

https://dspace.org/

Implementation of the performance management and development system in a Gauteng Provincial Department

Makhooa, Lirontso

2018

https://hdl.handle.net/10539/28635

Makhooa, Lirontso, 2018, Implementation of the performance management and development system in a Gauteng provincial department, University of the Witwatersrand, https://hdl.handle.net/10539/28635

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

Implementation of the performance management and development system in a Gauteng Provincial Department

Lirontso Makhooa
WITS Graduate School of Governance

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

November 2018

DECLARATION

I declare that this thesis/dissertation titled 'Implementation of the performance management and development system in a Gauteng Provincial Department' is my own, unaided work. I have acknowledged and referenced all sources that I have used and quoted. I hereby submit it in partial fulfilment of the requirements of the degree of Master of Management (Public and Development Management) in the University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg. I have not submitted this report before for any other degree or examination to any other institution.

Lirontso Makhooa

Johannesburg, November 2018

ABSTRACT

Author: Lirontso Makhooa **Supervisor:** Dr Kambidima Wotela

Thesis title: Implementation of the performance management and development system in a Gauteng Provincial Department

The South African government identified the need for improved individual and organisational performance to deliver quality services to the citizens of the country. In 2003, the government introduced the performance management and development system (PMDS) to improve individual and organisational performance and, ultimately, achieve quality service delivery (Penceliah, 2012). This paper proposes to explore employees' perceptions of the implementation of the PMDS in the Gauteng Department of Agriculture and Rural Development (GDARD) and the role of HRD.

This study applied a qualitative research strategy and case study research design to conduct the empirical part of the research. Research participants were recruited through purposive sampling. A semi-structured interview was used to collect data from employees who are on salary levels four to twelve and assessed through the PMDS. Primary data was analysed using direct thematic content analysis.

The findings in this research suggest that employees at the GDARD perceive the PMDS to be a tool to improve individual and, ultimately, organisational performance. The employees are particularly motivated by the financial element attached to the rewarding of excellent performance. Their perceptions confirms the reinforcement theory, which proclaims that rewarding good performance encourages employees to repeat the same behaviour. Furthermore, the findings in this research suggest that the role of human resource development (HRD) in GDARD is to ensure that the PMDS is implemented correctly.

This research concludes that implementation of the system in the Department needs to be improved, and a collective effort is required from human resource development (HRD) directorate and senior management of GDARD.

Johannesburg, November 2018

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DECLARATION ii
Abstract iii
Table of contents iv
List of figures vii
LIST OF TABLES vii
List of tables and figures in appendices viii
Acknowledgements ix
1. Introduction to the research 1
1.1 Background 1
1.1.1 Introduction of performance management and development system in the South African public service 1
1.1.2 The legislative framework on performance management and development system 2
1.1.3 History and description of the Gauteng Department of Agriculture and Rural Development 3
1.2 Assessing the implementation of the performance management and development system 4
1.2.1 Research problem statement 4
1.2.2 Research purpose statement 5
1.2.3 Research questions 6
1.3 Delimitations of the research 6
1.4 Justification of the research 7
1.5 Preface to the research report 7
2. Reviewing Literature to derive the conceptual framework 9
2.1 History and description of the Gauteng Department of Agriculture and Rural Development 9
2.2 The evolution of the performance management and development system 13
2.2.1 Description of the performance management system 13
2.2.2 The Performance Management and Development System in the South African Public Service 14
2.2.3 Symptoms, root causes and consequences associated with the implementation of the performance management system 15
2.3 Methods, data, findings and conclusions of studies and evaluations of the implementation of the performance management system 17
2.3.1 Qualitative studies and evaluations on the implementation of the performance management system 18
2.3.2 Quantitative studies and evaluations on the implementation of the performance management system 23
2.3.3 Global studies and evaluations on the implementation of the performance management system 24
2.4 An introduction to public management studies 25
2.4.1 Describing public management 26
2.4.2 The purpose of public management 26
2.4.3 Major components of public management 27
2.4.4 Major processes of public management 31

2.4.5 Established facts in public management....32
2.4.6 Key issues in the study of public management....33
2.4.7 Describing the management component in detail....34
2.4.8 Describing the purpose of management....34
2.4.9 Major components of management....35
2.5 Key public management attributes for assessing the implementation of the performance management system....40
2.5.1 Goals....40
2.5.2 Training....40
2.5.3 Communication....41
2.5.4 Rewards....41
2.5.5 Training....42
2.6 Established frameworks that can interpret empirical findings on the implementation of the performance management system....42
2.6.1 The reinforcement theory....43
2.6.2 The goal-setting theory....44
2.6.3 McGregor's Theory X and Y....46
2.6.4 Herzberg Motivation-Hygiene Factor Theory....47
2.7 Assessing the implementation of the performance management and development system, a conceptual framework....47
3. Research strategy, design, procedure and methods....52
3.1 Strategy....52
3.2 Design....54
3.3 Procedure and methods....56
3.3.1 Data collection instrument....56
3.3.2 Targeting and selecting respondents....59
3.3.3 Ethical considerations when collecting research data....63
3.3.4 Data collection and storage....65
3.3.5 Data processing and analysis....68
3.3.6 Description of the respondents....73
3.4 Research strengths: Reliability and validity measures applied....75
3.5 Research weaknesses: Technical and administrative limitations....77
4. Presentation of research results....79
4.1 Employees' perception regarding the implementation of the performance management and development system in the Gauteng Department of Agriculture and Rural Development....79
4.2 Role of human resource development in the implementation of the performance management and development system in the department....90
4.2.1 Presentation of the results....91
4.3 Conclusion....97
5. Discussion of research findings....98
5.1 The employees' perception regarding the implementation of the performance management and development system in the Gauteng Department of Agriculture and Rural Development....98
5.1.1 Employees' knowledge and understanding....98
5.1.1.2 Benefits of the system....102
5.1.1.3 Challenges of the implementation of the system....106

5.1.1.4 The PMDS as a tool 108
5.2 The role of human resource development in the implementation of the performance management and development system in the department 109
5.2.1 The responsibility of Human Resource Development 109
5.2.2 Challenges of the system 112
5.3 Conclusion 112
6. Summary, conclusions, limitations, and recommendations 114
6.1 Summary 114
6.2 Conclusions 115
6.3 Limitations 117
6.4 Recommendations 118
7. References 120
Appendices 127
Appendix 1.1: Consent Form and Interview Guide 127
Appendix 1.2 Information Sheet 130
Appendix 1.3: Transcribed Interview with employee 132
Appendix 1.4: Transcribed Interview with human resource manager 142
Appendix 1.5: Matrix Table for Data Fragmentation. 150

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure1: Organisational Structure of the Department of Agriculture and Rural Development 11
Figure 2: Public management and its major components 28
Figure 3: Strategic planning process 30
Figure 4: Changing behaviour with reinforcement 44
Figure 5: Goal-setting theory 46
Figure 6: Assessing the implementation of the performance management system, a conceptual framework 51

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: The interview schedule for the GDARD 67
Table 2: Matrix table for data fragmentation 71
Table 3: Description of the research respondents 74

LIST OF TABLES AND FIGURES IN APPENDICES

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I thank you Heavenly Father for giving me the strength, courage and wisdom to embark this journey.

My deepest gratitude goes to the most important contributor in this research, Dr K Wotela. When I did not apply the instructions, you patiently directed me to the right path. At times I felt like this journey was not for me, but you encouraged me to hold on. You motivated me and guided me into being the best I can be. I walk away from this research taking with me "***the what, the why and the how***". May the good Lord continue to bless you. Thank you so much Dr Wotela.

My gratitude also goes to my sister Ms Phuti Sejeng. I do not know where I would be without you. You believed in me more than I believed in myself. I thank you for the continuous emotional, physical and spiritual support. May God bless abundantly. Thank you so much *setlogolo sa Mapitsi.*

To my brother Mr. Khumbulani Mchunu, thank for continuously inspiring, motivating and mentoring me. My gratitude towards you is limitless.

To my friend Ms Vonani Mhlanga, thank you very much for your support. The world could do better with people like you. May God enlarge your territory.

To Dr Gillian Godsell, thank for your motivation, inspiration and patience. You always allowed me time in your busy schedule. You said, "*Be patient Lirontso, research requires patience"*

To my friends Dr Ntombi Zwane and Mr. Given Mzubanzi, family, colleagues at Wits and GDARD, thank you for your support.

To my beautiful niece Tshepiso Asante Machaela Mokwena, I hope one day you will do better than I did.

1. INTRODUCTION TO THE RESEARCH

1.1 Background

This chapter presents the problem statement and purpose of the research, but first gives a brief introduction to the terms used in conceptualising the research. Section 1.1.1 introduces the concept of the performance management system in the South African public service, while Section 1.1.2 presents the legislative framework on the performance management and development system (PMDS), and Section 1.1.3 the history and description of the Gauteng Department of Agriculture and Rural Development (GDARD). Section 1.2.1 presents the research problem statement, Section 1.2.2 the purpose of the research, and Section 1.2.3 the research questions. The research delimitations are discussed in Section 1.3, and the justification for the research in Section 1.4. Lastly, Section 1.5 provides a brief discussion on the preface to the research.

1.1.1 Introduction of performance management and development system in the South African public service

The PMDS refers to a system that identifies the performance management process and cycle in the public institution (Penceliah, 2012). The government introduced the PMDS to improve performance in the public service. The PMDS was introduced across the national and provincial sphere of government on 1 April 2001 (Penceliah, 2012). The system involves the phases of performance planning, monitoring, measuring, review and reporting in line with the strategic plan of the particular public institution (Muller, Bezuidenhout and Jooste, 2008).

The purpose of the PMDS is to ensure that employees in a particular department or institution are equipped with the necessary skills, knowledge and competencies to effectively and efficiently achieve the goals and objectives of the department (Du-Plessis, 2015). More so, the PMDS should ensure that performance is managed in such a way that previous performance is reviewed and current performance assessed, so that corrective measures can be taken when performance is poor and recognition (or reward) can be given when performance is excellent (Penceliah, 2012).

The PMDS policy used at the GDARD was developed by the Gauteng provincial government, effective 1 April 2003. The provincial government saw the need to implement a practical performance management system that would improve productivity and performance and, ultimately, bring quality service delivery to the community of Gauteng (Gauteng Provincial Government, 2002).

1.1.2 The legislative framework on performance management and development system

The South African government established the regulatory framework that will guide departments on the implementation of the PMDS. The Constitution of the Republic of South Africa, Act No. 108 of 1996, the Public Service Act No. 103 of 1994, and the Public Service Regulations of 2001 are key legislations that guide the implementation of the PMDS. The Public Service Act No. 103 of 1994 (Section 7(3)(b)) requires the Head of Department (HOD) to develop and implement a system that will measure the performance of employees. Furthermore, the regulation requires that the system be implemented in such a way that it does not discriminate against employees. The system should be consultative and supportive in order to enhance efficiency and effectiveness in the department (Republic of South Africa, 1994).

The White Paper on Human Resource Management in the Public Service of 1997 stipulates that employees should be assessed on the work plan that is signed at the beginning of the performance management cycle (Republic of South Africa, 1997). Moreover, training and development interventions should be implemented to manage the performance of the employee (Republic of South Africa, 1997). Management should recognise and reward good performance, and counselling should be implemented to address poor performance (Republic of South Africa, 1997). Chapter 1 of the Public Service Regulations of 2001 provides the basic guidelines for implementation of the performance management system (Republic of South Africa, 2001). The regulations stipulate that performance management should be implemented consultatively, supportively and non-discriminatively, in order to improve efficiency, effectiveness, accountability and the achievement of results in the organisation (Republic of South Africa, 2001). Moreover, the regulations require that, prior to

implementation of a performance management system, the HOD adequately test the system on groups of personnel at different occupational levels to allow for reasonable rationality (Republic of South Africa, 2001).

The Department of Public Service Administration (DPSA) and the Public Service Commission are responsible for facilitating and supervising how performance management systems should be applied in the public service so as to ensure efficiency (Malefane 2010). The Office of the Presidency established the Department of Performance, Monitoring and Evaluation to further strengthen the implementation of the performance management system (Penceliah, 2012). The purpose of this department is to improve the standard of service delivery by measuring and monitoring the performance of public servants (Penceliah, 2012).

1.1.3 History and description of the Gauteng Department of Agriculture and Rural Development

According to the Auditor-General of South Africa, insufficient compliance with the relevant legislation on the PMDS has been prevalent at the GDARD during the financial years 2014, 2015 and 2016 (Gauteng Department of Agriculture and Rural Development, 2016). The department introduced the PMDS to impart a culture of excellence (Gauteng Department of Agriculture and Rural Development, 2016). GDARD's operations are implemented from its head office in Johannesburg and four regional offices (Germiston, Randfontein, Pretoria), which provide services at a municipal level (Gauteng Department of Agriculture and Rural Development, 2016). Prior to 2010, the department was known as the Gauteng Department of Agriculture Conservation and Environment (GDACE) and mandated with issues of agriculture, conservation and the environment in Gauteng. After the national elections in 2010, the name of the department was changed to the Gauteng Department of Agriculture and Rural Development, and its mandate amended.

The GDARD plays a major role in ensuring food security for the community of Gauteng. The vision of the department is to ensure "an economically transformed agricultural sector and sustainable environmental management for healthy, food security, developed rural and urban communities in Gauteng" (Gauteng Department of

Agriculture and Rural Development, 2016, p. 18). The GDARD's mission is to radically modernise and transform agriculture, the environment and rural development by promoting environmental protection and management, expanding access to agricultural opportunities, maximising food security, upscaling rural development, promoting the One Health System, and supporting sustainable livelihoods and communities (Gauteng Department of Agriculture and Rural Development Annual Report, 2016, p.18).

The mandate of the GDARD is further strengthened by the Bill of Rights in Chapter 2 of the Constitution (Gauteng Department of Agriculture and Rural Development, 2015). According to the Constitution of the Republic of South Africa, all people have the right to an environment that is not harmful to their wellbeing, and to access to sufficient food and water (Gauteng Department of Agriculture and Rural Development, 2015). Furthermore, the department takes into account the legislative framework that governs the administration of agriculture, the environment and rural development. The GDARD takes into consideration the importance of quality service delivery. Government departments are measured through their performance in terms of service delivery.

1.2 Assessing the implementation of the performance management and development system

1.2.1 Research problem statement

The South African government realised that improved individual and organisational performance was key to the delivery of quality services to the citizens of the country. The PMDS was therefore introduced across the public service to improve individual and organisational performance and, ultimately, achieve quality service delivery (Penceliah, 2012). The purpose of the PMDS is to monitor, assess and review the performance of employees, and to reward and recognise good performance (Munzhedzi and Phago, 2012). Prior studies have shown that compliance and implementation of the system is a challenge in the South African public service (Mello 2015; Hendricks & Matsiliza, 2015; Munzhedzi & Phago, 2014; Allen-lle, lle & Munyaka, 2007; Cameron, 2015).

The issue of non-compliance is prevalent in the GDARD. According to the findings of the Auditor-General (GDARD Annual Report, 2016), management did not sufficiently and adequately comply with existing legislation on the implementation of performance management. It is not known to what extent employees in the South African public service are content with the implementation of the system (Mello, 2015). This research sought to investigate the perceptions of employees regarding the implementation of the PMDS in the GDARD. Additionally, the research sought to explore the role of human resource development (HRD) in the implementation of the PMDS, since it is the custodian of the system.

1.2.2 Research purpose statement

The purpose of this research is to explore the employees' perception regarding the implementation of the PMDS in the GDARD; and the role of HRD in its implementation. Firstly, the research reviews literature on the implementation of the performance management system in South Africa and other countries in order to gain an understanding of the associated challenges. Secondly, a review of past studies and documented frameworks helps this research to establish frameworks that can interpret the empirical findings on the implementation of the performance management system. Thirdly, this research uses the review of literature to develop a conceptual framework on "Assessing the implementation of the performance management and development system in the Gauteng Department of Agriculture and Rural Development". The conceptual framework provides a guideline to conduct empirical research. Fourthly, this research collects and analyses data on the implementation of the PMDS in the GDARD, in accordance with the established frameworks. Lastly, the study uses the research results to draw conclusions and provide recommendations.

1.2.3 Research questions

To achieve the purpose of the study, this research seeks to answer the following questions:

1. What is the employees' perception regarding the implementation of the performance management and development system in the Gauteng Department of Agriculture and Rural Development?
2. What is the role of human resource development in the implementation of the performance management and development system in the department?

1.3 Delimitations of the research

According to Sharma (2014, p. 96), "delimitations are boundaries that are set by the researcher in order to control the range of a study." Performance management falls within the discipline of public management. Hood (2005, p.68) describes the term 'public management' as the "study practice of design and operations of arrangement for the provision of the public services and executive government" (p.68). Public management has two major components, namely the political and management processes (Minaar, 2006). This research excludes the political process component, which focuses mainly on political authority and policymaking structures (Minaar, 2006; Van der Waldt & Du Toit, 1999). The research, therefore, focuses only on the management component, which is relevant to the research problem under investigation. Management focuses on formulating and implementing strategies and utilising resources to effectively and efficiently deliver on the mandate of the organisation (Smit, de J Cronje, Brevis & Vrba, 2007). In terms of the management component, this research focuses on human resource management. Werner (2014) indicates that human resource management is about establishing and implementing systems, practices and procedures that direct employees towards effectively and efficiently achieving the goals and objectives of the organisation. Furthermore, public service legislation requires organisations to integrate performance management with human resource management and development (Republic of South Africa, 1997).

1.4 Justification of the research

The South African government introduced the PMDS to improve both individual and organisational performance. It is therefore important to explore and determine how the employees of the GDARD received the system. Furthermore, it is critical to determine the role of HRD managers in the implementation of the PMDS, as they are the custodians of the system. In addition, there is a need for research and publication on performance management in the South African service context (Mello, 2015). This will contribute to the body of knowledge on performance management in the context of the South African public service.

According to the literature reviewed, successful implementation of the performance management system can be beneficial to an organisation in that it contributes to the performance, morale and behaviour of employees. The reinforcement and goal-setting theories also support proper implementation of the performance management system. Past studies and evaluations on the implementation of the system did not apply these theories to the empirical results of the research. This research, however, closed the gap, applying the reinforcement and goal-setting theories to interpret the research results.

1.5 Preface to the research report

This research report comprises six chapters, with Chapter 1 an introduction. Chapter 2 introduces the research context and broadly reviews literature on the implementation of performance management systems. It examines the findings of previous research, identifies a knowledge gap, and provides a detailed discussion on public management as the broad academic field of study for the PMDS. The components, processes, facts and debates on public management are discussed, as are the attributes. Established frameworks that can interpret empirical findings on the implementation of the PMDS are discussed, and the chapter concludes by developing a conceptual framework.

Chapter 3 describes the strategy, design, procedures and methods applied when conducting the research. It presents a discussion on the processes of data collection and data analysis applied in this research. Furthermore, the chapter describes the reliability and validity measures applied to make the research credible. Ethical considerations

adhered to are presented, as are the technical and administrative limitations relating to the research.

Chapter 4 reports the research results on the implementation of the PMDS in the GDARD. The chapter presents results derived from the key themes that emerged from the data analysis process. The chapter presents the research results on employees' perceptions of the implementation of the PMDS in the GDARD and the role of HRD.

Chapter 5 presents the analysis of the key findings reported in Chapter 4. The data analysis is based on themes identified in the literature review and established frameworks. The analysis is also made from the attributes discussed in Section 2.5 (Chapter 2). Furthermore, the analysis is based on data collected from the different data sources discussed in Chapter 3.

Chapter 6 presents a summary of this research report and concluding remarks. It also highlights the limitations of the research. Lastly, it provides recommendations.

2. REVIEWING LITERATURE TO DERIVE THE CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

This chapter has four broad objectives, namely to understand the research problem (Sections 2.1 and 2.2), identify the knowledge gap (Section 2.3), develop a theoretical framework for interpreting the findings (Sections 2.4), and conceptualise the research approach (Section 2.7). Section 2.1 briefly describes the research context in preparation for Section 2.2, which details the research problem. Section 2.3 reviews literature on past studies and evaluations of the implementation of the performance management system, and identifies knowledge gaps. We situate the research within the implementation of the performance management system and its key components and attributes in Sections 2.4 and 2.5. The research establishes the relevant explanatory frameworks in Section 2.6. Lastly, this study develops a conceptual framework in Section 2.7, which provides a roadmap of how this research intends to assess the implementation of the PMDS in the GDARD.

2.1 History and description of the Gauteng Department of Agriculture and Rural Development


The GDARD is a public service institution under the administration of the Gauteng Provincial Government. It was previously known as the Gauteng Department of Agriculture, Conservation and Environment (GDACE), and mandated to address issues of agriculture, conservation and the environment in Gauteng. Post the national democratic elections in 2010, the department's mandate was amended and its name changed to the Gauteng Department of Agriculture and Rural Development (or GDARD).

The vision of the GDARD is to ensure "an economically transformed agricultural sector and sustainable environmental management for healthy, food secure, developed rural and urban communities in Gauteng" (Gauteng Department of Agriculture and Rural Development 2016, p. 18). The mission of the GDARD is to "radically modernise and transform agriculture, the environment and rural development by promoting environmental protection and management, expanding access to agricultural opportunities, maximising food security, upscaling rural development, promoting the One Health System, and supporting sustainable livelihoods and communities" (Gauteng

Department of Agriculture and Rural Development, 2016, p.18). The mandate of the GDARD is strengthened by the Bill of Rights in the Constitution, which provides for rights to equal access to an environment that is not harmful to wellbeing, and access to food and water (Gauteng Department of Agriculture and Rural Development, 2015).

Furthermore, the department takes into account the legislative framework that governs the administration of agriculture, the environment and rural development (Gauteng Department of Agriculture and Rural Development, 2015).

Figure1: Organisational Structure of the Department of Agriculture and Rural Development



The operations of the GDARD are implemented from its head office in Johannesburg and the regional offices, which provide services at a municipal level (Gauteng Department of Agriculture and Rural Development, 2016). The administration of the department is governed by the Executive Management Team (EMT), which comprises the Member of the Executive Council (MEC), the Head of Department (HOD) and Chief Directors in different directorates of the department, (Figure 1). The EMT is responsible for ensuring the effective and efficient implementation of the GDARD's vision, mission and mandate. The department will review the organisational structure to ensure delivery of the strategic plan, and implement the strategic plan through capacitating the organisational structure with the necessary skills, knowledge and expertise (Gauteng Department of Agriculture and Rural Development, 2016). The department will take measures to ensure financial and human resources are available for the implementation of the strategic plan (Gauteng Department of Agriculture and Rural Development, 2016). The GDARD, however, faces the challenge of not being able to fill vacant posts due to budget limitations (Gauteng Department of Agriculture and Rural Development, 2016). Priority is therefore given to filling those posts considered critical, while staff secondment is implemented as a temporary solution. Moreover, the GDARD has implemented the Occupational Specific Dispensation (OSD) to retain critical skills, but inconsistent application of the resolution by provinces and the national Department of Environment Affairs remains a challenge (Gauteng Department of Agriculture and Rural Development, 2016).

The GDARD developed methods and mechanisms to monitor departmental performance against the predetermined strategic plan, annual performance plan and annual expenditure. The Premier, the Executive Council, the Legislature and the Auditor-General monitor the performance of the MEC. The MEC is responsible for monitoring the performance of the HOD, who in turn monitors that of the programme managers (also known as Chief Directors). The Chief Directors are responsible for monitoring the sub-programme managers. All parties, from the MEC to the sub-programme managers, must produce monthly, quarterly and annual reports (Gauteng Department of Agriculture and Rural Development, 2016).

The department has taken an initiative to effectively implement employee performance management. After discovering a gap in the application and implementation of the

performance management framework, the department introduced a new process map and refresher sessions that would impart new knowledge and understanding of the application of the PMDS. The department managed compliance with significant legislation when utilising the performance management budget. Moreover, it modernised, introducing an electronic performance management and development system (e-PMDS) to the division of Transversal Services, effective 1 April 2016 (Gauteng Department of Agriculture and Rural Development, 2016). In terms of financial and performance management, the department received an unqualified audit with findings from the Auditor-General. According to the Auditor-General, the management of the GDARD did not sufficiently monitor compliance with key legislation. There was no credible evidence that supported the financial statements (Gauteng Department of Agriculture and Rural Development, 2016).

2.2 The evolution of the performance management and development system

The purpose of this section is to provide a detailed discussion on the implementation of the performance management system. Section 2.2.1 presents a description of the system., while Section 2.2.2 presents a discussion on the PMDS in the context of the South African public service. Lastly, Section 2.2.3 presents a discussion on the challenges, root causes and consequences of the system.

2.2.1 Description of the performance management system

The concept of the performance management system includes approaches, formal mechanisms, structures, processes and networks that management use to communicate the strategic goals of the organisation (Fereirra & Otley, 2009; Agunis, 2009). The concept of the performance management system was developed in the 1980s, and evolved from the use of traditional accounting and data to measure the performance of an organisation to a new trend of methods to measure business performance (Zelgat, AIRawabdeh, AlMadi & Shrafat, 2012). Arakral and Mampilly (2016) assert that the purpose of performance management is to improve both individual and organisational performance (Arakral & Mampilly, 2016). In addition, Biron, Fardale and Paauwe (2011) maintain that performance management systems help senior management to

achieve the strategic goals of the organisation. Senior management need the employees to accept the system, so that their behaviour can contribute to the success of the organisation (Biron et al., 2011). Implementation of the system, however, differs in the private and public sectors. In the public sector, people use the system for financial gain, while in the private sector they contribute to the success of the organisation.

Literature highlights that in many organisations, performance management is about linking the strategic goals of the organisation to those of the employee (Dzimbiri, 2008; Pulakos & O'Leary, 2011; Ferreira & Otley 2009; Frink & Ferris, 1998; Saravanja, 2010). Agunis (2009) asserts that the system provides managers and employees with a platform from which to set goals, measure and review results, reward performance and achieve organisational objectives. Agunis (2009) maintains that managers and employees should agree on how work will be done and that managers should not simply dictate to employees. In addition, Mello (2015) argues that the objective of the performance management system in the public service should be to improve service delivery.

2.2.2 The Performance Management and Development System in the South African Public Service

After the first democratic national elections in 1994, the new government was willing to transform the administration of the public service (Pencilliah, 2012). The focus shifted to a public service that would serve the community of South Africa in an efficient, effective and economic manner (Pencilliah, 2012). The public service is an administrative vehicle utilised by government to provide quality service delivery to the citizens of the country (Nengwekulu, 2009). The South African democratic government wanted to create a public service that is responsible and accountable in the implementation of its mandate (Nengwekulu, 2009; Penceliah, 2012). The priority of government was therefore to ensure that service delivery is measured, managed and improved (Penceliah, 2012). Thus, in order to ensure an execution of quality service delivery in South Africa, the performance of the public service must be measured, managed and improved (Penceliah, 2012).

The government introduced the PMDS to improve performance in the public service (Penceliah, 2012). The PMDS is defined as a system that identifies the performance

management process and cycle in the public institutions (Penceliah, 2012; Muller, Bezuidenhout & Jooste, 2008). The purpose of the PMDS is to provide policy measures and guidelines that will assist government departments to effectively and efficiently achieve their objectives (Van Dijk & Thornhill, 2003). Du-Plessis (2015) asserts that the PMDS ensures that employees in government departments are equipped with the necessary skills, knowledge and competencies to effectively and efficiently achieve the goals and objectives of the department or government institution.

The objectives of the PMDS are to establish a performance culture in the department, review past performance, assess current performance, address poor performance, recognise and reward good performance, and facilitate performance and organisational development (Van Dijk & Thornhill, 2003; Penceliah, 2012). Performance management aims to enhance the potential and current employee output in terms of quality and quantity, ultimately increasing the performance of the organisation as a whole (Van Dijk & Thornhill, 2003). Muller et al. (2008) assert the performance management process should be applied in accordance with the strategic plan of the particular public institution. Mello (2015) argues that when applied correctly, the PMDS should both enhance the potential and increase the morale of the employee. Additionally, Malefane (2010) asserts that the system has been recognised as the most effective tool for government to measure performance and identify gaps and challenges that need to be addressed.

2.2.3 Symptoms, root causes and consequences associated with the implementation of the performance management system

Grobler, Warnich, Carell, Elbert and Hatfield (2011) mention that South Africa faces enormous challenges regarding the implementation of the performance management system in both the private and public sectors. Grobler et al. (2012) argue that inadequate support on the implementation of the performance management system is a challenge in many organisations. Similarly, Manyaka and Sebola (2012) argue that management in the public service fails to commit to the system, and that there is a general view that managers could care less about the performance of their subordinates. Most managers in the public service are reluctant to communicate feedback to their employees, and would rather use a pass-one-pass-all system. Makamu and Mello (2014)

maintain that inexperienced managers prefer employees to rate themselves a five so as to avoid any potential conflicts. Allen-lle, lle and Munyaka (2007) argue that managers in the public service are not implementing the system correctly, hence it is viewed by public-service employees as a Western policy imposed on Third World countries.

Makamu and Mello (2014) argue that managers in the public service are reluctant to give employees feedback because they tend to view constructive criticism in a negative light or as an attempt by managers to undermine their self-esteem. Manyaka and Sebola (2012), however, assert that constructive feedback is essential to performance management in the public service in that it helps managers to separate those employees who are performing excellently from those performing poorly. Managers discount this process because they focus mainly on the final appraisal (Manyaka & Sebola, 2012). Maseti and Maclean (2016) add that feedback is necessary after reviews so that managers can correct or reward performance.

Lack of knowledge and understanding of the system on the part of both managers and employees is another problem cited by Mello (2015), Munzhedzi and Phago (2014), Magoro (2016), Allen-lle et al. (2007). Mello (2015) argues that no one measures the supervisors' knowledge of the performance management system, which leads to problems in its implementation. Additionally, Makumu and Mello (2014) assert that managers' lack of knowledge and understanding creates issues with regards to performance measurement and evaluation. As a result, it is problematic for managers to assess performance they are not sure of (Makumu & Mello, 2014). Munzhedzi and Phago (2014) emphasise that not only is the managers' lack of knowledge cause for concern, but also that of the employees. Employees' lack of knowledge of the system renders into managers having inadequate understanding of the performance management system (Munzhedzi & Phago, 2014). Literature proposes that managers should train employees to understand and accept the performance management system (Pulakos & O'Leary, 2011; Arakal & Mampilly, 2016). Akral and Mampilly (2016) argue that it is very important for employees to be trained to accept and understand the performance management system. Moreover, Munzhedzi and Phago (2014), Sebashe and Mtapuri (2011) maintain that public service institutions must allocate budget for training of employees so that they can be effective in their jobs, as required by the Skills Development Act No. 97 of 1999.

Hvidman and Anderson (2013) assert that a lack of resources hinders successful implementation of the performance management system. Hvidman and Anderson (2013) maintain that rewarding performance is more of a challenge for managers in the public sector than for those in the private sector because of a lack of financial resources. Sebashe and Mtapuri (2011) argue that employees are anxious about not being rewarded for excellent performance. Furthermore, Sebashe and Mtapuri (2011) maintain that performance bonuses lead to an increase in morale and a decrease in problems around service delivery. By contrast, Van der Vyver and Bussin (2013) argue that pay incentives are not always the answer when dealing with low employee morale and performance. Non-financial rewards are an alternative, and managers should use incentives such as certificates of excellence, new innovation awards or articles in departmental newsletters to acknowledge the good performance of employees (Van der Vyver & Bussin, 2013). Manyaka and Sebola (2012) assert that the lack of tools such as computers, training opportunities and human resources is another challenge for performance management in the public service. Moreover, it takes some time to fill posts left vacant by employees who have resigned (Manyaka & Sebola, 2012).

The above-mentioned academic literature and studies highlight the many challenges that exist in the implementation of performance management systems, both in the private and public sectors. Performance is a key element in the success of any institution. In the private sector, the performance of the organisation is measured against profit, while performance in the public service is measured against the ability to provide quality services to the community. Failure to implement the performance management system results in a failure of service delivery. To improve service delivery, there is a need for effective performance management (Manyaka & Sebola, 2012).

2.3 Methods, data, findings and conclusions of studies and evaluations of the implementation of the performance management system

The purpose of this section is to review previous studies and evaluations on the implementation of the performance management system, and to identify a knowledge gap. The section identifies the research approaches, designs, procedures and methods applied in the studies and evaluations. Section 2.3.1 presents the qualitative studies and

evaluations on the implementation of the performance management system. Section 2.3.2 presents the past studies and evaluations on the implementation of the performance management system. Lastly, Section 2.3.3 presents the global past studies on the implementation of the performance management system.

2.3.1 Qualitative studies and evaluations on the implementation of the performance management system

Maclean and Maseti (2016) employed a qualitative research strategy and case study research design to assess the effectiveness of the implementation of the PMDS in the Eastern Cape Provincial Planning and Treasury Department. The study used purposive sampling to select the participants. The sample comprises top and middle management. The study found that performance management is not clearly defined, is incapable of assisting subordinates to grow, employees perceive performance management as a non-developmental tool, and the rating system does not serve its intended purpose. The study concluded that the Provincial Planning and Treasury Department should adopt change management.

Magoro (2016) applied a qualitative research strategy to study the implementation of the performance management system in the Makhuduthamaga Local Municipality. The study applied a case study research design and utilised a questionnaire (fully structured interview guide) as its data collection instrument. Magoro (2016) found that employees in the municipality have a different understanding of the system; there is lack of capacity in the implementation of the system; Section 56 managers displayed reluctance; and employees do not have knowledge of their senior managers' performance targets. The study concluded that different understandings exist with regard to performance management and is an obstacle to implementation of the system.

A similar study by Hendricks and Matsiliza (2015) employed a qualitative research strategy to determine the understanding of the implementation of the performance management system in the public sector. The research design for this study was a case study of the Department of Rural Development and Land Reform in the Western Cape. The qualitative research strategy enabled the researchers to describe and interpret the action of the study participants. The study collected secondary data through

unstructured interviews and observation (with the researcher being the participant observer). Purposive sampling was used to select senior and middle managers, union representatives and human resource practitioners to participate in the interviews. Hendricks and Matsiliza (2015) collected secondary data through journal articles, policy documents and government reports, and concluded that public sector institutions should take the performance management system seriously and enhance organisational growth.

