on listed companies, de-listed companies, commodities, N-shares and preference shares. What makes their information especially useful for this study is that they capture the data contained in the annual financial statements of listed companies on a yearly basis, standardize it and calculate a set of 42 standard financial ratios per company.

The 42 ratios have been pre-defined by McGregor BFA and are based on their initial study of the information demanded by analysts and the feedback that they have received from clients over the years. It can thus be said that the set of BFA ratios have been found useful by the market as the market's feedback was used in compiling their set of financial ratios.

The final "large" data set used in the study consists of a matrix of 13 years of observations of 65 financial ratios for 53 companies. Each component of this 13x65x53 matrix will now be discussed in greater detail.

The years 1990 – 1994 can be regarded as a changeover period for South-Africa from the political system of Apartheid to that of a representative democracy. This political change would have influenced the South African capital markets. Markets are forward-looking and as the negotiations that led to South-Africa's first democratic elections on 27 April 1994 were completed in 1993, it was decided to limit the data used in the study to a period after this "structural break". Data was obtained for the 13 years from 1993 to 2005.

The 65 financial ratios obtained for the study are a combination of "traditional" financial ratios as represented by the 42 McGregor BFA standard financial ratios and more "modern" financial ratios that have been identified in the literature on EVA. Table 1 presents the 65 financial ratios that were included in the final data set.

Table 1: Financial ratios included in final data set

Ratio group	Description	Number of ratios in group
Traditional ratios	Ratios defined for this study	12
	BFA McGregor ratios	40
Modern ratios	Cash flow ratios	6
	Sales growth %	1
Value based ratios	Balanced financial scorecard ratios (includes ratio to be backcasted - MVA)	6
Total		65

All companies listed on the JSE on 25 January 2006 were identified as a first step in choosing the companies from which financial ratios will be obtained, a total of 325 companies. Banks, other financial institutions and mining companies were then excluded as they could not provide the required information to determine the critical variables for the analysis, for example, the cost of capital to determine the EVA. ALT_x , Development Capital and Venture Capital listed companies were also excluded on the grounds that the ALT_x has not existed for the full period of the data required and that companies not listed on the main exchange would not be comparable to those that are. This brought the total down to 177 companies. Thinly traded shares were identified and those companies were excluded from the study (113 companies). A further 11 companies were finally eliminated due to missing data or financial year-ends that changed during the 13 years under review. This left 53 companies for which the 65 financial ratios were obtained for the 13 years from 1993 to 2005.

Description of procedure applied to datasets

Bouwman, Frishkoff and Frishkoff (1987:1) state that the objective of financial reporting is to provide information that is useful in investment and credit decisions. In this study the focus was on the usefulness of accounting information for investment purposes. The financial outcome MVA was chosen as a measure of external or market performance to be derived from other internal financial ratios.

The objective of this empirical exercise is to show that five chosen financial ratios, the ratios suggested for tracking on the balanced financial scorecard, is as accurate or even more accurate in predicting MVA as a much larger set of financial ratios. If true, a possible conclusion is that the ratios included in the balanced financial scorecard should be the financial ratios that top management monitors and gives special attention to.

Frequently in deciding on the “best” set of explanatory variables for a regression model, researchers often follow the method of stepwise regression. In this method one proceeds either by introducing the X variables one at a time or by including all the possible X variables in one multiple regression and rejecting them one at a time. The decision to add or drop a variable is usually made on the basis of the contribution of the variable under consideration in explaining the changes in the dependant variable (the F-score and the R^2 value is frequently used). According to Goldberg & Jochems (1961:105) stepwise regression, especially when multicollinearity is present, underestimates the contribution of variables not tested first.

It is common for data associated with financial markets to have a high degree of collinearity. This is characterized by a few sources of information in the data that are common to many variables. Collinearity in our dataset can be observed by studying the correlation diagram of the data (Appendix A). Eighty instances of correlation between one financial ratio and another of more than 0.7 can be observed.

Taking into consideration the high level of collinearity in the data and the problems noted with stepwise regression it was decided to use principle component analysis (PCA) as the statistical method for the study. The principle component analyses tool reduces the many different variables describing a movement/change under investigation to orthogonal dimensions. This assists with overcoming the problems with data where the explanatory variables are highly collinear and the principle component technique can be used to fill in data points for variables where the variables in the system are highly correlated.

Specifically the last 70 observations of the financial outcome MVA will be removed from the data matrix and will then be backcasted/calculated using PCA based, in the first instance, on all 64

financial ratios. Then MVA will be backcasted using PCA based on only five specifically chosen ratios. The accuracy of the backcasted MVA values will be compared with each other.

