Journal of Management and Science

16(3) 2026 52-60

OPEN ACCESS

RESEARCH ARTICLE

DOI: https://doi.org/10.26524/jms.16.29

An Integrated Framework for Evaluating Business Performance and Management Effectiveness

Dr. V. P. Amuthanayaki [1*]

Abstract

Business performance is a multidimensional outcome influenced by financial discipline, customer relationships, operational efficiency and organisational competitiveness. These outcomes are shaped not only by market conditions and available resources but also by the effectiveness of managerial practices. This study examines an integrated framework connecting four dimensions of management effectiveness strategic planning, leadership effectiveness, performance monitoring and control, and innovation-oriented learning with perceived business performance among organisations in Coimbatore, Tamil Nadu. The study is geographically confined to Coimbatore and is structured around 300 respondent records drawn from manufacturing, trading and retail, service, and information-technology-related organisations. The analysis considers respondent profiles, construct-level descriptive statistics, internal consistency, correlation, multiple regression, sampling adequacy, exploratory component structure, regression diagnostics, group differences and association between sector and respondent role. The reported results indicate positive and statistically significant bivariate relationships between all four management dimensions and business performance. In the combined regression model, strategic planning, leadership and performance monitoring and control remain statistically significant predictors, whereas innovation-oriented learning does not make a statistically significant unique contribution after controlling for the other dimensions. The model explains 19.0 per cent of the variance in perceived business performance. The findings highlight the practical importance of translating plans into action, strengthening leadership and establishing systematic performance-review mechanisms. Since the study is cross-sectional and perception-based, the results should be interpreted as associations rather than evidence of causation.

Keywords: Business Performance; Management Effectiveness; Strategic Planning; Leadership Effectiveness; Performance Monitoring; Innovation-Oriented Learning; Coimbatore.

Author Affiliation: [1] Assistant Professor, Department of Commerce, Suguna College of Arts and Science, Coimbatore, Tamil Nadu, India.

Corresponding Author: Dr. V. P. Amuthanayaki, Assistant Professor, Department of Commerce, Suguna College of Arts and Science, Coimbatore, Tamil Nadu, India.

Email: vp.amuthanayaki@gmail.com

How to cite this article: Dr. V. P. Amuthanayaki, An Integrated Framework for Evaluating Business Performance and Management Effectiveness, 16(3) 2026 52-60. Retrieved from https://jmseleyon.com/index.php/jms/article/view/989

Received: 2 September 2026 **Revised:** 14 September 2026 **Accepted:** 22 September 2026 **Published:** 30 September 2026

1. INTRODUCTION

Business organisations operate in an environment characterised by changing customer expectations, technological developments, competitive pressure and cost fluctuations. In this setting, organisational performance cannot be evaluated adequately through a single financial indicator. Profitability and revenue remain important, but they do not fully explain the managerial processes that produce sustainable results. An organisation may report satisfactory short-term financial outcomes while experiencing weaknesses in customer retention, process reliability, employee capability or adaptability.

The measurement of business performance has therefore developed beyond a narrow financial perspective. (Venkatraman and Ramanujam, 1986) distinguished financial measures from broader operational measures in strategy research, while (Richard et al., 2009) emphasised the need to select performance measures that are appropriate to the research context. (Kaplan and Norton, 1992) Balanced Scorecard similarly connects financial outcomes with customer, internal-process, and

© The Author(s). 2026 Open Access This article is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and non-commercial reproduction in any medium, provided you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons license, and indicate if changes were made. The Creative Commons Public Domain Dedication waiver (http://creativecommons.org/publicdomain/zero/1.0/) applies to the data made available in this article, unless otherwise stated.

learning-and-growth perspectives. These approaches suggest that managers should assess both achieved results and the organisational capabilities that support those results.

Management effectiveness is reflected in the quality and consistency with which organisational goals are translated into action. Strategic planning provides direction and guides resource allocation. Leadership communicates priorities, supports employee involvement and coordinates execution. Performance monitoring and control compare actual outcomes with agreed targets and enable corrective action. Innovation-oriented learning encourages organisations to respond to feedback, improve processes and adopt appropriate technologies. Although these dimensions are related, each represents a distinct managerial capability.

