

# Operational performance measures for startups

Nopadol Rompho

## Summary

**Purpose** – The purpose of this study is to investigate the uses of performance measures in startup firms, including perceived importance and performance of those measures.

**Design/methodology/approach** – The survey method is used in this study. Data are collected from founders/chief executive officers/managers of 110 startups in Thailand. The correlation analysis and analysis of variance techniques are used as the analysis tool in this study.

**Findings** – The results show that there is a positive relationship between the perceived importance and the performance of each metric. However, no significant differences are found in the importance and performance of each metric among the various stages of startups.

**Research limitations/implications** – Because there are so few startups compared to large corporations, the sample size of this study is relatively small, which is a limitation for some statistical tests.

**Practical implications** – Startup should measure and monitor the correct metrics in a particular stage, instead of trying to perform well in all areas, which will lead them to lose focus, and possibly even fail. Results obtained from this study will aid startups in properly monitoring and managing their performance.

**Originality/value** – Unlike large corporations, the performance measures used by startups vary, and depend on a startup's stage and type. Because of the fact that there are much fewer startups than large corporations, there are a limited number of studies in this area. This research is among the first studies that try to investigate the uses of performance measure for this new type of organizations.

**Keywords** Metrics, Performance measures, Startup

**Paper type** Research paper

Nopadol Rompho is University Professor at Thammasat Business School and Center of Excellence in Operations and Information Management, Thammasat University, Bangkok, Thailand.

## Introduction

A startup is the pursuit of an opportunity without currently controlled resources (Stevenson *et al.*, 1994), and includes several definitions. Blank and Dorf (2012) defined a startup as a temporary organization in search of a scalable, repeatable and profitable business model. Alternatively, Ripsas and Troger (2014) defined a startup as a young company, less than 10 years old, with an innovative business model and/or innovative technologies, and that demonstrates significant growth in the number of employees and/or in turnover.

Startups are the result of entrepreneurial activity (Ripsas *et al.*, 2015). Modern startups do more than just seize opportunities, because they also create opportunities themselves (Stevenson *et al.*, 1994). Entrepreneurship can be defined as the process of developing an innovative and value-creating business model, starting and leading a company to serve customers and users with new products or services, and changing the way companies and people work and live (Faltin and Ripsas, 2011). Startups also need innovation to survive. Business model innovation that requires effective management of the intellectual capital of a startup can also be a key to success because it can unleash value creation from the company (Elia *et al.*, 2017).

Startups differ from large corporations. Each possesses what the other lacks. For example, corporations have resources, scale, power and the processes needed to efficiently operate a proven business model. Conversely, a startup has none of these, but typically has

Received 18 June 2017  
Revised 3 October 2017  
Accepted 16 November 2017

This research was financially supported by Thammasat Business School, Thammasat University.

promising ideas, organizational agility, the willingness to take risks and aspirations of rapid growth (Weiblen and Chesbrough, 2015).

The other difference between startups and large corporations is that for startups, there will be unused capacity in the earlier stages of the firm when the funding is usually tight. Although unused capacities are generally not desirable, firms build it to accommodate uncertainty and plan for potential growth (Balanchandran *et al.*, 2007). This excess capacity is particularly important for startups because startups face a tremendous amount of uncertainties and, at the same time, aim for high growth. The inclusion of unused capacity certainly brings challenges to startups.

Because large corporations and startup ventures are different organizations, the tools applied to these two organizational types must also differ. An important management tool used in organizations is the management accounting system, and many organizations have implemented the management accounting system to better understand the firm's performance. It is used to evaluate the effectiveness and efficiency of services or products, and to highlight strengths and areas for improvement in business processes. Startup ventures are no exception.

Davila and Foster (2005) argued that adopting a management accounting system is an important event for a startup. Their study, based on results from 78 startup companies, found that proxies for agency cost, perceived benefits and costs, company scale and top management style can be used to explain differences in the time-to-adoption of budgets, which is an important management accounting system. Granlund and Taipaleenmaki (2005) studied the role of management accounting in startups and found that these new economy firms face fast growth and external influences from venture capitalists; thus, they use this system differently from traditional firms.

Sandino (2005) also found that early-stage firms use two sets of systems: basic management control systems, which include budgets, pricing systems and inventory control, and systems that will reflect their strategy. For example, companies that emphasize cost leadership strategy are more likely to use systems that focus on operating efficiencies, whereas those that emphasize product differentiation strategy are more likely to use nonfinancial information in response to their customers. Moores and Yuen (2001) confirmed that management accounting systems are not used extensively in the early stages of companies, and factors that can affect the adoption of a management control system in startups include the presence of venture capital, company size and founder replacement as chief executive officer (CEO) (Davila, 2005).

