ORGANIZATIONAL PERFORMANCE IN THE PUBLIC AND PRIVATE SECTORS IN ROMANIA: THE BALANCED SCORECARD PERSPECTIVE

Ana Alexandra OLARIU
Bucharest University of Economic Studies, Piata Romana, 6, Bucharest, Romania
anaalexandra.olariu@man.ase.ro

Ștefan Cătălin POPA
Bucharest University of Economic Studies, Piata Romana, 6, Bucharest, Romania
catalin.popa@man.ase.ro

Andreea BREAZU
Bucharest University of Economic Studies, Piata Romana, 6, Bucharest, Romania
andreea.breazu@man.ase.ro

Cătălina Florentina POPA
Bucharest University of Economic Studies, Piata Romana, 6, Bucharest, Romania
catalina.albu@man.ase.ro

Abstract
In today's fast-paced world, performance measurement is not just an option, it is a necessity. It is the only way to track progress, identify areas for improvement, and drive meaningful change. Our research objective is to conduct an analysis of organizational performance in the public and private sectors, using all four perspectives of the Balanced Scorecard (BSC) framework. This examination will encompass financial, customer, internal processes, and learning and growth perspectives. Therefore, we used a quantitative research method and administered a questionnaire to assess organizational performance in both the public and private sectors in all development regions of Romania. The data collected from the 233 respondents were tested to assess the distribution of the variables of interest, and a first element of research interest was to identify the differences between the public and private sectors in terms of organizational performance using the nonparametric Mann-Whitney test. The results of the research suggest that, overall, employees in private sector organizations value to a greater extent the recording of organizational performance viewed from all four perspectives of the BSC at the level of the organization from which they come, compared to those in public sector organizations.

Keywords: Balanced Scorecard, BSC, four perspectives, performance, private sector, public sector, Romania.

1. INTRODUCTION

In today's highly competitive and rapidly changing business landscape, organizational performance is critical for success. Organizations must continually improve their performance to meet the ever-increasing demands of customers, stakeholders, and the market. High-performing organizations are better equipped to achieve their goals, remain relevant, and stay ahead of their competitors. Therefore, focusing on organizational performance is not only important, but also necessary for survival and growth in today's business environment.

In recent years, there has been a growing interest in understanding the differences between the public and private sectors in terms of organizational performance. While both sectors aim to achieve similar goals, they often operate under different constraints and incentives, which can impact their performance (Hodge & Greve, 2017). Moreover, Romania, like many other countries, has both public and private sectors that play a significant role in the country's economy and society. However, little is known about how these sectors differ in terms of organizational performance measurement and management. This lack of understanding makes it difficult to identify areas for improvement and drive meaningful change.

Management Research and Practice
Volume 15, Issue 2 / June 2023

ISSN
2067- 2462

The research problem is therefore to identify the differences in organizational performance between the public and private sectors in Romania. This research problem is significant because it can help identify areas where the public sector can learn from the private sector, and vice versa, to improve organizational performance. It can also help policymakers and managers in both sectors make informed decisions about performance measurement and management practices.

Therefore, the aim of our research is to analyze organizational performance from the four perspectives of the Balanced Scorecard (BSC) framework at the organizational level in both the public and private sectors. By examining the financial, customer, internal processes and learning and growth perspectives of the BSC framework, our objective is to identify the key drivers of organizational performance and how they differ between the public and private sectors.

In the first part of our paper, we conducted a comprehensive literature review that focused on the essential elements of the BSC framework developed by Kaplan and Norton (2005). We examine how the BSC framework has developed and its impact on organizational performance. In addition, we emphasize the importance of analyzing the performance of organizations in both the public and private sectors. We explored how the importance of the BSC framework differs between these two sectors and how this affects their performance.

In the second part of our paper, we present the methodological elements of our study. Our research sample consisted of 233 participants, from various organizations from the eight development regions of Romania. This diverse sample allowed us to obtain a comprehensive view of the BSC frameworks.

To evaluate organizational performance in the public and private sectors in Romania, the study used a comparative approach. Specifically, the study analyzed the specific dimensions and perspectives of the BSC framework for both sectors. Using the BSC, the study identified specific dimensions and indicators for each perspective that were relevant to both the public and private sectors. For example, under the financial perspective, the study looked at metrics such as financial resources and organizational performance. Under the customer perspective, the study looked at metrics such as customer satisfaction and loyalty. Under the internal process's perspective, the study looked at metrics such as operational efficiency and quality. Under the innovation and development perspective, the study looked at metrics such as employee engagement and training. After identifying the relevant dimensions and indicators for each perspective, the study used the nonparametric Mann-Whitney test to compare the performance of organizations in the public and private sectors.

The final section of our paper is devoted to achieving our research objective. As a result of our study, we found that private sector organizations prioritize organizational performance using the four dimensions of the BSC to a greater extent. This highlights the importance of a balanced approach to performance management in the private sector.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Conceptual distinctions of organizational performance.

