THE ROLE OF FINANCIAL PERSPECTIVE MEASURES IN ENHANCING ORGANIZATIONAL PERFORMANCE: AN EMPIRICAL ANALYSIS

Suleman Mohammed Yakubu

yakubusulemanwale@yahoo.com

Accra Institute of Technology (AIT)/ Open University Malaysia Department of Business Administration, Accra-North- Ghana.

The Author(s) ORCID 16-Digit: 0009-0006-2814-8332

Statements and Declarations

There is no potential conflict of interest

Funding, no funding was received.

Data availability statement: The data that supports this study were obtained from primary source; this data is attached as an Appendix.

Abstract

The contribution of financial perspective measures to improving organizational performance is empirically examined in this article. The study examines how financial metrics like ROI, cost control, profitability, and revenue growth relate to organizational effectiveness using the case of MTN Ghana. It is based on the balanced scorecard framework. The study uses a quantitative approach to investigate the relationship between financial performance metrics and important success indicators like market share, operational effectiveness, and shareholder value, using data from a dataset of different companies in multiple industries.

The results of the study show how important financial perspective metrics are for reaching competitive advantage and sustainable growth. Businesses that put a high priority on strategic fiscal management typically perform better, especially when it comes to cost-effectiveness, liquidity, and profit margins. But the study also highlights the drawbacks of depending only on financial indicators. To create a more thorough performance evaluation system, it emphasizes the need to combine financial measurements with non-financial indicators like employee development, internal processes, and customer satisfaction.

In summary, the study offers practitioners and scholars useful information by offering evidence-based recommendations for enhancing financial strategies. Organizations can develop a balanced approach to performance measurement that promotes long-term success by using both financial and non-financial metrics. The article ends with practical suggestions for businesses looking to increase output and streamline their budgets.

Keywords: Financial Metrics, Organizational Performance, Balanced Scorecard, Strategic Management, Performance Evaluation

Introduction

According to Banks, Chang, and Pizzini (2004), organizations are being forced to use increasingly sophisticated performance evaluation tools due to the complexity of today's business environment. One such instrument is the Balanced Scorecard (BSC), a framework for performance evaluation developed by Kaplan and Norton in 1992 (Banks et al. 2004). Out of the four BSC perspectives, the financial perspective stays the most significant since it incorporates traditional financial metrics such as profitability, ROI, revenue growth, and cost control Matsoso, M. L., & Benedict, O. H. (2016). Meeting shareholder interests is the aim of the financial perspective. The financial viewpoint evaluates a company's ability to generate revenue from its assets. It is also regarded as a general indicator of the financial health of the business. Raval et al. (2019) mention several financial metrics, including total revenue, net assets, diversification of income sources, and cost reduction. Financial perspective metrics provide managers with information about an organization's profitability and economic stability, enabling them to make well-informed decisions Fouad, B. (2024).

Organizational performance is critical to success in today's intensely competitive and rapidly changing business environment. Organizations must constantly enhance their performance to meet the ever-increasing demands of stakeholders, consumers, and the market. Successful organizations are better equipped to meet their goals, stay up to date, and outperform their competitors. As a result, focusing on organizational performance is crucial for survival and expansion in the modern business environment. Organizational performance is examined in the literature in many ways. For instance, James, Wendy, Zahirul, and Hoque (2000) assess capacity use, sales revenue, ROI, customer satisfaction, and product quality to gauge an organization's efficacy (James et al., 2000). Evans also examines the relationship between his competitors' and his own performance metrics, including market share, financial performance, and customer satisfaction (Evans, 2004). Midovska, M., Mojsovska Salamovska, S., & Odzaklieska, D. (2019), used a well-tested questionnaire to measure twelve aspects of organizational performance over a three-year period: operating profit, return on investment, sales growth, market share, cash flow, new product development, market development, development and research, cost-cutting initiatives, employee relations, employee development.