Similarly, a study by Mello (2015) applied a qualitative research strategy to understand the nature and extent of the symptoms and problems associated with the PMDS in the South African public service. Mello (2015) analysed fact sheets on grievance resolutions produced by the Public Service Commission and reviewed statistics from the 2010 to 2014 financial years. The study concludes that the primary problem of the implementation of the PMDS in the public service is the lack of resources and knowledge as well as the thin focus on financial incentives. Mello (2015) maintains that little justice is done to literature on performance management and public sector human resources, and recommends research and publications on the subject. The author is of the view that the piecemeal approach to dealing with challenges around implementation of the performance management system is not enough and hence the study was undertaken.

Cameron (2015) applied a qualitative research strategy to determine the hindrances and difficulties experienced in the implementation of the performance management system on both an organisational and individual level. The study examined the different roles in the implementation of the system in the South African Department of Labour, both nationally and provincially as well as in labour centres. The study applied a case study research design and judgment (purposive) sampling to select the participants, and collected data through interviews and focus groups. It used a semi-structured interview schedule to collect data from participants. Cameron (2015) found that little progress had been made in the establishment of a performance management system, the department lacks a performance culture, and performance management reforms were unsuccessful.

A study by Mosoge and Pilane (2014) applied a qualitative research strategy to clarify the concept 'performance management' as an aspect of the IQMS, and to explore the experiences and perceptions of school management teams in the implementation of performance management. This included an explanation of performance management against the background of the structural-functionalist and conflict theories. The use of the qualitative research strategy allowed the researchers to collect descriptive data and record changes in the real-life context of the study participants. Mosoge and Pilane (2014) conducted structured interviews to collect data from participants, utilising an interview schedule consisting of standardised questions. The study utilised purposive sampling to select participants with knowledge of the research problem. Random sampling was used to select three schools from a total population of 24 primary schools in Rustenburg. The researchers enhanced trustworthiness through the triangulation of transcripts, field notes and draft reports, as well as via member-checking, where the audio tapes were played back to the participants for their comments. The study analysed primary data using the content analysis method, a process that involved transferring data from audio tapes to transcripts, and studying the field notes. Mosoge and Pilane (2014) found that a lack of knowledge and expertise on processes such as mentoring, coaching and monitoring hampered the implementation of performance management.

Munzhedzi and Phago (2014) similarly applied a qualitative research strategy to determine whether the introduction of performance management contributes to improved productivity in the Department of Co-operative Governance, Human Settlements and Traditional Affairs (COGHSTA) in Limpopo. The study applied a case study research design and purposive sampling to select the participants. Primary data was collected through the use of semi-structured questionnaires and observations. Semi-structured questions were utilised to provide the participants with the freedom to express their opinions as to how they understand the situation, rather than quantitative questions, which restrict responses. Munzhedzi and Phago (2014) conducted data analysis by reducing raw data to manageable proportions and identifying themes and patterns. Munzhedzi and Phago (2014) found that managers are incompetent with regard to implementation of the performance management system, supervisors and managers lack an understanding of the system, ratings are biased, and unrealistic

performance targets are set. The study concludes that employees are not convinced that their knowledge of the system is enough to sustain performance and productivity.

Seotlela and Miruka (2014) employed a qualitative research strategy to investigate the challenges in the implementation of performance management in the South African mining industry. The study applied a single case study research design, which allowed for an in-depth, detailed understanding of a specific phenomenon within a closed system. The total population was employees of a health service organisation in the North West. This included senior and middle management, the human resources department as the custodian of the performance management system, nurses and allied health professionals. The quota sampling method was used to select participants. Primary data was collected through unstructured interviews, focus groups and observation, and secondary data obtained from the analysis of existing documents. The study enhanced validity with through triangulation of data sources such as key informant and focus group interviews (different functional categories of employees), observation and the analysis of documents. The study assessed credibility, noting that the written records, interviews and participant observation all resulted in similar conclusions being drawn. Seotlela and Miruka (2014) found a lack of support from the human resources department, despite the fact that it is the custodian of the performance management process. Seotlela and Miruka (2014) further indicate that the management of the organisation failed to implement change management in relation to the performance management system. They conclude that failure to implement change management can lead to resistance to change and limited understanding.

Sebashe and Mtapuri (2011) applied a qualitative research strategy to investigate the implementation of the performance management system in the Ba-Phalaborwa Municipality. The study utilised semi-structured questionnaires (interview guide) with predetermined open-ended questions to collect data. The target population for this study was 421 employees at the Ba-Phalaborwa Municipality comprising managers, assistant managers and lower-level employees. The study used snowball sampling to select the participants. The participants were selected on the basis that they were either affected by or were implementers of the system. The study analysed data using content analysis. Sebashe and Mtapuri (2011) found that employee involvement in performance planning is minimal; there was a lack of training opportunities to address the

weaknesses; there were no performance rewards; and most employees did not know their performance targets as per the service delivery and budget implementation plan. Sebashe and Mtapuri (2011) conclude that the implementation of the performance management system in the municipality is flawed.

Allen-lle, lle and Munyaka (2007) employed a qualitative research strategy to determine employees' perceptions of the performance management system on career development. The study collected data from five focus groups, each of which comprised seven participants. The use of focus groups allowed the study to collect homogenous and trustworthy qualitative data. The thematic analysis method was applied to analyse primary data. The researchers reviewed Super's Theory (1957), which indicates that self-perception changes over time and influences career decision-making. The study population was public servants in the Eastern Cape Provincial Government, and participants were randomly selected from different clusters. The study found no clear understanding of the performance management system at all occupational levels, a lack of professionalism, there were no champions of performance management, the system is viewed as threating by some employees, and employees at lower levels displayed reluctance with regard to the change process. The study concludes that performance management is important because it provides employees with opportunities to advance their careers and meet the objectives of the organisation.

2.3.2 Quantitative studies and evaluations on the implementation of the performance management system

A study by Nzimakwe and Ntshakala (2016) applied a quantitative research strategy and case study research design at the West Rand District Municipality to analyse the alignment of planning, implementation and performance management, and evaluate the extent to which performance management and measurement contributes to fast-tracking and improving service delivery. Nzimakwe and Ntshakala (2016) collected primary data using questionnaires that were quantitative in nature, while secondary data was obtained through the review of relevant literature. The study concludes that there is a strong relationship between planning, implementation and performance management, but system monitoring remains a challenge that needs to be addressed.

Ramulumisi, Schultz and Jordaan (2015) conducted a quantitative research strategy to determine the perceptions of employees with regard to the effectiveness of performance management at a government department in South Africa. The study applied a survey research strategy to obtain relevant data, and used convenience sampling to select participants. The study collected data through a Likert-type five-point scale to measure employee perceptions with regard to the implementation of the performance management system. The study concluded that employees were positive about their own personal performance, but negative about the effectiveness of the system.

Du-Plessis (2015) applied a quantitative research strategy to determine the knowledge of professional nurses regarding the implementation of the PMDS in selected primary healthcare in Tshwane. The study used a questionnaire to collect quantitative data, and the non-probability sampling technique to select participants. The study used convenience sampling to select respondents based on the fact that they have experience with and knowledge of the PMDS. The study collected data from 39 nurses, all of whom manage the performance of others, and analysed the data using descriptive statistics to describe the frequencies and percentages. Du-Plessis (2015) found that professional nurses play an important role in the implementation of the PMDS; there is a need to decrease incidents of misunderstanding or knowledge deficits relating to the implementation of the PMDS; and study participants have inadequate knowledge of the legislative framework governing the implementation of the PMDS.

A study by Adejoka and Bayat (2014) employed a quantitative research strategy to evaluate the integration of performance management and Balanced Scorecard in the performance appraisals of healthcare staff at the Mthatha General Hospital. The study applied a cross-sectional research design and collected data through well-structured self-administered questionnaires. The population of the study is the employees in the healthcare facilities. The employees comprise doctors, therapists, pharmacists, nurses, paramedics and support-service staff. The study concludes that training regarding the implementation of the performance management and development policy is ongoing. Compliance, however, is still poor, and managers and employees are not familiar with the policy.

2.3.3 Global studies and evaluations on the implementation of the performance management system

Mughal, Akram and Ali (2014) conducted a study using a qualitative research strategy to determine the weaknesses of the current performance management system at Alfalah Bank. The researchers selected this strategy because it allows for better results for analysis. A semi-structured interview guide was used as a data collection instrument, with the purpose of closing the gap between the current and proposed performance management systems. Seven employees were sampled to participate. Data was analysed using content analysis, which allowed the authors to find consistency in data. The study found that the employees are dissatisfied with the current performance management system, which lacks proper reward and motivation. The study concludes that employees should be more involved in setting performance standards.

Biron, Farndale and Paauwe (2011) applied a qualitative research strategy to explore the effectiveness of the performance management system in high-performance companies globally. The study applied a case study research design, and selected 16 top-performing companies from around the world to participate in the research. The participants included human resource professionals, senior managers, line managers and labour representatives. The study collected primary data through 90-minute face-to-face interviews, and employed a semi-structured interview schedule. The study adhered to ethical considerations by sending letters to invite companies to participate. Moreover,

the study used pseudonyms to protect the identities of the companies. The collected data was coded in different text to prepare for interpretation of the results. The study concludes that companies should consider economic difficulties and focus on the signals they are sending to their employees regarding performance management.

Cheng, Dainty and More (2006) applied a qualitative research strategy to evaluate the implementation process of the new performance management system in a construction company in the United Kingdom. The study applied a case study research design, and collected data through interviews and observations of the feedback and appraisal process. The study collected data in a longitudinal manner, sampled managers and employees to participate in the interviews, and applied Nvivo qualitative analysis software. It found that implementation of the new system was hampered by a lack of support and commitment from senior management, a lack of training as well as the presence of entrenched working practices.

A limited number of studies exist that focus specifically on the implementation of performance management systems in the private sector. Most studies undertaken in the public service utilised the qualitative research strategy to address the research problem. These studies are very descriptive in their interpretation of the research results. A limited number of past studies and evaluations applied the quantitative research strategy. Furthermore, the preferred research design for most of these studies was the case study. This research draws insight from the above reviewed studies. It adopts a qualitative research strategy because it is descriptive in nature and is the most preferred strategy. It also adopts a case study research design, and purposive sampling to recruit participants.

2.4 An introduction to public management studies

This research falls within public management as the broad academic field of study. This section presents a detailed discussion of public management, its purpose, major components and processes, established facts, key issues and debates.

2.4.1 Describing public management

Hood (2005, p.8) describes the term 'public management' as the "study practice of design and operations of arrangement for the provision of the public services and the executive government". Public management was established in the 1980s and represents both the management activity and academic field of study, as opposed to public administration, which focuses on bureaucracy, and institutional and constitutional government mechanisms (Hood, 2005). Lynn (2005) cites that the study of public management is rooted in the scientific modern administration of the 1970s America. Public management evolved from the traditional model of public administration (Hughes, 2012; Hood, 2002; Bovald, 2009). It applies managerial techniques, both theoretically and practically, to improve efficiency, effectiveness, accountability and transparency in the provision of public services (Hughes, 2012; Hood, 2002; Bovald, 2009). Hughes (2012) maintains that public management and public administration are separate because they involve different tasks. Furthermore, Hughes (2012) asserts that management means the activity of taking responsibility to achieve the anticipated results of the predetermined objectives, whereas administration refers to the act of following instruction. Tripathi and Raddy (2008) share the same view. There is, however, a lack of unity among writers with regard to the two terms. Hughes (2012) maintains that during the years of the traditional public administration, politicians were policy developers and instructed public officials to implement those policies. Public management focuses on long-term strategies, and public officials are responsible for the development of objectives and priorities of the organisation (Hughes, 2012).

2.4.2 The purpose of public management


Hart (1998) and Sapru (2013) assert that the purpose of public management is to impart a culture of efficiency, effectiveness, accountability and transparency in the delivery of public services (Hart, 1998; Sapru 2013). Generally, governments deliver public services through the implementation of policies (O' Toole & Meier, 2011). Furthermore, O'Toole and Meier (2011) argue that public policies emanate from addressing challenges such as climate charge, unemployment, economic growth, and the provision of social security, healthcare, infrastructure and education (O'Toole & Meier, 2011). Public management is relevant in ensuring that managers allocate the appropriate human and

financial resources to implement government policies and programmes (Van Baleen & De Coning, 2011; O'Toole & Meier 2011). Public management applies managerial techniques and approaches adopted from the private sector to improve performance on service delivery (Bovald, 2009). O'Toole and Meier (2011) argue that performance has become a concern in public management across the world (O'Toole & Meier, 2011). Additionally, Andrew (2011) emphasises that performance management is an important element of public management and provides individual and performance information that cannot be undervalued. Armstrong (2009, p.9) defines performance management as "a continuous process of improving performance by setting individual and team goals which are aligned to strategic goals of the organisation, planning performance to achieve goals, reviewing and assessing progress, and developing the knowledge, skills and abilities of people".

2.4.3 Major components of public management

According to Minaar (2006), public management consists of two integrated components known as political and management process, as illustrated in Figure 2. The political process involves the formulation of government policies, while the management process involves the implementation of policies. This research does not focus on the political process, but rather provides a detailed discussion on the management component, which is relevant to the research problem under investigation.

Figure 2: Public management and its major components




2.4.3.1 Political component

The political components of government are the legislature, executive and judiciary (Minaar, 2006; Van der Waldt & Du Toit, 1999). Literature highlights that the political and management components are separate but linked entities (Minaar, 2006; Van der Waldt & Du Toit, 1999). Van der Waldt and Du Toit (1999) maintain that the management function takes place in a political environment, in which public managers implement the requirements of the political authority and government policy-making structures such as Parliament (legislature), the executive and judiciary. The role of Parliament is to debate on public issues and pass laws in the best interest of the citizens of the country (Taljaard & Venter, 2006). The executive is responsible for executing the laws of government (Venter & Mtimkulu, 2006). Malherbe (2006, p 63) indicates that "the judicial function is the function of the courts, as impartial referees to resolve legal disputes by determining which rule of law applies and what it means, and by applying it in an authoritative way to the facts of the particular legal disputes".

2.4.3.2 Managerial component

The managerial component is concerned with the implementation of policies and decisions of the political authority (Van der Waldt & Du Toit, 1999). Public service managers implement the policy of government, utilise resources effectively and efficiently, and execute quality service delivery to the citizens of the country (Lynn, 2006; Bovald, 2009; O'Toole & Meie, 2011; Thornhill, 2012). Smit, de Cronje, Brevis and Verba (2007) contend that management entails formulating strategies that will enable the organisation to succeed (Smit, de J Cronje, Brevis & Verba, 2007). Smit et al. (2007) maintain that strategic planning is imperative for the growth of the organisation (Smit et al, 2007). Moreover, Smit et al. (2007) cite that strategic planning (Figure 3) involves formulating a vision, mission and goals, and identifying opportunities and threats that exist in the external environment (Smit et al., 2007). Maheswari (2004) maintains that management in its broader sense is important in addressing economic, individual, social, local, national or public problems. O'Toole and Meier (2011) cite that public management takes place at all levels of the organisation, with people allocated the right tasks and resources to be able to achieve the predetermined goals and objectives of the organisation.

Figure 3: Strategic planning process



Adapted from Smit et al., 2007

Andrew (2011) cites that the New Public Management evolved in the 1980s as a thought or model of public management. In addition, Hughes (2012) mentions that the New Public Management became a simplified way to define economic and managerial ideas in public management. Andrew (2011) argues that the driving force behind the development of the New Public Management was the belief that public organisations are fundamentally inefficient. Literature describes the New Public Management as the managerial technique using the business style of the private sector that is now applied by many governments in the public sector (Tummers, 2013; Andrew, 2011; Hughes, 2012). In addition, Hart (1998) cites that managerialism evolved in the New Public Management. Hart (1998) refers to managerialism as the private-sector style of management to re-invent the public organisation. Studies indicate that the principle of managerialism is to transfer significant authority to managers, so that they make business decision and allocate resources for work to be executed (Hart, 1998; Pollitt, 1998; Sharfritz, Russell, Borick & Hyde, 2016). Managerialism is an important approach of bringing managers, methods, plans and technology to all levels of the organisation

(whether private or public) to achieve predetermined goals and objectives (Hart, 1998; Pollitt, 1998; Sharfritz et al., 2016).

2.4.4 Major processes of public management

The processes that have been in existence in public management for decades include improving public management (Schiavo-Campo & McFerson, 2008; Christensen & Lagreid, 2011; Pillot & Bouckaert, 2004). It has always been an assumption that improvements in public-sector effectiveness require flexible personnel management to be in place (Schiavo-Campo & McFerson, 2008). In this regard, most OECD countries have reinvented their personnel reforms by giving their managers the authoritative power to improve the performance of their employees (Schiavo-Campo & McFerson, 2008; Christensen & Lagreid, 2011). In an effort to improve employee performance, countries such as New Zealand, Sweden, Australia, Italy and the United Kingdom have recruited senior officials on fixed-term contracts (Schiavo-Campo & McFerson, 2008). These contracts can only be renewed once the official has achieved the expected performance targets (Schiavo-Campo & McFerson, 2008; Christensen & Lagreid, 2011). Schiavo-Campo and McFerson (2008) cite that the rewarding of performance is considered a good principle of performance management. Practically, however, it is difficult for many governments to apply this principle (Schiavo-Campo & McFerson, 2008). Governments use performance-based annual bonuses to reward and recognise those employees who work well so that the behaviour can be reinforced (Schiavo-Campo & McFerson, 2008; Burnham & Horton, 2013; Shield & Johns, 2016; Armstrong, 2009). Schiavo-Campo and McFerson (2008) argue that in many countries public servants use the performance management system as source of income or to supplement their salaries. Some countries, however, abolished the system and resorted to non-monetary rewards such as certificates of achievement (Schiavo-Campo & McFerson, 2008).

Developed countries, including the United States, use e-government to issue licences and tax payments (Schiavo-Campo & McFerson, 2008). Youm (2007) cites that Japan has moved to e-government service provision because it is advanced in terms of technology. Furthermore, Youm (2007) cites that the citizens of Japan are able to access the government website and download certificates and government documents in

the comfort of their homes. The Japanese government has also made it easy for citizens to obtain certificates from automatic vending machines at Family Mart Stores (Youm, 2007). Additionally, Anttiroiko (2007) cites that Finland introduced the e-government system to ensure openness, transparency and responsiveness in its public management.

2.4.5 Established facts in public management

Diamond and Liddle (2012) argue that there are those who favour traditional public administration over the economic theory, which they claim is too complex to apply in the public sector. Hughes (2012), however, argues that the economic theory in public management is appropriate because government functions in an environment of scarce resources and high demand for services. Hughes (2012) further emphasises that the economic theory has worked successfully in many governments. Diamond and Liddle (2012) state that Australia has proven the economic theory to be a success in public management. The theory was used in Australia to justify the privatisation of public enterprises, deregulation and performance management (Diamond & Liddle, 2012).

The movement from public administration to public management is astonishing (Diamond & Liddle, 2012). Public management allows for more interaction between managers and outsiders, such as interest groups and contractors, than was possible in public administration (Diamond & Liddle, 2012). Public managers are now accountable for achieving results, being innovative in executing goods and services, and managing risk (Hughes, 2012; Diamond & Liddle, 2012). In public management, managers are given the opportunity to lead, to be accountable and make rational decisions without being intimidated (Hughes, 2012). Currently, it is rare to find people still using the phrase 'public administration' (Hughes, 2012; Diamond & Liddle, 2012). Public servants are now presenting themselves as managers as opposed to administrators (Diamond & Liddle, 2012; Hughes, 2012). This is very dominant in countries like Australia, where the word 'administration' is slowly fading away (Diamond & Liddle, 2012).

2.4.6 Key issues in the study of public management

According to Pillott & Boukaert (2004), many studies on public management reform argue that private-sector management techniques have been implemented in public-sector institutions around the world, but how successful is this strategy and for how long should it proceed? As with any debate, there are opposing opinions on the matter, with one group saying the practice should continue and another believing it has gone on for far too long. Moreover, the political and technical components may be in favour of the implementation of private-sector management techniques in the public sector, but are officials with the proper skills or expertise available to successfully implement these techniques?

Hughes (2012) indicates that managerialism has been criticised by a number of authors as a revival of scientific management and opposed to traditional public management. Furthermore, Painter (1998) argues that managerialism assumes that managers are more important than doctors, accountants or clerks, for example. Painter (1998) maintains that managerialism ignores the important activities undertaken by other professions to improve the wellbeing of the people of the country. Painter (1998) is also critical of the performance management system, the redeployment of subordinate employees, and the removal of the central agency on resource management.

There are a number of critics of the utilisation of private-sector management techniques in the public sector (Schiavo-Campo & McFerson, 2008). The implication is that the public sector is of little value, demeaning the profession of public servants (Schiavo-Campo & McFerson, 2008). The role of the public servant is to serve the people of the country, not to be a business manager (Schiavo-Campo & McFerson, 2008; Van der Waldt & Du Toit, 1999). Furthermore, the New Public Management pays little attention to policy formulation, focusing more on the 'doers' than the 'thinkers (Schiavo-Campo & McFerson, 2008). Hughes (2012), however, argues that these techniques should not be criticised simply because they originate from the private sector, and that they would work in the public sector. The techniques should be modified to suit the public-sector environment (Hughes, 2012).

2.4.7 Describing the management component in detail

According to Tripathi and Raddy (2008), management began to be recognised as a separate field of study during the second half of the 19th century. Maheshwari (2004), Tripathi and Raddy (2008) emphasise that there is no universal acceptable description of management. Different authors have their own way of defining management. Maheshwari (2004) stipulates that the term 'management' has been defined by various authors as "a plan of action, the art of maximising efficiency, a social process, a method of getting things done through the efforts of other people, direction of action by a co-operative group towards a common goal, art and science of decision making and executive leadership, etc.".

Maheshwari (2004) indicates that management is a continuous process of getting work done through others. Bagard (2009) and Maheshwari (2004) both agree that the process of management consists of various functions such as planning, organising, staffing, directing and controlling. Bagard (2009) further affirms that management is a continuous process that involves the effective and efficient deployment of human, physical, information and financial resources to achieve increased productivity.

2.4.8 Describing the purpose of management

Maheshwari (2004) states that management plays a key role in the operations of the organisation. Van der Waldt and Du Toit (1999) indicate that the role of public management is to implement policies developed by government authorities. Rudani (2013) states that the primary purpose of management is to ensure that the objectives of the organisation are met. Maheshwari (2004) agrees with this view, stating that the purpose of management is to ensure that the goals of the organisation are achieved effectively and efficiently. Koontz et al. (1986) add to the discussion, indicating that management is not the job of one particular department, but should be implemented across all levels of the organisation.

Van der Waldt & Du Toit (1999) emphasise that the implementation of the management process requires skilled and experienced public managers who will be able to convert objectives into activities. Schermerhorn (2011) also emphasises that best

results can only be achieved through the successful implementation of the management process. Public managers should be responsible for activities that will result in the achievement of objectives (Hughes, 2012). Koontz et al. (1986) cites that managers have to ensure that knowledge is integrated so that it can assist in the managerial functions of planning, organising, staffing, leading and controlling (Koontz et al., 1986). Furthermore, management must ensure that the environment is conducive for employees to achieve their predetermined goals with little time, finance and other resources (Koontz et al., 1986).

2.4.9 Major components of management

2.4.9.1 Human resource management

Du Toit, Erasmus and Strydom (2010) and Werner (2014) cite that human resource management plays a significant role in the success of any organisation. Werner (2014) indicates that human resource management is critical for each and every organisation. Du Toit et al. (2010) and Lessing (2008) emphasise that the successful implementation of the human resource management strategy requires integration with the overall organisational strategy and plan. Lessing (2008) views human resource management as the function involved with the management of employees within the organisation. Werner (2014), on contrary, indicates that human resource management is about establishing and implementing systems, practices and procedures that direct employees towards achieving the goals and objectives of the organisation effectively and efficiently.

The White Paper on Human Resource Management in the Public Service of 1997 requires organisations to integrate performance management with human resource management and development (Republic of South Africa, 1997). The concept of the performance management system includes setting goals (at both an individual and organisational level), observing, communicating expectations, appraising performance, and providing employees with feedback and skills development (Sebola & Manyaka, 2012; Van der Waldt, 2012). Moreover, Van der Waldt (2012) maintains that performance management at an organisational level links the team and individual performance to the strategic goals of the organisation. At an individual level, this involves human resource planning to attract, retain and support employees. The White Paper on Human Resource Management in the Public Service of 1997 requires that

public service employees be assessed on an annual basis (Department of Public Service Administration, 1997). The purpose of the assessment is to identify the strengths and weaknesses of employees in performing their tasks, to recognise and reward good performance, and to manage poor performance.

2.4.9.2 Financial management

Du Toit et al. (2010) state that the purpose of financial management is to ensure an efficient management financial function. Financial management involves financial reporting, analysis, planning and control (Du Toit et al., 2010). Du Toit et al. (2010) indicate that financial planning is an important aspect of the overall organisational strategy. In many organisations, financial planning and control are done through budgets (Du Toit et al., 2010). Meintjies (2008) indicates that it is the responsibility of the financial manager to prepare the overall budget after integrating subsidiary budgets from managers in different departmental sections. Furthermore, Meintjies (2008) and Du Toit et al. (2010) indicate that financial managers must conduct a financial analysis to monitor and determine the current financial position of the organisation.

2.4.9.3 Information management

According to Rankhumise (2008), every organisation must have in place a management information system that provides past, present and projected future information, as well as details about events taking place in the internal or external environment of the organisation. Rankhumise (2008) indicates that the system should provide top-level management with information for strategic planning and control, and include economic information, developments in technology, and how the organisation's competitors are doing financially.

2.4.10 Process in management

Daft and Marcic (2004) indicate that management is about the effective and efficient achievement of organisational goals through the process of planning, organising, leading and controlling resources. Daft and Marcic (2004) illustrate the process of effective and efficient management of resources to achieve organisational goals.

Many studies outline that the management process involves the functions of planning, organising, staffing, leading and controlling (Schermerhorn, 2011; Fax et al, 2004; Ijeoma, 2013; Karmakar & Datta, 2012; Maheshwari, 2004). These functions were first discovered by Henry Fayol, who is known as the modern management theorist (Karmakar & Datta, 2012). Ijeoma (2013) indicates that all these functions are essential for public managers at all levels of the organisation, to ensure efficiency, effectiveness and accountability when providing public services.

Planning can happen at the beginning of new financial years, projects, programmes or services (Ijeoma, 2013). At the beginning of the performance management process, the manager communicates to employees the objectives, how to go about achieving the goals, who is going to be responsible for what, and the timeframe in which to achieve the goals (Shermerhorn, 2011; Ijeoma, 2013; Schwella, 2004). Sometimes, planning is necessary due to the inadequate outcomes of previous programmes (Ijeoma, 2013). Furthermore, planning presents a framework as to how other management functions will unfold, such as organising, leading and controlling (Karmakar & Datta, 2012).

The planning process involves the identification of objectives, followed by the coordination of work and allocation of resources needed to achieve the predetermined objectives (Schermerhorn, 2011; Karmakar & Datta, 2012). The manager must assign duties to employees and allocate resources (e.g. technology equipment, stationery or finances) that will enable them to perform their duties according to expectations (Schermerhorn, 2011). Human resource organisation involves promoting the division of labour, identifying and grouping jobs with similar content, defining job responsibilities, and establishing supervisor and subordinate relationships (Karmakar & Datta, 2012).

According to Rudani (2013), staffing is the process of recruiting people to different positions in the organisation. Staffing involves recruiting, selecting and appointing people to vacant posts; remuneration and compensation of employees; training and career development; handling of grievances; appraising performance and so forth (Rudani, 2013). Hoek (2014) adds to the discussion, indicating that staffing can be implemented through the recruitment of people both internally and externally. Internal recruitment involves appointing employees to entry-level positions. Moreover, current

employees can fill vacant posts through transfer or promotion (Hoek, 2014). As for external recruitment, posts are advertised to attract people from outside the organisation who have the necessary skills and expertise to fill the vacancies.

In the management process, leading takes place when the manager takes action (Ijeoma, 2013). This is the process whereby the strategies, policies and programmes established in the planning phase are implemented by leading, communicating with and motivating employees to achieve the desired goals of the organisation (Karmakar & Datta, 2012). Schermerhorn (2011) states that managers should take a leading role in building commitment to a shared vision, find ways to encourage employees to be enthusiastic in performing their tasks, identify areas where employees are struggling and provide the necessary support (Schermerhorn, 2011). In the leading process, managers should be able to direct, supervise, communicate with and motivate employees.

The objectives of the organisation are set out in the planning phase. The controlling phase requires managers to lay out clear plans and action to be taken in order to achieve the predetermined goals of the organisation (Schermerhorn, 2011; Karmakar & Datta, 2012). Controlling is about measuring the individual and organisational performance to ensure that the organisation's objectives are achieved (Schermerhorn, 2011; Karmakar & Datta, 2012; Daft & Marcic, 2011). The manager should establish standards for work performance, measure actual performance against these standards, determine the difference between the two and take corrective action. Corrective action means rewarding good performance or managing poor performance (Daft & Marcic, 2011; Shields, 2007).

2.4.11 Established facts about management

Bagard (2009), Kroon (2008), Tripathi and Raddy (2008) indicate that managers must have the technical, human and conceptual skills to be able to successfully carry out managerial functions. Most authors agree that managers must have technical skills that will help them execute their duties as managers (Bagard, 2009; Tripathi and Raddy, 2008; Kroon 2008). Bagard (2009) and Kroon (2008) both agree that technical skills involve the ability of the manager to use (and allow employees to use) knowledge, technology, techniques, procedures and resources to perform tasks in specialised areas. Bagard (2009) cites that human skills are also referred to as interpersonal skills. Some

studies emphasise that managers should be able to effectively communicate with employees, understand and motivate employees where necessary, portray leadership skills and be a team player (Bagard, 2009; Tripathi and Raddy, 2008; Kroon, 2008). Furthermore, Tripathi and Raddy (2008) indicate that managers should not only focus on their departments, but also be able to interact with employees across all levels of the organisation. Most authors agree that it is important for the manager to have conceptual skills (Bagard, 2009; Tripathi and Raddy, 2008; Kroon, 2008). Tripathi and Raddy (2008) refer to conceptual skills as the manager's ability to analyse the current forces at play and to be able to prepare for the future.

2.4.12 Key issues and debates about management

According to Chandan (2014), there has been debate around management being a science or an art. Bagard (2009), Maheshwari (2004), Tripathi and Raddy (2008) cite that management can be seen as an art, science and profession. Chandan (2014) is of the view that managers are not made, but rather born for the position they hold. Tripathi (2008) agrees with this view, stating that management is the art of getting work done through others. Furthermore, Chandan (2014) argues that management is not a complete science, but that applying scientific methods to solve problems in management has been proven to be effective. Tripathi (2008) acknowledges that management is a science, but not an exact or natural science. Tripathi (2008) further explains that physics can be studied through the laboratory, but that management focuses on studying man and the factors affecting man.

According to Torlkdisen (2005), management is neither a science, art nor profession. Torlkdisen (2005) maintains that science has precise laws and expected behaviour whereas management does not. Furthermore, Torlkdisen (2005) argues that management is not an art if it means taking decisions based on personal instinct or personal judgment. Torlkidsen (2005) also argues that management is not a profession, although a code of ethics has been established in some countries. Management is concerned with human behaviour, and behaviour can change from time to time. The next section will discuss the key attributes of performance management.

2.5 Key public management attributes for assessing the implementation of the performance management system

This section presents the key attributes involved in the implementation of the performance management system.

2.5.1 Goals

Mone and London (2010) cite that goal-setting is the process in which the manager and employee agree on how the employee will do work. Locke & Latham (2013) argue that goals are set because they give performance expectation. Additionally, goals must be set in relation to the mission, vision statement and strategic goals of an organisation (Mone & London, 2010; Locke & Latham, 2013). Mone and London (2010) argue that allowing employees to set their own goals enables them to become more focused and accountable in achieving those goals. Armstrong (2009) maintains that setting goals provides direction, and encourages employees to put in the effort and use their skills, knowledge and expertise to improve performance.

2.5.2 Training

Mello (2015) maintains that one of the most important steps before implementation of the performance management cycle is to determine whether managers or supervisors have the capacity to manage the process. If a knowledge gap regarding implementation of the PMDS was evident in the previous cycle, managers should attend a workshop to be brought up to speed. Similar studies suggest that managers must attend training on the implementation of the performance management system, while others suggest that the focus should be on the training of employees (Pulakos & O'Leary, 2011; Arakal & Mampilly, 2016). Training employees to accept the performance management system is very important (Arakal & Mampilly 2016).

2.5.3 Communication

Daft and Marcic (2011) maintain that communication is a two-way process of exchanging information between parties to bring about motivation or influence behaviour. Additionally, Daft and Marcic (2011) suggest that feedback is an important part of the performance management process, but managers choose to ignore it for fear of how employees could react (Daft & Marcic, 2011). Landy and Conte (2010) maintain that feedback forms an essential part of employee engagement, particularly when it improves individual performance. Landy and Conte (2010) argue that giving feedback to the employee is important because it removes uncertainties about performance and provides opportunities for improvement. Generally, employees prefer to receive and managers prefer to give positive feedback (Landy & Conte, 2010). Armstrong (2007) cites that positive feedback from managers serves as recognition for a job well done and motivation for the employee to produce even better results in the future. Mone and London (2010) argue that giving the employee feedback not only reinforces performance, but also encourages a change in behaviour towards work (Mone & London, 2010). Locke and Latham (2013) maintain that managers should not be reluctant to communicate because it helps employees to decide on areas that require improvement or where a new strategy is necessary to achieve a goal.

