

Retraction

Retracted: BSC-Based Performance Evaluation Model for Securities Industry and Its Application

Journal of Function Spaces

Received 19 December 2023; Accepted 19 December 2023; Published 20 December 2023

Copyright © 2023 Journal of Function Spaces. This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

This article has been retracted by Hindawi following an investigation undertaken by the publisher [1]. This investigation has uncovered evidence of one or more of the following indicators of systematic manipulation of the publication process:

- (1) Discrepancies in scope
- (2) Discrepancies in the description of the research reported
- (3) Discrepancies between the availability of data and the research described
- (4) Inappropriate citations
- (5) Incoherent, meaningless and/or irrelevant content included in the article
- (6) Manipulated or compromised peer review

The presence of these indicators undermines our confidence in the integrity of the article's content and we cannot, therefore, vouch for its reliability. Please note that this notice is intended solely to alert readers that the content of this article is unreliable. We have not investigated whether authors were aware of or involved in the systematic manipulation of the publication process.

Wiley and Hindawi regrets that the usual quality checks did not identify these issues before publication and have since put additional measures in place to safeguard research integrity.

We wish to credit our own Research Integrity and Research Publishing teams and anonymous and named external researchers and research integrity experts for contributing to this investigation.

The corresponding author, as the representative of all authors, has been given the opportunity to register their agreement or disagreement to this retraction. We have kept a record of any response received.

References

- [1] L. Yuan, S.-H. Sun, and Z.-Q. Cai, "BSC-Based Performance Evaluation Model for Securities Industry and Its Application," *Journal of Function Spaces*, vol. 2022, Article ID 8596540, 10 pages, 2022.

Research Article

BSC-Based Performance Evaluation Model for Securities Industry and Its Application

Ling Yuan ¹, Shan-Hui Sun ¹ and Zheng-Qun Cai ²

¹College of Mathematics and Statistics, Suzhou University, Suzhou, Anhui 234000, China

²School of Foreign Studies, Anhui Jianzhu University, Hefei 230601, China

Correspondence should be addressed to Shan-Hui Sun; shanhuisun@ahszu.edu.cn

Received 17 April 2022; Accepted 29 June 2022; Published 14 July 2022

Academic Editor: Hanan Alolaiyan

Copyright © 2022 Ling Yuan et al. This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

In the study on China's securities industry, the securities industry is divided into four types: investment in securities, securities brokerage, securities consulting, and securities underwriting and asset management. In this paper, a performance evaluation index system for the securities industry is established by using the balanced scorecard method. Based on the analytic hierarchy process, entropy weight method, and improved entropy weight method, we propose the traditional integrated weighting method and improved integrated weighting method, thus arriving at four different index weight systems. Finally, we work out the comprehensive scores of four types of securities companies under the four index weight systems, analyze the actual situation of China's securities industry by comparing the scores and rankings of securities companies under the four index weight systems, and then put forward specific suggestions.

1. Introduction

Securities industry is an industry that provides services related to securities investment. Its basic functions are to attract savings and make investments, help to raise new funds, establish and maintain an orderly securities market, and analyze economic and financial information. It is a small professional service sector in all countries, which consists of securities brokers, stock exchanges, and related commodity brokers [1]. As the subsidiaries of securities companies increase and the activities of securities companies become increasingly diversified, securities companies will face increasing risks in internal management. At the same time, there are various risks in the internal management of securities companies. Therefore, it is of great significance to evaluate the overall performance of the securities industry.

At present, Chinese securities companies have grown in both number and scale and shown uneven levels of internal management. In this context, the enterprise performance evaluation index system has been paid more and more attention [2]. Performance evaluation is to make qualitative and quantitative analysis on the operation and management

behaviors and activities of investment companies in a given period by establishing a set of evaluation criteria and practical indexes, so as to conduct a fair and complete evaluation [3, 4]. Evaluating the performance of securities companies can help securities companies to have a detailed and comprehensive understanding of the past and present situation, find ways for improvement, and promote the constant progress of business performance.

2. Research Status

2.1. Research Status of Performance Evaluation in Securities Industry. With the rise of China's economy, China's financial and securities market has ushered in a valuable opportunity of rapid development, which results in more and more attention attached to the research on performance evaluation in the securities industry.

Fang and Changwen (2004) summarized the main risks of the securities industry and pointed out that securities companies need to improve their ability of risk identification and evaluation in the operation of securities business. She believed that securities companies can no longer rely entirely

on traditional business, and it has become an inevitable choice for securities companies in China to seek business differentiation, characteristic management, and sustainable innovation [5]. Wang (2005) argued that as the market capacity declines, China's securities market has changed from a sellers' market to a buyers' market and has established an effective performance evaluation system suitable for securities investment funds [6]. Wang and Song (2012) believed that in China's securities industry, there is no significant correlation between market share, efficiency, and performance of securities companies, and efficiency is not correlated with market share [7]. Bo et al. (2021) argued that the securities industry needs to accurately identify, carefully evaluate, monitor in real time and actively deal with various risks, and conduct performance evaluation in accordance with the risk assessment principles such as setting clear objectives, clearly analyzing the risks for specific objectives, taking into account potential frauds, and identifying and evaluating factors that have a significant impact on the internal control system [8]. Fischer and Khoury (2007) proposed an increasingly popular method among portfolio managers, i.e., screening securities for portfolio selection on the basis of the moral ratings published by professional research institutions [9]. Do et al. (2022) introduced the performance evaluation mechanism in the study on the competition between target companies and peer companies and found that companies with poor performance during the transition period are faced by greater risks than those with better interim performance [10].