Coimbatore offers a relevant setting for examining these relationships because its business environment includes manufacturing enterprises, trading and retail establishments, service organisations and information-technology-related activities. Organisations across these sectors operate under different conditions, yet each must coordinate people, processes and resources to achieve its objectives. A balanced framework can help managers understand which management practices are associated with stronger perceived performance.

The present study examines the relationship between the four identified management dimensions and perceived business performance among respondents working in business organisations located in Coimbatore. It also compares performance perceptions across selected respondent groups and business sectors. The study is not designed as an audit of company financial statements or an experimental assessment of managerial interventions. Accordingly, its findings are interpreted as statistical associations within the respondent dataset.

1.1 Statement of the problem

Many organisations monitor sales, costs and profitability but may not systematically evaluate the managerial practices that contribute to these outcomes. In the absence of an integrated assessment, weaknesses in planning, leadership, performance control or organisational learning may remain unidentified. There is therefore a need for a practical framework that considers multiple management dimensions together and examines their association with business performance in the Coimbatore business context.

1.2 Research gap

Prior performance-measurement literature provides established perspectives on financial and non-financial outcomes. However, organisations require an integrated assessment that examines strategic planning, leadership, performance monitoring and innovation-oriented learning together in a specific regional business setting. This study addresses that contextual need by examining these four dimensions in relation to perceived business performance among respondents from multiple business sectors in Coimbatore.

1.3 Objectives of the study

- To examine the major dimensions of management effectiveness practised in business organisations in Coimbatore.
- To assess perceived business performance with reference to financial discipline, customer outcomes, operational efficiency and competitiveness.
- To analyse the relationship between strategic planning and business performance.
- To examine the relationship between leadership effectiveness and business performance.
- To evaluate the association between performance monitoring and control and business performance.
- To analyse the relationship between innovation-oriented learning and business performance.
- To compare perceived business performance across selected respondent groups and business sectors.
- To develop an integrated framework to support managerial review and identification of improvement priorities.

1.4 Hypotheses

- H1: Strategic planning is positively associated with business performance.
- H2: Leadership effectiveness is positively associated with business performance.
- H3: Performance monitoring and control are positively associated with business performance.
- H4: Innovation-oriented learning is positively associated with business performance.

2. Research Methodology

2.1 Research design and study area

The study follows a quantitative, cross-sectional and descriptive-cum-analytical design. The geographical scope is restricted to business organisations located in Coimbatore city and its immediate urban business area in Tamil Nadu, India. The unit of analysis is the individual respondent who is familiar with organisational management practices and operating results.

2.2 Population and sample size

The target population comprises owners, partners, senior and middle-level managers, supervisors and employees working in business organisations in Coimbatore. The study dataset contains 300 respondent records. This target is workable for the planned descriptive analysis, internal-consistency assessment, correlation analysis and multiple regression model containing four principal explanatory variables. It also permits the inclusion of respondents from different sectors and organisational roles.

The sample-size rationale is supported by (Cochran, 1977) formula for a large or unspecified population: $n_0 = Z^2p(1-p)/e^2$. At a 95 per cent confidence level (Z = 1.96), maximum variability (p = 0.50) and approximate precision of 5.7 per cent (e = 0.057), the estimated sample is approximately 296. This value is rounded to 300. This calculation provides a planning rationale; it does not, by itself, establish probability representativeness. Generalisation depends on the sampling frame, respondent-selection procedure, response rate and quality of completed questionnaires.

2.3 Sampling procedure

The sampling plan groups organisations into manufacturing, trading and retail, services, and information technology and allied activities. Respondents are drawn from owners or partners, senior or middle managers, supervisors and other employees. Where a complete sampling frame is unavailable, purposive selection of organisations and convenience-based recruitment of eligible respondents may be used. If this non-probability approach was followed, the findings should be interpreted as describing the participating respondents and should not be generalised automatically to all businesses in Coimbatore. The final manuscript should report the actual recruitment method, number approached, number of usable responses and data-collection period.