RESEARCH RESULTS

The 70 MVA values that were backcasted by the PCA statistical engine based on 13 years of observations of the five balanced financial scorecard ratios were extremely accurate. The results are surprising as previous studies have shown that it is very difficult to predict external market variables by using internal accounting derived information.

A visual inspection of Figure 4 later on the next page suggests that the backcasted results based on the five balanced scorecard variables track the actual data values very well. The performance of all the accounting variables in backcasting the missing MVA variables is not nearly as good. This visual conclusion is confirmed by the root mean square error (RMSQE) of the missing MVA values backcasted by the PCA engine based on the five balanced financial scorecard variables being equal to R 12 051 817; substantially less than the RMSQE of the missing MVA values backcasted by the PCA engine based on all the accounting variables that is equal to R 22 099 430.

Originally it was intended to use only 10 years of data to build the PCA backcasting engine on. When this was done the results above changed substantially. In this instance the accuracy of the backcast based on the five balanced financial scorecard ratios was worse than the backcast made based on all the accounting ratios. The accuracy of the backcast made using all the accounting ratios was also relatively stable across the move from 13 years of data to 10 years of data. As mentioned the results for the backcast made using the balanced financial scorecard was not very stable and over 10 years the accuracy declined by a huge margin.

Figure 4: Backcasting results based on 1) all the accounting variables and 2) the five balanced scorecard variables



Table 2: Accuracy of different backcasts

Matrix Name	Number of ratios in matrix (excluding MVA)	Type of matrix	R ² of PC's included in back casting model	No. of PC's used to backcast	RMSQE
A	5	13 years of data used. Backcast with balanced financial scorecard ratios	100%	5	12,051,817
B	64	13 years of data used. Backcast with all ratios	97%	30	22,099,430
C	5	10 years of data used. Backcast with balanced financial scorecard ratios	100%	5	27,598,194
D	64	10 years of data used. Backcast with all ratios	97%	30	20,892,399

Interpretation of results

The focal point of this empirical exercise was to show that a carefully selected group of few internal accounting ratios can be effectively used instead of a large group of detailed accounting ratios. The results, especially the long-term results, indicate that this is certainly worthy of consideration as the forecasting ability of the large group and the smaller group is of the same order with the balanced financial scorecard ratios outperforming traditional accounting ratios over the long term.

The remarkable accuracy achieved over the longer term by using the balanced financial scorecard ratios to backcast MVA and the subsequent disappearance of that ability over the 10 year period is more difficult to explain. A possible answer might lie in the South African business cycle that according to Smit (2003:2) entered an upswing in June 1993 that lasted until December 1996 (the stock market, our ultimate data source, usually leads the business cycle). The difference between the 10 year data set and the 13 year data set is the exact period from January 1993 until December 1995. We believe that it is over the long term that the balanced scorecard ratios as selected have predictive ability and that over the short term other factors dominate the market movements.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The balanced scorecard approach to evaluating corporate performance certainly advanced the ability of management to add value to shareholders in the long-term. However, the financial component of the balanced scorecard lagged behind in terms of reflecting the latest developments in financial management and contributing to the goal of maximizing shareholder value.

The initial measures originally deemed important from a financial perspective by Kaplan and Norton (1992:76) were cash flow, sales growth, operating income, market share and ROE. New developments in financial management theory, which somehow need to be reflected in an appropriate financial perspective, include the shareholder value (SVA) model of Rappaport (1986:76), the EVA and MVA concepts popularized by Stewart (1991:153) and Stern (1993:36) and the financial strategy matrix developed by Hawawini and Viallet (1999:507).

In this paper a new updated approach is suggested for the financial component of the balanced scorecard based on the latest financial management theory. Recent research from various sources indicated the need to retain some measure of cash flow and sales growth from the original suggestions of Kaplan and Norton (1992:76) and to augment them with three measures of value-creation, namely spreads, invested capital and EVA. Spreads represent a component of EVA (as does invested capital), but it was decided to include EVA as well as spreads and invested capital in order to have absolute measures of value-creation, namely EVA and invested capital, as well as a relative measure of value creation, namely spreads. Being a relative measure of financial performance, spreads are ideal for the purposes of comparison between different companies. The statistical technique principal component analysis was used to show that the five chosen financial ratios, the ratios suggested for tracking on the balanced financial scorecard, is as accurate or even more accurate in predicting MVA as a much larger set of financial ratios.