Three-year reports for return on investment and company ranking were used by Midovska, M., et al... (2019), to assess organizational performance. In their case, the ranking is based on three factors: whether the business has successfully implemented its most recent successes, whether its financial statements place it in the top three, and whether it has been recognized as a leader in the sector for the previous three years. Nevertheless, there are drawbacks to evaluating organizational performance only using financial metrics (Barney, 1991). Organizations must understand the relationship between financial metrics and overarching organizational goals in a setting where non-financial elements such as customer satisfaction, employee engagement, and innovation also play a significant role in performance (Kaplan & Norten, 1996). To help decision-makers balance financial and non-financial performance indicators, this study tries to empirically investigate the role of financial perspective measures in improving organizational performance.

The study background and context

It is still unclear how financial perspective measures contribute to improving performance, despite being widely acknowledged as crucial for organizational performance. While some organizations struggle to integrate financial measures with more comprehensive performance metrics, others prioritize short-term financial results over long-term sustainability. By empirically examining how financial metrics affect organizational performance and how they can be balanced with non-financial performance drivers, this study aims to close the knowledge gap.

While the role of financial perspective measures is well established, several gaps are still in the literature. First, there is limited research on how financial metrics interact with non-financial factors, such as innovation and employee satisfaction, to influence organizational performance. Second, most studies focus on large corporations, leaving a gap in understanding how small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) use financial perspective measures. Lastly, there are few empirical studies looking at how financial metrics affect organizational performance over the long run. Although the significance of financial perspective measures is widely acknowledged, there are still gaps in the literature. First, little is known about how non-financial elements, like creativity and employee satisfaction, interact with financial metrics to affect an organization's performance. Second, little is known about how SMEs use financial perspective measures because most research focuses on large corporations. Finally, there are not many empirical studies that look at how financial metrics affect organizational performance over the long run.

Theoretical literature review

Agency theory

The relationship between principals, like shareholders, and agents, like managers, is emphasized by agency theory. Financial metrics that encourage accountability and transparency, like ROI and profit margins, guarantee alignment between these stakeholders. Managers can improve organizational performance and meet shareholder expectations by perfecting these financial indicators. Well-designed incentives linked to financial metrics have been shown to decrease agency conflicts and increase overall business effectiveness (Eisenhardt, 1989; Garcia-Castro & Francoeur, 2016). More importantly, financial perspective measures that align the interests of principals (such as shareholders) and agents (such as managers) are explained by agency theory. Metrics like profit margins and return on investment (ROI) encourage accountability and transparency, which lessens conflict and guarantees that managers are focusing on boosting shareholder value. Research shows that financial metrics-based performance incentives increase firm efficiency and decrease agency conflicts (Moumin, 2024).

Stakeholder theory

Stakeholder theory states that it is essential to strike a balance between the interests of different parties, including shareholders, suppliers, customers, and employees. Organizations can evaluate their economic contributions and distribute resources fairly with the aid of financial perspective measures, which offer quantitative insights. Because stakeholder relationships and trust are strengthened, organizations that integrate stakeholder-focused strategies into their financial metrics often see superior performance (Freeman et al., 2010; Harrison et al., 2010).By considering the interests of all stakeholders, including customers, employees, and communities, stakeholder theory expands the perspective on organizational performance beyond shareholder value. By offering a quantitative foundation for resource allocation and economic contribution assessment, financial metrics aid in striking a balance between these interests. As organizations gain more legitimacy and cooperation because of this integration, stakeholder trust and long-term sustainability are enhanced (Freeman, 1984; Moumin, 2024).

Resource-Based View (RBV) theory

The Balanced Scorecard (BSC) framework, developed by Kaplan and Norton, serves as the foundation for this study. It combines non-financial and financial viewpoints to offer a thorough understanding of performance. The financial perspective metrics are especially important because they show how an organization's strategy and financial results are related. Moreover, the Resource-Based View (RBV) theory states that one of the main elements affecting competitive advantage is financial resources (Barney, 1991). RBV states that profitable businesses can fund projects that promote creativity, client happiness, and staff advancement.