2.4 Research instrument and measurement

A structured questionnaire is used as the proposed measurement instrument. The questionnaire covers respondent background, strategic planning, leadership effectiveness, performance monitoring and control, innovation-oriented learning, and perceived business performance. Construct items are measured on a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). Each construct is represented by four statements. Planning items address goal clarity, action plans, resource allocation and review. Leadership items cover communication, employee involvement, delegation and decision-making. Performance-control items consider targets, review of deviations, corrective action and accountability. Innovation-learning items address new ideas, employee suggestions, process improvement, feedback and technology adoption. Business-performance items cover perceived financial discipline, customer outcomes, operational efficiency and competitiveness.

The final questionnaire should be reviewed by subject experts and pilot-tested. The exact questionnaire, item wording, coding procedure and any reverse-coded items should be retained as part of the research record.

2.5 Variables and analytical model

The independent variables are strategic planning (SP), leadership effectiveness (LE), performance monitoring and control (PMC), and innovation-oriented learning (IL). Perceived business performance (BP) is the dependent variable. The multiple regression model is expressed as:

$$BP = \beta_0 + \beta_1 SP + \beta_2 LE + \beta_3 PMC + \beta_4 IL + \varepsilon$$

Here, β_0 is the intercept, β_1–β_4 are the regression coefficients and ε is the error term.

2.6 Statistical tools

Frequency and percentage analysis describe respondent characteristics. Mean and standard deviation summarise construct scores. (Cronbach, 1951) alpha assesses internal consistency. Pearson's product-moment correlation examines bivariate associations. Multiple linear regression estimates the unique association of each management dimension with business performance while controlling for the

other dimensions. The additional analyses include Kaiser–Meyer–Olkin (KMO) and (Bartlett, 1950) test of sphericity, exploratory component analysis, variance inflation factors, residual diagnostics, Welch's independent-samples t-test, one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA), and Pearson's chi-square test. Statistical significance is assessed at the 5 per cent level. The assumptions and limitations of each test should be considered before drawing conclusions.

2.7 Ethical considerations

Participation in the survey should be voluntary. Respondents should be informed of the academic purpose of the study, and identifying information should not be disclosed in the report. Organisational responses should be treated confidentially. The final submission should state the actual consent procedure, data-collection period and institutional ethics approval, where applicable.

3. Results and Discussion

The following analysis presents the numerical results supplied in the manuscript dataset. Each table is followed by an interpretation that explains the statistical pattern and its relevance to the objectives. The results are perception-based and should not be treated as independently audited financial or operational outcomes.

3.1 Respondent profile

Profile variable	Category	Frequency	Percentage
Business sector	Manufacturing	90	30.0
Business sector	Services	84	28.0
Business sector	Trading/Retail	66	22.0
Business sector	IT and Allied	60	20.0
Respondent role	Senior/Middle Manager	96	32.0
Respondent role	Other Employees	78	26.0
Respondent role	Supervisor	72	24.0
Respondent role	Owner/Partner	54	18.0
Work experience	Above 10 years	123	41.0
Work experience	5–10 years	105	35.0
Work experience	Below 5 years	72	24.0

Inference: The sample comprises 300 respondents distributed across four business sectors. Manufacturing accounts for the largest share (30.0 per cent), followed by services (28.0 per cent), trading and retail (22.0 per cent), and IT and allied activities (20.0 per cent). Senior and middle managers form the largest role group (32.0 per cent), while owners or partners account for 18.0 per cent. A substantial proportion of respondents (41.0 per cent) have more than ten years of work experience. The profile therefore includes a mix of sectors, organisational positions and experience levels. This diversity supports a broader examination of management perceptions, although it does not establish that the sample is statistically representative of every business in Coimbatore.

3.2 Descriptive statistics and reliability

Construct	Mean	Std. deviation	Cronbach's alpha
Strategic planning	3.50	0.91	0.941
Leadership effectiveness	3.52	0.90	0.941
Performance monitoring and control	3.57	0.91	0.943
Innovation-oriented learning	3.58	0.91	0.945
Business performance	3.53	0.90	0.940

Inference: The construct means range from 3.50 to 3.58 on a five-point scale, indicating moderately positive respondent assessments overall. Innovation oriented learning records the highest mean (3.58), followed closely by performance monitoring and control (3.57). Strategic planning has the lowest mean (3.50), although the difference between the constructs is small. (Cronbach, 1951) alpha values range from 0.940 to 0.945, indicating high internal consistency for the item sets. Very high alpha values can sometimes reflect overlapping item content; therefore, reliability should be considered alongside item-total statistics and evidence of construct validity.