The goal of a management accounting system is to reduce agency cost and facilitate decision-making (Baiman, 1982). To achieve these goals, performance measures are used as the main tools. These performance measures are market-based (Sloan, 1993) and nonfinancial (Iltner *et al.*, 1997). Although many studies on performance measurement exist, most focus on large organizations. The existing performance measures, although widely known in large corporations, might not apply to startup companies, which focused more on short-term rather than long-term planning. Consequently, this research aims to investigate how startup companies use performance measures to help understand and improve their operations. It also includes the study of the performance and perceived importance of those measures in various stages of a startup.

### Performance measures in startups

Performance measurement is now garnering much attention, and interest in this topic continues to increase (Taticchi, 2008). This tool helps firms improve their business performance (Sharma *et al.*, 2005). However, although there is extensive research that investigates the need of performance measurement in large corporations, literature related to its uses in small organizations, though existing, is still very limited (Hudson *et al.*, 2000).

Taticchi *et al.* (2010) argued that research on performance measurement in relation to small- and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) takes two directions. The first is the application and adaptation to the models developed for large corporations. The second is the development of specific models for SMEs. The performance measurement framework developed for SMEs includes models related to quality management in SMEs (McAdam, 2000; Noci, 1995), adaption of the balanced scorecard for SMEs (Chee *et al.*, 1997; Manville, 2007), activity-based costing in SMEs (Gunasekaran *et al.*, 1999) and other performance measurement models developed for SMEs (e.g. Hudson *et al.*, 2001; Khan *et al.*, 2007; Kueng *et al.*, 2000; Kwaku and Satyendra, 1998; Laitinen, 2002; Marri *et al.*, 2000; Sharma *et al.*, 2005). Taticchi *et al.* (2008) also integrated these models into performance measurement and management framework for SMEs, which consisted of five main systems: performance, cost, capability evaluation, benchmarking and planning systems. Normally, SMEs do not have well-defined processes; hence, their value chain should be clearly identified. Then it can be evaluated by the performance system. To utilize information from the performance system, a company's capability should be identified. Then, SMEs should consider information from the cost system. Finally, all results should be benchmarked with top-performing firms and should be used in planning (Taticchi and Balachandran, 2008; Taticchi *et al.*, 2012).

Although a startup is a type of SME, its nature is quite different. It can be argued that SMEs are like large corporations on a smaller scale. Although their characteristics are not exactly the same, both types of organizations operate in more stable environments compared with startups. According to the contingency theory, there is no universally appropriate performance measurement system that can be applied to all types of organizations in all conditions (Wadongo and Abdel-Kader, 2014). The system should be adapted on the basis of specific organizational and contextual factors (Otle, 1980; Rejc, 2004).

For startups, as venture capital is an important source of finance, this can be a major contingency factor that affects their performance measures. Venture capitalists may encourage the use of performance measures in startup firms to help reduce agency cost. These performance measures help control the founders/CEOs and management staff to ensure that they act in accordance with the investors' interests. These performance measures also help startups' founders/CEOs and management staff to make the right decisions. They help startups learn by using correct information, a concept Simon (1995) called "interactive systems."

Identifying current and future successful ventures helps to further the understanding of the entrepreneurial process and to guide public policies to improve the success rate of startups (Fried and Tauer, 2015). However, startups are not all the same. Different types of startups use different metrics. Croll and Yoskovitz (2013) identified metrics used in six types of startups: e-commerce, software as a service (SaaS), mobile apps, media sites, user-generated content and two-sided marketplaces (see Table I).

Muntean *et al.* (2016) also studied the performance of e-commerce startups, and revealed several key performance indicators, such as the shopping cart dropout rate, average revenue per visitor, order conversion rate, average number of products in an order and average value of an order. Other researchers have identified further important measures, including survival, employment growth, sales growth (Bruderl and Preisendorfer, 1998), growth (McKelvie and Wiklund, 2010), growth rate, sales volume, business stability, customer acceptance, overall satisfaction of the entrepreneur (Sebora *et al.*, 2009), employment growth, rate of return, productivity (Reid and Smith, 2000), employment created, profits, turnover, creation of financial assets (McCartan-Quinn and Carson, 2003), the annual rate of growth of the business in terms of sales turnover since startup (Basu, 1998) and profit (Fu *et al.*, 2002).