Increasing competitiveness and organizational performance is the goal of any organization (Ștefan, 2018). For researchers interested in management, organizational performance is, of course, a variable of interest. The emphasis on market competition, customers, and capital characterizes organizational performance as essential to the survival and success of modern business. As a result, this construct has played a key role in modern industrial activities (Richard et al., 2009). In this part of the paper, we focus on defining what organizational performance is and how it is measured.

In the specialized literature, we identify organizational performance as being characterized by the sum of all elements that measure it and not by what it represents. However, there have been researchers who have tried to define organizational performance. Georgopoulos and Tannenbaum (1957) mentioned that organizational performance is equivalent to organizational efficiency and represents the measure of how an organization (with limited resources) manages to achieve its objectives with a minimum effort from its members.

Subsequently, other definitions of organizational performance have been outlined. Yuchtman and Seashore (1967) defined performance as the ability of an organization to exploit its environment to access and use limited resources, while according to Warmington et al. (1977), in a high-performing organization, the productivity rate, motivation levels, and satisfaction of its members are high, while the turnover rate, costs, and work disturbances are low or absent.

Porter (1986) states that organizational performance represents the organization's ability to create value elements for its customers, while a more recent definition characterizes organizational performance as the organization's ability to achieve profitability, productivity, profitability, efficiency, and competitiveness (Taouab & Issor, 2019).

With industrialization, the concept of performance emerged for the first time in the specialized literature. Small enterprise operations have traditionally been simple, with cash flow being the most important measure of performance (Taouab & Issor, 2019). For large industries, however, the concept became extremely useful, since the general aim was to evaluate whether each group of stakeholders (employees, customers, suppliers) supported the company in achieving its main objectives (Atkinson et al., 1997).

Gimbert et al. (2010) defines a performance measurement system as a well-defined and succinct collection of financial or nonfinancial metrics that aid an organization's decision-making process by gathering, processing, and evaluating quantitative data related to performance information. As a result, various models have been created to evaluate organizational performance using specific characteristics outlined in the value process. BSC, activity-based costing, competitive benchmarking, and shareholder value added are just a few examples of performance measurement frameworks within organizations. Each of these provides a unique and different perspective (Micheli & Manzoni, 2010). Next, we propose to analyze the BSC perspective of performance measurement.

2.2. Measuring organizational performance – Balanced Scorecard (BSC)

Kaplan and Norton (1992) developed a performance measurement framework called the BSC based on their research in various companies in the United States. The BSC attracted a lot of attention as a strategy that integrates financial and non-financial performance measures to help organizations learn and improve their internal and external processes. Therefore, according to Al-Najjar and Kalaf (2012), BSC gradually spread to the United States, Europe, Australia and Latin America, and the use of BSC became necessary in various business sectors.

Additionally, BSC is a multidimensional set of performance measures that seeks to include through its analysis four dimensions or perspectives (Kaplan, 2012) that are interconnected by the financial perspective, and these are (Kaplan & Norton, 1992 cited in Alhyari et al., 2013): *the customer perspective, the internal process perspective, innovation, and organizational development perspective.* Each perspective must consider and connect with other elements (Kaplan & Norton, 2005), which refer to strategic objectives, measuring indicators, but not least organizational objectives, and company development initiatives. Moreover, in line with the mentioned elements, according to Kaplan and Norton (1992), the BSC model should provide answers to several fundamental questions:

- What is the customer's perspective?
- What do we need for performance?
- Can we continue to improve and add value?

From the customer perspective and to improve customer satisfaction, performance should be measured in its entirety to identify customer need, with the goal of creating customer value (Kaplan & Norton, 1992). Mendes et al. (2009) believe that the main purpose is to identify customers, their needs, and the market segments in which the organization wants to compete, in order to align its critical measures for success. But before we evaluate performance through the eyes of customers, companies must remain aware of the costs of their products, bearing in mind that most customers see price as only one component of the total cost they will incur for a product or service (Kaplan & Norton, 1992).

From the perspective of internal processes, after evaluating performance indicators regarding customer satisfaction, it is vital for an organization to understand how it can generate value for the company (Maiga & Jacobs, 2003) and how it can develop and deliver products and services to consumers (Kaplan & Norton, 2005). Therefore, the perspectives of internal processes reflect the collection of activities and behaviors that have been formed based on the objectives set by the organization to satisfy customers (Pedro, 2004).

According to Kaplan and Norton (1992), companies should also try to identify and evaluate their core competencies, such as the critical technologies needed to maintain a high market share and choose which processes and competencies they need to excel in, as well as define parameters for each.

The innovation and organizational development perspective incorporates a collection of intangibles, including human resources, knowledge, and organizational culture, in the process of generating value for the company (Sharma, 2009). It is also important to invest in infrastructure, management, and information systems, but also organizational procedures (Kaplan, 2012), to help the company develop according to established objectives.
Financial performance measures reflect whether strategy, implementation, and execution of processes lead to organizational performance (Kaplan & Norton, 1992). The financial perspective is recognized for the importance it gives to financial results, and these can be different at each stage of the company's development focusing on three main levels: increasing revenues, reducing costs, or improving productivity and efficient use of resources (Chiţu & Opriş, 2014).