2.5.4 Rewards

Burnham and Horton (2013) state that rewarding good performance is one of the principles of the performance management system. Shields (2007) argues that the Vroom expectancy theory suggests that employees make behaviour choices expecting extrinsic rewards in return (Shields, 2007). Literature suggests that the main objectives of the reward system are to attract and retain employees, recognise and reward performance, motivate and encourage employees to put more effort into their work, and reinforce organisational culture (Burnham & Horton, 2013; Shield & Johns, 2016). Furthermore, studies suggest that rewarding and recognising performance motivates employees to work even harder (Houldsworth & Jarasighe, 2006; Armstrong, 2009; Shields, 2007). Armstrong (2009) argues that reward incentives reinforce positive behaviour, which is repeatable as emphasised by the reinforcement theory. Andrew (2011) suggests that rewards must be linked to measured results. Schiavo-Campo and

McFerson (2008) emphasise the different types of rewards that managers can provide employees. Schiavo-Campo and McFerson (2008) suggest that managers can use extrinsic instead of intrinsic rewards. Furthermore, Schiavo-Campo and McFerson (2008) cite that intrinsic rewards are non-monetary rewards expressed in the form of certificates or commendations. Intrinsic rewards are common in governments in East Asia (Schiavo-Campo & McFerson, 2008).

2.5.5 Training

Academic literature suggests that managing poor performance is an important element of the performance management system (Van der Vyver & Bussin, 2013; Westhuizen, Wessels, Swanepoel, Erasmus, Van Wyk & Schenk, 2011; Colyvas, 2014). Managers must discover underperformance in the early stages of performance management (Van der Vyver & Bussin, 2013; Van der Westhuizen et al., 2011). Poor performance should be managed during each quarter of the performance management cycle. Studies suggest that managers must address poor performance through measures such as counselling, training and development, employee coaching and mentoring, and setting clear work performance standards (Van der Vyver & Bussin, 2013; Van der Westhuizen et al., 2011; Marrelli, 2011; Asad & Mahfod, 2015; Obisi, 2011). Van der Vyver (2013) suggests that managers should record underperformance in the incapacity programme only if the interventions were not successful. In South Africa, for example, the Labour Relations Act No. 66 of 1995 requires that management do a thorough investigation of the performance of the employee before carrying out action (Van der Westhuizen et al., 2011).

2.6 Established frameworks that can interpret empirical findings on the implementation of the performance management system

Smit et al. (2007) mention that theories of management are divided into two schools of thought, known as the classical and contemporary approaches. Contemporary approaches include scientific management, bureaucracy, administrative management, human relations, quantitative management and system theory (Smit et al., 2007). Classical approaches include contingency theory, total quality management, leaning organisation and re-engineering. Smit et al. (2007) maintain that there is no dominant

theory in the field of management. Theories used in management are adopted from the human relation theory, the most important contributing factor of which is the view that employees are human beings, not equipment (Smit et al., 2007). This section provides a discussion on the theories that evolved during the human relation movement. Subsection 2.6.1 presents a discussion on the reinforcement theory and subsection 2.6.2 on the goal-setting theory. Subsection 2.6.3 discusses McGregor's Theory X and Y, while subsection 2.6.4 focuses on the Herzberg Motivation-Hygiene Factor theory.


2.6.1 The reinforcement theory

The reinforcement theory was developed by behaviourist or psychologist B.F. Skinner in 1974. The reinforcement motivation theory is based on the notion that employees can be motivated by a conducive and well-designed work environment as well as recognition for good performance, while punishment for poor performance conveys negative consequences (Koontz et al., 1986; Daft & Marcic, 2004). The theory is based on the notion that recognising employees for their hard work serves as motivation for more hard work (Koontz et al., 1986). Motivation does not always have to be financial; managers can influence the behaviour of employees by using non-financial reinforcement such as positive feedback, attention and social recognition (Koontz et al., 1986). In addition, Daft and Marcic (2004) cite that positive reinforcement tools include giving praise to employees (Daft & Marcic, 2004). Positive reinforcement has a positive effect on employee performance (Koontz et al., 1986; Daft & Marcic, 2004).

Punishment is another performance management tool proposed by the reinforcement theory (Invancevich, Konopaske & Matteson, 2011). Punishment can refer to criticism or demotion of the employee by the manager (Invancevich et al., 2011). Daft and Marcic (2004) argue that punishment is an intervention strategy used by managers to deal with unwanted behaviour from employees. The aim of punishment is to decrease the likelihood of the negative behaviour happening again (Invancevich et al., 2011; Daft & Marcic, 2004). Invacevich et al. (2011) cite that many organisations view punishment in a negative light and indicate that it should be the last resort. The reinforcement theory also favours extinction (Daft & Marcic, 2004), which entails the suppression of pay raises, praise and other positive outcomes (Daft & Marcic, 2004). Daft and Marcic (2004) illustrate the model of changing behaviour with reinforcement in Figure 4.

Koonz et al. (1986) argue that the advantages of the reinforcement theory is that it focuses on eliminating barriers to performance, and ensures careful planning and organising, control through feedback, and expanded communication between the manager and employee (Koontz et al., 1986). The supporters of the reinforcement theory are Jablonsky and De Vries (1972) and they suggest that managers should positively reinforce good behaviour, ignore unexpected behaviour as much as possible, avoid using punishment as a tool for influencing desired behaviour, and regularly apply positive reinforcement (Koontz et al., 1986). Behavioural scientists and some managers are sceptical about this approach, but it has proven to be effective in some companies (Koontz et al., 1986).

Figure 4: Changing Behaviour with Reinforcement



Adopted from Daft & Marcic, 2004


2.6.2 The goal-setting theory

The goal-setting theory was proposed by Edwin Locke in the late 1960s (Odendal & Roodt, 2009). The goal-setting theory is a motivation theory that explains what makes some employees perform better than others in the workplace (Locke & Latham, 2013). Locke and Latham (2013) argue that goal-setting enables employees to become more committed to their work, to make an effort to achieve their goals and to be persistent and invest time in doing so. The notion of purposefulness and intentionality is peculiar

to goal-setting (Landy & Conte, 2010). The goal-setting theory is based on the notion that when employees set themselves difficult goals, they will achieve them, while those who set themselves simple goals will record a drop in individual performance and, ultimately, reduce organisational performance (Houldsworth & Jarasinghe, 2006; Shields, 2007; Armstrong, 2009; Odendal & Roodt, 2009; Landy & Conte, 2010; Shields & Johns, 2016). Landy and Conte (2010) maintain that research has proven that difficult goals lead to higher levels of performance. Setting difficult goals encourages employees to put more effort into their work and increases the levels of performance (Daft and Marcic, 2011; Landy & Conte, 2010). Goal commitment is an important factor in the goal-setting theory (Cole, 1995). Goal commitment is enhanced when employees set their own goals (rather than when goals are imposed on them) and those goals are made public (Cole, 1995).

When goal-setting is properly implemented, it builds communication, trust and cooperation between the manager and employee (Odendal & Roodt, 2009; Shields & Johns, 2016. Daft and Marcic (2011) state that goal-setting is useful because it allows both the manger and the employee to focus their energy on achieving the objectives of the organisation. Goals also encourage employees to establish plans to remain focused on attaining the end goal (Daft and Marcic, 2011). Goal-setting can broaden the feedback loop (Landy & Conte, 2010). Feedback provides knowledge of the results so that employees can see the outcome of their commitment (Locke & Latham, 2013). Cole (1995) maintains that receiving regular feedback improves employee motivation. Moreover, Cole (1995) maintains that clear goals and feedback are necessary for higher performance (Cole, 1995). Ledlow and Stephens (2017) illustrate the process of the goal-setting theory in Figure 5.

Figure 5: Goal-setting theory



Ledlow & Stephens 2017 (p.473)

2.6.3 McGregor's Theory X and Y

David McGregor (1906-1964) was a professor in industrial management at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (Rundani, 2013). He developed Theory X and Theory Y (Rudani, 2013; Smit et al., 2007). The McGregor's Theory X is based on the notion that managers assume that employees are inherently lazy, hate their jobs, do not want to accept change, are not responsible, are not ambitious, and don't follow direction (Odendal & Roodt, 2009; Schermerhorn, 2011; Tulsian & Pandey, 2008; Smit et al., 2007). McGregor, however, favoured the Theory Y, in which managers assume that employees like their jobs, have self-control, are able to accept responsibility, can work unsupervised, and can be innovative or creative (Odendal & Roodt, 2009; Shermerhorn, 2011). The advantage of Theory Y is that it brings higher outputs and lower labour problems.

2.6.4 Herzberg Motivation-Hygiene Factor Theory

The hygiene motivation theory, otherwise known as the two-factor theory, was proposed by clinical psychologist Frederick Herzberg (Odendal & Roodt, 2009). Herzberg believed that an employee's attitude towards his or her work could determine accomplishment or disappointment (Odendal & Roodt, 2009). The theory is based on the factors affect the satisfaction and dissatisfaction of employees (Karmakar & Datta, 2012; Odendal & Roodt, 2009). The factors include policy and administration of the company, technical supervision, the working relationship between supervisor and subordinates or colleagues, job status and job security, and money and salary (Karmakar & Datta, 2012; Tulsian & Pandey, 2008). The second category is known as the motivators or satisfiers, which are concerned with employees' motivation for high performance (Karmakar & Datta, 2012; Tulsian & Pandey, 2008). These factors improve performance and employee efficiency by motivating the employee, and include achievement, recognition, work responsibility, advancement and growth (Karmakar & Datta, 2012; Tulsian & Pandey, 2008). Karmakar and Datta (2012) argue that the presence of motivators brings strong motivation to the work of the employee, but their absence does not bring any form of dissatisfaction. The Herzberg Factor Theory is criticised, however, for not attaching the importance of pay, status and interpersonal relations, which are general motivators (Karmakar & Datta, 2012).

2.7 Assessing the implementation of the performance management and development system, a conceptual framework

Beyond discussing the problem and purpose statement, this chapter focuses on the review of literature to help understand the challenges associated with the implementation of performance management. The chapter concludes by establishing a conceptual framework, and providing a roadmap of how this research intends to assess the implementation of the PMDS in the GDARD. The chapter reviews academic writing and research regarding the implementation of the performance management system.

The point of departure for the literature review was understanding the research context, which is the GDARD. The GDARD is a public service institution in Gauteng that is mandated to ensure quality service delivery for all citizens of South Africa. The South African government introduced the PMDS to improve performance in the public service. The legislative framework, which includes the Constitution of the Republic of South of 1996, the Public Service Act No. 104, 1994, and the Public Service Regulations of 2001, governs the effective implementation of the PMDS. There are, however, challenges with implementation across the public service in South Africa.

Numerous studies of the performance management system reveal that one of the problems associated with implementation is the lack of commitment from managers (Manyaka & Sebola, 2012; Alle-lle et al., 2007). Studies show that managers are reluctant to commit (Manyaka & Sebola, 2012; Alle-lle et al., 2007). They also show that a lack of understanding of implementation of the system on the part of both managers and employees poses a challenge (Mello, 2015; Munzhedzi and Phago, 2014 Magoro ; 2016; Allen-lle et al, 2007). Munzhedzi and Phago (2014) maintain that the employees' lack of knowledge of performance management translates into the supervisors' lack of understanding. Lack of training opportunities on understanding and implementing the system is another problem highlighted by academic literature and research (Magoro, 2016; Seotlela & Miruka 2014; Sebashe and Matapuri 2011; Obisi, 2011; Pulakos & O'Leary, 2011).

Past studies have attempted to address the challenges associated with the implementation of performance management. This research reviewed both international and local studies, but mostly of the South African public service. There seems to be a limited number of studies in the private sector. Most studies used the qualitative research strategy to address the research problem and aimed to understand the problem from the point of view of the participants. A limited number applied the quantitative research strategy. Furthermore, most preferred the case study research design, while some applied purposive sampling (Hendricks & Matsiliza, 2015; Mosoge & Pilane , 2014; Munzhedzi & Phago, 2014).

The following findings and conclusions were made: training, feedback, communication and bias are critical to implementation; system objectives were not achieved; job

dissatisfaction was present among employees; employees displayed resistance; there was lack of support from management; non-compliance and misunderstanding; and poor performance was not effectively managed. Common findings and conclusions are that poor performance is not properly managed.

This research identified the following knowledge gaps in its review of past studies and evaluations: only one study applies theories or frameworks to interpret the empirical results of the research; they focus more on identifying the challenges and ignore interventions to address those challenges; are not explicit about the methods used to analyse secondary data; did not specifically draw their sample from occupational levels 1 to 12, with some including the unions, politicians and members of senior management; and do not focus on exploring the perception of the human resources development management in an organisation.

To close the knowledge gap, this research applies the reinforcement and goal-setting theories as the established frameworks that can interpret empirical findings on the implementation of the PMDS in the GDARD. This research draws a sample from salary levels one to 12. Senior managers, labour unions and politicians are excluded from this study. Lastly, this research will explore the perception of the human resources development management in the organisation.


Section 2.4 reviewed the broad academic field of the study, which is public management. Literature reveals that public management has been established to represent both an activity and a study field since the 1980s. Public management has two major components, namely the political and management process. The political process pays attention to the functions of the political authority and government structures (Parliament, the executive and judiciary). This research focuses deeply on the review of management and its components, processes, debates, facts and key issues. Management is concerned with the implementation of the policies and decisions of the political authority, and is relevant to the implementation of the performance management system. Section 2.5 discussed the attributes of public management. Burham and Horton (2013) indicate that the fundamental nature of performance management is continuous communication between manager and employee. This

research identified goal-setting, communication, reward systems and management of poor performance as the most important attributes of public management.

This research then reviewed frameworks to interpret the empirical findings on the implementation of the performance management system. Literature indicates that there are no dominant theories in the field of management, and that the borrowing of different management theories is influenced by the circumstances (Smit et al., 2007). This research reviewed theories from the human relations movement, including the reinforcement and goal-setting theories, McGregor's Theory X and Y, and the Hertzberg Motivation-Hygiene Factor. The reinforcement motivation theory is based on the notion that employees can be motivated by a conducive, well-designed work environment and recognition for good performance, while punishment for poor performance conveys negative consequences. The goal-setting theory is based on the notion that employees who set themselves difficult goals will achieve them, while those who set simple goals will perform poorly and decrease the overall performance of the organisation. The theory also places emphasis on communication and feedback. This research utilises the reinforcement and goal-setting theories to interpret the empirical results of the implementation of the PMDS in the GDARD.

The review of previous studies on the implementation of the performance management system clearly identifies qualitative research as the most preferred strategy. This research takes its cue from past studies and employs a qualitative research strategy and a case study research design to conduct the study. Purposive sampling is used in recruiting participants. The research collects data through interviews using a semi-structured interview guide. Thematic analysis is applied to analyse data collected from the interviews. The knowledge gap identified is that previous studies reviewed did not apply frameworks to interpret the results of their research. This research closes the gap by applying these frameworks to interpret the empirical results of the implementation of the PMDS in the GDARD. An illustration of the conceptual framework is shown in Figure 6.

Figure 6: Assessing the implementation of the performance management system, a conceptual framework



3. RESEARCH STRATEGY, DESIGN, PROCEDURE AND METHODS

This chapter identifies and describes the research approach, design, procedure and methods applied in this study. Section 3.1 identifies, describes and commits to a research strategy, while Section 3.2 identifies, describes and commits to a research design. The chapter also identifies and discusses the procedure and methods to collect, process and analyse the empirical evidence obtained (Section 3.3). Section 3.4 describes and presents the research strengths, in terms of the reliability and validity measures applied, while Section 3.5 chapter describes and presents the research weaknesses or technical and administrative limitations.

3.1 Strategy

A research strategy refers to "a general orientation to the conduct of social research" (Bryman, 2012, p.35). Literature provides three types of research strategies applied when conducting social research, namely qualitative, quantitative and mixed methods (Bryman, 2012; Kumar, 2014). This research applied a qualitative research strategy to assess the implementation of the PMDS in the GDARD. A qualitative research strategy is the process of being eager to understand the social and cultural norms that create dissimilar behaviour practices in society (Nieuwenhuis & Smit, 2012). Additionally, Bryman (2012) maintains that the qualitative research strategy is about using words rather than numbers to collect and analyse data. Academic literature emphasises that a qualitative research strategy is suitable when a researcher wants to present the experience or perspective of people towards a certain issue or phenomenon that exists in their social or cultural context (Creswell, 2013; Yin, 2015). Yin (2015) maintains that the values, principles and views of the researcher on the existing phenomenon should not matter at all. Additionally, Houser (2015) argues that a qualitative research strategy is an option when the aim is to understand a situation that cannot be explained on a large, quantitative scale. The greatest strength of the qualitative research strategy is its ability to obtain in-depth, rich descriptive data, with the researcher the data collection, analysis and interpreting instrument (Nieuwenhuis & Smit, 2012; Creswell, 2013). On the other hand, one of the noticeable weaknesses of the qualitative research strategy is its inability to generalise the findings to the population (Houser, 2015).

This research reviewed past studies that have successfully applied a qualitative research strategy to explore the implementation of the performance management system. Hendricks and Matsiliza (2015) employed a qualitative research strategy to understand the implementation of the performance management system in the public sector. The use of the qualitative research strategy enabled the study to describe and interpret the action of the participants. The study concluded there is a need for public-sector institutions to take the performance management system seriously, in order to enhance organisational growth. Similarly, Seotlela and Miruka (2014) employed a qualitative research strategy to investigate the challenges faced during the implementation of performance management. The use of the qualitative research strategy allowed the study to understand issues from the perspective of the study participants. The study found that support from human resources was lacking, and that management failed to implement change management in relation to performance management.

Generally, most reviewed studies and evaluations preferred the qualitative research strategy (Section 2.3). Studies by Hendricks and Matsiliza (2015) and Seotlela and Miruka (2014) were able to describe and interpret the actions of participants regarding the research problem and derive conclusions. Additionally, the studies were able to understand the research problem from the perspective of the participants. This research adopted the qualitative research strategy, drawing insight from the above studies (and other studies discussed in Section 2.3). This research did not opt for a quantitative research strategy because it is not testing hypotheses. Moreover, adopting a quantitative would limit this research in presenting and interpreting the research problem from the view of the study participants. The adoption of the qualitative research strategy, as applied in past studies and evaluations, enabled this research to collect rich, descriptive data (Appendix 1.1), and to present and interpret the research problem from the perspective of the study participants.

3.2 Design

Creswell (2013) defines research design as a detailed plan of how you are going to conduct the study. This includes details on how the researcher will collect and analyse data (Bryman, 2012). There are various types of research designs for conducting a social research, namely action research, ethnography, experimental, grounded theory, phenomenology, case study, comparative, longitudinal and cross-sectional (Bryman, 2012; Wagner et al., 2012). This research applied a case study research design, whereby the researcher collects rich descriptive data from different sources to discover real-life issues within bounded or multiple systems (Creswell, 2013). A case study research design is applicable to qualitative studies, but can also be applied in quantitative studies (Bryman, 2012). Additionally, a case study research design favours qualitative methods because it generates a thorough examination of a case (Bryman, 2012). A case study research design applies when a researcher wants to examine an area on which there is limited information or when the researcher wants a universal understanding of a community, phenomenon or situation (Kumar, 2014). In this research, the aim was to gain a general understanding of the employees' perceptions regarding the implementation of the PMDS in the GRARD.

The advantage of a case study research design is that it enables the researcher to triangulate many data sources, including in-depth interviews, observations, secondary records and focus groups (Creswell, 2013; Kumar, 2014; Houser, 2015). This research applied a case study research design with the desire to explore employees' understanding of the implementation of the performance management system within its real-life context, which is the GRARD. Moreover, a case study research design allowed this research to obtain rich, descriptive data through interviews. This design also facilitated triangulation, which enhanced validity of the research. Creswell (2013) argues that before making a decision on which research design to use, researchers should determine which is most suitable to achieve the research objectives. As a result, this research reviewed and determined the success of past studies and evaluations on the implementation of performance management systems that applied the case study research design.

Notably, Cameron (2015) employed a case study research design to discover hindrances and problems experienced when implementing the performance management system on both an organisational and individual level. The study examined the performance management system and the different roles regarding its implementation in the Department of Labour, both nationally and provincially and at the labour centres. The study found little progress in the establishment of the performance management system in the department, a lack of performance culture, and that performance management reforms were not successful.

Similarly, Seotlela and Miruka (2014) applied a case study research design to critically assess and evaluate the challenges regarding the implementation of the PMDS. The application of a case study research design enabled Seotlela and Miruka (2014) to achieve a comprehensive and exhaustive understanding of the problem inside a bounded system. Furthermore, the study triangulated through the application of different data collection methods such as interviews, focused groups, observations and secondary data (document) analysis. Triangulation enhanced the validity of the study. The study found that there is lack of support from human resources and that the management failed to implement change management in relation to the performance management system. Failing to implement the change management process can result in employees opposing change and an inadequate understanding of the performance management system.

Munzhedzi and Phago (2014) also applied a case study research design to determine whether the introduction of performance management contributes to improved productivity in the Department of Co-operative Governance, Human Settlements and Traditional Affairs (COGHSTA) in the Limpopo province. The study found the managers in COGHSTA to be incompetent in implementing the performance management system, that there is inadequate training and bias ratings. The study concludes that performance management system is not enough to sustain performance and productivity in the Department.

This research applied a case study research design drawing insight from the above-mentioned studies. The study by Seotlela and Miruka (2014) explicitly captures the advantage of applying a case study research design, in that it was able to achieve a

comprehensive and exhaustive understanding of a problem inside a bounded system. In addition, the study triangulated data sources such as interviews, focused groups, observations and secondary data (document) analysis. This research, therefore, explored the research problem within a bounded context (which was the GDARD), and obtained a comprehensive and in-depth understanding of the research problem. This research also described in detail the views and perceptions of the employees regarding the implementation of the PMDS in the GDARD (Appendix 1.1). However, this research could not triangulate from different data sources such as observations and focus groups. Data on this research problem, for example, could not be collected through observation. Additionally, this research could not collect data through focus groups because it would compromise anonymity. The absence of these methods, however, was a limitation on the research validity.

3.3 Procedure and methods

This section presents the data collection procedures and methods employed in the research. Section 3.3.1 presents a discussion on the data collection instrument employed, and Section 3.3.2 the target population and sampling techniques. Section 3.3.3 presents the ethical considerations adhered to in this research, and Section 3.3.4 a discussion on data collection and storage. Section 3.3.5 presents a discussion on the data processing and analysis applied, and Section 3.3.6 the description of respondents in this research.

3.3.1 Data collection instrument

Bryman (2016) cites that a research data collection instrument is a tool applied to collect data on a selected sample of participants, with the hope of answering the research question. Additionally, Kumar (2014) mentions that a research data collection instrument is an important part of the research project as the findings are based on the collected information. Academic literature provides two types of data collection instruments, namely observation and interview schedules (Bryman, 2012; Kumar, 2014; Nieuwenhuis & Smit, 2012). This research employed an interview schedule to collect qualitative data. An interview schedule refers to a set of open-ended or closed questions, thoroughly pre-tested and prepared by the researcher to ask the study

participants in a face-to-face, telephonic or media interview (Kumar, 2014; Neuman, 2011). An interview schedule can be unstructured, semi-structured and structured (Kumar, 2014).

This research employed a semi-structured interview schedule to collect data. A semi-structured interview is useful when there is limited information about the research problem and the researcher would like to explore further. The advantage of a semi-structured interview schedule is that it creates an opportunity for new concepts to emerge that the researcher may have overlooked or did not know about and had not included (Nieuwenhuis & Smit, 2012; Bryman, 2012). Another advantage is that it brings flexibility (Bryman, 2012). Additionally, Bryman (2012) maintains that it is not necessary to ask the questions in the same order as they appear in the interview schedule, but that questions should be asked using the same wording. Nieuwenhuis and Smit (2012) add that the approach enables the researcher to probe and triangulate data.

Generally, most qualitative studies and evaluations on the implementation of performance management have preferred collect data using the semi-structured interview schedule. A study by Sebashe and Mtapuri (2011) explores the implementation of the performance management system in the Ba-Phalaborwa Municipality. The study used a semi-structured interview schedule comprising a set of open-ended questions that were predetermined and allowed for probing. The study concluded that the implementation of the performance management system in municipality appears flawed.

Similarly, Munzhedzi and Phago (2014) applied a semi-structured interview schedule to collect data from the employees of the Department of Co-operative Governance, Human Settlement and Traditional Affairs (COGHSTA). The aim was to explore whether the implementation of the performance management system contributed to improved productivity in the COGHSTA. The study applied the semi-structured interview schedule because it allowed for flexibility, giving the participants the freedom to express their views and opinions according to their own understanding of the problem at hand, whereas quantitative questionnaires restrict responses. The study found that the employees in the COGHSTA were that doubtful that the performance management system contributes to sustained productivity.

Mughal et al. (2014) similarly applied a semi-structured interview schedule to collect data from study participants. The aim of the study was to explore the challenges that obstruct proper implementation of the performance management system in an organisation. The study applied the semi-structured interview schedule to explore matters relating to the system and its consequences on the participants. It found that employees were not satisfied with the current system, and concluded that it lacks rewards and motivation.

Cameron (2015) also used a semi-structured interview schedule to collect information from study participants. The aim of the study was to discover weaknesses in the implementation of both the organisational and individual performance management systems. The study concluded that there has been little progress in the implementation of performance management systems, and no performance culture in the department.

Notably, the studies by Sebashe and Mtapuri (2011), Munzhedzi and Phago (2014), Mughal et al. (2014) and Cameron (2015) supported the use of a semi-structured interview schedule since it allowed for flexibility and freedom of expression in the way in which participants answer the questions. These studies did not opt for the structured interview schedule, which results in restrictive answers. This research therefore developed a semi-structured interview schedule (Appendix 1.1), drawing insight from literature (Kumar, 2014; Bryman 2012), previous studies and evaluations reviewed. The semi-structured interview schedule included an introductory paragraph presenting the purpose of the study, and a set of open-ended questions (Kumar, 2014; Neuman, 2011). This research sourced the open-ended questions from the literature reviewed, and divided the interview schedule into sections, with the first including questions regarding employees and the second questions about the HRD managers. The interview schedule was not piloted, because it would require testing the instrument in another Department. This research asked participants questions using the exact same wording, but not in the same order as they appear in the schedule (Bryman, 2012). The research acknowledged the new emerging idea that we did not gain from the literature (Nieuwenhuis & Smit, 2012; Bryman, 2012). The research probed when asking questions in order to obtain rich information and triangulate data (Nieuwenhuis & Smit, 2012). The semi-structured interview schedule had a concluding statement thanking the study participants.

3.3.2 Targeting and selecting respondents

3.3.2.1 Target population

Neuman (2011) describes the target population as an enormous group of cases from which the researcher extracts a sample and the results can be generalised. On the other hand, Bryman (2012, p.187) refers to a population as "the universe of units from which the sample is to be selected". The universe of units includes people, nations, cities, companies and so forth (Bryman, 2012). In this research, the target population is the 953 employees of the GDARD. The PMDS covers the employees from salary levels one to 12. The target population for this study therefore comprised employees from salary levels one to 12, who are evaluated and measured through the PMDS. The occupational levels include employees from lower management (administration clerks, senior administration clerks, administration officers, and senior administration officers) and middle management (assistant directors and deputy directors). This research sought a representation of employees from level one to 12. However, the structure of GDARD is different from other Departments in Gauteng. In GDARD, the security and cleaning services are outsourced to private companies. Therefore, in GDARD cleaners and securities are not assessed through PMDS.

This research committed to the target population, drawing insight from various past studies on the implementation of the performance management system. Hendricks and Matsiliza (2015), for example, conducted a study to develop a deeper understanding of the implementation of performance management system in the public sector. The target population was the public managers and employees of the Department of Rural Development and Land Reform (DRDLR) in the Western Cape. The study by Sebashe and Mtapuri (2011) committed to a target population in the same way as other prior studies. The aim was to explore how the performance management system is implemented in the Ba-Phalaborwa Municipality. The target population for the study was 421 employees of the Ba-Phalaborwa Municipality, and included Section 56 managers, middle managers, assistant managers and lower-level employees, from which a sample of 30 was extracted. The study concluded that the performance management system is not successfully implemented in the municipality.

The study by Mughal et al. (2014) committed to the target population in the same way as the abovementioned studies. The aim of the study was to explore the weaknesses that obstruct proper implementation of the performance management system in an organisation. The target for the study was 6 453 employees from Alfalah Bank. The target population included managerial and non-managerial employees. Seven employees were extracted for the study.

Drawing insight from the abovementioned past studies and evaluations, this research selected the employees of the GDARD as the target population. As anticipated, the target population brought insight on the research problem.

3.3.2.2. Sampling or selecting respondents from the target population

According to Kumar (2014, p 229), "sampling is the process of selecting a few (a sample) from a bigger group (the sampling population) as the basis for estimating or predicting the prevalence of an unknown piece of information, situation or outcome regarding the bigger group." Neuman (2011) cites different purposes for sampling in both the qualitative and quantitative studies. For instance, the goal in qualitative studies is to explore how people view an issue, event or problem in their social or cultural settings, however, generalisability gets compromised (Neuman, 2011). The advantages of sampling are saving time, money and human resources (Kumar, 2014). On the contrary, the disadvantage of sampling is that it can compromise the accuracy in the findings because of the estimate made from respondents (Kumar, 2014). Academic literature describes the probability and non-probability sampling strategies as the two options available for sampling (Kumar, 2014; Neuman, 2011; Laher & Botha, 2012).

This research applied the non-probability sampling strategy. Laher and Botha (2012) maintain that the non-probability sampling strategy is commonly used to select people to participate in research because they are both keen and available. Laher and Botha (2012) further maintain that the strength of this strategy is that it is convenient and inexpensive. In addition, Kumar (2014) argues that usually qualitative studies find the non-probability studies highly relevant. Non-probability sampling strategy has various forms such as convenience sampling, judgmental or purposive sampling, expert sampling, snowball sampling, quota sampling (Kumar, 2014; Neuman, 2011; Bryman, 2012).

This research applied a purposive sampling form, which involves the researcher finding respondents who will provide relevant information to answer the research objective (Kumar, 2014). Additionally, Laher and Botha (2012) cite that in purposive sampling the researcher takes guidance from previous research, skill, experience and innovation to find relevant people to partake in the study. The researchers go to the people who they believe are willing and able to share the required information (Kumar, 2014). Generally, most past qualitative studies and evaluations on the implementation of the performance management system reviewed in this research preferred a purposive sampling form.

The study by Hendricks and Matsiliza (2015) applied a purposive sampling form to select people to participate in the research. The aim of the study was to gain a deeper understanding of the implementation of performance management in the public sector. The sample included human resources practitioners, union representatives, and middle and senior management from the Department of Rural Development and Land Reform (DRDLR) in the Western Cape. The study selected participants because they were knowledgeable on the performance management system and would be able to provide relevant data. The study concluded that public-sector institutions should take the performance management system seriously in order to achieve organisational growth.

Mosoge and Pilane (2014) also used the purposive sampling form. The aim of the study was to clarify the concept of 'performance management' as an aspect of the IQMS because of the confusion that exists in literature; to explore the experiences and perceptions of school management teams in the implementation of performance management; and to define performance management against the background of the structural-functionalist and conflict theories. The study focused on 24 primary schools in the Rustenburg area project office. The sample selected 15 people to participate in the study. The study used purposive sampling to select significant participants that could provide insight on the research problem. The study concluded that performance management is important for the development of teachers, and should be given central attention in the teachers' development workshop facilitated by the Department of Education.

Similarly, Munzhedzi and Phago (2014) applied purposive sampling to recruit participants in a study to determine whether the introduction of performance management contributes to improved productivity in the Department of Co-operative Governance, Human Settlements and Traditional Affairs (COGHSTA) in Limpopo. The study sample included senior managers, deputy managers, managers and operational workers of the COGHSTA. A sample of 28 employees was selected from the lower to senior levels of the department. The participants were recruited to partake in the study on the basis of their knowledge on the performance management system. The study concluded that employees in the COGHSTA were doubtful that the performance management system contributed to sustained productivity.

Cameron (2015) also employed a purposive sampling form to select participants in a study to discover the hindrances and difficulties experienced when implementing the performance management system at both an organisational and individual level. The sample included six senior managers from the PES office and five senior managers from the IES head office. The study found little progress in the establishment of performance management systems in the Department of Labour, a lack of performance culture, and that performance management reforms were unsuccessful.

Accordingly, this research employed a purposive sampling form, drawing insight from past studies (Laher & Botha, 2012). The above studies, however, included senior managers and labour unions in their samples. This research took a slightly different approach and did not include senior managers because their performance is not measured in the same way as employees in occupational levels one to 12. Additionally, this research excluded the labour unions because they form only a small part of the performance management process. This research selected the study participants based on judgement, choice and innovation (Laher & Botha, 2012), and approached those employees who were willing and able to share the required information (Kumar, 2014). This research accessed 12 participants from levels four to 12. The research excluded level one and two (cleaners and securities) because they are not assessed by the Department. The employees in level three are drivers and messengers, who are constantly in and out of the Department. The research could not access level three participants because of their work schedule. The general workers also fall within the salary level three, and they are situated in the nature reserve of GDARD. The nature of

their work makes it hard for them to be accessible, because they are constantly working in the field. Two level three employees were approached to participate in the study. However, the two participants pulled out in the last minute due to the time constrains. This was a limitation to this research.

Those who participated in the study were nine employees: comprising two administration clerks, two personal assistants, three assistant directors, one environmental officer and one deputy director. The remaining three selected participants were HRD employees because the division in which they work is the custodian of the PMDS. These three employees were selected for the purpose of answering the second research question (Chapter 1), and included a deputy director (level 12), administration officer (level 7) and director (level 13). The human resource development (HRD) directorate has a sub-directorate that is directly responsible for PMDS. The sub-directorate has only two employees (the deputy director and the administration officer) who are the custodians of the system. The deputy director (DD) and the administration officer (AO) are directly responsible for the operational work of the system. Even though the performance management of senior managers differs from that of middle management and those employed in the lower levels of the Department, the director was included in the sample because he oversees the PMDS and would be able to provide relevant information that would answer the second research question.

3.3.3 Ethical considerations when collecting research data

According to Neuman (2011, p.143), "ethics define what is or is not legitimate to do or what 'moral' research procedures involve." Creswell (2016) proposes that ethical consideration should take place throughout the different phases of the research process: before conducting the research; at the beginning of the research; during the data-collection process; data analysis; data storage and reporting; and when publishing the research. In addition, Ogletree and Kawulich (2012) argue that when conducting the research, the researcher should consider ethical issues such as gatekeeping, deception, prevention of harm, power and social justice, reciprocity, informed consent, confidentiality and anonymity.