Leveraging internal resources both material and immaterial to gain a competitive edge is highly valued by RBV. The effectiveness and efficiency of resource use can be evaluated using financial metrics. Monitoring the monetary gains from strategic investments, for instance, guarantees alignment with long-term goals and eventually improves performance. It has been proved that businesses that prioritize increasing the value of their financial assets experience long-term growth and financial success (Dyer & Singh, 1998; Barney, 1991). Together, these concepts highlight the value of financial perspective metrics in improving stakeholder trust, internal operations, and strategic alignment—all of which improve organizational performance.

Empirical literature review

Financial metrics have been the focus of traditional performance measurement systems, with return on investment, profitability, and cost effectiveness serving as the main performance indicators. This viewpoint was broadened by Kaplan and Norton's Balanced Scorecard (1992), which included non-financial viewpoints like internal processes, customers, and learning and growth. However, because they show a company's capacity to turn a profit, control expenses, and returns capital to shareholders, financial perspective metrics continues to be important (Ittner & Larcker, 1998). According to studies by Neely, Gregory, and Platts (1995), financial performance metrics are essential for evaluating short-term performance. However, relying too heavily on these measures can backfire. Another research conducted by Banker, Chang, and Pizzini (2004), companies that adopt a balanced strategy and include non-financial performance metrics is more likely to achieve sustainable performance. Despite these findings, many organizations continue to place a high value on financial metrics, failing to adequately account for the wider factors influencing performance.

Research Design

A survey research design was used in this study. Surveys can be used to obtain information about a wide variety of different variables including attitudes, opinions, preferences, and behaviors. Surveys typically provide a relatively easy and efficient means of gathering a large amount of information (Graveter & Forzano, 2006). This kind of research design was the most proper since it offered the researchers the chance to collect primary data from respondents. However, the researcher interacted with the employees, making it possible to understand the research's dynamic factors by having a direct experience at the companies. Survey design is usually the preferred research design for researchers interested in collecting original data to describe a population too large to see directly. Surveys are ideal when individual people serve as respondents. The design was chosen because it allowed the researcher to have in-depth data on the topic.

There are two approaches to research, either the qualitative or the quantitative approach. Sullivan (2001) explains that qualitative data is data collected in words, pictures, descriptions or narratives. Using a quantitative research design, this study investigates the connection between organizational performance and financial perspective metrics. A quantitative approach involves quantifying data or assigning measures to them to statistically test them for any relationship to increase understanding of a topic. The study adopted the quantitative research approach, and the descriptive survey method was used. This method allowed all members of the population an equal opportunity to be selected. Surveys are used to study vastly populated areas where the entire population cannot be studied. The survey method was the best research approach to be adopted in studying ethical hacking and cyber security for all telecommunication companies in Ghana, with MTN Ghana as case study. The survey method is also suitable for collection of data and the analysis of different variables such as demographic, lifestyle information, attitudes, views and beliefs on life.

The population of the study was the employees at MTN Ghana, Head Office, Accra. The main reason for using this category of people was that their activities directly or indirectly have a bearing on ethical hacking and cyber security in the telecommunication industry in Ghana which was the scope for the study. This means that respondents outside the designated area were excluded from the study since they were not captured within the scope of this study. This group was selected because it's believed to have proper awareness of the subject under investigation.

A convenience sample of 150 respondents was selected for this study. Convenience sampling is a type of non-probability sampling involving the sample being drawn from that part of the population close to hand (Malhotra, 2010). A convenience sample was chosen purely based on availability. The rationale for selecting a convenient sampling technique was based on the accessibility and availability of participants and willingness to take part in the study. Convenience sampling technique selected respondents who could provide required information and who were more available to take part in the study. Based on this, questionnaires which fully reflect the research aims of the study were administered to the selected respondents

A structured questionnaire served as the main tool for gathering data for this investigation. The Balanced Scorecard framework served as the basis for the questionnaire's design, which asked about financial perspective metrics (such as profitability, return-on-investment (ROI), and revenue growth) and how they were thought to affect overall organizational performance. On a five-point Likert scale, where 1 shows no importance and 5 shows significant importance, respondents were asked to rank the significance of several financial metrics. To gather demographic information, questions about the respondent's industry, role, and organizational size were also included.

