

https://dspace.org/

Assessing the challenges in attaining the predetermined organisational performance objectives in the Gauteng Office of the Premier

Molapho, Makgaba Samuel

2024
University of the Witswatersrand, Johannesburg
https://hdl.handle.net/10539/38524

Downloaded from a DSpace repository. https://dspace.org/

Assessing the challenges in attaining the predetermined organisational performance objectives in the Gauteng Office of the Premier

Makgaba Samuel Molapo
WITS Graduate School of Governance

Thesis presented in partial fulfilment for the degree of Master of Management (in the field of Public and Development Sector Monitoring and Evaluation) to the Faculty of Commerce, Law, and Management, University of the Witwatersrand

February 2024

DECLARATION

I Makgaba Samuel Molapo, a student at University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg confirms that this research namely, "Assessing the challenges in attaining the predetermined organisational performance objectives in the Gauteng Office of the Premier" is originally conducted by myself. This research is unique to me, and I have not submitted it to any academic institution for examination. I also confirm that I have referenced as well as credited and recognised all the views of authors sourced somewhere else. It is in this regard that I am submitting this research to satisfy the requirements of attaining the master's degree in Management and in particular the specialisation of Public and Development Sector Monitoring and Evaluation.

Name of candidate	**Makgaba Samuel Molapo**
Student number	**2398113**
Signature	
	Signed at Johannesburg on 26 February 2024
Telephone numbers	**0762797990**
Email address	**Makgaba.molapo@gmail.com**
First year of registration	**2020**
Date of proposal submission	**02 December 2022**
Date of report submission	**24 February 2024**
Name of supervisor	Kambidima Wotela

ABSTRACT

Author: Makgaba Samuel Molapo **Supervisor** Kambidima Wotela

Thesis title: Assessing the challenges in attaining the predetermined organisational performance objectives in the Gauteng Office of the Premier

This research aims to assess the challenges in attaining the predetermined organisational performance objectives in the Gauteng Office of the Premier. In doing so, I have applied the strategy of qualitative research as well as the case study design. This enabled the research to use semi-structured interviews to collect primary data that informs challenges in attaining the predetermined organisational performance objectives in the Gauteng Office of the Premier. The population of this study is Gauteng Office of the Premier and from this population I have sampled 9 participants using a purposive sampling technique. I have located this research in the academic field of organisational performance studies. This field was suitable for my incumbent research due to its aspect connecting to the research problem. Furthermore, I have established attributes of organisational performance and linked them to interpretative frameworks of this research to answer empirical results. The interpretative frameworks of this study are bureaucracy theory, government management frameworks, Government Wide Monitoring and Evaluation (GWM&E) framework, and programme logical model. Using these frameworks as a lens of interpreting research findings, the study indicates that the organisational structure of Gauteng Office of the Premier is not fit for purpose, and it is not approved by the Department of Public Service and Administration (DPSA). As a result, the organisational structure hinders the office of the premier ability to employ human resources that will achieve predetermined objectives. The findings also point out the challenges of data collection, duplication, and alignment of budget to office priorities. Moreover, it was found that stakeholders are non-compliant and do not conform to the implementation of monitoring and evaluation system. As a result, the Gauteng office of the premier is unable to perform because is depended on stakeholders to achieve the office mandate. Lastly, the findings pointed that challenges of attaining predetermined objectives are linked to components of logical model.

Johannesburg, February 2024

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DECLARATION ii
Abstract iii
Table of contents iv
List of tables vii
List of figures viii
List of tables and figures in the appendices ix
Acknowledgements x
1 Introduction to the research 1
1.1 Background 1
1.1.1 The Gauteng Office of the Premier in brief 1
1.1.2 State of reporting on predetermined objectives in Gauteng Office of the Premier 2
1.1.3 An introduction to organisational performance 3
1.2 Research conceptualisation: Towards assessing organisational performance challenges in attaining the predetermined objectives in the Gauteng Office of the Premier 5
1.2.1 The research problem statement 5
1.2.2 The research purpose (aim and objectives) statement 6
1.2.3 The research questions. 7
1.3 Delimitations of the research 7
1.4 Justification of the research 8
1.5 Preface to the research report 9
2 Reviewing Literature to derive the conceptual framework 10
2.1 The description and history of the Gauteng Office of the Premier 10
2.1.1 Description of Gauteng Office of the Premier 11
2.1.2 History of Gauteng Office of the Premier 13
2.1.3 Aspects connecting the context to the research problem 15
2.2 Organisational performance challenges in attaining predetermined objectives. 16
2.2.1 Linking symptoms to the problem 16
2.2.2 Linking root causes to the problem 19
2.2.3 Linking consequences to the problem 21
2.2.4 Gauteng Office of the Premier results chain framework 22
2.3 Methods, data, findings, and conclusions of studies on and evaluation of organisational performance challenges in attaining predetermined objectives 27
2.3.1 Aim and objectives of previous research studies on organisational performance challenges 27
2.3.2 Interpretive/theoretical frameworks considered by previous studies on organisational performance 28
2.3.3 Research strategy and design used by previous studies on organisational performance 29
2.3.4 Data collection instruments used by previous authors on organisational development 30
2.3.5 Sampling technique and limitations from previous studies on organisational performance 30

2.3.6 Data collection process, processing, and analysis from previous studies on organisational performance 30
2.3.7 Key empirical results presented by previous studies on organisational performance 31
2.3.8 Research findings from previous studies on organisational performance 32
2.3.9 Limitations from previous studies of organisational performance 32
2.4 Introduction to organisational performance studies and its components and processes 33
2.4.1 Describing organisational performance 33
2.4.2 The purpose of organisational performance 34
2.4.3 Established facts in organisational performance. 34
2.4.4 Key issues and debates in the study of organisational performance 35
2.4.5 Major components of organisational performance 36
2.4.6 Major processes of organisational performance 36
2.5 Key attributes in organisational performance that are key to organisational performance challenges. 37
2.5.1 Organisational structure 38
2.5.2 Organisational outcomes 40
2.5.3 Organisational outputs 41
2.5.4 Organisational enablers 42
2.6 Describing bureaucracy, performance management framework, Government Wide Monitoring and Evaluation framework and the programme logical model for interpreting empirical results on organisational performance challenges against predetermined objectives 43
2.6.1 Theory of organisational bureaucracy 43
2.6.2 Government performance management framework 45
2.6.3 Government Wide Monitoring and Evaluation Systems 47
2.6.4 Programme Logic Model 48
2.7 A conceptual framework for assessing challenges in attaining predetermined objectives: the case of the Gauteng Office of the Premier 50
3 Research strategy, design, procedure and methods 55
3.1 Research strategy 55
3.2 Research design 57
3.3 Research procedure and methods 59
3.3.1 Research data and information collection instrument(s) 59
3.3.2 Research target population and selection of respondents 62
3.3.3 Ethical considerations when collecting research data 64
3.3.4 Research data and information collection process 65
3.3.5 Research data and information processing and analysis 68
3.3.6 Description of the research respondents 71
3.4 Research strengthens—reliability and validity measures applied 72
3.5 Research weaknesses—technical and administrative limitations 74
4 Presentation of research results 76
4.1 Organisational structure challenges affecting the Gauteng office of the Premiers performance in attaining predetermined objectives. 76
4.1.1 Response to research question 1 77
4.1.2 Comparison of research results to other similar studies 82

4.2 Challenges of managing performance information in the Gauteng Office of the Premier....83
4.2.1 Response to research question 2....83
4.2.2 Comparison of research results to other similar studies....89
4.3 Challenges affecting the implementation of Government Wide Monitoring and Evaluation (GWM&E) System in the Gauteng Office of the Premier to achieve predetermined objectives?....90
4.3.1 Response to research question 3....90
4.3.2 Comparison of research results to other similar studies....94
4.4 Key components of the logical model affecting the performance of the Gauteng Office of the Premier....95
4.4.1 Response to research question 4....95
4.4.2 Comparison of research results to other similar studies....100
5 Discussion of research findings....101
5.1 Organisational structure challenges affecting the Gauteng office of the Premiers performance in attaining predetermined objectives....101
5.1.1 Formal rules....102
5.1.2 Specialisation of task....104
5.2 Challenges of managing performance information in the Gauteng Office of the Premier....105
5.3 Challenges affecting the implementation of Government Wide Monitoring and Evaluation (GWM&E) System in the Gauteng Office of the Premier to achieve predetermined objectives?....108
5.4 Key components of the logical model affecting the performance of the Gauteng Office of the Premier....110
5.4.1 Inputs....110
5.4.2 Activities....111
5.4.3 Output....111
5.4.4 Outcome....112
6 Summary, conclusions, limitations, and recommendations....113
6.1 Summary....114
6.2 Conclusions....117
6.3 Limitations....119
6.4 Recommendations....120
References 123
Appendices 131
Appendix 1.1: Letter permitting the researcher to carry out the research in Gauteng Office of the Premier....132
Appendix 2.1: Ethical clearance certificate to conduct research....133
Appendix 3.1: Informed consent and participation information sheet....134
Appendix 4.1: Research instrument (Interview questions)....135
Appendix 5.1: Researchers bio....137
Appendix 6.1: Example of fully populated interview schedule....138

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Alignment of outcomes that best describes the Gauteng Office of the Premier
Table 2: Results chain framework for Gauteng Office of the Premier's performance
Table 3: Tangible and intangible inputs affecting the Gauteng office of the Premier's performance

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1: Gauteng Office of the Premier's 5th administration programme performance
Figure 2: The organogram of the Gauteng Office of the Premier
Figure 3: Gauteng Provincial map
Figure 4: Problem tee analysis
Figure 5: Number of indicators in the Gauteng Office of the Premier
Figure 6: Components of organisational performance in government
Figure 7: Key attributes in organisational performance
Figure 8: Planning, budgeting, and reporting cycle
Figure 9: Key performance information concepts
Figure 10: Diagram showing conceptual framework to assess challenges in attaining predetermined objectives in the Gauteng Office of the Premier
Figure 11: Components of logical model affecting Office of the Premier's performance
Figure 12: outlining summary, conclusion, and recommendations for the study

LIST OF TABLES AND FIGURES IN THE APPENDICES

Appendix 1.1 Letter permitting the researcher to carry out the research in Gauteng Office of the Premier

Appendix 2.1 Ethical clearance certificate to conduct research

Appendix 3.1 Informed consent and participation information sheet

Appendix 4.1 Research instrument (Interview questions)

Appendix 5.1 Researchers bio

Appendix 6.1 Example of fully populated interview schedule

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

All thanks and gratitude to GOD Almighty for the knowledge and strength. Similarly, to Professor Kambidima Wotela for immensely guiding me through supervision and ensuring that my research meet the maximum quality standards of a masters student. I will continuously value the knowledge and experience you have imparted. Moreover, to the Gauteng Office of the Premier for opening their doors and making this research possible. I am grateful to all participants that took part. Furthermore, my appreciation is extended to Joseph and Maria Molapo (Parents) who have always supported me and taught me the importance of learning and advancing my academic career. Similarly, to also thank Sethoga Molapo and Gugu Hlela for always believing in me when there was no hope. I am grateful to all my friends Sifiso Ndaba, Mlungisi Mthembu and Mahlatse Mojapelo who indirectly influenced me to undertake this masters qualification by making education fashionable.

1 INTRODUCTION TO THE RESEARCH

1.1 Background

This chapter starts by drawing attention to commonly used concepts that informs our research conceptualisation, that is providing the brief understanding of the research context and setting (starting from section 1.1.1 till section 1.1.3). Secondly, this chapter drills down to understand research problem statement that is outlined in section 1.2.1. Thirdly, in section 1.2.2, I draw attention to the research purpose statement as well as the aims and objectives. Fourthly, in section 1.2.3 of this chapter, I point out the research questions. lastly, the delimitations, justification and preface of the research are highlighted from section 1.3 to 1.5.

1.1.1 The Gauteng Office of the Premier in brief

Gauteng Office of the Premier is one of the Fourteen Departments within Gauteng Provincial sphere of Government (South Africa, 1996). Its existence and mandate are guided by the constitution and specific pieces of legislation as well as policy directives that describes the scope within which the Gauteng Office of the Premier is expected to function. Some of the legislative pieces amongst others includes the Public Financial Management Act 1 of 1999 and Public Service Act 1 of 1994 and its regulations (Treasury, 1999, Treasury, 1994 & Diedericks, 2017). Notwithstanding other policy directives, the National Development Plan (NDP) of 2030, Growing Gauteng Together Plan (GGT) of 2030 and Medium-Term Strategic Framework are amongst other policy directives that describe the scope of the office of the Premier (Diedericks, 2017 & DPME, 2019).

The Constitution of the Republic of South Africa Act 108 of 1996 therefore becomes an overarching umbrella as well as the blueprint of all the above legislative mandates and policy directives. In detail, Chapter 3 of the constitution situates the Gauteng Office of the Premier within the middle sphere of government (Provincial Sphere) in terms of separation of powers and cooperative government functions (South Africa, 1996). For instance, schedule 4 and 5 of section 41 (1) clearly outlines the principles and relationships of cooperation between National government, Provincial government as well as Municipalities that are known as Local government (South Africa, 1996). It is in the Provincial Sphere that the Premier's office is responsible for the effective and

efficient implementation of intergovernmental relations as well as cooperative governance between National and Local government to ensure good governance (Koenane & Mangena, 2017).

Over and above the role of implementing intergovernmental relations, the Gauteng Office of the Premier also performs executive, legislative, policy and ceremonial functions amongst other roles defined in chapter 6 of the constitution of the Republic of South Africa. It is in the Office of the Premier that the executive authority is vested in the Premier of Gauteng in terms of section 125 (1) of the constitution. However, it must be noted that the Premier exercises executive authority jointly with provincial Members of Executive Council.

1.1.2 State of reporting on predetermined objectives in Gauteng Office of the Premier


The context of reporting on predetermined objectives in the Gauteng Office of the Premier became the centre of attention after the newly democratically elected government in 1994 with the aim to improve service delivery in the marginalised communities that were previously disadvantaged by the apartheid government (Van der Nest & Erasmus , 2011). Similalry the constitution of the republic of South Africa motivates for efficient use of public resources and accountability as well as transperancy on the work of government (South Africa, 1996). In doing so, it was necessary for the South African governemnt to embark on a nation wide public sector reform with the focus on performance and budget expenditure (Van der Nest & Erasmus , 2011). Engela & Ajam (2010) points out that the reforms focused on value for money spent by the "public sector".

Furthermore, the public sector in South African drafted laws on performance management processes and implemented them to ensure that they are binding (Van der Nest & Erasmus, 2011). Diedericks (2017) points out that one of the first legislation that required spheres of governemnt to account on predetermined objectives was introduced in 1999 namely, the Public Finance Mnagement (PFMA) Act of 1999. Similarly, the existance of PFMA paved a way for a number of guiding documents and frameworks issued by the department of Treasury as well as the Department of Planning Monitoring and Evaluation (DPME) to guide implementation of performance management agaisnt predetermined objectives (Treasury regulations, 2001 & Department of Planning

Monitoring and Evaluation (DPME), 2020). The guiding documents and frameworks on reporting and attainment of predtermiend objectives amongst other includes the Framework for Managing Programme Performance (Treasury, 2007) and the latest Revised Framework for Strategic Plans and Annual Performance Plans (DPME, 2020).

Using the guiding documents and frameworks for reporting and attaining performance against predetermined objectives, I indicate in figure 1 below the state of performance of Gauteng Office of the Premier in attaining its predetermined objectives during the 5th administration.

Figure 1: Gauteng Office of the Premier 5th administration programme performance



Source: Adopted from Gauteng Office of the Premier Annual Reports 2014/15 till 2019/20

The Gauteng Office of the Premier inability to meet all its predetermine objectives is a symptom of performance challenges. For instance, when I compare the Gauteng Office of the Premier annual reports in figure 1 above for 2014/15 till 2017/18 there is a regression of performance from 85% to 65% achievement of predetermined objectives. It is important to use such measures for this research argument to establish the performance progress of the Gauteng Office of the Premier in attaining predetermined objectives. Similarly, Marr (2006) argues that such progress and evidence serve as foundations to formulate interventions on performance challenges if we know our starting point.

1.1.3 An introduction to organisational performance

Organisational performance is amongst the concept included in the title of this research, henceforth this section will provide a background to the concept of organisational

performance. Over and above this section providing the background to the concept of organisational performance, section 2.4.1 will go into details of defining the concept of organisational performance as part of academic field of study for this research.

The origins of the concept and idea of organisational performance can be traced back to mid-nineties century particularly in the field of competitive contest. This is more apparent in the work of Elena-Iuliana & Maria (2016), who points out that sporting contest used this concept to define and translate competitive results. However, in the late twentieth century, the concept of organisational performance has evolved, and multiple authors have adopted several definitions that are aimed at making sense of what is perceived to be the definition of organisational performance (Marr, 2008 & Silitonga, 2017 & Khunoethe & Reddy & Mthuli, 2021).

The introduction of organisational performance, particularly in government departments was essential for government to monitor as well as measure service delivery. For instance, organisational performance in government illustrate performance against service delivery indicators to assess if whether government departments and entities have done a good job and to establish if the predetermined objectives have been achieved or not (Treasury regulations, 2001 & DPME, 2020).

Organisational performance was mainly introduced to provide an overview of achievements in an organisation. This is more evident in the work of Silitonga (2017) who points out that organisational performance has evolved overtime to become a tool of measuring the level of policy implementations, organisational and individual achievements. Similarly, Marr, (2008) points out that the background to organisational performance is linked to job performance in line with what is expected to be achieved. While the introduction of organisational performance can be associated with implementation of organisational tasks with the sole responsibility of achieving organisational vision, goals, and mission, it cannot be possible without enablers (Marr, 2008 & Silitonga, 2017). The enablers of organisational performance in question vary from non-physical enablers to physical enablers. This includes employees or workforce, finances, equipment, policies and regulation information amongst others (Silitonga, 2017).

1.2 Research conceptualisation: Towards assessing organisational performance challenges in attaining the predetermined objectives in the Gauteng Office of the Premier.

1.2.1 The research problem statement

The Gauteng Office of the Premier like any other government departments in South Africa is required by government frameworks and regulations to report on performance against predetermined objectives (Deidericks, 2017 & Van der Nest & Erasmus , 2011). Furthermore, Diedericks (2017) states that government departments in the Republic of South Africa are mandated by "Section 40 of the Public Finance Management Act 1 of 1999, read in line with Section 5.1.1 of the Treasury Regulations to report on performance against predetermined objectives". In addition to performance regulations stated above, the South African constitution (1996) specifically chapter 6, becomes the overarching umbrella to provide the context of reporting on performance information which involves the Gauteng Office of the Premier being accountable to the provincial legislature by means of providing regular progress reports to determine achievements and assess performance challenges for intervention.

With the above-mentioned statutory regulations on organisational performance in government departments, the Gauteng Office of the Premier finds it difficult to achieve 100 percent of its predetermined objectives. This challenge can be attributed to the lack of political will that has destroyed the public sector ability to provide sustainable public service (Thusi, Matyana & Nokukhanya, 2023). Furthermore, it is evident from the previously submitted quarterly and annual performance reports to the Gauteng Provincial Legislature that the Office of the Premier is unable to achieve 100 percent of its predetermined objectives (Gauteng Office of the Premier Annual Report, 2022). Treasury (2007) has laid the foundation that enforces reporting on performance against predetermined objectives in line with the Public Financial Management Act Sections 40 (3) and 55 (2). This is done in the spirit of accountability to indicate government performance towards the implementation of policy outcomes and to share information with community groups (Simanjuntak, Siahaan, Situmorang & Elisabeth, 2023).

Furthermore, the development of the performance reports in the Premier's Office are aligned to the organisational predetermined objectives as well as Medium Term Strategic

Framework (MTSF) priorities (Diedericks, 2017), however a challenge of achieving them remains to be a concern. Scholars such as Zwikael (2020) argue that delivery must ultimately contributes towards the achievement of the predetermined objectives, meaning that reporting must contribute to the achievement of predetermined objectives unlike reporting for compliance. Although the Department of Planning Monitoring and Evaluation (DPME) developed the 2019-2024 MTSF priorities that serves as medium-term roadmap for the Gauteng Office of the Premier to perform against, the priorities are unlikely to be achieved due to the consistent underachievement of annual targets (DPME, 2019).

The challenge of not achieving 100 percent of the predetermined objectives in the Gauteng Office of the Premier amongst others, affects the principle of value for money and decision-making (Ndevu & Muller, 2018 & DPME, 2019). Furthermore, the Director General performance as the accounting officer becomes compromised because the Director General is mandated by the Public Service Regulations (2016) to sign a performance agreement with the Premier with a sole purpose of outlining the predetermined objectives against which the organisational performance will be measured. This is what Sofyani, Akbar & Ferrer (2018) refers to as "performance management tasks which involve setting goals, measuring results, and reporting on progress" against planned targets.

Meanwhile organisational performance can be determined as the achievement of project objectives as well as organisational broader outcomes, its indicators remain to be productivity, service quality as well as customer satisfaction (Olivier, 2018). Henceforth it is important to undertake this research due to the growing violence in protest of government performance which has laid a foundation for academic researchers to understand causes and effects of protests (Breakfast, Bradshaw, & Nomarwayi, 2019 & Ngcamu, 2019). The context of this research problem will therefore provide insight on performance challenges experienced by Gauteng Office of the Premier.

1.2.2 The research purpose (aim and objectives) statement

The purpose of this research is to assess the challenges in attaining the predetermined organisational performance objectives in the Gauteng Office of the Premier. I have chosen to use the organisational performance field of study perspective as my general lens

in this research. More specifically, the organisational performance lens provides for attributes such as organisational structure, outcomes, outputs, and enabler/inputs which are key to this research. Furthermore, I have used four frameworks to interpret the empirical results. The frameworks are namely Bureaucracy, Government performance management framework, Government Wide Monitoring Systems and lastly the logical model framework.

In detail, this research will achieve the first objective that looks at organisational structure challenges affecting the organisational performance in attaining predetermined objectives. The Second objective will look at challenges of managing performance information in the Gauteng Office of the Premier. The third objective will look at Government Wide Monitoring and Evaluation Systems implementation challenges in the Gauteng Office of the Premier. The last objective will look at the key components of the logical model affecting the performance of the Gauteng Office of the Premier.

1.2.3 The research questions.

1.2.3.1 Question: What are the organisational structure challenges affecting the Gauteng office of the Premiers performance in attaining predetermined objectives?

1.2.3.2 Question: What are the challenges of managing performance information in the Gauteng Office of the Premier?

1.2.3.3 Question: What are the challenges affecting the implementation of Government Wide Monitoring and Evaluation (GWM&E) System in Gauteng Office of the Premier to achieve predetermined objectives?

1.2.3.4 Question: What key components of the logical model affect the performance of the Gauteng Office of the Premier?

1.3 Delimitations of the research

Section 1.2.2 above has clearly articulated the purpose of this research which is to assess the performance challenges in attaining organisational predetermined objectives in the Gauteng Office of the Premier. A qualitative research strategy and a case study research design has been employed to achieve the purpose of this research and gather useful and in-depth understanding of the research problem articulated in section 1.2.1. The qualitative research strategy and a case study design has played a role to understand the underlying challenges in relation to the attainment of predetermined objectives from the

views and perspectives of the sampled unit in the Gauteng Office of the Premier. The Gauteng office of the Premier is the population from which the sample has been drawn to generalise the results within the Gauteng Office of the premier as a government department. This study has four explanatory frameworks that have been used to interpret the results and subsequently converting them into research findings. The four explanatory frameworks are namely, Bureaucracy theory, Government management framework, Government Wide Monitoring & Evaluation system and lastly, the programme logical model.

This research has also considered ethics of conducting research and in doing so I have applied and obtained ethical clearance certificate through the University of Witwatersrand. Noting that I used a qualitative research strategy, I have ensured validity and reliability of which the details are alluded to in chapter 3 of this research report. Moreover, this research does not generalise the findings to the other Provincial government departments as well as other provincial Offices of the Premier in South Africa, however, it only limits its scope in the Gauteng Office of the Premier as a provincial department in Gauteng. Further, I have proposed an intervention of the research problem in this research following the identified problem tree in section 2.2 however, it is important for the reader to understand that I will not be evaluating the intervention, but rather I will solely focus the research on understanding challenges in attaining predetermined organisation performance objectives in the Gauteng Office of the Premier.

1.4 Justification of the research

This research aims to contribute to the body of knowledge by uncovering details of understanding performance challenges in attaining predetermined objectives within the Gauteng Office of the Premier context. As part of the policy development processes to better the lives of Gauteng Citizens, the Gauteng Office of the Premier is provided with a mandate to identify its broader strategic outcomes and targets for achievement over a five-year period (Strategic Plan, 2020). Subsequently, these outcomes are then transformed into outputs to develop Annual Performance Plans that will help measure the strategic outcomes (DPME, 2020). Following this which are progress reports produced on a quarterly and annual basis to provide progress towards the achievement of predetermined objectives (Treasury 1991 & Treasury 2001). Noting the above existing plans and reports that clearly outline the predetermine objectives for the Gauteng Office

of the Premier, I justify for this research to be conducted to establish challenges of attaining them.

Furthermore, authors such as Curristine & Lonti & Joumard (2007) have acknowledged that government remains to be under pressure to achieve and improve public sector performance in line with budget expenditure. This has resulted to citizens taking matters into their own hands to hold government accountable for their performance and question what they achieve with the taxpayer's money (Curristine & Lonti & Joumard, 2007). Further, not attaining predetermined objectives in government is seen to be associated with failure. For instance, Carroll (2022) points out that government implements programmes however when they fail to meet predetermined objectives of the programme, it is considered as a failed intervention that ends up creating social welfare harm or economic destabilisation.

Although all these authors highlight a great deal of consequences brought by government inability to attain predetermined objectives, I still motivate that an intervention be made in the Gauteng Office of the Premier to understand the context of the challenges faced in attaining predetermined objectives. I also believe that the findings and recommendations of this research will provide insight to the Office of the Premier management and the executive to make informed decisions regarding predetermined objectives and their achievements.

1.5 Preface to the research report

Overall, this research consists of six chapters. I have just completed the first chapter which was introducing this research. The second chapter, will detail the literature review by unpacking and diagnosing the problem, discussing studies that were conducted in the past and present, discussing frameworks/theories as well as outlining the conceptual framework. Chapter 3 will look at the entire methodology that will be applied to carry out this research including limitations, strategy, tools, design, and methods. Then I move to chapter 4 which will provide findings and subsequently move to chapter 5 to interpret results using the findings, literature, frameworks, and theories identified by this research. The last chapter will provide summary and conclusion, that is chapter 6.


2 REVIEWING LITERATURE TO DERIVE THE CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

To tackle this chapter, I have divided it into Seven sections. This was done for ease of reference in unpacking the conceptual framework. In doing so I have started by unpacking section 2.1 & 2.2 to focus on the research problem. Secondly, I focused on section 2.3 and pointed out the knowledge gap. Thirdly, in section 2.4 till 2.6 I then point out and discuss organisational performance field of study as well as its key attributes and explanatory frameworks that will be applied when discussing the findings later in chapter 5. Section 2.7 will be focusing on conceptual framework. In much more detail, this chapter reviews literature to describe the research context, diagnose the problem using problem tree, provide a sense of what other similar studies have found within our research context and review literature to understand which field of study and attribute does the study contribute to. In doing so, bureaucracy, government performance management frameworks, Government Wide Monitoring and Evaluation systems and programme logical model are found to be the most appropriate explanatory frameworks linked to the attributes of this research and that is Section 2.6. The last Section (2.7) provides a road map of how this research intends to assess organisational performance challenges against predetermined objectives in the Gauteng Office of the Premier.

2.1 The description and history of the Gauteng Office of the Premier

This section is discussing an overview of the Gauteng Office of the Premier to provide an understanding of the physical setting understudy. Two components will be the focus in this section. The first component will look at the description of Gauteng Office of the Premier and the second component will focus on the History of Gauteng Office of the Premier. In unpacking the two components of this section, I am setting a precedence to understand the context of this research. Lastly this section identified government planning, reporting and performance management as the main aspects connecting the context to the research problem. However, before I dwell into the details of this section, I will display the organogram in figure 2 known as organisational structure of the Gauteng Office of the Premier.

Figure 2: The organogram of the Gauteng Office the Premier



Source: Gauteng Office of the Premier Annual Report 2021: p35

2.1.1 Description of Gauteng Office of the Premier

The Gauteng Office of the Premier Strategic Plan (2020) informs us that Gauteng Office of the Premier is a government department situated in Gauteng Province, central Johannesburg. In describing the Gauteng Office of the Premier as a government department, I start by laying out its organisational structure as displayed in Figure 2 above (Gauteng Office of the Premier Annual Report 2021). At the bottom of the organisational structure there are 5 Branches each led by a Deputy Director General. These Branches are namely, (a) Policy, Research and Advisory Services, (b) Executive Support and Stakeholder Management, (c) Institutional Development and Integrity management, (d) Corporate Management and (e) Provincial Communications Services (Gauteng Office of the Premier Annual Report 2021). The middle tier of the organisational structure consists of the Director General's Office and Internal audit as well as Organisation risk and integrity Management (Gauteng Office of the Premier Annual Report 2021). The bottom layer and the middle tier have a direct reporting line to the Accounting Officer of the Gauteng Office of the Premier (Gauteng Office of the Premier Annual Report 2021 & South Africa, 1996).

The Accounting Officer therefore becomes accountable to the Premier as per the constitutional mandate (South Africa, 1996). The Premier becomes the ultimate political

head of the province as elected by members of the Gauteng Provincial Legislature and entrusted by the electorate to deliver on the provincial mandate (South Africa, 1996).

Diedericks (2017) points outs that the Office of the Premier has an administrative role to oversee the performance of provincial departments in achieving the broader provincial priorities and objectives. Similarly, the Gauteng Office of the Premier strategic plan (2020) points out that Office of the Premier plays an administrative role by providing leadership, coordination, oversight, and support to 13 provincial government departments as well as related government entities. In doing so, the Gauteng Office of the Premier strategic plan (2020) has also laid out 7 provincial outcomes in line with National outcomes to reinforce the administrative role and focus for the next 5 years of government administration. The 7 outcomes that best describes the Gauteng Office of the Premier administrative focus and role are highlighted in table 1 below.