Ripsas *et al.* (2015) introduced a measurement tool called the startup cockpit. They showed that there are three clusters of metrics relevant to startups: customer activity, the financial perspective and the process (or efficiency) perspective. Customer activity helps startups to

**Table I** Performance measures by type of startup

<i>E-commerce</i>	<i>SaaS</i>	<i>Mobile app</i>
Conversion rate	Attention	Downloads
Purchases per year	Enrollment	Launch rate
Average shopping cart size	Stickiness	Percentage of active users/players
Abandonment	Conversion	Percentage of users who pay
Cost of customer acquisition	Upselling	Cost of customer acquisition
Revenue per customer	Cost of customer acquisition	Customer lifetime value
Top keywords driving traffic to the site	Revenue per customer	Ratings click through
Top search items	Virality	Virality
Effectiveness of recommendation engines		Time to first purchase
Virality		Monthly average revenue per user
Mailing list effectiveness		Churn
<i>Media site</i>	<i>User-generated content</i>	<i>Two-sided marketplaces</i>
Ad inventory	No of engaged visitors	Buyers and sellers growth
Ad rates	Content creation	Inventory growth
Content/advertising balance	Engagement funnel changes	Search effectiveness
Audience and churn	Value of creation content	Conversion funnels
Mailing list effectiveness	Notification effectiveness	Rating and signs of fraud
	Content sharing and virality	Pricing metrics

measure and understand how customers perceive the delivered benefit. The metrics in this cluster include customer satisfaction and recurring customers. The financial perspective is related to economic survival and profit. Measures in this category include liquidity, burn rate, margin analysis and ROI. The process (or efficiency) perspective helps to improve efficiency. Indicators include the learning curve, customer lifetime value and customer acquisition costs.

On the basis of literature reviews, it can be concluded that there are many measures available to startups. However, unlike large corporations, startups are temporary organizations with limited resources. This makes it difficult for them to measure and monitor all aspects of the business at the same time. Startup companies also face dynamic settings and thus need to update their information more frequently. The need for such updated information increases with the scale of the company (Moore and Yuen, 2001). As a startup begins to grow, it needs more information to make decisions. Consequently, it can be argued that to use time and resources effectively and efficiently, a startup should pay more attention to areas considered to be more important. As a result, it is expected that startups will perform better in areas that management considers to be more important, and less so in others. This leads to the first hypothesis of this study:

*H1. The perceived importance of the metrics used by a startup is positively correlated with its performance level.*

To investigate the uses of performance measures in startups properly, the stage of the startup should first be identified. Ries (2011) defined three stages of startups: build, measure and learn. In the early stages, successful startups complete the business model iteration loop until the learning and insight derived from customer feedback provides enough evidence that the business model is profitable and scalable (Ripsas et al., 2015). Croll and Yoskovitz (2013) identified five main stages of startups: empathy, stickiness, virality, revenue and scale. Empathy is the stage when real customers' needs, which are not being met, are identified. The stickiness stage starts when the startup knows how to meet these needs and to keep customers coming back. If customers are satisfied with the solution, they will recommend it to others. This is the virality stage. In this stage, startups grow substantially. Then, all startups need to begin earning revenue (revenue stage). In this stage, the startup begins to perform on the basis of a sustainable and scalable business model. If everything goes with plan, the startup will enter the final stage, scalable, when it

becomes a larger corporation and is no longer classified as a startup. [Maurya \(2016\)](#) argued that startups in the early stages typically rely on two measures of progress: how much work they are generating, and how much money they are making. However, traditional measures of progress are unhelpful because there may not be any revenue in these stages. Furthermore, monitoring using quantitative metrics does not automatically provide a solution. Even when startups are generating revenue, unless they can connect cause and effect, they cannot leverage the elements that are making it successful, which can easily lead to the business following the wrong path. [Pirolo and Presutti \(2010\)](#) also found that metrics such as social networks are important to startups' success. However, their impact depends on the stage of the startup. Because the nature of each stage is different, the importance and performance of metrics used in each stage should also be different. This leads to the second and third hypotheses in this study:

*H2.* Startups assign different levels of importance to performance measures, depending on their stage of growth.

*H3.* Startups perform differently, depending on their stage of growth.

## Design/methodology/approach

This research adopts the survey method. Overall, 607 startup companies were found to exist in Thailand. The list of these companies was compiled using the Thailand Startups – AngelList, the extensive online database for startups in Thailand. Based on a preliminary exploration of each startup's website, it was found that only 292 startups are still in operation. The questionnaires were then distributed to the founders, CEOs or senior managers in these startup companies. Respondents were asked to identify the type and stage of the startup, the level of importance of the performance measures they use, and to evaluate their performance for that indicator. The questionnaire uses a five-point rating scale, where 1 denotes the least importance/poorest performance and 5 is highest importance/best performance.