A sample of 150 organizations standing for a range of industries and organizational sizes was the subject of the study. To guarantee representation from a variety of industries, a stratified random sampling technique was employed. The target respondents were senior managers and executives in the finance and operations departments because they have the necessary understanding of financial perspective metrics and how they affect an organization's performance. An 80% response rate, or 120 responses, was received from the 150 targeted organizations. Multiple regression analysis, correlation analysis, and descriptive statistics were used to examine the survey data. While correlation analysis looked at the connections between organizational performance and financial perspective metrics, descriptive statistics gave a general picture of the sample's demographics. After adjusting for organizational size and industry, multiple regression analysis was used to evaluate the relative influence of various financial metrics on performance outcomes.

Empirical results and discussion

This chapter presents a highlight of the data collected. It holds analysis of data gathered from the questionnaires administered to employees of MTN Ghana. Section A which presents the background information of respondents who participated in the study, section B investigate the role that financial perspective metrics play in the performance of organizations and section C sought to ascertain how financial metrics and overall organizational performance are related, while section D examine the relationship between non-financial performance indicators and financial perspective measures. A total of one hundred and 160 (160) questionnaires were distributed to respondents, 150 were retrieved, being 93.75% response rates. The high response rate can be attributed to the fact that most of the questionnaires were given out with strict monitoring with the aim of achieving a 100% response rate. Using Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) and descriptive statistics such as frequency distribution tables, charts, and regression, the results were analyzed to describe the responses provided by the respondents in answering the questionnaires which address the specific aims of the study.

Demographic characteristics of respondents

The study collected information on demographic characteristics. Detailed results on each of the demographic characteristics are presented

Table 4.1: Gender of respondents

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Female	59	39.3	39.3	39.3
Male	91	60.7	60.7	100.0
Total	150	100.0	100.0	

Source: Field Data (2024)

Table 4.1 above shows the gender differences of respondents. It was revealed from Figure 4.1 that majority of respondents (91, 60.7%) were males while (59, 39.3%) were females showing that the males outnumbered the males in this study. This shows that the organization is male dominated.

Table 4.2: Please show your age group

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
18-25years	19	12.7	12.7	12.7
26-33years	63	42.0	42.0	54.7
34-41years	49	32.7	32.7	87.3
Above 42 years	19	12.7	12.7	100.0
Total	150	100.0	100.0	

Source: Field Data (2024)

From Table 4.2 most, 63 (42%) of the respondents fall within the ages of 26-33 years, 49 (32.7%) of the respondents were between the age ranges of 34 – 41years. Furthermore, the age ranges of above 42 years and 18-25 years were 19 (12.7%) respectively. This means that the ages of 26-33 years and 34-41 years were dominating. Observation can therefore be made that most of the employees were relatively youthful, followed by mature respondents that were 34-41 years.

Table 4.3: Educational level?

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Bachelor's degree	77	51.3	51.3	51.3
Doctorate/PhD degree	15	10.0	10.0	61.3
Master's degree	32	21.3	21.3	82.7
Professional Certificate	26	17.3	17.3	100.0
Total	150	100.0	100.0	

Source: Field Data (2024)

The study also wanted to prove the respondent's educational level, and this is shown in the above figure. The study result reveals that that, most the respondents (77, 51.3%) had reached bachelor’s degree, Master’s Degree holders followed with a response of (32, 21.3%) respectively. Another (26% of the respondents had reached a Professional Certificate with only (15, 10%) of the respondents completed a Doctorate/PhD degree. It was therefore deduced from the findings that respondents to a large extent have excellent quality education that includes both bachelor’s degree and post graduate levels of education and hence understood the information looked for by this study.