Table 1: Alignment of outcomes that best describes the Gauteng Office of the Premier

Gauteng Outcomes as per Strategic Plan (2020/21-2024/25)	**National Outcomes as per MTSF of 2019/2024**
Outcome 1: A skilled, capable, ethical and developmental state	**Outcome 1**: Capable, ethical and developmental state
Outcome 2: A growing and inclusive economy, jobs and infrastructure	**Outcome 2**: Economic transformation and job creation
Outcome 3: Inclusive quality education and healthcare and growing the skills needed for the economy	**Outcome 3**: Education, skills and health
Outcome 5: Responsive engagement between government and the citizenry and deepened social cohesion	**Outcome 4**: Consolidating the Social Wage through Reliable and Quality Basic Services
	Outcome 6: Social Cohesion and Safer Communities
Outcome 4: Spatial transformation and integrated planning	**Outcome 5:** Spatial Integration, Human Settlements and Local Government
Outcome 7: GCR energy sector reform	
Outcome 6: Collaborative relations between sub-national governments enhanced	**Outcome 7**: A Better Africa and World


Source: Gauteng Office of the Premier strategic plan (2020: p42)

Although I have described the Gauteng Office of the Premier in terms of its administrative role and focus above, I do not neglect a different view posed by the constitution of the Republic of South Africa (1996) that confines the description of the

Gauteng Office of the Premier within the ambits of the supreme law. More specifically, chapter 3 of the constitution that describes the Gauteng Office of the Premier as the department that falls within the second sphere of government between National and Municipal spheres (South Africa, 1996). This is well known as *Trias Politica,* the doctrine of constitutional separation of powers between National, Provincial and Municipalities (Koenane & Mangena, 2017). It is in this regard that the Premier is provided with powers to develop and implement provincial policies, legislation, and sign bills amongst other constitutional requirements within the jurisdiction of Gauteng Province (South Africa, 1996)

2.1.2 History of Gauteng Office of the Premier

Figure 3: Gauteng province Map



Source: Municipalities of South Africa (2012).

Historical evidence indicates to us that Gauteng Province was initially known as Pretoria-Witwatersrand-Vereeniging (PWV) and the birth of the first democratically elected Premier of PWV took place after the African National Congress (ANC) won the 1994 provincial elections by 58 per cent of the majority votes (Independent Electoral Commission 1994 & Lodge, 1995). Post winning the 1994 elections we saw the demarcation of South Africa into 9 provinces and the renaming of PWV into Gauteng Province which is loosely translated into "a place of Gold" from the Sotho language (South African History Online (SAHO), 2019). It was this events that necessitated the

first government administration of Gauteng and the election of the first Premier of Gauteng (Independent Electoral Commission, 1994).

With the above historical basis, I can confirm that the Gauteng Office of the Premier is precisely situated in the Gauteng Province covering a total area of 18 178 square kilometres or approximately 1.4% of the South African total surface (Municipalities of South Africa, 2012). Its governance jurisdictions are bordered by Limpopo, Free State and North-West provinces (SAHO, 2019). Further, within the borders of the Gauteng Province led by the Premier of Gauteng, we have 5 corridors to date which are namely the central corridor governed by City of Johannesburg Municipality, North Corridor governed by Tshwane Municipality, East Corridor governed by Ekurhuleni Municipality, West Corridor governed by West Rand Municipality and lastly South Corridor governed by Sedibeng Municipality (SAHO, 2019 & Strategic Plan of Gauteng Office of the Premier, 2020).

While I consider Gauteng Office of the Premier to be governing the smallest province in the Republic of South Africa, I also take note of the growing population in the province. For instance, the estimates for 2022 Mid-Year Population indicates a total migration of 1.5 million people moving into Gauteng for economic opportunities between 2016 and 2021 (Statistics South Africa, 2022).

There are also different opinions and views about the history and existence of the Office of the Premier. One Camp suggest that Office of the Premier was established to deal with the lack of service delivery issues post 1994. This is much more apparent in the work of Muchaonyerwa & Khayundi (2014) who points out that the establishment of the Office of the Premier was necessary to build confidence between citizens and government in light of service delivery. The second camp turns to differ with the last camp by arguing that the Office of the Premier was not established to directly deliver services to the citizens. This is more apparent in the work of Gauteng Office of the Premier strategic Plan (2020) & Ishmail & Tully (2020) who argues that Office of the Premier does not directly deliver services to its citizens however, provincial departments are the ones responsible for delivering services, henceforth the office of the Premier was historically established to play a role of coordination, oversight, intervention, and facilitation of evaluations in departments. Similarly, enhancing coordination through the

Office of the Premier assist with better cooperation, design and implementation of Annual Performance Plans (APP's) and integrated Development Plans (IDP) between national, provincial and local spheres of government and can also help address challenges, share resources and optimise service provision (Mamokhere, 2023).

2.1.3 Aspects connecting the context to the research problem

2.1.3.1 Government Planning

Government planning connects the Gauteng Office of the premier to our research problem of attaining predetermined objectives because one needs to plan before they deliver. Almost all the authors that have written about planning are of the view that government planning should be coherent, aligned and must include stakeholders that will help achieve the set objectives (Gauteng Office of the Premier, 2020 & Diedericks, 2017). However, Ishmail & Tully (2020) argues differently that government planning cycles includes planning for evaluations with proposed budgets.

2.1.3.2 Government reporting


The second aspect that connects Gauteng Office of the Premier to our problem is government planning. Van der Nest & Erasmus (2011) points that government departments are required by legislation to develop Annual Reports to show case performance against predetermined objectives and mitigations on underachievement's. Similarly, the constitution of the Republic of South Africa (1996) as well as Public Finance Management Act of 1991 mandates government executives to provide quarterly reports against matters of their jurisdiction. These quarterly reports must be evidence based for verification and audit (Diedericks, 2017).

However, Muchaonyerwa & Khayundi (2014), Van der Nest & Erasmus (2011) & Diedericks (2017) holds a different view by stating that government departments face serious challenges when reporting performance information and amongst them includes late reporting on matters of service delivery. Meanwhile, Engela & Ajam (2010) argues that government has institutionalised monitoring and reporting systems that work hard instead of working smart, for instance, Gauteng provincial departments must report the same information to multiple oversight departments such as Premier's office, Treasury, Department of Public Service and Administration.

2.2 Organisational performance challenges in attaining predetermined objectives.

In this section I am interrogating literature to discuss organisational performance challenges in attaining predetermined objectives in the context of Gauteng Office of the Premier as one of the components of government departments in Gauteng. I firstly start by reviewing and discussing literature on symptoms of the problem of performance challenge in the Gauteng office of the Premier. Then I move towards reviewing literature to highlight the direct and indirect causes that are interlinked to the problem of performance challenges in the Gauteng office of the premier. I also review literature to understand the consequences that are interlinked to the problem of performance challenges. Towards the end of this section, I develop a proposed intervention for the problem identified. However, before I begin to source literature on the above, I firstly provide a diagram (figure 4) in a form of a problem tree to paint a picture of the problem analysis for the reader to understand the interlink between root causes, symptoms and consequences of the main problem.

Figure 4: Problem tree analysis



2.2.1 Linking symptoms to the problem

Organisational performance challenges lead to the symptom of reporting non-reliable and invalid performance information. For instance, the introduction of audit committees

in government was to ensure that the quarterly and annual performance reports of government departments are validated, tested and are complete to avoid non-reliable and invalid performance information (King 2009). Similarly, Brusc and Montesino, (2016) argue that validated performance reports must present performance information in an honest and responsible manner while submitting timeously within the prescribed timeframes. However, if we do not address the problem of organisational performance challenges in attaining predetermined objectives, organisations will continuously see the symptoms of reporting non-reliable and invalid performance (Beattie, 2000). Therefore, organisations will find it difficult to learn, assess risks for sustainability and facilitate decision making (Marr, 2006).

Interlinked to the symptom of non-reliable and invalid performance information is the symptom of audit findings experienced by government departments. The constitution of the Republic of South Africa (1996) institutionalised the Office of the Auditor General (AG) to perform independent audit process against government predetermined objectives. It is therefore the role of AG to assess performance information against predetermined objectives in government Annual Performance Plans (APP), Strategic Plans and the use of allocated budget (South Africa, 1996 & DPME, 2020 & Vyas-Doorgapersad et al, 2013).

Similarly, Brusc and Montesino, (2016) argues that government performance information must be audited to provide sufficient controls and improve performance measurements. When we situate audit findings as part of the symptoms of performance challenges in the Gauteng provincial government, we note that the non-reliability of performance information is fluctuating from 68% in 2017/2018 then regression of 9% which resulted to 59% in 2018/2019 and then an improvement of 12% which resulted to 71% in the 2019/20 financial year (AG, 2018 & AG, 2019 & AG, 2020). This means in 2019/20 a total of 29% of Gauteng government performance information could not be relied upon whereas in 2018/2019 the percentage of non-reliable performance information increased to 41%. This has to show that the efforts placed by King Code of governance (2009) on the requirements to instituting internal audit processes for purposes of reliability is still ineffective in the spheres of government.

Mismanagement of government monetary resources is often brought to the attention of the public through AG reports and is one of the symptoms that are interlinked to performance challenges against predetermined objectives. For instance, the Auditor General of South Africa (2018) reported that the Gauteng provincial government has incurred irregular expenditure of R6 367 Million in 2017/2018 financial year and subsequently had an increase of irregular expenditure relating to R7 Billion in 2018/2019 (AG, 2019) and in 2019/2020 there was fruitless and wasteful expenditure of R103 Million (AG, 2020). Similarly, Bereketeab (2018) labels South African government as one of the leading countries in procurement fraud, mismanagement of allocated funds and corruption.

Over and above the mismanagement of funds exposed by the audit process, investor confidence emerges to be another symptom brought by performance challenges. Investors turn to lose interest in organisations that faces performance challenges mainly because the interest of investors is vested in performance, growth and value for money (Roberts, 2004 & Marr, 2006). Similarly, Bereketeab (2018) argues that when external investors of government stop investing in government initiatives, the government will have to sanction citizens in a form of tax to meet societal needs. The other camp of authors argue that government departments must always be a responsible corporate citizen and invest in the wellbeing of the society (King 2009 & Vyas-Doorgapersad et al, 2013), however, Vyas-Doorgapersad et al (2013) goes on to argue that despite investment of resources, government still faces performance challenges against predetermined objectives therefore overshadowing its efforts.

Organisational performance challenges against predetermined objectives have a direct link to the inability of achieving Annual Operational Plans (AOP), Annual Performance Plans (APP), and 5-year Strategic Plan of the Gauteng office of the Premier (Diedericks, 2017). For instance, DPME (2020) argues that the operational activities that are stated in the AOP contribute to the budgeted high-level APP outputs which will therefore enable the broader achievement of the 5-year Strategic Plan outcomes. This is what Marr (2006) refers to as single loop learning process where the Gauteng Office of the Premier's executive mangers as well as the public will require feedback relating to the successful executions of plans. Even more importantly, feedback will be required to inform decision making relating to the viability of the Gauteng Office of the Premier

(Van der Nest & Erasmus, 2011 & Marr, 2006). Similarly, the viability of the strategy is likely to be hampered should we not attend to the problem of performance challenges through the implementation of remedial action plans (King, 2009)

The Gauteng Office of the Premier has a provincial plan called Growing Gauteng Together (GGT) which therefore becomes the broader predetermined objective towards achieving the 2030 provincial vision (GGT, 2020). All AOP, APP and 5-Strategic Plan of the Office of the Premier are aligned to feed into the GGT 2030 vision (Gauteng Office of the Premier, 2020). Vyas-Doorgapersad (2013) argues that each individual government department including Gauteng Office of the Premier have a significant role towards the achievement of a common plan. However, noting the performance challenges that result to the inability to achieve AOP and APPs I can argue that the 2030 vision is likely to be in a shortfall. According to DPME (2020) the Gauteng Office of the Premier inability to sufficiently achieve the GGT 2030 will have a direct bearing to the achievement of the NDP priorities. King (2009) argues that the executive will be held accountable for failing to perform and manage operations of the organisation.

2.2.2 Linking root causes to the problem


In reviewing the literature, I also point out the root causes that have a direct and indirect causal link to the problem of organisational performance challenges in attaining predetermined objectives. Inadequate intergovernmental collaboration between government departments is one of the standalone direct root causes of performance challenges. For instance, The Public Service Act (1994) leveraged on this direct root cause by clearly situating the role of Gauteng Office of the Premier as an oversight department responsible for overseeing Gauteng provincial government performance and therefore collaborating with all departments. Similarly, through the Constitution, the Gauteng Office of the Premier is at the centre of Gauteng Provincial administration and therefore leveraging on collaboration with other departments (South Africa, 1996). However, Marr (2006) argues that the lack of collaboration still exists because performance information is kept in individual spreadsheets that are not designed to promote collaboration amongst departments.

Similarly, to the argument made by Marr (2006), Vyas-Doorgapersad et al (2013) also argues that lack of collaboration affects systematic relationship between various

components of government departments. For instance, inadequate collaboration will affect the role of Gauteng Office of the Premier to oversee provincial performance and subsequently affect the functionality of governance system and separation of powers (South Africa, 1996). King (2009) maintains a different view by arguing that inadequate collaboration might not necessarily have direct link to performance challenges but indirect link to an increase in corruption and decrease in practice standards as well as isolated codes of conducts, integrity pacts and policy initiatives of performance.

Setting of indicators in quantities instead of setting quality indicators has become one of the indirect root causes of organisational performance challenges. For instance, Figure 5 below indicate that during the 2014/2015 financial year, the Gauteng Office of the Premier APP had 149 performance indicators (Gauteng Office of the Premier, 2014) and has only achieved 85% of the set performance indicators (Gauteng office of the Premier, 2015) meanwhile in 2020/21 financial year, they only had 95 performance indicators (Gauteng office of the Premier, 2020b) with an achievement of 79% (Gauteng office of the Premier, 2021). Almost all the authors from literature agree that organisations must set quality performance measurements that are monitorable and attainable with the ability to guide everyday decision-making processes (Marr, 2006 & King, 2009 & Vyas-Doorgapersad et al., 2013)

Figure 5: Number of performance indicators in the Gauteng Office of the Premier



Source: Gauteng Office of the Premier annual reports 2014/15 till 2018/19

Lack of relationship between planning, budgeting and reporting to measure performance also comes out as a result of not addressing the problem of performance challenges. For instance, Marr (2006) argues that planning in silos contributes to employees seeing the organisations as individual parts and not as a whole functioning system that integrates planning with budgeting and reporting to achieve its mandate. Similarly, if government

departments like Gauteng office of the premier are failing to plan in line with the budget this will have an impact on budget controls and process as well as the inability to restructure public spending (Vyas-Doorgapersad et al., 2013). Evidence based reporting from literature also came out strongly as one of the interlinked causes of performance challenges against predetermined objectives. For example, organisations such as the Office of the Premier test and validate their performance based on evidence (Marr, 2006). The same evidence is used by auditors to assess if the assumptions of performance hold true (King, 2009).

2.2.3 Linking consequences to the problem

Over and above symptoms and root causes of performance challenges in attaining predetermined objectives, there are also consequences that arise, henceforth the motivation of conducting research to understand the problem. Almost all the authors agree that government performance challenges lead to lack of citizenry confidence in government and increased complaints against government inefficiencies. For example, Vyas-Doorgapersad et al. (2013) argues that government has been overly criticised for being bureaucratic, slow in response of citizens demands and ineffective in providing services. Similarly, Brusc & Montesino (2016) argues that there is an increase in complaints of citizens about government performance and this increase is observed through participation in evaluation process of government in partnership with citizens. Particularly in the Gauteng province where Gauteng Office of the Premier is situated, only 19% of the population is satisfied with government performance to grow the economy (GRCO, 2021).

A potential consequence arising from dissatisfaction of citizens about government performance challenges also leads to mass mobilisation. For instance, Lancaster (2016) indicates that Civil protests and strike action are common consequences of government performance in South Africa. Similarly, when citizens are not satisfied with government performances the only language that seems to awaken government to pay attention and render quality services to the citizens is though threat of violence or strike (Vyas-Doorgapersad et al., 2013).

2.2.4 Gauteng Office of the Premier results chain framework

Most interventions like the one of Gauteng Office of the Premier in table 2 below, requires the use of results chain framework to explicitly outline relevant objectives and indicators that will be monitored and evaluated overtime to assess the achievement of the intended impact (Johnson, 2013). It is in this regard that this section will define the elements of results chain framework with reference to the Gauteng Office of the Premier.

At the top of the results chain framework is the element of impact. Several authors for example Wotela (2017) have discussed the concept of impact. Despite different opinions and approaches I can argue that an impact is a long-term aspiration towards which an intervention must contribute. Almost all authors are of the view that impact is the end-result required to be achieved, for example USAID (2016) argues that an impact is a central point of interest that a program seeks to achieve. Similarly, Kinyuira & Kenyatta (2019) had argued that impact is a long-term effect of activities that are related to broad national and international goals and its only debatable after months or even years.

Activities, outputs and outcomes are some of the critical elements aligned towards the realisation of the impact (USAID, 2016). Activities according to Norad (1999) refers to the tasks carried out by the people involved in the intervention. Outputs are services or products delivered as a result of the implementation of activities (Kinyuira & Kenyatta, 2019). Then outcomes are defined as expected short to medium term results brought by the implementation of interventions outputs (Wotela, 2017). All these elements are accompanied by indicators, which according to Norad (1999) are used to define performance standards. Below I propose an intervention by applying the abovementioned elements in the context of the Gauteng Office of the Premier

For the purpose of this research and intervention, the proposed impact of the Gauteng Office of the Premier is to enhance Gauteng Office of the Premier's performance against predetermined objectives to achieve a liveable, equitable, inclusive and united Gauteng City Region (Gauteng Office of the Premier, 2020). This ultimate impact is therefore measured based on achieving 100% of predetermined objectives stipulated in the annual performance plan which will subsequently realise the achievement of the 5-year plan stipulated in the 2020/21 till 2024/25 strategic plan. Over and above the achievement

of predetermined objectives as a measure, the fiscal budget expenditure and the human development index of Gauteng citizens is also a measure to realise the impact of Gauteng office of the Premier. Below are there three outcomes interlinked towards the achievement of the Gauteng Office of the Premier impact and intervention under study.

Outcome 1 indicates that the intervention must achieve a capable Gauteng Office of the Premier, which is also interlinked to chapter 14 of the NDP 2030 vision that aims to also achieve a capable state at the national level (National Planning Commission, 2011). Similarly, Du Plessis (2016) defines a capable state as the ability of government to realise its objectives and render quality and acceptable services for public consumption which will in turn increase government performance credibility. To measure the capability of Gauteng Office of the Premier in line with the definition provided, I have proposed two indictors. The first indicator will measure the total percentage of service delivery cases resolved while the second proposed indicator will subsequently measure the percentage of Gauteng citizens feeling good about government services and performance.

Interlinked to Outcome 1 are three outputs. The first proposed output requires Gauteng Office of the Premier to perform against the reduction of corruption incidents in the Gauteng province. Similarly, the National Planning Commission (2011) argues that to achieve a capable state (which in this case is our Outcome 1) we must have an ethical state. This output is therefore measured through the percentage reduction in incidents of corruption in the Gauteng province received from the National and Provincial anti-corruption Hotline.

The second proposed output requires the Gauteng Office of the Premier to get a clean audit opinion. Clean audit refers to unqualified opinion issued by Auditor General of South Africa on non-material findings, compliance with key legislation of financial statements and quality of performance reports (Auditor General of South Africa (AGSA), 2020). Clean audit will therefore be measured using management reports issued by AGSA. The last proposed output contributing to outcome 1 refers to the achievement of a Skilled public work force. The Medium-Term Strategic Framework (MTSF) of 2019/2024 indicates that to achieve a capable state (Outcome 1) we need a capable and skilled public workforce that is committed to deliver high quality services (DPME, 2019). We are therefore going to measure by assessing personnel skills.

Outcome 2 indicates that the intervention must achieve Medium-term strategic outcomes provided by the Presidency. All departments in South Africa including the Gauteng Office of the Premier are expected to plan and align their performance to the Medium-term outcomes in this case being National Priorities (DPME, 2020). Two measurements have been proposed to measure the performance against national priorities. The first measure will assess the percentage contribution of OoP performance towards the achievement of national priorities. Similarly, Diedericks (2017) argues that provincial performance must align and contribute to national performance. The second measure will assess the percentage of alignment between OoP priorities and national priorities. The 2020 revised framework for strategic plans and annual performance plans argues that planning must be mainstreamed from local, provincial and national sphere (DMPE, 2020). Similarly, the RSA Constitution supports separation of powers with unified approach (RSA, 1997).

Interlinked to Outcome 2 are three outputs. The first proposed output requires Gauteng Office of the Premier to develop and finalise a strategic plan in line with national priorities. The second proposed outputs require the Gauteng Office of the Premier to develop an Annual Performance Plan (APP) aligned to the strategic plan on an annual basis. The third proposed outputs require the Gauteng Office of the Premier to develop Annual Operational Plans (AOP) aligned to employee contracts and APP. Strategic Plans, APP's and AOP's are all planning documents of government departments and must be mainstreamed for ease of performance reporting and achievement of Medium-term strategic outcomes (DMPE, 2020).

The last proposed Outcome 3 indicates that the intervention must achieve alignment between planning, budgeting and reporting of targets. Diedericks (2017) argues that planning, budgeting and reporting are part and parcel of enforcing accountability in order to track and measure performance, in this case being the achievement of our stated impact. Two measures are proposed to measure Outcome 3. The first measure assesses the percentage alignment of expenditure and reporting of targets. Diedericks (2017) & PFMA Act of 1999 emphasises the alignment of reporting performance information and expenditure of allocated budget. The second measure assess the allocation of budget in line with plans to avoid over budgeting and underbudgeting (RSA, 1999).

Interlinked to Outcome 3 are three outputs. The first proposed output requires the Gauteng office of the Premier to align their performance indicators to the budget allocation. The second proposed output requires the Gauteng Office of the Premier to reduce overspending while the third proposed output focuses on reduction of under expenditure of the allocated budget. The measurement focus on underspending and overspending is motivated by AGSA (2020) who argues that financial health of government departments is alarming due to persistent unauthorised expenditure caused by overspending and underspending.

In conclusion, section 2.2 has conducted a trend analysis of performance challenges in the context of Office of the Premier as one component of government departments both in Gauteng province as well as South Africa. The trend analysis included discussing symptoms, root causes then consequences of not treating the problem of performance challenges. Furthermore, I explored the results chain framework to propose an intervention that will assist us to remedy the problem. This section (section 2.2) was completed to prepare us for the following section (section 2.3.) which will look at data, methods, conclusions, and findings of studies on and evaluation of organisational performance challenges.

Table 2: Results Chain-Framework for Gauteng Office of the Premier's performance

Results Chain level	Description	Indicator	Data source	Baseline	Targets	Assumptions	Risks
Impact	Enhanced Gauteng Office of the Premier's performance against predetermined objectives to achieve a liveable, equitable, inclusive and united Gauteng City Region	% Achievement of predetermined objectives	Gauteng Office of the Premier (QoP)	80%	100%	Stable Economic conditions	Emergence of Natural Disasters Economic downgrade
		% Expenditure of fiscal budget	QoP	80%	100%		
		Human Development Index for Gauteng Province	Stats SA & Gauteng City Region Observatory (GCRO)	-	Stats SA & GCRO database		
Outcome 1	A capable Gauteng Office of the Premier	Percentage (%) of service delivery cases resolved	QoP	80%	90%	Officials are skilled to resolve service delivery cases	Protest and vandalism of public property
		% of Gauteng citizens feeling good about government services and performance	GCRO/ Government Communications Information Services (GCIS)	80%	90%	Government officials are skilled to resolve service delivery cases	Citizen's protest and destroying of public property
Output 1.1	Performance against reduction of corruption incidents in the Gauteng province	Percentage reduction in incidents of corruption in the Gauteng province	National Anti-corruption Hotline (NACH)/ Qop	90%	100%	All assets lost will be easily recovered on time	the process of recovery of lost assets is expensive
Output 1.2	Clean audit performance	Unqualified audit opinion issued by AGSA	QoP / Gauteng Provincial Treasury/ Auditor General	Clean audit	Clean Audit	QoP will continuously receive clean audit	Qualified audit opinion with matter misstatements
Output 1.3	Skilled public work force	% Of officials with relevant skills	QoP	80%	100%	QoP employ's officials with relevant skills	QoP officials do not have relevant skills
Outcome 2	Achievement of medium-term outcomes (National Priorities)	% Contribution of QoP towards the achievement of national priorities	QoP	10%	12%	The QoP performance contributes directly to the achievement of the National Priorities	The plans of the QoP misaligned to the priorities of National Government
		% Of alignment between QoP priorities and national priorities	QoP	100%	100%		
Output 2.1	Strategic plan	Number of strategic plans developed in line with national priorities and finalised	QoP	1	1	The strategic plan will be developed in line with national priorities for the period of 5 years	The developed Strategic plan is difficult to implement
Output 2.2	Annual Performance Plan (APP)	Number of Annual Performance Plans developed and finalised annually	QoP	1	1	The APP will be developed in line with the Strategic Plan	The APP aligned to the Strategic Plan
Output 2.3	Annual Operational Plan (AOP)	Number of Annual Performance Plans developed and finalised annually	QoP	1	1	AOP's are aligned to employee contracts and QoP APP	AOP's are not monitored for progress
Outcome 3	Alignment between planning, budgeting and reporting of targets	% Alignment of expenditure and reporting of targets	QoP	80%	100%	There is a relationship between planning, budgeting and reporting	Expenditure is more and performance is low. Budget cuts
		Adequate budget allocated in line with plans	QoP	QoP budget	QoP budget		
Output 3.1	Performance indicators aligned to budget allocation	% Of indicators aligned to the budget	QoP	QoP budget	QoP budget	performance indicators require budget to be achieved	budget cuts, redirecting of funds and inflation
Output 3.2	Reducing budget overspending	% Reduction of over expenditure	QoP	QoP budget	QoP budget	Funds will be used to achieve performance	Corruption and underperformance
Output 3.3	Reduce budget Underspending	% Reduction of under expenditure	QoP	QoP budget	QoP budget		

Source: Author

2.3 Methods, data, findings, and conclusions of studies on and evaluation of organisational performance challenges in attaining predetermined objectives

This section will identify the research knowledge gap by reviewing the past and current primary and empirical research articles in the context of organisational performance as well as the research topic under study. I am doing so to point out what other authors in similar studies have pursued. When unpacking this, I bring your attention to research strategies, designs, procedures, and methods applied by different authors within the field of organisational performance in government. This will also include the collected data, the methods used to analyse empirical results, the findings of the research as well as the frameworks used to interpret the research findings. Moreover, the research conclusions and limitations. It is also important to note that this section is only limited to identifying similar studies and not identical studies so that I can establish the knowledge gap.

2.3.1 Aim and objectives of previous research studies on organisational performance challenges

Several authors for example Cheruiyot, Katumba & Chris Wray (2019) have conducted research on organisational performance challenges. Notwithstanding different views and approaches, I can clearly argue that the aspect of challenges in attaining predetermined objectives as part of organisational performance challenges remains to be a gap that requires to be studied. To justify this conclusion, Diedericks (2017) aimed "to establish challenges faced by Limpopo provincial government" by solely focusing on challenges of reporting predetermined objectives to Auditor General of South Africa (AGSA). However, reporting to AG does not necessarily mean one will attain and achieve the predetermined objectives and hence the gap of this research.

Almost all the authors who wrote about organisation performance challenges in government are accounting for the existence of government organisational challenges in the context of municipalities compared to organisational challenges in the context of Premiers Offices as the centre of governance in the province. For example, Khunoethe, Reddy & Mthuli (2021) study examines performance challenges in a Local Municipality called Msunduzi. Similarly, Olivier (2017) determines organisational performance challenges of municipalities in South Africa as a whole, while Ndevu (2019) explores relationships between trust and performance within municipal environment.

However, there are divergent approaches to the studies conducted around government organisational performance challenges. One camp suggests that organisational performance challenges in government can be understood through separation of powers. This is much more evident in the work of Cheruiyot et al (2019) who has explored citizens performance dissatisfaction of three government spheres in South Africa.

2.3.2 Interpretive/theoretical frameworks considered by previous studies on organisational performance

Several authors for example, Ndevu (2019) have used interpretive/theoretical frameworks to unpack government organisation performance challenges. Despite different views and approaches I can argue that interpretive/theoretical framework provides the basis of arguments which the research will limit its scope and structure.

Almost all the authors used New Public Management (NPM) as the most relevant interpretative/theoretical framework to study government organisational performance challenges. For example, Khunoethe et al (2021) argues that limiting the study of organisational performance challenges within the interpretative framework of NPM motivates for improved performance in public institutions. Similarly, Makoba & Ruffin (2016) had earlier stated that NPM interpretative framework is introduced to "measure and improve government performance through the observation of three Es which are namely Effectiveness, Efficiency and Economy".

However, there are divergent interpretative frameworks adopted by different authors. One camp suggests that triangulation is the best interpretative framework to adopt when studying organisational challenges. This is more apparent in the work of Deidericks (2017), who argues that data triangulation provides for multiple data collection such as researching relevant literature pertaining to government performance information. The second camp of authors is of the view that organisational performance challenges can be studied through regression model. For example, Cheruiyot et al (2019) argues that regression model can be used to account for spatial effects to ensure robust results of understanding government performance challenges based on geographical areas. The last camp seems to be emphasising the use of Burk-Litwin model to better study

organisational performance challenges. This view was most notable in Olivier (2017) who argues that Burke-Litwin model of organisational performance explains causal effect relationship by linking elements that contribute to organisational performance.

2.3.3 Research strategy and design used by previous studies on organisational performance

Multiple authors for example, Khunoethe et al (2021) adopted research strategies and designs for organisational performance studies. Besides different views and approaches, I can argue that both qualitative and quantitative strategies are more common in the studies of organisational performance.

Almost all authors are of the view that qualitative strategy is best suited to understand the depth of organisational challenges. For example, Diedericks (2017), Khunoethe et al (2021) & Ndevu (2019) have applied qualitative strategy to research about government organisational performance. This is because it focuses on understanding own interpretations and make sense of the phenomenon of systems, process and structure under study (Ndevu 2019). However, a different view is taken by other authors who argue for the use of mixed methods when intending to research about government organisational performance. For example, Makoba & Ruffin (2016) and Olivier (2017) argued that mixed methods advocated for validity of collected data and further provides for triangulation.

However, it is important to also note that qualitative strategy must be relatable to the adopted research design. For example, Diedericks (2017), Khunoethe et al (2021) & Makoba & Ruffin (2016) identified the use of case study as the suitable research design when using a qualitative strategy to better understand organisational performance challenges in a specific context of research. Other authors are taking a different view. For example, Cheruiyot et al. (2019) advocates for comparative research design while Ndevu (2019) argues for the use of grounded theory to study organisational performance challenges when one has adopted mixed methods.

2.3.4 Data collection instruments used by previous authors on organisational development

Data collection instruments must also be aligned to the strategy and design of the research so that one can be able to collect relevant and reliable data. For example, in the context of qualitative research strategy, Diedericks (2017), Khunoethe et al (2021) and Makoba & Ruffin (2016) argue that one need to use primary data collected through interviews, and municipal or government documents/ policies/ frameworks/ guidelines. However, in the context of mixed strategy there are different data collection instruments used compared to qualitative strategy. For example, Ndevu (2019), Olivier (2017) and Makoba (2016) argue that mixed methods use both interviews and surveys as instruments to collect data.