2.3. Organizational Performance in the Public - Private Sector

Nowadays, the performance measurement framework developed by Kaplan and Norton (1992) is used in both private and public organizations. The main difference between public and private organizations lies in their ownership and control structures, which can have a significant impact on their goals, operations, and performance.

Public organizations are owned and controlled by the government, and are typically created to provide goods and services to the public, regulate various aspects of society, or administer public programs. Public organizations are funded by taxpayers' money, and they are subject to a wide range of legal and regulatory requirements (Rainey, 2009). In terms of performance, public organizations are typically evaluated based on their ability to fulfill their public mission, provide services to the public, and comply with legal and regulatory requirements (Wright & Pandey, 2011). Other studies also considered social-related outcomes, such as employees and customer/patients satisfaction, patients health status (Popa and Ștefan, 2019) or quality of life (Ștefan, Popa and Dobrin, 2016). Public organizations are also subject to public scrutiny, and their performance is often compared to that of other public organizations in similar fields. When it comes to public institutions, Kaplan and Norton (1999) argued that the BSC can help these organizations focus on outcomes that matter to the community they serve. For example, a public hospital might use the BSC to measure performance in areas such as patient satisfaction, quality of care, and access to services. Similarly, a government agency might use the BSC to measure performance in areas such as citizen satisfaction, cost-effectiveness, and responsiveness.

Private organizations, on the other hand, are evaluated based on their ability to generate profit, create value for their shareholders, and compete effectively in their respective markets (Ring & Perry,1985). Private organizations are also subject to the demands of their customers and investors, and their performance is often compared to that of other private organizations in similar fields. Also. When it comes to private organizations, Kaplan (2009) argues that the BSC can help these organizations align their performance metrics with their overall strategy. For example, a manufacturing company might use the BSC to measure performance in areas such as customer satisfaction, operational efficiency, and innovation.

The Balanced Scorecard was initially designed for use in private sector organizations, but it was eventually adapted for use in non-profit and public sector enterprises. Prior to the implementation of the Balanced Scorecard, performance reports for public sector organizations focused solely on financial measures such as budgeting, earmarked funds, donations, expenses, and operating expenses (Kaplan, 2009).

Over time, research on BSC in public and private organizations has been extensive and varied, covering topics such as implementation, effectiveness, benefits, and challenges. The results of these studies have been mixed, with some showing positive impacts on organizational performance and others indicating limited success or even failure in implementation.

3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Data collection to carry out the research was carried out through an online survey; the questionnaire was distributed in the form of Google forms between September and October 2022. The targeted population included employed people, regardless of the field of activity or other individual or organizational characteristics, and a convenience sampling was used to select the respondents.

From a larger questionnaire, the subscales referring to organizational performance measurement, designed according to the BSC model, were used for this work. More precisely, the four subscales aim at (Hegazy & Eldeeb, 2022; Hoque & James, 2000; Kaplan & Norton, 1992; Mavlutova & Babauska, 2013; Mavlutova & Babauska, 2012; Rahimi, Kavosi, Shojaei & Kharazmi, 2016): (1) Internal process perspective, which included three subscales: Customer Relationship Improvement (IRC) - 5 items, Process Improvement (PI) - 5 items, and Capability Utilization (CU) – 6; (2) Innovation and continuous development perspective, represented by Organizational Capital (OC) - 7 items and Human Capital (HC) - 12 items; (3) Customers / citizens perspective, this dimension being analyzed through the lens of Customer Growth and Retention (CGR) - 6 items and Customer Satisfaction (CS) - 10 items and (4) Financial perspective, taking into account Financial Resources (FR) - 8 items and Organizational Performance (OP) - 6 items. All items were evaluated on a 5-point scale, from Total disagree to Total agree. The questionnaire also included demographic questions. Respondents were informed of the purpose of the research and of the fact that participation in the survey is voluntary and anonymous; they express their agreement to participate by ticking the appropriate option of a question placed at the beginning of the questionnaire.

The data set that resulted included 254 cases. Of these, 16 were removed since the respondents declared that they were not employed (for this reason, they were not part of the research population), and five other cases were not considered in the analysis, because the value five had been ticked for all research variables (unengaged respondents). The data set was also checked for coding errors or missing data. Therefore, in view of the above, a database with no missing values was used for subsequent analyzes, including 233.

In a first step, the preliminary analysis of the data was carried out, in terms of identifying and treating errors, possible missing data, or extreme cases. Also, at this stage, elements of descriptive statistics were presented, such as mean (M), standard deviation (SD), frequency, and tests aimed at evaluating the distribution of variables of interest for research according to the normal law (Kolmogorov-Smirnov test and Shapiro-Wilk test) and the shape of the distribution (Skewness and Kurtosis). In order to identify differences between the public and private sector in terms of organizational performance, the nonparametric Mann-Whitney test was used. The Mann-Whitney test is the nonparametric equivalent of the T-test for independent samples, being used when the variables of interest do not meet the presumptions for performing parametric tests, so that for the comparison of the two groups, not their mean, but the median is used (Pallant, 2011). IBM SPSS Statistics, version 28.0 (IBM Corp., 2021) was used for both preliminary data analysis and nonparametric tests.