This research observed protocol provided by literature regarding ethical issues when conducting a research (Cresswell, 2013; Ogletree & Kawulich, 2012; Neuman, 2011). Creswell (2013) maintains that prior to conducting research, it is necessary to obtain permission from the university, research site and study participants. Before proceeding with this research, the Wits School of Governance granted the researcher permission to collect data. The permission was signed by the research director. The researcher then requested permission from the HOD to interview the employees of the GDARD (permission was granted by the HOD in 2016, who was seconded to another department the following year). The HOD responded by giving the HRD manager (the director) a directive to issue a letter of permission to conduct the interviews. The researcher received a signed letter (confidentiality agreement) on 6 September 2016. The researcher obtained a new letter with a new date (3 November 2017) from the human resource management director in the GDARD (Appendix 1.5).

The researcher obtained permission from the employees before proceeding with the interviews. The participants were assured that permission had been obtained from both the Wits School of Governance and the GDARD. Participants were requested to read the information sheet (Appendix 1.2), which was then explained to them. The information sheet detailed the researcher's profile, which is discussed below.

My name is Lirontso Makhooa. I am currently registered for the degree of Master of Management (in the field of Public Development and Management) under the Faculty of Commerce, Law, and Management at the University of Witwatersrand. I am conducting a research on assessing the implementation of the performance management and development system in the Gauteng Department of Agriculture and Rural Development. The purpose of this research is to explore the perception of employees regarding the implementation of the performance management and development system in the Gauteng Department of Agriculture and Rural Development, and the role of HRD managers in ensuring successful implementation of the system in the department. I am doing the research as part of the requirement to complete my degree. I worked as a Rural Development Facilitator (contract) in the Gauteng Department of Agriculture and Rural Development from 1 October 2014 to 30 September 2017.

The information sheet also indicted that the study is voluntary. The study will ensure confidentiality at all times; only the researcher will know the identities of the study participants. The study will not force employees to participate. The participants are welcome to withdraw from the study at any time. The environment will not harm the participants emotionally or physically, and the study will not damage the reputation of the participants. The study will treat the participants with dignity and the respect. The interview will take a maximum of 20 to 30 minutes, and will be audio recorded with the permission of the participants. The study will keep the recordings safe and secured.

After reading and explaining the information sheet, the participants were requested to sign the consent form (Appendix 1.1). The consent form discussed the following information: confirmation that the participant read and understood the information sheet; the study is voluntary and the participant can withdraw at any time; agreement to participate in the study; agreement that the participation will remain anonymous; the researcher will use anonymous quotes in the research; and agreement to record the interview session. The study participants were requested to tick if they agree with the statement and sign in agreement to participate in the study.

3.3.4 Data collection and storage

According to Bryman (2016), data collection is a critical point of any research. Additionally, Cresswell and Poth (2018) indicate that during the data collection process researchers must thoroughly determine the type of data they want collect and the procedures they want to use to collect such data. Primary data can be collected using four modes of data, namely, observation, interview (face-to-face, telephone or internet-based) focus group and documents (Bryman, 2012; Nieuwenhuis and Smit, 2012). The use of various modes of data collection will enable triangulation (Guest et al., 2012; Nieuwenhuis & Smit, 2012). Triangulation enhances the validity of the study. This research, however, was not able to use the observation mode for data collection because it impossible to observe the implementation of the performance management and development system since it involves an interaction between the employee, the line manager and the moderation committee. The performance management process does not allow for the presence of outsiders. This research also avoided using focus group because of the ethical issues around confidentiality and anonymity.

This research employed the interview as the mode for collecting data. An interview is a purposive interaction from one person to another, in which data on the interviewee's experience and opinions are collected (Nieuwenhuis & Smit, 2012; Kumar, 2014). In an interview, the researcher has the power choose the format and content of questions to be asked (Kumar, 2014). Additionally, Bryman (2016) argues that qualitative interviews are flexible in contrast to quantitative interviews. Bryman (2016, p. 467) maintains that "the interviewers can depart significantly from the interview guide; they can ask new questions that follow up interviewees' replies and can vary the order and even the wording of the of question". An interview can be conducted using various forms such as face-to-face, telephone and open-end internet interviews (Cresswell, 2016). This research applied the face-to-face interview form to collect primary data. A face-to-face interview is where both the interviewer and the interviewee are in the same physical location (Creswell & Poth, 2018). The advantage of a face-to-face interview is that the researcher is able to observe the physical reaction and emotion expressed by the interviewee (Cresswell, 2016). In addition, Kumar (2014) cites that the researcher is able to supplement data with the emotional expression they observed from the interviewee.

This research reviewed past studies that applied this form of data collection. The study by Mughal et al. (2014) applied the face-to-face interview to collect data from the participants. The aim of the study was to discover the weaknesses that hindered proper implementation of the organisation's current performance management system. The study used the interview to close the gap between the current and proposed performance management system. The study interviewed seven employees from different departments of the Bank.

Mosoge and Pilane (2014) also applied the face-to-face interview to collect data from key informants in a study that aimed to clarify the concept of performance management as an aspect of the IQMS because of the confusion that exists in the literature, and to explore the experiences and perceptions of school management teams in the implementation of performance management. The study interviewed 15 participants, taking into consideration the fact that interviews do not involve large numbers of participants. The use of interviews enable the researchers to observe the physical

expressions and emotions of the participants. The interviews were audio taped and later transformed into transcripts.

This research applied the face-to-face interview form, adopting methods from the abovementioned studies by Mughal et al. (2014), Mosoge and Pilane (2014)) and academic literature (Creswell, 2016). The interviews took place at the offices of the GDARD in Johannesburg. The interviews were scheduled beforehand with agreement between the interviewer and interviewees. This research approached one participant via WhatsApp message. The interview schedule was recorded in a book and all appointments were honoured (Table 1.1). The interviews were conducted from 30 November 2017 until 25 January 2018, and the majority took place in the offices of the participants. Some interviews were conducted in boardrooms because participants work spaces were located in open-plan settings, so as to ensure anonymity and confidentiality. Each interview was planned to take about 20 to 30 minutes, however, some took a little longer due to the amount of information the interviewees had to offer. All the interviews were recoded with the permission of the participants. The interviews began with an explanation of the purpose of the study and concluded by thanking the participants for taking part in the research.

Table 1: The interview schedule for the GDARD

Date	Time	Duration of Interview	Participant
30 November 2017	10:00 am	11 minutes	Respondent 1
08 December 2017	11:30 am	12 minutes 29 seconds	Respondent 2
13 December 2017	09:00 am	29 minutes 33 seconds	Respondent 3
13 December 2017	11:00 am	30 minutes 26 seconds	Respondent 4
14 December 2017	10:30 am	30 minutes 34 seconds	Respondent 5
18 December 2017	15:08 pm	18 minutes 03 seconds	Respondent 6
19 December 2017	11:15 am	15 minutes 08 seconds	Respondent 7
19 December 2017	14:00 pm	34 minutes 04 seconds	Respondent 8
20 November 2017	10:00 am	17 minutes 05 seconds	Respondent 9
20 December 2017	12:40 pm	22 minutes 42 seconds	Respondent 10
22 January 2018	14:30 pm	33 minutes 01 second	Respondent 11
25 January 2018	10:00 am	39 minutes 05 seconds	Respondent 12

The study recorded the interviews after gaining permission from the participants. A mobile phone was used to record all interviews. All recordings were transferred into

personal computer that is password protected. The recordings were labelled with numbers to protect the identity of the participants. The recordings were subsequently transferred into transcripts using Microsoft Word. The transcripts were also stored into a personal computer that is password protected. The transcripts were saved into a folder, with a label (that was not the actual names of the participants). This research adhered to ethical considerations. Under no circumstances, was data accessible to anyone other than the interviewer. The collected data was used merely for the purpose of this research.

3.3.5 Data processing and analysis

3.3.5.1 Data processing

Kumar (2014) cites that data processing involves converting raw information into data. Additionally, the researcher has to clean or edit data to remove inconsistencies (Kumar, 2014). At this stage, the researcher is preparing data for analysis (Kumar, 2014; Bryman, 2016). Transcribing and determining themes are the most common methods of data processing in qualitative studies (Bryman, 2012; Magnusson & Marecek, 2015; Creswell, 2013; Kumar, 2014). Literature describes transcribing as the process of transferring recorded audio interviews into transcripts (Bryman, 2012; Magnusson & Marecek, 2015). In addition, transcribing is a time-consuming process; it can take three or more hours to transcribe an hour-long interview (Bryman, 2012; Magnusson & Marecek, 2015). Magnusson and Marecek (2015) argue that transcribing should be done simultaneously with the data collection process. Moreover, the researcher should transcribe immediately after each interview (Magnusson & Marecek, 2015). Furthermore, the researcher must observe protocol regarding the ethical issues when transcribing, which includes refraining from making use of the real names of the participants in the transcripts (Cresswell, 2013; Ogletree & Kawulich, 2012; Magnusson & Marecek, 2015)

This research reviewed studies and evaluations that applied the transcribing process. Mosoge and Pilane (2014) conducted a study to clarify the concept of performance management as an aspect of the IQMS because of the confusion that exists in literature, and to explore the experiences and perceptions of school management teams in the implementation of performance management. The study conducted structured

interviews to collect descriptive data. After collecting the primary data, the audio tapes were transferred into transcripts. The study later used the transcripts for data analysis. Similarly, Seotlela and Miruka (2014) conducted a study to explore challenges encountered when implementing the performance management system in an organisation. The study used a digital recorder to record the interviews. The study later transferred the audio recordings into transcripts.

This research applied the transcribing process, drawing insight from past studies (Seotlela and Miruka, 2014; Mosoge and Pilane, 2014) and taking reference from Magnusson and Marecek (2015). In this research, transcribing was conducted parallel to data-collecting process (Magnusson & Marecek, 2015). A group of interviews was done and transcribing took place immediately after. The recordings were transferred into transcripts using Microsoft Word. The researcher listened to the audio and then paused and typed the words. This process took place until the end of the recording. Sometimes a group of interviews were collected before transcribing. For example, two interviews took place on 19 December, one in the morning and one in the afternoon. As a result, it was impossible to transcribe immediately after each interview. This was a limitation on the part of the researcher. Moreover, it took many hours to transcribe one interview, with many breaks needed. The study noted that it took about three hours to transcribe a 15-minute interview. Additionally, it took about eight hours to transcribe a 30-minute interview. Transcribing took place from 8 December 2017 to 28 January 2018, after the last interview was conducted. The process of transcribing was time-consuming, given the fact that the researcher is not an expert in the field of transcription. Under no circumstances were the names of the study participants revealed in the transcripts. Labels were used to identify the transcripts.

This research also applied the process of determining themes, drawing insight from literature (Creswell, 2013; Kumar, 2014). Creswell (2013, p. 186) refers to themes as "broad units of information that consists of several codes aggregated to form a common idea". Bryman (2016) argues that one way of determining themes is to code through the transcripts. Additionally, Kumar (2014) argues that the researcher must read the transcripts to find meaning from the responses of participants, and then develop themes and assign codes to these themes (Kumar, 2014). Kawulich and Holland (2012) argue that one way of determining themes is by reading each transcript,

identifying the unit of analysis (words, phrase or sentences), and assigning a code label to the unit of analysis.

This research determined themes drawing insight from Kumar (2014) and the studies by Mosoge and Pilane (2014), Munzhedzi and Phago (2014). These studies reduced primary data into manageable segments or transcripts, identified themes and patterns, and coded the themes. This research developed themes from the research questions using words or phrases. It then developed a matrix table detailing the themes from the research questions. The researcher read and re-read the transcripts to find words, phrases and patterns, and included them in the matrix table (Table 2). Themes were developed from data using words that appear many times in the transcripts.

This research applied data fragmentation as another form of data processing. Data fragmentation is also known as data segmentation. This is the process of breaking up, unscrambling, disentangling and decreasing data into small pieces (Bryman, 2016; Boeije, 2010; Durdella, 2017). This research segmented data based on what the researcher believed to be applicable to achieve the purpose of the research. This research applied segmentation (Table 2) through reading and re-reading the transcripts (Boeije, 2010). Moreover, this research segmented data by finding words, phrases, sentences and small passages (Johnson & Christensen, 2012). The pieces of data were compared in order to find similarities and differences, and the meaning they have with regards to the research purpose (Boeije, 2010).

3.3.5.2 Data analysis

Bryman (2016) cites that data analysis is the process of reducing a large amount of information from transcripts into small segments of data so that the researcher can draw meaning from it. Literature highlights that data analysis involves organising data into categories, coding themes, finding similar concepts or features, presenting data and interpreting data (Creswell, 2013; Neuman, 2011). A number of methods can be used to analyse data in qualitative research, namely content, thematic, narrative, phenomenological, discourse and grounded theory analysis (Kumar, 2014; Bryman, 2012; Creswell, 2013; Kawulich & Holland, 2012).

This research applied direct thematic content analysis to analyse data. Direct thematic content analysis is a combination of thematic and content analysis (Bryman, 2016; Kumar, 2014; Kawulich & Holland, 2012). Thematic analysis involves channelling the researcher into ways of thinkning to identify and manage themes or patterns in data (Bryman, 2012; Kawulich & Holland, 2012). In addition, Guest, MacQueen and Namey (2012) mention that the codebook is an important tool that is used in thematic analysis. A well-designed codebook details all the steps in the analysis process (Guest et al., 2012). On the other hand, Kumar (2014) argues that content analysis means analysing the contents of the transcripts to identify themes that appear from data.

This research reviewed past studies and evaluations on the implementation of the performance management system that have used the thematic analysis method to analyse primary data. The study by Allen-lle et al. (2007) applied thematic analysis to analyse primary data. The purpose of the study was to explore the perception of employees with regard to the influence of performance management system on career development. The target population for the study was public service employees in the Eastern Cape provincial government.

This research applied direct thematic content analysis drawing insight from literature (Bryman, 2016; Kumar, 2014; Kawulich & Holland, 2012). The first step was to develop themes that would help reflect on the meaning of data. The main goal of this research is to answer the research questions. This research developed themes of interest from the two main research questions. The first research question was turned into a statement: The perception of employees regarding the implementation of the PMDS in the GDARD. Under this statement, the following themes were identified: employees' knowledge and understanding; benefits of the system; challenges of the implementation of the system; and the PMDS as a tool. The second research question was also turned into a statement: The role of HRD in the implementation of the PMDS in the GDARD. Under this statement, the following themes were developed: the responsibility of HRD; and challenges of the system. This information was captured in a matrix table (Table 2), which included the main themes and sub-themes, responses from participants, similarities and differences in responses, and a reconciled view (Bryman, 2016). *This research notes data is table 2 is not clear, therefore, a better version of table two is provided in Appendix 1.5.*

Table 2: Matrix table for data fragmentation

Themes	Data fragmentation: assessing the implementation of the performance management and the development system in the Gauteng Department of Agriculture and Rural Development Respondent 1	Respondent 2	Respondent 3	Respondent 4	Respondent 5	Respondent 6	Respondent 7	Respondent 8	Respondent 9	Respondent 10	Respondent 11	Respondent 12	Similarities	Differences	Reconciled Views
Empoyees' knowledge and understanding															
Performance management and development system	PMDS was introduced to me as a tool to measure my performance	It was not properly introduced.	the monitoring of performance of individuals and also that of the organisation,	system which the government uses to actually try and track in terms of	It is also to ensure that whenever they are lacking they develop in those areas	PMDS is like a work evaluation, where you are being measured	a tool that is used in government to measure the performance indicators,	I understand is a tool that assist you to gage your performance	I believe is…..your performance ratings of how well have you been doing in your job	To remedy ill behaviour when it comes to employees,	seeks to evaluate whether an employee…. a government employee is performing	Is to manage individual performance in order to see whether	Most employees are know what is pmds and what it seek to achieve		There is general knowledge of PMDS amongst all employees
PMDS policy	haven't read the policy	No that I know off	I was actually drafting the policy when I was still in the Premiers Office	Policy wise No		I don't even know where to get it	Yes….did read the policy,	I haven't	- I haven't read the policy	I've read the policy initally when it was introduced to me	Eer…I just read it and….		Majority of the employees in GDARD have not read the policy	Only a minority (three respondent have read the policy	The culture of reading and understading policies in inadequate
Contracting process	Goals are assigned to me according to the work plan.	You just get a contract sign here, he it you [try] to challenge it.	Challenges definitely is that people does not contract correctly.	we just…eer… go to the internet get a copy for that specific salary level and fill in your details	And if the contracting from the onset is not straight,	we have to sign the new contract and the work plan.	so that you have the agreement with employee also with the supervisors	…..you are more or less told….in terms of what you are supposed to being doing	between me and my…immediat e supervisor, we'll agree on what is my duties.	then we agree on…we agree on what is expected from the officials	when you are given a job description each item is then put into a contract to say you will be measured,		Employees get to sign the performance contract in line with their job description	For some employees it its not negotiated, employees are told what do to, others are just given a contract to sign	There is a communication breakdown when implementing the process. The process is implemented incorrectly
PMDS training/workshop	Since I have joined the Department there was never training for PMDS	I have never even received an invite for PMDS training	provide training irrespective of what topic on PMDS,	I got to understand what the Department wants us to do	induction our facilitator from HRD would come and do a presentation on PMDS	Two years back I attended the refresher training.		I have just attended one training…ever	Shocking I have never been to any PMDS training	I have only attended once or twice since I joined the Department	I think I only attended once, but then when the PMDS	the PMDS workshops at the induction	Some employees have attended the training when they joined the Department	A few minority do not remember going to a pMDS training	PMDS training are not happening as regsarly as possible
Benefits of the system															
Skills Development	if I need to excel on something and I do struggle, I do go for training	There is no support that we are getting from the managers		Well…eem… in terms of the development, they do offer support when I have to go for training	We have different types in trainings within the HRD unit where you can send in your name	senior managers will noject say no you can't do this course and this course.	because since I have arrived here I have already attended more than four courses.	Nothing, that why I am saying. I don't get any support	you will never get a chance to attend those training.	Currently personally I don't get support, because when I applied for a buzary	Sometimes you will get support to go and do a course, like I wanted to do video editing		four employees out of nine who were interviewed are of the view that they are getting enough support	five employees were of the view that they are not getnih enough support for training	There is not enough support from HRD and managers in terms of attending training. This should be improved
Performance bonus	Normally we if you have worked beyond what was contracted eer…then you do get something	People got bonuses, and those that are working they don't get a bonus here at GDARD	It should be, really the people who deserve the bonus should must get the bonus, not the others	recognition is the Department acknowledging that as an official I managed to achieve and go above	Performance bonus, if you perform you get a four and then you the a performance bonus.	They can tell now the scote is reduced, the scores changed	Remember if you have performed four upwards, there is money that you need get, R1500…	They even…..they even make a sarcasm , according to me, to say if you get a four it means you are walking on water	because when say here I have done this and it was extra mile. You are told no that was part of your job.	Like I am saying since I've joined the Department I've never received bonus	I have been getting my bonuses almost consistently, and the work from the ground shows.		The scores get reduced; employees cant get a four because they were doing the jobs; bonuses are received by a few	Minority a contend with receiving their bonuses consistently	The scoring and awarding of performance bonuses is not executed fairly
Recognition	[Because] always when I do my PMDS I always get a good feedback from my supervisor. So that…it kind of encourage you to work harder	no one will recognise that today at least you have went an extra mile with your work, no forget.		It was frustrating, it was demoralising, and it was like I am not being recognised	Which they issue for if you have been in the Public Service for more than 10 years.	You don't get the promotion, unless if you have to apply and go through the proces		We are not recognised for what ever good work you are doing	There is no recognition, and it kills your morale if you don't get it	But for that you never get the recognition			employees are not given enough recognition for the work they are doing		Not being recognised demotivates employees to better their performance
Poor performance managed	I remember while I was on my maternity leave, my performance was not good [because] I was away	at Facilities we are regarded as poor performers, but measures are not taken to improve that	A personal development plan is also indicating this is the shortcoming of the individual	I have never been recognised as a poor performer	we have something which is called Personal Development Plan…it also called a PDP	Fortunately I have never experience that to say maybe I didn't perform	I have never been regarded as a poor performer	I've never, I've never been		Unfortunately not			Majority of the respondent were never regarded as non-performers	there is a particular employees who was a non-performer because she was on maternity leave	Another employee alluded that non-performance can also be due insufficient tools of trade
Challenges on the implementation of the system															
Feedback communication	Normally the feedback from my supervisor is always positive, [because] she would always say keep up the good work. You are doing very well.	You just given letters to say no you dint qualify for a bonus, you qualify for a notch, and then that's it	my rating is now reduced without my knowledge, that's where most of the grievances comes from. It's feedback to employees	It's coming as I don't agree with what you are saying change it or say something else or done like that to also try and comply with the fact that the Department says at this particular date	And then now the manager would be advised go back to the employee	They can tell now the scote is reduced, the scores changed		As I have said, they do communicate but it is always one sided	That's the other thing they don't really get back to us with feedback	We get feedback from HR telling us you qualify or you didn't qualify	Emails, phone calls good job what… what. I also do the same to people who report to me.	If it is the lack of feedback then a lot of then them we suggest that action be taken against those managers f	Managers ar failing to communicate feedback properly to their employees	Two employees said feedback is communicate d properly to them	managers are failing to communicate; HRD has also confirmed that issues
Implementation					some people implementing it incorrectly	for final assessment the supervisor don't follow what they…maybe		But the way is being implemented it ends up being on the negative not on the positive.	They don't really consult, once its done its done, its signed,its filed , has gone to HR	Eer…fro me it's flawed	must not be abused like to settle scores and to say now I have a way of fixing this employee.				Most employees are of the view that there is a problem regarding the implementation of the system
Relationship		through the relationship between me and my supervisor is not healthy.	The challenge is that people don't know what is a three and what is a four or even a five.	Well in relation to that I would say…the relationship in…..im not necessarily there		Eeer…the relationship between me and manager is good	The relationship is good, we don't have anything that is not good between us	So I think in a nutshell it means that the relationship is one sided, is not two sided.	Its….we agree…there is no	my boss tells me that eer… for you to get a four you must be over this			the relationships between employees and their manager is not necessarily good	Only a minority felt like they are having a good relationship with their manager	the relationship between managers and employees is eroksved
Punishment						I never received anything related to punishment			No, I would be lying	Eem….I would say I want acted in a position and it was not given to me, for me that was a punishmen	Ooh No				Employees in the Department have never experienced punishment
PMDS as a tool															
Improve or Punish	For me I think it's a tool to encourage us to work more	No it's a tool to punish employee,		Eem…it's a tool designed to improve a performance, hence		Yah, so to me I don't see it as something that can improve me	No I think is a tool for performance,		A tool to emprove, because its rating you, s	It's a tool to improve performance if is done correctly	No its eer… clearly a tool to improve performance,		Most employees view pmds as tool to improve performance	One employee alluded that managers a using it to settle scores	PMDS is defiantly a tool to improve the employee and organisational performance, however it is utilised badly in some instances
The roles of Human Resource Development															
Create awareness			**Okay so where the was a business plan for the Department and is going down to the individual level**		It is really to create a learning culture and to assess to employees….										
Develop employees					We have different types of trainings within the HRD unit where you can send in your name and say you [want to] go for….for example										
Quality check			**Then what we do is we do a quality check on the document itself to see whether anything is missing**		If the…the rating is right… you know…. the is the quality check I do										
Quality assurance/ Moderation session					So what happens is that we would look at the rating, this is a four…then the manager of that particular employee would come in…							So the Chief Director has that responsibility of overall quality assurance before it comes to us on a quarterly basis				
Award bonuses			certain levels qualify for certain percentage of performance bonus and stuff		Performance bonus, if you perform you get a four and then you the a performance bonus							where if you are rated certain level you qualify for certain monetory rewards	**For a certain level you qualify for a bonus**		**When an employee gets a rating of a four aand above they qualify for a performance bonus**
Management of poor performance			According to…according to the policy [okay] if a person is rated a two there should be a personal development plan attached to that assessment												
Presentation of performance															
PMDS Challenges of the system															
Grievances			most of the grievances relates to mundate ratings		Where an employee has agreed with the manager that the rating is a four							they lodge the grievances and the a lot of the time is a lack of feedback	grievances on ratings		The rating of scores is serious challenge
Non compliance			Challenges for me as the implementers of this PMDS is when people do not meet deadlines.												

The next step applied in this research was to classify the main themes. This step involved reading through the 12 transcripts developed from the interviews. This process involved reading through the transcripts and finding words, phrases or sentences that match a particular theme and to capture them in the matrix table (Table 2 or Appendix 1.5) (Kawulich & Holland, 2012; Kumar, 2014). This research captured responses from each participant under a particular theme. It captured the responses, the similarities, the difference, and a reconciled view (Bryman, 2016).

The next step was to consolidate the themes and the responses into a report (Chapter 4). This research presented the themes and the responses under the main research questions, which were turned into statements. It formed a discussion under each theme, and presented in verbatim the responses so as to avoid the loss of any meaning (Kumar, 2014). This research then presented a discussion on the responses based on the similarities, differences and a reconciled view (Bryman, 2016). Furthermore, this research reviewed other studies and evaluations in order to compare the results presented in this research with those of other studies.

3.3.6 Description of the respondents

This research recruited a small sample of employees who fall within the category salary levels one to 12 who are measured through the PMDS. The participant included employees from different levels and sections of the department. The respondents were two personal assistants, two administration clerks, one administration officer, three assistant directors, one environmental officer (equivalent to assistant director), two deputy directors and one director. The work experience of respondents ranges from eight to 17 years, and the majority are qualified with a bachelor's degree, with one respondent holding a Master's. Respondents were mostly male aged 40 plus, with the oldest being 51 years old. Below is a description table of the research respondents (Table 3).

Table 3: Description of the research respondents

Respondent number	Salary level	Job title	Years of employment	Qualification	Age	Gender
1	7	Personal Assistant	3	Diploma in management	29	Female
2	4	Administration Clerk	8	National Diploma	39	Female
3	12	Deputy Director	11	Degree in Business Management	51	Male
4	9	Assistant Director	5	BSc Agricultural Economics	30	Female
5	7	Administration Officer	2 (plus one year internship)	National Diploma in Human Resource Management	28	Female
6	9	Environmental Officer	9	Degree in Environmental Science	36	Male
7	5	Administration Clerk	3	BTech Public Management	32	Male
8	10	Assistant Director	8	LLB	47	Male
9	7	Personal Assistant	7	BTech Human Resource Management	42	Female
10	12	Deputy Director	5	BTech Public Management	45	Male
11	9	Assistant Director	10	Master in Journalism and Media Studies	45-50	Male
12		Director	17	Management Advance Programme: NQF Level 8	47	Male

3.4 Research strengths: Reliability and validity measures applied

In social science research, the researcher is measuring intangible constructs, which creates uncertainty about whether the researcher is measuring what he/she intends to measure; this is where the issue of validly and reliability comes in (Mentz & Botha, 2012). Validity is the ability of the data collection instrument to show that it is producing the intended results (Kumar, 2014). Reliability refers to the achievement of same results when repeating the study (Kumar, 2014). Additionally, Guest et al. (2012) mention that the issues of validity and reliability go together; it is impossible to have validity without reliability and it is impossible to have high validity and low reliability in research. When data collected are valid, it will produce reliable results if the study is applied on the same target population and in the same context (Guest et al., 2012). Ensuring validity and reliability of the data collection instrument helps the researcher to guarantee the quality of the research report (Mentz & Botha, 2012).

This research did not overlook the issues of validity and reliability since they guarantee the quality of research report (Mentz & Botha, 2012). Qualitative research uses trustworthiness and credibility to explain validity and reliability in the research. The trustworthiness of the research is enhanced using criteria of credibility, transferability, dependability and conformability (Kawulich & Holland, 2012; Kumar, 2014; Bryman, 2012; Nieuwenhuis & Smit, 2012).

This research enhanced dependability, which is similar to reliability in quantitative research (Kumar, 2014). The study is dependable when the same results are achieved when the study on the same phenomenon is repeated (Kumar, 2014; Bryman, 2012). Dependability is enhanced when the researcher is detailed about the steps taken in the research so that it can be replicated (Kumar, 2014). This research provides an audit trail of all the steps taken in the research process (Kumar, 2014). The steps in the data collection and data analysis processes are explicitly discussed, and an interview schedule details the number and period of the interviews as well as the duration of each interview. The research clearly explains that a mobile phone was used to record the interviews, and the recordings were then transferred to a personal computer, which is password protected.

This research states the time taken to transcribe the recordings and clearly explains that they were transferred into transcripts using Microsoft Word. With regards to the data analysis process, themes were developed from the main research questions and recorded in a matrix table. The researcher read and re-read the 12 transcripts to find words, phrases and sentences that match those themes. Themes were developed from data using words that appear many times in the transcripts. The research results are presented in detail in Section 4.1 and Section 4.2. and a detailed discussion of the research findings presented in Chapter 5.

This research enhanced conformability, which is reliability in quantitative research (Kumar, 2014). Conformability refers to the researcher being objective and ensuring that the findings presented from the data are not influenced by personal feelings (Kumar, 2014; Kawulich & Holland, 2012). The researcher was employed in the GDARD from 1 October 2014 to 30 September 2017 (i.e. a period of three years) and was objective when presenting the research findings. There was no personal bias and the findings presented are strictly from the primary data. This research explicitly presents the perception and experiences of the participants.

This research enhanced validity to guarantee the quality of the research report (Mentz & Botha, 2012). Internal validity refers to credibility in qualitative research (Kumar, 2014). Kawulich and Holland (2012) argue that another way of enhancing credibility in qualitative research is through triangulation. This research triangulated data from participants in the lower and middle levels of management. Moreover, data was collected from participants in different divisions of the department, namely rural development, intergovernmental relations, publications, supply chain management, facilities management, human resources management, strategic governance, environmental management and records management. Seotlela and Miruka (2014) also applied triangulation in their study, the objective of which was to critically assess challenges associated with the performance management system and then to perform an evaluation on the subject area. The study enhanced validity through the triangulation of data sources such as interviews with key informants and focus groups (different functional categories of employees), observations and the analysis of documents. The study found a lack of support from human resources, even though the division is the

custodian of the performance management process. It also found that management failed to implement change management in relation to the performance management system.

This research enhanced credibility by interpreting the research results through the lens of different theories (Kawulich & Holland, 2012). The results were interpreted through the lens of the reinforcement and goal-setting theories. In addition, this research enhanced credibility by researching the problem in its natural environment (Nieuwenhuis & Smit, 2012). Data was collected in the offices of the GDARD, where implementation of the PMDS takes place.

Lastly, transferability refers to external validity in quantitative research (Kumar, 2014). Transferability can be achieved when the researcher is transparent in detailing the steps taken during the research process, so that it can be repeated by others (Kumar, 2014). This research is explicit about the research strategy and design applied, and provides justification. It presents the data collection instrument used in Appendix 1.1, and clearly explains the interview process, which includes the period and duration of the interviews. The sample is openly discussed and justification given. The data storage, transcription and data analysis processes are explicitly discussed. Moreover, to enhance validity, the results (Chapter 4) is presented with thick description (Nieuwenhuis & Smit, 2012).

3.5 Research weaknesses: Technical and administrative limitations

This research experienced both technical and administrative limitations throughout the research process. In terms of technical limitations, generalisability was compromised owing to the fact that data was collected on a small scale using a small sample of 12 participants (Houser, 2015). Moreover, another way of enhancing validity and reliability of the study is through triangulation (Kawulich & Holland, 2012). This research could not triangulate data from different data sources such as focus groups and observation (Kawulich & Holland, 2012) since the PMDS cannot be studied through observation. The PMDS process is also an interaction between the supervisor and subordinate, and subsequently the moderation committee. As a result, this research could not use focus groups to collect data as this would compromise the issue of anonymity and

confidentiality. Additionally, the issue of ethics was compromised, because of thick descriptions provided in Chapter 4.

The fact that this research was unable to pilot the data collection instrument was a limitation. In some instances, the participants could not understand the questions and requested that they be rephrased, which impacted on the duration of the interviews. Some interviews were also of a shorter duration than expected, with participants given brief responses to the questions. Note-taking was compromised during the interview process in that the researcher at times did not pick up on the physical or emotional expressions of the participants. In some instances, participants shortened their answers when they saw that notes were being taken. As a result, note-taking was compromised. Moreover, the honesty of the study participants could not be guaranteed. In their eyes, the researcher could still be regarded as their colleague as she had only left the department in September 2017. In addition, some participants were sceptical to reveal their age. One participant, for example, said he was in 40-50 age range (Table 3) and would not be more specific. Another limitation in this research was that the researcher could not transcribe immediately after each interview because some interviews took place in close time proximity (Table 1).

This research also experienced administrative limitations. The interviews were conducted from 30 November 2017 to 25 January 2018. Most of the interviews took place in December 2017, when people were preparing to close off on work before taking annual leave. Some people were busy and did not honour their appointments, which necessitated rescheduling of appointments or approaching other employees to take their place. Some participants requested that the interviews be conducted as quickly as possible because they had urgent matters to attend to.

4. PRESENTATION OF RESEARCH RESULTS

This chapter presents the empirical research results, to answer the main the research questions, which were presented in Chapter 1. Chapter 2 discussed the research problem in the physical context in Sections 2.1 and 2.2; reviewed past studies and evaluations on the implementation of the performance management system in Section 2.3 (identified a knowledge gap); presented and discussed the academic field of studies in Section 2.4; discussed the attributes in Section 2.5; established appropriate frameworks that would help interpret the research results in Section 2.6; and developed a conceptual framework in Section 2.7. Chapter 3 discussed the research strategy, design, procedure and methods used to collect and analyse the empirical research information. The purpose then of this chapter is to present the research results. This research presents the first research question in statement format in Section 4.1. Section 4.1.1 presents the research results, while Section 4.1.2 compares the results from this research with those of past studies and evaluations. Section 4.2 presents the second research question in statement format. Section 4.2.1 presents the research results to help answer the question, while Section 4.2.2 compares the research results with past studies and evaluations on the implementation of the performance management system. Section 4.3 presents a conclusion of Chapter 4.

4.1 Employees' perception regarding the implementation of the performance management and development system in the Gauteng Department of Agriculture and Rural Development

The first main question for this research is: What is the employees' perception regarding the implementation of the PMDS in the GDARD? This research question was turned into a statement, as presented in Section 4.1, to enable the researcher to unpack the research results.

