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Abstract

This study determined that the availability of capacity to implement Results Based Management (RBM) is a major determinant of the success or failure of the strategy. The purpose of the study was to investigate the main factors that impacted on the implementation of the RBM strategy in the Zimbabwe Public Service. Over the past three decades, the principle of RBM has been adopted by many Governments and public organizations worldwide to improve the implementation of national programmes. In Zimbabwe, the strategy was introduced in 2005 with the expectation that there would be improvement in the Public Service delivery and subsequently the lives of all stakeholders within the delivery system. However, the results, like in many other countries, had not been realized as expected. The study sought to understand the factors that affected the implementation of the strategy from the perspective of individual managers in the Zimbabwe Public Service, to determine whether or not the implementation process could help to explain the limited impact of the strategy. Limited research had been done to explore the experiences of individuals in the implementation of Public sector reforms. Understanding the experiences of Civil Servants regarding RBM could help to identify strategies to improve implementation and hence increased impact of the management strategy. Such understanding can also provide insight into the formulation of future initiatives for the implementation of other national programmes. It is expected that this study will contribute towards providing the Zimbabwe Public Service, and possibly other organizations, with suggestions on how they can improve their service to stakeholders. The study used both secondary and primary data. The secondary data was obtained through extensive study of relevant literature while the primary data was obtained from an exploratory study that comprised purposive and snowball sampling of middle and top managers from Head Offices of government institutions. Semi-structured open ended questions were asked to 32 managers to explore their experiences and challenges in the implementation of RBM. Content analysis of the original transcripts was employed to identify emergent themes. A number of key findings emerged from this study including the inadequacy of
skills, information, attitude as well as financial resources to effectively implement RBM. In the case of financial resources, the inadequacy was reportedly in terms of both timing and quantity. Also, there was inadequate performance by managers in both the planning and performance measurement functions which are the core components of RBM. The main conclusion drawn from this research is that managers, particularly those within the line Ministries, were implementing the strategy without the requisite capacity to allow for the realization of the benefits of RBM. This study argues for a results based capacity building model to effectively equip managers with the required capacity. That is, a model that focuses on results emphasizes full participation of stakeholders in the identification of knowledge needs, formulation of strategies, monitoring and evaluation of these strategies. Such monitoring and evaluation includes the review and adjustment of the related systems as well as the incorporation of learning and information sharing throughout the process.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background to the Study

The advent of globalization and the ensuing competition has brought about growing pressures on governments and organizations around the world to respond more effectively to the growing demands from a growing number of stakeholders. Such demands include that for good governance, accountability, transparency, greater development effectiveness and delivery of tangible results (Kusek and Rist, 2001). That is, stakeholders are demanding more attention as well as expecting improved public service performance and quality services delivery and also the determination of related service delivery priorities (Welch et al, 2005). In the past, public administration focused on managing the inputs and processes under set rules and regulations (Ibid). To address these challenges, Governments have engaged in numerous reforms and initiatives that drive public services towards results-orientation and citizen focus, with emphasis on strategic and business planning (OECD, 2002; Pollitt and Bouckaert, 2000). One such initiative was the adoption of Results Based Management (RBM) by the Government of Zimbabwe (GoZ) in 2005.

Results-based management is a public sector management strategy aimed at improving performance management with a central focus on performance results (outcome and impact) (RBMG, 2003; OECD, 2000). Its essentials include the definition of the organisation’s mission and strategic objectives, identification of clear target outputs and outcomes to meet these objectives. The approach has been tested and was regarded as an authentic tool for improving the quality of public services (Uganda, 2007). Success stories of marked improvements in public service delivery through the implementation of RBM have been recorded in several countries including Canada, the United States, South Africa, Botswana, Malaysia, Kenya, Mauritius, Rwanda, New Zealand and Singapore (Thomas, 2006). However, public services in most countries are widely perceived to be
unsatisfactory and deteriorating despite such considerable investment to improve their capacity (Shadrach and Lilian 2003).

The reason for introducing the strategy in Zimbabwe was to improve the quality of the Public Service as well as enhancing efficiency, effectiveness and accountability (OPC, 2012). However, the impact of the strategy appeared to be rather limited. The research was motivated by the researcher’s long term experience, both as a practitioner and consultant, in the implementation of RBM within Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) where the strategy appeared to be making an impact. The apparent difference in the effectiveness of the strategy, between the NGOs and Public Service, generated interest to investigate the implementation in the Public Service in Zimbabwe.