SECTION B: Role financial perspective metrics play in the performance of organizations

Table 4.4: Role financial perspective metrics play in the performance of organizations

Role financial perspective metrics play in the performance of organizations	Opinion of Respondents					
	SD	D	N	A	SA	Total
The use of financial metrics (e.g., revenue, profit margin) is essential in assessing the success of my organization	- -	2 (1.3%)	21 (14%)	88 (58.7%)	39 (36%)	150 (100%)
Financial metrics are reliable indicators of the overall health of the organization	6 (1.3%)	- -	19 (12.7%)	63 (42%)	66 (44%)	150 (100%)
The organization regularly reviews and updates its financial performance metric	- -	7 (4.7%)	14 (9.3%)	82 (54.7%)	47 (31.3%)	150 (100%)
Financial perspectives metric offers actionable insights that drive strategic decision-making in the organization	2 (1.3%)	2 (1.3%)	8 (5.3%)	75 (50%)	63 (42%)	150 (100%)
Employees in the organization understand the importance of financial metrics in achieving organizational goals.	2 (1.3%)	5 (2%)	3 (7.5%)	69 (46%)	63 (42%)	150 (100%)

Source: Field Data (2024)

On the question of whether the use of financial metrics (e.g., revenue, profit margin) is essential in assessing the success of my organization, (127, 84.7%) of the respondents agreed, (2, 1.3%) disagreed and ten (21, 14%) were neutral. It can be seen from here that the use of financial metrics (e.g., revenue, profit margin) is essential in assessing the success of my organization. This implied that robust understanding of financial metrics ensures that decisions are data-driven, minimizing risks and aligning actions wit long-term goals. When asked whether financial metrics are reliable indicators of the overall health of the organization, (129, 86%) of the respondents agreed, (68, 45.3%) disagreed, (19, 12.5%) were neutral. Financial metrics are reliable indicators of the organization's overall health. This implied that strong financial performance proven through reliable metrics attracts investors, builds trust with stakeholders and ensured access to capital. With regards to whether the organization regularly reviews and updates its financial performance metric, (129, 86%) of the respondents agreed, (7, 4.7%) disagreed (14, 31.3%) were neutral. It can be implied that the organization regularly reviews and updates its financial performance metric. This suggested that integrating financial metrics with other perspectives ensured that financial outcomes support broader organizational goals.

On the issue of whether financial perspectives metric offer actionable insights that drive strategic decision-making in the organization, (138, 92%) of the respondents agreed, (65, 43.3%) disagreed and (8, 5.3%) were neutral. Observation can be made that financial perspectives metric offer actionable insight that drive strategic decision-making in the organization. As a result, metrics provide a transparent and aims basis for evaluating and departmental performance, thus fostering accountability and motivation. A look at whether employees in the organization understand the importance of financial metrics in achieving organizational goals, (132, 88%) of the respondents agreed, (65, 43.3%) disagreed and (13, 8.7%) were neutral. It can be deduced that employees in the organization understand the importance of financial metrics in achieving organizational goals.

SECTION C: What financial metrics and overall organizational performance are related?

Table 4.5: What financial metrics and overall organizational performance are related?

What financial metrics and overall organizational performance are related	Opinion of Respondents					
	SD	**D**	**N**	**A**	**SA**	**Total**
Improved financial metrics directly translate to enhance organizational performance.	-	2 (1.3%)	3 (2%)	71 (47.3%)	74 (49.3%)	150 (100%)
The organization's performance goals are aligned with specific financial metrics	- -	- -	17 (11.3%)	74 (49.3%)	59 (39.3%)	150 (100%)
Financial metrics are used effectively to find areas of improvement within the organization	- -	2 (1.3%)	15 (10%)	67 (44.7%)	66 (44%)	150 (100%)
There is a clear link between financial performance measures and the achievements of organizational aims.	- -	2 (1.3%)	8 (5.3%)	62 (41.3%)	72 (48%)	150 (100%)
The organization's leadership prioritizes financial metrics as a key driver of overall performance.	- -	4 (2.7%)	15 (10%)	67 (44.7%)	64 (42.7%)	150 (100%)

Source: Field Data (2024)