4. RESULTS

4.1. Sample Characteristics

As previously mentioned, our study was conducted on a sample of 233 participants from the eight development regions of Romania, and the sampling was non-probable, based on the availability criterion. Although all development regions were represented, most of the respondents, 154, which represents 66.10%, are from the Bucharest-Ilfov region. The participants are employed in various fields of activity, such as education, other service activities, wholesale and retail trade health and social care. Regarding the distribution by gender, 149 (63.90%) of the respondents are women and 84 (36.10%) are men. Participants are between 19 and 68 years of age, with an average age of 34.22 (standard deviation being 11.247). 150 of the respondents work in the private sector (64.40%), while 83 work in the public sector (35.60%). Regarding the distribution of managerial and nonmanagerial positions, 61 of the study participants are managers (26.40%) and 172 are nonmanagers (73.60%). The participants were asked how they performed their professional activity in the last month. Thus, 113 of them (48.50%) declared that they carried out their activity with physical presence at the company's headquarters/workplace, 30 (12.90%) carried out their activity at home/teleworking, while 90 (38.60%) had a flexible schedule, which included both activities carried out with physical presence at the company's headquarters and from home.

4.2. Research Variables

Before using the data collected from the respondents, a descriptive analysis of the data to be processed in this paper was also carried out to achieve the purpose of the research. The descriptive statistics related to these data are highlighted in Table 1.

TABLE 1 - DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS OF RESEARCH VARIABLES (N = 233)

Name of scales and subscales	No. items	Mean (M)	Standard Deviation (SD)	Cronbach Alfa
Internal processes perspective - IPP	**16**	**3.922**	**0.896**	**0.964**
Improving Customer Relationship (IRC)	5	4.056	0.901	0.900
Process Improvement (PI)	5	3.881	0.975	0.923
Capability Use (CU)	6	3.841	0.960	0.915
Innovation and development perspective - IDP	**19**	**3.642**	**1.020**	**0.975**
Organizational Capital (OC)	7	3.641	1.117	0.930
Human Capital (HC)	12	3.620	1.052	0.965
Client Perspective - CP	**16**	**4.004**	**0.832**	**0.958**
Customer Growth and Retention (CGR)	6	3.990	0.889	0.913
Customer Satisfaction (CS)	10	4.015	0.865	0.949
Financial perspective - FP	**14**	**3.833**	**0.920**	**0.962**
Financial Resources (FR)	8	3.854	0.971	0.957
Organizational Performance (OP)	6	3.802	0.985	0.935

Source: Authors

All variables included in the table above are unstandardized mean scores of the latent constructs included in the PLS-SEM model, generated after validation of the measurement model. This solution was preferred over the simple average score of the variables of each scale because, coming from an already validated measurement model, it more accurately reflects the relationships between the observed variables and the construct in forming, and, therefore, the concept that measures.

Given that some variables that will be used in the research include several items, the Cronbach Alpha coefficients related to each variable were calculated. The Cronbach Alpha coefficient measures the internal consistency of a scale and is intended to show whether the specific items of that scale were designed so that when analyzed together they measure the same thing as when they were assessed separately. Therefore, as in the results of Table 1, the Cronbach Alpha coefficients took values between 0.829 and 0.975, so they were above the recommended minimum value of 0.70 (Opariuc-Dan, 2011; Taber, 2018).

Organizational performances were evaluated through the lens of four dimensions specific to the Balanced Scorecard tool: internal process improvement (IPP), Organizational Innovation and Development Level (IDP), Organizational Performance from the perspective of customers (CP), Organizational Performance from the financial perspective (FP). Among them, the variable Organizational Performance from the perspective of customers (CP) (M = 4.004; SD = 0.832) obtained the highest mean, followed by the variable Internal Process Improvement (IPP) (M = 3.922; SD = 0.896) , the variable Organizational Performance from a financial perspective (FP) (M = 3.833; SD = 0.920), and the variable Level of Organization Innovation and Development (IDP) (M = 3.642; SD = 1.020).

The values of the Skewness indicator were different from 0 for all variables, reflecting the fact that the data have an asymmetric distribution. On the other hand, the values of the Kurtosis indicator were also different from 0, indicating that the data do not have a normal distribution in terms of skewness. Furthermore, to test the normality of the data distribution, the values of the Kolmogorov-Smirnov and Shapiro-Wilk tests were calculated for each individual variable. Based on the values obtained in both tests, it is found that statistically significant values ($p < 0.05$) are obtained for all variables, which means that the data distribution is different from normal. Therefore, nonparametric statistics were selected for the underlying analyses, which allow the analysis of variables that do not meet the assumption of normality.