This list of startup metrics was gathered from the work of [Croll and Yoskovitz \(2013\)](#), because it is comprehensive and provides specific measures for each type of startup. It also covers all measures proposed in other studies. Nevertheless, to be certain that the list is comprehensive in the context of Thai startups, it was tested by interviewing startups of each type to determine whether they used any measures that did not appear in the list. The results of the interviews revealed that startups also track several financial measures: revenue, expenses and profit. Thus, these three measures were added to the list of performance measures.

The data were extracted from the returned questionnaires, and were analyzed using both descriptive and inferential statistics. A correlation analysis was performed to test the first hypothesis, whereas the analysis of variance tests were used to test the second and third hypotheses.

## Findings

Of the 292 distributed questionnaires, 115 were returned. Thus, the response rate was 37.67 per cent. Note that five startups did not identify their type and, thus, were eliminated from the study. The startups were distributed among the various startup types, with most being two-sided marketplaces (29.1 per cent), followed by SaaS (28.2 per cent), and e-commerce companies (22.7 per cent); see [Table II](#).

The survey results revealed that 27.3 per cent of the startups are in the revenue stage, where they begin to generate revenue, whereas 25.5 per cent of the startups are in an early stage, where they are trying to find solutions that meet the market's needs. [Table III](#) shows how the startups are distributed among the various stages.

Different types of startups indicated different levels of importance/performance for the various measures used. [Tables IV](#) and [V](#) show the importance/performance of each

<b>Table II</b> Types of startups in the sample		
<i>Type of startup</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>(%)</i>
E-commerce	25	22.7
Software as a service	31	28.2
Mobile app	12	10.9
Media site	2	1.8
User-generated content	8	7.3
Two-sided marketplaces	32	29.1
Total	110	100.0

<b>Table III</b> Stages of startups in the sample		
<i>Stage of startup</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>(%)</i>
Empathy	28	25.5
Stickiness	25	22.7
Virality	17	15.5
Revenue	30	27.3
Scalable	10	9.1
Total	110	100.0

measure, based on the perceptions of the founder/CEO/senior management. The average importance/performance score for each measure is shown in parentheses.

Then, a correlation analysis revealed that the perceived importance of the performance measures is positively correlated with the performance level of the startups in the sample, overall. The correlation coefficient is 0.232, with  $p$ -value of 0.000. Thus, the first hypothesis is supported. However, when examining each type of startup, the relationship between the importance and the performance of each measure was found only for e-commerce, SaaS and mobile app startups, but not for media sites, user-generated content and two-sided marketplace startups. This indicates that the latter three types do not perform well in areas considered to be important. [Table VI](#) shows the correlation coefficients and  $p$ -values for each startup type.

For the second and the third hypotheses, a statistical analysis was not possible for each measure in each stage, owing to the small size of the samples and the fact that each type of startup uses different measures. Thus, to test the second and third hypotheses, statistical analyses were performed only on measures used by all startups, namely, revenue, expenses and profit.

Somewhat surprisingly, the results revealed that the importance and the performance of these three metrics (profit, revenue and expenses) are not statistically different among the various stages. Although the means of the importance and performance tend to be higher in the latter stages of growth (revenue and scalable), there is not sufficient evidence to suggest that this difference is statistically significant. [Table VII](#) shows the means of the importance and performance for the profit, revenue and expenses of each startup stage.

A further analysis was then performed to test whether this finding held for the remaining performance measures. Owing to the small sample sizes, as indicated earlier, this test was performed only for two types of startups, namely, SaaS and two-sided marketplaces, because they provided the largest sample sizes. Once again, the results showed no statistical difference in the importance (with two exceptions) and the performance of each measure among the different stages. The first exception in importance is the stickiness measure, which is not important in the scalable stage for SaaS. The second is the conversion funnels measure, which is not important in the empathy stage. No statistically significant differences were identified in terms of the performance of each measure.