2.2. Research Status of BSC Method. BSC (balanced scorecard) method is not only an information-based management tool but also a performance evaluation method which has been used by many scholars to evaluate the performance of securities companies.

In the study on enterprise development and transformation, Hu (2006) found that there are many unregulated structural factors in the process of transformation from planned economy to market economy, and BSC is an integrated performance evaluation method that takes into account enterprise development and management demands and can effectively solve the problem of enterprise performance evaluation, in particular, financial evaluation [11]. Li (2017) deemed that it is very feasible to design strategic performance management systems by using BSC [12]. Hao (2020) decomposed objectives into several subindexes from four dimensions and found the way to help managers and shareholders have a clear and comprehensive understanding of the real operating conditions and development and growth capabilities of companies [13]. Annick et al. (2004) studied the main differences between BSC and tables, explained them with ideological hypothesis, and concluded that a management tool is in accord with the local ideology of the country of origin [14]. Kaplan et al. (2007) found that subordinate managers' performance-related judgments will not be weakened by BSC format or structure and concluded that subordinate affinity has direct and indirect influence on bonus distribution [15]. Said et al. (2021) found through path analysis that the traditional causality in BSC method

can provide empirical support for hotel performance evaluation [16].

3. Construction of BSC-Based Performance Evaluation Index System for Securities Industry and Data Processing

3.1. Construction of Basic Framework of BSC-Based Performance Evaluation Index System for Securities Industry. Chinese securities companies are mainly engaged in securities brokerage, securities investment consulting, financial counseling related to securities trading and investment, securities underwriting and sponsorship, self-run securities, securities asset management, and other securities business. At present, securities companies generally choose one or more businesses. However, there are compulsory provisions on the operation of multiple businesses, or there are higher capital and qualification requirements for the operation of multiple businesses [17, 18]. Therefore, the practice of securities companies engaged in multiple businesses is to set up a corporate structure composed of multilayer organizations and departments which separately manage different businesses.

In order to better classify the securities industry, this paper classifies the main businesses of securities companies into four types: investment in securities, securities brokerage, securities consulting, and securities underwriting and asset management, specifically, investment in securities: underwriting and sponsoring securities issuance and serving as a financial consultant in M&A activities; securities brokerage: buying and selling stocks and securities on behalf of investors; securities consulting: institutions and their consultants who have obtained relevant certificates issued by regulatory authorities provide securities investors or customers with relevant information, analysis, prediction, or suggestions on securities investment; and securities underwriting and asset management: trustors hand over their assets to trustees, who provide underwriting and asset management services for trustors.

3.2. BSC-Based Performance Evaluation Index System for Securities Industry. In this paper, we construct the basic framework of the performance evaluation index system for the financial and securities industry based on the concept of BSC from four dimensions: business finance, customer service, internal management, and learning and growth [19]. One of most prominent characteristic of BSC is that it transforms the strategic mission of an enterprise into specific objectives to complete the strategic planning of the enterprise, which not only highlights the "balance" concept but also makes the performance evaluation index system for the securities industry more objective, just, and scientific, as shown in Table 1.

For the market survey, a rigorous survey plan was first created to guarantee the authenticity of collected data. Second, the research group conducted investigation and statistics on the business of the securities industry through a presurvey. Finally, based on the targets and objectives of performance evaluation of the securities industry, and adhering

TABLE 1: Index system for securities industry.

| Criterion level | Index level | Index type |
|--------------------------------|--|---|
| Operating financial evaluation | A1: growth rate of main business income | Basic income from main business/total income |
| | A2: growth rate of per capita profit | Total profit in a given period/total number of employees |
| | A3: growth rate of enterprise profit | Profit of the current year/profit of the previous year |
| | A4: average interest rate of customer accounts | Net interest income of customer account assets/total customer account assets |
| | A2: asset stock ratio of newly opened effective accounts | Asset stock of new customers/average number of customers of the business department |
| | A6: task completion rate of the target market | Actual book profit of the business department/target profit of the business department |
| | A7: asset stock ratio of regular customers | Asset stock of regular customers/total customer assets |
| | A8: commission retention rate | Average commission rate of the current period/average commission rate of the previous period |
| | B1: new customer acquisition rate | Number of new accounts/number of existing accounts |
| | B2: customer retention rate | Number of regular customers/total number of customers |
| Customer service evaluation | B3: customer retention rate | Number of satisfied customers/total number of customers |
| | B4: market share | Sales of main business/total sales of similar business in the market |
| | B5: customer complaints | Number of customer complaints in a given period |
| | C1: cost control rate | Average cost of the current period/average cost of the previous period |
| | C2: recognition of the internal control system | Number of employees recognizing the internal control system/total number of employees |
| Internal management evaluation | C3: information product update rate | Number of newly developed products/days of production |
| | C4: business process rate | Processing time of main business/average business processing time |
| | C5: business error rate | Number of daily business errors/total number of daily business |
| | D1: completion rate of training hours | Actual training hours/planned training hours |
| | D2: proportion of staff training expenses | Staff training expenses/total office expenses |
| Learning and growth evaluation | D3: achievement rate of personal targets | Total personal targets achieved in the current period/total planned targets of the current period |
| | D4: employee satisfaction | Number of satisfied employees/total number of employees |
| | D5: employee turnover | Number of departing employees/total number of employees before departure |