2.3.5 Sampling technique and limitations from previous studies on organisational performance

Sampling techniques are there to determine the sample out of the population that one needs to study. Khunoethe et al (2021) and Diedericks (2017) have adopted purposive sampling technique where participants are top management and are selected based on judgement that they are suitable for the study. Directors in government are primarily responsible for performance of various units. However, Cheruiyot et al (2019) uses a different sampling technique called random sampling while Makoba & Ruffin (2016) uses nonprobability sampling technique.

2.3.6 Data collection process, processing, and analysis from previous studies on organisational performance

Aligned to qualitative strategy, Diedericks (2017), argues that qualitative data is collected through existing legislation and official documents of the department. However, Khunoethe et al (2021) takes a different view that data in qualitative strategy is collected through interviews. Contrary to qualitative strategy, the quantitative strategy data collection processes contain survey. For example, Cheruiyot et al (2019) argues that data must be collect through surveys with close ended questions.

Data is also processed after being collected. For example, Ndevu (2019) argues that data must be coded for processing, where keywords or phrases are identified for comparison. Similarly, Diedericks (2017) argues that close ended questions are categorised for

purposes of processing such as providing a range to a score e.g., a range from 1 to 5. However, different to the above Olivier (2017) argues that quantitative numeric data is processed using systems such as SPSS.

Data analysis process of qualitative strategy are different to mixed strategies or qualitative strategies. In the previous conducted studies on organisational performance, qualitative data analysis includes interpreting data into themes (Diedericks, 2017). Similarly, Makoba & Ruffin (2016) and Khunoethe et al (2021) argues that data can be analysed through combination of thematic analysis, content and matrix. Computer software system such as SPSS are also used to analyse numeric data (Olivier, 2017).

2.3.7 Key empirical results presented by previous studies on organisational performance

Several authors for example, Makoba & Ruffin (2016) have presented empirical results on performance challenge. Despite different views or perspectives, I can argue that the results on government organisational performance challenges are administrative in nature.

Almost all authors presented results on performance management. For instance, Diedericks (2017) argues that performance management is interlinked to four element which are namely, "Strategic planning and performance management, performance reporting, auditing of performance as well as monitoring and evaluating performance". reporting, Similarly, Khunoethe et al (2021) argues that performance requires the alignment of three elements to be achieved, which are namely the strategic objectives in the Integrated Development Plan (IDP), Key Performance Areas (KPA's) and Performance indicators (PI's).

However, there are different views provided as well, for example, Cheruiyot et al (2019) argues that government organisational challenges results to citizen dissatisfaction. While Ndevu (2019) argue that organisational performance challenges are related to elected administrative leaders and they also have direct and indirect relation to political factionalism, power relations, lack of active participation and gaps in employee skills and capacity as well as budget constraints.

2.3.8 Research findings from previous studies on organisational performance

Most of the findings are because of poor planning. For instance, poor alignment between indicators and IDP policy documents for the realisation of organisational impact was at the core of findings identified by Khunoethe et al, (2021). Similarly, Cheruiyot et al (2019) found that apartheid spatial planning resulted to citizens experiencing different level of dissatisfaction about government performance due to some municipal wards being previously economically excluded under apartheid.

Different findings have also been presented. For example, Diedericks (2017) argues that performance challenges are a result of not paying necessary attention to performance reporting in government departments. The second camp argues differently as well, and this is evident in the work of Olivier (2017) who argues that Burke and Litwin Model is a valid and accurate model to remedy organisational challenges and improve organisational performance.

2.3.9 Limitations from previous studies of organisational performance


Upon reviewing the literature, Cheruiyot et al (2019) used Provincial Quality of Life survey data to sample the population and instead neglected to make comparison of the Quality-of-Life Survey with Municipal data indicators which therefore means that the Quality-of-Life Survey might have had weaknesses of zooming into Municipalities. Similarly, Khunoethe et al (2021) study had its own limitations which indicates that the study is only limited to development policy alignment in municipalities and their performance which can therefore not be generalised to the other spheres of government.

Inconclusion, this section reviewed literature to understand performance challenges, by discussing previously used frameworks, data collection methods, processing, collection and analysis as well as sampling techniques. I further looked at the findings and discussions identified by previous studies.

2.4 Introduction to organisational performance studies and its components and processes

This section aims to discuss organisational performance as the relevant academic field of study for this research. In doing so, I adopt Wotela (2016) approach of decoding academic field of study. I also applied systems thinking methodology originally described in Gharajedaghi (2006:107) "to see through chaos and understand the complexities" of organisational performance field of study. I do this by interrogating literature directed by the following six questions. (1) What is organisational performance? (2) What is the purpose of organisational performance? (3) What are key issues and debates of organisational performance? (4) What are the established facts in Organisational performance? (5) What are the processes of organisational performance? and (6) What are the components of organisational performance?

Figure 6: components of Organisational performance in government



Source: Author

2.4.1 Describing organisational performance

Multiple authors, for example Elena-Iuliana & Maria (2016) have discussed the concept of organisational performance. Notwithstanding different views and approaches we can argue that organisational performance is an overall result of the organisation against the set objectives or targets. For example, Silitonga (2017) argues that organisational performance is the efforts to achieve organisational predetermined objectives in line with ethical and moral standards. Similarly, Ovadje & Aryee (2019) states that organisational

performance is the ability to acquire maximum and valuable outputs from the allocated set of limited resources.

However, there are different views about the concept of organisational performance. For instance, Marr (2008) argues that organisational performance is the involvement of employees in the organisational strategy and its execution so that individual performance can contribute to the ultimate organisational performance. The other camp is of the view that organisational performance is aligned to the predetermined plan. For example, Khunoethe & Reddy & Mthuli (2021), argues that government has milestones, indicators and key performance areas that are necessary for the implementation of Integrated Development Plans, Annual Performance Plans and Strategic Plans.

2.4.2 The purpose of organisational performance

I can clearly argue that the purpose of organisational performance is to evaluate and assess the achievement of predetermined objectives (Ovadje & Aryee, 2019). For instance, Marr (2008) argues that organisational performance purpose is to assess, implement, clarify, and continuously improve the organisational strategy and its implementation. Similarly, Khunoethe et al (2021) argues that organisational performance clarifies and translate organisational vision and strategy into achieved actions and goals.

However, other authors share different views on the purpose of organisational performance. For example, Vyas-Doorgapersad & Muhiya & Ababio (2013) argues that organisational performance purpose in government is to provide a sense of achieving public interest values such as accountability, transparency, efficiency, and effectiveness. While Silitonga (2017) argues that organisational performance purpose is to examine whether the organisation has done a good job or whether the established indicators and targets have been achieved or not.

2.4.3 Established facts in organisational performance.

The are several facts established in organisational performance studies. For example, Vyas-Doorgapersad (2013) points out that organisational performance is detrimentally undermined by corruption regardless of its forms leading to the decrease in public service performance and dissatisfaction. Similarly, the quality of leadership plays a vital

role to ensure that corruption does not affect the performance of the organisation. This is more apparent in the work of Ovadje & Aryee (2019) who argues that the quality of leadership has an immense impact on organisational performance as well as its operations, henceforth the organisational leadership is regarded as a valuable layer of any organisation.

It is a known fact that economic conditions influence how organisations perform. This is more evident in the work of Elena-iuliana & Maria (2016) who states that global financial crisis turns to manifests worldwide and affect organisations and how they perform, and only powerful organisations can adapt, meet customer satisfaction, add value to shareholders and create an enabling environment for employees to continuously implement the organisational mandate.

Different facts are also established by different authors in organisational performance. One camp points to the fact that organisational performance is influenced by relationships. This more apparent in the work of Marr (2008) who states that organisational performance levels are increased by good relations between employees and citizens/customers which in turns increases loyalty and trust. The second camp points to the fact that job satisfaction is a determinant of organisational performance. For example, Silitonga (2017) states that it is a fact for organisational performance to increase if the executor of the task is satisfied.

2.4.4 Key issues and debates in the study of organisational performance

There are several key issues and debates in organisational performance and one of the heated issues and debate emanates from the definition of organisational performance itself. For instance, Elena-iuliana & Maria (2016) points out that organisational performance must not only be viewed or defined as term for enterprise performance because performance of an organisation has determinants such as activities, employees like mangers, departments/units, and other performers. Similarly, Marr (2018) support the latter by debating that there is no need to work in silos, however there is a need to mainstream the dialogue and definition of organisational performance because this is where organisational lifeless data and information from individual components is

transformed into useful and meaningful knowledge, wisdom, insight and information that will lead to decision making as well as interactive learning.

Secondly, there is a rising debate between managing relationships to improve organisational performance vice versa getting efficiency rather than good relationship. This is more apparent in the work of Ovadje & Aryee (2019) who points out that one part of the debate and issue informs us that organisational performance outcomes and productivity are based on healthy relationship between operational employees and managers while the second counter debate and issue inform us that organisational performance is about increasing efficiency at the expense of excellent working relationship. The latter being a compromise and a negative consequence to organisational performance (Ovadje & Aryee, 2019).

2.4.5 Major components of organisational performance

Figure 6 above illustrates that the components (function and structure) of organisational performance studies are organisational strategy, performance measurements and separation of powers. Marr (2008) defines the first component (Organisational strategy) as an overall long-term plan of action that must be achieved by an organisation and further argues that a complete organisational strategy needs a clearly stated results chain framework. Similarly, Silitonga (2017) defines the second component (performance measurements) as the use of results to record achievements of activities. Lastly, Vyas-Doorgapersad et al (2013) defines the third component (separation of powers) as spheres of government that has a continued corporative relationship to ensure that performance of government and service delivery is carried out.

2.4.6 Major processes of organisational performance


Silitonga (2017) points out that inputs such as resources, outputs, outcomes as well as overall impact are five important processes that can best explain organisational performance. We are also required to set measurable key performance indicators and targets for these processes so that we can monitor and review their performance and initiate steps that will improve any other emerging underperformance (Khunoethe 2021 et al & Vyas-Doorgapersad, 2018).

Inconclusion, section 2.4 discussed the organisational performance field of study and further linked its components to elements using both Gharajedaghi (2006:107) systems thinking approach of organising a mess and Wotela (2016) of decoding an academic study by asking and answering the 6 relevant questions.

2.5 Key attributes in organisational performance that are key to organisational performance challenges.

Contextualised with organisational performance (Section 2.4) read in conjunction with discussion of organisational performance components (section 2.4.5), I approach this section by breaking down the component of organisational performance, in this case being organisational strategy into attributes that are key to this research. Upon identifying attributes that are key to this research, I discuss them paying attention to their description as well as their causal linkage to one another. The attributes identified understudy are namely the enablers, outputs, outcomes, and organisational structure. These attributes are furtherly depicted in a diagram format to better provide a clear picture of their relationship. Furthermore, the attributes in discussion are not only discussed in isolation however they are discussed with the approach to systems thinking process and it is in this regard that a systematic approach in discussion of the identified attributes takes form. In detail, this section will clearly define each attribute. The assessment of individual attributes will therefore serve as an argument to develop a whole systematic chain of attributes. Wotela (2017) argues that there is no straightforward answer to the question of how one can decode the academic field of study, however we can adopt and apply the systems thinking approach to see through the chaos.

Figure 7: Key attributes in organisational performance



Source: Author

2.5.1 Organisational structure

Organisational structure is defined as the workflow of an organization. It is a relationship between components of an organized whole (Ahmady & Mehrpourb & Nikooravesh, 2016). For instance, Mintzberg (1979) argues that organisational structure is a framework of relationships between systems, jobs, people, operating processes, and groups to achieve a common goal. It is the approach and process of dividing tasks to determine organisational functions and how to coordinate them. Similarly, Arabi, (2007), points out that organisational structure refers to the relationship between the organization and its communication channels, reporting lines, responsibility, power, and clear decision-making lines. Organisational structures are meant to make information flow easily (Ahmady & Mehrpour & Nikooravesh, 2016).

To understand Organisational structure as an attribute of this study, I link it to its component (organisational strategy) and further link it to the academic field of study (Organisational performance). There is a direct link between organisational structure and organisational strategy (Mintzberg, 1979). For instance, Ahmady et al, (2016) points out that for organizations to perform and deliver on their plans, the strategy and structure of

the organization must be woven together seamlessly. In other words, organizations must align their action plans (strategy) to hierarchy, tasks, and workforce (structure) to achieve a common goal, in this case being organisational performance (Arabi, 2007). This will help organizations to avoid task overlap and workforce confusion, particularly when an organization wants to lay a strong foundation for long term productivity (Ahmady et al., 2016).

I also link organisational structure as an attribute to other attributes identified to be relevant for this research which are Outcome, Outputs and Enablers. This linkage is more evident in the work of multiple authors such as Norad (1999) & Marr (2008) & Ahmady et al (2016) who argues that once an organisational structure has been formulated, one needs to define a set of assumption and categorize them into a cause-and-effect relationship of outcomes, outputs and enablers and further develop performance indicators to validate and test the relationship of the assumptions. When all these attributes are linked together for a common cause they will help organizations to perform against a common goal.

Further, I link the organisational structure as an attribute of this study to the first research question that is "What are the organisational structure challenges affecting the Gauteng office of the Premiers performance in attaining predetermined objectives?". In this way, I am guided by Wotela (2021) who points out that linking such attributes to the research question bring the advantage of identifying appropriate frameworks to interpret research results and the benefit of constructing relevant research data collection instruments that we use to ask questions to our respondents.

There are various ways that an organisational structure attribute can be sourced. For instance, multiple authors such as Mintzberg (1979) & Arabi (2007) have described that organisational structures are sourced and developed in line with organisational size, strategy, technology, environment, and goals. These are key sources to inform the development of an organisational structure. Similarly, Ahmady et al (2016) describes that an organisational structure can be sourced in different forms of social structures, which amongst others includes, network, functional, bureaucracy, Matrix, Multidivisional, and Hybrid, structures.

2.5.2 Organisational outcomes

Several authors have written about the definition of an Outcome and not withstanding different views and approaches, this research defines an Outcome as the achievement of results that an organisation expects in a short to medium term, given that the relevant interventions outputs are also achieved (Wotela, 2017 & DPME, 2020).

To understand Outcome as an attribute of this study, we link it to its component (organisational strategy) and further link it to the academic field of study (Organisational performance). For instance, Once the strategy component has been defined and clearly set out, the organisation must set out the outcomes (attribute) that will be realised in a short to medium term period to help assess if the strategy will be met before the end of the intervention (Wotela, 2017 & DPME, 2020). Similarly, for organisational performance to be realised, organisations must continuously review if outcome achievements are still aligned to the strategy (Marr, 2008).

This research also links Outcome as an attribute to other attributes identified to be relevant for this research which are Organisational Structure, Outputs and Enablers. The causal effect of the last two attributes (Output and Enablers) is more evident in the work of Wotela (2017) who argues that there is a direct causal relationship between enablers and outputs to achieve interventions outcomes. Similarly, Marr (2020) points out that the cause effect between enablers and outputs will assist in achieving a common joint outcome. This common joint outcome will be carried out through the organisational structure in line with structure hierarchy, power, rules, and reporting lines (Ahmady et al, 2016).

Outcome as an attribute of this study links to the second research question that is "What are the challenges of managing performance information in the Gauteng Office of the Premier?". Further, there are various ways in which outcomes can be sourced. For instance, DPME (2020) points out that outcomes can be sourced through national Medium Term Strategic Framework drafted by presidency. Similarly, & Marr (2008) point s out that outcomes can be sourced through the drafting of the mission of the organisation. However, Wotela (2017) points out that the result chain framework is the best tool to source information about attributes such as an outcome.

2.5.3 Organisational outputs

Multiple authors have written about the definition of output however, not withstanding different definitions I can argue that an output is a result of activities. Norad (1999) & Marr (2008) & Wotela (2017) points out that outputs are services and products brought by the achievement of activities under the control of an organisation.

To understand an Output as an attribute of this study, I link it to its component (organisational strategy) and further link it to the academic field of study (Organisational performance). Products and services produced by an organisation constitute a part of performance and consequently help to execute the strategy of the organisation and hence the link between outputs, academic field of study (organisational performance) and its component of organisational strategy. For instance, Marr (2008) argues that when an organisation conducts a customer needs analysis it aligns the needs of the customer to the strategy, products, and services it offers. This gives an organisation an opportunity to also assess control over its outputs (Norad, 1999).

There is an existing causal effect between the output and other attributes of this study (organisational structure, outcome, and enablers). For instance, Norad (1999) argues that to achieve an output one will require enablers such as personnel and facilities. Similarly, Wotela (2017) strongly argue that outputs cannot be achieved by themselves however they require resources and activities to be achieved. Having put in place the enablers that activate the outputs and outcomes, there is need for an organisational structure that will facilitate and account for the enablers, outputs, and outcomes (Ahmady et al, 2016)

Output as an attribute of this study links to the third research question that is "What are the challenges affecting the implementation of Government Wide Monitoring and Evaluation (GWM&E) System in Gauteng Office of the Premier to achieve predetermined objectives?" Further, there are various ways in which outputs can be sourced. For instance, Norad (1999) points out that outputs can be sources through linking the results of activities. Outputs must also be within the control of the organisation and, they must be verifiable and clear.

2.5.4 Organisational enablers

2.5.4.1 Defining enablers

Multiple authors have written about the definition of enablers and not withstanding different views and approaches, I can clearly argue that enablers are resources. For instance, Marr (2008) defines enablers as tangible and intangible resources of an organisation to achieve its mandate. Similarly, Ongeti & Machuki (2018), and Mwai, Namada, Katuse (2018) provides examples of these resources which is not limited to equipment's, buildings, tools, monetary values, capabilities, organisational knowledge, and organisational culture.

To understand Enablers as an attribute of this study, I link them to the component (organisational strategy) and further link them to the academic field of study (Organisational performance). For instance, Ongeti & Machuki (2018) points that strategic management effectiveness requires the employment of resources that are within the control of the organisation. Similarly, Mwai et al, (2018) stipulates that an organisational strategy must be allocated resources in line with its structure for a successful strategy implementation and thus performance.

There is an existing causal effect between the enablers and other attributes of this study (organisational structure, outcome, and outputs). Enablers are at the bottom of the value chain but acts as the most valuable attribute to achieve other attributes and components linked to it. This is more evident in the work of Marr (2008) who are argues that enablers are performance drivers that reinforce cause and effect relationship between organisational resources to enable the achievement of outputs, outcomes. Further for organisational structure to be effective and efficient it must be allocated with enablers such as personnel, laws, policies, functional lines, and financial resources (Ahmady et al, 2016).

Marr (2008) states that enablers are drivers of performance, and it is in this regard that I link the enablers to the questions that is "What key components of the logical model affect the performance of the Gauteng Office of the Premier?". Further, there are various ways in which enablers can be sourced. For instance, Marr (2008) and Ongeti & Machuki (2018) points out that enablers may be sourced through different categories such as tangible and intangible resources, physical resources, financial resources and human resources.

2.6 Describing bureaucracy, performance management framework, Government Wide Monitoring and Evaluation framework and the programme logical model for interpreting empirical results on organisational performance challenges against predetermined objectives

Contextualised with organisational performance field of study (Section 2.4) and linked to key attributes of assessing organisational performance challenges (Section 2.5), this section specifically points out and discusses existing frameworks that this research will employ to interpret findings in Chapter 5. In pointing out the frameworks that are key to this research, I start by discussing Max Weber theory of Bureaucracy as a key framework to the general academic context of this study and covers the attribute of organisational structure. I also ensure that all the remaining attributes identified in section 2.5 are covered by the identified frameworks namely performance management framework, Government Wide Monitoring and Evaluation framework and the programme logical model framework.

2.6.1 Theory of organisational bureaucracy

This research uses the theory of bureaucracy to respond to the academic field of study that is organisational studies (Section 2.4) and to the attribute of organisational structure (Section 2.4.1). The Bureaucracy theory was coined by Max Weber in 1922 with the believe that it is most efficient system of setting up an organisation (Weber, 1978 & Heckscher, 1994). However, critics of bureaucracy argue that the rise in maintenance of public finances in government, military and empires states are amongst the events that led to the development of the bureaucracy theory (Livioara, 2009 & Serpa & Ferreira, 2019).

In describing, bureaucracy, Weber (1978) & Dolan & Rosenbloom (2003) situate the description of bureaucracy within the boundaries of six characteristics, which are namely, (a) Specialisation of task, (b) Hierarchy, (c) Rules, (d) Formality, (e) Impersonal and personal indifferences, (f) Career orientation. These characteristics signifies a distinct organisational setting, office, or bureau with legal domination attached to it (Olsen, 2007 & Serpa and Ferreira, 2019). The intended purpose of bureaucracy is to create a model for government administration and its management to bring power structures into focus. For instance, to ensure economic effectiveness and efficiency through basic principles of

division of labour, rule-based authority, hierarchy, and relationships (Dolan & Rosenbloom, 2003 & Olsen, 2007, & Daneshfard and Aboalmaali, 2016).

The bureaucracy theory is used to respond to the first research question that is "What challenges does Gauteng Office of the Premier organisational structure have on organisational performance against predetermined objectives?" as well as interrogate one attribute that is "organisational structure". There are several advantages and disadvantages brought by the theory of bureaucracy. Starting with advantages, Weber (1978) points out that bureaucracy can effectively structure the work of complex organisations with procedures that allow efficiency and consistent implementation of work by all employees. Performance of employees in this regard is highly specialised and provides space for growth and learning (Dolan & Rosenbloom, 2003). Similarly, Olsen (2007) points out that employees in bureaucracy are appointed and promoted based on merits, tenure, formal education with legal protection against unfair dismissal. This in turn helps reduce the temptation of corruption (Serpa & Ferreira, 2019).

Different views point out that bureaucracy unlike other traditional structures can adapt quickly to changing commands from the top (Heckscher (1994). For instance, the hierarchical and authoritarian lines of command institute discipline amongst employees in the organisation and allow decisions and instructions to easily flow from top executives to lower management levels (Livioara, 2009). This where enormous amount of paperwork happens (Daneshfard & Aboalmaali, 2016).

Disadvantages amongst others includes that bureaucracy has been criticised for not coping with circumstances, activities, and purposes of contemporary democracy (Olsen, 2007). Similarly, Livioara (2009) argues that decisions in bureaucracy are taken from top level to bottom level contradicting democracy that promotes that a leader must listen to the citizens and implement accordingly. Therefore, bureaucracy becomes a monster to democracy. Although Weber saw bureaucracy as the most efficient and effective form of organisation, he also feared that it will sow seeds of its our distraction and become a tool for threat and domination to the foundations of democracy (Weber, 1978 & Daneshfard & Aboalmaali, 2016). Therefore, in some cases individuals at the top of the organisational hierarchy will rapidly lose their control (Serpa & Ferreira, 2019).

2.6.2 Government performance management framework


The second theoretical framework this research uses to interpret empirical research findings and results is the government management frameworks. The concept of performance management was coined in the 1970s by Aubrey Daniels and its developments was crucial in the field of organisational performance management in the 1980s (Phago & Munzhedzi, 2014). The Government management frameworks this research refers to are Public Finance Management Act of 1999 (PFMA) which emphasizes accountability of expenditure and will help us interrogate the last attribute namely enablers (Treasury, 1999). Interlinked to this government framework is Framework for Managing Programme Performance Information (FMPPI) and Revised Strategic Framework for Strategic Plans and Annual Performance Plans which will help us interrogate the two attributes which are namely, Outcome and outputs (Treasury, 2007 & Diedericks (2017 & DPME, 2020). I will further use these three government frameworks to respond to the second question that is "What are the challenges of managing performance information in the Gauteng Office of the Premier?".

In detail, the sole purpose of Public Finance Management Act of 1999 is to bind government departments with rules of transparency, sound management and accountability of expenditure, revenue, liabilities, and assets (Treasury, 1999). While the purpose of Framework for Managing Programme Performance Information is to clarify standards, definitions, roles, and responsibilities of managing of performance information in government. The purpose of Revised Strategic Framework for Strategic Plans and Annual Performance Plans is to guide government department on processes of developing five-year Plans, Annual Plans and Operational Plans. However, other authors hold different views about the purpose of these frameworks. For instance, Diedricks (2017) argues that these frameworks are mainly to promote action. While Penceliah (2012) & Phago & Munzhedzi (2014) point out that these frameworks are meant to assist government to monitor, review, recognise good performance and develop improvement plans for underperformance.

Figure 8 below shows the advantages of government frameworks. There is a clear process of planning, budgeting and reporting. For instance, Planning begins from the top to bottom where all government departments take the mandate from National, and it is cascaded down to Provincial government and Municipalities (DPME, 2020).

Interlinked to the process of planning is the provision of budget which is facilitated through the National Treasury and cascaded down to other spheres (Treasury, 1999). Lastly at the reporting level, section 5.3 of the Treasury regulations in line with section 27(4) and 36 (5) of the PFMA mandates departments through accounting officers to establish reporting process, performance monitoring and evaluation systems as well as improvement plans where underperformance has been identified (Treasury, 1999 & Treasury, 2007 & Treasury, 2001 & DPME, 2020). The reporting process is continuous on a monthly, quarterly, annually, mid-term review and end of term review.

Figure 8: Planning, budgeting and reporting cycle



Source: National Treasury 2007:4

The disadvantages brought by government performance management frameworks are that they do not provide any punitive measure for non-compliance of the implementation. This is more evident in the work of Phago & Munzhedzi (2014) who holds the view that the Labour relation act of 1995 which is the primary foundation of managing labour relations of government departments makes it difficult to dismiss government officials for not performing and achieving predetermined objectives. Furthermore, Treasury (2007) also argue that the frameworks are silent on the details of performance information that should be accessible to the public. Although I have discussed the alignment of budgets above, Diedricks (2017) holds a view that budget cuts can limit the extent of achieving and implementing predetermined objectives.

2.6.3 Government Wide Monitoring and Evaluation Systems

Thirdly, this research uses Government Wide Monitoring and Evaluation (GWM&E) framework which was officially introduced by the South African government in 2005 (DPME, 2007 & Matsiliza, 2012). This framework is used to interrogate the attribute namely enablers or inputs which is the term mostly used in monitoring and evaluation of performance. Henceforth this research uses the GWM&E lens because it advocates for government integrated M&E principles, definitions, objectives, standards, and practices to inspire confidence and good practices of government M&E and I can argue that the attributes are best suited in this framework (Van der Waldt, 2015 & Cloete, 2009). In interrogating these attributes using this lens, I will also be able to answer the third research question and that is "What are the challenges affecting the implementation of GWM&E System in Gauteng Office of the Premier to achieve predetermined objectives?".

The purpose of GWM&E is to clearly define functions of M&E and provide a system that will detect early warnings, collect data, verify, analyse and report (Engela & Ajam, 2010). Further, Matsiliza (2012) argue that GWM&E was mainly to improve public participation and government performance scrutiny. GWM&E is a system used in government to facilitate a clear sequence of inputs, outputs, outcomes and impacts (Matsiliza, 2012). However, Engela & Ajam (2010) points to a different description by arguing that GWM&E describes roles of government departments in line with legal mandates, institutional arrangements, and responsibilities towards the implementation of the current and future M&E.

Multiple authors pointed out the advantages of GWM&E. For instance, GWM&E advocates for public financial allocations and performance in departments to be evidence based so that public officials or managers can make informed decisions, identify challenges for redress and successes for replication (Matsiliza, 2012 & Van der Waldt, 2015). Functions of M&E and its lines of reporting are clearly outlined (DPME, 2008). Furthermore, Engela & Ajam (2010) points out that GWM&E allows expertise and existing M&E systems from different sectors and spheres of government to integrate and develop future appropriate M&E strategies. While Cloete (2009) argues that GWM&E provides the advantage of spelling out the responsibilities and roles of

different government stakeholders, such as National Treasury which is responsible for monitoring budget allocations and expenditure.

Multiple authors also present disadvantages. For instance, the decentralisation of functions across the three government spheres exposes the weakness of GWM&E system and makes it difficult for GWM&E to prevent fragmentation and institutionalisation of strong M&E systems that promotes coordination of performance information (DPME, 2007). Similarly, current lines of reporting are complex and there is reasonable amount of the same performance information reported to different departments (DPME, 2008). Engela & Ajam (2010) argues that it is this kind of complex intergovernmental structures that exposes the weakness of GWM&E. Furthermore, Cloete (2009) argues that the most serious disadvantage of GWM&E it is the inability to explicitly inform government departments on what needs to be monitored and evaluated.


2.6.4 Programme Logic Model

Lastly, this research also uses programme logical model as an additional framework to help interrogate the three attributes that is enablers, output, and outcome. This model was firstly suggested in 1995 publication by Aspen Institute Roundtable on Community Change on New approaches to Evaluating Comprehensive Community Initiatives (Weiss, 1998:11.) Its introduction in government came as a need to assist government to package and structure performance information against predetermined objectives in clear way that demonstrate the use of resources to achieve the ultimate outcome and impact (Kellogg Foundation, 2004 & Treasury, 2007). It is in this regard that this model will help map performance challenges in attaining predetermined objectives in the Gauteng office of the Premier logically for ease of reference and understanding. This model will help this research to answer the last question that is "What key components of the logical model affect the performance of the Gauteng Office of the Premier?".

Programme logic model is described as a sequence of expectations to achieve the results of an intervention. This is more evident in the work of Weiss (1998) & Kellogg Foundation (2004) who argues that programme logic models are systematic and presents the relationship of attributes to achieve the intended results. Similarly, Treasury (2007) & Kinyuira (2019) points out in figure 9 below that the latter stated attributes are namely,

Inputs, activities, outputs, outcomes, and impacts. These attributes are therefore used to describe government performance against predetermined objectives. For instance, government departments must apply the approach of "if... then" relationship to provide an understanding of how the intervention will realise its impact (Johnson, 2013 & Andhika et al., 2018). A different view is posed by Auriacombe (2011) who describes programme logic model as an analytical tool mainly used by planners to link programmes means to an end to enable government departments to implement, monitor and evaluate the planned programmes.

Figure 9: Key performance information concepts



Source National Treasury 2007:6

In terms of advantages, Weiss (1998) points out that logic model can help programme managers in government to determine if the road towards achieving the impact is implausible or complex, leads to unexpected consequences or requires expertise and skills not readily available. Auriacombe (2011), points out that logic models provide an advantage of defining a business plan to focus on activities and their implementation to realise consequences. The last camp such as Kinyuira (2019) argue that managers can differentiate between short term outcomes and impacts that are beyond their influence.


The disadvantages are that managers can interpret assumptions of the programme logic model differently from its intended purpose especially when assumptions are not explicitly defined (Weiss, 1998). This can also lead to performance improvements based on incorrect assumption and therefore considered as a doomed or failed programme (Auriacombe, 2011). It is in this case that Andhika et al. (2018) argues that there is no

guarantee that logic models are easy to understand. Further, there is no standardised logic model and organisations are encouraged to come up with a model that best suits their strategies to measure performance against predetermined objectives (Treasury, 2007 & Kellogg Foundation, 2004).