**Table IV** Importance score for each performance measure by type of startup, in descending order

<i>E-commerce</i>	<i>SaaS</i>	<i>Mobile app</i>
Conversion rate (4.50)	Enrollment (4.06)	Percentage of active users/players (4.44)
Purchases per year (4.40)	Conversion (4.06)	Cost of customer acquisition (4.44)
Average shopping cart size (4.40)	Stickiness (4.00)	Churn rate (4.44)
Revenue (4.40)	Revenue (4.00)	Expenses (4.11)
Revenue per customer (4.20)	Attention (3.94)	Virality (4.00)
Cost of customer acquisition (4.00)	Revenue per customer (3.75)	Customer lifetime value (3.89)
Expenses (4.00)	Cost of customer acquisition (3.71)	Launch rate (3.67)
Top search items (3.71)	Upselling (3.63)	Downloads (3.56)
Top keywords driving traffic to the site (3.70)	Expenses (3.57)	Revenue (3.33)
Abandonment (3.60)	Virality (3.35)	Ratings click through (3.22)
Virality (3.60)	Profit (3.00)	Monthly average revenue per user (3.22)
Mailing list effectiveness (3.40)		Time to first purchase (3.00)
Profit (3.40)		Percentage of users who pay (2.89)
Effectiveness of recommendation engines (3.18)		Profit (2.44)
<i>Media site</i>	<i>User-generated content</i>	<i>Two-sided marketplaces</i>
Ad rates (3.50)	Content sharing and virality (4.00)	Buyers and sellers growth (4.52)
Content/advertising balance (3.50)	Revenue (3.75)	Revenue (4.24)
Audience and churn (3.50)	Expenses (3.75)	Conversion funnels (4.22)
Mailing list effectiveness (3.50)	No. of engaged visitors (3.83)	Search effectiveness (4.09)
Ad inventory (3.00)	Content creation (3.83)	Rating and signs of fraud (3.87)
	Value of creation content (3.83)	Expenses (3.81)
	Engagement funnel changes (3.67)	Pricing metrics (3.61)
	Notification effectiveness (3.67)	Inventory growth (3.26)
	Profit (3.00)	Profit (2.95)

**Table V** Performance score for each performance measure by type of startup, in descending order

<i>E-commerce</i>	<i>SaaS</i>	<i>Mobile app</i>
Conversion rate (4.00)	Cost of customer acquisition (3.76)	Downloads (3.70)
Abandonment (3.89)	Revenue per customer (3.53)	Expenses (3.56)
Average shopping cart size (3.78)	Profit (3.50)	Launch rate (3.22)
Profit (3.70)	Conversion (3.47)	Profit (3.11)
Top keywords driving traffic to the site (3.67)	Attention (3.41)	Customer lifetime value (3.00)
Top search items (3.56)	Expenses (3.29)	Virality (3.00)
Purchases per year (3.44)	Enrollment (3.24)	Percentage of active users/players (2.89)
Mailing list effectiveness (3.33)	Stickiness (3.18)	Churn rate (2.89)
Revenue (3.30)	Virality (3.18)	Cost of customer acquisition (2.89)
Virality (3.00)	Revenue (3.14)	Revenue (2.56)
Expenses (2.70)	Upselling (2.82)	Monthly average revenue per user (2.33)
Cost of customer acquisition (2.67)		Ratings click through (2.22)
Effectiveness of recommendation engines (2.67)		Time to first purchase (2.22)
Revenue per customer (2.56)		Percentage of users who pay (2.11)
<i>Media site</i>	<i>User-generated content</i>	<i>Two-sided marketplaces</i>
Audience and churn (3.50)	Content creation (4.00)	Buyers and sellers growth (3.83)
Mailing list effectiveness (3.50)	No. of engaged visitors (3.80)	Profit (3.55)
Ad rates (3.00)	Profit (3.75)	Conversion funnels (3.39)
Content/advertising balance (3.00)	Value of creation content (3.67)	Pricing metrics (3.30)
Ad inventory (2.50)	Content sharing and virality (3.50)	Revenue (3.29)
	Engagement funnel changes (3.33)	Search effectiveness (3.13)
	Notification effectiveness (3.33)	Rating and signs of fraud (2.87)
	Revenue (3.00)	Expenses (2.86)
	Expenses (3.00)	Inventory growth (2.83)

**Table VI** Correlation between importance and level of performance by startup type

<i>E-Commerce</i>	<i>SaaS</i>	<i>Mobile app</i>	<i>Media site</i>	<i>User-generated content</i>	<i>Two-sided marketplaces</i>
0.382** ( <i>p</i> -value = 0.000)	0.203* ( <i>p</i> -value = 0.023)	0.265** ( <i>p</i> -value = 0.000)	0.606 ( <i>p</i> -value = 0.063)	−0.247 ( <i>p</i> -value = 0.197)	0.117 ( <i>p</i> -value = 0.417)

Notes: \*Significant at 0.05 level; \*\*significant at 0.01 level

**Table VII** Means of the importance and performance of metrics by startup stage

<i>Stage of startup</i>	<i>Profit</i>	<i>Importance</i>		<i>Performance</i>		
		<i>Revenue</i>	<i>Expenses</i>	<i>Profit</i>	<i>Revenue</i>	<i>Expenses</i>
Empathy	3.75	4.15	3.62	2.69	2.77	3.00
Stickiness	2.79	3.57	3.79	2.64	2.86	2.86
Virality	3.83	4.08	4.17	2.67	2.75	3.00
Revenue	3.65	4.29	3.88	3.65	3.88	3.47
Scalable	4.00	4.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	1.50
Total	3.51	4.03	3.83	2.97	3.12	3.05
<i>F</i> -score	2.110	0.939	1.163	1.296	1.612	1.726
<i>p</i> -value	0.093	0.449	0.338	0.283	0.185	0.158