4.3. Performance in the Public and Private Sectors

To carry out a comparative approach between organizations in the private sector and organizations in the public sector, in terms of organizational performance, the dimensions and dimensions specific to these variables were analyzed using the nonparametric Mann-Whitney test. The specific analyzes carried out in this regard are interpreted

as follows. The non-parametric Mann-Whitney test was selected for this purpose since the data set does not meet all the assumptions for performing parametric statistical tests (see the previous sub-chapter).

In the context of this research, organizational performance was measured using the Balanced Scorecard tool, taking into account the four specific perspectives: (1) improvement of internal processes; (2) the level of innovation and development of the organization; (3) organizational performance from a customer perspective and (4) organizational performance from a financial perspective. Therefore, the differences in perception between respondents from private sector organizations and those from public sector organizations in organizational performance measured through the perspective of internal process improvement (IPP) are highlighted in Table 2.

TABLE 2 - DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PRIVATE AND PUBLIC SECTOR ORGANIZATIONS IN TERMS OF INTERNAL PROCESS IMPROVEMENT

Variables		Mean ranks	Sum ranks	Mann-Whitney U	Z	Asymptotic
Internal Process Improvement (IPP)	Private sector	127.91	19187.00	4588.000	-3.324	0.001
	Public sector	97.28	8074.00			
Improving customer relations (IRC)	Private sector	126.82	19023.00	4752.000	-3.001	0.003
	Public sector	99.25	8238.00			
Process Improvement (PI)	Private sector	128.55	19282.00	4493.000	-3.539	0.000
	Public sector	96.13	7979.00			
Using capabilities (CU)	Private sector	127.27	19090.00	4685.000	-3.133	0.002
	Public sector	98.45	8171.00			

Source: Authors

Based on the results of the nonparametric Mann-Whitney test, illustrated in Table 2, it can be found that at the level of employees in organizations of the private and public sectors, there are statistically significant differences in perception about organizational performance measured from the perspective of improving internal processes ($U = 4588.000$; $p < 0.01$). More precisely, by analyzing these differences, it can be found that the employees of the private sector organizations appreciate to a greater extent the improvement of the internal processes of the organizations to which they belong compared to those of the public sector (mean ranks = 127.91 compared to mean ranks = 97.28). Similar and statistically significant results are also recorded in terms of respondents' perception of the three subdimensions of organizational performance viewed from the perspective of improving internal processes, respectively: Improving customer relations (IRC); Process Improvement (PI) and Capability Utilization (CU).

Second, organizational performance was also measured from the perspective of the level of innovation and development (IDP) of the organization. In this sense, the differences in perception between respondents from private sector organizations and those from public sector organizations regarding this perspective of organizational performance are highlighted in Table 3.

TABLE 3 - DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PRIVATE AND PUBLIC SECTOR ORGANIZATIONS IN TERMS OF THE LEVEL OF INNOVATION AND DEVELOPMENT

Variables		Mean ranks	Sum ranks	Mann-Whitney U	Z	Asymptotic
Innovation and Development Perspective (IDP).	Private sector	123.72	18558.50	5216.500	-2.047	0.041
	Public sector	104.85	8702.50			
Human Capital (HC)	Private sector	122.38	18356.50	5418.500	-1.638	0.101
	Public sector	107.28	8904.50			
Organizational Capital (OC)	Private sector	126.98	19046.50	4728.500	-3.048	0.002
	Public sector	98.97	8214.50			

Source: Authors

The results of the Mann-Whitney test, illustrated in Table 3), reflect the fact that respondents from organizations in the private sector appreciate to a greater extent (mean ranks = 123.72) the recording of organizational performance from the perspective of the level of innovation and development at the level of the organizations from which they come, compared to those of the public sector (Mean ranks = 104.85), and these differences in perception are also statistically significant ($U = 5216.500$; $p < 0.05$). Similar results are also recorded regarding the organizational capital

(OC) sub-dimension. Specifically, when the perspective of the level of innovation and development of the organization is evaluated through the lens of human capital (HC), although there are differences in perception of this aspect between respondents from private sector organizations and those from public sector organizations, they are statistically insignificant (U = 5418.500; p > 0.05).

Third, organizational performance was also measured from the customer perspective (CP). Therefore, the differences in perception between respondents from private sector organizations and those from public sector organizations with respect to this perspective of organizational performance are illustrated in Table 4.