3.3 Correlation analysis

Management dimension	Pearson r	p-value	Direction
Strategic planning	0.257	<0.001	Positive
Leadership effectiveness	0.308	<0.001	Positive
Performance monitoring and control	0.337	<0.001	Positive
Innovation-oriented learning	0.207	<0.001	Positive

Inference: All four management dimensions show positive and statistically significant correlations with perceived business performance at the 5 per cent level. Performance monitoring and control has the strongest bivariate association (r = 0.337), followed by leadership effectiveness (r = 0.308), strategic planning (r = 0.257), and innovation-oriented learning (r = 0.207). The coefficients indicate positive but generally modest relationships. The results support the view that stronger management practices tend to accompany higher perceived business performance. Correlation does not establish causation, and the coefficients do not account for the simultaneous influence of the other management dimensions.

3.4 Multiple regression analysis

Predictor	Unstandardised B	Std. error	t-value	p-value
Strategic planning	0.156	0.054	2.893	0.004
Leadership effectiveness	0.210	0.057	3.695	<0.001
Performance monitoring and control	0.228	0.057	3.998	<0.001
Innovation-oriented learning	0.036	0.058	0.616	0.539

Model summary: R^2 = 0.190; adjusted R^2 = 0.179; F = 17.334; model p-value < 0.001.

Inference: The overall regression model is statistically significant (F = 17.334, p < 0.001), indicating that the four management dimensions jointly explain a meaningful proportion of variation in perceived business performance. The R^2 value of 0.190 indicates that 19.0 per cent of the observed variance is explained by the predictors; the adjusted R^2 is 0.179. Strategic planning (B = 0.156, p = 0.004), leadership effectiveness (B = 0.210, p < 0.001), and performance monitoring and control (B = 0.228, p < 0.001) have positive and statistically significant unique associations with business performance. Performance monitoring and control has the largest unstandardised coefficient among the predictors. Innovation-oriented learning has a positive coefficient but is not statistically significant in the combined model (B = 0.036, p = 0.539). This does not mean learning is unimportant; its bivariate relationship may overlap with the other management dimensions, or its unique contribution may be comparatively limited in this model. The results are associational and should not be interpreted causally.

3.5 Integrated framework and managerial implications

The results support an integrated management-performance framework in which strategic planning, leadership effectiveness, and performance monitoring and control are directly associated with perceived business performance in the combined regression model. Innovation-oriented learning is positively correlated with business performance,

although it does not show a statistically significant unique contribution after the other dimensions are controlled.

- Strategic planning: Organisations should translate broad goals into measurable departmental action plans, assign responsibilities, allocate resources and review progress at defined intervals.
- Leadership effectiveness: Managers should communicate priorities clearly, encourage employee participation, strengthen delegation and ensure that decisions are followed through.
- Performance monitoring and control: Organisations should use relevant key performance indicators, review deviations regularly, identify root causes and monitor corrective and preventive actions to closure.
- Innovation-oriented learning: Organisations should maintain channels for employee suggestions, customer feedback, process experimentation and technology adoption. The non-significant regression result suggests that the conversion of learning initiatives into measurable outcomes may require clearer implementation measures.
- Balanced performance review: Financial indicators should be reviewed alongside customer outcomes, operational efficiency, service or product quality, employee capability and competitiveness.

Taken together, the framework proposes a continuous management cycle: establish strategic priorities, align people through leadership, monitor performance against targets, and use learning to improve plans and processes. The cycle is intended as a managerial review approach rather than a causal model proven by the cross-sectional analysis.

3.6 Assessment of sampling adequacy and factorability

Test	Statistic	Degrees of freedom	p-value	Interpretation
Kaiser–Meyer–Olkin measure	0.890	—	—	Sampling adequacy assessed as good
Bartlett's test of sphericity	5659.06	190	<0.001	Correlation matrix is factorable

Inference: The KMO value of 0.890 indicates that the pattern of correlations is suitable for factor analysis under commonly used guidelines. (Bartlett, 1950) test is statistically significant ($\chi^2 = 5659.06$, df = 190, $p < 0.001$), indicating that the correlation matrix differs from an identity matrix. Together, these results support the factorability of the 20-item correlation matrix. They do not, by themselves, establish the final factor structure; item loadings, communalities, rotation method and cross-loadings should also be reported.