Thus, the findings reject the second and third hypotheses. These results were somewhat surprising, because it was expected that each startup stage being different would mean their focus in terms of measures would vary. A possible explanation for the result is that although startups should pay more attention to particular measures in various stages, external pressure (e.g. from investors) might affect where they focus their attention. For example, although revenue, expenses and profit should be more important in the latter stages, startups might need to report these measures to investors. Another possible explanation is that startups simply do not focus on measures that matter the most in each stage. This might not be a good sign, because trying to perform well in every area might lead to a loss of focus, and possibly failure, given the limited resources typically available to startups in each stage.

## Conclusion

Unlike large corporations, startup companies are still searching for an appropriate business model. Thus, the performance measures used by startups vary and depend on a startup's stage and type. The findings show that some startup types (media site, user-generated content and two-sided marketplace) demonstrate performance that is inconsistent with the importance of a measure, implying that some startups perform well in less important areas, but poorly in areas that are more important.

It can be argued that startups can face four situations based on the importance and performance of each metric. First, when a metric is considered important and performance is excellent, it implies that startups are doing well in the important areas, and thus the startup's strategy should be to maintain this status. Second, if a metric is considered less important, but the startup is doing very well in this area, this is not a good sign, as many might believe. Rather, this shows that the startup is wasting its limited resources in an unimportant area. Resources should be reallocated to more important areas instead.

Third, when the performance of a startup is not very good in an unimportant area, the startup should not become anxious, as that area has low priority. Finally, if the startup is performing poorly in the most important areas, this is a red flag. It is of highest priority for a startup to improve its performance in this area. Thus, the results from this study can help startups allocate resources properly.



In addition, this study found no difference in the perceived importance and performance for each metric among the startup stages. This may be because of startups receiving pressure from outside, for example from investors, whose interests might differ to those of the startup in a particular stage. Hence, startups might need to report results, even though these results are not that important to the business in that stage. These conflicting interests might be a warning to startups, because if they do not measure and monitor the correct metrics in a particular stage, and instead try to perform well in all areas, they may lose focus, and possibly even fail.

It is also interesting to note that no startups in this study paid attention to unused capacity. Startups need to build up excess capacities at the beginning because they normally aim for a high rate of growth and demand is normally very uncertain. The metrics that can identify the unused capacities of a startup can be very useful for this type of organization (see for example the work of [Balanchandran et al., 2007](#)).

Based on the findings previously discussed, a startup should measure and monitor the correct metrics in a particular stage, instead of trying to perform well in all areas, which will lead them to lose focus, and possibly even fail. Results obtained from this study will aid startups in properly monitoring and managing their performance.

However, because there are so few startups compared to large corporations, the sample size of this study is relatively small, which is a limitation for some statistical tests. This might also explain why there are so few studies in this area. Nevertheless, the findings of this study will hopefully aid startups in properly monitoring and managing their performance.

## References

- Baiman, S. (1982), "Agency research in management accounting: a survey", *Journal of Accounting Literature*, Vol. 1, pp. 154-213.
- Balanchandran, K.R., Li, S. and Radhakrishnan, S. (2007), "A framework for unused capacity: theory and empirical analysis", *Journal of Applied Management Accounting Research*, Vol. 5 No. 1, pp. 21-38.
- Basu, A. (1998), "An exploration of entrepreneurial activity among Asian small businesses in Britain", *Small Business Economics*, Vol. 10 No. 4, pp. 313-326.
- Blank, G. and Dorf, B. (2012), *The Startup Owner's Manual – The Step-by-Step Guide for Building a Great Company*, K&S Ranch, Percadero, CA.
- Bruderl, J. and Preisendorfer, P. (1998), "Network support and the success of newly founded businesses", *Small Business Economics*, Vol. 10 No. 3, pp. 213-225.
- Chee, W.C., Kamal, M.H. and James, E.W. (1997), "Applying the balanced scorecard to small companies", *Management Accounting*, Vol. 79 No. 2, pp. 21-27.
- Croll, A. and Yoskovitz, B. (2013), *Lean Analytics: Use Data to Build a Better Startup Faster*, O'Reilly, Sebastopol, CA.
- Davila, A. and Foster, G. (2005), "Management accounting systems adoption decisions: evidence and performance implications from early-stage/startup companies", *The Accounting Review*, Vol. 80 No. 4, pp. 1039-1068.
- Davila, T. (2005), "An exploratory study on the emergence of management control systems: formalizing human resources in small growing firms", *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, Vol. 30 No. 3, pp. 223-248.
- Elia, G., Lerro, A., Passiante, G. and Schiuma, G. (2017), "An intellectual Capital perspective for business model innovation in technology-based industries: empirical evidences from Italian spin-offs", *Knowledge Management Research and Practice*, Vol. 15 No. 2, pp. 155-168.
- Faltin, G. and Ripsas, S. (2011), "The entrepreneurial design as the core aspect of entrepreneurship", Working paper [No. 61], Institute of Management Berlin, Berlin School of Economics and Law (HWR Berlin), Berlin.
- Fried, H. and Tauer, L. (2015), "An entrepreneur performance index", *Journal of Productivity Analysis*, Vol. 44 No. 1, pp. 69-77.

