



BEYOND BUDGETING

Analysis and Limitations

Judith Alaba (2014791)

Table of Contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....	2
1. INTRODUCTION	3
2. MAIN FINDINGS.....	3
3. SUCCESS SINCE INTRODUCTION.....	5
4. POTENTIAL BARRIERS TO IMPLEMENTING THE BEYOND BUDGET MODEL	5
5. INDUSTRY DYNAMICS & BARRIERS.....	6
6. CONCLUSION	7
BIBLIOGRAPHY	8

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report examines the function of Budgeting and the suitability of conventional budgeting techniques in light of the rapidly evolving corporate environment. It considers any inherent shortcomings of conventional budgeting techniques. It also evaluates the rationale behind the creation of Beyond Budgeting. In addition, the success and potential Barriers that make researchers consider Beyond Budgeting dynamic approach in building and sustaining a business are discussed in this report.

This report concludes that the perceived limitations to Beyond Budgeting are some specific barriers listed in the report which stagnate organisations/businesses from completely transforming to Beyond Budgeting.

1. INTRODUCTION

Traditional budgeting models are coming under fire in the ever-changing corporate world for being too inflexible and unable to change quickly. Beyond Budgeting Model is a ground-breaking strategy that promotes adaptability, agility, and a break from the traditional yearly budgeting cycle. Beyond Budgeting entails a new perspective on leadership that supports a drastic decentralisation of the company and a set of instruments for new procedures that facilitate these adjustments and foster a culture of accountability and self-direction. This report will explore the Beyond Budgeting Model, assess possible implementation challenges, and examine industry-specific elements that may facilitate or impede the uptake of this innovative approach (Bogsnes, 2013).

2. MAIN FINDINGS

According to King et al., 2010, a budget is a forward-looking set of numbers that projects the future financial performance of a business. It helps determine whether plan changes are needed or whether the business strategy is financially viable. Budgets assist in contracting with partners, aid in formulating clear goals, and offer "the ability to weave together all the disparate threads of an organisation into a comprehensive plan that serves many purposes" (Hansen & Otley, 2003). As early as the 1920s, large corporations defined Budgeting as a compass, providing a well-organized plan to reach financial objectives and ensure wise utilisation of resources. It promotes fiscal responsibility and self-control by providing a transparent picture of earnings, outlays, and possible investments. This fundamental instrument becomes even more critical in a company environment that is evolving quickly" (King et al., 2010). However, the inflexibility of traditional Budgeting is one of its fundamental shortcomings. A scenario whereby a manufacturing business does not consider current market swings and instead strictly follows a yearly budget; in a situation like this, the company might pass up chances to cut expenses or be unable to adjust quickly to changes in customer demand. For example, the quick speed at which technology is developing has shaken the corporate environment, caused changes in the global market, and caused unanticipated occurrences like the COVID-19 pandemic. Traditional Budgeting, frequently typified by static annual plans, might become a barrier rather than a help at these times (Baines & Langfield-Smith, 2003; Drury & Tayles, 2005).

In Coombs & Jenkins 2006 Perspective, the conventional budget is the set plan that all management procedures are based on and coordinated with. This establishes the conduct of managers and the tasks and goals they prioritise. It is believed that annual planning takes up a significant amount of management effort, and control concerns are the main focus of the monthly performance comparisons between actual and budgeted. Because they risk losing their bonuses or jobs, managers will not exceed their allotted budgets by investing required funds outside the scheduled budget cycle to respond to unforeseen circumstances. A more competitive global arena highlights the issue even more. Thus, it is believed that the main drawback of traditional Budgeting is its lack of flexibility. As a

result, businesses are being pushed to switch to continuous rolling forecasting, allowing them to quickly and systematically adjust to real-time and predicted changes in the business environment.

The fact that different circumstances existed when the budget was determined, when comparisons were made later, and when management choices were needed presents a significant issue.

Emsley 2005 believes that innovations help businesses adjust to changing business conditions and further describes innovation as existing from when an idea arises until companies fully implement it. Examples of innovations include new plans or programmes, new services or goods, new technology, new organisational structures or administrative systems, and new ideas. An IT business that spends money on research and development may discover that its limited resources discourage innovative ideas. Consequently, this lack of adaptability can hinder the company's ability to maintain a competitive edge. However, we should note that not every innovation is beneficial and ideal for everyone or a societal structure (Rogers, 2003). Many academics like Haraldsen 2009 suggest shifting the emphasis of business management from traditional (detailed) accounting systems to new (more flexible) management control systems that can make every employee contribute to increasing company value, given the increasing demand and unpredictable nature of the business environment. Successful companies create new ventures and do not just concentrate on short-term performance indicators. The interest in these advancements was so great that a research forum called the Beyond Budgeting Round Table (BBRT) was formed in 1998 by the Consortium for Advanced Manufacturing-International (CAMI) to study and report on these developments. The BBRT concluded that companies needed to restructure their organisations to transfer power to the front line more effectively and implement more effective strategic management following years of study. However, understanding that these two components of the beyond-budgeting paradigm require equal attention is essential to success (Libby and Lindsay, 2010).