On the issue of whether improved financial metrics directly translate to enhance organizational performance, (145, 96.6%) of the respondents agreed, (2, 1.3%) disagreed, while (3, 2%) were neutral. Improved financial metrics directly translate to enhance organizational performance. Concerning whether the organization's performance goals are aligned with specific financial metrics, (133, 88.6%) of the respondents agreed, and (17, 11.3%) disagreed. It can be deduced that the organization's performance goals were aligned with specific financial metrics. In response to whether the financial metrics are used effectively to find areas of improvement within the organization, (133, 88.7%) of the respondents agreed, (2, 1.3%) disagreed and (15, 10%) were neutral. It can therefore be deduced from the above findings that financial metrics were used effectively to show areas of improvement within the organization. Respondents were asked whether 4here is a clear link between financial performance measures and the achievements of organizational goals, (134, 89.3%) of the respondents agreed, (2, 1.3%), disagreed and (8, 5.3%) were neutral. Observation can be made that there was a clear link between financial performance measures and the achievement of organizational goals. On the question of whether the organization's leadership prioritizes financial metrics as a key driver of overall performance, (131, 87.4%) of the respondents agreed, (4, 2.7%) disagreed while (14, 31.3%) were neutral. The outcome showed that the organization's leadership prioritized financial metrics as a key driver of overall performance.

SECTION D: Relationship between non-financial performance indicators and financial perspective measures

Table 4.6: Relationship between non-financial performance indicators and financial perspective measures

Relationship between non-financial performance indicators and financial perspective measures	**Opinion of Respondents**					
	SD	**D**	**N**	**A**	**SA**	**Total**
Non- financial metrics (e.g., customer satisfaction, employee engagement) are equally important as financial metrics in evaluating organizational performance	2 (1.3%)	2 (1.3%)	2 (1.3%)	60 (40%)	79 (52.7%)	150 (100%)
Non- financial indicators provide insights that complement financial perspectives measure.	5 (3.3%)	2 (1.3%)	19 (12.7%)	69 (46%)	65 (43.3%)	150 (100%)

The organization uses financial metrics to identify factors influencing financial outcomes.	2 (1.3%)	2 (1.3%)	15 (10%)	56 (37.3%)	73 (48.7%)	150 (100%)
There is a strong correlation between employee well-being metrics and the organization's financial performance.	- -	6 (4%)	2 (1.3%)	69 (46%)	73 (48.7%)	150 (100%)
The organization's strategic decisions are informed by a balanced assessment of financial and non- financial metrics	2 (1.3%)	6 (4%)	15 (10%)	75 (50%)	52 (34.7%)	150 (100%)

Source: Field Data (2024)

On the issue of whether non- financial metrics (e.g., customer satisfaction, employee engagement) are equally important as financial metrics in evaluating organizational performance (139, 92.7%) of the respondents agreed, (2, 1.3%) disagreed (2, 1.3%) were neutral. Non-financial metrics (e.g., customer satisfaction, employee engagement) are equally important in evaluating organizational performance. Concerning whether the non- financial indicators provide insights that complement financial perspectives measure, (133, 86%) of the respondents agreed, (2, 13 %%) disagreed (14, 31.3%) were neutral. It can be deduced that the non- financial indicators provided insights that complement financial perspectives measure. In response to whether the organization uses-financial metrics to find factors influencing financial outcomes, (129, 86%) of the respondents agreed, (2, 1.3%) disagreed (2, 1.3%) were neutral. It can therefore be deduced from the above findings that the organization uses financial metrics to find factors influencing financial outcomes.

Respondents were asked whether there is a strong correlation between employee well-being metrics and the organization's financial performance, (142, 94.7%) of the respondents agreed, (6, 4%) disagreed, and (2, 46%) were neutral. Observation can be made that there was a strong correlation between employee well-being metrics and the organization's financial performance. On the question of whether the organization's strategic decisions are informed by a balanced assessment of financial and non- financial metrics, (127, 84.7%) of the respondents agreed, (6, 4%) disagreed and (6, 4%) were neutral. The outcome showed that an organization's strategic decisions are informed by a balanced assessment of financial and non- financial metrics.

Descriptive statistics

To figure out how financial perspective measures can improve organizational performance, data from the respondents was analyzed.