- Fu, T., Ke, M. and Huang, Y. (2002), "Capital growth, financing source and profitability of small businesses: evidence from Taiwan small enterprises", *Small Business Economics*, Vol. 18 No. 4, pp. 257-267.
- Granlund, M. and Taipaleenmaki, J. (2005), "Management control and controllership in new economy firms – a life cycle perspective", *Management Accounting Research*, Vol. 16 No. 1, pp. 21-57.
- Gunasekaran, A., Marri, H.B. and Grieve, R.J. (1999), "Activity based costing in small and medium enterprises", *Computer and Industrial Engineering*, Vol. 37 Nos 1/2, pp. 407-411.
- Hudson, M., Lean, J. and Smart, P.A. (2001), "Improving control through effective performance measurement in SMEs", *Production Planning and Control*, Vol. 12 No. 8, pp. 804-813.
- Hudson, M., Smart, A. and Bourne, M. (2000), "Theory and practice in SME performance measurement systems", *International Journal of Operations & Production Management*, Vol. 21 No. 8, pp. 1096-1115.
- Ittner, C., Larcker, D. and Rajan, M. (1997), "The choice of performance measures in annual bonus contracts", *The Accounting Review*, Vol. 72 No. 2, pp. 231-255.
- Khan, Z., Bali, R.K. and Wickramasinghe, N. (2007), "Developing a BPI framework and PAM for SMEs", *Industrial Management & Data Systems*, Vol. 107 No. 3, pp. 345-360.
- Kueng, P., Meier, A. and Wettstein, T. (2000), "Computer-based performance measurement in SMEs: is there any option?", *Proceedings of the 1st International Conference on Systems Thinking in Management, Institute of Informatics, University of Fribourg, Fribourg, July*, pp. 318-323.
- Kwaku, A. and Satyendra, S. (1998), "Customer orientation and performance: a study of SMEs", *Management Decision*, Vol. 36 No. 6, pp. 385-394.
- Laitinen, E.K. (2002), "A dynamic performance measurement system: evidence from small Finnish technology companies", *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, Vol. 18 No. 1, pp. 65-99.
- McAdam, R. (2000), "Quality models in an SME context: a critical perspective using a grounded approach", *International Journal of Quality & Reliability Management*, Vol. 17 No. 3, pp. 305-323.
- McCartan-Quinn, D. and Carson, D. (2003), "Issues which impact upon marketing in the small firm", *Small Business Economics*, Vol. 21 No. 2, pp. 201-213.
- McKelvie, A. and Wiklund, J. (2010), "Advancing firm growth research: focus on growth mode instead of growth rate", *Entrepreneur Theory Practice*, Vol. 34 No. 2, pp. 261-288.
- Manville, G. (2007), "Implementing a balanced scorecard framework in a not for profit SME", *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, Vol. 56 No. 2, pp. 162-169.
- Marri, H.B., Gunasekaran, A. and Grieve, R.J. (2000), "Performance measurements in the implementation of CIM in small and medium enterprises: an empirical analysis", *International Journal of Production Research*, Vol. 38 No. 17, pp. 4403-4411.
- Maurya, A. (2016), *Scaling Lean: Mastering the Key Metrics for Startup Growth*, Penguin, London.
- Moore, K. and Yuen, S. (2001), "Management accounting systems and organizational configuration: a life-cycle perspective", *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, Vol. 26 No. 4-5, pp. 351-389.
- Muntean, M., Tarnaveanu, D. and Ion, A. (2016), "E-commerce performance. Shopping cart key performance indicators", *Informatica Economica*, Vol. 20 No. 1, pp. 62-71.
- Noci, G. (1995), "Accounting and non-accounting measures of quality-based performances in small firms", *Journal of Operations & Production Management*, Vol. 15 No. 7, pp. 78-105.
- Otley, D. (1980), "The contingency theory of management accounting: achievement and prognosis", *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, Vol. 5 No. 4, pp. 413-428.
- Pirollo, L. and Presutti, M. (2010), "The impact of social Capital on the start-ups' performance growth", *Journal of Small Business Management*, Vol. 48 No. 2, pp. 197-227.
- Reid, G. and Smith, J. (2000), "What makes a new business start-up successful?", *Small Business Economics*, Vol. 14 No. 3, pp. 165-182.
- Rejc, A. (2004), "Toward contingency theory of performance measurement", *Journal for East European Management Studies*, Vol. 9 No. 3, pp. 243-264.
- Ries, E. (2011), *The Lean Startup: How Today's Entrepreneurs Use Continuous Innovation to Create Radically Successful Business*, Crown Business, New York, NY.