1.2. Statement of the Problem

Since its adoption by the Public Service in 2005, RBM had apparently not made an impact on the quality of the public services in Zimbabwe as the majority of stakeholders continued to express dissatisfaction with them. This was despite the fact that the Government had always reiterated its full commitment to the implementation of the RBM strategy (Chief Secretary to the President and Cabinet, 2011) with a substantial quantity of resources committed to the programme. That is, the outcome of the implementation of RBM by the Zimbabwe Public Service was, generally, not encouraging according to the majority of stakeholders. RBM has to be translated into improved programming and service delivery for the end users in order to meet its expectations and render justice to the investments deployed in it (UNJIU, 2004:2). The research is purposed to study the implementation of RBM in the Zimbabwe Public Service.

1.3. Purpose of the study.
This study sought to investigate the factors that influenced the implementation of RBM in the Zimbabwe Public Service in order to assess the practicalities of implementation with a view to providing recommendations for improvement. It also aimed at contributing evidence to the discussion on the implementation of RBM from the perspective of individual managers as well as making recommendations for improving the process. Data on the experiences of individual managers in the Zimbabwe Public Service, who were involved in the implementation of RBM since 2005 when the strategy was introduced, was provided. Added to the data collected from earlier studies elsewhere, though limited from the individual perspective, it was expected that this study would enhance the availability of data for analysis of the implementation of RBM globally. It is also hoped that the study could draw more attention to the need to assist stakeholders in the Zimbabwe Public Service in the implementation of RBM.

An earlier review of RBM in Zimbabwe by the government and the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) noted very low familiarity with the concept among some members of the management team (UNDP, 2006). Against this background the study assessed the situation as regards the level of knowledge among Civil Servants again with a view to providing recommendations for improvement.

1.4. Objectives of the study.

The objectives of the study were to:

- Investigate the factors affecting the implementation of RBM in the Zimbabwe Public Service. Specifically, it aimed at exploring the experiences of individual managers in the implementation of the strategy.
- Recommend a model for improving the implementation of RBM in the Zimbabwe Public Service.
1.5. **The Research Question**

To achieve the above-mentioned objectives, the following question was addressed:

What have been the main factors affecting the implementation of RBM in the Zimbabwe Public Service?

1.6. **Assumptions of the study.**

The study started with the assumption that Civil Servants had the responsibility to implement RBM when they did not have the necessary capacity to ensure the expected outcome. Secondly, the study assumed that implementation of RBM in the Zimbabwe Public Service was to continue as planned. Lastly, it was also assumed that the group of managers selected to participate in the study was a representative of the population considered in the study.

1.7. **Significance of the study.**

The study was seen as important in that the knowledge and understanding of the factors impacting on the implementation of RBM would help policy makers in reviewing the entire implementation process and improve on it. Also, RBM is a relatively new concept and needs further exploration. Findings from the study are expected to contribute to the body of knowledge on RBM implementation specifically in Zimbabwe and most likely Africa, as well as globally. Also, substantive resources had reportedly been channelled towards the implementation of the programme such that improving its effectiveness would help to justify such investment.

The effects of Public Service delivery are widespread and thus enhancing their quality is essential since it affects the standard of living within nations as well as globally. Also, the relationship between the Public Service and its stakeholders is involuntary in most cases because the services
involved are not available anywhere else. Therefore, the study is expected to contribute positively to the general improvement of the implementation of RBM and subsequently the quality of life in Zimbabwe.

1.8. Delimitation of the study.

The population involved in this study focused only on managers of entities within the Zimbabwe Public Service based at the Headquarters in Harare. Managers in other locations as well as other civil servants were excluded. The exclusion was due to the very large number of Civil Servants. Also, key informants advised that this group of managers was the most knowledgeable on RBM and therefore most likely to provide quality data for the study. Also, RBM is a relatively new concept and this impacted on the amount of information available for the study.

1.9. Limitations of the study.

The body of knowledge on RBM, particularly in Zimbabwe and from the individual perspective was not well developed which justified the exploratory design of this study. Consequently new issues emerged which need to be addressed through further research (Yin, 2003). Also, it was noted that, against the background of marked reluctance by managers to participate in this study, it is possible that the study failed to identify all relevant or critical factors affecting the implementation of RBM in the Zimbabwe Public Service.

Due to the limitations of a thesis where there is need to de-limit the area of research, other stakeholders, including lower level staff, citizens and politicians were excluded. These groups would most likely have different views based on issues such as their expectations and experience which may have led to different findings, had they been included.
There are also the usual limitations inherent in research methods especially the use of a sample comprising 32 individuals who may not necessarily reflect the views of all the managers. Again as with all research methods, the generalization of findings is made with caution, considering the diversity of the Public Service where roles of stakeholders and politics influence viewpoints and behaviour (Ibid). Further research, as recommended in Chapter 7 can assist in addressing these limitations.