4.1.1 Presentation of the results

To collect empirical evidence for this study, the researcher developed a semi-structured interview schedule (Appendix 1.1) to present questions to the employees of the

GDARD. The questions interlink with the attributes discussed in Section 2.5 and the research questions outlined in Chapter 1. This research developed the main themes from the main research questions. As the researcher continued with data analysis, this research identified the subthemes that form part of the discussion under the four main themes.

4.1.2 Employees knowledge and understanding

Literature refers to the PMDS as the system that identifies the performance management process and the cycle in the public institutions (Penceliah, 2012; Muller et al., 2008). Du-Plessis (2015) asserts the purpose of the PMDS is to ensure that employees in government institutions are equipped with the skills, knowledge and competencies that will assist them to effectively and efficiently achieve the goals and objectives of the department. The research results show that employees in the GDARD have the necessary knowledge and understanding of the PMDS and its purpose. The participants were able to define and discuss the PMDS according to their own understanding.

Respondent_11, however, stood out in bringing the aspect of service delivery in the following answer: *"Is basically a performance management system that seeks to evaluate whether an employee…. a government employee is performing according to the set standards or below the set standards. If they are below, they should be sent for training, if they are above or if they just meet the standards you should encourage them to do better. And if they are above you should reward them for doing a lot for the government, the excellent, and the effort….eem… and then you should reward them to keep up the good work. And that's how the government will then benefit by delivering good public services…services to the public. Because we are not here…we don't make profit. We measure our results by how people lives are being bettered out there; we don't make profit to say today we made so many millions. We just get budget from the taxpayers' monies those are the people whom we should serve, and they should get a good service of…"*

Although the majority of the research participants have an understanding of what the PMDS is about, most of them have not read the PMDS policy used in the GDARD. While they do understand the meaning of the PMDS, their knowledge and understanding of the system is limited due to the fact that they have not read the policy. Only three of the participants mentioned that they had read the policy, however, they

merely browsed through it. Respondents 7, 10 and 11 said they had read the PMDS policy, while the remaining participants said they had not. Respondent_6, for example, indicated, "*No I have never read it. I don't even have it. I don't even know where to get it.*" Similarly, Respondent_8 argues: "*I don't even think there are many people who are aware of the policy itself. Eer…eer, so I…I don't think there's even awareness on it. I don't even think there are workshops on it…*" The response from Respondent_8 suggests that the HRD unit has not created sufficient awareness of the PMDS policy in the department. The participants who have not read the policy had the same perspective. Moreover, the research results show that the department lacks a culture of reading policies.

Reading and understanding the PMDS policy is critical because it provides a guideline on the do's and don'ts of implementing the system. Moreover, it gives employees the opportunity to challenge the system if not implemented correctly. The implementation of the PMDS begins with the contracting process. Mone and Lodon (2010) assert that the contracting or goal-setting process involves the manager and employee reaching agreement on the work plan of the employee. Additionally, this involves linking the employee's goals to the organisation's mission, vision and strategy (Mone & London, 2010; Locke & Latham, 2013). The research results show that the contracting process is implemented incorrectly in the GDARD. The employees are simply instructed by their managers and are not afforded proper engagement. For example, Respondent_4 argues, "*It's not like we get to sit…sit…as a Branch and we get to see that these are the targets for the Branch or this is the APP [for] the Department and this is where we fall in as a Branch, these are the targets that we have to split amongst ourselves. No you just do it and then you submit it, whoever is your supervisor just checks it and sign…it goes to the next and if they feel that it must be changed they add those changes…*" Similarly, Respondent_8 argues, "*Wherever, by the way, when you are contracting, if you find that the contract has been made already it must be given to you. And you've got seven days to read the contract before you can sign it, and you are not forced to sign it. If it's a negotiated contract before you even sign, you supposed to have that period as well, where you are still negotiating and discussing issues on both sides until you are on the same page…*" Furthermore Respondent_8 asserts that, "*In my directorate that's what is happening, you are more or less told ….you are more or less told…..in terms of what you are supposed to being doing than negotiating, especially when you even know your work at operational level."* Similarly, Respondent_2 argues that, "*You just get a contract sign here, be it you [try] to challenge it.*"

The HRD manager had also observed that the contracting process is implemented incorrectly by mangers in the department. Respondent_12 argues that, "*And pursue the contracting process obviously looking at the…eem… Departmentally what needs to be achieved. Eem…and this is where the challenge comes in. If you look at the… the contracts there is no direct link between this official and his direct manager.*" The responses from other participants, such as Respondents 1, 6, 7 and 10, suggest that they are content with the contracting process. The research results show that there is limited knowledge on how to implement the contracting process, and Respondent_12 as the overseer of the system confirms this.

Respondent_8 highlighted that workshops are critical to create awareness of the policy and process of the PMDS. Mello (2015) argues that managers should go for training before the new financial year's performance management cycle kicks off. Additionally, literature states that employees should attend training to familiarise themselves with the performance management process (Pulakos & O'Leary, 2011; Arakal & Mampilly, 2016). The research results show two divided views regarding the issue of training or workshop on the PMDS. There are those who do not recall attending a training session or workshop on the PMDS. For example, Respondent_1, who has been working in the GDARD for the past three years, stated, "*Since I have joined the department there was never training for PMDS."* Similarly, Respondent_2 replied, "*I have never even received an invite for PMDS training*". Respondent_9, who has been working in the department for seven years, agrees with this: *"Shocking I have never been to any PMDS training.*" Other participants, however, recall attending training once or twice. For example, Respondent_8 has worked for the department for past eight and said, "*I have just attended one training…eeer….."* Similarly, Respondent_11 recalls only attending the PMDS training once during the 10 years' the respondent has been working for the GDARD: *"I think I only attended once, but then when the PMDS process started from what I know it was explained to me how it works.*" The research results show that another problem is that senior managers do not attend training on the PMDS. For example, Respondent_8 argues, "*The flaw on the very same training is that managers are not trained.*" Similarly, Respondent_2 argues, "*I don't think even our senior managers understand PMDS*." On the other hand, Respondent_11 suggests, "*managers, when they are employed, they must be given a good induction to say PMDS is a serious process; it must not be abused like to settle scores and to say now I have a way of fixing this employee.*" The research results show that although

workshops do take place, they are limited. Furthermore, the PMDS training in the department is not happening as regularly as it should. The responses from the participants suggest that senior managers should be trained on the system.

4.1.3 Benefits of the system

The purpose of the performance management system is to manage and evaluate both individual and organisational performance. Additionally, performance management provides employees with necessary skills, knowledge and capabilities to achieve the objectives of a particular organisation (Penceliah, 2012). Furthermore, the White Paper on Human Resource Management in the Public Service of 1997 requires government institutions to establish training and development interventions to manage employee performance. With regards to skills development, the research results indicate that there is not enough support for employees to attend training. Most participants felt that their managers were not giving them support to attend the training. Respondent_2 replied, "*There is no support that we are getting from the managers.*" Respondent_8 shares the same view: "*Nothing, that's why I am saying. I don't get any support.*" Similarly, Respondent_10 has no access to development opportunities: "*Currently, personally I don't get support, because when I applied for a bursary I was told that for a Master's Degree the department doesn't make bursaries."* Respondent_6 shares the same notion: "*Senior managers will reject, say no you can't do this course and this course."* Respondent_9 also argues, "*Ever since I have been here I have been indicating every year. I went for PFMA, I think I had just started, it was in 2010. Then the other one, I just went last year 2016. Two only ever since I have been here.*" However, a minority of the participants have a different perception. For instance, Respondent_7 replied: "*They always encourage us to go and attend some training, because since I have arrived here I have already attended more than four courses.*" Similarly, Respondent_4 indicted that, "*Well…eem… in terms of the development, they do offer support when I have to go for training.*" Respondent_11 argues, "*Sometimes you will get support to go and do a course, like I wanted to do video editing."* A reconciled view is that the department (particularly HRD) is not doing enough to address the issue of skills development. The department is therefore not meeting the requirements of the White Paper on Human Resource Management in the Public Service of 1997.

The performance management system does not only focus on skills and development for employees, but also on rewarding employees for excellent performance. Armstrong

(2009) and Andrew (2011) maintain that rewards motivate employees and reinforce good behaviour. The research results show that management is not implementing the reward system correctly. According to Respondent_5 (the custodian of the PMDS), the department is using performance bonuses to recognise and motivate the performance of the employee: "*Performance bonus, if you perform you get a four and then you get the performance bonus.*" Similarly, Respodent_11 argues that "*if you are doing well you have to be rewarded, and then when you are rewarded you do not become disinterested in what you are doing. You actually maintain that level or even better it.*" The research results show that the minority of the participants are pleased with receiving their bonuses consistently. For instance, Respondent_11 replied, "*I have been getting my bonuses almost consistently, and the work from the ground shows.*" Respondent_7 shares the same sentiment: "*Remember if you have performed four upwards, there is money that you get, R1500…something like that, that you have performed beyond."* However, a large part of the participants felt that the performance bonuses are not awarded fairly. For example, Respondent_8 argues that managers are very sarcastic when they implement the process: "*They even…they even make a sarcasm, according to me, to say if you get a four it means you are walking on water.*" Similarly, Respondent_5 argues that "*if a person gets a rating of a four, they qualify for a bonus".* Respondent_9 argues, *"Extra miles…I might as well…because then say here I have done this and it was extra mile. You are told no, that was part of your job. Then you say, oh okay, then you just leave it. Even…if they see that you have done it, you have gone for an extra mile to do certain things. You just do what you are contracted for and that's it."* Similarly, Respondent_10 argues, "*Ever since I joined the department I've never received a performance bonus. We are always told…my boss tells me that…eer…for you to get a four you must be over this. So I have made peace that I won't get it.*" On the other hand, Respondent_7 argues that managers reduce scores without the employee's knowledge: "*They can tell now the score is reduced, the scores changed.*" Respondent_2 argues, "*People got bonuses, and those that are working they don't get a bonus here at GDARD."* Similarly, Respondent_3 (PMDS custodian) suggests, "*It should be, really the people who deserve the bonus should must get the bonus, not the others.*" The research results show that much has to be corrected regarding the awarding of performance bonuses. There is favouritism as far as the issuing of bonuses is concerned.

Recognising performance is important because it influences the behaviour of the employee. Van der Vyver and Bussin (2013) assert that recognition does not always have to attach a financial element. Other methods of acknowledgment include

certificates of excellent performance, new innovation awards, articles in the department's internal newsletter, and verbal recognition. The research results suggest that managers do not give employees enough recognition, and this is demoralising the employees. For instance, Respondent_9 argues, "*There is no recognition, and it kills your morale if you don't get* it." Similarly, Respondent_8 argues, "*We are not recognised for whatever good work you are doing. They only thing that would happen is to be shouted at. Whenever you do a small mistake, not even a mistake, you know. Something which maybe even the bosses themselves they were supposed to close those gaps.*" Additionally, Respondent_4 argues, "*Out of the four quarters in a year, I was away for just one quarter. He says all the work that I did in all the three quarters is irrelevant. It was frustrating, it was demoralising, and it was like I am not being recognised.*" Another participant argued that the department does not recognise employees through promotion. Respondent_6 argues, "*However there is not promotion like what the….the…the PMDS said on the remarks to say if this person qualifies for a promotion, even if my supervisor ticks to say yes this person qualifies promotion. You don't get the promotion, unless if you have to apply and go through the process.*" To counter this argument, Respondent_5 (PMDS custodian) suggests, "*I think in most if not all…eer…departments, with government departments you have to apply before you get a promotion, you don't just get promoted, you apply for a promotion.*" Similarly, Respondent_12 (PMDS custodian) argues, "*There is a section in there that ask if the person is ready for a promotion, now the province took a decision long ago…to… to not utilise that section because it creates unnecessary expectation for promotion. Remember the way that government is structured, at specific levels it says in the regulations and so on, this post must be advertised widely, alright. So now if I am creating expectations for promotion for you but I got eer…eer to advertise it the national media you see it causes conflict as well.*" The research results show that participants are demoralised by the fact that they are not recognised for their work performance. Furthermore, HRD managers reject promotion as a method for recognising employees who perform excellently.

Poor performance is a sub-theme that appeared in the research results. Academic literature emphasises that poor performance should be managed through employee counselling, training and development, coaching and mentoring, and setting clear work-performance standards (Van der Vyver & Bussin, 2013; Van der Westhuizen et al., 2011; Marrelli, 2011; Asad & Mahfod, 2015; Obisi, 2011). The results in this research show that employees are performing to expectation. For instance, Respondent_6 maintains, "*Fortunately I have never experience that to say maybe I didn't perform.*" Similarly, Respondent_7

maintains, "*I have never been regarded as a poor performer.*" Respondent_4 maintains, "*I have never been recognised as a poor performer.*" Respondent_1 was the only participant who agreed to being regarded as a poor performer: "*I remember while I was on my maternity leave, my performance was not good [because] I was away. But then when I come back, when we do…when we do my PMDS when I was assessed, yes, my boss did mentioned that because I was not available for third quarter my performance will just be at normal level.*" Respondent_8 argues, "*Because mind you that non-performance or poor performance is in two folds. One there is non-performance with blame, whereby if we are saying with blame it means that on those indicative or developmental areas is where you have indicted certain things, it could even be there working tools themselves to elaborate on that. It could even be the working tools, like right now the computer that I have…the laptop maybe is the fifth one. I have been having this problem since 2014, till now I have not been having a properly working or effective working computer.*" Respondent_8 also argues, "*Then there is the non-performance without blame, that one is whereby all the things that you need for you to perform they have been done by your bosses or by the department, you know, or by the employer. But you still did not perform, which the warrants for you to be disciplined or taken to any other corrective measures which may include rehabilitation or whatever.*" Respondent_11 also argues that not having the necessary tools can derail performance: "*But now because of that problem eer…because I could not perform because of the software, is like tools of the trade. And I have asked the…the IT guys and even our Chief Director to support me to get an Apple Mac so that I can get the software.*" Respondents 8 and 11 highlight tools of the trade as an important aspect of performance management because their absence can negatively affect an employee's performance.

4.1.4 Challenges of the implementation of the system

Daft and Marcic (2011) maintain that feedback is an important part of the performance management process. Furthermore, managers are not willing to implement this process because of lack of rejection (Daft & Marcic, 2011). The research results show that employees are not happy with the managers' failure to communicate feedback.

Respondent_12 (PMDS custodian) confirms lack of feedback from managers: "*And the they lodge the grievances and the a lot of the time is a lack of feedback from the quality assurance process to the actual individual.*" Similarly, Respondent_9 argues, "*That's the other thing; they don't really get back to us with feedback.*" Respondent_2 agrees: "*You just given letters to say no you dint qualify for a bonus, you qualify for a notch, and then that's it.*" Similarly, Respondent_4 argues that feedback is not communicated properly: "*It's coming as I don't agree with what*

you are saying change it or say something else or…" Similarly, Respondent_8 argues, "*It's not an engagement, to say when they…let's say they have dropped a score they give an opportunity to…to…to raise your concerns*." Respondent_1 had a different viewpoint, stating, "*Normally the feedback from my supervisor is always positive, [because] she would always say keep up the good work. You are doing very well*."

The lack of feedback from managers could be as a result of poor working relations between managers and employees. The research results show that the relationship between managers and employees is uneven regarding the PMDS. For example, Respondent_4 maintains, "*Well in relation to that I would say…the relationship is…is not necessarily there. Because it is not very good. Because…er my supervisor is the type of person who doesn't really like confrontations. So if we have to sit down and really discuss something like PMDS he avoids it by any means. You know try and procrastinate, or try and leave it until the last minute to come and say I want you to change here and there*." Similarly, Respondent_8 argues, "*But my supervisor I think is like…is like. What do you call this thing? Is just there for the sake of being there, but a person a person who end up being like my supervisor is my supervisor's boss. Who is the Director, who does what he likes when it comes to theses engagement sessions*." Some employees, however, do acknowledge that their relationship with their supervisor is good. For example, Respondent_7 maintains, "*The relationship is good, we don't have anything that is not good between us*."

The research results also show that managers do not resort to punishment to manage poor performance. Managers do not punish the employees. For example, Respondent_6 maintains, "*I never received anything related to punishment*." Similarly, Respondent_9 maintains, "*No, I would be lying*." On the contrary, Respondent_10 argues, "*Eem…I would say I want acted in a position and it was not given to me, for me that was a punishment. Because I was not invited to the interview to go and compete with other candidates. So for me that was a punishment*."

The research results also show that participants are of the view that there is a problem regarding implementation of the system. Respondent_4 argues that the purpose of the PMDS is defeated because managers do things just for compliance: "It *defeats the whole purpose of PMDS. But it's just done like that to also try and comply with the fact that the Department says at this particular date PMDS must be submitted. So it's done rushing… rushing*

trying to make sure that we meet that deadline." Similarly, Respondent _8 argues, "*But the way is being implemented it ends up being on the negative not on the positive.*" Similarly, Respondent_10 maintains, "*The way we are doing it is not applicable with the kind of job that we do. People are expected to submit eer…evidence of what they were doing. People are expected to write motivations. I believe that if the system is crystal clear we don't need all those.*" Respondent_11 argues, "*I think managers when they are employed they must be given a good induction to say PMDS is a serious process it must not be abused like to settle scores and to say now I have a way of fixing this employee.*"

4.1.5 The PMDS as a tool

The research results show that the majority of participants view the PMDS as a tool to improve performance rather than to punish employees. For example, Respondent_1 maintains, "*For me I think it's a tool to encourage us to work more. [Because] they do provide us with an incentive and that make us to work harder.*" Similarly, Respondent_4 suggests, "*Eem…it's a tool designed to improve a performance, hence there is an attachment of a reward to it neh. But with the way at times is being handled or done…seemingly we are all doing to try in get the reward. We are more interested in the reward than actually doing what expected.*" Respondent_10 concurs, "*It must be able to address, but for me it doesn't address it's only for people getting money that's it. It doesn't go deeper to address the problem. And the way it has been done also it has got an effect, people don't take it seriously.*" Others agree that it is indeed a tool to improve performance, but state that managers are not using it wisely. For example, Respondent_11 argues, "*No its eer… clearly a tool to improve performance, but I know some people…some managers might want to use it as tool to… settle scores for those who are deserving.*" Similarly, Respondent_8 argues, "the *way it's implemented you may perceive it here as a tool to punish or to be against.*" Similarly, Respondent_2 argues, "*No it's a tool to punish employee, because if you went an extra mile why are you not getting a bonus*?" Respondent_6 differs, however, has a different viewpoint: "*It's just a PMDS that you do the same things every year, each assessment. Yah, so to me I don't see it as something that can improve me. It is just a standard document that has been used to assess, but rather than that nothing much I can talk about it.*" The results show that the PMDS is tool to improve performance, but managers should not abuse it.

4.1.6 Comparing the results to those of similar studies and evaluations

This section compares the empirical research results with similar studies and evaluations reviewed in Section 2.3. This research has identified the research approaches, designs, procedures and methods that were employed by the past studies and evaluations (Section 2.3). Here, this research compares the research results presented in Section 4.1.1 with those of past studies and evaluations on the implementation of the performance management system.

The research results are similar to those of the studies by Hendricks and Matsiliza (2015), Mughal et al. (2014) and Mosoge and Pilane (2014), which found that participants were knowledgeable about the system. The results, however, are different from the studies by Seotlela and Miruka (2014) and Munzhedzi and Phago (2014), which found that managers have a better understanding of the system than those on the lower levels, who displayed little or no understanding. Moreover, the research results are different from the study by Allen-lle et al. (2007), which found a lack of understanding of the system on the part of both top management and employees on lower levels.

Regarding the aspect of feedback from managers to employees, the research results are similar to the studies by Sebashe and Mtapuri (2011) and Mello (2015), which found that managers are reluctant to communicate feedback to employees on a regular basis. However, the results differ from those of the studies by Mughal et al. (2014) and Biron et al. (2011), which found that managers are frequently trained to communicate feedback to employees. The research results also differ from the study by Du-Plessis (2015), which found that participants had no knowledge about when should they receive feedback from the managers.

With regards to the aspect of training on the implementation of the system, the research results are similar to the studies by Seotlela and Miruka (2014), Du-Plessis (2015), Sebashe and Mtapuri (2011) and Cheng et al. (2006), which found that insufficient training opportunities are available. The results, however, differ from the study by Biron et al. (2011), which found that managers are trained on how to implement the system. Moreover, the research results show that employees are concerned with the training of senior management on the system (since they play a major role in the

moderation committee). The research results are similar to the study by Mello (2015), which found that the moderation committee comprises people who are not knowledgeable about the employees' work.

Specifically, the research results show that some managers are not using the system correctly in the rewarding of performance bonuses. The results are similar to the studies by Sebashe and Mtapuri (2011), Munzhedzi and Phago (2014), Mughal et al. (2014) and Cameron (2015), which found that people who deserve to receive the performance bonuses do not get them and that managers display favouritism when rating employees.

The purpose of the performance management system is to improve both organisational and individual performance. Generally, the research results are similar to the study by Mughal et al. (2014), which found that the system is accepted by both employees and managers as an effective tool for improving performance. A minority of the research participants, however, believed that managers were using the system to punish employees. This finding is similar to that of the study by Hendricks and Matsiliza (2015), which found that certain managers want to use the system as a tool to punish or 'deal with' with employees.

4.2 Role of human resource development in the implementation of the performance management and development system in the department

A semi-structured interview schedule was developed to respond to the second research question through the collection of the empirical information. The questions included in the semi-structured interview schedule interlink with the attributes presented in Section 2.5. The questions were addressed to the HRD managers as the custodians of the system. Section 4.2.1 presents the results as per the responses from the participants. In Section 4.2.2, this research compares the empirical research results with results from similar studies and evaluations that were reviewed in Chapter 2.

4.2.1 Presentation of the results

The second main question for this research is: What is the role of human resource development in the implementation of the performance management and development system in the department? Sections 4.2.1.1 and 4.2.1.2 present the themes that were developed from the second research question.

4.2.1.1 Responsibility of Human Resource Development

The research results show that one of the key responsibilities of HRD is to create awareness of the PMDS among the employees of the GDARD. Respondents 3, 4 and 12 mention that PMDS training takes place during the induction of new employees. Respondent_3 explains, "*So what is happening…eer…at induction…all employees are inducted. I think PMDS is one-day training during the induction. So there people get familiarised with PMDS. They are told during induction that they need to enter into performance agreement, they need to enter to the work plan and they need to do their job description. Okay, normally the job description would be there. Which is more generic your work plan focusing on a specific financial year. So they need to sign, enter into those things and sign them.*" Similarly, Respondent_5 maintains that while PMDS training takes place during induction, employees who need training can still request it: "*I remember there was a unit who were struggling with the contracting. So if we have such challenges we would go back and do a presentation again… because remember some people were trained long time ago.*"

According to Mone and London (2010), performance contracting is the process in which the manager and employee agree on how the employee will do his/her work. The research results show that the HRD division is responsible for creating awareness of the proper contracting process. Respondent_3 mentions, "*The entire process starts at the beginning of the financial year in April, when all people I made to do performance contracting for a specific financial year.*" Similarly, Respondent_12 asserts, "*So what will happen is the official will interact with direct the manager. And pursue the contracting process obviously looking at the…eem…departmentally what needs to be achieved. Eem…and this is where the challenge comes in. If you look at the…the contracts, there is no direct link between this official and his direct manager. And we are trying to address that as well because there is no flow from the top down. To say that okay*

the HOD is contracting this then DDG is supposed to have this in there and the Chief and Directors and whoever else below that as well. So that there is an alignment of what should be in the contracts." Furthermore, Respondent_12 suggests, "*At that stage as well there should be a discussion around if we are going to achieve this, what sort of support do I need. Is it a development area; is it a coaching process; is it a formal programme that I need undertake to get specific skills etcetera…etcetera.*" Additionally, Respondent_5 mentions that there are those who are struggling with the contracting process: "*So if we have such challenges we would go back and do a presentation again…because remember some people were trained long time ago. So we would go back and do a presentation again…just a refresher to say this is how you contract...and if you go above what you have contracted on it is a bonus…what is your target…so we had to really outline how to get from a three to a four.*" Once all the performance contracts are completed, they are submitted to the HRD unit. Respondent_12 mentions, "*Our responsibility once is submitted to the HRD team is to also quality assurance. For example, you would look at the weighting is should not exceed 100%; you look at the development sections; you look at signatures has all relevant people sign off.*" Moreover, Respondent_3 maintains that "*what we do is we do a quality check on the document itself to see whether anything is missing, to see whether is…all information has been captured.*"

The White Paper on Human Resource Management in the Public Service of 1997 stipulates that management should recognise and reward good performance. The good performance of employees is incentivised through pay progression and performance bonuses. With regards to pay progression, Respondent_5 indicates, "*So you must complete two performance cycles then…you qualify for a pay progression, not a performance bonus.*" The research results show that there is criteria to determine who qualifies for a performance bonus. For example, Respondent_5 argues that "*a performance bonus you can get if you have been on the same salary level for a period of 12 months…"* Similarly, Respondent_3 argues that "*certain levels qualify for certain percentage of performance bonus and stuff. It's not the same percentage across all levels. The higher the level, the smaller the percentage.*" In preparation to issue bonuses to the performing employees, Respondent_3 asserts, "*We say you do an assessment for the entire financial year, but bearing in mind the performance you have already evaluated in quarter one two and three. So then it comes to us, we always ask directorates to submit a coordinated…consolidated list. So when it comes I don't even have to look at the forms, though we do the quality check. I look at the names and then I look at the ratings here. So then what we do before we actually start the process of, you know, preparing payments we do a quality assurance session.*" In addition, Respondent_12 mentions that "*for the final assessment ,which we are also trying to do for each quarter, the Chief*

Director calls a formal meeting, a quality assurance meeting where they ask the Directors and the DDs to come with everything, evidence etcetera. And then it gets presented then by the DDs and the Directors to the Chief Director. In the presence of independent Chief Director plus organised labour plus HR, for fairness, alright." During the quality assurance process, the scores are not reduced but reviewed. Respondent_12 explains, "*The Chief Director can say no, I am satisfied with everything that presented here, let's go ahead with it to HR, or he can say maybe one or two people I am not comfortable with evidence you are providing, please go back and see because the evidence is not sufficient.*" This is where proper feedback from the manager to the employee is critical. Respondent_5 argues that "*the manager is supposed to go back to the employee to obviously give feedback.*" When the whole process is completed, all information is captured in PERSAL. Respondent_3 explains, "*There's certain percentages, certain levels qualify for certain percentage of performance bonus and stuff. It's not the same percentage across all levels. The higher the level the smaller the percentage. Okay that takes a lot of time hey, but eventually we submit to the MEC, who is the approving authority. After it comes back we submit that information to e-Government to process payment on PERSAL.*"

The purpose of the PMDS is to measure the performance and develop the skills of employees. Regarding the issue of skills development, Respondent_5 asserts, "*And also again we have training. We have different types of trainings within the HRD unit where you can send in your name and say you [want to] go for…for example…maybe an Excel training or PFMA training, so you understand the acts of financial management.*" This training emanates from the PMDS documents in which employees indicate at the beginning of the financial year the type of training they want to attend. The training needs are also identified when the employee's performance is poor.

The White Paper on Human Resource Management in the Public Service of 1997 requires management to address poor performance. Additionally, academic literature emphasises that managers should address poor performance through counselling, training and development, employee coaching and mentoring, and clear performance targets (Van der Vyver & Bussin, 2013; Van der Westhuizen et al., 2011; Marrelli, 2011; Asad & Mahfod, 2015; Obisi, 2011). The research results show that addressing poor performance is not the sole responsibility of the HRD managers. The line function manager and employee should draw up a personal development plan (PDP). Respondent_3 argues that "*a personal development plan is also indicating: this is the shortcoming*

of the individual, there was a two rating let's say on Project Management. This person didn't meet target and so on. One of the things to correct that performance is to send this person on the Project Management Course." Poor performance is addressed through the identification of the PDP, which should not be confused with indicative training.

4.2.1.2 Challenges of the system

The research results show that one of the challenges of the system is the lodging of grievances by employees. Grievances mainly relate to ratings. For example, one complaint is that managers change the rating without the knowledge of the employee. Respondent_3 argues, "*Now what some of the managers are doing, they just change the ratings without having a discussion. If a manager doesn't come and have a discussion with me it's wrong.*" Similarly, Respondent_12 argues that "*where the managers move…the…the rating of the direct report without consulting with the official, which is not correct.*" The reason this happens is that managers are reluctant to communicate feedback to the employee. Respondent_12 asserts that "*they lodge the grievances and a lot of the time is a lack of feedback from the quality assurance process to the actual individual.*" Additionally, some managers communicate the wrong feedback to the employee. Respondent_5 argues that "*most managers don't say the panel was not convinced they would be like no HRD asked that you reduced the score…you know…as HRD we are the scribers we don't have the powers to say reduce your score.*"

Another challenge regarding the performance management process is that people implement the contracting process incorrectly. For example, Respondent_12 argues that "*the other major challenge is the contracting process where the individual and managers don't do a thorough contracting process and it end up bringing conflict at the end.*" The manager should explain clearly what is expected from the employee. For example, Respondent_12 argues, "*And if they would sit and do a thorough contracting process, for an example: if I say you should do this I should say okay this is what I need you to do. This is the standard which I need you to. This is the evidence that I need you to provide, you need to show that you have done it the way it's supposed to be done. If you do all of that I will give you a three for a satisfactory performance. Now beyond this let's have a conversation of what we consider to be a four rating at a bonus level.*" Moreover, employees should use clear language in their performance contracts. For example, Respondent_5 suggests that "*if the contracting from the onset is not straight, if you say you will do…or you use words like various or several events you are not being specific, but if you contracting and you as in this quarter I'm contracted to do three events should I do six then I'm…I'm*

above." Similarly, Respodent_3 argues that "*challenges definitely are that people do not contract correctly. They don't know what constitutes a three, what constitutes a four or a five for that matter*." In some instances, managers would give people scores they do not deserve, just to avoid conflict. Respondent_3 argues, "*So come year end you find supervisor that don't want to be bad people. And then allocate people fours because they don't want any conflict, the sense of applying the criteria*."

The research results show that non-compliance with deadlines is another challenge concerning the implementation of the PMDS. Managers and employees in the department do not submit their PMDS documents on time. Respondent_3 argues that "*because people see no even if I don't comply nothing is [going to] happen to me*." To address the issue of non-compliance in the department, Repondent_3 asserts, "*Take action against those people who do not submit, instead of me reminding them to submit*." In addition, a new regulation regarding the submission of performance contracts came into effect two years ago. Respondent_12 argues that "*if you don't submit your contract by a certain period you don't qualify for a notch progression. So there is an automatic disqualification*."

The research results also show that managers apply favouritism when awarding bonuses. The performance bonuses go to those who are the managers' favourites. For example, Respondent_5 argues, "*Like using things like favouritism, because you find two employees doing the very same thing and you find that one does not get a performance bonus while the other does*." Similarly, Respondent_3 argues, "*Now the manager knows when looking at the registers they can see that this person didn't meet most of the deadline, but still the manager is providing…is giving a four*."

4.2.1 Comparison of the research results to those of similar studies and evaluations

This section sought to compare the empirical results with those of similar studies reviewed in Section 2.3 of Chapter 2. This study identified the research approaches, designs, procedures and methods employed by the past studies, and explored their results, findings and conclusions. This research identified a knowledge gap. In this section, the research results presented in Section 4.2.1 are compared with those from past studies and evaluations.

Regarding the payment of bonuses, the research results are similar to those of the study by Hendricks and Matsiliza (2015), which found that a certain percentage of performance bonuses are paid according to the employee's salary scale, and employees were satisfied with bonuses received. The research results, however, differ from those of the study by Munzhedzi and Phago (2014), which found that bonuses motivated the employees to improve their performance, however, they were not satisfied with the bonuses received. The research results also differ from those of the study by Sebashe and Mtapuri (2011), which found that performance bonuses are given to employees who are not deserving.

Generally, the research results show that contracting is not done correctly at the GDARD. In some instances, people do not know what constitutes a three, four or five. Furthermore, people end up not doing what is in their work plans and contracts. The research results are similar to those in the study by Cameron (2015), which found that there is no link between performance agreements and work plans.

The research results show that managing poor performance is not the sole responsibility of the HRD managers, and that managers and employees should develop a PDP to address poor performance. The research results are similar to the findings of the study by Hendricks and Matsiliza (2015), where poor-performing employees are included in PDPs, that include training and mentoring. The results, however, differ with those of the study by Munzhedzi and Phago (2014), which found that there are no systems in place for the correct management of poor performance in the department.

The research results show that employees are not meeting the deadlines for the submission of contracts and quarterly assessments, which is similar to the findings of the study by Hendricks and Matsiliza (2015).

The research results show that some managers prefer to avoid conflict and so would rather give their employees a rating of four, even if they did not deserve it. This finding is similar to that of the study by Cameron (2015), from which it emerged that performance ratings are subjective and some managers do not want to have to deal with hatred and dissatisfaction from employees.

The research results show that one of the challenges associated with the system is the lodging of grievances by employees who are not satisfied with their ratings. The research results are similar to those of the study by Mello (2015), which found that employees at levels one to eight tend to lodge grievances because their assessments are presented at the Moderation Committee by managers who have not interacted with them directly.

4.3 Conclusion

This chapter presented the research results in the context of themes derived from the data. It presented the results under the following statement: The employees' perception regarding the implementation of the PMDS in the GDARD (Section 4.1). The study presented the research results according to the following themes: Employees' knowledge and understanding; benefits of the system; challenges of implementation of the system; and the PMDS as a tool. The results show that managers in the GDARD have failed to implement the system correctly. The employees, however, perceive the PMDS to be a tool to help improve performance, although some managers abuse the system. Secondly, this chapter presented the research results under the following statement: The role of the HRD in the implementation of the PMDS in the department. This research presented the results under this statement through the following themes: The responsibility of the HRD; and the challenges of the system. The research results have shown that the HRD managers are doing enough to ensure successful implementation of the system, however, gaps still exist regarding implementation of the system.