3.7 Exploratory structure of the measurement items

Component	Eigenvalue	Variance explained (%)	Cumulative variance (%)
Component 1	7.008	35.04	35.04
Component 2	3.196	15.98	51.02
Component 3	2.519	12.60	63.61
Component 4	2.413	12.06	75.68
Component 5	1.946	9.73	85.41

Inference: The five retained components have eigenvalues greater than 1 and together account for 85.41 per cent of the total variance reported. The first component explains 35.04 per cent, while the remaining four components contribute a further 50.37 per cent. This indicates that the item set contains substantial shared structure and that the retained components collectively account for a large proportion of the variance. However, the table alone is insufficient to label the components or confirm

that they correspond exactly to the five theoretical constructs. A complete exploratory factor analysis report should include extraction and rotation methods, rotated factor loadings, communalities, cross-loadings and the basis for retaining five components.

3.8 Multicollinearity and regression diagnostics

Diagnostic	Result	Decision guide	Inference
VIF – Strategic planning	1.086	Below 5	No indication of serious multicollinearity
VIF – Leadership	1.188	Below 5	No indication of serious multicollinearity
VIF – Performance monitoring	1.202	Below 5	No indication of serious multicollinearity
VIF – Innovation and learning	1.228	Below 5	No indication of serious multicollinearity
Durbin–Watson	1.902	Value near 2	Consistent with limited residual autocorrelation
Shapiro–Wilk residual test	W = 0.994; p = 0.280	p > 0.05	Normality is not rejected
Breusch–Pagan test	LM = 3.986; p = 0.408	p > 0.05	No evidence of heteroscedasticity

Inference: All four VIF values are close to 1 and well below the commonly used screening threshold of 5, suggesting that serious multicollinearity is unlikely among the predictors. The Durbin–Watson statistic of 1.902 is close to 2 and is consistent with limited residual autocorrelation. The Shapiro–Wilk test is not statistically significant (p = 0.280), so the null hypothesis of normally distributed residuals is not rejected. The Breusch–Pagan test is also not statistically significant (p = 0.408), providing no evidence of heteroscedasticity in this test. These diagnostics are supportive, but regression assessment should also include residual plots, linearity, influential-case checks and an assessment of independence appropriate to the sampling design.

3.9 Independent-samples t-test by managerial position

Group	n	Mean business-performance score	SD
Owners / partners and senior / middle managers	150	3.535	0.892
Supervisors and other employees	150	3.532	0.912
Welch t-test	—	t = 0.032	p = 0.974; Cohen's d = 0.004

Inference: The mean business-performance scores are almost identical for the two respondent groups: 3.535 for owners or partners and senior or middle managers, compared with 3.532 for supervisors and other employees. Welch's t-test is not statistically significant (t = 0.032, p = 0.974). Cohen's d of 0.004 indicates a negligible difference in practical terms. The results suggest that the two broad role groups hold similar perceptions of business performance in this dataset. This finding should not be interpreted as proof that managerial position never affects performance perceptions; it applies to the grouping and sample examined.

3.10 One-way analysis of variance across business sectors

Sector	n	Mean score	SD
Manufacturing	90	3.683	0.905
Trading/Retail	66	3.508	0.950
Services	84	3.482	0.874
IT and Allied	60	3.408	0.867
ANOVA	300	F(3, 296) = 1.331	p = 0.264; η^2 = 0.013

Inference: Manufacturing respondents report the highest mean business-performance score (3.683), while IT and allied respondents report the lowest (3.408). However, the one-way ANOVA is not statistically significant, F (3, 296) = 1.331, p = 0.264. The effect size (η^2 = 0.013) is small. Therefore, the observed differences between sector means are not statistically significant at the 5 per cent level. The descriptive ranking should not be interpreted as evidence that one sector performs significantly better than another. The analysis reflects respondent perceptions rather than audited sector-level performance.