Clearly the 'holy grail' of a single reliable financial performance measure does not exist or has not been found. At least research to date has shown that some combination of measures would be required for a balanced financial view. It is concluded that the balanced financial scorecard suggested better predicts shareholder value (MVA) than traditional accounting ratios over the long-term. It is therefore recommended that as far as the financial perspective of the balance scorecard is concerned, traditional accounting measures are replaced by the real drivers of

shareholder value, including EVA, spreads and invested capital. Without a doubt, other combinations of measures could be just as effective, or even more effective in measuring the drivers of shareholder value. Even so, it is believed that the balanced financial scorecard suggested, as part of a bigger overall balanced scorecard, could make a significant contribution towards more elegant financial navigating.

REFERENCES

ALBRECHT, W.S., STICE, J.D., STICE, E.K. & SKOUSEN, K.F. 2002. *Management Accounting*. 2nd edition. Cincinnati: South-Western.

ANGEL, R. & RAMPERSAD, H. 2005. Do scorecards add up? *CA Magazine*. Vol.138, nr.4:30-35.

ATKINSON, A. & EPSTEIN, M. 2000. Measure for measure. *CMA Management*. Vol.74, nr.7:22-28.

BANKER, R.D., CHANG, H. & PIZZINI, M.J. 2004. The balanced scorecard: Judgmental effects of performance measures linked to strategy. *The Accounting Review*. Vol.79, nr.1:1-23.

BARFIELD, R. 1999. How to achieve shareholder value. *Balance Sheet*. Vol.7, nr.3:33-34.

BARSKY, N.P. & BREMSER, W.G. 1999. Performance measurement, budgeting and strategic implementation in the multinational enterprise. *Managerial Finance*. Vol.25, nr.2:3-15.

BEAN, L. & JARNAGIN, B.D. 2002. New cost priorities: Using a balanced scorecard approach in financial reports. *The journal of corporate accounting & finance*. Vol.13, nr.3:55-62.

BEASLEY, M., CHEN, A., NUNEZ, K. & WRIGHT, L. 2006. Working hand in hand: balanced scorecards and enterprise risk management. *Strategic finance*. Vol.87, nr.9:49-65.

BERKMAN, E. 2002. How to use the balanced scorecard; You can't tell when you're winning if you don't keep score. The Balanced scorecard helps track your hits and misses. *CIO*. Vol.15, nr.15:1-4.

BOUWMAN, M, FRISHKOFF, P, & FRISHKOFF, P. 1987. How do analysts make decisions? A process model of the investment screening decision. *Accounting Organisations and Society*, Vol. 12, No. 1, pp.1-29.

BREWER, P.C. 2004. Six sigma helps a company to create a culture of accountability. *Journal of organizational excellence*. Vol.23, nr.3:45-59.

BUKH, P.N., JOHANSEN, M.R. & MOURITSEN, J. 2002. Multiple integrated performance management systems: IC and BSC in a software company. *Singapore management review*. Vol.24, nr.3:21-33.

CATES, D.C. 1997. The case for a new model of financial performance. *Bank Accounting & Finance*. Vol.11, nr.1:21-28.

CATES, D.C. 1998. Turning shareholder value into stock price. *American Bankers Association Journal*. Vol.90, nr.5:59-64.

CLEVERLEY, W.O. 2001. Financial dashboard reporting for the hospital industry. *Journal of health care finance*. Vol.27, nr.3:30-40.

CLEVERLEY, W.O. & CLEVERLEY, J.O. 2005. Scorecards and dashboards: using financial metrics to improve performance. *Healthcare Financial Management*. Vol.59, nr.7:64-69.

COKINS, G. 2004. Performance measurement – making it work. *The journal of corporate accounting & finance*. Vol.16, nr.1:65-70.

DAVIS, S. & ALBRIGHT, T. 2004. An investigation of the effect of the balanced scorecard implementation on financial performance. *Management accounting research* nr.15:135-153.