2.7 A conceptual framework for assessing challenges in attaining predetermined objectives: the case of the Gauteng Office of the Premier

This section of the report will conceptualise the conceptual framework of the research focus. In doing so this section will logically summarise the literature that I have collected and interrogated in the last six sections above from section 2.1 throughout section 2.6. Further, based on the collected and analysed literature I am going to propose how I intend to interrogate the empirical components of this research (Components 3 through 5). In detail this section will summarise the history and description of the Gauteng Office of the Premier (section 2.1), the organisational performance challenges (section 2.2), the Methods, data, findings, and conclusions of studies on and organisational performance challenges (section 2.3), introduction to organisational performance studies and its components (section 2.4), key attributes of organisational strategy that are key to organisational performance (section 2.5) as well as Frameworks for organisational performance to interpret empirical results on the organisational performance challenges against predetermined objectives in the Gauteng Office of the Premier (section 2.6).

Figure 10: Diagram showing conceptual framework to assess challenges in attaining predetermined organisational performance objective in the Gauteng Office of the Premier



Source: Author

The topic of this research has been clearly stated and refers to: "Assessing the organisational challenges in attaining predetermined objectives in the Gauteng Office of the Premier". I have since reviewed literature in chapter 1 of this proposal to situate the context of this research and introduced key concepts and terms I have used. That is defining the Gauteng Office of the Premier as a government department through its organogram (South Africa, 1996 & Gauteng Office of the Premier Strategic Plan, 2020).

I have noted in the reporting lines of the organogram that there are DDG's, DG and Premier based on departmental branches/components (Gauteng Office of the Premier Annual Report 2021).

Further, in chapter 1, I have provided a brief status of reporting on predetermined objectives in the Gauteng Office of the Premier and noted the fluctuations in attaining predetermined objectives. Such fluctuations call for interventions because they provide a starting point on information about challenges of attaining predetermine objectives (Marr, 2006). Organisational performance concept is also discussed. Multiple authors, for example Elena-Iuliana & Maria (2016) have discussed the concept of organisational performance. Notwithstanding different views and approaches I argued that organisational performance is an overall result of the organisation against the set objectives or targets.

With the context and concepts clarified, I then link and discuss them in the context of the research problem. Chapter 2 links research problem analysis using the concept of the problem tree. I have linked the symptoms to root causes and consequences. For instance, my research problem is organizational performance challenges in attaining predetermined objectives and the literature have pointed out that symptoms that are linked to this problem includes non-achievement of predetermined objectives in the legislated and statutory plans such as Annual Operational Plans, Annual performance Plans and Strategic Plans (Diedericks 2017 & DPME, 2020).

Reporting non reliable and invalid performance information as well as audit findings raised by the auditor general are also amongst the symptoms brought by challenges of organisational performance against predetermined objectives. (Brusc and Montesino, 2016 & Auditor General of South Africa (AGSA), 2020). The literature also informs us that all these listed symptoms are as a result of the root causes such as inadequate intergovernmental collaboration, setting indicators in quantities and not quality and lack of relationship between planning, budgeting and reporting (South Africa, 1996 & Gauteng Office of the Premier, 2014 & Marr, 2006). Further, I pointed out the consequences of the problem if not resolved which includes loss of citizenry confidence in government and subsequent mass mobilizations and protest (Vyas-Doorgapersad et al., 2013 & GCRO 2021). In concluding this section, I proposed an intervention by

describing the key aspects of results-chain and results-framework underpinning the research problem.

Although almost all the authors wrote about organisational performance challenges, the gap remains that they did not focus their aim and objectives on government performance challenges in attaining predetermined objectives in the context or setting of the Gauteng Office of the Premier as the centre of governance in the province, however they did so in municipalities which are arguably the elements of local government (Olivier, 2017 & Ndevu, 2019 & Khunoethe et al (2021). Secondly, I point out the interpretative frameworks used in the past which are New Public Management used by Khunoethe et al (2021), triangulation used by Diedericks (2017), and Burk Litwin Model applied by Olivier (2017). With the contribution made by these authors I can still argue that none of them used the lens of organizational bureaucracy, government performance management frameworks, government wide monitoring and evaluation framework and programme logical frameworks which are discussed as relevant interpretive frameworks to this study.

I am locating this research in the academic field of organisational performance studies. I have identified this field as a suitable field for this incumbent research due to its aspect that connect to the research problem. I have started section 2.4 by providing the description of the organizational performance and then discussed the facts and debates around it (Silitonga, 2017 & Ovadje & Aryee, 2019). I have also identified and linked three major components to organizational performance studies. The components are namely the Organizational strategy, measures of performance and separation of powers (Marr, 2008 & Silitonga, 2017 & Vyas-Doorgapersad et al, 2013).

Interlinked to the identified attributes above are the interpretive frameworks. I have identified 4 interpretative frameworks which are namely, Organizational bureaucracy theory linked to the first research question and first attribute of organisational performance, namely organisational structure (Weber, 1978 & Heckscher, 1994). I therefore ask, "What are the organisational structure challenges affecting the Gauteng office of the Premiers performance in attaining predetermined objectives?". The second interpretive framework is government performance management frameworks which I link to the attribute of enablers (Treasury, 1999 & Treasury, 2001 & Phago & Munzhedzi,

2014). I further link it the second research question by asking "What are the challenges of managing performance information in the Gauteng Office of the Premier?".

The third interpretive framework is Government Wide Monitoring Systems which links to the attribute of outcome, output and enablers (DPME, 2007 & Matsiliza, 2012). I link this interpretive framework to question 3 by asking "What are the challenges affecting the implementation of GWM&E System in Gauteng Office of the Premier to achieve predetermined objectives?". The last interpretive framework is programme logical model which is the most suited interpretive framework for this research. The logical programme model links all the identified attributes of organizational performance studies in this research (Weiss, 1998 & Treasury, 2007 & Auriacombe, 2011). I link this interpretive framework to question 4 by asking "what key components of the logical model affecting the performance of the Gauteng Office of the Premier?". These interpretive frameworks will help us interpret our research findings.

.

Proposed approach of the current study

This study will focus on organisational performance challenges in attaining predetermined objectives in the Gauteng office of the Premier and it has applied qualitative research strategy to get an understanding of the in-depth challenges faced by the Office of the Premier. In the reviewed past and current studies, I have learned that qualitative strategy is the most used strategy to understand organization challenges (Diedericks, 2017 & Khunoethe et al (2021) & Ndevu, 2019). This study will also apply case study research design in the Gauteng Office of the Premier. Further, primary research instruments such as face-to-face interviews comprising of semi-structured interviews are used. A purposive sampling technique is adopted to purposefully identify the respondents and participants of this research. This research interviewed middle and senior management officials in the Gauteng Office of the Premier responsible for reporting and managing performance information. The details of our research design, strategy and methods are details below in chapter 3.

3 RESEARCH STRATEGY, DESIGN, PROCEDURE AND METHODS

Drawing back to section 1.2.3, I have pointed out the main Four research questions that this research aims to answer—which are, 'What are the organisational structure challenges affecting the Gauteng office of the Premiers performance in attaining predetermined objectives? What are the challenges of managing performance information in the Gauteng Office of the Premier? What are the challenges affecting the implementation of GWM&E System in Gauteng Office of the Premier to achieve predetermined objectives? And what key components of the logical model affect the performance of the Gauteng Office of the Premier?'. Furthermore, I have reviewed literature and developed the conceptual framework that provides a picture of the methodology and techniques to be applied. Therefore, in this chapter, I have detailed and pointed out the design, approach, strategy, methods and procedures of this research and further discussed the tools I have used to collect data, how I process it and analyse it. In summary, I have divided this chapter into 5 sections. In section 3.1, I share the research strategy followed by section 3.2 where I share the design of this research. Moreover, in section 3.3 I share the methods and procedures while in section 3.4 I point out how I ensured reliability and validity. Lastly, in section 3.5 I conclude by sharing limitations that are both administrative and technical.

3.1 Research strategy

Multiple authors have written about the definition of research strategy and not withstanding any other definitions, this research paper can clearly argue that research strategy refers to an action plan used to conduct research and produce quality results (Bryman, 2012). Most notable research strategies are qualitative, quantitative, and mixed method research strategies (Creswell, 2014 & Tracy 2013). Amongst these three strategies, I have committed to use qualitative research strategy to assess performance challenges against predetermined objectives in the Gauteng Office of the Premier based on literature reviewed in section 2.1., 2.2 and 2.3.

In detail, qualitative research strategy emphasises the use of text or words during data collection and analysis (Bryman, 2012). It rejects natural scientific models as well as positivism paradigm in favour of interpretivism paradigm that intent to understand individual ways of interpreting the social world (Tracy 2013). In this way, qualitative

strategy embraces the idea of social reality as a continuous changing property of individual creation (Bryman, 2012). Further, qualitative research strategy affords the researcher an opportunity to collect data at the setting of the research where participants experience the problem understudy (Creswell, 2014). This means participants are not brought into a lab or allocated data collection instruments to complete. It is in this detailed description that I have used qualitative strategy in this research. The fact that this research is contextualised in a manner that requires in-depth description and understanding of Gauteng Office of the Premier performance challenges against predetermined objectives meant that qualitative research strategy is appropriate.

Multiple authors have also applied the use of qualitative research strategy in reasonably similar research field to this research. For instance, Diedericks (2017) applied qualitative research strategy to understand Limpopo provincial government challenges when reporting performance against predetermined objectives to the Auditor General. One of the main reasons Diedericks (2017) used qualitative research strategy in his study was to collect necessary data that will provide generalisation and insight about Limpopo provincial departments. Further, qualitative research strategy provided Diedericks (2017) with the benefit of triangulation where data was collected from existing literature, guidelines, protocols, and respondents to gain in-depth understanding of Limpopo provincial challenges when reporting to the Auditor General.

Similarly, Ndevu & Muller (2018) also adopted qualitative research strategy when examining performance management as a tool in municipalities. The authors aimed to assess the use of a balance scorecard to improve performance and eradicate service delivery challenges. Ndevu & Muller (2018) used qualitative strategy to get an in-depth understanding of current context and challenges facing local government including the existing legislative frameworks, white paper, and the constitution. In quest of using qualitative research strategy, Ndevu & Muller (2018) got the benefit of assessing attitudes of different stakeholders and the use of performance measures in local government.

To further strengthen the argument and choice of using qualitative research strategy in this paper, Helo & Dwight (2009) also used qualitative research strategy in a similar study to ours. The aim and objectives of study was to identify possible challenges from successfully integrating performance management into management process within the

Office of the Public Sector Development Commission (Helo & Dwight, 2009). The reason for using qualitative strategy was to have an in-depth discussion with specialist in areas of performance measurement to identify potential future performance challenges (Helo & Dwight, 2009). This provided the benefit of using interviews and analysis of data using text to assign key terms or codes for that served as a basis for understanding the trends of performance measurement challenges (Helo & Dwight, 2009).

Inconclusion of section 3.1, I have used qualitative research strategy and benefited from the use of text to analyse and understand the performance challenges of Gauteng Office of the Premier in attaining predetermined objectives. In this way I have also benefited from interactions through interviews with experts responsible for managing organisational performance within the Gauteng Office of the Premier.

3.2 Research design

Different authors have written about the concept of research design. For example, Creswell (2014) & Tracy (2013), describes research design as a framework or criteria used to conduct a study or assess social research. Notwithstanding any other existing research designs, Bryman (2012) points out five notable research designs which are namely: Longitudinal, comparative, case study, experimental and cross-sectional design. Out of these five research designs, I have committed to use a case study research design for this research.

In detail, a case study research design is mostly concerned with the setting and context of the research. For instance, Bryman (2012), points out that case study designs are extensively associated with a specific location such as an organisation or community, in this regard being the Gauteng Office of the Premier. Similarly, I have previously adopted qualitative research strategy in section 3.1 which makes it suitable for this research to adopt a case study research design. For instance, Creswell (2014) points out that it is suitable to use a case study research design in qualitative research to answer questions and structure themes arising from the setting. Similarly, Bryman (2012) also points out that elements of case study design favour qualitative research strategy with the use of interviews that help generate meaningful and detailed data from the case understudy. Further, a case study provides for generalisation about the setting of the study (Tracy, 2013). I justify the commitment of using a case study design in this research to align the

research strategy and solely focus on collecting data in the Office of the Premier as my focal case of study to understand performance challenges.

Further to my commitment and justification to adopt a case study design, I have reviewed similar literature to this research that have applied a case study design. For instance, Schooley & Horan (2007) conducted case study research with the aim of examining dimensions of interorganisational information sharing with the objective of investigating technical and operational levels of organisational performance information. The main reason for using a case study design was to assess the exchange of performance information in an Emergency Medical Services (EMS) system (Schooley & Horan, 2007). In using the case study design, Schooley & Horan (2007) have obtained the benefit of identifying factors that can improve performance information sharing in organisations.

Similarly, Mdhlalose (2020) is another author that has adopted a case study design with the aim of evaluating the impact on organisational performance brought by training and development within the Gauteng Department of Economic Development. The reason for using a case study design according to Mdhlalose (2020) was to be descriptive in nature and collect primary data by means of descriptive data collection tools such as interviews and focus group discussions using Gauteng Department of Economic Development as a case study. It was in this regard that benefits of case study design were harvested. Benefits according to Mdhlalose (2020) includes, researchers' objectivity at all times, collection of descriptive data from persons, situations and events of Gauteng Department of Economic Development as well as understanding the impact on organisational performance as a result of training and development.

Lastly in strengthening my commitment and motivation to use a case study design, I have also looked at the case study conducted by Masilela & Nel (2021) with the aim of analysing the institutionalisation of Data and Information Security Governance (DISG) measures that have been implemented by government towards the protection of Public Sector Data Information (PSDI) assets. A case study was used in this regard to focus the research on respective departments to understand experts' views on DISG (Masilela & Nel, 2021). This brought the benefits of focus, limitation of research scope and generalisation of the three national departments such as Department of Energy,

Department of Science and Technology and Department of Environmental Affairs (Masilela & Nel, 2021).

Inconclusion of section 3.2, I have committed to use a case study research design and indicated the benefits of focusing this research within the Gauteng Office of the Premier as the context of this research. Qualitative strategy elements favoured this research to use a case study research design (Bryman, 2012). Further, I have committed to use a case study design to be able to limit this research study in the Gauteng Office of the Premier.

3.3 Research procedure and methods

The purpose of this section is to outline the procedure as well as the methods that this research has used for ease of reference on how I have collected, processed, and analysed empirical evidence. In doing so, I have divided this section into 6 parts. In section 3.3.1 I have shared the tools of data and information instruments followed by section 3.3.2 where I have identified the population group as well as the sample. Subsequently, in section 3.3.3 I have observed ethics of conducting research while in section 3.3.4 I have shared the process of data and information collection. In section 3.3.5 as well as section 3.3.6 I have detailed the process I have used to analyse and process data and further described the participants of this research for background purposes.

3.3.1 Research data and information collection instrument(s)

In this subsection I start by defining the term data collection instrument which refers to any form of a tool used to collect data that will be used to answer the research questions of this paper (Bryman 2012). Further, research instruments are tools that I have used to provide inputs to this research study upon which the validity and quality of my findings will be depended (Kumar, 2011). It is in this case that my data collection instruments is limited and specific to the research understudy to extract relevant information (Creswell, 2014). (Bryman, 2012) mentions two types of data collection instruments which are namely Observation schedule and interview schedule. In this study I commit to use the latter schedule (interview schedule).

In detail, my commitment to use interview schedule provided me with an advantage of having a written list of questions that I use to collect my data. In doing so Kumar (2011) points out that I have reaped the benefits of preparing questions before hand as well as

options to choose how I conduct my interviews. Options includes electronic interviews, face to face interviews and telephonic interviews (Kumar, 2011). In this research I chose to use face to face interviews. Further, the use of interview schedule provided me with the benefit of gaining confidence and experience needed to prompt more open questions to the participants to gain more in-depth information about this research. Merriam & Tisdell (2016) points out that it is good to prompt questions during interviews. It is these highlighted benefits that made me choose interview schedule for this research.

Data collection instruments such as my committed use of interview schedule have structure. Notwithstanding any other description of data collection instrument structure, I can argue that it is a scripted technique followed to collect data. For instance, Tracy (2013) points out that data collection instrument structure can either adopt a planned or ordered technique and free flowing or spontaneous script technique. Further, Bryman (2012) categories these script techniques into fully structured, semi structured, and unstructured. Quantitative strategy favour fully structured while qualitative strategy favours semi structured and unstructured interviews (Kumar, 2011). However, for purposes of this research, I have committed to use semi-structured interviews. In this commitment I have prepared 20 semi-structured questions and aligned them to my (i) research questions in chapter 1 and (ii) my identified attributes for this study in chapter 2. I have done this process to ensure that my data collection instrument contains questions that will help me answer the research questions in chapter 4 and 5.

In detail to my commitment to use semi-structured interviews, I am pointing out the benefits they brought to this research. Bryman (2012) points out that semi-structured interviews provide an advantage of not rigidly following the questions as outlined in my interview schedule. It is in this regard that prompting questions that are not included in my original interview schedule were asked especially when I pick up important information from the participants regarding Gauteng Office of the Premier performance challenges. This refers more to what Kumar (2011) calls flexibility. Although I have reaped the benefit of being flexible, all questions that were asked during the semi- structured interviews used similar wording as recommended by Bryman (2012) that similar wording must be used with all participants. It is based on the abovementioned benefits relevant to my research that I have committed to use semi-structured interviews to understand performance challenges in the Gauteng Office of the Primer.

In support of my commitment to use semi-structured interviews for this research, I have reviewed similar literature to this research. For instance, Masilela & Nel (2021) conducted a study using semi-structured interviews with the aim of analysing the institutionalisation of DISG measures that have been implemented by government towards the protection of PSDI assets. The reason for using semi-structured interviews was to collect data and communicate directly with chosen participants to gain rich understanding of their responsibilities and views (Masilela & Nel, 2021). Further, semi-structured interviews provided Masilela & Nel (2021) with the benefit of having a guide for interviews as well as using the guide to view the research topic from the perspective of the participants.

Similarly, Ndasana & Umejesi (2022) used semi-structured interviews on a study that aimed at examining organisational success and performance management in the administration of local municipalities in South Africa. The reason for using semi-structured interviews was to gain in-depth understanding about intersections between productivity and performance management systems at Buffalo City Metropolitan Municipality (BCMM) (Ndasana & Umejesi, 2022). The benefit that Ndasana & Umejesi (2022) got from using semi-structured interviews was to have face to face interview sessions and get clarity on productivity and performance management systems at BCMM.

Lastly, Diedericks (2017) also used semi structured interviews to understand Limpopo provincial government challenges when reporting performance against predetermined objectives to the Auditor General. The reason for using semi-structured was to become descriptive and adopt an interpretive social science approach when conducting interviews (Diedericks, 2017). The benefit that Diedericks (2017) got from using semi-structured interviews was an in-depth perspective of participants on strategic planning and performance management processes, performance auditing, reporting, and monitoring and evaluation.

Based on the literature reviewed (section 2), the questions that are included in the semi-structured interview schedule are structured in the context of this research setting (section 2.1), that is the Gauteng Office of the Premier and subsequently linked to the problem (section 2.2), and that is performance challenges in attaining predetermined objectives. In doing so I have ensured that semi-structured interview questions are also linked to the

main research questions of this research (section 1.2.3), which are directly linked to the interpretative frameworks (section 2.6) as well as attributes (section 2.5).

3.3.2 Research target population and selection of respondents

3.3.2.1 Research target population

Multiple authors have defined the term population (Bryman, 2012 & Creswell, 2014 & Tracy, 2013). Notwithstanding multiple descriptions, I describe population according to Bryman (2012:187) as "the universe of units from where the sample is selected". In this research I refer to the Gauteng Office of the Premier which is a government department in Gauteng Province as the population from which the sample of this research is selected.

Multiple authors have also used government departments as their population. For instance, Diedericks (2017) used Limpopo provincial government as the population to understand challenges when reporting performance against predetermined objectives to the Auditor General. Similarly, Ndasana & Umejesi (2022) used Buffalo City Metropolitan Municipality as the population on a study that aimed at examining organisational success and performance management in the administration of local municipalities in South Africa. Lastly, Masilela & Nel (2021) used national government in South Africa as a population with the aim of analysing the institutionalisation of DISG measures that have been implemented by government towards the protection of PSDI assets. All these authors gained the benefit of getting a sample that is representative from their chosen population. I also point out with reference to this research population being a government department (Gauteng Office of the Premier) that I have reaped the benefit of sampling a representative sample.

3.3.2.2 Sampling or selecting respondents from the target population

A sample can be defined as a portion selected from the population for purposes of conducting research (Bryman, 2012). Similarly, it can also refer to a selection of a few from a bigger group to form the basis of predicting the occurrence of unknown knowledge regarding the population (Kumar, 2011). However, Creswell (2014) adds that a sample must be representative of the population. In line with this research chosen qualitative strategy, I acknowledge the four sampling techniques for qualitative strategy which are namely: Purposive sampling, snowball sampling, theoretical sampling, generic

purposive sampling (Bryman, 2012). However, for purposes of this research, I commit to using purposive sampling technique.

I have committed to use purposive sampling technique in this research because I do not seek to sample my participants randomly. I have selected my sample based on relevance and knowledge of the Gauteng Office of the Premier performance information and challenges. For instance, Bryman (2012) points out that we must sample in a strategic way so that our portion of sample is relevant to the research problem and questions. It is in this regard that my sample included 4 Senior Management Services (SMS) members, 1 Executive Management Team (EMT) member as well as 4 Middle Management Services (MMS) members. SMS members in this regard refers to Directors and Chief Directors (CD) while EMT members refers to Director General (DG) and Deputy Director Generals (DDG's) and MMS refers to Deputy Directors. The sample of this research totalled to 9 participants, and I have referred to the participants of this study as "OoP" which refers to Office of the Premier. In this regard I have OoP 1 to OoP 9 as respondents of this study and this is more evident in chapter 4. This is the sample group that is responsible to manage, report and take decisions on performance information and challenges in the Gauteng Office of the Premier.

It is in this sample that I used my judgement to sample according to those I think can provide information to answer the research questions of this study. (Kumar, 2011) points out that researchers should use their judgement when applying purposive sampling. In detail, this sample was representative of all branches within the Gauteng Office of the Premier. The Gauteng Office of the Premier as identified in the literature (context of research study) has five branches that is, Corporate Management Branch, Executive Stakeholder Management Branch, Institutional Development and Management Branch, Communication Branch, Policy, Research and Advisory Support Branch. All these five Branches were represented in the sample.

In motivating for this research commitment to use purposive sampling, I have further reviewed similar studies to ours that have used purposive sampling techniques. For instance, Masilela & Nel (2021) used purposive sampling with the aim of analysing the institutionalisation of DISG measures that have been implemented by government towards the protection of PSDI assets. The reason for using purposive sampling was to

purposively sample DG, DDG's, CDs of government departments at national sphere (Masilela & Nel, 2021). This brought the benefits of getting valuable data on how DISG management functions are entrenched to defend its PSDI against threats of loss, misuse, and damage (Masilela & Nel, 2021)

Similarly, Diedericks (2017) used purposive sampling to understand challenges when reporting performance against predetermined objectives to the Auditor General. Purposive sampling was used was used to sample 36 senior managers from 12 provincial departments in Limpopo (Diedericks, 2017). The benefits were that the sample was representative of the population (Diedericks, 2017). Lastly, Ndasana & Umejesi (2022) also used purposive sampling with the aim of examining organisational success and performance management in the administration of local municipalities in South Africa. Purposive was used to sample 20 participants in Buffalo City Metropolitan Municipality.

In conclusion of section 3.3.2, I have committed to use purposive sampling technique to draw a sample from the Gauteng Office of the Premier which is my population. I have further reviewed literature on similar studies that have applied purposive sampling technique in government departments to motivate for the relevance and use of purposive sampling in this study.

3.3.3 Ethical considerations when collecting research data

Multiple authors have written about ethics in research. For instance, Kumar (2011) refers to ethical consideration as principles of conduct that are not harmful to the population understudy. Similarly, Bryman (2012) points out that it is ethical procedural rules of working closely with research participants. For example, obligation from the researcher to respect the rights, values and needs of the participants (Cresswell, 2014).

I Makgaba Samuel Molapo, the registered student for Master of Management in the field of Public Sector Monitoring and Evaluation enrolled at the University of Witwatersrand, Johannesburg declare that I do not have any form of sponsors for this research paper. I have also assured the Gauteng Office of the Premier from which my sample is drawn that I will not deceive the respondents, nor will I cause any harm or stress to the respondents. I have assured and not pushed my respondents to the limits of losing self-esteem. I have assured my respondents in the Gauteng Office of the Premier that I have

obtain informed consent before conducting my interviews as well as recordings. The consent form is attached as an appendix in this research paper and was shared with the participants of this research.

I have assured the Gauteng Office of the Premier respondents that I will protect and secure the collected data in a secured cloud with a protected password known by myself only for a period of 7 years. All the respondents in the Gauteng office of the Premier are protected and remain anonymous, their names are not mentioned in this final version of the research report. Lastly, I have obtained ethical clearance from the University of Witwatersrand, Johannesburg of which I am bind by its ethical rules and procedures.

I am currently an employee of the Gauteng Office of the Premier and my positionality does not affect this research. I am privileged that I work in the Gauteng Office of the Premier however, it should be noted that I currently occupy a junior position and I do not qualify nor have the privilege to sit in governance structures that discuss and take decisions regarding organisational performance reports, challenges, and interventions. Senior Managers and Executive Managers are responsible for the organisational performance of the Gauteng Office of the Premier and they are solely responsible for reporting and ensuring that organisational performance gets discussed in management meetings as well as oversight bodies. These reports are confidential till they are published on the Gauteng Office of the Premier website for public viewing by citizens as per Treasury regulations.

3.3.4 Research data and information collection process

The concept of data collection has been discussed by various authors. For instance, Bryman (2012) & Creswell (2014) & Tracy (2013) refers to data collection as the process of getting data from the chosen sample to answer the questions of the research. Further, Bryman (2012) identifies four modes of data collection which are namely: ethnography or participant observation, interviews (telephonic, face to face or internet based), documents and focus group discussions. Based on the four modes I have committed to use interviews with specific reference to face-to-face interviews. This commitment aligns to the chosen strategy (qualitative research strategy) in section 3.1.

There are two most important characteristics in face-to-face interviews, one being in-depth interviewing and secondly being repeated interaction (Bryman, 2012 & Creswell (2014). I have adopted both characteristics during face-to-face interviews where interview sessions were more interactive to understand performance challenges. In support of this, Kumar (2011) motivates that face-to-face interviews are repeated encounters between us as researchers and participants to understand lived experiences and perspectives on our research topics. However, I must emphasise that this process was time consuming because most of the respondents were taking their time to answer the questions. More particularly when participants became more passionate to talk about their own lived experiences and challenges in the Gauteng Office of the Premier. Although face-to-face interviews method can be time consuming, Tracy (2013) argues that the time taken during face-to-face interviews helps establish rapport and enhance understanding as well as confidence between the researcher and participants which ultimately lead to accurate in-depth data collection. All participants were requested to be recorded and the recordings were used as reference of transcribing. It is in this regard that I was able to collect data that helped me to answer the research questions.

Further, face-to-face interviews allowed me to collect both verbal and nonverbal data about performance challenges in the Gauteng Office of the Premier and I was able to probe questions and make follow up on information that I did not understand. Almost all the authors agree that face-to-face interviews provides for flexibility to probe for more information when there is an indication of valuable information to be disclosed by the participants on our research topic and problem (Bryman, 2012 & Creswell, 2014 & Kumar, 2011. It is these stated benefits that this research has leveraged on face-to-face interviews to have repeated interactions and collect in-depth data about Gauteng Office of the Premier performance challenges in attaining predetermined objectives.

Several authors who have written similar studies to ours also used face-to-face interviews. For instance, Mdhlalose (2020) adopted face-to-face interviews with the aim of evaluating the impact on organisational performance brought by training and development within the Gauteng Department of Economic Development. Similarly, Mdhlalose (2020) used face-to-face interviews because it assisted to mitigate biasness. The benefits that Mdhlalose (2020) got from using face-to-face interviews was that participants were able

to answer questions on their own and the researcher was able to probe questions based on participants lived experiences.

Similarly, Ndasana & Umejesi (2022) used face-to-face interview sessions with the aim of examining organisational success and performance management in the administration of local municipalities in South Africa. The reason for using face-to-face was to get clarity on productivity and performance management systems at BCMM. The benefits that Ndasana & Umejesi (2022) got from using face-to-face interviews was that participants got an opportunity to present their in-depth views and experiences on performance management systems and its challenges in respect to BCMM.

Considering organisational performance, Koketso & Rust (2012) also conducted face to face interviews with the study that aimed to identify talent management challenges at Cape Town local Municipality. The reason for using face-to-face interviews was to understand in-depth challenges brought by the level of talent loss faced by the local municipality of Cape Town (Koketso & Rust, 2012). Understanding talent management through participants views on their job satisfaction, talent attraction, organisational commitment and turnover was amongst the benefits of using face-to-face interviews since the research topic is sensitive and required face-to-face contact (Koketso & Rust, 2012).

In respect to the literature reviewed above, the commitment to use face-to-face interviews assisted me to establish rapport with the Gauteng Office of the Premier selected sample and enhance confidence in interviewing and understanding lived experiences on performance challenges against predetermined objectives. This means I have collected primary data instead of secondary data for this research. Further, face-to-face interviews assisted me to mitigate the risk of biasness because I have asked questions and the respondent had the latitude of answering and expanding on the performance challenges in attaining predetermined objectives.

In section 3.3.3 (ethical considerations) I have assured that the collection process was in line with ethical processes. I have also assured the Gauteng Office of the Premier respondents that the data collected is protected and secured on cloud and email with a protected password known by myself only for a period of 7 years. All the respondents in

the Gauteng office of the Premier are protected and remain anonymous, their names are not mentioned in the in this research report for ethical reasons.

3.3.5 Research data and information processing and analysis

3.3.5.1 Research data and information processing

Several authors have written about research data processing. Notwithstanding multiple definitions, this research argues that research data processing refers to the conversion of raw data into clear readable, usable, and valuable information (Kumar, 2011 & Bryman, 2012 & Creswell, 2014 & Tracy, 2013). For the relevance of this research, I have used recordings and transcripts to write down the conversation of the interviews with the Gauteng Office of the Premier participants. Transcripts informed by the recordings according to Braun & Clarke (2013) is a process that holds the products of engagement between a researcher, recording and the transcriber. Before I conducted the process of coding the transcripts, I have conducted the process of data cleaning. In doing I have looked at errors that includes sentence structure, mistaken words, quotation, and omission errors. Further, I have also provided the participants pseudonym as compared to their real names for ease of reference. Braun & Clarke (2013) points out this is what makes a good transcript.