TABLE 2: Survey data of BSC-based performance evaluation index system for securities industry.

| Index level | Investment | Brokerage | Consulting | Management |
|--|------------|-----------|------------|------------|
| Growth rate of main business income | 0.1500 | 0.1200 | 0.2000 | 0.1100 |
| Growth rate of per capita profit | 0.2000 | 0.1800 | 0.1500 | 0.1200 |
| Growth rate of enterprise profit | 0.1800 | 0.2000 | 0.1400 | 0.1600 |
| Average interest rate of customer accounts | 0.1000 | 0.1200 | 0.0800 | 0.0600 |
| Asset stock ratio of newly opened effective accounts | 0.2000 | 0.3000 | 0.2500 | 0.3000 |
| Task completion rate of the target market | 1.1000 | 1.2000 | 1.1000 | 0.9000 |
| Asset stock ratio of regular customers | 0.7000 | 0.8000 | 0.6000 | 0.7000 |
| Commission retention rate | 1.1000 | 1.2000 | 0.9000 | 0.9500 |
| New customer acquisition rate | 0.1200 | 0.1800 | 0.1000 | 0.0900 |
| Customer retention rate | 0.9000 | 0.8500 | 0.7800 | 0.7500 |
| Customer satisfaction | 0.8900 | 0.8600 | 0.7900 | 0.8000 |
| Market share | 0.3000 | 0.8400 | 0.2000 | 0.1000 |
| Customer complaints | 0.0200 | 0.0500 | 0.0300 | 0.0400 |
| Cost control rate | 0.9500 | 0.9000 | 0.8800 | 0.7500 |
| Recognition of the internal control system | 0.8900 | 0.9000 | 0.8500 | 0.8300 |
| Information product update rate | 0.1500 | 0.1200 | 0.1000 | 0.0800 |
| Business process rate | 0.1200 | 1.3000 | 1.2000 | 1.1000 |
| Business error rate | 0.0300 | 0.0200 | 0.0400 | 0.0200 |
| Completion rate of training hours | 0.9000 | 0.9200 | 0.8900 | 0.8500 |
| Proportion of staff training expenses | 0.0800 | 0.1000 | 0.0900 | 0.0700 |
| Achievement rate of personal targets | 1.3000 | 1.2000 | 1.1000 | 1.0000 |
| Employee satisfaction | 0.9000 | 0.9200 | 0.8900 | 0.8500 |
| Employee turnover | 0.0300 | 0.0200 | 0.0400 | 0.0500 |

to the objective rules of market survey and the requirements of survey, the research group selected appropriate survey objects, formulated a perfect survey plan, and then took samples [20, 21]. In this paper, we construct the performance evaluation index system for the securities industry based on the concept of BSC, introduce BSC into the performance evaluation of the securities industry, and then comprehensively evaluate the performance of the securities industry through quantitative and qualitative analysis.

3.3. Standard Processing of Survey Data on Performance of Securities Industry. Nondimensionalization can effectively avoid the influence of data type and size on the final results. In order to better analyze the performance, we need to standardize the original data. In the process of standardization, the commission retention rate, customer complaint rate, business error, and employee turnover are all variables that the smaller, the better. As a result, they should be calculated with the index standardization formula that the smaller the value, the better. The rest are variables that the higher, the better. Hence, they should be calculated with the index standardization formula that the higher the value, the better. The final results of standardization are shown in Table 2.

3.4. Standardization of Survey Data for Performance Evaluation of Securities Industry. The article subjectively and objectively weighted the securities industry performance index system. The results are shown in Table 3.

4. Index Weighting Method and Calculation Results of Performance Evaluation Index System for Securities Industry

4.1. Index Assignment Methods

4.1.1. AHP. The data acquisition of the analytic hierarchy process (AHP) should be started with professional training for performance evaluators, with a view to helping evaluators have a general understanding of different business models that are currently popular in the securities industry, master the relevant skills of performance evaluation, and get familiar with all links of performance evaluation. The training for performance evaluators mainly covers standard content of performance evaluation, calculation and scoring method of the evaluation index system, performance evaluation methods, and matters needing attention in performance evaluation. After training, performance evaluators are required to have a full grasp of performance evaluation methods and standards and be capable of solving the common problems in evaluation and sharing the experience of evaluation [22, 23].