5. DISCUSSION OF RESEARCH FINDINGS

This chapter interprets the research findings through the established frameworks outlined in Section 2.6. The research applies the reinforcement and goal-setting theories, and presents the discussion under two statements derived from the main research questions. Firstly, this research interprets the results of the employees' perception regarding the implementation of the PMDS in the GDARD (Section 5.1). Secondly, it interprets the results of the role of HRD in the implementation of the PMDS in the department (Section 5.2). Lastly, this chapter is concluded (Section 5.3).

5.1 The employees' perception regarding the implementation of the performance management and development system in the Gauteng Department of Agriculture and Rural Development

The first research question intends to explore the employees' perception of the implementation of the PMDS in the GDARD. This section presents the discussion under the following themes: Employees' knowledge and understanding; the benefits of the system; challenges of implementation of the system; and the PMDS as a tool.

5.1.1 Employees' knowledge and understanding

According to Du-Plessis (2015), the purpose of the PMDS is to ensure that public-service employees are equipped with the skills, knowledge and competencies to achieve the goals and objectives of the department. The implementation of the PMDS is guided by key legislation, including the Constitution of the Republic of South Africa Act No. 108 of 1996, the Public Service Act No. 103 of 1994 and the Public Service Regulations of 2001. The legislation requires government departments to develop and implement a system that will measure the performance of employees. The PMDS should enhance efficiency and effectiveness in the department (Republic of South Africa, 1994). The PMDS is about managing both the individual and departmental performance, since the departmental performance is realised through that of individuals. The research results show that the employees of the GDARD have knowledge and understanding of the

PMDS; they are aware of the purpose and objectives of the system. This finding differs from those of the study by Muzhedzi and Phago (2014), which discovered that managers and employees in COGHSTA lack knowledge and understanding of the system.

The study participants from the GDARD have knowledge and understanding of the PMDS, but display a lack of interest in reading the policy, which is a matter of concern. A thorough understanding of the PMDS policy is important because it gives employees a guideline on the implementation of the system. Furthermore, participants who are aware of the content of the policy would be able to challenge any discrepancies in the implementation of the system. Most of the study participants had not heard about or read the department's PMDS policy. Respondent_8 indicated, *I don't even think there are many people who are aware of the policy itself. Eer…eer, so I…I don't think there's even awareness on it. I don't even think there are workshops on it*…" The participants suggested a lack of awareness of the existence of the policy.

Based on the responses from participants, this research can conclude that employees do not take the initiative to familiarise themselves with the department's policies. Furthermore, the HRD management is not doing enough to create awareness of the PMDS policy.

Raising awareness of the PMDS policy can be done through training and workshops. The findings show that the participants are willing to workshop the PMDS. The HRD management must take responsibility for ensuring that employees in the department are aware that the policy exists and how to access it. Training and workshops on the PMDS should take place as regularly as possible. Makamu and Mello (2014) suggest that training and induction should be provided to all employees at the beginning of the performance management cycle so that new employees can be integrated and familiar with the PMDS. The research findings show that the induction of new employees takes place on an annual basis, but the process excludes those who have been in the department for a long time and might have forgotten what was taught during induction. Mello (2015) argues that in order for the performance management process to be implemented successfully, managers must be trained at the beginning of the performance cycle at the start of each financial year. Biron et al. (2011) support the findings, arguing that the training of managers and employees is critical as it eliminates

bias in the implementation of the performance management system. The findings show that the custodians of the system do not take PMDS training seriously. The majority of employees who participated in the study joined the department more than seven years ago and have been to training only once or twice. Some participants do not even recall attending PMDS training. For example, Respondent_9 states, "*Shocking I have never been to any PMDS training."* It is amazing that this individual has been working in the department for seven years, but has never been invited to PMDS training. Similarly, Respondent_11 recalls only attending the PMDS training once during the 10 years of working at the GDARD: *"I think I only attended once, but then when the PMDS process started from what I know it was explained to me how it works."* The findings show that no refresher training is provided to refresh those have been in the department for a long time.

The findings show that the study participants believe their senior managers should attend the PMDS training. They are concerned that their senior managers sit on the moderation committee and have the authority to decide whether they qualify for performance bonuses or should give further motivation as to why they deserve the scores. The research findings also show that the employees have little faith in the moderation committee, which asks for further motivation or for scores to be reduced. A previous study by Mello (2015) found that sometimes the managers who sit on the moderation committee do not even have knowledge of what the employees' work entails. Such lack of knowledge can invite bias with regard to the scoring process. On the contrary, a study by Munzhedzi and Phago (2014) found that employees were hopeful that the moderation committee in COGHSTA had the power to overrule assessments that displayed bias by managers. Makumu and Mello (2014) argue in their study that senior managers and supervisors should jointly agree on the manner in which to approach implementation of the performance management system so as to avoid discrimination.

When all managers and employees are well trained and familiar with the PMDS, the goal-setting process should become easy. This process is the point of departure for the performance management system. Goal-setting is a contracting process whereby the manager and employee together reach agreement as to how the employee is going to do work (Mone & London, 2010). The correct manner in which to implement the contracting process is for managers and employees to jointly look at the vision, mission,

objectives and annual performance targets of the department and then determine goals. The GDARD has an annual performance plan and PAOs; these are the targets that will assist in achieving service delivery. Alignment should exist in the implementation of the contracting process. For example, the HOD has certain goals; the DDGs should draw their goals from those of the HOD, the Chief Directors from those of the DDGs, the Directors from the Chief Directors, the Deputy Directors from the Directors, the Assistant Directors from the Deputy Directors, and so forth, right down to the lowest level of the organisation. Although alignment should exist in the contacting process, it does not mean that managers should dictate to subordinates what their goals should be.

The goal-setting theory asserts that managers and employees should engage on how the employee is going to work. The theory also asserts that when employees set their own goals, they are highly likely to be committed to their work. The research findings, however, show that some managers do not use this as an engagement process, but merely dictate to employees what to include in their performance contracts. Managers simply give employees the contracts and expect them to sign without dispute. This process rejects the notion of the goal-setting theory, which proclaims that employees should set their own goals. The research findings are supported by those of a previous study by Muzhedzi and Phago (2014), which determined that the supervisors influence the goal-setting process and expect employees to set goals that are neither realistic nor achievable.

According to Mello (2015), managers should attend training and workshops at the start of each financial year before implementation of the new cycle of performance management. Similarly, Sebola and Manyaka (2012) argue that managers and employees should both attend training in order for the system to be successful. These arguments emphasise the importance of training to ensure successful implementation of the performance management system. The findings from the research indicate that there is not much training on the PMDS at the GDARD. The HRD managers mentioned that training on the PMDS happens during the induction of new employees. One day is allocated to training on the PMDS during which the HRD managers introduce and explain the PMDS to the new employees. Those directorates in need of clarity on issues concerning the PMDS, however, can request the HRD unit to make a presentation at their branch meeting. The HRD managers in the GDARD are not taking into account

the fact that some employees have been in the employ of the department for more than five years and have forgotten what they were taught at induction. Furthermore, employees do not take the initiative to read the PMDS policy; as a result, the HRD should implement compulsory refresher sessions and workshops that accommodate all employees in the department. The senior managers in the department should all be part of the process, and the HRD management should deal with employees and senior managers who do not comply. The refresher training sessions on the PMDS should be included in the HRD management contracts so that they can be measured on this process.

5.1.1.2 Benefits of the system

The White Paper on Human Resource Management in the Public Service of 1997 stipulates that management in government institutions should establish training and development interventions to improve employee performance. Furthermore, Penceliah (2012) argues that the purpose of performance management is to equip employees with with necessary skills, knowledge and competencies to achieve the objectives of a particular organisation. Skills development is an important aspect that contributes to the implementation of the PMDS. The findings in this research show that there is insufficient support for employees in terms of upskilling. The research findings are similar to those of the study by Sebashe and Mtapuri (2011), which found that there is a lack of training opportunities to equip employees with essential skills and competencies to do their work effectively. The findings show that managers in the department are not doing enough to support employees in their career development. Most participants argue that managers do not approve applications to attend courses. One participant even suggested that the reason behind this could be that managers believe that certain training would make employees more employable and they therefore retain employees by denying them opportunities for training. At the beginning of the performance management cycle, employees are encouraged to indicate what type of training or courses they would like to attend. However, they do not get to attend the identified training. This issue defeats the requirements of the White Paper on Human Resource Management in the Public Service of 1997. Taking into account that employees have to be capacitated and developed so that their performance can improve, this process discards the reinforcement theory. The reinforcement theory proclaims that employees have to be recognised, be it through rewards or training and mentoring, so that they can

improve on their performance or repeat good performance. The HRD should try to address this problem by ensuring that employees are granted opportunities to attend training or courses. Furthermore, senior management should play an active role in addressing this problem, as legislation clearly stipulates that employees should be developed so that they can contribute to the success of the PMDS.

Another benefit of the performance management system is to reward excellent performance. Burnham and Horton (2013) argue that rewarding the performance of employees serves as a motivating factor to put more effort into their work. Rewarding performance brings about a culture of performance in the organisation because everyone will want to perform and be recognised. Furthermore, it encourages competition between employees because they will want to perform better than their colleagues and receive a reward (Burnham & Horton, 2013). The research findings show that participants are content with being rewarded for excellent performance. For example, the following response stood out from the rest: *"If you are doing well you have to be rewarded, and then when you are rewarded you do not become disinterested in what you are doing. You actually maintain that level or even better it.*" The research findings resonate with the reinforcement theory, which proclaims that recognising excellent performance encourages employees to repeat the same behaviour. The research findings also correlate with those of the study by Munzhedzi and Phago (2014), which found that performance rewards motivate employees to improve performance.

The research findings underscore the goal-setting theory, which encourages the rewarding of performance so that it can improve. The research findings show a culture of employees wanting to score a rating of four or above. Study participants indicted that they were driven by the idea of getting a four or above so that they can be rewarded. The research findings, however, show that managers are biased when it comes to the scoring of employee performance. For example, a participant argues, *"They even…..they even make a sarcasm , according to me, to say if you get a four it means you are walking on water.*" The findings show that some managers behave like they own the system, and resort to favouritism and bias when rating employees. The research findings resonate with those of the studies by Sebashe and Mtapuri (2011), Munzhedzi and Phago (2014), Mughal et al (2014), Cameron (2015), which found that managers use favouritism to score employees, and undeserving people are rewarded. The research

findings reject the notion of the reinforcement theory, which asserts that when employees do not receive the recognition they deserve, they will become demoralised and their performance will drop. Furthermore, the research findings show that the HRD managers in the department are aware that favouritism is exercised by some managers. They are, however, not introducing any intervention measures to address the issue. More needs to be done regarding the implementation of the PMDS in the department. In addition, the HRD management should re-establish their role as the custodians of the system.

A financial element does not always need to be attached to the rewarding of performance. Van der Vyver and Bussin (2013) assert that managers must recognise employees through tools such as certificates of excellence, new innovation awards, the publication of articles in internal newsletters, and verbal recognition. The research findings show that there is no element of non-financial recognition in the GDARD. This is similar to the findings of previous research by Munzhedzi and Phago (2014), which discovered that the COGHSTA was not making use of non-financial recognition, such as leadership recognising employees in the presence of their colleagues, which can inspire a culture of excellent performance. The absence of recognition invites the presence of low staff morale. The research findings hinder the notion of the reinforcement theory, which suggests that the use of non-financial tools such as positive feedback, attention and social recognition can encourage good performance.

The reinforcement theory also proclaims that managers should use promotion as another pay increase, which motives improved performance. The research findings show that promotion is not used as a form of recognition in the department. One study participant argued during the interviews that there is a section where promotion is mentioned in the performance contract, but the department does not practise this. The responses from the HRD (as the custodians of the system) indicated that this section is not utilised. The HRD manager, however, indicated that the public service is encouraging competition among employees, who should go through the interview process so that they can qualify to be promoted to another position. The GDARD and the public service as whole needs a wakeup call. The public service should adopt the employee-promotion-style of the private sector, where employees are upgraded to another level because of excellent performance. The process of applying for a post and

going through the interview process just like everyone else is not promotion. This is one the reasons why public servants do not grow and hold one position for more than 10 years. The public servants have lost hope, which translates into a decrease in performance.

Another benefit of the performance management system is the identification and management of poor performance. Academic literature emphasises that poor performance should be managed through employee counselling, training and development, coaching and mentoring, and the setting of clear work performance standards (Van der Vyver & Bussin, 2013; Van der Westhuizen et al., 2011; Marrelli, 2011; Asad & Mahfod, 2015; Obisi, 2011). The findings in this research show that poor performance is rare at the department. During the interviews, the study participants indicated that they were never regarded as poor performers. The findings show that the employees are performing to the expectations. However, the findings are too good to be true. This raises a question: Is there a department that operates only with good performers?

Literature proposes that setting clear work performance standards is another means by which to manage poor performance (Van der Vyver & Bussin, 2013; Van der Westhuizen et al., 2011; Marrelli, 2011; Asad & Mahfod, 2015; Obisi, 2011). The goal-setting theory, however, rejects the idea of setting clear and simple goals. The theory proposes that employees who contract on simple goals will display a drop in individual performance, which will ultimately reduce organisational performance. The research findings reject the notion of the goal-setting theory because this is not what is happening at the GDARD. In fact, employees in the public service set simple goals for themselves so that they can perform above what they contracted for and receive the rewards. Non-performance is not the result of setting simple goals; it can be facilitated by lack of working tools such as computers. For example, one of the study participants argued that he/she could not perform a certain task because it required a certain program that was not available in the department. The management, however, realised the need for that program and made a request for procurement of the required tool. In order to counter underperformance due to a lack of tools of the trade, senior managers should ensure that all employees have the necessary equipment at their disposal to perform their duties effectively.

5.1.1.3 Challenges of the implementation of the system

The research findings show that managers in the GDARD are reluctant to communicate feedback to their employees Managers fail to realise the impact of the lack of feedback. Some participants in the research mentioned that managers do not really get back to them with feedback and it is demoralising. Other participants argued that the feedback is communicated in the form of a command; it is not an engagement type of communication where both parties can raise their concerns. If the employee is not happy with the way feedback is communicated, their performance will ultimately be affected. The research findings resonate with previous studies by Sebashe and Mtapuri (2011) and Mello (2015), which found that managers are reluctant to communicate feedback to employees. On the contrary, a study by Du-Plessis (2015) found that participants had no knowledge as to when they should receive feedback from managers. The research findings oppose the reinforcement and goal-setting theories, which proclaim that positive feedback strengthens good performance. The manager's lack of feedback demoralises the employees. When morale is law, the performance of employees will decrease. Although the majority of the participants were not happy with the fact that they did not receive feedback, a small group indicated that they were receiving feedback from supervisors and it was always positive. Based on the research findings, it is clear that managers (both middle and senior) are lacking when it comes to inspiring a culture of performance in the department. All managers should attend training to improve their communication skills, and the HRD management should ensure that all managers receive training on how to correctly implement the PMDS. The training should take place on a regular basis throughout the year.

The reinforcement theory proclaims that a conducive and well-designed work environment motivates employees. The research findings show that the working environment in the GDARD is toxic because of the relations between managers and employees regarding the PMDS. These findings are similar to those of the study by Hendricks and Matsiliza (2015), which found that there was an unhealthy relationship between managers and employees in the department under study. The majority of the participants in this research indicated that they do not have a good relationship with their supervisors regarding the PMDS. Some participants mentioned that they think

twice or dread coming to work because the working environment is not conducive. They are therefore unable to perform in such a toxic environment. The participants are aware that low performance contributes to low production. This finding differs from that of the study by Munzhedzi and Phago (2014), which found that employees in the department under study were aware that their high performance has a significant contribution to productivity. The HRD has to intervene to address this challenge in the department. Perhaps team-building sessions should be implemented across all sections of the department. The HRD management should allow employees to offer suggestions for team-building.

The research findings show that managers are not implementing the system correctly at the GDARD. This goes back to the issue of training proposed by academic literature and studies on the implementation of the performance management system. The fact that some managers have been working at the GDARD for more than 10 years and have attended the PMDS training only once or twice shows that there is a dire need for compulsory training on the system. Previous studies by Hendricks and Matsiliza (2015), Munzhedzi and Phago (2014), Makumu and Mello (2014), and Sebashe and Mtapuri (2011) also found that the system is not implemented effectively; some managers are misusing the system to punish their employees; while others award bonuses to employees who are not deserving. The research findings show that managers do not comply with the system and the HRD management is not doing anything to address the issue. In actual fact, one of the HRD managers indicated that the challenge with the system is that managers do not comply and know that nothing will be done. When it comes to the quarterly and final assessments, some managers simply follow the process for compliance. In some areas of work, employees are expected to submit evidence that is impossible to produce. Furthermore, employees are told that getting a score of a four or five means that you need to have walked on water. Such remarks make a mockery of and demoralise employees. One participant argued that there is lot of absenteeism during the assessment period because employees are not content with implementation of the scoring process. The HRD should implement measures that will ensure compliance regarding the implementation of the PMDS.

5.1.1.4 The PMDS as a tool

The purpose of the PMDS is to equip employees with the necessary skills and competencies so that they can achieve the goals of the department (Penceliah, 2012). In addition, the PMDS serves to develop the individual and organisational performance. The findings in this research show that the majority of employees in the GDARD view the PMDS a tool to improve performance. Some participants argue that the system is a tool to encourage them to work even harder because they are recognised through financial reward. The research findings resonate with the reinforcement theory, which proclaims that recognition encourages employees to increase performance. Employees view the system as a tool to improve performance because it comes with reward. The research findings also acknowledge the goal-setting theory, which rewards improved performance. However, Schiavo-Campo and McFerson (2008) argue that in many countries the public servants use the performance management system as source of income or to supplement their salary. This results in many organisations resorting to non-monetary rewards such as certificates (Schiavo-Campo & McFerson, 2008). Regardless of whether employees use the system a source of income, the reality is that performance improves and what is important in the public service is performing to a high standard in the delivery of services.

Employees in the department acknowledge that the PMDS improves performance; however, they argue that managers abuse the system. Some managers use the PMDS to punish employees or do not recognise those who have exceeded the deliverables to which they have been contracted. Moreover, managers do not represent their employees in the moderation committee. Additionally, managers use the system to settle whatever disagreements they may have with employees. The employees argue that it is demoralising if their managers do not recognise their efforts. This aspect rejects the reinforcement theory of dealing with unwanted behaviour through punishment. If you punish employees, they became resentful and this may ultimately lower their performance.

5.2 The role of human resource development in the implementation of the performance management and development system in the department

The second research question intends to explore the role of the HRD managers in the implementation of the PMDS in the department. This section presents the discussion under the following themes: The responsibility of the HRD (Section 5.2.1); and the challenges of the system (Section 5.2.2).

5.2.1 The responsibility of Human Resource Development

The research findings show that the HRD plays a critical role in ensuring successful implementation of the PMDS. It is the responsibility of the HRD to ensure that all employees in the department are knowledgeable about the PMDS. The research findings show that most participants have a knowledge and understanding of the system. This finding resonates with previous research by Hendricks and Matsiliza (2015), Mughal et al. (2014), and Mosoge and Pilane (2014), which found that all the participants are knowledgeable about the system. The research results, however, show that participants in the department are not aware of the policy on the PMDS because the HRD in the department failed to impart this knowledge. The participants argue that lack of training on the PMDS is a contributing factor to the poor knowledge of the PMDS policy.

Literature on the implementation of performance management systems emphasise the importance of training to raise the awareness of managers and employees of the system (Pulakos & O'Leary, 2011; Arakal & Mampilly, 2016). The research findings show that the department's HRD management is not hosting sufficient training on the PMDS. The research results are similar to findings in the previous research by Sebashe and Mtapuri (2011), which show that officials are not trained on the implementation of the system. Some study participants in the GDARD do not recall attending training on the PMDS. According to the HRD manager who participated in the study, however, training on the PMDS takes place during induction of new employees over a period of one day. During induction employees are taught all aspects of the PMDS, what to do and what not to do. Although some employees joined the department a long time ago,

they can still request refresher sessions on the PMDS. The HRD managers are invited to Directorate meetings to assist with certain aspects of the PMDS. None of the study participants interviewed, however, mentioned ever inviting the HRD managers to assist them with regard to the PMDS. This means there is a lack of knowledge of the refresher sessions that the HRD can implement as per request of Chief Directorates. The HRD has to go back to the drawing board and correct this. The HRD should host workshops on the PMDS two to three times a year to accommodate those who have forgotten about certain aspects of the system. The attendance of these workshops should be compulsory. The Chief Director in Human Resource Management should address those directorates that fail to comply.

The research findings also show that another duty of the HRD is to ensure that the contracting process is done correctly. Mone and London (2010) suggest that during performance contracting, the manager must sit down with the employee and agree on how the employee is going to work. The manager should not impose goals on the employees (Mone & London, 2010). The employees should set their own goals because it brings a sense of commitment. One HRD manager indicated that communication between the manager and the employees in the contracting process should be about the goals of the employees and the support they will receive to achieve to goals; thereafter the contract should be signed. The findings resonate with the goal-setting theory, which proposes that managers and employees should discuss the employees' goals, and the goals should be known.

The research findings show that the HRD managers are also responsible for the issuing of performance bonuses. The White Paper on Human Resource Management in the Public Service of 1997 stipulates that management should recognise and reward good performance. The goal-setting theory suggests that rewarding employees improves their performance. Before performance bonuses can be paid, however, the HRD must perform a quality check to ensure that all information contained in the performance documents is correct. Moreover, a moderation committee meeting, also known as the quality assurance session, takes place. The session comprises the Chief Director, independent Chief Director (external), the manager of the employee (Deputy Director or Director), the HRD managers (Secretariat duties) and labour unions (to ensure the process is fair). When the process is completed and all parties are content with the

results, the information is submitted to the MEC, who is the approving authority. Once approved by the MEC, the HRD submits the information to e-Government to process payment on PERSAL. The department uses pay progression as another means by which to recognise employees. These research findings are similar to those of the study by Hendricks and Matsiliza (2015), which found that employees are recognised through performance bonus and salary progression. The research results concur with the reinforcement theory, which proclaims that employees can be recognised through the awarding of pay increases.

The White Paper on Human Resource Management in the Public Service of 1997 requires management to address poor performance. Additionally, academic literature emphasises that mangers should address poor performance through counselling, training and development, employee coaching and mentoring, and clear performance targets (Van der Vyver & Bussin, 2013; Van der Westhuizen et al., 2011; Marrelli, 2011; Asad & Mahfod, 2015; Obisi, 2011). The research findings show that the identification and management of underperformance is not only the responsibility of the HRD. According to the HRD, managers and employees should establish a personal development plan (PDP) to address underperformance (through counselling, mentoring and coaching). The findings resonate with the study by Hendricks and Matsiliza (2015), which found that poor performing employees are integrated through the PDP. However, the HRD managers (participants) were too vague when explaining the issue of poor performance, and did not give an in-depth explanation as to what happens to the employees after they attend training and counselling. Based on this, this research concluded that the HRD is not managing poor performance properly. The findings are similar to the study by Munzhedzi and Phago (2014), which found that no proper mechanisms are in place to address the issue of poor performance in the department under study. However, the HRD managers should monitor and receive constant feedback from the supervisor on the progress of the employee. It is a fruitless exercise to take a non-performing employee to mentoring and training and never monitor their progress.

5.2.2 Challenges of the system

The research findings show that one of the challenges that the HRD faces is the issue of grievances. Some managers avoid communicating feedback to their employees and so when employees receive letters from the HRD to say they do not qualify for a bonus but will get a notch progression, they are surprised. This infuriates many employees, who then lodge grievances with the HRD, only to find that their managers failed to communicate with and kept information from them. The research findings override the goal-setting theory, as it proclaims that managers should communicate feedback to their employees so that they can increase their performance.

The research findings also show that some managers would communicate incorrect information to the employees. Some managers would tell employees that the HRD said they must reduce their scores, while others would not blame the HRD, but rather simply command the employees to reduce their scores without any engagement. The communication is one-sided, coming from manager to employee, with the expectation that the employee must listen and do as commanded. The correct way of undertaking this process, however, is through clear communication between manager and employees. Sometimes the moderation committee would tell the manager that it is not convinced that the employee deserves the score, and that the manager should discuss the rating further with the employee and request evidence. The majority of managers in the GDARD, however, would not have a discussion with the employees, but rather tell them to reduce their scores because would rather avoid having to go back to the moderation committee to fight for the employee. Some managers do not have good relationships with their subordinates and believe they do not deserve the recognition. The managers forget that recognition motivates employees to improve their performance, as proposed by the reinforcement theory.

5.3 Conclusion

This chapter concludes that employees of the GDARD perceive the PMDS to be a tool to improve their individual performance and contribute to the overall performance of the department. Generally, employees are content with the reward element attached to the PMDS and perceive the reward to be a contributing factor to performance.

Employees believe the PMDS is a good tool, but it sometimes does not serve its indented purpose because managers are using it as a tool to punish employees. The second purpose is to explore the role of human resources development in the implementation of the performance management and development system in the Department. The analyses show that the HRD in the Gauteng Department of Agriculture and Rural Development is not so hands regarding the implementation of the system. Their role is of ensure compliance with target dates of submission of performance contracts and performance assessment (quarterly or at the end of financial year). The content of the PMDS is left to the managers and their subordinates to handle it.

6. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, LIMITATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter summarises the research report. Section 6.2 links the purpose of the study with the research findings and presents a conclusion of the research, while Section 6.3 discusses the limitations of the research, and Section 6.4 presents recommendations for the research problem.

6.1 Summary

The purpose of this research is to explore the employees' perception regarding the implementation of the PMDS in the GDARD, and the role of the HRD in implementation. To conduct the assessment, this research responded to the following questions: What is the employees' perception regarding the implementation of the PMDS in the GDARD; and what is the role of the HRD in the implementation of the PMDS in the department?

This research reviewed literature on the implementation of the performance management system in order to get an understanding of the associated challenges, both in the South African context and in other countries. A review of past studies and evaluations identified a knowledge gap. We reviewed documented frameworks, from which we established frameworks that would help us interpret the empirical findings on the implementation of the performance management system. Furthermore, based on the literature reviewed, this research developed a conceptual framework on "Assessing the implementation of the performance management and development system in the Gauteng Department of Agriculture and Rural Development".

The conceptual framework provided a guideline on how to conduct empirical research after interrogating literature. This study applied a qualitative research strategy and case-study research design to undertake the empirical research. It employed a semi-structured interview schedule to ask questions of the study participants. The target population for this research was employees from the GDARD. Purposive sampling was applied to select 12 participants. The sample comprised employees from levels one to 12, all of whom are measured and managed through the PMDS. The sample included

employees in the lower levels and middle management. Twelve face-to-face interviews were conducted in the offices of the GDARD. The interviews took place from 30 November 2017 to 25 January 2018. Data was collected using a mobile phone, and the recordings later transferred to a personal password-protected computer. This research analysed data through thematic direct content analysis. All ethical procedures were adhered to in conducting the research. The limitation of the research is that the research could not be generalised to a larger population, which is the other departments in the Gauteng provincial government.

This research applied the reinforcement and goal-setting theories to interpret the findings of the research. In response to the first research question, the finding is that employees in the GDARD do have knowledge on the PMDS, but limited or complete lack of knowledge on the PMDS policy. The majority of the employees had not attended the PMDS training, and these employees have been at the department for more than five years. A minority of the employees recall attending the PMDS training. The findings in the research also show that there is not enough feedback communication. Managers are reluctant to communicate feedback to their employees. Furthermore, employees are not getting enough support from their managers to attend training and courses. The findings also show that managers are not correctly implementing the PMDS in terms of awarding bonuses. The research results also show that relationship between managers and employees is uneven.

In response to the second research question, the findings show that the HRD is not providing sufficient training on the PMDS. Awareness raising only takes place during induction and when directorates request clarity on issues relating to the PMDS. Furthermore, the HRD is not doing enough to address the issue of poor performance. The findings also show that no measures are implemented to address the issue of non-compliance.

6.2 Conclusions

The purpose of this research is to explore the employees' perception regarding the implementation of the PMDS in the GDARD; and the role of the HRD in the implementation of the system. From the findings related to the first research question, "what is the employees' perception regarding the implementation of the PMDS in the

GDARD?" The research concludes that employees in the department perceive performance management to be a tool for improving their performance. This notion is attributed by their broad knowledge and understanding of the PMDS.

The findings show that employees in the GDARD perceive the financial element attached to good performance to be a contributing factor to improved performance. The employees are of the view that if they are recognised, they will be motivated to repeat the same behaviour in the next financial year. This perception is supported by a study by Burnham and Horton (2013), in which the two authors argue that rewarding the performance of employees serves as a motivating factor for them to put more effort into their work (Burnham & Horton, 2013). This perception also verifies the reinforcement theory, which proclaims that rewarding good performance encourages employees to repeat the same behaviour. This notion is also proven in the study by Munzhedzi and Phago (2014). This research, therefore, concludes that giving employees the recognition they deserve creates an environment conducive for good performance. Essentially, employees who are happy at work are more productive.

The analysis from the research findings also shows that employees view the PMDS as a tool to punish employees. The employees' perception is that the system is not correctly implemented in the GDARD. It therefore defeats the whole purpose of the PMDS, which is to manage, develop and recognise employees. Some managers use it as a tool to settle scores with employees. They employ bias and favouritism when rating performance or give bonuses to undeserving employees. This challenge cuts across the South African public service, as similar findings emerged in other past research by Hendricks and Matsiliza (2015), Munzhedzi and Phago (2014), Makumu and Mello (2014), and Sebashe and Mtapuri (2011).

One of the challenges associated with the PMDS is the lack of feedback. The analysis from the research findings shows that managers do not want to effectively communicate feedback to employees. The employees' view is that the lack of feedback is demoralising and that low morale leads to a drop in performance. Lack of feedback opposes the reinforcement and goal-setting theories, which say that giving feedback to employees encourages them to improve performance. From the analysis, this research concludes that it is unfortunate that employees are caught in this controversy. The

managers or supervisors hold power when implementing the PMDS. Furthermore, the HRD and senior managers in chief directorates are not implementing measures to deal with managers who are non-compliant. This research concludes that the HRD in the GDARD is more concerned with the quantity rather the quality of the PMDS contracts and assessments and the process of developing those documents.

This brings us to the second research question: What is the role of HRD in the implementation of the PMDS in the department? The research findings show that the HRD plays a critical role in ensuring that the PMDS is implemented correctly in the department. The HRD is responsible for ensuring compliance regarding the submission of performance contracts and assessments. The HRD role in the moderation committee is one of secretariat. This research concludes that the HRD is not hands-on regarding the implementation of the system. Training on the PMDS is insufficient, only taking place during induction and when directorates request clarity on issues relating to the system. Furthermore, the HRD is not doing enough to address the issue of poor performance. There are no follow-up processes in place to ensure that poor-performing employees get up to par with their colleagues. The findings also show that no measures are implemented to address the issue of non-compliance. This research concludes that the implementation of the system needs to be improved.

6.3 Limitations

The limitation in this study is that qualitative research is conducted on a small scale and cannot be generalised to a larger population. This research cannot be generalised to other government departments in the Gauteng Provincial Government. The reliability in the research may be limited by the fact that should another researcher want to replicate the research in a few years, the implementation of the PMDS could have changed. Moreover, the researcher previously worked in the department under study, which places a limitation on the research with regard to interviews conducted, in that study participants might have been reluctant to provide honest answers. The target population was compromised because of the structure of the Department (cleaners and securities are excluded from PMDS). The sample of this research was limited to 12 employees from both the lower levels and middle management. The sample for human resource development (HRD) personnel was very small, because the directorate consist of three people who are responsible for PMDS. Moreover, this research could not get

representation of staff from level three because of their work schedule. The sample did not include senior management because the PMDS policy is for the management of employees from levels one to 12. Senior management was mentioned during the course of the interviews, meaning that their perception regarding the implementation of the system was missed. If we had included the senior management were could have triangulated data from all levels of the organisation. However, to close the gap, we were still able to triangulate data that we received from different levels and sections or units of the department.

6.4 Recommendations

This research recommends that the HRD implement compulsory refresher sessions on the PMDS. The refresher sessions should accommodate all employees in the department. Furthermore, the HRD managers must implement a number of workshops for all staff in the department. The senior managers must be part of the process, and the HRD management should address those employees and senior managers who do not comply. The refresher training on the PMDS should be included in the HRD management contracts so that they can be measured on this process. As recommended by Mello (2015), all managers should attend training on the implementation of the system before the new performance management cycle kicks off. This training must be compulsory for all middle and senior managers in the department. Non-attendance and non-compliance should be regarded as a serious offence. The Chief Director for Human Resources should take part in managing the process.

This research also recommends that the HRD implement programmes to enhance the relationship between managers and employees, because the current relationships are uneven. The morale of staff is low. Furthermore, the HRD should ensure that employees managed through PDPs are monitored. The management of non-performing employees should not be the responsibility of the managers alone. The HRD managers should conduct post-development monitoring to ensure that those employees are brought up to par with their colleagues. Furthermore, this research recommends that the HRD must enforce strict measures to address non-compliance with all aspects of the PMDS. The HRD in the GDARD should introduce non-monetary tools to recognise employees.

This research further recommends that the public service should consider implementing the promotion of employees, rather than making them go through the exhaustive process of interviews. Promotion must be implemented on the basis that employees are doing exceedingly well in their jobs. The employee should just receive a letter, stating that they are promoted to the next position in the department. This method of promotion is possible in the private sector and can therefore also be possible in the public sector. This will encourage public servants to work harder and not to become comfortable staying in the same position for extended periods of time. It will eliminate culture of employees remaining in one position for 10 years or more of service. This research also recommends that the public service reconsider including employees in the moderation committee. We acknowledge the fact that employees have to represented by their immediate supervisors, however, the employees should be given a chance to defend themselves. This process will eliminate the issue of lack of feedback from the managers.

7. REFERENCES

Adejeka, A.B., & Bayat, M.S.(2014). Evaluation of performance management and development system with balanced scorecard as a appraisal tool at Mthatha General Hospital- Eastern Cape Province. *Journal of Research and Development*, 1(7), 7-24.

Agyen-Gyasi, K., & Baoteng, M. S. (2014). Performance appraisal system in academic and research libraries in Ghana: a survey. *Library Review*, 64(1/2), 58-81.

Akral, T., & Mampilly, S.R. (2016). An Empirical Attestation of the Impact of Performance Management System on Employee Involvement Moderated by Employee Acceptance of Performance Management System. *Journal of Business and Management System*, 18(1), 25-32.