TABLE 4 - DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PRIVATE AND PUBLIC-SECTOR ORGANIZATIONS IN TERMS OF CUSTOMER PERSPECTIVES

Variables		Mean ranks	Sum ranks	Mann-Whitney U	Z	Asymptotic
Client Perspective (CP)	Private sector	130.47	19571.00	4204.000	-4.104	0.000
	Public sector	92.65	7690.00			
Customer Growth and Retention (CGR)	Private sector	129.33	19400.00	4375.000	-3.763	0.000
	Public sector	94.71	7861.00			
Customer Satisfaction (CS)	Private sector	130.05	19507.00	4268.000	-3.982	0.000
	Public sector	93.42	7754.00			

Source: Authors

Based on the results of the Mann-Whitney test, also presented in Table 4, it can be emphasized that at the level of employees in organizations of the private sector and those of organizations of the public sector, there are statistically significant differences in perception about organizational performance viewed from the perspective of the customer (U = 4204.000; p < 0.001). More precisely, by analyzing these differences, it can be found that the employees of private sector organizations appreciate to a greater extent the recording of organizational performance seen from the perspective of customers at the level of the organizations from which they come compared to those of public sector organizations (mean ranks = 130.47 compared to mean ranks = 92.65). Similar and different statistically significant results are also recorded in terms of respondents' perception of the two subdimensions of organizational performance viewed from the perspective of customers, respectively: Customer Growth and Retention (CGR) and Customer Satisfaction (CS).

Fourth, organizational performance was also measured through the financial perspective (FP). Therefore, the differences in perception between respondents of private sector organizations and those of public sector organizations regarding this perspective of organizational performance are presented in Table 5.

TABLE 5 - DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PRIVATE- AND PUBLIC-SECTOR ORGANIZATIONS IN TERM OF FINANCIAL PERSPECTIVE

Variables		Mean ranks	Sum ranks	Mann-Whitney U	Z	Asymptotic
Financial Perspective (FP)	Private sector	128.59	19288.50	4486.500	-3.531	0.000
	Public sector	96.05	7972.50			
Financial Resources (FR)	Private sector	127.72	19158.50	4616.500	-3.271	0.001
	Public sector	97.62	8102.50			
Organizational Performance (OP))	Private sector	129.73	19460.00	4315.000	-3.891	0.000
	Public sector	93.99	7801.00			

Source: Authors

Similarly, to the differences recorded between the perceptions of the respondents of private sector organizations and those of public sector organizations regarding organizational performance from a customer perspective, the organization performance from a financial perspective is perceived significantly differently by the two categories of respondents (U = 4486.500; p < 0.001). And in this situation, respondents who come from the private sector appreciate to a greater extent the recording of organizational performance from a financial perspective at the level of organizations in organizations in the private sector organizations (Mean ranks = 128.59), compared to those of organizations in the public sector (mean ranks = 96.05). Similar and different statistically significant results are also recorded in terms of respondents' perception of the two subdimensions of organizational performance from a financial perspective: Financial Resources (FR) and Organizational Performance (OP).

Summing up, the research results suggest that, overall, employees from private sector organizations value to a greater extent the recording of organizational performance viewed from all four perspectives of the BSC at the level of the organization they come from, compared to those from public sector organizations, these differences being statistically significant. Similar and significant results are also recorded at the level of all subdimensions of organizational performance viewed from the perspective of internal processes, from the perspective of the level of innovation and development, from the perspective of customers, and from the financial perspective, with only one exception where the differences are not significant from a statistical point of view (Organizational Innovation and Development Level (IDP), Human Capital (HC) sub-dimension).

There are not many studies that analyze all perspectives of BSC in the public and private sectors, most of them focusing on performance measurement in a general way. One of them is the paper written by Pryke (1982), who examined the performance of public and private enterprises in terms of their productivity, profitability, and efficiency. The author reviews the existing literature on this topic and concludes that the evidence on the comparative performance of public and private enterprises is mixed and inconclusive. Some studies suggest that private companies are more efficient and profitable than public companies, while others suggest the opposite. The author argues that these inconsistencies are due to the difficulty in accurately comparing public and private companies, because they operate under different constraints and objectives. Indeed, a performance comparison between the public and private sectors was probably more difficult to achieve 20 years ago, today, and using the BSC measurement can be achieved more easily.

A recent study by Tuan (2020) examines the impact of the BSC on the performance of Vietnamese commercial banks, more precisely on the private sector. The findings of the study suggest that the use of BSC has a positive impact on the performance of Vietnamese commercial banks. Specifically, the study finds that the use of the BSC is positively associated with customer satisfaction, financial performance, and operational performance. Furthermore, the study also finds that the use of the BSC is positively associated with the implementation of strategies that focus on customer satisfaction, employee satisfaction, and process improvement.

The study written by Farooq and Hussain (2011) investigated the impact of using the Balanced Scorecard (BSC) framework on the performance of selected Indian companies. The main findings of the study relate to the fact that the adoption of the Balanced Scorecard framework had a positive impact on the performance of the selected Indian companies. Companies reported improvements in financial, customer, internal business processes, and learning and growth prospects. Also, the implementation of the BSC framework facilitated the alignment of organizational objectives with individual employee performance, leading to increased motivation and commitment among employees.

There are also studies that have only focused on one perspective within the BSC model. From the financial perspective of the Balanced Scorecard, private sector organizations may appear more efficient, while public sector organizations prioritize the provision of social assistance and public services (Lapuente & Van de Walle, 2020). However, by considering the customer's perspective, organizations in the private sector can achieve comparable or even superior performance results, such as higher levels of customer service (Grego-Planer 2019). Furthermore, from a learning and growth perspective, private sector organizations can prioritize employee satisfaction, leading to a more motivated and productive workforce.