When AHP is used for performance evaluation of the securities industry, the following requirements should be met: (i) performance evaluators are required to have a full understanding of the securities business to be evaluated; (ii) performance evaluators are required to have a good grasp of the basic principles and practices of evaluation;

TABLE 3: Standardization of survey data for BSC-based performance evaluation of securities industry.

| Index level | Investment | Brokerage | Consulting | Management |
|--|------------|-----------|------------|------------|
| Growth rate of main business income | 0.1016 | 0.1200 | 0.2000 | 0.1100 |
| Growth rate of per capita profit | 0.1406 | 0.1800 | 0.1500 | 0.1200 |
| Growth rate of enterprise profit | 0.1250 | 0.2000 | 0.1400 | 0.1600 |
| Average interest rate of customer accounts | 0.0625 | 0.1200 | 0.0800 | 0.0600 |
| Asset stock ratio of newly opened effective accounts | 0.1406 | 0.3000 | 0.2500 | 0.3000 |
| Task completion rate of the target market | 0.8438 | 1.2000 | 1.1000 | 0.9000 |
| Asset stock ratio of regular customers | 0.5313 | 0.8000 | 0.6000 | 0.7000 |
| Commission retention rate | 0.8438 | 1.2000 | 0.9000 | 0.9500 |
| New customer acquisition rate | 0.0781 | 0.1800 | 0.1000 | 0.0900 |
| Customer retention rate | 0.6875 | 0.8500 | 0.7800 | 0.7500 |
| Customer satisfaction | 0.6797 | 0.8600 | 0.7900 | 0.8000 |
| Market share | 0.2188 | 0.8400 | 0.2000 | 0.1000 |
| Customer complaints | 1.0000 | 0.0500 | 0.0300 | 0.0400 |
| Cost control rate | 0.7266 | 0.9000 | 0.8800 | 0.7500 |
| Recognition of the internal control system | 0.6797 | 0.9000 | 0.8500 | 0.8300 |
| Information product update rate | 0.1016 | 0.1200 | 0.1000 | 0.0800 |
| Business process rate | 0.0781 | 1.3000 | 1.2000 | 1.1000 |
| Business error rate | 0.9922 | 0.0200 | 0.0400 | 0.0200 |
| Completion rate of training hours | 0.6875 | 0.9200 | 0.8900 | 0.8500 |
| Proportion of staff training expenses | 0.0469 | 0.1000 | 0.0900 | 0.0700 |
| Achievement rate of personal targets | 1.0000 | 1.2000 | 1.1000 | 1.0000 |
| Employee satisfaction | 0.6875 | 0.9200 | 0.8900 | 0.8500 |
| Employee turnover | 0.9922 | 0.0200 | 0.0400 | 0.0500 |

(iii) performance evaluators are required to maintain effective communication with related persons in the securities industry in the process of evaluation.

The specific steps got through AHP are as follows: determine the relationship between indexes, construct a judgment matrix, solve the maximum eigenvalue and eigenvector of matrix T , judge the consistency of matrix T , and determine the weight of the index system.

Based on the judgment matrix T passing the consistency test, and according to the following formula:

$$TA = \lambda_{\max} A, \quad (1)$$

the subjective weight vector based on AHP can be got:

$$A = \{a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n\}^T. \quad (2)$$

4.1.2. Entropy Weight Method. The entropy weight method produces the standardized matrix of evaluation data by standardizing market survey data. Based on the values corresponding to evaluation indexes in the standardized matrix, the entropy of the performance evaluation index system of the securities industry can be calculated, and the index weight can be finally solved with the entropy. As the entropy weight method solves the weight by analyzing market survey data, the weight obtained by this method is also called objective weight.

The data used by the entropy weight method includes both social survey data and market survey data. For social survey, the first step is to determine the survey tasks according to the performance evaluation objectives of the securities industry, including selecting the survey indicators and options, as well as preliminary assumptions. The second is to design a questionnaire and a survey plan suitable for the securities industry according to the performance evaluation objectives, including designing survey indicators. The third is to design an overall social survey plan, demonstrate the feasibility of the survey plan, and screen, train, and mobilize investigators. The final is the implementation of social survey, which mainly includes data collection and collation, and later screening, return visit, and confirmation [24].

In this study, we determined the objective weight of index level and criterion level by the entropy weight method, including producing the original data matrix $S = (s_{ij})_{n \times r}$, standardizing the original matrix $S = (s_{ij})_{n \times r}$, and calculating the proportion p_{ij} of the evaluation value of the j^{th} type of business under the i^{th} index.

By calculating the entropy e_i of the i^{th} index:
 $e_i = -k \sum_{j=1}^s p_{ij} \ln p_{ij}$, where $k = 1/\ln n$.

We obtained the entropy weight b_i of the i^{th} index:

$$b_i = \frac{1 - e_i}{\sum_{i=1}^n (1 - e_i)} \left(0 \leq b_i \leq 1, \sum_{i=1}^n b_i = 1 \right). \quad (3)$$

4.1.3. Improved Entropy Weight Method. There is a big flaw in the above formula when $e_i \rightarrow 1$, i.e., when $e_i \rightarrow 1$, $1 - e_i \rightarrow 0$, and the denominator $\sum_{i=1}^n (1 - e_i)$ is constant. At this time, a slight difference of e_i may lead to a great change of b_i . To solve this problem, we improve the traditional entropy weight method by introducing a common factor, so that when $e_i \rightarrow 1$, the limit of the numerator used to calculate the weight in the entropy weight method is not zero. This can avoid the above extreme case.

The formula of the improved entropy weight method is as follows:

$$\bar{b}_i = \frac{1 - e_i + (1/n)[\sum_{i=1}^n (1 - e)]}{\sum_{i=1}^n \{1 - e_i + (1/n)[\sum_{i=1}^n (1 - e)]\}}, \quad (4)$$

$$\left(0 \leq b_i \leq 1, \sum_{i=1}^n \bar{b}_i = 1\right). \quad (5)$$

As a result, the objective weight calculated by the entropy weight method is $\bar{B} = \{\bar{b}_1, \bar{b}_2, \dots, \bar{b}_n\}^T$.