Allen-Ile, C.O.K.., Ile, I.U., & Munyaka, S.A. (2007). Public Sector Employees' Perception on Performance Management System's Influence on Career Development. *Journal of Public Administration,* 42(4), 403-413.

Andrews, R. (2011). NPM and the search for efficiency. In T. Christensen & G. Bouckaert (Eds), The Ashgate Research Campanion to New Public Management. Surrey, England: Ashgate Publishing Limited.

Anttiroiko, A. (2007). Issues on information society in Finlad. In T, Obi (Ed). E-governance: a global perspective on a new paradigm (pp. 19-22). Amsterdam, Netherland: IOS Press.

Armstrong, M. (2009). Armstrong's Handbook of performance management: an evidence-based guide for delivering high performance. London, United Kingdom: Kogan Page Publishers.

Armstrong, M. (2015). Armstrong's Handbook of Performance Management: An Evidence-Based Guide to Delivering High Performance. London, United Kingdom: Kogan Page Publishers.

Asad, M., & Mahfod, J. (2015). Training and Development and its Impact on the Employee's Performance: A Study by Agility Company-Kingdom of Bahrain. *International Review of Management and Business Research*, 4(3), 700-712.

Atan, J., Raghavan, S., & Mahmood, N.K. (2015). Impact of training on employee's job performance: a case study by Malaysian small medium enterprise. *Review of Management.* 5(1/2), 40-50.

Bagard, V.S.(2009). Principles of management (3 rd ed.). Pune, India: Technical Publication Pune.

Baloyi, S., Van Waveren,C.C., & Chan, K.Y. (2014). The role of supervisor support in predicting employee job satisfaction from their perception of the performance management system: A test of competing models in engineering environments. *South Africa Journal of Industrial Engineering*, 25(1), 85-95.

Benedict, M. A., & Kehinde, T. (2015). An Empirical Study by Performance Management as a Managerial Tool for the Development and improvement in Employees' Job Performance in Organization. *Australian Journal of Business and Management Research*, 4(12), 1-20.

Bilgin, K.U. (2007). Performance Management for Public Personnel: Multi-Analysis towards Personnel. *Public Personnel Management*, 36(2), 93-113.

Biron, M., Farndale, E., & Paauwe, J. (2011). Performance management effectiveness: lessons from world-leading firms. *Journal of Human Resource Management*, 22(06), 1294-1311. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2011.559100

Boeije, H. (2010). *Analysis in Qualitative Research*. London, United Kingdom: Sage Publication, Inc.

Bovaird, T., & Loffler, E. (2009). Understanding public management and governance. In T. Bovaird & E. Loffler (Eds), *Public management and governance* (pp. 3-14). New York, USA: Routledge.

Bovald, T. (2009). Public management and governance (2 nd ed.)

Broadbent, J., & Laughlin, R. (2009). Performance management systems: A conceptual model. *Management Accounting Research*, 20, 283-295.

Bryman, A. (2012). *Social Research Methods*. (4th ed.). New York, United States of America: Oxford University Press.

Bryman, A. (2016). *Social Research Methods*. (5 th ed.). New York, United of America: Oxford University Press.

Buick, F., Blackman, D.A., O'Flynn, J.L., & West, D. (2015). Can enhanced performance management support public sector change? *Journal of Organisational Change*, 28(2), 271-289. DOI 10.1108/JOCM-12-2013-0249

Burnham, J., & Hoton, S. (2013). Public Management in the United Kingdom: a new introduction. New York, United States: Palgrave Macmillian.

Cameron, R. (2015). Performance management in the South African Department of Labour: Smoke and Mirror? *African Journal of Public Affairs*, 8(1), 1-18.

Chandan, J.S. (2014). *Principles of management* (2 nd ed.). New Delhi, India: Vikas Publishing House Pvt Ltd.

Cheng, M., Dainty A., & Moore, D (2006) Implementing a new performance management system within a project-based organization: A case study, *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, 56 (1),60-75. https://doi.org/10.1108/17410400710717082

Cole, G. A. (1995). *Organisational Behavior: Theory and Practice*. London, United Kingdom.

Colyvas, A. (2015). Public Sector Performance Management and Reporting: Does a "clean audit" mean everything is fine? Accountancy SA, 42-43.

Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Qualitative inquiry & research design: choosing among five approaches*. (3rd ed.). Los Angeles, United States of America: Sage Publications, Inc.

Creswell, J. W. (2016). *30 Essential Skills for the Qualitative Researcher*. Los Angeles, United States of America: Sage Publications, Inc.

Creswell, J.W., & Poth, C.N. (2018). *Qualitative Inquiry & Research Design: Choosing Among Five Approaches*. (4th ed.).Califonia, United States of America: Sage Publications, Inc.

Daft, R. L., & Marcic, D. (2004). *Understanding Managing*. Ohio, United States of America: Thomson Learning.

Daft, R.L., & Marcic, D. (2011). *Understanding management*. Mason, USA: South-Western Cengage Learning.

Denharrdt, J.V., & Denhardt, R. (2007). *The new public service: seeing not steering* (Exp ed.). New York, USA: Armonk.

Du Toit, D., & Van der Waldt, G. (1999). Public administration and management: the grassroots (2nd ed.). Cape Town, South Africa: Juta & Company Limited.

Du-Plessis, M.A.R. (2015). Determining professional nurses' knowledge on the performance management and development system in Tshwane. *Curationis*, 38(1), 1-7. http://dx.doi.org/10.4102/curationis.v38i1.1186

Durdella, N. (2017). *Qualitative Dissertation Methodology: A Guide For Research Design and Method*s. Califonia, Unites Stes of America: Sage Publication, Inc.

Dzimbiri, L.B. (2008). Experiences in New Public Management in Africa: The Case of Performance Management Systems in Botswana. *Africa Development*, XXXIII (4), 43-58.

Ferlie, E., Lynn, Jr, L.E., & Pollit, C. (2005). *The Oxford handbook of public management*. New York, United States: Oxford University Press.
Ferreira, A., & Otley, D. (2009). The design and use of performance management systems: An extended framework for analysis. *Management Accounting Research*, 20, 263-282. DOI:10.1016/j.mar.2009.07.003
Gauteng Department of Agriculture and Rural Development. (2015). 2014-15 Annual Report. Retrieved November 20, 2016 from http://gdardintranet.gpg.gov.za/Pages/Annual-Reports.aspx
Gauteng Department of Agriculture and Rural Development. (2016). 2015-2016 Annual Performance Report. Retrieved November 14, 2016 from https://provincialgovernment.co.za/department_annual/404/2016-gauteng-agriculture-and-rural-development-annual-report.pdf
Gauteng Department of Agriculture and Rural Development. (2017). 2016-2017 Annual Report. Retrieved November 20, 2017 from http://www.gauteng.gov.za/government/departments/agriculture-and-rural-development/Annual%20Reports/GDARD%20Annual%20Report%202016-2017.pdf
Gauteng Department of Agriculture and Rural Development.(2014). 2013-14 Annual Report. Retrieved November 20, 2016 from http://www.gdard.gpg.gov.za/Publications1/iGDARD%2013-14%Annual%20Report.pdf.
Gauteng Provincial Government. (2002). Policy on Performance Management and Development. Johannesburg, South Africa.
Grobler, P.A., & Warnich, S. (2011). *Human Resource Management in South Africa*. (4th ed.). North Way, United Kingdom: South –Western Cengage Learning.
Gruman, A.J., & Saks, A.M. (2011). Performance management and employee engagement. Human Resource Management Review, 21, 122-136.
Guest, G., MacQueen, K., & Namey, E.E. (2012). *Applied Thematic Analysis*. Califonia, United States of America: Sage Publications, Inc.
Hart, J. (1998). Central Agencies and Departments: Empowerment and Coordination. In B.G. Peters & D.V. Savoie (Eds). Taking stock: assessing public sector reforms. Canada: Canadian Centre for Management Development.
Hendricks, C.C., & Matsiliza, N.S. (2015). Management of employee performance in the South African Public Service: the case of the National Department of Rural Development and Land Reform in the Western Cape. *Problems and Perspectives in Management*, 13(3-1), 125-131.
Heystek, J. (2014). Principals' perception about performance agreements as motivational action: Evidence from South Africa. Educational Management Administration & Leadership, 42(6), 889-902. DOI:10.1177/1741143214549425
Hondeghem, A., & Van Dorpe, K. (2012). Performance management systems for senior civil servants: how strong is the managerial public service bargain? *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, 79(1), 9-27. DOI: 10.1177/0020852312467549
Hood, C. (1995).The "New Public Management" in the 1980s: Variations on a them. *Accounting Organisation and Society*, 20(2/3), 93-109.
Hood, C. (2005). Management. In E. Ferlie, L.E. Lynn Jr. & C. Pollit (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of public management*. New York, USA: Oxford University Press.
Hope, Sr, K.R. (2013). Performance contracting as a performance management tool in the public sector in Kenya: Lessons of learning. Teaching Public Administration, 31(2), 204-217. DOI: 10.1177/0144739413488905
Houldsworth, E., & Jirangighle, D. (2006). Managing and measuring employee performance. London, United Kingdom: Kogan Page Limited.

Houser, R. A. (2015*). Counselling and Educational Research: Evaluation and Application*. (3rd ed). California, United States of America: Sage Publications, Inc.
Hughes, O. (2012). Public management and administration: an introduction. England, United Kingdom: Palgrave MacMillian.
Hvidman, U., & Andersen, S. C. (2013). Impact of performance management in public and private organization*, Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 24, 35-58.
Ivancevich, J. M., Konopaske, R., & Matteson, T. M. (2011). *Organisational behaviour and managemen*t (9th ed.). New York, United States of America: McGraw-Hill Irwn.
Jain, M. (2014). Organizational effectiveness and strategic HR. *Journal of Social Welfare and Management*, 6(4), 199-207.
Jelavic, M., & Salter, D. (2014). Performance measures and rewards: The alignment of management goals and employee motivation. *Canadian Manager*, 39(1), 26-27.
Johnson, B., & Christensen, L. (2012). *Quantitative, Qualitative and Mixed Approaches*. (4th ed.) Califonia, United States of America: Sage Publication, Inc.
Karmakar, A., & Datta, B. S. *Principle and practice of management and business communication*. New Delhi, India: Doling Kindersley Pvt. Ltd.
Kawulich, B., & Holland, L. (2012). Qualitative Data Analysis. In C. Wagner, B. Kawulich & M. Garner (Eds), *Doing Social Research: A global context* (pp. 228-245). London, United Kingdom: McGraw-Hill Education.
Koontz, H., & Weihrich, H. (1998). *Management*. (9th ed.). Singapore: McGraw-Hill, Inc.
Koontz, H., O'Donnell, C., & Weihrich, H. (1986). *Essentials of management* (4th ed.). Singapore: McGraw-Hill, Inc.
Kumar, R. (2014). *Research Methodology: step-by-step for beginners*. (4th ed.). London, United Kingdom: Sage Publications, Inc.
Laher, S., & Botha, A. (2012). Methods of Sampling. In C. Wagner, B. Kawulich & M. Garner (Eds), *Doing Social Research: A global context* (pp. 86-99). London, United Kingdom: McGraw-Hill Education.
Landy, F.J., & Conte, J.M. (2010). Work in the 21st century: an introduction to industrial and organisational psychology (3rd ed.). Califonia, USA: John Wiley & Sons Inc.
Ledlow, G. R., & Stephens, H. J. (2017). *Leadership for health professionals: theory, skills and applications*. (3rd ed.). Burlington, United States: Jones & Bartlett Learning.
Liddle, J. & Diamond, J. (2012). Business and management schools in times of crisis and austerity: choices and dilemmas. In Diamond, J., & J. Liddle (Eds). *Emerging and potential trends in public management: an age of austerity* (1 st ed., pp. 25-46). Bingley, UK: Emerald Group Publishing Limited.
Locke, E.A., & Latham, G.P.(2013). *New developments in the goal setting and task performance*. New York, USA: Routledge Taylor & Francis Group.
Lynn, Jr. L.(2006). *Public management old and new*. New York, USA: Routledge.
Lynn,Jr. L.E. (2006). Public management: a concise history of field. In E. Ferlie, L.E. Lynn Jr. & C. Pollit (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook pf public management*. New York, USA: Oxford University Press.
Maclean, S., & Maseti, B. (2016). Implementation of a Performance Management Development System: The Case of the Provincial Planning and Treasury Department in the Eastern Cape, South Africa. *Journal of Public Administration,* 51(2), 306-321.
Magnusson, E., & Marecek, J. (2015). *Doing interview-based qualitative research: a leaner,s guide*. Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.
Magoro, M. (2016). Implementation of a Performance Management System as a Driver for Improved Service Delivery: A Case Study by Makhuduthamaga Local Municipality. *Journal of Public Administration,* 51(3), 391-398.

Maheshawri, R.P. (2004). Principles of business studies. New Delhi, India: Pitambar Publishing Company Pvt. Ltd.

Malefane, S.R. (2010). Is it Really Performance that is measured? A Reflection of the South African Government's Performance Management System. *Journal of US-China Public Administration*, 7(8), 1-12.

Malherbe, R. (2006). The legal system and the Judiciary. In A. Venter & C. Landsberg (Eds.), *Government and Politics in the new South Africa.* (3rd ed., pp. 61-78). Pretoria, South Africa: Van Schaik Publishers.

Manyaka, R.K., & Sebola, M.P.(2012). Impact of performance management on service delivery in the South African Public Service. *Journal of Public Administration,* 47 (1.1), 299-310.

Mello, D. M (2015). Performance management and development system in the South African Public Service. *Journal of Public Administration*, 50(3.1), 689-699.

Methods of Sampling. In C. Wagner, B. Kawulich & M. Garner (Eds), *Doing Social Research: A global context* (pp. 86-99). London, United Kingdom: McGraw-Hill Education

Minnaar, F. (2006). Integrated Performance Management: The Evolving South African Management Model. *Journal of Public Administration,* 41(2.1), 177-190.

Mintzberg, H. (2005). *Managing not MBAs: a hard look at the soft practice of management and management development*. San Fransisco, United Stes of America: Berret-Koehler Publishers Inc.

Mone, E.M., & London, M. (2010). Employee engagement through effective performance management: a practical guide for managers (1st ed.). New York, USA: Routledge Taylor & Francis Group.

Mosoge, M. J., & Pilane, M. W. (2014). Performance management: the neglected imperative of accountability systems in education. *South African Journal of Education*, 34(1), 1-18.

Mughal, F., Akram, F., & Ali, D. (2014). Implementation and Effectiveness of Performance Management System in Alfalah Bank. *Journal of Public Administration and Governance,* 4(4), 111-122. http://dx.doi.org/10.5296/ jpag.v4i4.6869

Munzhedzi, P. H., & Phago, K. (2014). Performance management system quandary in the public service: a case of the Limpopo Province, South Africa. *Journal of Public Administration*, 49(4), 1083-1099.

Nengwekhulu, R.H. (2009). Public Service Delivery Challenges Facing the South African Public Service. *Journal of Public Administration,* 44(2), 341-363.

Newman, W. L. (2011). *Social Research Methods: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches.* (7th ed.). Boston, United States of America: Pearson Education Inc.

Nieuwenhuis, J., & Smit, B. (2012). Qualitative Research. In C. Wagner, B. Kawulich & M. Garner (Eds), *Doing Social Research: A global context* (pp. 124-139). London, United Kingdom: McGraw-Hill Education.

Nzimakwe, T. I., & Ntshakala, T. E. (2016). Implementing performance management in the local governance in South Africa: A case study by West Rand District Municipality. *African Journal of Public Affairs,* 9(1), 110-122.

O'Toole,Jr. L.J., & Meier, K.J.(2011). *Public management: organisations, governance and performance.* New York, United States of America: Cambridge University Press.

Obisi, C. (2011). Employee Performance Appraisal System and Its Implications For Individual and Organizational Growth. *Australian Journal of Business and Management Research*, 1(9), 92-97.

Odendal, A., & Roodt. G.(2009). Basic motivation concepts. In S.P. Robbins, T.A. Judge, A. Ondendaal & G. Roodt (Eds), *Organisational behaviour global and*

Southern African perspectives (pp. 143-164). Cape Town, south Africa: Pearson Education.
Ogletree, T., & Kawulich, B. B. (2012). Ethical Consideration in Conducting Research. In C. Wagner, B. Kawulich & M. Garner (Eds), *Doing Social Research: A global context* (pp. 63-72). London, United Kingdom: McGraw-Hill Education.
Painter, M. (2011). Managerialism and models of management. In T. Christensen & G. Bouckaert (Eds), *The Ashgate Research Companion to New Public Management*. Surrey, England: Ashgate Publishing Limited.
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), 197-215.
Pollitt, C., & Bouckaert, G. (2004). *Public management reform: a comparative analysis* (2 nd ed.). New York, United States: Oxford University Press.
Put, V., & Bouckaert, G. (2011). Managing performance and auditing performance. In T. Christensen & G. Bouckaert (Eds), *The Ashgate Research Campanion to New Public Management*. Surrey, England: Ashgate Publishing Limited.
Ramulumisi, T.V., Schulltz, C. M., & Jordaan, C.J. (2015).Perceived effectiveness of a performance management system. *Journal of Contemporary Management*, 12, 517-543.
Republic of South Africa. (1994). *Public Service Act 104*. Pretoria, South Africa.
Republic of South Africa. (1996). *The Constitution of the Republic of South Africa Act 108*. Pretoria, South Africa.
Republic of South Africa. (1997). *The White Paper on Human Resource Management in the Public Service* . Pretoria, South Africa.
Republic of South Africa. (2001). *The Public Service Regulations*. Pretoria, South Africa.
Rudani, R. (2013). *Principles of management*. New Delhi, India: McGraw Hill Education Privated Limited.
Sapru, R.K. (2013). *Administrative theories and management thought*. Delhi, India: Patpargon Industrial Estate.
Schermerhorn, Jr, J. (2011). Management. New Jersey, USA: John Wiley & Sons Inc.
Schiavo-Campo, S., & McFerson, H. M. (2008). Public management in global perspectives. New York, United Stes of America: M.E. Sharpe, Inc.
Schwellla, E. (2004). Introduction to public management. In W. Fax, E. Schwella & H. Wissink (Eds*), Public management* (pp.1-6). Stellenbosch, South Africa: Sun Press.
Scott, Z., & Alam, M. (2011). *Resource guide on decentralisation and local government*. London, United Kingdom: Commonwealth Secretariat.
Sebashe, S.S., & Mtapuri, O. (2011). Implementation of a performance management system: a case study by Ba-Phalaborwa Municipality in Limpopo. *Journal of Public Administration*, 46(4), 1323-1337.
Seotlela, R. P.J., & Miruka, O. (2014). Implementation Challenges of Performance Management System in the South African Mining Industry. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences,* 5(7), 177-187. Doi:10.5901/mjss.2014.v5n7p177
Sharfritz, J.M., Russell, E.W., Borick, C.P., & Hyde, C.H. (2016). *Introducing public management* (9th ed.) Routledge.
Sharma, S.K. (2014). *Nursing Research & Statistics*. (2nd ed.). Uttarakhand, India: Reed Elsevier India Private Limited.
Shields, J. (2007). *Managing employee performance and reward: concepts, practices and strategies*. Port Melbourne, Australia: Cambridge University Press.
Shields, J., & North-Samardic, A. (2016). Managing for results. In J. Shields, M. Brown, S. Kaine, C. Dolle-Smauel, A. North-Samardzic, P. Mcbean, R. Johns, P. O'Leay, G. Plimmer & J. Robinson (Eds), *Managing employee performance and*

reward: concepts, practices, strategies (pp. 78-95). Port Melbourne, Australia: Cambridge University Press.
Smit, R. J., de Cronje, G. J., Brevis, T., & Vrba, M. J. (2007). *Management Principles: a contemporary edition for Africa.* (4th ed.). Cape Town, South Africa: Juta & Co.
Thornhill, C. (2012). Effective Political-Administration Relations for Policy Making and Implementation. *African Journal of Public Affairs*, 5(1), 56-68.
Torkilden, G. (2005). *Leisure and recreation management* (4th ed.). New York, USA: Roudeledge.
Tripathi, P. C ., & Raddy, P.N. (2008). *Principles of management* (4th ed.). New Delhi, India: The Mcgrwa-Hill Publishing Company Limited.
Tulsian, V. P. (2008). *Business organisation and management*. Delhi, India: Dorling Kindersley Pvt. Ltd.
Van Baalen, J & De Coning, C. (2011). In E. Ferlie, L.E. Lynn Jr. & C. Pollit (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook pf public management*. New York, USA: Oxford University Press.
Van der Waldt, G. (2012). Project management and performance management potential transdiciplinary contributions. *The Journal for Transdiciplinary Research in Southern Africa*, 8(2), 217-234.
Van der Waldt, G., & Du Toit, D.F.P. (1999). *Managing for excellence in the public sector* .(2nd ed.). Cape Town, South Africa: Juta & Co Ltd.
Venter, A., & Mtimkulu, P. (2006). The Executive. In A. Venter & C. Landsberg (Eds.), *Government and Politics in the new South Africa.* (3rd ed., pp. 40-60). Pretoria, South Africa: Van Schaik Publishers.
Wagner, C., Kawulich, B., & Garner, M, M (2012). *Doing Social Research: A global context.* London, United Kingdom: McGraw-Hill Education.
Yin, K.R. (2016). *Qualitative research from start to finish.* (2nd ed.). New York, United States of America: The Guilford Press.
Youm, J. (2007). Ubiquitous society experiences in Korea. In T, Obi (Ed). *E-governance: a global perspective on a new paradigm* (pp. 16-18). Amsterdam, Netherland: IOS Press.

APPENDICES

Appendix 1.1: Consent Form and Interview Guide

Consent Form

Research Title: Implementation of the performance management and development system in a Gauteng Provincial Department

Name of the Researcher: Lirontso Makhooa

Position of the Researcher: Student at Wits School of Governance

Student No: 1530281

Contact number of the researcher: 0782522337

Please tick the box if you agree with the statement before proceeding with the interview

1	I confirm that I have read and understand the information sheet for the above study. I have had the opportunity to consider the information and ask questions.	
2	I understand that my participation is voluntary and that I am free to withdraw at any time, without giving reasons.	
3	I agree to take part in this study.	
4	I agree that my participation will remain anonymous.	
5	I agree that the researcher may use anonymous quotes in the research report.	
6	I agree to the interview and for the interview session to be tape-recorded.	

_____ _____

Signature of the Participant Date

_____ _____

Signature of the Researcher Date

Interview schedule for employees in GDARD

Introduction

- We introduce who we are
- Read the Information Sheet to the participants
- Request the participants to sign the Consent Form

Demographic questions

- How old are you?
- What is your highest qualification?
- What is your job title?
- What is your salary level?
- How long have you been working in the Department?

Questions on PMDS for employees

1. What is your understanding of the PMDS
2. How was PMDS introduced to you
3. Have you read the PMDS policy used in the Department?
    - And what did you gather from it?
4. What is the view on the way PMDS score are rated in your Directorate
5. How is the contracting done in your directorate?
6. What is your view on the way PMDS scores are rated in your Directorate or the Department as a whole?
7. How often have you attended the PMDS training in the Department?
    - What did you gather from it?
8. What support are you getting from your manager to ensure that your skills are developed?
9. In your view, how is the relationship between you and your manager in terms of PMDS?
10. How does your manager communicate feedback to you?
11. In your opinion, are you receiving enough recognition for performance? And does the recognition have an impact in your performance?

12. Have you been regarded as a poor performer?
    - What measures were implemented to address that?
13. What sort of punishment have you received from your manager/supervisor?
14. In your opinion, is PMDS a tool to improve performance or a tool to punish employees? Please elaborate

Questions for the Human Resource Development Managers

1. Please tell me, what is your understanding about PMDS?
2. How were you informed about the PMDS process in the Department?
3. Please explain to me what is the process implemented after you have received the PMDS document's from different Directorates?
    - Tell me about the scoring process, who decided that the score should be reduced?
    - What forms of recognition/rewards are implemented?
    - What measures are undertaken to assist employees who are not performing?
4. What training programs have been implemented to ensure that managers and employees are knowledgeable about PMDS?
5. What awareness has been created for the employees in terms of understanding the system? How often does the awareness take place?
6. What kind of grievances do you often receive after the PMDS final assessment?
    - What measures are implemented to address the grievances?
7. What are the challenges of PMDS?
8. What else would you like to share about PMDS that we might have not touched on during the interview?

Closure

Thank you so much for participation in the research.

Appendix 1.2 Information Sheet

Information Sheet

Research Title: **Implementation of the performance management and development system in a Gauteng Provincial Department**

Dear Participant

My name is Lirontso Makhooa; I am registered for the degree of Master of Management (in the field of Public Development and Management) under the Faculty of Commerce, Law, and Management at the University of Witwatersrand. I am conducting a research on assessing the implementation of the performance management and development system in the Gauteng Department of Agriculture and Rural Development. The purpose of this research is to investigate employees' perceptions on the implementation of the performance management and development system (PMDS) in the Gauteng Department of Agriculture and Rural Development (GDARD): and explore the role of HRD managers in ensuring a successful implementation of the performance management and development system in the Department. I am doing the research as part of the requirement to complete my degree. I am a former employee of the Gauteng Department of Agriculture and Rural Development. I held a position of a Rural Development Facilitator (contract) from the 1st of October 2014 to 30th of September 2017.

I am kindly inviting you to participate in this research. Participation in the study is voluntary. Confidentiality will be preserved at all times. The identity of the participant will only be known by the researcher and will not be revealed to anyone. The name of the participants will not be used in this research; instead numbers will be assigned to participants' names. You are welcome to withdraw from this research anytime you feel like it.

The participant will not be coerced to take part in this research. This research will not be harmful to anyone. There are no actions that will lead towards the participant being harmed emotionally or physically. The reputation of the participant will not be damaged

by taking part in the research. The participant will be treated with dignity and respect they deserve.

The interview will take 20 to 30 minutes. The interview will be audio recorded. Your permission is requested to record the interview. The recordings will be labelled with numbers, no real names will be used. The audio recordings will be kept safe and they will not be accessed by anyone other than the researcher. You have been approached to participate in this research, as an employee, because opinion will contribute to the effective implementation of performance management and development system (PMDS) in GDARD.

The results of the study will be reported in my thesis, which will be published in the University of Witwatersrand library. Feedback will be provided to individual participants upon request. Any queries regarding the interviews or other aspects of the research can be directed to me or my supervisor, Dr Kambidima Wotela, on the contact details listed below. If you are willing to participate in this, please sign this Informed Consent form.

Thank you

Lirontso Makhooa

deejaymak@gmail.com

0782522337

Dr Kambidima Wotela

Kambidima.Wotela@WITS.ac.za

0712603260

Appendix 1.3: Transcribed Interview with employee

Interview with Respondent 11

Demographic questions

- How old are you?

Respondent 11: 40-45 range

- What is your highest qualification?

Respondent 11: Master in Media Studies and Journalism

- What is your salary level?

Respondent 11: Level 9

- How long have you been working in the Department?

Respondent 11: 10 years

The main questions

Interviewer: How was PMDS introduced to you?

Respondent 11: *PMDS was just basically introduced to me as a performance management measure, but not so much as to reward a person. I think I actually learned maybe three years later that oh you can actually get a bonus. Otherwise, I just thought it was matter of you getting assessed just see that you are meeting the standard requirements. Later on I just learned that if you attain a certain percentage, maybe to years later, if you attain a certain percentage or a certain mark then you could be rewarded. So the incentive part of PMDS was not clearly explained to me, but what appeared very clear and distinct was that you needed to meet certain standard in order to be worthy of your position in government. But now I can see that it is actually supposed to be both the standard and incentive. And more so the incentive because if you are doing well you have to be rewarded, and then when you are rewarded you do not become disinterested in what you are doing. You actually maintain that level or even better it. That's my observation, but I can see that within the budgeting system it looks like some managers try actually to manage the funds and not the performance. So basically it's always a controversy that people are always contesting the scores. Someone saying you don't deserve this and someone saying I deserve it. Not….and the contestation coming from some managers you can see in some cases not particularly in my section but other sections, because these things are discussed at branch level that maybe this manager is looking at the budget probably somewhere at the top probably they are being advised not to give to many bonuses because there is not much money in the budget. It just*

questions the whole system to say is it about incentivising performance or just to ensure that people are meeting the standards and then you don't reward them. It is not very clear. It is a very controversial issue. And what I had found that if people don't get the scores that they think they deserve, you actually find that the absenteeism…especially the like month where the budget are given you find that some don't come to work or the are on a go slow kind of thing. You know I have been seeing these kind of things all the time, it not a good period. And then there others who get their scores because they know that this guy performs or this person performs you can't contest that. That was an open ended question and I gave a lot answers.

Interviewer: Yes you have, you have already answered some of the questions that are coming forth.

Interviewer: What is your understanding about PMDS? Remember I just asked how it was introduced to you.

Respondent 11: *Its basically a performance management system that seeks to evaluate whether an employee…. a government employee is performing according to the set standards or below the set standards. If they are below, they should be sent for training, if they are above or if they just meet the standards you should encourage them to do better. And if they are above, you should reward them for doing a lot for the government, the excellent, and the effort….eem… and then you should reward them to keep up the good work. And that's how the government will then benefit by delivering good public services…services to the public. Because we are not here…we don't make profit. We measure our results by how people's lives are being bettered out there; we don't make profit to say today we made so many millions. We just get budget from the taxpayers monies those are the people whom we should serve, and they should get a good service of. That's what the performance management system is supposed to achieve, at an employee level and at…eer… the public service level. That is what is supposed to achieve.*

Interviewer: Have you read the PMDS policy used in the Department? And what did you gather from it?

Respondent 11: *Eer…I just read it and….. I gathered that one needs to score themselves honestly without fear and without under scoring yourself. And when you meet with your manager then you will have to explain that I gave myself this score because of that and that. It is like a motivation and you have the evidence. And I have learned more about that policy with people like the Premier's Office, who have actually told me in…public workshops that someone can be given a five. People can walk on water in the work they do. As long as excel there is no reason why they should not be given that mark.*

Otherwise if they could match that grade then the score should not to a four. Why should you put a level which people could never reach? But then some people inside you will start hearing them…you know….saying that there is no where a person can get a five. So there are always those things…you know…to say, so you have to agree to say sit back to say a five is like this. It doesn't really set it like that, maybe it's just explained generically that if you do more things out of your way , more work than what you are assigned to do that's the understanding in government that when you can be rewarded. As long as you are doing what you are supposed to do you can't be rewarded? I always believe that someone can do what they are supposed to do, but there is that degree of excellence when measure the work and the impact it gets. Eer… you can't just say you employed to do say and that is what you are doing and why should we give you a bonus anyway. But…we can be doing the same thing but….like football players but I am scoring more goals and creating more opportunities than other but people don't see it that way. So I don't know why when they say…you are doing basically what you are…..There is some wow factor in what a person does. We can all be writers but the other writer can been seen like their work has got more impact. So I think even if you are doing what you are supposed to be doing the impact of your work is measured, I can tell you if you are a writer you both write a story but your story is the one which is [going to] get feedback and good kind of… eem remarks from people and mine does not get. What does that show you? It means your story has got impact. But we were both doing what we were supposed to do. So that philosophy of saying you are supposed to be rewarded when you are doing things that are outside your…your contract, me I also think is problematic. Although it's maybe done to…say…to make sure that people do more work but it's also problematic. I think they should to both, did someone go out of their way to do extra things and you are exactly supposed to do. How…what are the wow factors in that, how did it bring better value and promote better service delivery? You know innovation style you know…you can come make changes in the Department. Those are affected in the PMDS…eem but you will be doing your work, so you bring new ideas; resolve conflicts and all those things…you know. There are there but they are not so….not many people would really see through those things. Not many people see through those things. And this issue of eem…three spheres of government, how does your work link that up. We as managers we just know how it is, but it's never explained to the junior staff. To say when you are saying three spheres of government there are certain work activities that we do that are cross cutting, and you should make sure that when you are doing it you are addressing it at national level; at provincial level ;and at district level and what what. Those things are not really unpacked. It is just through experience that you see that oh we actually work like this in intergovernmental level. So when I do this, this person should also know and cooperate. It's not really unpacked. Some of us we have come to know about it through our interactions. To say this is how…these are the three spheres of government.

Interviewer: Sorry just to take you back I didn't capture your job tittle.

Respondent 11: *Assistant Director (Publications)*

Interviewer: What is your view in the way PMDS score are rated in your Directorate?

Respondent 11: *The way they are given or approved*?

Interviewer: Okay, maybe I should have asked this one first. Sorry about first?

Interviewer: How is the PMDS contracting process done in your Directorate?

Respondent 11: *Contracting*?