The inadequacies of annual budget cycles and top-down management mechanisms prompted the departure from traditional Budgeting. The basic idea behind the creation of the Beyond Budgeting Model was to promote a financial management strategy that is more adaptable, decentralised, and flexible. The realisation that business settings are unpredictable and prone to sudden changes is one of the main reasons for its creation. Annual budgets find it challenging to keep up with the changing market dynamics as they are swiftly proven false assumptions. Contrarily, the Beyond Budgeting Model is based on continuous planning and forecasting, which enables businesses to react quickly (agile) to changes in the business environment (Bourmistrov & Kaarbøe, 2013). Furthermore, the concept tackles the drawbacks of traditional Budgeting, namely the focus on hitting predetermined goals that might incite dishonest behaviour to make quick money. Beyond Budgeting promotes a more comprehensive definition of success that considers financial and non-financial aspects, shifting the emphasis from attaining relative performance gains (Hope & Fraser, 2003, p. 16; Kaplan & Norton, 1992).

The view held by the advocates of the beyond-budgeting model within the private sector shows that benefits may accrue because of its successful application by management:

- It establishes and nurtures a competitive, success-based performance atmosphere by objectively comparing them to outside standards rather than internally determined benchmarks. Beating the competitors becomes the new managerial objective, instead of outwitting other managers for a share of resources. (Bourmistrov, A. & Kaarbøe, K. 2013).

- People are motivated by defined ideals that serve as standards, challenges, and duties. In acknowledgement of the reality that no one individual can act alone to achieve goals, rewards are team-based (Tyler and Blader, 2003)
- Operational management, situated closer to the "action," is more responsible for performance. It takes advantage of the "know-how" of people and groups interacting with customers, allowing for a considerably quicker response to shifting market demands (Chong, V. K., Eggleton, R. C., & Leong, M. K. C. 2005).
- It establishes open, transparent information systems throughout the company, which ought to deliver quick, dispersed, and visible information to support control across the board. The IT system is essential for adjusting the key performance indicators as part of the rolling forecast process (Bourne, M., Neely, A., Mills, J., & Platts, K. 2003).

However, the legal framework of public sector organisations would probably prevent such a system from being introduced. The specific organisation's requirements determine whether a method is successful, just as with any other option. The Beyond Budgeting Model alternative focuses on how organisational, managerial, and cultural changes are necessary for organisations to implement them properly to create significant behavioural issues, and managers may find it too difficult to make decisions in such an uncontrolled setting due to the intricacy of the process (Libby and Lindsay 2010).

3. SUCCESS SINCE INTRODUCTION

The complexity of the organisation and the uncertain dynamic inside the organisational environment serves as the foundation for the present attempts to evaluate the benefits of Beyond Budget (Weber and Linder, 2008). These attempts imply that Beyond Budget is unsuitable for complex organisations because of its emphasis on efficiency and simplicity, which may make it challenging to address all the myriad aspects and procedures that are a part of huge, complicated organisations. They also suggest using Beyond Budget when there are many unknowns in the organisational environment, which makes it hard to foresee and prepare for company development. In these circumstances, they view Beyond Budget as advanced as it depends on internal markets and quick decision-making, which helps firms better adjust to rapidly shifting market conditions. However, most Beyond Budget users are enormous, complex organisations, according to (Becker et al., 2010), who looked at the creation and adoption of Beyond Budget. In addition, well-documented case studies of most actions demonstrate that the practice has been around for decades in certain instances (Kroner, 2011; Pfläging, 2011; Wallander, 1999). This result could also imply that Beyond Budget fared well throughout these extended periods of prolonged use, given varying degrees of environmental uncertainty. In summary, the Beyond Budgeting Model is becoming increasingly popular across sectors as a revolutionary approach to financial management. Its capacity to adapt to the dynamic nature of business situations makes it successful (Bogsnes, B. 2016).