4.1.4. Improved Integrated Weighting Method. The combination weight of the traditional integrated weighting method is usually calculated by the multiplier normalization method, as follows:

$$\omega_i = \frac{a_i b_i}{\sum_{i=1}^n a_i b_i} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n a_i b_i = 1, 0 \leq \omega_i \leq 1 \right), \quad (6)$$

where a_i is the index weight determined by AHP, and b_i is the index weight determined by the entropy weight method.

Similarly, the combination weight of the improved integrated weighting method is also calculated by the multiplier normalization method, as follows:

$$\bar{\omega}_i = \frac{a_i \bar{b}_i}{\sum_{i=1}^n a_i \bar{b}_i} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n a_i \bar{b}_i = 1, 0 \leq \bar{\omega}_i \leq 1 \right), \quad (7)$$

where a_i is the index weight determined by AHP, and b_i is the index weight determined by the entropy weight method.

4.2. Determination of Index Weight in Performance Evaluation of Securities Industry

4.2.1. Calculation of Subjective and Objective Weights of Performance Evaluation of Securities Industry by AHP and Entropy Weight Method. The article subjectively and objectively weighted the securities industry performance index system. The results are shown in Table 4.

The calculation results show that the entropy weight method and AHP differ greatly in criterion level weight. The main reason may lie in that AHP calculates the weight through experts' scoring, while the entropy weight method calculates the weight by analyzing market survey data. The reality may be that there is a gap between most ordinary

people's perception and experts' more ideal planning in terms of business finance, customer services, internal management, and learning and growth [25].

Despite the difference between the subjective weight obtained by AHP and the objective weight obtained by the entropy weight method, the weight order of business finance, customer services, internal management, and learning and growth has no change. This shows that in the current performance evaluation of the securities industry, attention should be first paid to business finance, then followed by customer services, internal management, and learning and growth in sequence.

4.2.2. Weights of Traditional Integrated Weighting Method and Improved Integrated Weighting Method in Performance Evaluation of Securities Industry. Based on the traditional integrated weighting method and improved integrated weighting method, we subjectively and objectively weighted the index level. The results as shown in Table 5.

The above weighting results of index level show that the growth rate of main business income, the growth rate of enterprise profits, and the recognition of internal control system are the three most important factors affecting the performance evaluation of banking.

5. Empirical Analysis on Performance Evaluation of Securities Industry Based on Improved Integrated Weighting Method

5.1. Feasibility of Introducing BSC into Performance Evaluation Index System of Securities Industry. BSC is a strategic management tool and management method system based on organizational development strategy. After nearly 20 years of development, it has set off a revolution of management system and performance evaluation in enterprise management.

First of all, the connotations of the two are similar. BSC decomposes the organizational mission and strategic vision into specific objectives. It can achieve performance management and evaluation by assessing each specific objective and help enterprises understand the factors that affect the performance of organizational strategic management by analyzing the causality among the four dimensions and the role and position of each dimension. The performance evaluation of securities industry is also carried out around the goal of investment funds, in which the strategic goal is decomposed into specific departments and projects. This is fully consistent with the inherent requirements of BSC.

Second, the two have similarities in technique. After nearly 20 years of development, BSC is mature in both theory and technique. Developing quantifiable performance assessment indexes according to corporate mission and organizational strategy can facilitate all-round and accurate performance appraisal and evaluation. Therefore, it is technically feasible to introduce BSC into the performance evaluation index system of the securities industry, which will help to alleviate the heavy reliance on economic performance indicators, and be of great practical significance and

TABLE 4: Weights of performance evaluation of securities industry.

| Index level | AHP | Entropy weight method | Improved entropy weight method |
|--|--------|-----------------------|--------------------------------|
| Growth rate of main business income | 0.1378 | 0.0455 | 0.0435 |
| Growth rate of per capita profit | 0.0824 | 0.0450 | 0.0433 |
| Growth rate of enterprise profit | 0.1481 | 0.0449 | 0.0432 |
| Average interest rate of customer accounts | 0.0423 | 0.0458 | 0.0436 |
| Asset stock ratio of newly opened effective accounts | 0.0241 | 0.0453 | 0.0434 |
| Task completion rate of the target market | 0.0545 | 0.0447 | 0.0431 |
| Asset stock ratio of regular customers | 0.0292 | 0.0448 | 0.0432 |
| Commission retention rate | 0.0175 | 0.0447 | 0.0431 |
| New customer acquisition rate | 0.0214 | 0.0458 | 0.0437 |
| Customer retention rate | 0.0283 | 0.0446 | 0.0431 |
| Customer satisfaction | 0.0199 | 0.0447 | 0.0431 |
| Market share | 0.0333 | 0.0525 | 0.0468 |
| Customer complaints | 0.0075 | 0.0446 | 0.0431 |
| Cost control rate | 0.0531 | 0.0447 | 0.0431 |
| Recognition of the internal control system | 0.1227 | 0.0447 | 0.0431 |
| Information product update rate | 0.0313 | 0.0454 | 0.0435 |
| Business process rate | 0.0349 | 0.0498 | 0.0456 |
| Business error rate | 0.0170 | 0.0446 | 0.0431 |
| Completion rate of training hours | 0.0107 | 0.0447 | 0.0431 |
| Proportion of staff training expenses | 0.0113 | 0.0448 | 0.0432 |
| Achievement rate of personal targets | 0.0404 | 0.0447 | 0.0431 |
| Employee satisfaction | 0.0259 | 0.0447 | 0.0431 |
| Employee turnover | 0.0064 | 0.0446 | 0.0431 |

application value for realizing the multiple objectives of securities industry performance evaluation [26].