5. CONCLUSIONS

This study aimed to understand how employee job performance influences organizational processes and organizational performance, while also highlighting particular aspects specific to organizations in both the private and public sectors. Thus, organizational performance was measured through four perspectives, specific to the BSC model: (1) improving internal processes; (2) the level of innovation and development of the organization; (3) organizational performance from the perspective of customers; and (4) organizational performance from a financial perspective, each of these perspectives having several subdimensions.

A first point of interest of the investigation was to identify the differences between private and public sector organizations regarding organizational performance. In this regard, the nonparametric Mann-Whitney test was used. The research results showed that, in general, employees in private sector organizations rated organizational performance from all four perspectives of the BSC at a higher level compared to those in public sector organizations,

and these differences were statistically significant. Similar and significant results were also recorded at the level of all subdimensions of organizational performance from the perspective of internal processes, innovation and development level, customer perspective, and financial perspective, with only one exception where the differences were not statistically significant (Innovation and Development level of the organization (IDP), the subdimension of Human Capital (HC)).

Our study provides a comprehensive analysis of all four perspectives on the BSC framework in both the public and private sectors. We identified a gap in the literature where previous studies focused on a single perspective or analyzed the implications of BSC measurement in the public or private sector. Our study contributes to the literature by providing an analysis of the BSC framework and its implementation in different sectors.

As researchers, we recognize that the sample size of our study was limited, and this could be a potential limitation. Therefore, in future research, we intend to address this limitation by including a larger sample size to provide a more comprehensive view of the situation in organizations. A larger sample size would allow us to increase the generalizability of our findings and provide a better understanding of the relationship between the BSC framework and organizational performance. Furthermore, it would allow us to examine the impact of different variables, such as organizational size, industry, and geographic location, on the implementation and effectiveness of the BSC framework.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This paper partially resulted trough the research developed within the project 724/18.05.2022 "Employee performance and performance measurement systems: comparison between the public and private sectors" from Bucharest University of Economic Studies.

This paper partially resulted trough the research developed through the advanced doctoral and post-doctoral research programs in the field of management, Bucharest University of Economic Studies.

REFERENCES

Alhyari, S., Alazab, M., Venkatraman, S., Alazab, M., & Alazab, A. (2013). Performance evaluation of e-government services using Balanced Scorecard: An empirical study in Jordan. *Benchmarking: An International Journal,* 20(4), 512-536. https://doi.org/10.1108/BIJ-08-2011-0063.

Al-Najjar, S. M., & Kalaf, K. H. (2012). Designing a balanced scorecard to measure a bank's performance: A case study. *International Journal of Business Administration*, 3(4), 44-53. https:/doi:10.5430/ijba.v3n4p44.

Atkinson, A. A., Waterhouse, J. H., & Wells, R. B. (1997). A stakeholder approach to strategic performance measurement. *MIT Sloan Management Review,* 38(3), 25.

Chiţu, A., & Opriş, M. E. (2014). Importance of financial perspective indicators in Balanced Scorecard in a leasing company. *Theoretical and Applied Economics,* 21(8), 59-68.

Farooq, A., & Hussain, Z. (2011). Balanced Scorecard perspective on change and performance: A study of selected Indian companies. *Procedia-social and Behavioral Sciences,* 24, 754-768. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2011.09.043.

Georgopoulos, B. S., & Tannenbaum, A. S. (1957). A study of organizational effectiveness. *American Sociological Review*, 22(5), 534-540. https://doi.org/10.2307/2089477.

Gimbert, X., Bisbe, J., & Mendoza, X. (2010). The role of performance measurement systems in strategy formulation processes. *Long Range Planning,* 43(4), 477-497. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lrp.2010.01.001.

Grego-Planer, D. (2019).The relationship between organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behaviors in the public and private sectors. *Sustainability,*11(22), 6395. https://doi.org/10.3390/su11226395.

Hegazy, M., Hegazy, K., & Eldeeb, M. (2022). The Balanced Scorecard: Measures that drive performance evaluation in auditing firms. *Journal of Accounting, Auditing & Finance*, 37(4), 902-927. https://doi.org/10.1177/0148558X20962915.

Hodge, G. A., & Greve, C. (2017). On public–private partnership performance: A contemporary review. *Public Works Management & Policy,* 22(1), 55–78. https://doi.org/10.1177/1087724X16657830.

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. https://doi.org/ 10.2308/jmar.2000.12.1.1.

IBM Corp. (2021). *IBM SPSS Statistics for Windows, Version 28.0*. Armonk, NY: IBM Corp.

Kaplan, R. S. (2009). Conceptual foundations of the Balanced Scorecard. *Handbooks of Management Accounting Research,* 3, 1253-1269. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1751-3243(07)03003-9.

Kaplan, R. S. (2012). The Balanced Scorecard: Comments on Balanced Scorecard commentaries. *Journal of Accounting & Organizational Chang,* 8(4), 539-545. https://doi.org/10.1108/18325911211273527.