4. POTENTIAL BARRIERS TO IMPLEMENTING THE BEYOND BUDGET MODEL

The Beyond Budgeting Model is full of potential; however, the main obstacles to moving to Beyond Budgeting were a lack of knowledge about the concept, the difficulties of setting rolling forecasts,

bureaucracy, a lack of virtues, the challenges of evaluating team performance, the culture of relying on shared services and budgets to guide and assess performance, the belief that setting dynamic goals is too ambiguous, and a lack of competitor intelligence (Neely, A., Mike, B., & Chris, A. 2003). Furthermore, a successful deployment may slow down the inadequate performance measurements and assessment tools. Since Beyond Budgeting depends on dynamic indications and real-time data, companies without the necessary IT infrastructure may find it challenging to make the switch (Bourne, M., Neely, A., Mills, J., & Platts, K. 2003).

The ease or difficulty of adopting the Beyond Budgeting Model massively depends on the industry in which an organisation works. For example, the competitive landscape increases barriers through rapid innovation and intense competition that often benefit from the agility that Beyond Budgeting offers. In areas like technology or business startups, where flexibility is a competitive advantage, the model easily matches the requirement for swift decision-making and adaptation (Dugdale, D., & Lyne, S. 2004). Hope & Fraser 2003 consider that Beyond Budgeting may encounter opposition in highly regulated areas with tight financial reporting and compliance requirements; however, with two essential principles of Beyond Budgeting, coordination and resources available on demand, the process can be seamless.

5. INDUSTRY DYNAMICS & BARRIERS

Below are examples of how the nature of the industry might either make the possible obstacles worse or make them better:

Market Volatility:

- Implementing Beyond Budgeting may be difficult in industries like commodities subject to sharp market swings. Due to the unpredictability of these markets, organisations can be reluctant to give up the security that they believe traditional budgeting offers (Weber & Linder, 2008).

Competitive Landscape:

- The adaptability that Beyond Budgeting provides is frequently advantageous for industries that are known for their quick innovation and fierce rivalry. The strategy fits well with the necessity for swift decision-making and adaptation in industries like technology or business startups, where flexibility is a competitive advantage (Bisbe, J. & Otley, D. 2004).

Regulatory Environment:

- Beyond Budgeting may encounter opposition in highly regulated areas with tight financial reporting and compliance requirements. The model's emphasis on decentralisation may conflict with the requirement for exact and auditable financial controls (Bogsnes, 2009).

Company Size:

- Since their organisational structures are naturally more flexible, smaller businesses or startups could find it simpler to adopt Beyond Budgeting. On the other hand, reorganising

decision-making processes may challenge larger companies with firmly established hierarchical structures (Gillet et al., 2013).

Lack of trust:

- Even though a management model such as Beyond Budgeting depends on the organisational culture, one of the most crucial conditions for implementing the Beyond Budgeting concept appears to be trust. For instance, an organization's ability to trust its members is a prerequisite for openness, two-way communication, and information exchange. However, trust appears to be missing, as open communication and information sharing are crucial for the Beyond Budgeting strategy and surviving in an innovation-driven economy. However, how can institutions foster trust if the management control system does not support this procedure (Rousseau et al., 1998; Colquitt et al., 2007).

Colquitt et al., 2007 suggest that despite the unrestricted exchange of information, confidence in organisations has several advantages; for example, trust is a dynamic construct that may grow and diminish work performance. The perception of fairness in implementing management control processes (such as performance assessment) and their execution by higher-ups is crucial for fostering confidence in a management control system. "The extent to which norms of propriety or entitlement are achieved" is the definition of a fairness shell.

6. CONCLUSION

A fascinating look at what organisational management may look like in the future is evident in the Beyond Budgeting Model. Its focus on flexibility, empowerment of workers, and ongoing training meets the needs of a changing corporate environment. The road to implementation is not without its challenges; comprehending the possible obstacles and acknowledging the influence of industry dynamics is vital for enterprises contemplating the transition. Through careful navigation of industry-specific obstacles, investment in appropriate technology, and tackling cultural barriers, businesses may prosper in a constantly changing environment (Bogsnes, 2009).

Understanding these potential barriers and recognizing the impact of industry dynamics is crucial for organizations considering the shift. Businesses can thrive in an ever-changing environment by addressing cultural resistance, investing in the necessary technology, and carefully navigating industry-specific challenges (Bourmistrov and Kaarbøe, 2013). Businesses that dare to break away from the constraints of traditional Budgeting may discover that doing so allows them to survive and thrive in the face of unpredictability. Adopting the Beyond Budgeting Model opens the door to a day when flexibility will be essential for success rather than merely a competitive advantage. Beyond Budgeting has several advantages, particularly concerning perceived Institutional equity. However, the benefits of the Beyond Budgeting method are only available to those companies whose management and staff are willing to go outside of their comfort zones to achieve the greatness therein.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Baines and Langfield-Smith (2003). *Antecedents to Management Accounting*.