Finally, both of them reflect the overall strategic thinking. BSC decomposes strategic objectives into specific performance evaluation indicators, combines the specific indicators with various departments in the organization, and achieves multidimensional and comprehensive evaluation in the whole process. The strategic objectives of securities industry performance evaluation are also flexible, involving objectives of different natures such as economy, society, management, and ecology. The strategic idea of all-round development penetrates into all aspects of securities industry performance evaluation, so as to comprehensively evaluate the performance of the securities industry.

To sum up, it is theoretically and technically feasible to introduce the concept of BSC into the performance evaluation index system of the securities industry.

5.2. Steps of Building Performance Evaluation Model for Securities Industry. BSC-based securities industry performance evaluation can be implemented in the following steps.

First of all, set the objective of securities industry performance evaluation. In order to achieve this strategic objective, the securities industry should make efforts to improve the business level.

Second, define all levels of BSC and their corresponding indexes: (i) evaluate the objective, and revise the four levels of BSC in combination with the actual situation of the securities

industry; (ii) decompose the strategic objective of the securities industry according to the four levels of BSC, and then develop the corresponding indexes; (iii) construct the BSC framework for the performance evaluation of the securities industry.

Third, determine the specific evaluation methods. In this study, qualitative and quantitative methods are used to combine scientific methods with experts' experience and wisdom, with a view to getting real and effective evaluation results.

Finally, set up a good evaluation team. The team members can be third-party evaluation agencies or relevant managers in the securities industry. In particular, authoritative representatives should be invited to participate in the evaluation. Evaluators score the performance of the securities industry in each aspect and then get the final score of the securities industry.

5.3. Results of Performance Evaluation of Securities Industry by Different Methods. Based on the five weighting, the article evaluated the performance of four securities businesses: investment in securities, securities brokerage, securities consulting, and securities underwriting and asset management. The final results are shown in Table 6.

According to the performance evaluation results, securities brokerage, which mainly involves buying and selling stocks and securities on behalf of investors, features high technology, heavy workload, and high work intensity, which

TABLE 5: Weights of traditional integrated weighting method and improved integrated weighting method in performance evaluation of securities industry.

| Index level | Entropy weight method | Improved entropy weight method |
|--|-----------------------|--------------------------------|
| Growth rate of main business income | 0.1379 | 0.1009 |
| Growth rate of per capita profit | 0.0820 | 0.0674 |
| Growth rate of enterprise profit | 0.1473 | 0.1070 |
| Average interest rate of customer accounts | 0.0425 | 0.0434 |
| Asset stock ratio of newly opened effective accounts | 0.0241 | 0.0323 |
| Task completion rate of the target market | 0.0541 | 0.0505 |
| Asset stock ratio of regular customers | 0.0290 | 0.0353 |
| Commission retention rate | 0.0174 | 0.0282 |
| New customer acquisition rate | 0.0215 | 0.0480 |
| Customer retention rate | 0.0281 | 0.0542 |
| Customer satisfaction | 0.0197 | 0.0463 |
| Market share | 0.0359 | 0.0613 |
| Customer complaints | 0.0074 | 0.0346 |
| Cost control rate | 0.0527 | 0.0305 |
| Recognition of the internal control system | 0.1217 | 0.0563 |
| Information product update rate | 0.0313 | 0.0225 |
| Business process rate | 0.0366 | 0.0244 |
| Business error rate | 0.0169 | 0.0171 |
| Completion rate of training hours | 0.0106 | 0.0232 |
| Proportion of staff training expenses | 0.0112 | 0.0236 |
| Achievement rate of personal targets | 0.0401 | 0.0404 |
| Employee satisfaction | 0.0257 | 0.0320 |
| Employee turnover | 0.0063 | 0.0207 |

TABLE 6: Results of performance evaluation of securities industry by different methods.

| Index level | Investment | Brokerage | Consulting | Management |
|---|------------|-----------|------------|------------|
| AHP | 0.2994 | 0.3799 | 0.1524 | 0.1683 |
| Traditional entropy weight method | 0.5089 | 0.6082 | 0.5177 | 0.4841 |
| Improved entropy weight method | 0.4893 | 0.58 | 0.4954 | 0.4637 |
| Traditional integrated weighting method | 0.4817 | 0.5486 | 0.4847 | 0.4421 |
| Improved integrated weighting method | 0.4754 | 0.5458 | 0.4592 | 0.4236 |

TABLE 7: Rankings of performance evaluation results of securities industry by different methods.

| Rankings | Investment | Brokerage | Consulting | Management |
|---|------------|-----------|------------|------------|
| AHP | 2 | 1 | 4 | 3 |
| Traditional entropy weight method | 3 | 1 | 2 | 4 |
| Improved entropy weight method | 3 | 1 | 2 | 4 |
| Traditional integrated weighting method | 3 | 1 | 2 | 4 |
| Improved integrated weighting method | 2 | 1 | 3 | 4 |

leads to a high rate of return. As a result, its scores are relatively high. Relatively speaking, securities underwriting and asset management features light workload and low work intensity, thus receiving low scores. Securities consulting and investment in securities present low technical content and moderate workload and work intensity, so their scores are in the middle level.