- DEFEO, J. 2000. Measuring what matters. *Industrial Management*. Vol.42, nr3:31-33.
- DENT, R. 2005. The balanced scorecard 101. *Accountancy SA*. March:24,25.
- DILLA, W.N. & STEINFORD, P.J. 2005. Relative weighting of common and unique balanced scorecard measures by knowledgeable decision makers. *Behavioral Research in Accounting*. Vol.17:43-53.
- DRURY, C. 2004. *Management and cost accounting*. 6th edition. London: Thomson.
- FRIGO, M.L. & KRUMWIEDE, K.R. 2000. The balanced scorecard: a winning performance measurement system. *Strategic Finance*. Vol.81, nr.7:50-54.
- FRIGO, M.L. & LITMAN, J. 2002. What is return driven strategy? *Strategic Finance*. Vol.83, nr.8:11-13.
- GARG, R.K. & MA, J. 2005. Benchmarking culture and performance in Chinese organizations. *Benchmarking*. Vol.12, nr.3:260-274.
- GARRISON, R.H., NOREEN, E.W. & SEAL, P.C. 2006. *Managerial accounting*. 11th international edition. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- GERING, M. & MNTAMBO, V. 2000. Neither balanced nor scorecard. *Accountancy SA*. August:17,19.
- GOLDBERGER, A.S. & JOCHEMS, D.B. 1961. Notes on Stepwise Least Squares. *Journal of American Statistical Association*. Vol.56, nr.293:105-110.
- GUMBUS, A. 2005. Introducing the balanced scorecard: creating metrics to measure performance. *Journal of Management Education*. Vol.29, nr.4:617-630.

GUMBUS, A., LYONS, B. & BELLHOUSE, D.E. 2002. Journey to destination 2005. *Strategic finance*. Vol.84, nr.2:46-50.

HANSEN, D.R. & MOWEN, M.M. 2003. *Management Accounting*. 6th edition. Mason: Thomson.

HAWAWINI, G. & VIALLET, C. 1999. *Finance for executives*. Cincinnati: Thomson.

HILTON, R.W. 2002. *Managerial accounting*. 5th edition. New York: McGraw-Hill.

HORNGREN, C.T., DATAR, S.M., FOSTER, G. 2003. *Cost accounting – a managerial emphasis*. 11th edition. Upper Saddle River: Prentice Hall.

ITTNER, C.D., LARCKER, D.F. & MEYER, M.W. 2003. Subjectivity and the weighting of performance measures: Evidence from a balanced scorecard. *The Accounting Review*. Vol.78, nr.3:725-758.

KAPLAN, R.S. 1998. Innovation action research: creating new management theory and practice. *Management Accounting Research* nr.10:89-118.

KAPLAN, R.S. 2005. How the balanced scorecard complements the McKinsey 7-S model. *Strategy & Leadership*. vol.33, nr.3:41-46.

KAPLAN, R.S. & NORTON, D.P. 1992. The balanced scorecard – measures that drive performance. *Harvard Business Review*, Jan – Feb:71-79.

KAPLAN, R.S. & NORTON, D.P. 1996a. Using the balanced scorecard as a strategic management system. *Harvard Business Review*, Jan – Feb:75-85.

KAPLAN, R.S. & NORTON, D.P. 1996b. *The balanced scorecard: translating strategy into action*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

KAPLAN, R.S. & NORTON, D.P. 2001a. Transforming the balanced scorecard from performance measurement to strategic management: part 1. *Accounting Horizons* Vol.15, nr.1:87-104.

KAPLAN, R.S. & NORTON, D.P. 2001b. *The strategy-focused organization*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

KAPLAN, R.S. & NORTON, D.P. 2006. *Alignment: using the balanced scorecard*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

RAPPAPORT, A. 1986. *Creating shareholder value*. New York: The Free Press

SIM, K.L. & KOH, H.C. 2001. Balanced scorecard: A rising trend in strategic performance measurement. *Measuring business excellence*. Vol.5, nr.2:18-26.

SKYRME, D.J. & AMIDON, D.M. 1998. New measures of success. *The Journal of Business Strategy*. Vol.19, nr.1:20-24.

SMIT, B. 2003. The medium-term outlook for the South African economy. Paper delivered at the BER conference at the Protea Hotel, Balalaika, Sandton, on 5 June 2003.

STERN, J. 1993. Value and people management. *Corporate Finance*, July:35-37.

STEWART, G.B. III 1991. *The quest for value*. New York: Harper-Collins.

AN APPROPRIATE FINANCIAL PERSPECTIVE FOR A BALANCED SCORECARD

AUTHORS:

Prof. JHvH de Wet

Associate professor

Tel. 012 – 420 3731

Fax. 012 – 420 3916

E.mail: johannes.dewet@up.ac.za

Office 3 – 15

Financial Management Department

EB – Building

University of Pretoria

Mr. P de Jager

Senior lecturer

Tel. 012 – 420 4489

Fax. 012 – 420 3916

E.mail: phillip.dejager@up.ac.za

Office 3 – 23

Financial Management Department

EB – Building

University of Pretoria