Interviewer: Yes the contracting process

Respondent 11: *Okay… well….basically what happens is the….when you are given a job description each item is then put into a contract to say you will be measured, each activity that you do they say for instance in my case if is like video production; writing; and research those kind of things. Then it will be explained to you that for writing we expect you to write so many articles. And that's basically like quantitative not qualitative. They would not even say for we would like…from your articles we would like people to give feedback and what not. So I am trying to say is the contracting comes to say each activity that you do is then discussed to say this is how we [going to] score you and these are the measurements, the indictors to say you are doing well, you must have written so many articles, the must have been published in a paper, you need to produce proof of publication. You know that kind of evidence and hard evidence. So you know that that's now going to be in your contract. If the story is not published or if the exact number of stories are not published and you don't have that copies, you can't get a good score. If you don't write the required number of stories you cannot get a three. If get the right number of stories you will get a three. And the way it works quantitatively here is….because government is all about quantitative eer…eem…assessment of work. They look at numbers a lot but they don't look at the quality. So basically here if I just say I produced so many videos about what I am supposed to do already I am sitting on a four. And if I say I produced a video and the quality; the comment; the MEC; the people from outside, and then at least that jumping on a five. But within that you are now getting qualitative analyses, but at quantitative level you can easily get a bonus because they are looking at quantities. Bonuses are awarded from four and above, because sometimes if the scores are low the can say 3.8 and above. So what I am saying in government the contracts when they are being drafted for PMDS to say these are your measurements or indicators of achieving. It's basically more quantitative than qualitative. If you look into the annual reports,*

counting, we have vaccinated so many million, people who have done this. You see everywhere in the adverts of government is all about numbers, but quality to say how have the people lives changed. There is nothing. And if you were to go to those projects like we do in Agriculture you find that some of them are collapsing. That's the quality which is lacking, but the quantity to say we have given so many millions seed bags and what. But then quality on how have the lives of so many people change and what…what. And it talks about the monitoring and evaluation and a lot of things….government is weak on M&E. So and the…the assessment is just like desk research. Not…you know when people are being measured not many people like Agriculture they don't go on site with their supervisor to say show me this. So you are the one who brings evidence with pictures. And sometimes you can just fake a project. So we…the contracts are drafted eer …using the quantitative…. analysis approach or evaluation approach. You are not evaluated qualitatively. I can turn out notes just to say the story was published. Nobody really looks at the quality to say how did they write them and what was the impact. So that's how the contracts are drafted and err …hard work, how many hours. I did extract work that quantity. I ended up working with people in Rural Development, all that is a concept of quantitative drafting of contracts. But it's…then when is drafted everyone must understand it. If you think you can't deliver on that you must not take what you can't sort of produce. And then coming back to quantitative, whenever we do work in government we must put a standard which is lower to what you can achieve so that…..if I know I can do five video in a year I just say I will produce two. So when I do five I am already…I know that I have got my bonus [laughter]. It is also good to do that when you are using public funds, because if you don't meet those targets for circumstance beyond your control. Then the Audit will say you have failed. So there is this ….eer engrained thought which tells us that you must not always say exactly what…you must under rate yourself in terms of what you [going to] do and if you achieve, you have achieved. So when you can achieve to do five things you just say I will do two [laughter].

Interviewer: What is your view on the way PMDS scores are rated in your Directorate or the Department as a whole?

Respondent 11: *Oh the way they are rated…well if you say rated is when you are given a score. Are you saying that do people think they deserve what they have got? Or you are asking me about PMDS as a good management measure? Can you unpack that for me please?*

Interviewer: In a sense that…..

Respondent 11: *Because I can tell you right now the way they are viewed, if that's the rating?*

Interviewer: Yes, I mean in terms of threes, fours and fives. Do you think eem…its fair or like some people would complain and say I tried to do my…beyond what I have contracted for, but still they are saying I am on a three…

Respondent 11: *Those are the dynamics I was explaining to you earlier that there are some cases where you really see that someone deserves this score, but the manager is always sort of always scoring them down. And eventually there is like…self-limitation in…you just underscore…you score yourself low all time because you know that from here the manager is [going to] contest this. There is this eer… malicious compliance which is coming to say people would just put a three no one is [going to] contest it, I am through with that problem. I don't want…is like it's a very involving and stressful process where people go with scores and then they get rejected. So because of that large percentage of rejection which people have been subjected to for many years, you find themselves…they just score themselves a three because they know when it's a three the manager is not [going to] contest it. So they are people who are beginning to score themselves like that because they don't want issues. But they are some who say you know what I deserve this and stand and fight for it. But I always tell the guys who report to me to say don't score yourself low and they say no even if we score yourself high when it get there is [going to] be a problem. So there are just those dynamics you see.*

Respondent 11: *How far are you from the end Lirontso? I think I have given you hundred per cent?*

Interviewer: There are still quite a lot

Respondent 11: *Let me answer you short questions*

Interviewer: How often have you attended the PMDS training in the Department?

Respondent 11*: I think I only attended once, but then when the PMDS process started from what I know it was explained to me how it works.*

Interviewer: So a follow up question is, what have you gained from the training?

Respondent 11: *The reality of PMDS is something that is supposed to incentivise better performance and also to ensure that there a good standard. That people are not just dead woods in the office, they must meet certain levels. And if they don't…its managing system, you are managing performance. So if you that your staff or people who report to you don't meet the grade, you must check them can I do in-house training or can I send them out for training. Even if it means requesting them to say do you think you can perform better in this section, you know. If someone is not interested…they came here they were happy with the job, but now performance is down. This is reality, you can see that*

this person is not enjoying. That's why I see in government people get seconded. They move to this place…place…place you know. That's part of performance management system.

Interviewer: So this question was coming a little bit later, but I am just shifting it because it's more similar to what you have just said. What support are you getting from your manager to ensure that your skills are developed?

Respondent 11: *There is always a lot of moral support. Eer…whatever I want I get support. Sometimes you will get support to go and do a course, like I wanted to do video editing. I know everything about videos I have trained myself even to do filming, but I wanted to go and do editing. Then they approved it but then there was no money. Sometimes things can get approved but they might not be money when they are approved. Then you have to go back again check in the new financial year, things like that. So the support is there, obviously is got to be moral because material is money coming from the Department.*

Interviewer: How does your manager communicate feedback to you?

Respondent 11: *Emails, phone calls good job what… what. I also do the same to people who report to me.*

Interviewer: In your opinion, are you receiving enough recognition for performance? And does the recognition have an impact in your performance?

Respondent 11: *I have been getting my bonuses almost consistently, and the work from the ground shows. [Yes] I think is quite good. I think is okay …is not much money that you know when you get this thing. When it's a bonus like that I think they should make 100% like the birthday. It looks like you get paid for having being born and going nothing. And then when it comes to performance the rate you and say you are good, but they don't give you the… the…the much money as that you get for your birthday. That is quite funny. Just by being born you get hundred per cent, but when you work now you are measured and it comes in a fraction. That's quite funny.*

Interviewer: But that one the call it a thirteenth cheque

Respondent 11: *It is it, it comes in hundred per cent. Just being paid for doing nothing. It's a celebration of a life.*

Interviewer: Yes

Interviewer: Have you been regarded as a poor performer? What measures were implemented to address that?

Respondent 11: *Eer…not in the areas I am working in, [because] I am doing writing, production, research, video production. I think I have been implementing things that are not in the Department. I am adding value to that. Eer…..when I joined the Department I could say I came in doing things like doing all things like graphic designing everything. In graphic designing I could say I was not strong as I was in writing and research. And eventually are just opted to say that maybe we should get someone to do graphic designing and I just focus on these other things. That…that is the only case I can remember. But I then shifted from where I was not so strong in graphics. And it was actually taking more of my writing work. It was like balancing to say where are your interests laying. Not so much on poor performance but so much on where are your interests lying. I could not just see myself as someone who was designing what not. But also my designing was not as strong as my writing and research, that most of my interest is in. But I think designing is not something that I can just say wow, is not something that I draw a lot of inspiration. But I can still design, but when that happened it was like a human resources issue. Because I used to design, and when I stopped design we got [someone] to be seconded because she had the interest.*

Interviewer: What sort of punishment have you received from your manager/supervisor?

Respondent 11: *Ooh No*

Interviewer: It means you are a good employee

Respondent 11: *What is your definition of punishment Lirontso?*

Interviewer: A punishment would be "you not going to take that leave until you complete your work"

Respondent 11: No I always fill gaps. I always meet my deadlines. And I speak to you now we staring a project for a magazine I am the editor, and we set down last year we said less submit all our work by this time. My work was done, now I am waiting for others. So I meet my deadlines, I think is a healthy way of doing work. When you go home not stressed about outstanding work. I have not been punished for not performing.

Interviewer: In your opinion is PMDS a tool to improve performance or a tool punish employees?

Respondent 11: *No its eer… clearly a tool to improve performance, but I know some people…some managers might want to use it as tool to… settle scores for those who are deserving. I know some people have been complaining about this issue, I am sure you have spoken to them. It's abuse of government system. PMDS is basically to manage performance, to make sure that people perform and when they perform they are supposed to be rewarded for it. And therefore we keep the good standards and you give good services to the public, because we are serving on taxpayers' money. We can't afford not perform, and provide good service delivery. We don't make profit but taxpayers' are always giving us money. So we should use it to benefit public welfare.*

Interviewer: In areas where you did not perform how are you assisted?

Respondent 11*: As I am saying like… right now I am in charge of video productions in the Department. I do research; I direct the shooting and everything. But there's the second skill I seen that if I can do editing and even if we procure the jobs from outside but sometimes the other jobs…like last year I was thrown in the deep end [Respondent 11] can you produced this video. We have got a new HOD who doesn't know our limitations here. And then they thought we had video production equipment and everything. So I ended up producing but I was using another computer. [Colleague] has got video premier, so I produced my first video editing just teaching myself there. But now because of that problem eer…because I could not perform because of the software, is like tools of the trade. And I have asked the…the IT guys and even our Chief Director to support me to get an Apple Mac so that I can get the software. So it's being procured it will be delivered. So where is like tools of trade and what… what the support is there.*

Interviewer: What else would you like to add that we did not touch on during the interview?

Respondent 11: *[Yes] just to….say that I think managers when they are employed they must be given a good induction to say PMDS is a serious process it must not be abused like to settle scores and to say now I have a way of fixing this employee. They are not [going to] get their bonus I will fix them, no matter how hard they work. And those whom I like a can reward them. Now you the one who is just using a judgement to that, you know. And that happens you end being taken to HR and. It just pulls the morale…the morale of the staff, it demoralises people. There is one thing about someone who can do their work…their work you can see a person is working but the morale is low. That one thing which should be avoided. So an abuse of PMDS is a normal thing. Those are government funds if*

someone deserves the money give them the money, but if someone is telling…you don't if someone telling someone that there is no budget you make sure that. We don't know…it has been explained to us that the PMDS comes with a limited budget, because how about if 50% of the GDARD employees deserves PMDS what do you do with that. Is like people can these vibes when they are being denied certain scores, that is like managing the budget available. Thank very much

Interviewer: Thank you Sir for this interview. We have come to end of the interview and thank you for participating in the interview.

Respondent 11: *I wish you can keep your information safely, it can disappear.*

Interviewer: I will do just that, follow all the ethical procedures that I have to. Thank you so much

Respondent 11: *All the best with your program.*

Interviewer: Thank you.

Appendix 1.4: Transcribed Interview with human resource manager

Interview with Respondent_ 3

Interviewer: Please tell me, what is your understanding about PMDS?

Respondent 3: *PMDS is the monitoring of performance of individuals and also that of the organisation, to see how the Department is doing in meeting the targets, but is also to further develop individuals. Can be used for indicative training purpose as well.*

Interviewer: Okay, is also used for indicative training.

Respondent 3: *Yes*

Interviewer: Okay maybe this question will come at a later stage.

Respondent 3: *Okay so where the was a business plan for the Department and is going down to the individual level. So I am measuring my performance to see how I actually contribute to the goal of the Department.*

Interviewer: Moving to another question, how were you informed about PMDS process in the Department? I know you are the custodian, but I just want know…..how did you come to know about it?

Respondent 3: *Okay let me start, when I was still in the Premiers Office the current policy that we use in Gauteng I was part of the…..I was actually drafting the policy when I was still in the Premiers Office. So that's the policy we apply now for fourteen year, I know it's been outdates. So [Yes] I am familiar with the process for quite a number of years. [Yes] obviously in this Department I…….in Premier's Office I haven't done it specifically, but since I came in this Department I was responsible for the implementation of PMDS, then for a few years I was not, which was done by HRM and then for the past three years it came back to me.*

Interviewer: So when you first came it was your responsibility and then it when to HRM and then it came back to you?

Respondent 3: *Remember I was in HRM when I started here.*

Interviewer: Oh, okay

Respondent 3: *Then I was responsible for PMDS, then I moved to HRD. I can't remember the year. So when I came here I left PMDS that side, but then PMDS followed me after some years.*

Interviewer: It means you are doing quite a good job on PMDS

Respondent 3: *I hope so*

Interviewer: Please explain the PMDS process after you have received the PMDS documents from different Directorates?

Respondent 3: *The entire process starts at the beginning of the financial year in April, when all people I made to do performance contracting for a specific financial year. Then what we do is we do a quality check on the document itself to see whether anything is missing, to see whether is…..all information has been captured. What we then do is we capture that performance agreement on to PERSAL. Okay so when it captured on PERSAL it indicates a specific financial year. Together with the performance agreement we also request people to submit job descriptions and also work plan for that specific financial year. Okay, now that is captured onto PERSAL. Now that is quarter one, quarter two, quarter three it's all the same processes. So we send out circulars reminding individual you submit your performance assessment for a specific quarter. Then it comes back….the forms comes back to us. We capture that information once again on PERSAL and we do a quality check every quarter. We do a quality check throughout the year. If there are mistake we refer it back, then we monitor that in terms of coordination how they should submit back to us, because some people are not…you refer it back then you never get the assessment form back or even a performance agreement. Okay what we then also do, it is an initiative of this Department, I think we are the only one the Gauteng Departments. We do a monitoring and evaluation presentation. It's an excel document nice graphs and stuff information for the whole of the Department. For each Chief Director and for each Director. Then we can say for the entire Department there are 900 people there 200 fours and the are 300 twos, there are so many two and there are so many who did not submit. Then we do graphs for all different Directorates eventually. This information gets presented to labour unions and also to SMT and EMT meetings. Okay, that quite a nice tool. Now we have done the three quarter, now comes the final assessment. Okay, the final assessment is done for the entire financial year. There is still some confusion, some Department in Gauteng Province they allocate quarter one quarter two quarter three and then quarter four rating they add it up subtotal and they divide it by four. We don't know that. We say you do an assessment for the entire financial year, but bearing in mind the performance you have already evaluated in quarter one two and three. So then it comes to us, we always ask Directorates to submit a coordinated… consolidated list. So when it comes I don't even have to look at the forms,*

though we do the quality check. I look at the names and then I look at the ratings here. So then what we do before we actually start the process of, you know, preparing payments we do a quality assurance session. So it the responsibility of the Chief Directors to ensure that there is parity in their Chief Directorates, let me explain to you what I am saying by that. We are in Support Service, we are two Directorates HRM and HRD. Let's say Facilities was still with us. So what the Committee then should do, which is chaired by the Chief Director. For example HRM can perform Facilities Management and HRD, but HRD rating is much higher than HRM which doesn't make sense, it's incorrect. Because if you look at your APP target, for example, HRM has achieved everything and exceeded, HRD didn't even achieve though our ratings are higher. So they need to be parity. So either the rating should be increased or reduced. Then, okay let me start by when we do the payment process. What we then do is we prepare an excel spread sheet. We request a record of all people..eer.. that worked for GDARD as for 31 March each financial year. Those are the people that are qualifying. Then we go through that list and we eliminate others. Not all people will qualify in terms of meeting the one year tenure requirement. Okay, for example, a person has been appointed in 1 July 2017 so comes 31 March 2018, that person will not qualify because they didn't serve the tenure requirements. Do you know all these requirements?

Interviewer: No

Respondent 3: *Okay, that one off….*

Interviewer: So, my I come in…..still in on that point where you are saying a person qualifying for a certain period, having served a certain period. Is it on a permanent basis or a contract, are the contract workers also included in that?

Respondent 3: *You see we've got three types of contract employees. There what I call in HRM language, Code 17 appointments and Code 31 appointments. What it means is if you look at the Office of the MEC [okay] all those people are appointed on contract, but they are appointed on contract within a specific post. That is 05 appointment, they are included. All the other contract workers [okay] they are not appointed within a specific post. They are not carried within a specific post. They are excluded. So when we budget for a post and there is a contract worker in a post, they will qualify. So that's what then we do, we start capturing information....eer...there's certain percentages, certain levels qualify for certain percentage of performance bonus and stuff. It's not the same percentage across all levels. The higher the level the smaller the percentage. Okay that takes a lot of time hey, but eventually we submit to the MEC, who is the approving authority. After it comes back we submit that information to e-Government to process payment on PERSAL.*

Interviewer: Okay you talking about payments now like, still on that [okay]. I just want know what is the criteria used to determine that this is the performing employee or they deserve recognition or something?

Respondent 3: *Okay, that is not done by us. That is done by each supervisor within the Department and measured against your contract. You see one of the shortcomings…..maybe you [going to] ask that question later. Is there question like that?*

Interviewer: Challenges?

Respondent 3: *Okay if we come to that question we just going to refer back to this one. Challenges definitely are that people do not contract correctly. They don't know what constitutes a three, what constitutes a four or a five for that matter. So what we are doing [okay], I am saying in my performance contract, for example, I am responsible for managing the PMDS system within GDARD. "Managing" I am not supposed to capture, I am not supposed to do the memo etcetera. Okay for me what constitutes a four for example is if [the Admin Officer] for some other reason cannot capture, I capture 30 percentage of all the reviews that a four for me. If a capture 80% that's a five for me. So upfront we know. The challenge is that people don't know what is a three and what is a four or even a five. So comes year end you find supervisor that don't want to be bad people. And then allocate people fours because they don't want any conflict the sense of applying the criteria. But a three means you are doing what you are supposed to do throughout the financial year. Four is if you have exceeded and five is obviously even better still.*

Interviewer: And then a five is you have exceeded…..is?

Respondent 3: *I can't remember what is written. It is very effective and outstanding or something.*

Interviewer: Eem…What measures are undertaken to assist an employee who is not performing very well?

Respondent 3: *According to…according to the policy [okay] if a person is rated a two there should be a personal development plan attached to that assessment. Now the personal development plan don't confuse it with indicative training [okay]. A personal development plan is also indicating: this is the shortcoming of the individual, there was a two rating let's say on Project Management. This person didn't meet target and so on. One of the things to correct that performance is to send this person on the Project Management Course. Okay on top of the indicative training, on a personal development training that is what supposed to happen, but no one come up with a personal development plan.*

Interviewer: When you are saying one you mean Directorates are not coming up or is it your responsibility as HRD?

Respondent 3: *No. It's not HRD responsibility. We cannot identify the training need for individuals. They can consult with us, but we cannot do it on our own. It is the responsibility of the manager and the individual. Because it is called man….what is that word? Not necessarily co-functions its co-business. We not always hundred per cent sure what people are doing. So it is the individual and the manager that should come up with the personal development plan. That obviously goes hand in with the indicative training.*

Interviewer: So the employee and manager are responsible for that. Now I'm coming to the training programs. What training program have you implemented to ensure that managers and employees knowledgeable about PMDS? Like you indicted earlier that people are not quite familiar whit the threes and fours. What measures are you implementing, any program to ensure that people really understand what they are doing when it comes to PMDS?

Respondent 3: *Okay, eer….you know my colleague is responsible for development in training, skills development. I am focusing on PMDS, even though I am focusing on PMDS they are providing training on PMDS. Okay …can we mention names…No you can't mention name.*

Interviewer: I am not going to write people's names. I am just going to say "My Colleague"

Respondent 3: *No but [my colleague] is responsible for skills development. I am focusing on PMDS, learnership, internships, internal and external bursaries those are my programs. So what is happening….eer…. at induction….all employees are inducted. I think PMDS is one day training during the induction. So there people get familiarised with PMDS. They are told during induction that they need to enter into performance agreement, they need to enter to the work plan and they need to do their job description. Okay, normally the job description would be there. Which is more generic your work plan focusing on a specific financial year. So they need to sign, enter into those things and sign them. Alright that's one, then…when there were staff meetings previously in the Department and there is a need to talk about PMDS we would do it there. But then we also have the arrangements if, for example, in your Unit there is a need that they should come and provide training irrespective of what topic on PMDS, how to contract; how to do whatever. Then on an ad hoc basis they also go and assist you. They either set up a specific meeting for that or they address people during their Component*

meetings. So [yes] that how is done. And obviously the supervisors are familiar with this process, so at any time they have questions and they don't know what to do, they can approach us.

Interviewer: What kind of grievances to often receive from employees after the PMDS assessment?

Respondent 3: *Okay the type of grievances….most of the grievances relates to mandate ratings. Where I agree with my supervisor my rating for example ….it's an old generic. What is this thing called? One to eleven or whatever I can't remember. But then also on the specific outputs, let's say my overall rating is a four. But let me more specific, if I think for example my rating on PMDS constitutes a five and I agree with my manager. Obviously I have to attach portfolio of evidence. Now if the next, the Chief Director he is responsible for PMDS quality checks and stuff there, decided the portfolio of evidence that I submitted does not constitute a five [okay] it should be referred back. Now what some of the managers are doing, they just change the ratings without having a discussion. If a manager doesn't come and have a discussion with me it's wrong. He should come and have a discussion. And the indicate to me the panel or the chairperson is not okay with rating of five with this type of POEs that you submitted, they need more motivation. Now in the absence of me not….if I can't submit additional motivation obviously then this rating need to b change. And I need to accept it, because they will also look at what was contracted and what constitutes a four and what constitutes a five. So some of the managers [okay] they don't talk to people and say no lets change the ratings. Now remember I am still under the impression my overall rating is a four. Now when it comes to the final outcome now my rating is now reduced without my knowledge, that's where most of the grievances comes from. Its feedback to employees*

Interviewer: Lack of feedback communication

Respondent 3: *Lack of feedback*

Interviewer: And then as HRD what measures are you implementing to addresses these grievances?

Respondent 3: *The grievances are dealt with by Labour Relations Unit, but what we are doing [okay] we a part. HRD forms part of the Quality Assurance Sessions. We are not only fulfilling a secretariat function we are there to give advice also. And then Labour is also involved even though they are just observers, but they…they are there to ensure that he process in transparent. So what we put in* place. *There is a process map, I am sure you have seen it. You can have it if you want it.*

Interviewer: I don't have it, I only have policy

Respondent 3: *It's on the intranet, it should be on the intranet. I will give you a copy.*

Interviewer: Okay we have covered the challenges already….

Respondent 3: *I want to add more challenges*

Interviewer: Okay let's talk about the challenges.

Respondent 3: *Challenges for me as the implementer of this PMDS is when people do not meet deadlines. You will see in the process map [okay] there is a corrective measure. If I for example does not my assessment for my staff members timeously, quarter one there is verbal warning, quarter two quarter three it goes up to a written warning. Now that thing never gets implemented within the Department. And I was saying to my managers [okay] I will institute that I will even go so far to draft all these written warnings from home. Because there is no…..there is no corrective measures if people miss their deadlines. My job is not to follow up three four five times. Where is your assessment….where. Every quarter I send out a reminder, remember you must submit your assessments for your Units of this day. Now I come back that is gone…I get instructions from my managers send out another circular. No I am refusing these days because I said I have done it. Take action against those people who do not submit, instead of me reminding them to submit. Because we can't send out two three reminders in a quarter it is unacceptable.*

Interviewer: So I didn't get the part on warnings. Meaning warnings for the different Directorates or?

Respondent 3: What I was saying [okay] if I am not doing the assessment of my Unit on time then action should be taken against me. Because I cannot be late every quarter

Interviewer: Okay now I understand.

Respondent 3: *So if you miss quarter one it's still fine, but if it becomes a tendency of me submitting late every quarter then action should be taken against me. Give a written warning. That's what I want. It's challenges; because people see no even if I don't comply nothing is [going to] happen to me. Don't worry PMDS is not one of my core responsibilities it can be sacrificed.*

Interviewer: So we have come to the last question. What else would you like to share about PMDS that you think we might have not touch on and it very important?

Respondent 3: *Eer…we touched on contracting, we touched on….I can't think of anything else. Eer…okay maybe this of. [Eih maan] you see this thing is supposed be objective but. My view is that*

irrespective of what system you have in place [okay] if a person wants to be subjective you will do it. You will be subjective. Let me give you an example, I told you about my contract that says I need capture 50% for example. Now I've seen it this year again whereby managers go and evaluate their staff members [okay]. They've got registers…..I can't, let me be more specific. Let me give an example on you know this EIAs?

Interviewer: Yes I have heard about them

Respondent 3: *There are legislated time frames and then there is Departmental time frames. Now they say for three it should be done within twenty days, for four it should be done within fifteen day, for five it should be done within seven days, for example. Now the manager now knows when looking at the registers they can see that this person didn't meet most of the deadline, but still the managers is providing….is giving a four. Which is unacceptable, completely unacceptable. So that why I am saying if you want to be subjective and disciplinary action should also be taken against those managers. It should be, really the people who deserve the bonus should must get the bonus, not he others. You know this, what you call the normal distribution curve. You find a normal distribution curve which some people are say 10% or 15% is underperforming, 50 % is over…. And then what is left 70% are performing on a three rating. If you look at …at most of the Department in Gauteng will find that the process is skewed meaning 60% of the people are performing above average and no one performing under average and now the 40% is. If you look at the performance of the Department as whole you will meets most of the targets. So the individual performance doesn't link up to the performance of the Department. That what I can add on this one.*

Interviewer: We have come to the end of our interview. Thank you so much for participation in this regard.

Respondent 3: *It's been a pleasure.*

Appendix 1.5: Matrix Table for Data Fragmentation

Data fragmentation: assessing the implementation of the performance management and the development system in the Gauteng Department of Agriculture and Rural Development															
Themes	**Respondent 1**	**Respondent 2**	**Respondent 3**	**Respondent 4**	**Respondent 5**	**Respondent 6**	**Respondent 7**	**Respondent 8**	**Respondent 9**	**Respondent 10**	**Respondent 11**	**Respondent 12**	**Similarities**	**Differences**	**Reconciled View**
Empoyees' knoweledge and understanding															
Performance management and development system	PMDS was introduced to me as a tool to measure my performance	It was not properly introduced.	the monitoring of performance of individuals and also that of the organisation,	system which the government uses to actually try and track in terms of	It is also to ensure that wherever they are lacking they develop in those areas	PMDS is like a work evaluation, where you are being measured	a tool that is used in government to measure the performance indicators,	I understand is a tool that assist you to gage your performance	I believe is…..your performance ratings of how well have you been doing in your job	To remedy ill behaviour when it comes to employees,	seeks to evaluate whether an employee…. a government employee is performing	Is to manage individual performance in order to see whether	Most employees are know what is pmds and what it seek to achieve		There is general knowelege of PMDS amongst all employees
PMDS policy	haven't read the policy	No that I know off	I was actually drafting the policy when I was still in the Premiers Office	Policy wise No		I don't even know where to get it	Yes….did read the policy,	I haven't	: I haven't read the policy	I've read the policy initially when it was introduced to me	Eer…I just read it and…..		Majority of the employees in GDARD have not read the policy	Only a minority (three respondent have read the policy	The culture of reading and understading policies in inadequate
Contracting process	Goals are assigned to me according to the work plan.	You just get a contract sign here, be it you [try] to challenge it.	Challenges definitely is that people does not contract correctly.	we just…eer… go to the intranet get a copy for that specific salary level and fill in your details	And if the contracting from the onset is not straight,	we have to sign the new contract and the work plan.	so that you have the agreement with employee also with the supervisors	…..you are more or less told…..in terms of what you are supposed to being doing	between me and my…immediate supervisor, we'll agree on what is my duties.	then we agree on…we agree on what is expected from the officials	when you are given a job description each item is then put into a contract to say you will be measured,		Employees get to sign the performance contract in line with their job description	For some employees is its not negotiated, employees are told what do to, others are just given a contract to sign	There is a communication breakdown when implementing the process. The process is implemented incorrecctly
PMDS training/workshorp	Since I have joined the Department there was never training for	I have never even received an invite for PMDS training	provide training irrespective of what topic on PMDS,	I got to understand what the Department wants us to do	induction our facilitator from HRD would come and do a presentation	Two years back I attended the refresher training.		I have just attended one training…eeer	Shocking I have never been to any PMDS training	I have only attended once or twice since I joined the Department	I think I only attended once, but then when the PMDS	the PMDS workshops at the induction	Some employees have attended the training when they joined	A few minority do not remember going to a pMDS training	PMDS training are not happening as reguarly as possible

	PMDS				on PMDS								the Department		
Benefits of the system															
Skills Development	if I need to excel on something and I do struggle, I do go for training	There is no support that we are getting from the managers		Well…eem…. in terms of the development, they do offer support when I have to go for training	We have different types of trainings within the HRD unit where you can send in your name	senior managers will reject say no you can't do this course and this course.	because since I have arrived here I have already attended more than four courses.	Nothing, that why I am saying. I don't get any support	you will never get a chance to attend those training.	Currently personally I don't get support, because when I applied for a busary	Sometimes you will get support to go and do a course, like I wanted to do video editing		four employees out of nine who were interviewed are of the view that they are getting enough support	five employees were of the view that they are not gettinh enough support for training	There is not enough support from HRD and managers in terms of attending training. This should be improved
Performance bonus	Normally we if you have worked beyond what was contracted eer…then you do get something	People got bonuses, and those that are working they don't get a bonus here at GDARD	It should be, really the people who deserve the bonus should must get the bonus, not the others	recognition is the Department acknowledging that as an official I managed to achieve and go above	Performance bonus, if you perform you get a four and then you the a performance bonus.	They can tell now the score is reduced, the scores changed	Remember if you have performed four upwards, there is money that you need get, R1500…	They even…..they even make a sarcasm , according to me, to say if you get a four it means you are walking on water	because when say here I have done this and it was extra mile. You are told no that was part of your job.	Like I am saying since I've joined the Department I've never received bonus	I have been getting my bonuses almost consistently, and the work from the ground shows.		The scores get reduced; employees cant get a four because they were doing the jobs; bonuses are received by a few	Minority a contend with receiving their bonuses consistently	The scoring and awarding of performance bonuses is not executed fairly
Recognition	[Because] always when I do my PMDS I always get a good feedback from my supervisor. So that…it kind of encourage you to work harder	no one will recognise that today at least you have went an extra mile with your work, no forget.		It was frustrating, it was demoralising, and it was like I am not being recognised	Which they issue for if you have been in the Public Service for more than 10 years.	You don't get the promotion, unless if you have to apply and go through the proces		We are not recognised for what ever good work you are doing	There is no recognition, and it kills your morale if you don't get it	But for that you never get the recognition			employees are not given enough recoognition for the work they are doing		Not being recognised demotivates employees to better their performance
Poor performance	I remember	at Facilities	A personal	I have never	we have	Fortunately I	I have never	I've never, I		Unfortunately			Majority of	there is a	Another

managed	while I was on my maternity leave, my performance was not good [because] I was away	we are regarded as poor performers, but measures are not taken to improve that	development plan is also indicating: this is the shortcoming of the individual	been recognised as a poor performer	something which is called Personal Development Plan…is also called a PDP	have never experience that to say maybe I didn't perform	been regarded as a poor performer	ve never been		not			the respondent were never regarded as non-performers	particular employees who was a non-performer because she was on maternity leave	emplyee alluded that non-performance can also be due insufficient tools of trade
Challenges on the implementation of the system															
Feedback communication	Normally the feedback from my supervisor is always positive, [because] she would always say keep up the good work. You are doing very well.	You just given letters to say no you dint qualify for a bonus, you qualify for a notch, and then that's it	my rating is now reduced without my knowledge, that's where most of the grievances comes from. It's feedback to employees	It's coming as I don't agree with what you are saying change it or say something else or	And then now the manager would be advised go back to the employee	They can tell now the score is reduced, the scores changed		As I have said, they do communicate but it is always one sided	That's the other thing; they don't really get back to us with feedback	We get feedback from HR telling us you qualify or you didn't qualify	Emails, phone calls good job what… what. I also do the same to people who report to me.	If it is the lack of feedback then a lot of then them we suggest that action be taken against those managers f	Managers ar failing to communicte feedback properly to their employees	Two employees said feedback is communicated properly to them	managers are failing to communicate; HRD has also confirmed that issues
Implementation				done like that to also try and comply with the fact that the Department says at this particular date	some people implementing it incorrectly	for final assessment the supervisor don't follow what they…maybe		But the way is being implemented it ends up being on the negative not on the positive.	They don't really consult, once its done its done, its signed,its filed , has gone to HR	Eer…for me it's flawed	must not be abused like to settle scores and to say now I have a way of fixing this employee.				Most employees are of the view that there is a problem regarding the implementation of the system
Relationship		though the relationship between me and my supervisor is not healthy.	The challenge is that people don't know what is a three and what is a four	Well in relation to that I would say…the relationship is…..its not		Eeer…the relationship between me and manager is good	The relationship is good, we don't have anything that is not good	So I think in a nutshell it means that the relationship is one sided, is	Its….we agree…there is no	my boss tells me that eer… for you to get a four you must be over this			the relationships between employees and their manager	Only a minority felt like they are having a good relationship with their	the relationship between managers and employees is cockeyed

			or even a five.	necessarily there			between us	not two sided.					regardinpmds is not necessarily good	manager	
Punishment						I never received anything related to punishment			No, I would be lying	Eem….I would say I want acted in a position and it was not given to me, for me that was a punishmen	Ooh No				Employees in this Department have never experienced punishment
PMDS as a tool															
Improve or Punish	For me I think it's a tool to encourage us to work more	No it's a tool to punish employee,		Eem…it's a tool designed to improve a performance, hence		Yah, so to me I don't see it as something that can improve me	No I think is a tool for performance,		A tool to improve, because its rating you, s	It's a tool to improve performance if it is done correctly	No its eer… clearly a tool to improve performance,		Most employees view pmds as tool to improve performance	One employee alluded that managers a using it to settle scores	PMDS is defiantely a tool to improve the employee and organistional performance, however it is utilised badly in some instances
The roles of Human Resource Development															
Create awareness			Okay so where the was a business plan for the Department and is going down to the individual level		It is really to create a learning culture and to assess to employees….										
Develop employees					We have different types of										

					trainings within the HRD unit where you can send in your name and say you [want to] go for….for example										
Quality check			Then what we do is we do a quality check on the document itself to see whether anything is missing		If the…the rating is right… you know… the is the quality check I do										
Quality assurance/ Moderation session					So what happens is that we would look at the rating, this is a four…then the manager of that particular employee would come in…							So the Chief Director has that responsibility of overall quality assurance before it comes to us on a quarterly basis			
Award bonuses			certain levels qualify for certain percentage of performance bonus and stuff		Performance bonus, if you perform you get a four and then you the a performance bonus							where if you are rated certain level you qualify for certain monetory rewards	For a certain level you qaulify for a bonus		When an employee gets a rating of a four aand above they qualify for a performance bonus

Management of poor performance			According to…according to the policy [okay] if a person is rated a two there should be a personal development plan attached to that assessment												
Presentation of performance															
PMDS Challenges of the system															
Grievances			most of the grievances relates to mandate ratings		Where an employee has agreed with the manager that the rating is a four							they lodge the grievances and the a lot of the time is a lack of feedback	grievances on ratings		The rating of scores is serious challenge
Non compliance			Challenges for me as the implementers of this PMDS is when people do not meet deadlines.												