5.4. Ranking of Performance Evaluation Results of Securities Industry by Different Methods. Based on the results of performance evaluation of the four securities businesses by five weighting methods, the performance evaluation results of the four enterprises are ranked in Table 7 as follows.

By comparing the performance evaluation rankings of four business models of the securities industry, we find that

securities brokerage companies always rank first in the evaluation by five index weighting methods, which is consistent with the reality. Because of the large volume of business and high rate of return, securities brokerage certainly performs better than others. Except for AHP, the rest four index weighting methods put securities underwriting and asset management at the bottom, which is directly related to the specific tasks and difficulty of this business. The rankings of investment in securities and securities consulting vary greatly depending on the index weighting methods, which is mainly reflected in the great difference of performance evaluation results between AHP and the improved integrated weighting method. This is because AHP relies on experts' subjective weighting, while the improved integrated weighting method combines the improved entropy weight method with AHP by normalization [27]. From the integrated ranking, it can be seen that securities consulting performs better, probably because of the opportunity to get in touch with more customers, which is conducive to business development and expansion.

6. Conclusions and Suggestions

6.1. The Performance Evaluation of the Securities Industry Should Combine Annual Evaluation with Daily Evaluation. Securities industry is a special knowledge-intensive industry, so the staff quality and working environment have a very important impact on staff's value creation. The annual evaluation and daily evaluation of the securities industry are both very important [28]. Hence, securities companies should pay attention to human resources and performance evaluation and appoint special evaluators to be responsible for the daily performance management of the business department.

6.2. The Performance Evaluation Plan of the Securities Industry Should Be Combined with the Development Strategy of the Company and the Development Planning of the Business Department. The performance evaluation of the business department should combine short-term and long-term objectives. It should not only focus on the income and profit but also fully serve the transformation of the brokerage business. In addition, performance evaluation cannot simply be treated as the basis of salary payment. It should aim at improving the staff quality and delivering ongoing value for customers [29].

6.3. The Combination of Performance Appraisal Target and Appraisal Result Feedback Promotes Employee Development. In order to achieve the improvement objective of performance evaluation, the business department should build a progressive and positive corporate culture, establish an accountability system, pay attention to the feedback interview of performance evaluation results, attach great importance to staff development and training, increase the investment in training, publicize performance evaluation plans and results in time, and take a full account of the opinions of grass-roots staff.

6.4. Establish an Open and Fair Formulation and Publicity System of Performance Evaluation Plans. Companies should improve the formulation process of performance evaluation

plans and prepare plans such as employee performance pay assessment plan and annual bonus assessment plan in advance according to the principle of target and task assignment. The plans must be approved by the leading group and the heads of business lines and be announced before implementation. The bonus assessment and distribution plan for employees and the promotion and salary adjustment plan for outstanding employees should be based on the company system, performance-oriented, and implemented upon the approval from the assessment team of the business department.

6.5. Establish a Performance Interview and Feedback System. As an important part of performance evaluation and management, performance communication and feedback can give full play to the incentive, training, and guiding functions of performance. Company heads should play an active part in the interviews with grass-roots staff, keep abreast of the developments in the business department and staff, have a full understanding of staff's personality, working status, and past performance, as well as relevant business data and comparable standards, and conduct interviews and feedback with scientific data and rational analysis.

Data Availability

The data used to support the findings of this study are included within the article.

Conflicts of Interest

The authors declare there are no conflicts of interest regarding the publication of this paper.

Authors' Contributions

All authors contributed to this paper equally.

Acknowledgments

This work was supported by the Suzhou College Development Fund Project (2021fzjj13), the Candidate project for Academic Technology Leader of Suzhou University (2020XJHB06), the Social Science Innovation and Development Research Project of Anhui Province in 2020 (2020CX104), the Key Teaching and Research Project of Provincial Quality Engineering Project of Anhui University (2020jyxm2213), and the massive open online courses (MOOC) of provincial quality project of Anhui Provincial Higher Education Institutions (2016mooc301).

References

- [1] H. Erin, "The relationship between CSR and performance: evidence in China," *Pacific-Basin Finance Journal*, vol. 51, no. 10, pp. 155–170, 2018.
- [2] K. Wang and C. Zhang, "A comparative study on the internationalization level, corporate performance and overseas revenue of Chinese and American investment banks," *Exploration of Economic Issues*, vol. 41, no. 4, pp. 151–160, 2020.
- [3] J.-B. Liu, J. Zhao, H. He, and Z. Shao, "Valency-based topological descriptors and structural property of the generalized