3.11 Chi-square test of association between sector and respondent role

Test	Value	df	p-value	Inference
Pearson chi-square	6.789	9	0.659	No statistically significant association detected

Inference: The Pearson chi-square statistic is 6.789 with 9 degrees of freedom and a p-value of 0.659. Since the p-value exceeds 0.05, the null hypothesis of independence is not rejected. The analysis does not provide evidence of a statistically significant association between business sector and respondent role in the sample. In practical terms, the distribution of respondent roles does not appear to differ significantly across the four sectors in this dataset. The expected cell frequencies should be checked to confirm that the chi-square approximation is appropriate.

3.12 Consolidated hypothesis assessment

Hypothesis	Predictor	Unstandardised coefficient (B)	p-value	Decision
H1	Strategic planning	0.156	0.004	Supported
H2	Leadership effectiveness	0.210	<0.001	Supported
H3	Performance monitoring and control	0.228	<0.001	Supported
H4	Innovation-oriented learning	0.036	0.539	Not supported

Inference: H1, H2 and H3 are supported because the corresponding regression coefficients are positive and statistically significant at the 5 per cent level. H4 is not supported in the multiple regression model because innovation-oriented learning does not have a statistically significant unique coefficient (p = 0.539). This decision concerns the predictor's contribution after controlling for the other three dimensions; it does not contradict the positive and significant bivariate correlation reported in Table 3.3. The distinction between correlation and regression is important: a variable can be positively correlated with the outcome but fail to make a statistically significant unique contribution when related predictors are included together.

4. Conclusion

The study examines business performance as a multidimensional outcome associated with strategic planning, leadership effectiveness, performance monitoring and control, and innovation-oriented learning. The analysis is confined to business organisations in Coimbatore, Tamil Nadu, and considers a dataset of 300 respondents across

manufacturing, trading and retail, services, and IT and allied activities. The respondent profile includes owners or partners, managers, supervisors and other employees, with varied levels of work experience.

The descriptive results show moderately positive mean scores across the management dimensions and perceived business performance. The reliability coefficients indicate high internal consistency. Correlation analysis identifies positive and statistically significant relationships between each management dimension and business performance. In the multiple regression model, strategic planning, leadership effectiveness, and performance monitoring and control remain significant positive predictors. Performance monitoring and control records the largest unstandardised coefficient among the four predictors. Innovation-oriented learning is positively correlated with business performance but does not make a statistically significant unique contribution in the combined model. The model explains 19.0 per cent of the variance in perceived business performance.

The group-comparison results show no statistically significant difference in perceived business performance between the two managerial-position groups or across the four business sectors. The chi-square analysis also does not identify a significant association between sector and respondent role. The diagnostic results do not indicate serious multicollinearity or major departures in the residual tests reported. Overall, the findings suggest that organisations may benefit from clearer strategic plans, effective leadership practices and systematic performance monitoring, while continuing to strengthen learning and innovation mechanisms.

The study has limitations. Its cross-sectional design does not establish causality, and the outcome is based on respondent perceptions rather than verified financial statements or operational records. The extent to which the findings can be generalised depends on the actual sampling procedure and coverage of participating organisations. Future research may use longitudinal data, sector-specific samples, objective performance indicators and confirmatory factor analysis to test the stability of the proposed framework. Further work may also examine how learning initiatives are translated into measurable improvements through implementation capability, employee participation and technology adoption.

References

1. Bartlett, M. S. Tests of significance in factor analysis. British Journal of Statistical Psychology, 3(2) (1950), 77–85. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8317.1950.tb00285.x
2. Cochran, W. G. Sampling Techniques (3rd ed.). John Wiley & Sons. (1977).
3. Kaplan, R. S., & Norton, D. P. The balanced scorecard Measures that drive performance. Harvard Business Review, 70(1) (1992), 71–79.
4. Richard, P. J., Devinney, T. M., Yip, G. S., & Johnson, G. Measuring organizational performance: Towards methodological best practice. Journal of Management, 35(3) (2009), 718–804. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206308330560
5. Venkatraman, N., & Ramanujam, V. Measurement of business performance in strategy research: A comparison of approaches. Academy of Management Review, 11(4) (1986), 801–814. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1986.4283976