Bjarte Bogsnes (2016). *Implementing Beyond Budgeting: Unlocking the performance potential*. Hoboken, New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Bjarte Bogsnes (2009). *Implementing Beyond Budgeting: Unlocking the performance potential*. Chichester: John Wiley.

Bourmistrov, A. and Kaarbøe, K. (2013). From comfort to stretch zones: A field study of two multinational companies applying 'beyond budgeting' ideas. *Management Accounting Research*, 24(3), pp.196–211. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mar.2013.04.001>.

Bourne, M., Neely, A., Mills, J. and Platts, K. (2003). Implementing performance measurement systems: a literature review. *International Journal of Business Performance Management*, [online] 5(1), p.1. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1504/ijbpm.2003.002097>.

Chong, V.K., Eggleton, I.R.C. and Leong, M.K.C. (2005). The impact of market competition and budgetary participation on performance and job satisfaction: a research note. *The British Accounting Review*, 37(1), pp.115–133. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bar.2004.06.007>.

Colquitt, J.A., Scott, B.A. and LePine, J.A. (2007). Trust, trustworthiness, and trust propensity: A meta-analytic test of their unique relationships with risk-taking and job

performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(4), pp.909–927.

doi:<https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.92.4.909>.

Coombs, H.M. and Jenkins, D.E. (2006). *Public sector financial management*. London: Thomson Learning.

Drury, C., & Tayles, M. (2005). Explicating the design of overhead absorption procedures in UK organizations. *British Accounting Review*, 37(1), 47–84

Emsley, D. (2005). Restructuring the management accounting function: A note on the effect of role involvement on innovativeness. *Management Accounting Research*, 16(2), pp.157–177. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mar.2005.02.002>.

Hansen, S.C., Otley, D.T. and Van der Stede, W.A. (2003). Practice Developments in Budgeting: An Overview and Research Perspective. *Journal of Management Accounting Research*, 15(1), pp.95–116. doi:<https://doi.org/10.2308/jmar.2003.15.1.95>.

Haraldsen, N.B. (2009). Performance measurement and incentives: A study on performance management in a changing environment. Master thesis in business analysis and per

Johnson, S. (2019), Prof H Coombs, 2019

<https://www.accaglobal.com/gb/en/student/exam-support-resources/professional-exams-study-resources/p5/technical-articles/beyond-budgeting.html> Iformance management, Institute for Research in Economics and Business Administration

Jürgen Weber and Linder, S. (2008). Neugestaltung der Budgetierung mit Better und Beyond budgeting? eine Bewertung der Konzepte. Weinheim Wiley-Vch-Verl.

Katarina Kaarbøe, Gooderham, P.N. and Hanne N  rreklit (2013). *Managing in Dynamic Business Environments*. Edward Elgar Publishing.

Kroner, N. (2011). A Blueprint for Better Banking. Harriman House Limited.

Libby, T. and Lindsay, R.M. (2010). Beyond Budgeting or Budgeting reconsidered? A survey of North American budgeting practice. *Management Accounting Research*, [online] 21(1), pp.56–75. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mar.2009.10.003>.

Lyne, S.R. and Dugdale, D. (2013). *The changing roles of company budgets*. Oxford: Cima.

Neely, A., Bourne, M. and Adams, C. (2003). Better Budgeting or Beyond Budgeting? *Measuring Business Excellence*, 7(3), pp.22–28. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1108/13683040310496471>.

Niels Pfl  ging (2011). Beyond Budgeting, Better Budgeting ohne feste Budgets zielorientiert f  hren und erfolgreich steuern. Norderstedt Books On Demand Gmbh.

Rogers, E.M. (2003). *Diffusion of innovations*. (Fifth Edition) New York: Free Press.

Schmitz, S.O. (2020). *The future of management control is fair: a new perspective on beyond Budgeting as promoter of trust and ethical behaviour*. Wiesbaden, Germany: Springer Gabler.

Tyler, T.R. and Blader, S.L. (2003). The Group Engagement Model: Procedural Justice, Social Identity, and Cooperative Behavior. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 7(4), pp.349–361. doi:https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327957pspr0704_07.