1.10. Review of Related Literature.

Literature on studies regarding the implementation of RBM in organizations and other countries was reviewed to obtain information on experiences as well as identify gaps in knowledge. The experiences reviewed also helped to guide the choice of methodology for this study. The studies considered were conducted by, among others, the Auditor General of Canada, the Organisation of Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), Overseas Development Institute (ODI), Schacter and Clark and Swain. According to Kusek & Rist (2001) and ODI (2003), most of the challenges identified by research could be addressed by ensuring the existence of appropriate organisational structures, political commitment and strong leadership as well as providing the necessary resources, among other solutions.

1.10.1 Gaps in knowledge

The implementation of RBM is a recent and significant departure from preceding principles of programme management, making it a fairly new concept. Relevant literature was, therefore, still relatively limited. Also, this limited literature mostly comprised theoretical and historical assessments of public sector reforms and was restricted to processes only. Research on issues relating to individuals appeared to be missing. The Auditor General of Canada (1996) stressed that the RBM system should be tailored towards the needs and situation that is unique to the users. A
study of the implementation in Zimbabwe would facilitate a deeper understanding of the unique factors affecting the implementation in the Zimbabwe Public Service.

1.11. **Research methodology and design.**

For this study the interpretivist paradigm and an exploratory design were selected. The related strategies comprised semi-structured interviews, conducted by the researcher, and a review of related literature. For the interviews, a sample of 32 middle and senior Public Service managers, from the Ministry head offices, was selected through a combination of purposive and snowball sampling methods. Semi-structured and open-ended questions relating to experiences in the implementation of RBM were put forward to the interviewees. Documentation for the literature review included print and electronic reports, minutes of review meetings and also policies and guidelines on RBM.

Data verification methods included triangulation, participant check as well as expert review. During the interviews, data was recorded on disk and iPad. A text file for each transcript was then created in a Microsoft Word computer program and analysed for content.

The findings were presented in narrative form with quotations referenced to the transcript code as necessary. Finally, the findings were discussed in relation to the research questions and literature and conclusions were drawn. Recommendations were made for improvement as well as for further research.

1.12. **Ethical and legal considerations.**

Permission to conduct the research was sought and obtained from the Zimbabwe Public Service Commission. The researcher personally communicated the request to managers for participation and the managers had the option to decline. The researcher personally safeguarded the data to avoid loss
as well as ensure confidentiality. Also, every effort was made to conceal the identity of respondents. For instance, names and titles have been deliberately concealed in this thesis where it was determined that they would be revealing. Assurance was provided to the managers that the research was genuine and participation would not have any negative effects on them. Risk was also minimized as the interviewees were selected on the basis of their willingness to participate.

1.13. Organization of the study Organization of the study and budgetary plans
This thesis comprises seven chapters. Chapter 1 is an introduction to the study and sets the context including the background, statement of the question to be answered by this thesis as well as explanations of choices made in the study. Chapter 2 reviews the literature from academic sources and other documents such as reports, minutes of review meetings, documented policies and guidelines as well as contributions from studies, with particular reference to the implementation of RBM. Chapter 3 provides an overview of the methodology and methods used in conducting the research with a focus on semi-structured in-depth interviews as well as document review. Chapter 4 presents the findings of the analysis of data collected from the interviews, in line with the research question. Chapter 5 provides a discussion on the findings in relation to existing literature. Chapter 6 provides assessments of the capacity to implement RBM as well as the institutionalization of the strategy in the Zimbabwe Public Service. A suggested model for improving the implementation is developed. Chapter 7 concludes the thesis by providing a summary of the thesis, responses to the research question, and recommendations for improving the implementation of RBM in the Zimbabwe Public Service. It also provides suggestions for potential research in future. Following these main chapters are references and appendices.

The budget and action plan for the study are shown in tables 1 and 2 below.
Table 1 - Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cost ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>1,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Budget</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,500</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Equipment includes an IC recorder, iPad and printer, supplies cover expenses for printing, copying, postage while communication comprises email and phone calls.

Table 2 - Action plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Time Frame (months)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Literature review</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mapping the fieldwork</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collection of data and transcription</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coding, analysis and production of the first draft</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production of final draft</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>24</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.14 Definition of special terms

The study focussed on the definition of key concepts which included the terms implementation, the compound name Results Based Management and the Public Service. The definition of RBM will be expanded on in the chapter on the review of related literature. Other concepts were defined in the context in which they occurred. The term implementation was used, as defined by the Oxford dictionary, to mean the process of putting a program into effect or execution.