Using the good transcript that I have cleaned; I started the process of coding. Coding according to Bryman (2012) & Creswell (2014) is the identification of data sets specific to the research. For this research I have used the transcripts to manually code the data that relates to challenges of attaining predetermined objectives in the Gauteng Office of the Premier. I have adopted inductive coding process and coded the transcript as I read it and this is because I have used open ended questions during interviews and the assumption is that I did not know where the conversation will lead. It is in this regard that I had to code the entire transcripts as I read through them. According to Bryman (2012), inductive coding helps to explore the research understudy.

Furthermore, I have used the Microsoft word documents that I have documented my transcript on to develop codes. In doing so, I have used the comment section to capture different codes. Similarly, I have used the Microsoft excel sheet and created columns for each respondent and named them "OoP" which refers to Office of the Premier and I then used the transcript to populate the important information to inform my themes in

line with the respondents. The details and processes of the thematic analysis will be discussed in section 3.3.5.2 below. Diedericks (2017) used a similar technique when assessing challenges of reporting predetermined objectives to the Auditor General.

3.3.5.2 Research data and information analysis

Research data analysis is the conversion of data into useful information using methods of analysis to make sense of the information (Creswell, 2014 & Tracy, 2013). Methods of analysis in qualitative strategy includes interpretative phenomenological analysis, pattern-based discourse analysis, grounded theory analysis and thematic analysis (Kumar, 2011 & Bryman, 2012 & Braun & Clarke, 2013). Of the four mentioned methods I have committed to apply thematic analysis in this research.

Thematic analysis refers to the process of identifying relevant themes to the research made up of the generated codes from the transcript (Bryman 2012). The transcripts of this research were coded as explained in section 3.3.5.1 (research data and information processing) and I have used these codes to group them together to formulate empirical themes that assisted this research to produce useful information about challenges of attaining predetermined objectives in the Gauteng office of the premier. However, for the theoretical themes I have converted my four research questions into statements and pulled out key words of emanating from the research question and that is for research question one (i) Organisational structure challenges, research question two (ii) Managing performance information and it challenges and research question three (iii) implementation of monitoring and evaluation systems. For research question four, there are no theoretical themes, but all the themes are empirical and linked the research attributes.

Further, both the theoretical and empirical themes were populated into a Microsoft excel sheet and I used the transcripts to populate information relating to the themes from each respondent. Following this process, I then added three more columns and named them similarities, differences, and reconciliation. In the similarities column I have extracted and grouped similar data from respondent that speaks to the identified themes. In the differences column I have extracted and grouped different views from participants relating to the identified themes. In the last column of reconciliation, I have summarised what all the respondents said in relation to the themes pointing out the main discussions

to make sense of the data and transform it into meaningful information to answer the research question. All this process was done to present the findings in chapter 4.

I also did in-depth repeated reading of the transcript as pointed by Braun & Clarke (2013) that it's recommended to do thorough reading of the transcript to produce relevant themes. The reason I have committed to thematic analysis is because I have linked the developed themes to the research questions, attributes and interpretive frameworks reviewed in chapter 2 and further link to the chosen qualitative research strategy and tools of processing data in chapter 3. All these helped me to interpret, narrate and discuss findings on challenges of attaining predetermined objectives in the Gauteng Office of the Premier. In detail, chapter 5 (discussion of findings) was done in line with interpretative frameworks that is bureaucracy theory, performance management frameworks, Government Wide Monitoring and Evaluation System and programme logical model as well as organisational performance studies attributes which are enablers, inputs, output, and Outcomes. Other supporting literature reviewed in chapter 2 was also included.

I have also reviewed academic studies that have applied thematic analysis. For instance, Diedericks (2017) used thematic analysis to understand challenges when reporting performance against predetermined objectives to the Auditor General. He applied thematic analysis to and derived four themes to interpret his finding. The themes identified are strategic planning and performance management, performance reporting, auditing and evaluation (Diedericks, 2017). It was in the context of these themes that Diedericks (2017) was able to understand Limpopo provincial government challenges in reporting predetermined objectives to the AG.

Similarly, Koketso & Rust (2012) also applied thematic analysis approach at the study that aimed to identify talent management challenges at Cape Town local Municipality. Koketso & Rust (2012) used thematic analysis to exercise inductive reasoning and point out thematic messages from the findings of talent management challenges. Talent management, career management and talent loss are amongst the themes identified to interpret challenges of talent management with specific reference to Cape Town Local Municipality.

Lastly, Masilela & Nel (2021) applied thematic analysis with the aim of analysing the institutionalisation of DISG measures that have been implemented by government towards the protection of PSDI assets. Interview responses were used to analyse the patterns related to measures implemented by government to protect public sector data information (Masilela & Nel, 2021). It was in this regard that Masilela & Nel (2021) were able to categorise themes according to structure, skills, systems, style, staff and strategy to interpret their data into useful and readable information.

In conclusion of this section, I point out that thematic analysis provided this research with benefits of narrating the research findings in line with the research questions, academic field of study and its attributes (section 2.5) as well as interpretative frameworks (section 2.6).

3.3.6 Description of the research respondents

The respondents of this research are derived from the Gauteng Office of the Premier. In detail, the respondents are derived from five Branches which are namely, (i) Corporate Management Branch, (ii) Executive Support Services and Stakeholder Management Branch, (iii) Institutional Development and Integrity Management Branch, (iv) Communications Branch, and (v) Policy, Research and Advisory Services. These Branches constitute the organisational structure of the Gauteng Office of the Premier and the sample of this research was representative of each branch. This research has promoted gender equity by ensuring that the number of participants is equal in terms of gender. For instance, this research has interviewed 40 percent of male employees and 60 percent of female employees in a sample of 9 employees within Gauteng Office of the Premier.

All participants interviewed have relevant qualification to serve as public servants within their respective Branches and Units in the Gauteng Office of the Premier. Further, almost all the participants are between the ages of 30 and 60 years and have been employed in the Gauteng Office of the Premier for more than a period of 5 to 10 years. This means they have been employed in the Gauteng Office of the Premier for more than 1 political term and have experienced the leadership of more than 1 Political executive leader (in this case is the Premier of Gauteng Province).

The respondents of this research were also extracted from 3 different managerial levels that is, (i) Middle Management Service (MMS) Members which refers to Deputy Directors, (ii) Senior Management Services (SMS) Members which refers to Directors and (iii) Executive Management Team (EMT) which refers to the Deputy Director Generals and the Director General. All these respondents were interviewed in the office during office hours. It was an easy process to get all respondents to participate because of the approval letter signed by the accounting officer (Director General) granting the permission to conduct the research. Respondents were interviewed as individual and not in groups.

In conclusion, section 3.3.6 described in detailed the respondents of this research by outlining, demographics in terms of age, gender and branches they are employed under in the Gauteng Office of the Premier. This section has also described the job titles of respondents as well as years of working experience in the Gauteng Office of the Premier. It was important to do the above process so that this research can authenticate the respondents as the most appropriate providers of the empirical results.

3.4 Research strengthens—reliability and validity measures applied

Generally, research reliability asks the question of whether the results of this study can be repeated and if whether the measures are consistence to yield the same results (Bryman, 2012). While validity is more concerned with the integrity and accuracy of this research results (Creswell, 2014).

Bryman (2012) & Cresswell (2014) identified some of the applicable techniques I have used to ensure reliability in this research which are namely, the research context, research dependability and confirmability. In detail to ensure reliability of this research, I have provided the detail description and history of this research which is Gauteng Office of the Premier (section 2.1) to provide the reader with context of this research. I have also ensured dependability by clearly stating the research problem using the problem tree to provide context of the problem (section 2.2) and subsequently I have developed and made available the research questions and clearly outlined an accurate structure of the research method, strategy, analysis, population and sample techniques in chapter 3.

I have also committed that this research data transcripts will be saved and accessed upon request should the need for audit or peer review arise to test reliability. Further, I have ensured conformability in this research by clearly outlining and confirming my role as a researcher and declaring all my interest relating to this research. I have since attached a detailed appendix on my role as the researcher under the appendix section of this research to eliminate biasness.

Multiple authors have ensured reliability in the manner outlined above. For instance, Diedericks (2017) ensured dependability where the methodology was clearly outlined to ensure reliability and consistence of measures used to report findings on the challenges of reporting performance against predetermined objectives to the Auditor General. Similarly, Schooley & Horan (2007) ensured reliability by detailing the research context and limiting the setting to San Mateo with the aim of examining dimensions of interorganisational information sharing with the objective of investigating technical and operational levels of organisational performance information.

Kumar (2011) & Bryman (2012) & Cresswell (2014) identifies types of research validity that we have employed in our research namely: dependability, credibility, transferability, and conformability. Dependability in validity refers to the criteria of establishing trustworthiness of our results (Bryman, 2012). I have ensured this by having this research reviewed by my supervisor whom I consider as an external auditor and peer reviewer throughout the processes of this research. I have also employed credibility as part of my validity process which refers to conduct of good practice (Creswell, 2014). In doing so I have consulted all the transcripts on challenges of attaining predetermined objectives with the sampled respondents in the Gauteng Office of the Premier to ensure that I captured the true and correct narrative of the respondents. Further, I have employed transferability because the sample of this research is representative of the population. The sample that this research has purposefully chosen is the unit within Gauteng Office of the Premier responsible for organisational performance. Lastly, I applied conformability which refers to conduct of good faith (Kumar, 2011). In doing so I have declared my role and interests and set aside my personal values to overcome biasness.

3.5 Research weaknesses—technical and administrative limitations

I have selected qualitative research strategy and I am acknowledging its critique and limitations on subjectivity. The results of this research rely on the data collected through transcripts and recordings, but they might be influenced by my understanding of what it is important to determine the challenges against predetermined objectives in the Gauteng Office of the Premier. More particularly that I have opted for semi-structured interviews which motivates for open-ended questions and interactions that might make it difficult for this research to be replicated. Bryman (2012) points out that in qualitative research strategy, replication is not a straight answer due to its unstructured nature.

I have also committed to use a case study design for this research and I acknowledge the limitations of generalisation. The semi-structured interviews are conducted with managers responsible for performance in the Gauteng Office of the Premier and the findings can only be limited to the Gauteng Office of the Premier population and cannot be generalised to Gauteng provincial government or other provincial offices of the Premier and any other sphere of government between National and Local government.

This research has adopted purposive sampling, and I note the limitation of non-probability sampling because I have used my knowledge and judgment to select the sample. Although I have used purposive sampling, I can argue that the sample is representative of the population because the sample include executive managers, Senior and middle managers responsible for performance of the Gauteng Office of the Premier.

I also note the limitation time when using transcript and fact that it had an impact on the submission timelines of this paper. However, to mitigate this I have immediately transcribed the interviews on an ongoing basis, for instance I have not procrastinated to transcribe to avoid facing monumental tasks.

Lastly, most of the executive managers sampled in the Gauteng Office of the Premier were occupied with meetings and have continuously cancelled the scheduled interviews. Further, due to Office of the Premier being a political administrative office, other managers that I have purposefully sampled were redeployed to work in other departments and therefore affecting the ability to meet face to face to conduct the

interviews. Due to being a junior official in the Gauteng Office of the Premier, most of the Deputy Director Generals that were sampled did not show interest to participate in the study and did not respond to the invites.

4 PRESENTATION OF RESEARCH RESULTS

This chapter will present the research results on challenges of attaining the predetermined organisational performance objectives in the Gauteng Office of the Premier. The research found that so far, no literature is available that present organisational performance challenges in the Gauteng Office of the Premier. Therefore, this chapter is going to discuss the findings of the first research question (Section 4.1) that is "What are the organisational structure challenges affecting the Gauteng office of the Premiers performance in attaining predetermined objectives?" Section 4.2 sought to discuss and share findings of the second research question that is "What are the challenges of managing performance information in the Gauteng Office of the Premier?". Section 4.3 will discuss and share the findings of the third research question that is "What are the challenges affecting the implementation of Government Wide Monitoring and Evaluation (GWM&E) System in Gauteng Office of the Premier to achieve predetermined objectives?". Lastly section 4.4 provides research results to answer the fourth question that is "What key components of the logical model affect the performance of the Gauteng Office of the Premier?". This chapter will also compare the results to those realised by similar studies that I interrogated when determining the knowledge gap in chapter 2 (section, 2.3). Note that I have referenced the respondent with the abbreviation "OoP" which simply refers to Office of the Premier. I therefore, have OoP 1 to OoP 9 as respondents (this was also indicated in chapter 3, section 3.3.2.2 when discussing the sample group). Semi structured interviews were used to collect the data and I adopted a thematic analysis and identified themes to discuss the findings. The details of data collection and analysis are discussed in chapter 3.

4.1 Organisational structure challenges affecting the Gauteng office of the Premiers performance in attaining predetermined objectives.

Section 4.1 presents research findings to answer the first research question that is "What are the organisational structure challenges affecting the Gauteng office of the Premiers performance in attaining predetermined objectives?". In doing so this section is divided into two subsections. The first subsection (4.1.1) focuses on responding to the question using three themes that is (i) Organisational structure challenges, (ii) Organisational structure fit for purpose and (iii) Human resource capacity challenges caused by the

organisational structure. While the second subsection (4.1.2) compares previous similar studies (already indicated in section 2.3) to the findings of this study. By comparing I am are not analysing but simply stating the similarities and differences.

4.1.1 Response to research question 1

4.1.1.1 Theme 1: Organisational Structure challenges

The Gauteng Office of the Premier respondents pointed out the organisational structure challenges that are affecting their ability to attain predetermined objectives. The organisational structure challenges highlighted by the respondents can be categorised into three categories namely (i) Unapproved Organisational structure, (ii) structure design and (ii) unclear roles and responsibilities. In terms of the unapproved organisational structure challenges, three respondents mentioned that the current organisational structure is not recognised by the Department of Public Service and Administration (DPSA) and therefore not approved as a suitable structure to administer the functions of the Gauteng office of the Premier which therefore affect organisational performance. For instance, **OoP1** feels disgruntled, **OoP8** feels like there is no clear direction while **OoP9** feels at risk of not performing due to the absence of an approved organisational structure.

> *"We need to redo it and we still need to consult with DPSA, so majority of us are disgruntled"* (**OoP1**).

> *"The organisational structure of the office is not even approved by the DPSA, which is supposed to approve all the Organizational structures of the of the public sector departments. The Office of the premier, has no clear direction in terms of the organizational structure"* (**OoP8**).

> *"The fact that we don't even have the organisational structure as a leading office in the Gauteng provincial government puts us at a risk and awkward situation. We should be having an organisational structure that is approved to allow us to carry out the functions of the premier's office given a magnitude of the task we have"* (**OoP9**).

Not only the non-approval of the organisational structure is a challenge but also the design of the structure is a challenge that respondents of the office of the Premier are concerned about. For instance, **OoP 2** mentions that the *"structure is not adequately capacitated at all, but it is designed and planned for ok"*. Similarly, more respondents further highlighted that the design of the structure has limitations that brings challenges of insufficient capacity to provide offices that are responsible for the work required to be done by the Office of the Premier. For instance, **OoP 7** argues that *"if you are to look at internal risk management unit, there was supposed to be a sub directorate for Lost Control Unit, which is responsible for the investigations of all assets losses"*. Similarly, this adequately indicates that the current structure design of the office of the Premier is only designed to accommodate the limited number of people, offices, and units. However, it neglected some of the crucial offices or units and human resources that the employees of the office of the Premier deem important to carry out the mandate of the office. Therefore, the design brings the challenge of employee dissatisfaction about the way the structure is functioning and placing offices and people.

> *"Majority of us are dissatisfied about the structure, it's design, it's functioning and it's placement of people on it"* (**OoP1**).

The dissatisfaction about the design of the organisational structure can be linked to the challenge of employees being confused about what is expected of them. For instance, two respondents share a common view that the roles and responsibilities are not clearly defined to enable them to perform their duties, this is in the case of **OoP 6** who mentions that *"in terms of coordinating the would-be unclear roles and responsibilities to say who exactly is supposed to deliver a specific service and at what point should that be done"*. Similarly, **OoP 3** also mentioned that *"I know that HoDs themselves report directly to the Premier, not necessarily to our own DG, and this causes a confusion"*.

Although I have pointed out similar views of the respondents about organisational structure challenges, there are also respondents who provided different views on the challenges that are brought by the organisational structure to hinder the attainment of predetermined objectives. One respondent mention that the structure does not follow the strategy which the office of the premier is supposed to implement and perform against. This provides an idea that if the structure does not follow the strategy, then the

office will likely not going to achieve the overall strategy. For instance, **OoP5** states that the organisational structure of the office of the premier does not align to the strategic agenda.

> *"Structure should follow the actual agenda and deliverables of the public. But in our case, we prioritise structure first without necessarily focusing on what we want to deliver. The structure should follow what is it that you want, but I think in a sense, within the office of the Premier, we have it vice versa"* (**OoP5**).

4.1.1.2 Theme 2: Organisational Structure fit for purpose

All respondents have a common view that the organisational structure of the office of the premier is not fit for purpose and thus posing a challenge for the public officials and the organisation to perform against the predetermined objectives. For instance, **OoP6** highlight that *"the structure is designed in a way that indeed does not fit for purpose"*. Similarly, one respondent also shares a common understanding that the current organisational structure is not fit for purpose because it is affecting the provision of human resources for the office of the premier to be able to deliver on its mandate. This is more evident with **OoP8** *"I wouldn't say the organisational structure is fit for purpose. I'm sure you can go to every unit within the office of the Premier. They will still complain that they don't have enough human resources to execute what is expected from them"*.

As a result of the organisational structure not being fit for purpose, employees are getting frustrated and resigning from their positions. This is an indication that the organisational structure is not fit to carry out the mandate of the office of the Premier therefore this affect performance especially when you have number of people resigning from their duties. Further the resignation of employee affects basic lines of responsibility and decision making as indicated by **OoP9**.

> *"People are resigning monthly because the organisational structure is not fit for purpose, hence we have challenges in decision making and basic lines of responsibility"* (**OoP9**).

Notwithstanding similar views from respondents, there are also different views posed by other respondents on why the structure is not fit for purpose. For instance, one respondent highlighted two indicators that can be used to prove that the current

organisational structure is not fit for purpose. The two indicators are (i) structural abnormalities and (ii) organisational structure misalignment to DPSA prescripts and framework. This is more evident in the words of **OoP1**

> *"There are still structural abnormalities that DPSA has indicated to us and it's a back and forth type of a ball game and we think that we are Gauteng province so we are unique in our own structuring, however we are not aligned to DPSA prescripts as well as the structural frameworks. So this are indicators that would tell you that definitely our structure is not fit for purpose in terms of achieving our objectives"* (**OoP1**).

Although the structure itself poses some challenges highlighted above, one respondent indicated that the office of the premier has designed the structure however, it remains a challenge to fully implement the structure. This is more evident in the words of **OoP2** "*As designed, I think it is fit, but it's not implemented as per the design, so that's where the disagreement then comes in"* This is an indication that the structure is available and suitable for the office of the premier however, the challenge becomes when the office of the premier is not strictly implementing the organisational structure in line with how it has been designed which then causes anomalies between the design and implementation.

Respondents further highlighted that design of the offices of the Premier structure is standardised and similar across all nine provinces of South Africa because of their similar mandates. Therefore, all nine provinces in the capacity of the premiers offices are expected not to deviate from the standardised organisational structure framework designed by the DPSA. However, this is not the case as one of the respondents holds a different view that the standardised office of the premier organisational structure design is not fit for purpose specifically for the Gauteng province because it's not structured uniquely to enable officials to perform and provide services to the population of the Gauteng province. Further, the argument is that the Gauteng office of the premier organisational structure design should not be standardised like other provincial offices of the premier.

> *"…if you look at population, Gauteng got the biggest population, so delivery in Gauteng will be different compared to delivery in Limpopo with the population of around 6 million or so while Gauteng is now at the population close to 16 million. Therefore, already that should tell you that our structure somehow should be geared enough to deliver the public*

needs of the citizens of Gauteng and in my view, our structure is not necessarily geared sufficiently to deliver" (**OoP 5**).

4.1.1.3 Theme 3: Human resource capacity challenges caused by the structure.

A common view was held by respondents that the organisational structure of the office of the premier have insufficient human resource capacity to achieve its predetermined objectives. For instance, **OoP5** indicates that *"from where I sit there is insufficient human capacity to deliver on what we deem is the vision of this province"*. Similarly, in most cases managers will only focus on urgent and prioritised objectives within their deliverables and neglect any other work that is planned but not on the priority list and urgent. This is more evident with **OoP1** who mentions that *"I was supposed to have a Deputy Director and Assistant Director or even an admin officer, but I do not I have any of that. So, it means the program must be compromised and I must just take as little as possible because I am only alone in the entire unit"*.

This is a similar view shared by **OoP2** who stated that *"In terms of human resources, that's where the problem starts because you don't have enough people that carry out the functions that are meant to be here within this Chief Directorate"*. This indicates that the Office of the Premier has a serious challenge of not performing all required tasks because of the limited human resource capacity that is meant to provide support to achieve the required objectives. For instance, **OoP6** indicated that *"you need full capacity to be able to fully perform"*.

Similarly, two respondents highlighted that there is a shortage in human resource capacity that is skilled to perform the required work within the Gauteng office of the premier. For instance, there are shortages of skilled human resources in the job specification of tender administration as highlighted by **OoP7** that *"we have a shortage when it comes to the skilled people who are supposed to deal with tender administration"*. Similarly, to augment the indication of the shortage of skilled human resources, respondents also referred to shortage of human resource skills relating to transformation of previously disadvantaged and targeted groups.

"Human resources is critical, we find that we do have a shortage of skilled workers or people that understand the particular environment that one is working in and it's very

difficult to find such individuals in today's current time that we're looking at and I am talking particularly around the transformation issues" (**OoP4**).

"We have a shortage when it comes to the skilled people who are supposed to deal with tender administration" (**OoP7**).

One Respondent holds a different view that although the Gauteng Office of the Premier is under capacitated in both human resource capacity and skills capacity, there is a leeway of sourcing service providers to support the human resource and skills capacity. This indicates that human resources and skills shortage is a challenge in the office of the premier. This view is posted by **OoP3** with an understanding that shortage of human resource capacity within the Gauteng Office of the Premier necessitates the appointment of service providers to add on the capacity of warm bodies that will assist in carrying out the required performance objectives.

"…that's why if we have a budget, we get those service providers to augment our own human resource capacity" (**OoP3**).

4.1.2 Comparison of research results to other similar studies

The empirical results presented under section 4.1.1 are totally different to the results of the identified similar studies presented in section 2.3 of this paper (gap analysis). The results of this paper found out that the organisational structure poses a serious challenge to the performance of the Gauteng Office of the Premier unlike Diedericks (2017) who argues that performance challenges are interlinked to four element which are namely, Strategic planning and performance management, performance reporting auditing of performance as well as monitoring and evaluating performance. reporting, Similarly, Khunoethe et al (2021) argues that performance requires the alignment of three elements to be achieved, which are namely the strategic objectives in the Integrated Development Plan (IDP), Key Performance Areas (KPA's) and Performance indicators (PI's). None of the studies pointed to the organisational structure as a challenge affecting the government performance.

4.2 Challenges of managing performance information in the Gauteng Office of the Premier

Section 4.2 presents research findings to answer the second research question that is "What are the challenges of managing performance information in the Gauteng Office of the Premier?". In doing so this section is divided into two subsections. The first subsection focuses on responding to the question using three themes that is (i) Managing performance information, (ii) Challenges of managing performance information and (iii) Challenges of aligning budget to performance priorities. While the second subsection compares previous similar studies (already indicated in section 2.3) to the findings of this study. By comparing we are not analysing but simply stating the similarities and differences.

4.2.1 Response to research question 2

4.2.1.1 Theme 1: Managing performance information

All respondents have provided an understanding of the management of performance information within the Gauteng office of the Premier. This was done through the identification and discussion of several performance management tools and systems used to manage performance information. The tools and systems amongst other include Annual Performance Plan, Operational Plan, Performance agreement, Strategy and Operational Support Unit, Demand Plan, Budget, and automated system called Monitoring and Evaluation Made Simple (MERMS). The first overarching performance information management tool is the Annual Performance Plan used to outline output indicators as part of the predetermined objectives of a particular financial year. Two respondents have a common view that the Annual Performance plan is the first point of call for managing performance information.

> *"The first point of call is the Annual Performance Plan. Is the minimum we must meet. The targets that have been put there and that's the minimum that we must do because it's linked to peoples performance contracts"* (**OoP2**).

> *"…So, the first thing one would look at is the annual performance plans"* (**OoP4**).

There is an understanding that the Annual Performance Plan is interlinked to the Operational Plan that is used to track the operational activities. For instance, **OoP4**

states that *"using the deliverables per quarter and then tracking them to see that you have achieved what you have outlined from your APP and your Operational Plan up to a monthly and weekly target, that is how we operate"*. Similarly, **OoP6** shares the same view that performance management is done at the operational level, and it starts by planning the expected deliverable. *"Operational planning in terms of saying what is the key deliverable that is expected and what are the outcomes or output that I would need to deliver"*.

Once the office of the Premier has outlined their plans through the Annual Performance Plans and Annual Operational Plans, there is a need to continuously provide progress reports as indicated by **OoP 8** that "*if you've got a quarterly report that you must submit, you submit that report quarterly, but the relationship between the employee and the supervisor is continuing throughout the year. You can have weekly and monthly reports so that you don't lose track of what your employees are doing"*. Similarly, the progress reports package the performance information into evidence that will show case the performance of a specific period. This further indicate the process of performance management from planning, reporting and provision and compilation of evidence. This idea is more evident in the words of OoP 9 who states that "*Performance information will be in form of development of reports as evidence that shows that we have performed in a specific area. So we usually draw on reports from departments"*.

Furthermore, two respondents highlighted that the Gauteng Office of the Premier institutionalised a unit namely "Strategy and Operational Support" (SOS) which is responsible for overall management and reporting of performance information. This is more evident in the words of **OoP 1** who mentions that *"the Strategy and Operational Support Unit remind us to say, look, are you still on track? Do you think that you can still achieve your objectives? If not, why do you think you cannot achieve such objectives?"*. This indicates that the office of the Premier manages performance information through the SOS unit and ensures that the organisational performance is centrally consolidated to provide an overall picture of the office performance.

> *"Information is consolidated and analysed at high level within SOS to provide an overall picture of how the office of the premier is performing"* **(OoP5)**.

Similarly, the two respondents also states that the process of managing performance information is automated and done through the system called MERMS. For instance,

> *"…One will have to populate such information or performance report on the system called MERMS"* (**OoP1**).

> *"We report performance on a quarterly basis through the automated MERMS system"* (**OoP5**).

However, there are different views that are not pointing to either the Annual Performance Plan, Operational plans or MERMS system as tools used to manage performance. This is evident in one camp that suggests that management of performance information is linked to performance agreements. For instance, **OoP2** holds a view that only deliverables that are linked to performance agreements are prioritised and managed and this has been the culture *"for the longest time, that's what we usually stick to because it's linked to peoples performance contracts"*. This provides an idea that only specific performance information that is linked to performance contracts is managed.

> *"Specific services are delivered coming down to the issue of performance agreement"* (**OoP6**).

The second camp mentions that there are 3 interlinked tools of managing performance information which are (i) Operational plans (ii) Budget (iii) Demand Plan. One suggests that the three tools are intertwined and work systematically to manage performance information. **OoP3** explains the link below:

> *"We have about 3 tools, the operational plan, we have the budget, we have the demand and procurement plan. So those are the tools that I used to manage performance information. If I have a budget of R10 000 and in my demand plan, I say each quarter will be spending R2500, it then needs to link to the operational activities in the operational plan. I need to states in the operational plan how I am going to use this money, right? for example, in the demand plan I then say how am I going to procure these things"* (**OoP3**).

4.2.1.2 Theme 2: Challenges of managing performance information.

All respondents identified challenges that contribute to the management of performance information within the Gauteng Office of the Premier. The challenges rage from the processes of data collection, duplication of request for performance information, non-availability of performance information, performance information evidence, timely performance information, specialised services, non-compliance to reporting, dependency and procurement challenges.

Three respondents have a common understanding that the process of data collection to inform performance poses a challenge on the management of performance information. This is more evident in the words of **OoP 5** who points out the challenge of manual data collection as follows: *"the manual way at which data is been collected provides room for error and I want to believe that since we have tried to automate tools it would then make it a bit easier and accurate in terms of analysis".* Similarly, the manual way of working indicated that there is no central systematic way of collecting data to a point that the is a central point of data storage that will be used by anyone who requires information within the Gauteng office of the premier. Therefore, the absence of the central data information centre leads to duplication of data collection processes, for instance **OoP 3** mentioned that *"Risk management will come and ask me something that is the same as what MERMS is asking me for".*

Furthermore, a similar concern was raised by another respondents on challenges relating to data collection that sometimes the custodians of the information are non-responsive to requests. Therefore, this gave an idea that one cannot manage performance information that is not available.

> *"Sometimes there's a challenge in collecting performance information, so meaning that for you to assess performance, you need to have information available or made available to you. So, in some instance you find that you don't get the specific or necessary performance information to be able to assess and report on performance information overall"* (**OoP6**).

Different views were posed by seven respondents relating to other challenges that affects the management of performance information. This is evident that managing performance information can be affected by different contributors. For instance, one

respondent holds the view that the timing of receiving performance information from stakeholders is a challenge that affects real-time decision-making processes. This was more evident by **OoP 2** who stated that "*After 30 days you would find that it's the time when we can only write the report and access the data, but at that time the information is so old we have moved to another quarter, and you are basically telling the executive old news. So, timing of data, timing of information is a big challenge that we have".*

This provided a view that the reporting period is misaligned to the presentation period where performance information is analysed and prepared in real time. However, the meetings scheduled to present the reports are scheduled to take place more later resulting in delayed reporting. This proves that there is a lag between reporting and presentation.

Another one respondents points out a different view that it is difficult to manage performance information of specialised services that Office of the Premier is providing. The argument is that if there is no participation from specialised sector then there will be no performance information to manage. For instance, **OoP 4** mentions that *"a lot of this depends on the service that you are rendering, so in particular with us as transformation, we are dealing with the communities, so lack of people attending meetings or lack of communication could hinder your deliverables"*. This is more like having to depend on someone else to be able to perform. This is evidence enough that the work of the office of the premier is dependent on its stakeholders and thus if stakeholders are not showing interest, then it automatically becomes a performance challenge to the office of the Premier. This is more evident in one of the respondents who mentions that it's difficult to manage the performance information that has dependencies

> *"The other main challenges is you find that we have deliverables where you rely on external factors or external stakeholders which are difficult to manage because reliance on external stakeholders can contribute to poor performance because some of the deliverables are really out of your control"* (**OoP8**).