Kaplan, R. S., & Norton, D. P. (1999). The Balanced Scorecard for public-sector organizations. *Balanced Scorecard Report in Harvard Business School,* 15(11).

Kaplan, R. S., & Norton, D. P. (2005). The office of strategy management. *Harvard Business Review,* 83(10), 72-80.

Kaplan, R. S., & Norton, D. P. (1992). The Balanced Scorecard – measures that drive performance. *Harvard Business Review,* 70(1), 71-79.

Lapuente, V., & Van de Walle, S. (2020). The effects of new public management on the quality of public services. *Governance,* 33(3), 461-475. https://doi.org/10.1111/gove.12502.

Maiga, A. S., & Jacobs, F. A. (2003). Balanced Scorecard, activity-based costing, and company performance: an empirical analysis. *Journal of Managerial Issues,* 15(3) 283-301.

Mavlutova, I., & Babauska, S. (2013). The competitiveness and Balanced Scorecard of health care companies. *International Journal of Synergy and Research*, 2(2), 131-148.

Mavlutova, L., & Babauska, S. (2012). Latvian health care company competitiveness determining indicators and their improvement possibilities. *Journal of Social Sciences*, 1(4), 234-250. https://doi.org/10.17770/lner2012vol1.4.1838.

Mendes, P., Almeida, S., Santos, A. C., Ribau Teixeira, M., Murta, E., & Silva, L. (2009). Balanced Scorecard as a management model in the waste sector. In ISWA/APESB WORLD CONGRESS 2009. International Solid Waste Association (ISWA) and APESB.

Micheli, P., & Manzoni, J. F. (2010). Strategic performance measurement: benefits, limitations, and paradoxes. *Long-Range Planning,* 43(4), 465-476. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lrp.2009.12.004.

Opariuc-Dan, C. (2011). *Statistică aplicată în științele socio-umane. Analiza asocierilor și a diferențelor statistice*. Cluj: Editura ASCR.

Pallant, J. (2011). *SPSS Survival Manual. A step by step guide to data analysis using SPSS*. In Automotive Industries AI (4th ed.). Allen & Unwin.

Pedro, J. M. (2004). O Balanced Scorecard (BSC) no sector público. *Informação e Informática,* 28, 14-23.

Popa, I., & Ștefan, S. C. (2019). Modeling the pathways of knowledge management towards social and economic outcomes of health organizations. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 16(7), 1114. http://dx.doi.org/10.3390/ijerph16071114.

Porter, M. E. (1986). *Competition in global industries*. Harvard Business Press.

Pryke, R. (1982). The comparative performance of public and private enterprise. *Fiscal Studies*, 3(2), 68-81.

Rahimi, H., Kavosi, Z., Shojaei, P., & Kharazmi, E. (2016). Key performance indicators in hospital based on Balanced Scorecard model. *Journal of Health Management and Informatics*, 4(1), 17-24.

Rainey, H. G. (2009). *Understanding and managing public organizations*. John Wiley & Sons.

Ring, P. S., & Perry, J. L. (1985). Strategic management in public and private organizations: Implications of distinctive contexts and constraints. *Academy of Management Review, 10*(2), 276-286. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1985.4278197.

Sharma, A. (2009). Implementing Balance Scorecard for performance measurement. *ICFAI Journal of Business Strategy*, 6(1), 7-16.

Ștefan, S. C., Popa, I., & Dobrin, C. O. (2016). Towards a model of sustainable competitiveness of health organizations. *Sustainability*, 8(5), 464. https://doi.org/10.3390/su8050464.

Ştefan, S. C. (2018). Do the management tools care for health organizations?. *Management Research and Practice*, 10(4), 89-101.

Taber, K. S. (2018). The Use of Cronbach's Alpha When Developing and Reporting Research Instruments in Science Education. *Research in Science Education*, 48, 1273-1296. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11165-016-9602-2.

Taouab, O., & Issor, Z. (2019). Firm performance: Definition and measurement models. *European Scientific Journal,* 15(1), 93-106. https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2019.v15n1p93.

Tuan, T. T. (2020). The impact of Balanced Scorecard on performance: The case of Vietnamese commercial banks. *The Journal of Asian Finance, Economics and Business,* 7(1), 71-79. https://doi.org/10.13106/jafeb.2020.vol7.no1.71.

Warmington, A., Lupton, T., & Gribbin, C. (1977). *The Press Room*. In Organizational Behaviour and Performance. Palgrave Macmillan, London, 85-116. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-349-03088-0_5.

Wright, B. E., & Pandey, S. K. (2011). Public organizations and mission valence: When does mission matter? *Administration & Society,* 43(1), 22-44. https://doi.org/10.1177/0095399710386303.

Yuchtman, E., & Seashore, S. E. (1967). A system resource approach to organizational effectiveness. *American Sociological Review*, 32(6) 891-903. https://doi.org/10.2307/2092843.