Results Based Management

Results Based Management (RBM), the master concept was used, as defined by Aucoin (2000) to mean a participatory and team-based management strategy through which all actors ensure that they contribute to the achievement of desired results focussing on outcome and impact.

Public Service

The term Public Service, in general, was used in the context in which it was used by (Mulikita, 2007:6) to mean the implementation mechanism of the State charged with translating the socio-economic vision of the State into tangible social and economic development for citizens. That is, to improve the standard of living for the citizens. In the Zimbabwean context, the term Public Service was used as defined by the Constitution of Zimbabwe (2007) where it consists of people who work for the State excluding members of the defence forces, the police service or the prison service, judges and anyone else whose office or post is stated by the Constitution or an Act of Parliament, not to form part of the Public Service. The terms Civil and Public service are used by most authors with the same meaning and this is also how they are used within the context of this study.
1.15. Chapter summary

The study applied research methodologies to explore the experiences of managers in the implementation of Results-Based Management (RBM) in the Zimbabwe Public Service. The research investigated the factors that were impacting on the implementation process including identification of major challenges, from the perspective of individual managers. The capacity to implement RBM as well as the level of institutionalization of the RBM in the Zimbabwe Public Service was assessed using models from literature. A suggested model to improve the implementation of RBM was developed on the basis of the assessment and literature. Recommendations for improvement as well as potential research areas were also offered.
CHAPTER 2
REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

2.1. Introduction
This chapter seeks to demonstrate the rationale for this study as well as put RBM into context in relation to earlier works by other researchers. It also identifies gaps in knowledge regarding the implementation of RBM, expected to be filled in part by this study.

2.2. Theoretical /Conceptual framework
According to literature, there are human and organizational factors that impact on the implementation of RBM (Auditor General of Canada, 1996; Wachira, 2013) and thus significantly influencing the effectiveness of implementing the strategy. Evidence to support this theory was gathered from the perspective of organizations while the perspective of individuals appeared to be missing.

In the year 2011, a civil servant in Zimbabwe remarked, on a professional online discussion forum, that he was responsible for implementing RBM when he did understand the concept which had been implemented since 2005. This study started on the assumption that this shortcoming was prevalent in the Zimbabwe Public Service. It then also sought to investigate the validity of the assumption as well as identify other factors that were impacting on the implementation of RBM from the perspective of individual civil servants in the Zimbabwe Public Service.

2.3. Rationale for the study
Findings from the study were expected influence policy on the implementation of RBM in the Zimbabwe Public Service as well as possibly assist in the formulation of other national strategies in future. The use of findings from the study was likely to improve the implementation process and subsequently the quality of service delivery. Such improvement would lead to improved standard of living for all stakeholders in the Zimbabwe Public service delivery system.

According to Kusek et al (2001) each country is unique in its socio-cultural and political context as it relates to the implementation of RBM. As the study was to explore factors that were unique to the environment within which the Zimbabwe Public Service was implementing RBM, it was expected to bring new information. The findings could be useful to improve the process by combining and/or adapting experiences from other countries and organizations particularly those in Africa where the environments have similarities.

RBM is also fast becoming a universal concept gaining relevance in all sectors including the private entities by way of demands for social responsibility. The findings were, therefore, expected to give insight into the education curriculum regarding the point at which to introduce the concept in educational institutions. In the Zimbabwe Public Service, the concept was reportedly introduced to staff already in the service or at the entry level on recruitment. Introducing RBM earlier could make a difference in the implementation of the strategy.

2.4. Management

Management is rather difficult to define. According to Drucker (1954) management is a core business activity while Hood (1991) identifies it as a doctrine and others regard it as an ideology (Pollit, 1990). However, it is generally defined as the process or series of activities that give an organization direction to utilise its resources towards the achievement of objectives as efficiently and
effectively as possible in its environment. According to Henri Fayol’s functional management theory, the fundamental activities include planning, organizing, leading and controlling (Smit and Cronje, 1992). To this list Jones and George (2000) add motivation which is identified as psychological forces that determine the direction of a person's behaviour in an organization, level of effort and persistence or the ability to energize and direct behaviour towards a goal. It is also the inspiration and reason that an individual performs a task or makes a decision (Baron, 1992 and Schunk, 1990). It is through these functions that both private and public organizations attain the objectives for which they are established. RBM is a part of the management science theory.