4.2.1.3 Theme 3: Challenges of aligning budget to performance priorities

There are budget alignment processes established in the Gauteng office of the Premier. For instance, one respondent mentions that the Office of the premier institutionalised

the Finance unit to guide and ensure the alignment of budget to priorities. This is more evident in words of **OoP5** who mention that *"finance would want to know exactly how you want to spend this money and under which priority is this money that you are requesting for. So that alignment is always there, and I think it's an area of continuous improvement"*. The fact that this process is an area that requires improvement, indicates that there are challenges in aligning budget to priorities.

Two respondents share a common view that the challenge of aligning budget to priorities is affected by the unplanned priorities that are expected to be funded during the financial year. For instance, **OoP4** indicates that *"There are things that comes in where you might have to fund something that is not on your line item"*. This indicates that the unplanned priorities are likely not going to be funded because the budget is already allocated for the planned priorities. Sometimes it becomes difficult to acquire budget to fund the new priorities. Therefore, this causes misalignment of budget to priorities because one will have more priorities with less budget. In most cases the new emerging priorities that are not funded are a result of decisions made by the executive.

> *"you have priorities that are, never communicated from the beginning of the financial year, and you cannot blame anyone. In quarter two or quarter three, the premier decides that this is the new priority and I need change management on board. You are then expected to appoint the service provider. So you never planned for it in the first place. So it might be difficult to even acquire budget"* (**OoP1**).

Similarly, other two respondents points out similar challenges that affects budget alignment to priorities which falls within two categories. One being the market analysis and second being spatial referencing. On Market analysis, the respondents mention that it is a challenge to acquire budget and align it to priorities when you do not know the market offer/price. For instance, **OoP2** mentions that *"what affects us mostly in terms of the budget is when we have to go to the market because for all of our evaluations, we go to market, but we don't know what the response will be"*. Similarly, on the spatial referencing it's difficult to align the budget to priorities that are located within previously disadvantaged areas that do not have business or service providers that are required by the state. This is more evident in the words of **OoP3**:

> *"There are big challenges, and those challenges are historical. So, you give me a budget of R100 000 and then you say, in that budget of R100 000 according to the preferential*

procurement policy you need to have spent a certain amount in the townships, right? Now the state has never capacitated those townships to have those services or products and as result you will find those products in a certain demographic. Now if I send out my terms of references through Request for Quotation (RFQ) for example, I find that the people that are responding according to technical evaluation are the people that are not historically disadvantaged" (**OoP3**).

There are also different perspectives on the challenges of aligning budget to priorities. For instance, one respondent mentions that the office of the premier excludes the strategic planning process from the demand planning process which therefore contributes to the overall misalignment of budgets to the plans of the office. This is more evident in the words of **OoP7** who states that *"when a strategic planning takes place at the office of the Premier, I have never had a situation whereby the supply chain management unit, through demand management, is part of the strategic planning and that is exactly where the misalignment between the budget and the requirements is actually happening"*. This view indicates that strategic planning process does not consider the supply chain management processes of how the strategies will be funded and aligned to budget allocations. However, one respondent holds a different view that even though the office can align its budget to the priorities, the challenge of spending the allocated budget remains. This is with reference to the tedious and red tape processes of supply chain management. For instance, **OoP8** mentions that *"So you still have to go through various stages. Sometimes you go through a tender process, then the Bid Evaluation Committee (BEC) does not sit. Evaluation will sit for three months but at the end of the day, they won't be able to recommend the service provider"*.

4.2.2 Comparison of research results to other similar studies

The empirical results presented under section 4.2.1 above have similarities to the findings that were presented Diedericks (2017) & Khunoethe et al (2021) (section 2.3). For instance, Diedericks (2017) found out that the Limpopo provincial government has challenges in performance management and challenges in reporting predetermined objectives. These challenges are similar our empirical results that found out that office of the premier has challenges of managing performance in areas of reporting. However, it is different when it come to budget. The office of the premier has a challenge of aligning budget to priorities while Diedericks (2017) highlights that the Limpopo provincial government has a challenge of budget cuts resulting to insufficient budget.

Similarly, Ndevu (2019) highlights the problem of budget constraints by finding out that all aspects of the fundamentals service delivery are included in the IDP and the budgets and are limited because of the low revenue base of the municipality. This indicates the alignment of budget and priorities however the difference to our findings is that it does not highlight challenges of aligning the budget.

Further, Khunoethe et al (2021) findings that performance requires the alignment of three elements to be achieved, which are namely the strategic objectives in the Integrated Development Plan (IDP), Key Performance Areas (KPA's) and Performance indicators (PI's) are different from our findings which emphasises that performance requires the alignment of 6 tools to be achieved namely Annual Performance Plan, Operational Plan, Performance agreement, Strategy and Operational Support Unit, Demand Plan, Budget, and automated system called Monitoring and Evaluation Made Simple (MERMS).

4.3 Challenges affecting the implementation of Government Wide Monitoring and Evaluation (GWM&E) System in the Gauteng Office of the Premier to achieve predetermined objectives?

Section 4.3 presents research findings to answer the third research question that is "What are the challenges affecting the implementation of Government Wide Monitoring and Evaluation (GWM&E) System in Gauteng Office of the Premier to achieve predetermined objectives?". In doing so this section is divided into two subsections. The first subsection focuses on responding to the question using two themes that is (i) Implementation of monitoring and evaluation systems and (ii) Challenges of stakeholder dependency affecting the implementation of Monitoring and Evaluation systems. While the second subsection compares previous similar studies (already indicated in section 2.3) to the findings of this study. By comparing we are not analysing but simply stating the similarities and differences.

4.3.1 Response to research question 3

4.3.1.1 Theme 1: Implementation of monitoring and evaluation systems

All respondents have shared their knowledge about the existence of the monitoring and evaluation systems in the Gauteng office of the Premier. Two respondents mentioned that the is an overarching automated monitoring and evaluation system that monitors

the entire Gauteng office of the Premier's performance information. The system is referred to as Monitoring and Evaluation System Made Simple (MERMS).

> *"We also have MERMS that is sending reminders and that is the only formal electronic system we have"* (**OoP2**).

> *"We report performance on a quarterly basis through the automated MERMS system"* (**OoP5**).

Although the respondents shared their experience about the existence of the electronic monitoring and evaluation systems, it is evident that the office does not rely on a single system for monitoring and evaluation but multiple systems beyond the electronic system. For instance, two respondents also mentioned that the office institutionalised a unit called Strategy and Operational Support (SOS) which is responsible for the coordination of monitoring and evaluation as well as the operations of the MERMS system that allows different internal directorates to report quarterly performance. **OoP6** states that "*I can make an example with one of our directorates (SOS) that it is also there to monitor the performance"*. Similarly, **OoP5** states that *"information is consolidated and analysed at high level within SOS to provide an overall picture of how the office of the premier is performing"*.

Interlinked to the MERMS system and SOS unit stated above, is the Annual Performance Plan that is also used as the monitoring and evaluation tool. For instance, **OoP4** states that *"we have the APP which is the monitoring tool that one works with"*. This indicates that the units within the Gauteng office of the premier are bind by the predetermined objectives in the Annual Performance Plan and they serve as a guide to measure performance achievement and non-achievement. For instance, **OoP2** indicates that *"each directorate works according to what is on the APP. So, the APP basically becomes a guide of what is required and when"*.

There seems to be opposing views from different camps of our respondents. One respondent mentioned that the systems of monitoring and evaluation are sourced from the service provider and not available within the Gauteng Office of the Premier. This is more evident in the words of **OoP3** who indicates that *"So my monitoring division has the opportunity to get a service provider that monitors communication output, or rather the impact of*

communication output". The second opposing view emanates from another respondent who states that there are governance structures established as part of the system of monitoring and evaluating the work of the Gauteng Office of the premier and this is more evident in the words of **OoP 6** who states that *"overall in the department we have different structures that can be there to monitor performance management. I would say your management structures, whether it's in the form of Executive Council (EXCO), or Executive Management Team (EMT) those are the structures"*. The last opposing views mentions that the office of the premier is guided by the monitoring framework from national departments.

> *"We use an M&E framework designed by the DPSA that looks at how you come up with what informs your key deliverables and it's an M&E framework that has about 8 building blocks that we plug in whenever we monitor and evaluate the framework of employee health and Wellness in the province"* (**OoP9**).

4.3.1.2 Theme 2: Challenges of stakeholder participation affecting the implementation of Monitoring and Evaluation systems

All respondents have a view that there are challenges that affects the monitoring and evaluation systems identified in the above theme (Section 4.3.1.1). However, all the challenges relate to stakeholder participation. There seems to be a common view that stakeholder participation has a negative impact on the role of the Gauteng office of the premier as an oversight office responsible for monitoring and evaluation. For instance, the office of the premier is not an implementing office but an oversight office that relies on other departments to execute the work that can be monitored using monitoring and evaluation systems. This is more evident with **OoP3** who gives context on the monitoring and evaluation of the state of the province address:

> *"Stakeholder dependency has a negative impact because remember the state of the province address is our road map annually. The state of the province address is written within the office of the Premier, but we are not service department, we will need service departments to implement on our behalf and we will then monitor the performance"* (**OoP3**).

This indicates that stakeholder dependency affects the implementation of monitoring and evaluation systems with the idea that systems are available to monitor and evaluate

however, the challenge becomes stakeholder participation. For instance, **OoP4** highlights that *"things that can halt is when you're not having a good relationship and the civil Society would just turn the blind eye on you and you would then end up having issues and problems"*. This indicates that the effectiveness of the monitoring and evaluation systems is reliant on stakeholder participation. For instance, **OoP5** indicates that *"It is actually a bit difficult to rely on various stakeholders to perform in a sense that other department are not doing what they are supposed to do and it impacts on the compliance of performance monitoring and evaluation systems which affects my performance"*. Similarly, this is the same challenge that exist internally within the Gauteng office of the premier where internal stakeholders or units are not complying with the systems put in place to ensure the monitoring and evaluation of preferential procurement targets.

> *"For us to be able to achieve certain set of objectives in terms of the preferential procurement spend, we depend on branches to submit their procurement request on time, which will give the supply chain management unit enough time to channel those procurement transactions. If we are to receive submissions late, then it does not actually give us time to process the payments. Now our backs are pressed against the actual delivery of the service versus ticking all the boxes so that we avoid creating noncompliance issues"* (**OoP7**).

Furthermore, on the challenges of stakeholder participation in monitoring and evaluation systems, **OoP1** also added that "*stakeholders are not cooperative, they are not attending the scheduled meetings"*. Similarly, **OoP2** highlights that "*There are times when we must beg and beg, particularly because some request will be last minute"*. This indicates that it is mandated that the office of the premier must monitor and evaluate stakeholders, however it is also difficult to do so when monitoring and evaluation systems are used to request information urgently or within limited timeframe.

> *"For example, they will say EXCO wants to know what is being done in this particular Township, you'll find that it's a human settlements thing and you must contact human settlements and then you find that the people are not responsive and things like that and because it's a last-minute thing and it was not a planned thing"* (**OoP2**).

Furthermore, respondents mentioned that there is duplication of efforts in the implementation of monitoring and evaluation systems between stakeholders and the Gauteng office of the premier. For instance, **OoP6** states that *"the is duplication of initiatives and you find that there is stakeholders that are planning for monitoring and evaluation systems on this side and the is stakeholders that are planning for monitoring and evaluation systems on the other side."*. This indicates that monitoring and evaluation system within the Gauteng Provincial government are not integrated to work together to manage and avoid systems duplications.

> *"Sometimes there's duplication of efforts"* (**OoP9**).

4.3.2 Comparison of research results to other similar studies

The empirical results presented under section 4.3.1 above have been different from similar studies were presented under our gap analysis (section 2.3). Our findings have pointed out that stakeholder participation remains to be a challenge affecting performance as well as the implementation of monitoring and evaluation system. Further there is a difference in the identification monitoring and evaluation tools. For instance, Khunoethe et al (2021) points to the Integrated Development plan while our findings point to the Annual Performance Plan as one of the monitoring and evaluation tools. This difference could be that the IDP is a system used to plan and monitor plans at the municipal level while the APP is used at the Provincial and National sphere of governance.

Furthermore, Diedericks (2017) point to the finalisation and submission of the APP as a challenge while our findings point to the challenge of Stakeholder participation. Similarly, Ndevu (2019) presented that there is a lack of stakeholder participation motivated by power dominance of political leaders and those who are in power. However, this is different from our findings that points out that stakeholders themselves are noncompliant to attend meetings, cause duplication as well as dependency of stakeholders that affect performance and M&E systems.

4.4 Key components of the logical model affecting the performance of the Gauteng Office of the Premier

Section 4.3 presents research findings to answer the fourth research question that is "What key components of the logical model affect the performance of the Gauteng Office of the Premier?". In doing so this section is divided into two subsections. The first subsection focuses on responding to the question using four themes that is (i) Office of the Premier priorities affecting performance (ii) Tools of trade challenges, (iii) Governance Structures challenges and (iv) Evidence based performance. While the second subsection compares previous similar studies (already indicated in section 2.3) to the findings of this study. By comparing we are not analysing but simply stating the similarities and differences.

4.4.1 Response to research question 4

4.4.1.1 Theme 1: Office of the Premier priorities affecting performance.

All respondents have an understanding that the office of the premier established provincial priorities that must be achieved. Although there is an understanding of the existence of the priorities, there seems to be a confusion on the implementation of the priorities. The first camp of respondents mention that the priorities are clear, the second camp mention that the priorities are not clear and not simplified to enable them to deliver on their performance while the third camp of respondents mention that the priorities are difficult to implement because of the buildings that are not accessible.

Based on the first camp, three respondents share a common view that the Gauteng Office of the Premier priorities are clear enough to simplify individual performance. For instance, **OoP3** mentions that *"I'm focusing on townships, informal settlements, Hostels and all of those are very clear"*. Similarly, **OoP7** have shared common views by stating that *"when it comes to the development of a Township enterprises, it's actually give us an indication of what it is expected from us and how do we go in achieving it*". This is an indication that understanding the priorities of the organisation simplifies individual performance and ultimately contribute to the overall performance of the organisation.

> *"we have the new elevated priorities. So I think for me they are clear enough to say now in my own performance individual what is it that I have to keep in mind in terms of the*

priorities and at an organisational performance level, what is it that I need to do to contribute to these priorities" (**OoP6**).

Contrary to above camp, the second camp of respondents mentions that the priorities are not clear and simplified to enable the performance of individuals and the organisation. For instance, three respondents have a common view that the priorities are not clear. **OoP2** mentions that *"the Growing Gauteng Together priorities are not that clear on what role we play as Performance Monitoring and Evaluation Unit and it's a very big problem"*. Similarly, the lack of clarity and simplicity of priorities contributes to the confusion of responsibilities between different units in the Gauteng office of the premier. This is more evident with **OoP1** who indicates that "*the priority seems to be from two units such as integrity management unit and my unit. Both units apply to the priority. So, you need to craft it to a point that removes any form of confusion or duplications. So, it must be as clear as concise as possible"*. Furthermore, **OoP9** points out that the is a need to simplify the priorities so that employees and the organisation can be able to deliver on them.

"I think there could be an effort to ensure that the priorities are being simplified so that people can understand what their role is in providing strategic support and strengthening the capacity of the state to deliver. To explain what it means exactly in simple terms and how can each business unit contribute to ensure that provincial priorities are met" (**OoP9**).

In addition, this could be the challenge of interpretating the priorities for meaning in different units, for instance **OoP5** mentions that "*the issue then becomes the interpretation, innovation and activities to deliver on the priorities"*.

The third and last camp points out that even if effort can made to clarify and simplify the priorities, the challenges of implementing them remains to be a problem. The priorities are impossible to implement due to the environmental barriers such as inaccessible buildings. For instance, respondents mentions that the priorities are difficult to implement concerning persons with disabilities. The environment is not accessible to unable employees with disabilities to implement the priorities of the office.

"There are things that in terms of achieving those things as a person with a disability is hindering ones service delivery. Certain places that one needs to go and have an oversight is not accessible as well" (**OoP4**).

Ultimately the challenge of implementing the priorities can be attributed to the role of the Office of the Premier as an oversight department considering that the office of the premier does not provide service delivery and relies on the departments to achieve the provincial priorities. For instance, **OoP8** mentions that *"We are not an implementing department, but we are a providing support to department henceforth our work is more transversal just to make sure that departments are delivering on what they are supposed to deliver"*.

4.4.1.2 Theme 2: Tools of trade challenges

All respondents acknowledged that the tools of trade are available within the Gauteng Office of the premier however, they are either insufficient or irrelevant to assist them to fully deliver on their objectives. Employees use old versions of laptops and most importantly they do not have office building that can accommodate the entire staff establishment. Three respondents mentioned that they are expected to perform their work using old and outdated laptops. For instance, **OoP4** mentions that *"lots of the colleagues do not have the proper tools of trades such as laptops and they have old machines"*. Similarly, this is the same view shared by **OoP9** *"Our laptops are old and some of them are damaged"*. This indicates that employees are affected by lack of laptops to carry out the required work.

> *"…even basic things like laptop we are all just very affected by the lack of availability of those and we have just been suffering basically on this"* (**OoP2**).

Different views have been shared as well relating to the tools of trade namely, office space and parking. Respondent shared the idea that the office of the premier struggles with office space to accommodate its employees. **OoP4** states that *"Currently we do not have office space"* and this could mean that employees are always physically absent at work

> *"…that's why we have many problems that we have in the office of the Premier right now with people not having a building. As much as you would think those are political issues, but those are the components that make up an employee to work hard, you can go to anyone and ask why you are not working then they will come with an excuse that says I do not have parking at the office"* (**OoP3**).

Similarly, the employees with disabilities are limited when it comes to work transportation. Respondent have mentioned that it is difficult to obtain work cars as an employee with a disability in case there are external meetings that must attended. This is more evident in the words of **OoP4** who has the view that *"when one needs to go to a meeting or you have an event for the entire week, we struggle to get transportation that will carry our colleagues to meetings"*. Furthermore, another different view was highlighted by respondents that the lack of automated systems as part of tools of trade affects their performance because the nature of the work that they are doing is more specialised and requires systems to be done.

> *"For instance, if you are going to conduct investigations as part of the work of integrity management you need access to certain systems, but we don't have access to those systems"* (**OoP8**).

4.4.1.3 Theme 3: Governance Structures challenges

Respondents have classified the governance structures into internal and external structures. Broad Management Team (BMT) and Executive Management Team (EMT) forms part of the internal structures while the Executive Council, Provincial Audit Committee (PAC) and Oversight Committee on Premier's Office and Legislature (OCPOL) are external governance structures.

> *"I think overall in the department we have different structures that can be there to monitor performance management. I would say your management structures, whether it's in the form of EXCO, EMT, BMT, PAC or OCPOL those are the structures"* (**OoP6**).

Based on the two classifications, there are conflicting views on how these structures influence the performance of the Office of the Premier. One camp suggest that internal structures are ineffective while the other camp suggest that the external structures are more effective in influencing performance. On the forma (internal structures) respondents provided a sense that the mandate of the internal governance structures (BMT & EMT) needs to be reviewed to influence performance of the Office of the Premier because currently it seems like it is not doing so. For instance, **OoP1** states that *"if you're to sit down and analyse it thoroughly, really such governance structures need a serious relook, a serious restructuring so that they can begin to function much better in terms of the intended APP's or*

whatever strategic objectives that we have in this department". Similarly, common views where shared as follows:

> *"So the current agenda of BMT and EMT is not geared to address the issues on the ground and I think it's more internally focused in the Gauteng office of the premier as oppose to looking both internally and transversally in the Gauteng provincial government"* (**OoP5**).

Similarly, respondents also share a common view that there is a lack of professionalism and personality differences affecting the effectiveness of the internal governance structures to influence performance of the office of the premier. **OoP2** states that *"some of us are not necessarily professionals but some public officials are politicians in their professional space"*. Similarly, **OoP9** shares a common view relating to professionalism and work ethic as follows *"I think even at that level they are not seeing eye to eye and not supporting one another. So, I think in terms of management, they're not pulling in the same direction. If they were, we would see a different office of the premier today"*.

Contrary to internal governance structures, different views have been shared by respondents relating to external governance structures. For instance, multiple respondents hold the view that only external structures (OCPOL and PAC) influences performance of the office of the Premier. In this case **OoP4** indicates that *"OCPOL were the office of the Premier reports to, all of these reports are checked from governance to service delivery to your targeted groups, to your budgets and all of that"*. This is a similar argument about the PAC governance structure which **OoP7** vouches for by stating that *"The audit committee has aided the organization to achieve its performance objectives in a sense that it pushes the office to ensure compliance with the expectations of the public financial management act"*.

4.4.1.4 Theme 4: Evidence to support performance.

Respondents are of the view that evidence-based reporting affects the Gauteng Office of the Premier in a positive way and there seems to be a view that employees welcome the use of evidence to inform decision making on whether what was set to be achieved is achieved or not based on the supporting evidence. For instance, **OoP3** indicated that *"evidence-based reporting is always positive, because at least then it's an objective account of what had*

happened in relation to whether we have performed or underperformed". Similarly, **OoP4** shares the same view by stating that *"you must have evidence to say that you have achieved, or you have not achieved, that's your tool to show the result to say yes, I am working or not. So, evidence basis is very critical"*.

> *"I think it's something that you can use to track my performance because if I say I have achieved so much that must be backed by evidence"* (**OoP8**).

A different view was pointed out by another respondent stating the challenge linked with evidence. For instance, **OoP5** mentions that the lack of human resource capacity affects the verification of evidence. This gives a sense that even though evidence is produced to support performance, the quality assurance of evidence is still a major problem because there is insufficient human resource capacity to verify the quality of evidence.

> *"There is room for everyone to verify what has been stated in the report but that also goes with capacity and what we find as gap is that there is no human capacity to interrogate the evidence"* (**OoP5**).

4.4.2 Comparison of research results to other similar studies

The results of this study for theme 4 are similar to Diedericks (2017) who found that evidence is required to substantiate performance. Our findings under theme 4 also pointed that evidence-based reporting is positive a measure to verify that work has been carried out. However, theme 3 of our findings is different to Ndevu (2019) who argue that organisational performance challenges are related to elected administrative leaders and they also have direct and indirect relation to political factionalism and power relations. Our theme 3 pointed to the governance structures as compared to administrative leaders having influence on performance. Furthermore, none of the similar studies pointed that we have identified in our knowledge gap (section 2.3) pointed to the challenges of misunderstanding organisational priorities and the absence of tools of trade in the organisation to enable performance.

5 DISCUSSION OF RESEARCH FINDINGS

The focus and purpose of this research is to assess the challenges in attaining the predetermined organisational performance objectives in the Gauteng Office of the Premier. This chapter will discuss the findings of this research and in doing so, the chapter is motivated by Wotela (2018) approach of interpreting research findings through interpretative frameworks and in the case of this research are (i) Bureaucracy theory, (ii) Government management frameworks, (iii) Government Wide Monitoring and Evaluation (GWM&E) framework and (iv) programme logical model. Wotela (2018) approach also motivates that interpretation of the empirical research results should align with the discussion of research findings. It is in this regard that the findings of this research are aligned to chapter 4 above and are also situated within the context of the research conceptualisation with key aspects drawn from (i) Physical setting (section 2.1) (ii) problem analysis (section 2.2), (iii) knowledge gap analysis (section 2.3) (iv)the inclusion of organisational performance studies (section 2.4) and its identified attributes (section 2.5) and lastly, (v)the interpretative frameworks (2.6). The discussion of assessing challenges in attaining predetermined organisational performance objectives in the Gauteng Office of the Premier is divided into four themes aligned to research questions and interpretative frameworks as follows:

- Organisational structure challenges affecting the Gauteng office of the Premiers performance in attaining predetermined objectives
- Challenges of managing performance information in the Gauteng Office of the Premier
- Challenges affecting the implementation of Government Wide Monitoring and Evaluation (GWM&E) System in the Gauteng Office of the Premier to achieve predetermined objectives?
- Key components of the logical model affecting the performance of the Gauteng Office of the Premier

5.1 Organisational structure challenges affecting the Gauteng office of the Premiers performance in attaining predetermined objectives

The Gauteng office of the Premier challenges in attaining predetermined objectives can be assessed through the application of bureaucracy theory coined by Max Weber during the late 90th century as pointed out in section 2.6.1 of this research. Weber (1978) & Dolan & Rosenbloom (2003) situate the description and performance of bureaucracy

within the boundaries of six characteristics, which are namely, (a) Specialisation of task, (b) Hierarchy, (c) Rules, (d) Formality, (e) Impersonal and personal indifferences, (f) Career orientation. However, this research found out that only two of the six characteristics poses a challenge to performance of the Gauteng office of the premier namely (i) Formal rules and (iii) Specialisation of task of the structure.

5.1.1 Formal rules

Weber (1978) refers to formal rules as the guidelines that dictate how things should be done. With reference to this definition to assess the challenges of Gauteng office of the Premier in attaining predetermined objectives I can clearly argue that the Gauteng Office of the premier did not follow the guidelines and formal rules that dictate how their organisational structure should be designed to perform the required objectives of the office. For instance, the findings pointed out that the current organisational structure is not approved by the Department of Public Service and Administration (DPSA) which is the department that lays out the blueprint and rules of how the government department structures should be designed. This indicates that the Gauteng office of the Premier organisational structure is not approved as a suitable structure to administer the functions and performance of the Gauteng office of the Premier.

When an organisation like the Gauteng office of the Premier does not have an approved organisational structure, it poses performance challenges in attaining predetermined objectives. Looking at the role of the Gauteng office of the Premier, it has an administrative role to oversee the performance of provincial departments in achieving the broader provincial priorities and objectives (Diedericks, 2017). However, I can argue that it is not possible to do so if the structure is not approved and aligned to the rules set out by the DPSA. The workflow of government is designed to contribute to a common goal and henceforth the design of organisational structure is centralised in DPSA to ensure that departments like the Gauteng Office of the Premier perform against its predetermined objectives to contribute to the bigger picture.

Similarly, scholars of organisational performance agree that organisational structure has an influence on organisational performance and henceforth I argue that the Gauteng office of the premier unapproved structure poses a challenge in attaining predetermined objectives. For instance, organisational structure is a workflow of an organization. It is

a relationship between components of an organized whole that enables performance (Ahmady et al., 2016). Furthermore, organisational performance scholars argue that we cannot separate the formality of organisational structure to organisational performance because the two are linked to the strategy of the organisation which serves as the predetermined objective that must be achieved in long term (Marr, 2008 & Ahmady et al, 2016). However, this rule and formality is not the case in the Gauteng Office of the Premier because participants highlighted that the structure does not follow the strategy. The misalignment between the structure and strategy indicates one of the reasons why structure is not approved the DPSA because Ahmady et al, (2016) points out that for organizations to perform and deliver on their plans, the strategy and structure of the organization must be woven together seamlessly. In other words, the Gauteng office of the Premier must align their action plans (strategy) to hierarchy, tasks, and workforce (structure) to achieve its predetermined objectives.

Furthermore, the findings point out that Gauteng office of the premier structure is not fit for purpose, and this could be an indication that DPSA formal rules are not implemented, and the current structure is not aligned to the mandate of the Gauteng office of the Premier to enable performance against predetermined objectives as defined in the constitution. For instance, to develop and implement provincial policies, legislation, and sign bills amongst other constitutional requirements within the jurisdiction of Gauteng Province (South Africa, 1996). This constitutional mandate serves as a predetermined objective for all offices of the Premier in South Africa, however, there is a common sense that the participants feel that the Gauteng Office of the Premier is unique and therefore should be structured different from other offices of the Premier which means that other formal structural rules should not be applicable to them.

This notion rejects the advantage highlighted by Heckscher (1994) who points out that bureaucracy unlike other traditional structures can adapt quickly to changing commands from the top. However, it is not the case in the Office of the Premier because it is not adapting to the recommendations made by the DPSA on how to effectively structure themselves in way that is fit for purpose of achieving their predetermined objectives. However, Weber (1978) highlights that bureaucracy can effectively structure the work

of complex organisations with procedures that allow efficiency and consistent implementation of work by all employees.

5.1.2 Specialisation of task

Participants highlighted that specialisation of tasks is a challenge that contributes to performance challenges in the Gauteng Office of the Premier. Weber (1978) refers to specialisation of tasks as division of labour to promote effectiveness and efficiency. However, this becomes difficult in the Gauteng Office of the Premier because findings point out that the organisational structure is not capacitated enough to provide human resources to attain the predetermined objectives. This a different view to Arabi (2007) who argue that tasks must be divided to determine organisational functions and how to coordinate them. However, this is a challenge in the Office of the Premier because the shortage of human resources does not allow them to divide task.

It is difficult for the employees to achieve bulk of the predetermined objectives, so they rather focus on the objectives that are linked to their performance contracts and neglect any other objectives that are deemed priority and important to the organisation. This has become the culture that eats performance and what Weber (1978) feared that bureaucracy will sow seeds of its our distraction and become a tool for its own downfall. It has become a routine to perform less objective because of lack of human resources. Olsen (2007) refers to this as routine task where in which bureaucracy thrives. Having a lot of tasks to perform without the allocation of human resources results to incomplete performance because there is no sufficient time to attain all the predetermined objectives simultaneously as other predetermined objectives are also expected to be achieved. However, this is not the case as pointed by Dolan & Rosenbloom (2003) that organisations must provide fair amount of division of labour.

The under capacitation of human resources is not a result of the structure design however, the inability to allocate human resources as per the structure design. For instance, there are post that are not being filled but exist on the structure while there are post that have been filled but do not exist on the structure. This causes misalignment between the structure design and placements of human resources. This indicates the abnormalities of the structure and the hinderance to achieve the mandate of the office

of the premier because one needs the human resource capacity to perform the required work.

Furthermore, specialisation of task requires specialised skills which is one of the challenges that has been raised by the participants of the Gauteng office of the premier. Olsen (2007) points out that employees in bureaucracy are appointed and promoted based on merits, tenure, formal education with legal protection against unfair dismissal. Similarly, performance of the organisation in this regard is highly specialised and provides space for growth and learning (Dolan & Rosenbloom, 2003). It becomes difficult to achieve some of the required performance because of shortage of specialised skills. For instance, there is shortage of skills in tender administration and transformation of previously disadvantaged groups. This indicates that the office will always under perform in areas that require specialised skills to be completed. Therefore, this remains to be a challenge that contributes to the attainment of predetermined objectives in the Gauteng Office of the Premier.

Similarly, there seems to be an acknowledgement sourcing service providers to assist in meeting the predetermined objectives, however this is not sustainable because service providers are not permanent dedicated human resources. Diedericks (2017) highlights that there is a challenge of budget cuts in government departments. This can be the case in the Gauteng premier office in future, which might mean that the office will not be able to source service providers. Furthermore, linked to the specialised task, there is also shortage of systems required to assist the office of the premier to perform.