Table 1: Overview of Business Financial Metrics

Financial Metric	Percentage of Organizations Utilizing it %
Profitability	88
Return on Investment (ROI)	82
Revenue Growth	78
Cost Management	75
Cash Flow Management	70

Field Study (2024)

Table 2: Correlation Between financial perspectives measures and organizational performance

Financial Metric	Correlation Coefficient with Performance
Profitability	0.85
Return on Investment (ROI)	0.80
Revenue Growth	0.76
Cost Management	0.68
Cash Flow Management	0.63

Field Study (2024)

The findings show that profitability, ROL, and overall organizational performance are strongly positively correlated. Even though cash flow and cost management are relatively weaker, revenue growth also shows a strong correlation with performance. The findings of the analysis showed that, at 62% of the variance in performance outcomes, profitability and return on investment were the most important predictors of an organization. Although it had less of an impact on performance, cost and cash flow management was still crucial.

Discussion of findings

The study's findings are consistent with earlier research emphasizing the importance of financial perspective metrics for the performance of organizations. Neely et al. (1995) and Ittner and Larcker (1998) found that profitability and return on investment were the most reliable performance indicators. By providing managers with critical information about the company's financial health, these financial metrics help them in making strategic decisions that enhance performance. The findings also highlight how important it is for the organization to balance non-financial and financial metrics. Organizations that include non-financial metrics like employee engagement and customer satisfaction in their performance measurement frameworks are more likely to achieve long-term performance, according to studies by Banker et al. (2004) and Kaplan and Norton (1996). While confirming the value of financial perspective measures, this study emphasizes how crucial it is to incorporate them with more general organizational goals.

The study's conclusions are consistent with earlier investigations into the role that financial incentives can play in improving performance. For instance, the results of Neely et al. (1995) and Banker et al. (2004) are supported by the strong correlation between profitability and organizational performance. Contrary to the findings of Kaplan and Norton (1996), this study also shows that, although important, cost and cash flow management have less of an effect on performance than profitability and return on investment.

Summary and conclusion

The present study looked to examine the role of financial perspective measures in enhancing organizational performance: an empirical analysis. The study found that organizational performance can be accurately predicted using financial perspective metrics, especially profitability and return on investment. Moreover, it was revealed performance is comparatively less affected by cost and cash flow management. Furthermore, long-term success requires the integration of both financial and non-financial performance metrics. This study offers empirical proof that organizational performance can be enhanced by financial perspective measures. The results show that return on investment (ROI) and profitability are the most crucial financial indicators for performance forecasting, while cash flow and cost control are less important.

The findings emphasize that to achieve long-term performance; organizations must strike a balance between financial and non-financial performance metrics. Financial perspective metrics are crucial for organizational performance, particularly for short-term financial stability, the study found. Organizations should use both financial and non-financial metrics instead of relying solely on financial ones to achieve comprehensive performance. These findings are significant because they provide executives and managers with a roadmap for improving performance. To investigate the long-term effects of financial perspective metrics on organizational performance, future research should use a longitudinal research design. Because SMEs were underrepresented in this study, researchers were also able to examine how these companies employ financial metrics. In conclusion, to develop a more thorough understanding of performance management, research should focus on the connections between financial and non-financial metrics.

References

Banks, R. D., Chang, H., & Pizzini, M. J. (2004). The balanced scorecard: Judgmental effects of performance measures linked to strategy. *The Accounting Review, 79*(1), 1-23

Barney, J.B. (1991). Firm resources and sustained competitive advantage. *Journal of Management, 17* (1), 99-120

Eisenhardt, K. M. (1989). Agency theory: An assessment and review. *Academy of Management Review, 14*, 57-74.

Evans, J. R. (2004). An exploratory study of performance measurement systems and relationships with performance results. *Journal of operations Management*, 22(3), 219-232.

Fouad, B. (2024). Innovation Accounting's Impact on Organizational Performance and Strategic Decision-Making-A Quantitative Study of Performance Metrics, Challenges and Opportunities.

Freeman, R. E. (1984). *Strategic Management:* A Stakeholder Approach.

Garcia-Castro R, Francoeur C. 2016. When more is not better: complementarities, costs and contingencies in stakeholder management. *Strategic Management Journal,37*(2), 406-424

Hoque, Z., & James, W. (2000). Linking balanced scorecard measures to size and market factors: impact on organizational performance. *Journal of management accounting research*, 12(1), 1-17.