- Sierpiński networks,” *Journal of Statistical Physics*, vol. 177, no. 6, pp. 1131–1147, 2019.
- [4] G. Tsafack and L. Guo, “Foreign shareholding, corporate governance and firm performance: evidence from Chinese companies,” *Finance*, vol. 31, p. 100516, 2021.
- [5] F. Fang and F. Changwen, “The impact of concentration and size on performance of China’s securities industry,” *Financial Research*, vol. 47, no. 1, pp. 70–77, 2004.
- [6] S. Wang, “Research and evaluation of the performance of China’s securities investment fund,” *Economic Research*, vol. 51, no. 3, pp. 119–127, 2005.
- [7] C. Wang and H. Song, “Empirical analysis of market structure and performance of Chinese securities companies,” *Economic Longitude And Latitude*, vol. 29, no. 1, pp. 157–160, 2012.
- [8] H. Bo, R. Han, and Y. Sun, “Research on the impact of internal control on financial performance of listed companies in securities industry,” *China Prices*, vol. 33, no. 4, pp. 95–98, 2021.
- [9] K. Fischer and N. Khoury, “The impact of ethical ratings on Canadian security performance: portfolio management and corporate governance implications,” *Quarterly Review Of Economics And Finance*, vol. 47, no. 1, pp. 40–54, 2007.
- [10] T. Do, H. Zhang, and L. Zuo, “Rocking the boat: how relative performance evaluation affects corporate risk taking,” *Journal of Accounting and Economics*, vol. 73, no. 1, p. 101425, 2022.
- [11] H. Qian, “Research on the performance of securities investment fund in the Transition Economy,” *Journal of Fujian University (Social Science Edition)*, vol. 72, no. 3, pp. 101–105, 2006.
- [12] M. Li, “Research on the construction of university evaluation system of multinational corporations based on balanced scorecard,” *Vocational education BBS*, vol. 24, no. 15, pp. 47–52, 2017.
- [13] D. Hao, *Research on Strategic Performance Evaluation of L Company Based on Balanced Scorecard*, Heilongjiang Bayi Agricultural University, Daqing, 2020.
- [14] A. Bourguignon, V. Malleret, and H. Nørreklit, “The American balanced scorecard versus the French tableau de bord: the ideological dimension,” *Management Accounting Research*, vol. 15, no. 2, pp. 107–134, 2004.
- [15] S. E. Kaplan, M. J. Petersen, and J. A. Samuels, “Effects of subordinate likeability and balanced scorecard format on performance-related judgments,” *Advances in Accounting*, vol. 23, pp. 85–111, 2007.
- [16] S. Elbanna, H. Kamel, and R. Eid, “An investigation of the causality links in the balanced scorecard: the case of the Gulf cooperation council hospitality industry,” *Tourism Management Perspective*, vol. 41, no. 12, article 100934, 2022.
- [17] J.-B. Liu, J. Zhao, J. Min, and J. D. Cao, “On the Hosoya index of graphs formed by a fractal graph,” *Fractals-Complex Geometry Patterns and Scaling in Nature and Society*, vol. 27, no. 8, p. 1950135, 2019.
- [18] J.-B. Liu, C. Wang, S. Wang, and B. Wei, “Zagreb indices and multiplicative Zagreb indices of Eulerian graphs,” *Bulletin of the Malaysian Mathematical Sciences Society*, vol. 42, no. 1, pp. 67–78, 2019.
- [19] S. Sun and M. Zhou, “Analysis of farmers’ land transfer willingness and satisfaction based on SPSS analysis of computer software,” *Cluster Computing*, vol. 22, no. 4, pp. 9123–9131, 2019.
- [20] J.-B. Liu, T. Zhang, Y. K. Wang, and W. S. Lin, “The Kirchhoff index and spanning trees of Mobius/cylinder octagonal chain,” *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, vol. 307, pp. 22–31, 2022.
- [21] J.-B. Liu, Y. Bao, W. T. Zheng, and S. Hayat, “Network coherence analysis on a family of nested weighted N-polygon networks,” *Fractals*, vol. 29, no. 8, article 2150260, 2021.
- [22] J.-B. Liu, X. F. Pan, L. Yu, and D. Li, “Complete characterization of bicyclic graphs with minimal Kirchhoff index,” *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, vol. 200, pp. 95–107, 2016.
- [23] J.-B. Liu and X. F. Pan, “Minimizing Kirchhoff index among graphs with a given vertex bipartiteness,” *Applied Mathematics and Computation*, vol. 291, pp. 84–88, 2016.
- [24] A. Farooq and Z. Hussain, “Balanced scorecard perspective on change and performance: a study of selected Indian companies,” *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, vol. 24, pp. 754–768, 2011.
- [25] J. Gao, N. O’Sullivan, and M. Sherman, “An evaluation of Chinese securities investment fund performance,” *The Quarterly Review of Economics and Finance*, vol. 76, no. 5, pp. 249–259, 2020.
- [26] H. Dinçer, Ü. Hacıoğlu, and S. Yüksel, “Balanced scorecard based performance measurement of European airlines using a hybrid multicriteria decision making approach under the fuzzy environment,” *Journal of Air Transport Management*, vol. 63, no. 8, pp. 17–33, 2017.
- [27] J. Zhang and L. Tian, “Research on the relationship between equity incentive and business performance of listed companies – based on the perspective of analysts’ attention,” *Nankai Economic Research Institute*, vol. 36, no. 5, pp. 171–184, 2020.
- [28] E. Luis and A. Quezada Eduardo, “Measuring performance using SWOT analysis and balanced scorecard,” *Procedia Manufacturing*, vol. 39, pp. 786–793, 2019.
- [29] W. Xue, P. A. N. Qi, and Z. Li, “The impact of corporate governance on firm performance: evidence from Shanghai stock market,” *Modern Management Science*, vol. 20, no. 3, pp. 75–77, 2017.