5.2 Challenges of managing performance information in the Gauteng Office of the Premier

The Gauteng office of the Premier challenges in attaining predetermined objectives in this section are assessed through the application of government management frameworks highlighted in section 2.6.2. We deem this framework important because is aligned to our academic field of study and the attribute of enablers.

The process of performance management in the Gauteng office of the Premier is a clear-cut process that is regulated by frameworks on how to manage performance. This frameworks amongst others includes the Public Finance Management Framework Act

of 1999 (PFMA) Framework for Managing Programme Performance Information (FMPPI) and Revised Strategic Framework for Strategic Plans and Annual Performance Plans (Treasury, 1999 & Treasury, 2007 & Diedericks, 2017 & DPME, 2020). The findings indicated that there are tools and system employed within the office to manage performance information. The Monitoring and Evaluation Made Simple (MERMS), Annual Performance Plan, operational Plans, performance agreement and Strategy and Operational unit are responsible for the management of non-financial performance information which indicates that they are bind by the framework for Managing Programme Performance Information (FMPPI) and Revised Strategic Framework for Strategic Plans and Annual Performance Plans (Treasury, 2007 & Diedericks, 2017 & DPME, 2020). This leaves the demand plan, budget and finance office to be regulated by the Public Finance Management Framework Act of 1999. These frameworks are intangible enablers of performance management (Marr, 2008).

Although there is a clear cut of government frameworks, tools, systems, and offices responsible for the management of performance information, I cannot neglect that there are challenges in managing performance information. This indicates that there is a loophole in the frameworks responsible for managing performance information in the Gauteng office of the Premier. For instance, the process of data collection remains to be a challenge for the office of the premier. This refers to the manual way of collecting data for performance information in different units which in most cases create a room for errors and duplication of efforts. The PFMA is only there to ensure that the Gauteng Office of the Premier is bind by rules of transparency, sound management and accountability of expenditure, revenue, liabilities, and assets mean while the FMPPI assist in clarifying standards, definitions, roles, and responsibilities of managing of performance information in government (Treasury, 1999 & Treasury 2007) therefore the process of data collection and duplication of processes is not covered, henceforth the office of the premier experiences challenges of managing performance information to attain predetermined objectives.

Diedricks (2017) argues that the above frameworks are mainly to promote action to achieve statutory obligations. This indicates that they are not there to deal with the processes of data collection and management of data collection duplication. The duplication of data informing performance information that should be managed

indicates that the reporting processes are not streamlined which leads to different units requesting reports on the same performance information that was requested before. This further causes reporting frustrations and non-responsiveness to request of performance information as highlighted by the findings. Therefore, it becomes difficult to manage performance information that has duplications or that cannot be received from custodians of performance defeating the purpose of evaluating and assessing the achievement of predetermined objectives (Ovadje & Aryee, 2019). Similarly, defeating the purpose of examining whether the organisation has done a good job or whether the established indicators and targets have been achieved or not because this is part of performance management to inform organisational performance (Silitonga (2017).

Furthermore, the FMPPI and PFMA provides the reporting timelines for all government departments however there seems to be a challenge when it come to the implementation (Treasury, 1999 & Treasury 2007). Findings highlight that reports that are tabled after 30 days at the end of each quarter, provides outdated performance information. This indicates that Gauteng office of the premier reports retrospective performance information which is also supported by the FMPPI and treasury regulations for reporting performance information (Treasury, 2001 & Treasury, 2007). However, this does not neglect the fact that there is a lag between collection of performance information and the reporting period which affects real time reporting and promotes delayed reporting. Moreover, the span of control on performance information poses a challenge as well because the Gauteng office of the Premier relies on government departments to provide performance information.

There is also an indication that Gauteng office of the Premier is finding it difficult to manage financial performance information. Although the Public Financial Management act of 1999 and the department of Treasury are there to guide the management of financial information, the challenges are unique to the Gauteng office of the Premier. For instance, the unplanned priorities that require budget to be achieved causes the misalignment of budget to priorities. This indicates the lack of budget, planning and non-adherence to frameworks of planning and budgeting. The budgeting and planning cycle of government is very clear that it must be concluded before the beginning of the financial year where plans are submitted and funded (Treasury, 1999 & Treasury 2007). This indicates that plans that do not form part of the planning and budget cycle will not be funded. In the case of the Gauteng Office of the Premier planning is done

continuously and plans emerge without budget which contradicts the planning and budgeting cycle and further leading to misalignment between planning and budgeting.

5.3 Challenges affecting the implementation of Government Wide Monitoring and Evaluation (GWM&E) System in the Gauteng Office of the Premier to achieve predetermined objectives?

The challenges affecting the implementation of Government Wide Monitoring and Evaluation (GWM&E) System in the Gauteng office of the Premier to achieve predetermined objectives are assessed through the GWM&E framework which was officially introduced by the South African government in 2005 (DPME, 2007 & Matsiliza, 2012). I will therefore interrogate the attribute of enablers in a form of stakeholders participation and answer the question of "What are the challenges affecting the implementation of GWM&E System in Gauteng Office of the Premier to achieve predetermined objectives?".

Drawing from enablers as an attribute that I am interrogating and linked to GWM&E framework, I can conclude that monitoring and evaluation systems are enablers of performance to help achieve predetermined objectives. Similarly, Marr (2008) points out that enablers are resources employed to achieve the organisational mandate. It is with this reference that the findings were able to point out available monitoring and evaluation systems as enablers that align to the GWM&E framework and its implementation to enable performance against predetermined objectives.

Engela & Ajam (2010) points out that the GWM&E framework assists government departments to define functions of M&E and develop systems that will detect early warnings, collect data, verify, analyse, and report. This research was able to do so by identifying several monitoring and evaluation systems that follow the function of M&E and help collect data, verify, and report it. This includes, the automated monitoring and evaluation system called MERMS, the Strategy and Operational Support Unit, the Annual Performance Plan (APP), Service providers and governance structures. These are classified as tangible and intangible enablers because they are assets to the Gauteng Office of the Premier to monitor and evaluate performance against predetermined objectives (Marr, 2008).

The above systems of monitoring and evaluation aligned to the GWM&E framework are good working systems however the findings of this research point out that stakeholders participation is affecting the implementation of this systems. Due to the stakeholders influence on the organisational performance of the Gauteng Office of the Premier, it is befitting to classify stakeholders under tangible enablers of performance. Tangible assets are physical assets of the organisation including employees and stakeholders of the organisation (Mwai, Namada, Katuse, 2018 & Marr, 2008). The challenge of stakeholder participation in implementing the monitoring and evaluation system indicate that the decentralisation of functions across the three government spheres exposes the weakness of GWM&E system and makes it difficult for GWM&E to prevent fragmentation and institutionalisation of strong M&E systems that promotes coordination of performance information (DPME, 2007).

Similarly, stakeholders who are supposed to be the enablers of implementing monitoring and evaluation systems are not effectively and efficiently doing so. This therefore renders the systems redundant and undermines the efforts made by the GWM&E as defined by Van der Waldt (2015) & Cloete (2009) that GWM&E is there for government to integrate M&E standards and practices to inspire confidence and good practices of government M&E. This is clearly not the understanding of Gauteng Office of the Premier's stakeholders as the findings pointed out that the standard and practice of using monitoring and evaluation systems to report is influenced by relationships to determine cooperation or non-cooperation to GWM&E frameworks. This is also supported by Marr (2006) & Vyas-Doorgapersad et al (2013) who argues that lack of collaboration affects systematic relationship between various components of government departments.

The findings of this research indicates that the absence and non-participation of stakeholders or stakeholder dependency can negatively affect the implementation of GWM&E systems. This can be attributed to the administrative role of the Gauteng office of the Premier which states that it is responsible for overseeing Provincial performance which means it relies on departments to implement provincial mandate (Diedericks, 2017). This indicates that office of the premier is not a service department but an oversight department which waits for departments to report performance using the GWM&E systems to determine the achievements. Similarly, While Cloete (2009)

argues that GWM&E provides the advantage of spelling out the responsibilities and roles of different government stakeholders, such as National Treasury which is responsible for monitoring budget allocations and expenditure. With the above analysis it fair to argue that the stakeholder dependency undermines the implementation of GWM&E with reference to arguments made by Engela & Ajam (2010) that complex intergovernmental structures with multiple stakeholders exposes the weakness of GWM&E. Furthermore, when the lines of reporting are complex from multiple stakeholders in government there is reasonable amount of the same performance information reported differently from one department (DPME, 2008).

5.4 Key components of the logical model affecting the performance of the Gauteng Office of the Premier

This section will interpret and assess the Gauteng office of the Premier performance challenges using key components of the logical model. The key components of logical model to assess performance include inputs, activities, outputs, and outcome. In doing so I will be subsequently interrogating enablers, outputs and outcomes as part of the attributes of this research and we will also be responding to the fourth research question of this research that is "What key components of the logical model affect the performance of the Gauteng Office of the Premier?". Impact is one component of the logical model that does not affect the Gauteng office of the Premier performance. In presenting the key components below we do so with the sequence of starting with inputs, activities, outputs and outcomes.

5.4.1 Inputs

Inputs and enablers are used interchangeable in the logical model and scholars of organisational performance refers to inputs and enablers as resources (Ongeti & Machuki, 2018 & Marr, 2008). I locate tools of trade as resources used to enable performance. The findings indicated that the Gauteng Office of the premier has a challenge of insufficient tools of trade to be used to attain their predetermined objectives. The tools of trade that were highlighted amongst other includes laptops, office space and parking, transportation, and automated systems. Using the definition of Marr, (2008) that refers to inputs as tangible and intangible resources of an organisation to achieve its mandate, I classify the inputs that affect the performance of the Gauteng Office of the Premier as follows:

Table 3: Tangible and intangible inputs affecting the Gauteng office of the Premier's performance.

Tangible inputs	Intangible inputs
Office space	Operating systems
Parking	
Laptops	

Source: Author

5.4.2 Activities

Organisational performance studies inform us that there is a direct link of inputs to activities (Norad, 1999 & Wotela, 2017). This indicates that once inputs are in place, the next step is to perform task. For instance, Norad (1999) defines activities as tasks that are carried out using the inputs allocated. However due to the insufficient allocation of inputs highlighted above it becomes impossible to perform against predetermined objectives in the Gauteng Office of the Premier. The findings of this research point out that the governance structures have a role to perform activities that will influence the performance of the Gauteng Office of the Premier. However, it was found that the activities of the internal structures have a negative influence towards performance while external structures have a positive influence on performance. Therefore, it can be assessed that there is a challenge in the attribute of activities to inform performance in attaining predetermined objectives.

5.4.3 Output

When interrogating the outputs of the Gauteng Office of the premier I am guided by the definition provided by scholars of organisational performance who define output as services or products delivered because of the implementation of activities (Kinyuira & Kenyatta, 2019). Producing evidence of performance can be classified as an output because evidence can only be produced once activities are completed. For instance, quarterly reports must be evidence based for verification and audit purposes to substantiate performance (Diedericks, 2017). Similarly, organisations such as the Office of the Premier test and validate their performance based on evidence (Marr, 2006). It is in this case that there is a common view in the findings of this research that evidence based reporting influences the performance of the Office of the premier positively.

Furthermore, King (2009) points out that the same evidence is used by auditors to assess if the assumptions of performance hold true.


This also indicates that there is a relationship between activities and outputs. By virtue of this relation, I can argue that the challenges that are brought through inputs and activities have an influence on outputs. Since outputs are products delivered from activities, I then classify the evidence as result of performing activities.

5.4.4 Outcome

Following the interrogation of inputs, activities, and outputs, I then link them to the outcomes. Organisational studies scholars define outcomes as the achievement of results that an organisation expects in a short to medium term, given that the relevant interventions outputs are also achieved (Wotela, 2017 & DPME, 2020). I locate the priorities of the Gauteng office of the Premier as outcomes. This is supported by the Seven outcomes that are in the Office of the Premier Strategic Plan (2020) and highlighted in section 2.1.1 (description of the Gauteng office of the Premier). Although these priorities are written on paper with expectation of being achieved, the findings state otherwise. It is difficult to implement the priorities because they are not clear, not simplified to enable performance and the buildings are not user friendly to accommodate persons with disabilities to achieve the priorities.

Following the descriptive assessment of the key components of logical model that influences performance of the Gauteng Office of the Premier, I have now provided a diagram that depicts the logical flow of these key components that are affecting the Gauteng Office of the Premier. This is done to satisfy the purpose of logical model which in this case is to package and structure components that affect performance of Gauteng Office of the Premier to attain predetermined objectives concisely.


Figure 11: Components of logical model affecting Office of the Premier's performance



6 SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, LIMITATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter is divided into four different components and that is summarising the research report (section 6.1), drawing conclusions of the research (section 6.2), providing limitations of the research (section 6.3) and lastly, proposing recommendations for future studies in organisational performance (section 6.3). In doing so I will detail section 6.1 by providing the summary of key aspects of the research conceptualisation (section 1.2), key aspects of the conceptual framework (section 2), key aspects of the methodology used for this research (section 3) key aspects of empirical results (section 4), as well as discussion of aspects of the research findings (section 5). It is important to note that the purpose of this chapter is to consolidate the entire report by indicating how the purpose of this research (section 1.2.2) including the research questions (section 1.2.3) have been answered. Figure 12 below illustrate summary, conclusions, and recommendations of assessing the challenges in attaining the predetermined organisational performance objectives in the Gauteng Office of the Premier.

Figure 12: outlining summary, conclusion, and recommendations for the study



Source: Author

6.1 Summary

The purpose of this research is to assess the challenges in attaining the predetermined organisational performance objectives in the Gauteng Office of the Premier. In doing so this research focused on the following objectives and that is (i) organisational structure

challenges affecting the organisational performance in attaining predetermined objectives. (ii) challenges of managing performance information in the Gauteng Office of the Premier. (iii) Government Wide Monitoring and Evaluation Systems implementation challenges in the Gauteng Office of the Premier. (iv) key components of the logical model affecting the performance of the Gauteng Office of the Premier.

To assess the challenges in attaining the predetermined organisational performance objectives in the Gauteng Office of the Premier, the study linked the above objectives to the research questions. That is the first objective linked to the first research question of "What are the organisational structure challenges affecting the Gauteng office of the Premiers performance in attaining predetermined objectives?". The second objective was linked to the second research question "What are the challenges of managing performance information in the Gauteng Office of the Premier?". The third research objective was linked to the third question "What are the challenges affecting the implementation of Government Wide Monitoring and Evaluation (GWM&E) System in Gauteng Office of the Premier to achieve predetermined objectives?". The last objective was linked to the fourth research question "What key components of the logical model affect the performance of the Gauteng Office of the Premier?".

Furthermore, this research reviewed the literature to derive a conceptual framework in chapter 2 and in doing so this research was able to provide literature review on physical context that is Gauteng Office of the Premier. Subsequently, this research provided literature on the research problem analysis (section 2.2) by detailing the organisational performance challenges in attaining predetermined objectives using the problem tree diagnostic tool. The problem tree assisted this research to systematically link the literature informing the root causes, symptoms, and consequences of organisational performance challenges in attaining predetermined objectives. Furthermore, in section 2.3 I reviewed past and current studies of organisational performance to present their methods, data, findings, and conclusions. This process exposes the knowledge gap that none of the studies access the challenges in the context of Gauteng Office of the premier (Olivier, 2017 & Ndevu, 2019 & Khunoethe et al, 2021).

Secondly, I have pointed out the interpretative frameworks used in the past which are New Public Management used by Khunoethe et al (2021), triangulation used by

Diedericks (2017), and Burk Litwin Model applied by Olivier (2017). With the contribution made by these authors I can still argue that none of them used the lens of organizational bureaucracy, government performance management frameworks, government wide monitoring and evaluation framework and programme logical frameworks which are discussed as relevant interpretive frameworks to this study.

In chapter 3 I have committed to use qualitative research strategy and case study design to assess the challenges in attaining the predetermined organisational performance objectives in the Gauteng Office of the Premier. Semi structured interviews were used to collect data. A permission was granted by the Gauteng Office of the premier to conduct research. This research applied purposive sampling technique and a total of 9 participants participated in the research. The collected data was transcribed and cleaned. I have used Microsoft excel to process and analyse data through the application of thematic analysis. Research questions were converted into themes to respond to the question.

In chapter 4 I have detailed the empirical research findings with an attempt to respond to the research questions and achieve the research objectives. The findings are presented using the themes. The findings for the first research question were presented using three themes that is organisational structure challenges (section 4.1.1.1), Organisational structure fit for purpose (section 4.1.1.2), Human resource capacity challenges caused by the structure (section 4.1.1.3). The second research question presented findings with focus on three themes that is managing performance information (section 4.2.1.1) and challenges of managing performance information (section 4.2.1.2), challenges of aligning budget to performance priorities (section 4.2.1.3). The third question presented findings with focus on two theme that is implementation of monitoring and evaluation systems (section 4.3.1.1) and Challenges of stakeholder participation affecting the implementation of Monitoring and Evaluation Systems (section 4.3.1.2).

The last research findings focused on four themes that is Office of the Premier priorities affecting performance (section 4.4.1.1), tools of trade challenges (section 4.4.1.2), governance structure challenges (section 4.4.1.3), and evidence to support performance (section 4.4.1.4). Beyond the presentation of findings, this research also compared the findings of the previous studies to the findings of this research.

In chapter 5, this research interrogated the findings presented in chapter 4 to make meaning of the findings. In doing so, chapter 5 draws inspiration from Wotela (2018) on how we should interpret the findings through interpretative frameworks and supporting literature. Therefore, discussion of this research findings was situated within the context of the research conceptualisation with key aspects drawn from (i) Physical setting (section 2.1) (ii) problem analysis (section 2.2), (iii) knowledge gap analysis (section 2.3) (iv)the inclusion of organisational performance studies (section 2.4) its identified attributes (section 2.5) and lastly, (v)the interpretative frameworks (2.6). The discussion of assessing challenges in attaining predetermined organisational performance objectives in the Gauteng Office of the Premier was divided into four themes aligned to research questions and interpretative frameworks.

6.2 Conclusions

The use and application of qualitative research strategy, case study design and thematic analysis has sufficiently demonstrated that they are the most effective methods to assess the challenges in attaining the predetermined organisational performance objectives in the Gauteng Office of the Premier. These methods have demonstrated that one, the Gauteng Office of the Premier organisational structure challenges forms part of challenges that hinder them to attain predetermined objectives. Two, there employees are experiencing challenges in managing performance information which subsequently affect their performance to attain predetermined objectives. Three, monitoring and evaluation systems are in place however the challenge becomes when their implementation is depended on stakeholders participation. Lastly, logically linking challenges of attaining predetermined objectives guided by the logical model.

Notably, the major contribution of this research is demonstrating the challenges of attaining predetermined objectives with a lens of four theoretical frameworks. Each theoretical framework has been linked to each research question. This process assisted the research to understand the results and interpret the findings. Firstly, having used bureaucracy theory to answer and interpret the first research question, we can conclude that the challenges of attaining predetermined objectives in the Gauteng office of the premier are structural and can be specifically categorised under two characteristics identified by Weber (1978) and that is (i) Formal rules and (iii) Specialisation of task of

the organisational structure. Furthermore, the bureaucracy theory assisted to understand that the organisational structure is not approved which further leads to employee dissatisfaction, the inability to place people in the structure/lack of human resources and unclear roles and responsibilities.

Secondly the application of performance management frameworks assisted this research to answer and interpret the second research question which revealed that the Gauteng Office of the Premier is regulated by PFMA, Treasury regulations, revised strategic framework for APP's and strategic plans to ensure the management of performance information. However, the challenges of data collection, data duplication, reporting of outdated performance information and the challenge of aligning budget to priorities remain and the frameworks are silent in addressing these challenges. Using the organisational performance studies, we can conclude that these findings can be linked to the attribute of enablers (Marr, 2008).

Thirdly, using the GWM&E framework as a lens to answer the third research question and present finding as well as interpreting result revelled that the Gauteng Office of the Premier has institutionalised monitoring and evaluation systems in line with the GWM&E framework however the are challenges of implementing the systems are due to stakeholder dependency or stakeholders resistance to participate and use the systems. With this challenge we can conclude that Gauteng office of the Premier performance objectives are highly depended on stakeholders implementing the systems, policies, and work that the Gauteng office of the Premier oversees. This also indicates the lack of control of departments or stakeholders that are supposed to implement the monitoring and evaluation systems.

Fourth, the use of logical model to answer and interpret the fourth research question assisted this research to align the three organisational studies attributes as identified by Marr (2008) & Wotela (2017) that is enablers, outputs, and outcomes. Using these attributes, the research was able to them to the key component of logical model that is input, activities, outputs, and outcomes (Norad, 1999). In doing so the was able to contextualise the Gauteng Office of the Premier performance challenges in the four components of the research. Therefore, we can conclude that the logical model is the best model to systematically assess the challenges of attaining predetermined objectives.

The above interpretative frameworks contribute assisted this research to contribute to the body of knowledge and the missing gap. This is because authors of organisational performance studies did not apply the frameworks that this study applied to understand the challenges of attaining predetermined objectives in the Gauteng Office of the Premier. However, they did so in municipalities which are arguably the elements of local government (Olivier, 2017 & Ndevu, 2019 & Khunoethe et al (2021). Similarly, interpretative frameworks used in the past and current studies are New Public Management used by Khunoethe et al (2021), triangulation used by Diedericks (2017), and Burk Litwin Model applied by Olivier (2017). With the contribution made by these authors we can still argue that none of them used the lens of organizational bureaucracy, government performance management frameworks, government wide monitoring and evaluation framework and programme logical frameworks which are discussed as relevant interpretive frameworks to this study.

6.3 Limitations

The effects of COVID-19 that resulted to hybrid rotational way of working has affected the sample of this research study. Most of the employees of the Gauteng office of the Premier were working from home. Having employed face to face interviews as a data collection method it was difficult to secure face to face interviews with Executive Managers, in this case Deputy Director Generals. Only 1 executive manager formed part of the sample while others ignored the invite. Furthermore, the executive managers sampled in the Gauteng Office of the Premier were occupied with meetings and have continuously cancelled the scheduled interviews.

Due to Office of the Premier being a political administrative office, other managers that I have purposefully sampled were redeployed to work in other departments and therefore affecting the ability to meet face to face to conduct the interviews. Furthermore, due to being a junior official in the Gauteng Office of the Premier, most of the Deputy Director Generals that were sampled did not show interest to participate in the study and did not respond to the invites even though the accounting officer has approved the research to take place. The aim was to secure at least 2 to 3 interviews with executive management members. This limitation led to the restructuring of the sample to include middle management officials who are responsible for the management and

reporting of performance against predetermined objectives in the Gauteng office of the premier.

The empirical results and findings of this study are limited to the interpretative frameworks that we discussed in section 2.6 as well as the key attributes identified in section 2.5 therefore the results and findings did not point out explicitly the predetermined objective of the Gauteng Office of the Premier. However, they have contextualised the challenges that affecting the performance of the Gauteng Office of the Premier to attain the predetermined objectives. We are raising this limitation to avoid expectations that the research was going to show predetermined objectives.

Furthermore, this research has opted for semi-structured interviews which motivates for open-ended questions and interactions that might make it difficult for this research to be replicated. Bryman (2012) points out that in qualitative research strategy, replication is not a straight answer due to its unstructured nature. Lastly, the research cannot be generalised to other provincial offices of the premier in South Africa because the results and findings are specifically for Gauteng Office of the Premier.

6.4 Recommendations

Firstly, the use of bureaucracy theory to unpack the performance challenges in attaining predetermined objectives have yielded result and findings that inform us that the organisational structure plays a vital role in taking the organisation forward and ensuring that it performs its mandate. Therefore, there is a need for future studies to study the designs of organisational structures of Offices of the Premier to determine if the organisational structures are fit for purpose. Moreover, by undertaking such studies we can influence the structural designs of government departments as well as policy prescripts that govern the structures of Provincial Offices of the Premier. This will assist to determine if whether government structures in the modern world can remain rigid or flexible.

Furthermore, with the findings presented through bureaucracy theory that the structure is not approved, has challenges of placing skilled human resources and does not follow formal rules and requirements of the DPSA to be considered a structure that is fit for purpose of attaining predetermined objectives, I recommend that the Gauteng Office of

the Premier benchmark with local and international best practices on organisational structures that are aligned to their mandate. Furthermore, to also consult with the DPSA to influence the restructuring of the current structure and motivate for the approval of the structure.

Secondly, the existence of performance management frameworks in government has loopholes of ensuring that officials in Gauteng Office of the Premier attaining their predetermined objectives. However, I acknowledge that they provide standardised guidelines on reporting of performance information. This indicates the guidelines on how to achieve predetermined objectives. I therefore recommend that empirical studies be carried out to propose a government performance curriculum model that will serve as guideline of mitigating underperformance and achievement of predetermined objective. Furthermore, this performance curriculum model can also influence legislative frameworks and policies on government performance. For instance, introducing government performance regulations that will support the likes of treasury regulations and other frameworks.

Thirdly, the GWM&E frameworks revealed that the monitoring and evaluation systems in the Gauteng Office of the Premier are undermined and not implemented by stakeholders. This calls for the awareness session on the importance of monitoring systems as well as strengthening partnerships. For instance, the literature of this research pointed out root causes that lack of collaboration still exists because performance information is kept in individual spreadsheets that are not designed to promote collaboration amongst stakeholder (Marr, 2006). Although studies about separation of powers have been conducted to understand collaboration (Koenane & Mangena, 2017), I recommend that studies be conducted to determine the effectiveness of consequence management policies in government to address noncompliance and further assess if there is a need to review the policies.

Lastly, logical model has presented itself as the best model to systematically understand the performance challenges of the Gauteng office of the premier. I recommend that further studies go above identifying challenges using the logical model and also propose systematic solutions to address the challenges. Moreover, the findings also indicated that there are insufficient tools of trade that serves as enablers of performance to attain

predetermined objectives. This study recommend that the office of the premier must look into securing resources that will enable employees to perform. Such resources include the procurement of laptops and systems. Furthermore, the procurement of building and parking bays.

REFERENCES

Ahmady, G. A., Mehrpour, M., & Nikooravesh, A. (2016). 3rd International Conference on New Challenges in Management and Organisation: Organisation and leadership. *Social and behavioral sciences* (pp. 455-462). Dubai: Elsevier.

Andhika, L. R., Nurasa, H., Karlina, N., & Candradewini, C. (2018). Logic Model of Governance Innovation and Public Policy in Public Service. *Policy and governance*, 2(2), 85-98.

Arabi, M. (2007). *The design of organisational structure.* Tehran: Cultural research office.

Auditor General South Africa (AGSA). (2018). *Consolidated general report on National and Provincial audit outcomes 2017-18*. Pretoria: Auditor General's Office.

Auditor General South Africa (AGSA). (2019). *Consolidated general report on National and Provincial audit outcomes 2018-19*. Pretoria: Auditor General's Office.

Auditor General South Africa (AGSA). (2020). *Consolidated general report on National and Provincial audit outcomes 2019-20*. Pretoria: Auditor General's Office.

Auriacombe , C. J. (2011). Role of Theories of Change and Programme Logic Models in Policy Evaluation. *African Journal of Public Affairs, 4*(2), 36-53.

Beattie, V. A. (2000). The future of business reporting: A review article. *The Irish Accounting Review, 7*(1), 1-36.

Bereketeab, R. (2018). *National Liberation Movements as Government in Africa.* New York: Routledge.

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2013). *Successful qualitative research: A practical guide for beginners.* London: Sage publication.

Breakfast, N., Bradshaw, G., & Nomarwayi, T. (2019). Violent Servoce Delivery Protest in post-apartheid South Africa,1994-2017. *African Journal of Public Affairs, 11*(1), 107-124.

Brusc, I., & Montesino, V. (2016). Implementing performance reporting in Local government: A cross-cointries comparison. *Public Performance & Management Review*, 506–534.

Bryman, A. (2012). *Social Research methods.* New York: Oxford University.

Carroll, E. (2022, October 11). *Government Failure: Definition & Examples*. Retrieved October 2022 16, 2022, from Study.com: https://study.com/academy/lesson/government-failure-definition-examples.html

Cheruiyot, K., Katumba, S., & Wray, C. (2019). Patterns and Correlates of Dissatisfaction with Government Performance in the Gauteng City-Region, South Africa: A Comparison across Three Government Spheres. *The Review of Regional Studies*, 1-26.

Cloete, F. (2009). Evidence-based policy analysis in South Africa: Critical assessment of the emerging Government-Wide Monitoring and Evaluation System. *Journal of Public Administration, 44*(2), 293-311.

Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, Quantitative and Mixed methods approaches.* California: Sage.

Curristine, T., Lonti , Z., & Joumard, I. (2007). Improving Public Sector Efficiency: Challenges and Opportunities. *Journal on Budgeting, 7*(1), 1608-7143.

Daneshfard, K., & Aboalmaali, F. S. (2016). Max Weber's Philosophy of Bureaucracy and Its Criticism. *International Journal of Scientific Management and Development*, 214-220.

Department of Planning Monitroing and Evaluation (DPME). (2007). *Policy Framework for the Goverment-wide Monitoring and Evaluation System.* Pretoria: Government Printers.

Department of Planning Monitroing and Evaluation (DPME). (2008). *The Role of Premiers' Offices in Government-wide Monitoring and Evaluation: A Good Practice Guide.* Pretoria: Government Printers.

Department of Planning Monitoring and Evaluation (DPME). (2019). *2019-2024 Medium Term Strategic Framework.* Pretoria: Governement Printers.

Department of Planning Monitoring and Evaluation (DPME). (2020). *Revised Framework for Strategic Plans and Annual Performance Plans.* Pretoria: Government Printers.

Diedericks, M. (2017). Challenges in reporting on predetermined objectives to the Auditor-General: The case of Limpopo provincial departments. *Journal for Transdisciplinary Research in Southern Africa, 13*(1), 1817-4434. doi:https://doi.org/10.4102/td.v13i1.386

Dolan , J., & Rosenbloom, D. H. (2003). *Representative Bureaucracy: Classic Readings and Continuing Controversies.* New York, USA: Routledge.

Du Plessis, L. M. (2016). Human Capital Development in Local Government and the search for a Capable State. *African Journal of Public Affairs*, 30-38.

Elena-iuliana, I., & Maria, C. (2016). Organisational performance - a concept that self seek to find itself. *Academica Brancu*, 179-183.

Engela , R., & Ajam , T. (2010). *Implementing a wide-government Monitoring and Evaluation System in South Africa.* Washington DC: Independent Evaluation Group.

Gauteng City Region Observatory (GCRO). (2021). *Quality of Life Survey 2017/2018*. Government Printers, Pretoria.

Gauteng Office of the Premier. (2015). *Annual Performance Plan 2014/2015*. Pretoria: Government Printers.

Gauteng Office of the Premier. (2016). *Annual report 2015/2016*. Pretoria: Government Printers.