Ripsas, S. and Troger, S. (2014), *Deutscher Startup Monitor 2014*, KPMG, Berlin.

Ripsas, S., Schaper, B. and Troger, S. (2015), "A startup cockpit for the proof-of-concept", *Handbuch Entrepreneurship*, available at: [https://link.springer.com/referenceworkentry/10.1007/978-3-658-05263-8\\_21-1](https://link.springer.com/referenceworkentry/10.1007/978-3-658-05263-8_21-1) (accessed 8 April 2017).

Sandino, T. (2005), *Introducing the First Management Control Systems: Evidence from the retail Sector*, Working Paper, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA.

Sebora, T., Lee, S. and Sukasame, N. (2009), "Critical success factors for e-commerce entrepreneurship: an empirical study of Thailand", *Small Business Economics*, Vol. 32 No. 3, pp. 303-316.

Sharma, M.K., Bhagwat, R. and Dangayach, G.S. (2005), "Practice of performance measurement: experience from Indian SMEs", *International Journal of Globalisation and Small Business*, Vol. 1 No. 2, pp. 183-213.

Simon, R. (1995), *Levers of Control: How Managers Use Innovative Control Systems to Drive Strategic Renewal*, Harvard Business School Press, Boston.

Sloan, R. (1993), "Accounting earnings and top executive compensation", *Journal of Accounting and Economics*, Vol. 16 No. 1-3, pp. 55-100.

Stevenson, H., Roberts, J. and Grousbeck, I. (1994), *New Business Ventures and the Entrepreneur*, Irwin, Boston.

Taticchi, P. (2008), "Business performance measurement and management: implementation of principles in SMEs and enterprise networks", PhD thesis, University of Perugia, Perugia.

Taticchi, P. and Balachandran, K.R. (2008), "Forward performance measurement and management integrated framework", *International Journal of Accounting & Information Management*, Vol. 16 No. 2, pp. 140-154.

Taticchi, P., Tonelli, F. and Cagnazzo, L. (2010), "Performance measurement and management: a literature review and a research agenda", *Measuring Business Excellence*, Vol. 14 No. 1, pp. 4-18.

Taticchi, P., Balachandran, K.R. and Tonelli, F. (2012), "Performance measurement and management systems: state of the art, guidelines for design and challenges", *Measuring Business Excellence*, Vol. 16 No. 2, pp. 41-54.

Taticchi, P., Balachandran, K.R., Botarelli, M. and Cagnazzo, L. (2008), "Performance measurement management for small and medium enterprises: an integrated approach", *Journal of Applied Management Accounting Research*, Vol. 6 No. 2, pp. 57-72.

Wadongo, B. and Abdel-Kader, M. (2014), "Contingency theory, performance management and organizational effectiveness in the third sector: a theoretical framework", *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, Vol. 63 No. 6, pp. 680-703.

Weiblen, T. and Chesbrough, H. (2015), "Engaging with startups to enhance corporate innovation", *California Management Review*, Vol. 57 No. 2, pp. 66-90.

### About the author

Dr Nopadol Rompho joined Thammasat Business School in 2003. His primary research interest is in the area of performance measurement and operations management. Before joining the university, he worked in oil and gas companies as an Engineer and Business Analyst. He obtained a bachelor's degree in chemical engineering (second-class honors) from Chulalongkorn University, Thailand in 1995, and he is a Master of Science in Chemical Engineering from Oregon State University, US in 1997, Master of Business Administration from Thammasat University, Thailand in 2001 and Doctor of Philosophy from University of Glasgow, UK in 2006. Nopadol Rompho can be contacted at: [nopadol@tbs.tu.ac.th](mailto:nopadol@tbs.tu.ac.th)

---

For instructions on how to order reprints of this article, please visit our website:

[www.emeraldgrouppublishing.com/licensing/reprints.htm](http://www.emeraldgrouppublishing.com/licensing/reprints.htm)

Or contact us for further details: [permissions@emeraldinsight.com](mailto:permissions@emeraldinsight.com)

Reproduced with permission of copyright owner. Further reproduction  
prohibited without permission.