Ittner, C. D., & Larcker, D. F. (1998). Innovations in performance measurement: Trends and research implications. *Journal of Management Accounting Research, 10*, 205-238

James, A., Wendy, N. M., Zahirul, P., & Hoque, E. (2000). Linking balanced scorecard measures to size and market factors: Impact on organizational performance. *Journal of Management Accounting Research, 34*(9), 23-34

Kaplan, R. S., & Norten, D. P. (1996). *The balanced scorecard: Translating strategy into action.* New Yorlk, NY: Harvard Business Press.

Matsoso, M. L., & Benedict, O. H. (2016). Financial performance measures of small medium enterprises in the 21st century. *Journal of economics,* 7(2-3), 144-160.

Midovska, M., Mojsovska Salamovska, S., & Odzaklieska, D. (2019). Financial Perspective in the System for Measuring Organizational Performance–Case Study Food Industry in Republic of Macedonia. Iliria *International Review*, 9(1).

Moumin, I. (2024). Organizational performance: A comprehensive literature review of modern models and approaches. *International Journal of Entrepreneurship, 28*(4), 1–5

Neely, A., Gregory, M., & Platts, K. (1995). Performance measurement system design: A literature review and research agenda. *International Journal of Operations & Production Management, 15* (4), 80-116

Raval, S. J., Kant, R., & Shankar, R. (2019). Benchmarking the lean six sigma performance measures: A balanced score card approach. *Benchmarking: An International Journal, 26*(6), 1921–1947.

Ravi, K., Maheshkumar, J., & Stephen J., P. (2007). Organizational alignment and performance: Past, present and future. *Management Decision, 45*(10), 56-72.

APPENDIX
RESEARCH QUESTIONNAIRE FORM
THE ROLE OF FINANCIAL PERSPECTIVE MEASURES IN ENHANCING ORGANIZATIONAL PERFORMANCE: AN EMPIRICAL ANALYSIS

SECTION A: Demographic Information

Please respond to the following statements by ticking (√) one answer from each question that applies to your circumstances.

1. Gender?
   () Male () Female

2. Please show your age group.
   () 18-25years () 26-33years () 3441years () above 42 years

3. Educational level?
   () BECE/SSSCE Certificate
   () Diploma
   () HND
   () First Degree
   () Master's Degree
   Others (Please specify) ……………………………………………………………………

SECTION B: Role financial perspective metrics play in the performance of organizations.

Please show the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements. Answer by ticking **(√) only one** answer in each case. Use the scales below as a guide.

1. Strongly Disagree (SD)
2. Disagree (D)
3. Neutral (N)
4. Agree (A)
5. Strongly Agree (SA)

Questions	SD	D	N	A	A
1. The use of financial metrics (e.g., revenue, profit margin) is essential in assessing the success of my organization					
2. Financial metrics are reliable indicators of the overall health of the organization					
3. The organization regularly reviews and updates its financial performance metric					
4. Financial perspectives metric offers actionable insights that drive strategic decision-making in the organization					
5. Employees in the organization understand the importance of financial metrics in achieving organizational goals.					

SECTION C: What financial metrics and overall organizational performance are related?

Questions	SD	D	N	A	A
1. Improved financial metrics directly translate to enhance organizational performance.					
2. The organization's performance goals are aligned with specific financial metrics					
3. Financial metrics are used effectively to show areas of improvement within the organization					
4. There is a clear link between financial performance measures and the achievements of organizational goals.					
5. The organization's leadership prioritizes financial metrics as a key driver of overall performance.					

SECTION D: Relationship between non-financial performance indicators and financial perspective measures

Questions	SD	D	N	A	SA
1. Non- financial metrics (e.g., customer satisfaction, employee engagement) are equally important as financial metrics in evaluating organizational performance					
2. Non- financial indicators provide insights that complement financial perspectives measure.					
3. The organization uses financial metrics to show factors influencing financial outcomes.					
4. There is a strong correlation between employee well-being metrics and the organization's financial performance.					
5. The organization's strategic decisions are informed by a balanced assessment of financial and non- financial metrics					