Gauteng Office of the Premier. (2017). *Annual report 2016/2017*. Pretoria: Government Printers.

Gauteng Office of the Premier. (2018). *Annual report 2017/2018*. Pretoria: Governement Printers.

Gauteng Office of the Premier. (2019). *Annual report 2018/2019*. Pretoria: Government Printers.

Gauteng Office of the Premier. (2020). *Annual report 2019/2020*. Pretoria: Governement Printers.

Gauteng Office of the Premier. (2020). *Office of the Premier Strategic Plan 2020/21 - 2024/25*. Pretoria: Government Printers.

Gauteng Office of the Premier. (2021). *Annual report 2020/2021*. Pretoria: Government Printers.

Gauteng Office of the Premier. (2022). *Annual Performance report 2022/2023*. Pretoria: Government Printers.

Gharajedaghi, J., (2006). *Systems thinking: Managing chaos and complexity, a platform for designing business architecture*, Elsevier Inc., Amsterdam.

Heckscher, C. (1994). Defining the post-bureaucratic type. *Accelerating the world's research*, 14-62.

Helo, P., & Dwight, R. (2009). Performance measurement: roles and challenges. *Industrial Management & Data Systems*, 263-5577.

Independent Electrol Commission . (1994). *1994 National and Provincial Elections.* Pretoria: Government Printers.

Ishmail , Z., & Tully, V. (2020). An overview of the provincial evaluation system of the Western Cape Government of South Africa as a response to the evaluation of the National Evaluation System. *African Evaluation Journal, 8*(1), 1-10. doi:https://doi.org/10.4102/aej.v8i1.425

Johnson, A. A. (2013). Results Chains: a Tool for Conservation Action Design, Management, and Evaluation. *Article in ecology and society*, 1-11.

Kellogg Foundation. (2004). *Using Logic Models to Bring Together Planning, Evaluation, and Action: Logic Model Development Guide.* Michigan: USA.

Khunoethe, H., Reddy, S. P., & Mthuli, A. S. (2021). Performance Management and the Integrated Development Plan of the Msunduzi Municipality in South Africa. *The NISPAcee Journal of Public Administration and Policy*, 161-187.

King. (2009). *King report on governance for South Africa.* Johannesburg: Institute of Directors Southern Africa.

Kinyuira, D. (2019). Using results chain framework as a tool for the improvement of performance evaluation in firms. *Journal of Strategy and Performance Management*, 28-36.

Koenane, M. L., & Mangena, F. (2017). Ethics, accountability and democracy as pillars of good governance: Case of South Africa. *Indigenous systems of governance, 9*(5), 61-71.

Koketso, L. P., & Rust, B. (2012). Perceived challenges to talent management in the South African public service: An exploratory study of the City of Cape Town municipality. *African Journal of Business Management*, 2221-2233.

Kumar, R. (2011). *Research methodology: A step by step guide for beginners.* New Delhi: Sage.

Lancaster, L. (2016). *At the heart of discontent: Measuring public violence in South Africa.* South Africa: Institutte for Security and Studies.

Livioara, G. G. (2009). Bureaucratic Administration in Modern Society. *EIRP Proceedings*, 1-11.

Lodge, T. (1995). The South African General Election, April 1994: Results, analysis and implications. *African Affairs*, 471-500.

Makoba, P. N., & Ruffin, F. A. (2016). Democratic Governance and the Outcomes Approach to Performance Management through African Epistemologies. 142-167.

Mamokhere, J. (2023). Understanding the Complex Interplay of Governance, Systematic, and Structural Factors Affecting Service Delivery in South African Municipalities: *Commonwealth Youth and Development*. 20(2), 1-28.

Marr, B. (2006). *Strategic Performance Management: Leveraging and measuring your intangible value drivers.* Burlington: Elsevier Ltd.

Marr, B. (2008). *Managing and delivering performance: how governmentm public sector and not for profit organisations can measure and manage what really matters.* Burlington: Elsevier Ltd.

Masilela, L., & Nel, D. (2021). The role of data and information security governance in protecting public sector data and information assets in national government in South Africa. *Africa's Public Service Delivery and Performance Review*, 2310-2195.

Matsiliza, N. (2012). Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation: Reviewing an Inclusive Approach in the South Africa's Government Wide Monitoring and Evaluation. *Africa's Development Watch*, 67-83.

Mdhlalose, D. (2020). An Evaluation of the Impact of Training and Development on Organisational Performance: A Case Study of the Gauteng Provincial Department of Economic Development. *Journal of Human Resource and Sustainability Studies*, 48-74.

Merriam, S. B., & Tisdell, E. J. (2016). *Qualitative Research: A Guide to Design and Implementation (4th ed.).* San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.

Mintzberg, H. (1979). *The structuring of organisations.* Englewood Cliffs NJ: Prentice Hall.

Muchaonyerwa, N., & Khayundi, F. (2014). The Management of Digital Records in the Office of the Premier of the Eastern Cape Province, South Africa. *African Journal of Library, Archives and Information Science, 24*(1), 41-52.

Municipalities of South Africa. (2012). *Gauteng Municipalities*. Retrieved July 13, 2023, from https://municipalities.co.za/provinces/view/3/gauteng

Mwai, G. M., Namada, M. J., & Katuse, P. (2018). Influence of Organizational Resources on Organizational Effectiveness. *American Journal of Industrial and Business Management*, 1634-1656.

National Planning Commission. (2011). *National Developement Plan.* Pretoria: Government Printers.

Ndasana, M., & Umejesi, I. (2022). Performance Management in South Africa's municipalities : a case study of Buffalo City metro. *Africa's Public Service Delivery and Performance Review*, 2310-2195.

Ndevu, Z. J. (2019). Trust and organisational performance: A grounded theory approach for a South African district municipality. *SA Journal of Human Resource Management*, 1-11.

Ndevu, Z. J., & Muller, K. (2018). Operationalising performance management in local government: The use of the balanced scorecard. *SA Journal of Human Resource Management*, 1683-7584.

Ngcamu, B. S. (2019). Exploring service delivery protests in post-apartheid South African municipalities: A literature review. *The Journal for Transdisciplinary Research in Southern Africa, 15*(1). doi:https://doi.org/10.4102/td.v15i1.643

Norad. (1999). *The logical framework approach (LFA): Handbook for objective-oriented planning fourth edition.*

Olivier, B. H. (2017). The use of mixed-methods research to diagnose the organisational performance of a local government. *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 1-14.

Olsen, J. P. (2007). The Ups and Downs of Bureaucratic Organization. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 1-40.

Ongeti, W. J., & Machuki, V. N. (2018). Organisational resources and performance of Kenyan state corporations. *European scientific journal, 14*(34), 1857-7881.

Ovadje, F., & Aryee, S. (2019). *Routledge Handbook of organisational change in Africa.* New York: Routledge.

Ozdem, G. (2011). An Analysis of the Mission and Vision Statements on the Strategic Plans of Higher Education Institutions. *Educational Sciences*, 1887-1894.

Penceliah, Y. (2012). Performance management in the public service with particular reference to the senior management service cadre in South Africa: A Perspective. *Corporate Ownership & Control, 9*(2), 197-205.

Phago, K., & Munzhedzi , P. H. (2014). Performance management system quandary in the public service: a case of the Limpopo Province, South Africa. *Journal of Public Administration*, 1083-1099.

Roberts, S. (2004, October). Investment in South Africa – a comment on recent contributions. *Development Southern Africa, 21*(4), 743-756.

Schooley, B., & Horan, T. A. (2007). Towards end-to-end government performance management: Case study of interorganizational information integration. *Government Information Quarterly*, 755-784.

Serpa, S., & Ferreira, C. M. (2019). The Concept of Bureaucracy by Max Weber. *International Journal of Social Science Studies*, 12-17.

Silitonga, P. E. (2017). Analysis of the Effect of Organizational Commitment on Mediation of Job Satisfaction. *International Journal of Economic Research*, 75-90.

Simanjuntak, A., Siahaan., S.B., Situmorang, D.R., & Elisabeth, D.M. (2023). Factors Affecting Accountability Government Institution Performance: *Accounting Analysis Journal.* 12(2), 112-122.

Sofyani, H., Arbar, R., & Ferrer, R. C. (2018). 20 years of performance measurement system implementatio in Indonesian local governments: Why is thier performance still poor? *Asian Journal of Business and Accounting, 11*(1), 151-180.

South Africa. (1996). *The Constitution of the Republic of South Africa, Act 108 of 1996*. Pretoria: Government printers.

South African History Online (SAHO). (2019). *A Hiritage trail through the provinces of South Africa.* Johannesburg: South African History organisation. Retrieved July 13, 2023, from https://www.sahistory.org.za/article/grade-5-term-4-heritage-trail-through-provinces-south-africa

Statistics South Africa. (2022). *2022 Mid year population estimates.* Pretoria: Government Printers.

Thusi, X., Matyana, M., & Nokukhanya, N.J. (2023). Lack of Political Will: A Barrier to Public Service Delivery in South Africa and a High Cost for Citizens: *Journal of Studies in Social Sciences and Humanities*. 9(2), 137-147.

Tracy, S. (2013). *Qualitative research methods: Collecting evidence, crafting analysis, communicating impact.* West Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell.

Treasury, (1999). *Public Finance Management Act 1 of 1999*, Government Printers, Pretoria.

Treasury. (1994). *Public Service Act 103 of 1994*. Pretoria: Governement Printers.

Treasury. (2001). *Treasury Regulations.* Pretoria: Government printers.

Treasury. (2007). *Framework for Managing Programme Performance Information.* Pretoria: Government printers.

Treasury. (2011). *Performance Information Handbook* . Pretoria: Government Printers.

USAID. (2016). *Using Results Chains to Depict Theories of Change in USAID Biodiversity Programming.* 10Washington, D.C.: USAID.

Van der Nest, D., & Erasmus , L. (2011). Reporting on performance against pre-determined objectives: The case of South African National Government Departments. *African Journal of Public Affairs, 3*(1), 135-151.

Van der Waldt, G. (2015). A Monitoring and Evaluation System Utilisation Model for support to South African Municipalities. *Journal for Political Science and Public Administration*, 4-29.

Vyas-Doorgapersad, S., Tshombe, L.-M., & Ababio, E. P. (2013). *Public Administration in Africa: Performance and Challenges.* USA: Taylor & Francis Group.

Weber, M. (1978). Economy and society: An outline of interpretive sociology. Univ of California Press.

Weiss, C. H. (1998).*Evaluation: Methods for studying programs and policies*. 2nd Edition. Upper Saddle River, NJ:Prentice Hall.

othing as practical as good theory: exploring theory-based evaluation for comprehensive community initiatives for children and families. Washington DC: USA.

Wotela, K., 2016, 'Towards a systematic approach to reviewing literature for interpreting public and business management research results', *Electronic Journal of Business Research Methods* 14(2), 83–97.

Wotela, K. (2017). Using systems thinking to conceptually link the monitoring and evaluation function within development interventions and public policy. *The Journal for Transdisciplinary Research in Southern Africa*, 1-13.

Wotela, K. (2018). Presenting empirical research results and discussing research findings in business and public administration, Paper presented at 17th European Conference on Research Methodology for Business & Management Studies, 12-13 July 2018. Rome, Italy on. Academic Conferences & Publishing International Limited.

Zwikael, O. (2020). *When doesnt formal planning enhance the performance of government projects.* Canberra: The Australian National University.

APPENDICES

Appendix 1.1: Letter permitting the researcher to carry out the research in Gauteng Office of the Premier

GAUTENG PROVINCE
OFFICE OF THE PREMIER
REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA

Permission to conduct research
Consent Form

I **Mr Mduduzi Mbada** confirm that I have read and understood the request from researcher (Mr Samuel Molapo) and the Institution concerned to conduct a research study entitled **"Assessing the challenges in attaining the predetermined organizational performance objectives in the Gauteng Office of the Premier"**.

Upon a review of the letter sent, I consent that this organisation will allow the researcher to conduct a study on the above-mentioned title in the Office of the Premier (OOP).

I am free to withdraw the OOP's input to the study at any time without giving a reason. I understand that the participants who agree to participate will not be disclosed (to protect anonymity) and information will be kept confidential and used solely for academic purposes.

All interviews, filed surveys, observations around the site and the distribution of questionnaires are approved and will be duly supervised by the Human Resource Unit.

By signing below, I am indicating that I consent to the above on behalf of the organization and that I am in a position to do so.

Authorised by: **Mr Mduduzi Mbada** Position **Acting Director General**

Signed: MF Mbada Date 09/12/2022

Appendix 2.1: Ethical clearance certificate to conduct research

UNIVERSITY OF THE WITWATERSRAND, JOHANNESBURG

SCHOOL OF GOVERNANCE ETHICS COMMITTEE
CONSTITUTED UNDER THE UNIVERSITY HUMAN RESEARCH ETHICS COMMITTEE (NON-MEDICAL)

CLEARANCE CERTIFICATE **PROTOCOL NUMBER:** WSG-2023-13

PROJECT TITLE	Assessing the challenges in attaining the predetermined organisational performance objectives in the Gauteng Office of the Premier
INVESTIGATOR	Makgaba Molapo
SCHOOL/DEPARTMENT OF INVESTIGATOR	Wits School of Governance
DATE CONSIDERED	21 February 2023
DECISION OF THE COMMITTEE	Approved unconditionally.
RISK LEVEL	MINIMAL RISK
EXPIRY DATE	Date of submission of the project Research Report

ISSUE DATE OF CERTIFICATE 22 February 2023 **CHAIRPERSON** Rekgotsofetse Chikane
Rekgotsofetse Chikane

cc: Supervisor:

DECLARATION OF INVESTIGATOR

To be completed in duplicate and ONE COPY returned to the Chairperson of the School/Department ethics committee.

I fully understand the conditions under which I am are authorized to carry out the abovementioned research and I guarantee to ensure compliance with these conditions. Should any departure to be contemplated from the research procedure as approved I/we undertake to resubmit the protocol to the Committee.

Signature **Date** 24 / 02 / 2023

PLEASE QUOTE THE PROTOCOL NUMBER ON ALL ENQUIRIES

Appendix 3.1: Informed consent and participation information sheet

Title of the research: Assessing the challenges in attaining the predetermined organisational performance objectives in the Gauteng Office of the Premier

You are kindly invited to participate in a semi-structured interview session for the research that aim to assess performance challenges in attaining predetermined objectives within the Gauteng Office of the Premier. The purpose of this study is to gain knowledge of challenges that are faced by the Gauteng Office of the premier in attaining predetermined objectives. The interviews will be conducted by Makgaba Samuel Molapo, a registered student at the University of Witwatersrand under school of governance. The semi-structured interview sessions will take approximately 30 minutes to complete.

Kindly note that your acceptance to participate in this study is voluntary and you are welcome to withdraw should the need arise. I can assure you that this research process does not foresee any risks that may cause you harm. I will also request to use a Dictaphone to record our interview which will later be transcribed and secured in an email that has a password known to myself only. Should you feel uncomfortable with the recording you are welcome to state so. The collected information will remain anonymous, and your name will not be mentioned in the report.

kindly complete the below consent form before participating in the study.

I……. agree/not agree to participate in the research stated above. All the requirements of the research have been explained to me and I also understand my role of participation in this research.

Please circle one of the options below

I **agree/not agree** to be recorded Yes/No

I **agree/not agree** to be anonymous Yes/No

…… ……

Participant signature Date

Appendix 4.1: Research instrument (Interview questions)

Research question 1: What are the organisational structure challenges affecting the Gauteng office of the Premiers performance in attaining predetermined objectives?

Interview questions

1. In what way does the organizational structure affect the Gauteng Office of the Premier to suitably contribute to the successful implementation of its mission?
2. In your own experience, to what extent is the Gauteng Office of the Premier's organisational structure fit for purpose? Explain Why?
3. How do you ensure communication and role play among different levels of the organizational structure in the Gauteng Office of the Premier to improve performance?
4. To what extent is the Gauteng Office of the Premier structured for efficiency and effective performance?

Research question 2: What are the challenges of managing performance information in the Gauteng Office of the Premier?

Interview questions

1. What is the process of managing performance information in the Gauteng Office of Premier?
2. What are the challenges associated with managing and reporting organisational performance?
3. What are the challenges associated with aligning the budget to your allocated priorities?
4. What are the consequences of legislated/statutory submission timeframes on your performance?

Research question 3: What are the challenges affecting the implementation of Government Wide Monitoring and Evaluation (GWM&E) System in Gauteng Office of the Premier to achieve predetermined objectives?

Interview questions

1. What performance monitoring systems do you have to ensure the attainment of your planned deliverables? Please also explain how the system works
2. What systems /processes are in place to detect and address underperformance within the Gauteng Office of the Premier?
3. What is the impact of stakeholder collaboration and dependency on your performance and systems? Or what impact does dependency on other stakeholders have on your performance and systems?

Research question 4: What key components of the logical model affect the performance of the Gauteng Office of the Premier?

Interview questions

1. To what extent are the Gauteng Office of the Premier priorities clearer in simplifying your deliverables and performance?
2. To what extent does the allocation of budget, human resources, and tools of trade affect your ability to achieve all your planned targets?
3. What challenges do you experience that ultimately contribute towards the achievement of the Gauteng Office of the Premier's outcomes?
4. To what extent does evidence-based reporting have an impact on your performance and attainment of targets?
5. To what extent do management/governance structures in the Gauteng Office of the Premier influence organisational performance? Please also clarify the kinds of management/governance structures and their role in the performance

Thank you for making time to participate in this interview

Appendix 5.1: Researchers bio

I am Makgaba Samuel Molapo, a Masters' student registered at the University of Witwatersrand and enrolled for a Master of Management with specialisation in Public Sector Monitoring and Evaluation within the school of governance. I am conducting this research to assess performance challenges in attaining organisational predetermined objectives in the Gauteng Office of the Premier and it is solely for the purposes of fulfilling my master's degree. I can confirm that I do not have any financial support or sponsors to conduct this research.

This research is undertaken through the supervision of the University of Witwatersrand, and I can confirm that this research will not cause any harm to the respondents. I am currently employed in the Gauteng Office of the Premier responsible for Monitoring and Evaluation, so this research report will assist me to sharpen my skills and knowledge within the field of organisational performance. This research report will also assist me to effectively understand the underlying challenges of performance reporting within the Gauteng Office of the Premier which will inform future interventions.

In pointing out my positionality to this research, it should be noted that I currently occupy a junior position in the Gauteng Office of the Premier and I do not qualify nor have the privilege to sit in governance structures that discuss and take decisions regarding organisational performance reports, challenges, and interventions. Senior Managers and Executive Managers are responsible for the organisational performance of the Gauteng Office of the Premier and they are solely responsible for reporting and ensuring that it gets discussed in management meetings as well as oversight bodies. These reports are confidential till they are published on the Gauteng Office of the Premier website for public viewing by citizens as per Treasury regulations.

Appendix 6.1: Example of fully populated interview schedule

Research question 1: What are the organisational structure challenges affecting the Gauteng office of the Premiers performance in attaining predetermined objectives?

Question

1. **In what way does the organizational structure affect the Gauteng Office of the Premier to suitably contribute to the successful implementation of its mission?**

Answer

Firstly, the structure is not approved by the DPSA. Secondly, our organizational structure in my view should follow the actual agenda and deliverables of the public. But in our case, we prioritise structure first without necessarily focusing as on what we want to deliver. The structure should follow what is it that you want, but I think in a sense, within the office of the Premier, we have it vice versa. The way our Human Resources is structured, and I think it's not just our office in the province, who's got that weakness, but nationally there is that weakness that suggests that structures within the offices of the premier should be standardized. But then it's not a one-size-fits-all because the office of the Premier in Gauteng is quite different from the office of the premier in Northwest such that our structure should be able to fulfill certain mandates that are deemed to be of priority in the province looking at different areas, you know for one, if you look at population, Gauteng got the biggest population, so delivery in Gauteng will be different compared to delivery in Limpopo with the population of around 6 million or so while Gauteng is now at the population close to 16 million. Therefore, already that should actually tell you that our structure somehow should actually be geared enough to actually deliver the public needs of the citizens of Gauteng and in my view, our structure is not necessarily geared sufficiently to deliver. There's a lot of work to do, but then the structure on the other hand is not necessarily responsive to what needs to be done, although still actually managed to fulfill the mandate of this. But I suspect if the structure was actually geared sufficiently, we will actually be able to do more.

Question

2. **In your own experience, to what extent is the Gauteng Office of the Premier's organisational structure fit for purpose? Explain Why?**

Answer

Look my answer to that is no, the structure is not fit for purpose. Structure should actually follow strategy but in our case is vice versa, so we're chasing the structure and what we can do. We should be saying this is our priorities, this is our mission, vision and what do we need to achieve. Is the structured geared to help us deliver on all of those things that we deem as priority and in my view the answer is no, our structure is not geared to deliver on the actual mandate as required by the Gauteng Office of the Premier so there is more required to be done, however, you don't necessarily have sufficient human capacity to deliver on the specific mandate, there could actually be outliers within the office, where in you could have a branch with sufficient capacity and so on and so forth. But from where I sit there is insufficient capacity to deliver on what we deem is the vision of this province.

Question

3. **How do you ensure communication and role play among different levels of the organizational structure in the Gauteng Office of the Premier to improve performance?**

Answer

Yeah. There are opportunities to ensure some level of alignment about duplicate. You have the EMT and BMT, but of course from those structures you have information cascading downloads to different branches and chief directorates through the structure to ensure that level of communication and a bit of opportunity to collaborate.

You mentioned EMT and BMT, what are they?

Oh yea, basically this are management structures for taking decisions about organisational performance. So EMT refers to Executive Management Team and it constitute of Director General and Deputy Director Generals and BMT refers to Broad Management Team which constitute all Senior Managers

Question

4. **To what extent is the Gauteng Office of the Premier structured for efficiency and effective performance?**

Answer

Definitely, in my opinion it is not structured efficiently and effectively to fulfil its policy and legislative mandates. I think that the evidence is there. It's really speaks for itself, the continued edge to engage in organizational structure, processes that are still not satisfactory. You would not understand why we are still having these problems. From time-to-time HR will come to us. This is how far we are. There's never been any meaningful progress in terms of the way organizational structure is. You look at the placement of people, look at organizational performance itself, look at how the position of posts actually pertain. What really informs that? it's only, attempts that have been done recently to bring alignment to service delivery model and for office of the Premier of course to even receive a concurrence. Concurrence is one, of course that could be an indicator that we are on track. So we just received a concurrence. But now I think it was in 2017.

Research question 2: What are the challenges of managing performance information in the Gauteng Office of the Premier?

Question

1. **What is the process of managing performance information in the Gauteng Office of Premier?**

Answer

So what we hve tried to actually do is somewhat automate the data collection tools that then becomes a basis for what we actually report on. So in terms of collecting data and the monitoring work that we actually do, we have automated systems. What then follows is adhering to the systems that we have within the office of the Premier wherein we report performance on a quarterly basis. Through the automated Monitoring and Evaluation Reporting Made Simple (MERMS) system, where in that information is consolidated and analysed at high level within SOS to provide an overall picture of how the office of the premier is performing.

From the base point of view and where I see it is through collection of performance information using various tools to be able to get a sense of what is happening in the field or ground and what is it that the political principles are saying and through that we generate reports that then feed into the quarterly reporting system within the office of the premier.

What do you mean by SOS providing overall picture?

I mean that the SOS team is responsible for analyzing organisational performance of the office and report it to oversight

What does the term SOS mean?

It is a unit in the office of the premier and its simple means Strategy and Operational Support

Question

2. **Following the process, you have highlighted, what are the challenges associated with managing and reporting organisational performance?**

Answer

So you see 1 area that we tried to address in the last couple of years it's been the manual way at which data is been collected and provides room for error and I want to believe that since we have tried to automate tools it would then make it a bit easier and accurate in terms of analysis. So what I'm saying is that one of the big challenges is the manual way of reporting, but we are mitigating that because we are in the process of automating systems to ensure that we have automated reports.

Another key area that is critical and might not necessarily only apply to where I sit, but generally it's that you get the report and so what? Who are the users of that data? You are collecting information that there is appetite for people who want to use that data. One example is evaluations and the question that arise is that is the appetite to use the evaluation findings of this evaluation. So is one thing developing evaluations for compliance and another for developing evaluations and implementing their recommendations.

Question

3. **What are the challenges associated with aligning the budget to your allocated priorities?**

Answer

You know, I think the Office of the Premier has done a lot of work in ensuring that budget is aligned to the set priorities to the extent that we map were we are going to be spending the money for instance, if you are going to build a school you must be able to say we are going to build a school in Tembisa in this particular area. So there's been a lot of work done over a period of time in ensuring that there's that level of alignment between budgets and priorities hance you see changes in our political principles.

The new premier came in and talked to some of the elevated priorities that must be realised by the end of term without negating all the other priorities, and we also see budget alignment to what the priorities of government is. So in terms of that, I must say government is actually doing quite some good work to ensure that priorities are aligned to what we will be spending on. This process is also picked up from a budgeting perspective, from supply chain and finance. You know finance would want to know exactly how you want to spend this money and under which priority is this money that you are requesting for. So that alignment is always there and I think it's an area of continuous improvement within the office of the premier and overtime I think we will be doing well in that space.

Question

4. **What are the consequences of legislated/statutory submission timeframes on your performance?**

Answer

Look I think ultimately what you find in government is that people will try to meet deadlines but in meeting deadlines we also need to test quality of what has been submitted. So you could meet the deadline but the quality might be compromised. If I say to you that I need a presentation tomorrow morning and it has not been part of your plan, you will deliver that presentation, but the question is the presentation of the right quality? So you

do find situation where quality is compromised but you do meet that particular timeline. Its more like for purposes of compliance to meet the submission timeline.

Research question 3: What are the challenges affecting the implementation of Government Wide Monitoring and Evaluation (GWM&E) System in Gauteng Office of the Premier to achieve predetermined objectives?

Question

1. **What performance monitoring systems do you have to ensure the attainment of your planned deliverables? Please also explain how the system works**

Answer

We are required to report and be monitored through the Strategic plan and the APP. So the Strategic plan and APP becomes the primary documents for planning and monitoring our plans. They serve as a guides for implementation of objectives.

Question

2. **What systems /processes are in place to detect and address underperformance within the Gauteng Office of the Premier?**

Answer

You know within the office of the premier, you have your strategic plan and annual performance plan that is broken down to quarterly targets. So that's the starting point in terms of what is it that you suppose to do. The second point comes within the directorates to monitor against those targets set. So leading to the end of the quarter, on the monthly basis we assess if we are working towards what we want to achieve at the end of the quarter. So by the end of the quarter there is no surprises in terms of the outcomes expected. We have chief directors and DDG's that hold regular discussions with directorates to assess how we actually are performing. Over and above that you have SOS that assess performance against APP on a quarterly basis and if there is insufficient evidence or information you are then expected to explain underperformance. So this are the verification checks and balances methods that actually exist in the Gauteng Office of the Premier.

Question

3. **What is the impact of stakeholder collaboration and dependency on your performance and systems? Or What impact does dependency on other stakeholders have on your performance and system?**

Answer

It actually a bit difficult to rely on various stakeholders to perform in a sense that other department are not doing what they are supposed to do and it impacts on your performance and systems. Let me give an example, so we are supposed to build houses as government and our office supposed to oversee the finalization of the houses and report on them however for us to report on the building of houses, we are depend on the department responsible for building houses. So the importance of intergovernmental relations, collaboration and building relationships with people that are suppose to help you to perform is quite critical. Which if you are not able to build relationships and work with the departments that automatically impact on the work of the office of the premier in general because the office of the premier is not an implementing office but a coordinating type of an office. We coordinate what is being delivered by the departments and state-owned entities. So yes, it a bearing for us to deliver because we must depend on someone to deliver. The stakeholders must feed and report into our system for us to be able to perform. So yeah, they do affect our performance and systems.

Research question 4: What key components of the logical model affect the performance of the Gauteng Office of the Premier?

Question

1. **To what extent are the Gauteng Office of the Premier priorities clearer in simplifying your deliverables and performance?**

Answer

So, what needs to be done is clear. One thing about government is that you are provided an opportunity for creativity and so you must answer the question how am I going to do it?. If Gauteng government is saying one of the priorities is to ensure the improvement of hostels, Gauteng Office of the premier needs to think about how we contribute to that priority because the executive council will not tell us how to do it because it is our role as administrators to interpret what is required to be done and actually do something about

it. So, the priorities in my view are clear but the issue then becomes the interpretation, innovation and activities to deliver on the priorities. And that's where we take interest in what are the objectives by clearly stating the indicators and targets to meet that specific priority. Usually what needs to be done is clear from what comes from the executive but the issue becomes interpretation and what time to deliver on what need to be done. Are we able to deliver on the time and do we have capacity.

Question

2. **To what extent does the allocation of budget, human resources, and tools of trade affect your ability to achieve all your planned targets?**

Answer

Well, I can say human resource capacity in the office is an issue that affect all of us and that same applies to having laptops for the current staff members. I mean we do not have sufficient staff and sufficient tools of trade to work. How do you then expect us to perform effectively? Yea so that is the current situation

Question

3. **What challenges do you experience that ultimately contribute towards the achievement of the Gauteng Office of the Premier's outcomes?**

Answer

One of the resources is obviously budget cuts and redirection of funds and so budget cuts is the first one, your second one is obviously the HR methods of employing the more people to assist on deliverables. But when it comes to the money, that's where we struggle with.

Question

4. **To what extent does evidence-based reporting have an impact on your performance and attainment of targets?**

Answer

I think that evidence goes along with performance. There is room for everyone to verify what has been stated in the report but that also goes with capacity and what we find as

gap is that there is no human capacity to interrogate the evidence. All reports need to be credible, and we believe that what is submitted to us is credible and we can confidently present a report that we deem to be well compiled. But then again what I am also saying is that in an ideal situation we should be having a big team that is able to go out and literally verify some work being done. However, departments also know that you cannot say something is done when is not actually done because you never know which of your projects could be visited next. When we do a random selection of verifying some of the work it could be one of those project that you said it was done and yet it's actually not done. We also have this reports that are being commissioned at high level in departments such that what we get is credible and the only gap is conducting our own independent verification due to human capacity constraints, and we are not able to do so.

Question

5. **To what extent do management/governance structures in the Gauteng Office of the Premier influence organisational performance? Please also clarify the kinds of management/governance structures and their role in the performance**

Answer

I think the agenda of BMT can change to look at the issues on the ground and how the office of the premier can help unlock some of the challenges faced by our departments and citizens. So the current agenda of BMT is not geared to address the issues on the ground and I think its more internally focused in the Gauteng office of the premier as oppose to looking both internally and transversally in the Gauteng provincial government and the needs of the people at the ground. We need to think about how to holistically reposition the agenda to look at the performance of the province and deliver the needs to the people on the ground. BMT its an important structure to have but it around the agenda that has been set that neglects the citizens in the Gauteng Province.

Thank you for making time to participate in this interview