CAFRAD (2010) notes that public organizations, like their private counterparts, should be required, at regular intervals, to account for their activities with regards to their management techniques and strategies to facilitate the optimal fulfilment of their mandate. That is, the management of public institutions should focus on the need to meet targeted results. This is in line with an earlier assertion by Drucker (1993) and others that effective management is more important in non-profit organizations because they lack the discipline of a financial bottom line. However, private sector firms have clear central profit making objectives as well as other relatively straightforward objectives relating to employees and society while public sector organizations have to cope with complex objectives and a wider range of stakeholders with less control over policy, strategy and structures (Park, 1997). This places pressure on public organizations more than their private counterparts. RBM is meant to address these issues, including accountability, within the public sector (Ibid).

2.5. Public Sector Reforms

Over the past four decades, Governments worldwide have undertaken extensive public sector reforms in response to economic, social and political pressures (OECD, 2002). Such economic
pressures included the demands for accountability mentioned in section 2.4., budget deficits, structural problems, growing competitiveness and globalization. Also, “political and social factors that include a lack of confidence in governments by the public, growing demands for better and more responsive services, and better accountability for achieving results with taxpayers’ money” (Ibid:5).

The related Public Sector reforms have a single new management approach known by several names such as strategic management, performance based management, RBM, outcome management and New Public Management (NPM). The approach, regardless of the name used, has the same or very similar core components that emphasise strategic planning, results oriented objectives, performance measurement particularly outcomes and client focus (Osborne and Plastrik, 1997). One of the clearest embodiments of this approach was the United States of America’s Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) introduced in 1993. The reforms entail a shift in the focus of public sector management approaches from budgets, activities, process controls, and objectives to results and customer focus (Meier 2003). Consequently, an integrated approach to performance measurement emerged and has been adopted by many organizations including governments, Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) as well as private businesses. This integrated approach “ensures that performance measurement is brought together with the strategic planning and budgeting processes of an organization to support the alignment between its overall goals and the delivery of policies and programs to stakeholders” (AFB, 2009:2).

The attributes of NPM entail changes in the way business is conducted including management processes (Saldanha, 2002). Such attributes require the organization to be strategically focused on outcomes and impacts while emphasizing efficiency and effectiveness in all business processes. The enhancement of accountability and transparency in planning and budgeting is also considered vital (Ibid).
2.6. Results Based Management (RBM)

The concept of RBM became an integral part of the “New Public Management” (NPM) movement and was adopted by all OECD countries, as a matter of policy, by the mid-1990s (OECD, 2002). Several organizations and governments worldwide have also adopted the concept, in some cases with different definitions used. However, in essence, it is a participatory approach that entails the definition of the organization’s mission and strategic objectives; identification of clear target outputs and outcomes to meet these objectives as well as learning and improvement in performance (MacKenzie, 2008).

In the context of management, RBM is an evolution with origins stemming from the management sciences. It is closely linked to prior efforts of implementing the Management-By-Objectives (MBO) approach which was first outlined by Peter Drucker in his book “The Practice of Management” as well as Total Quality Management (TQM) (Meier, 2003). These concepts relating to earlier approaches focused on outputs without considering the details of implementation to obtain those outputs. An attempt to address this shortcoming was the introduction, in the 1970s, of a management and planning tool, the Logical Framework, in some cases referred to as the LogFrame. The framework, which included the cause-and-effect relationship among the elements of a logic model, evolved into the rudimentary versions of the RBM (Thomas, 2006).

The RBM strategy attempts to shift focus towards the attainment of actual results rather than mere outputs (Mayne 2007). OECD (2010) defines results as changes in a state or condition which derive from a cause-and-effect relationship. There are three types of such changes which can be set in motion by an intervention, namely output, outcome and impact. These terms are defined in the
context of the results chain in section 2.6.1. According to DANIDA (2011) RBM presents a management framework and tools for effective strategic planning, risk management, resource allocation, performance monitoring and evaluation.

The RBM system cascades from the top with organization-wide priorities, leading the process. According to Col et al (2006), each subordinate level defines anticipated results of its own work to contribute, in an aggregative manner, to the accomplishment of the higher level objectives for the organization as a whole. That is, at the end of an operational cycle, the results at the lowest level are aggregated to the next higher level, eventually leading upward to accomplishment of the system results. Also, the RBM strategy was determined to be one of the most useful tools to enhance the strategic utilisation of finite resources. Such a tool was needed to address growing pressure from an increased number of stakeholders for improved service delivery and growing competition (Ibid).

Also, according to Thomas (2006), if implemented properly, the concept can positively affect the quality of life through the improvement of public service delivery. This is because adopting the strategy in the Public Service creates close linkages between national policy and strategy with plans and budgets as well as monitoring and evaluation tools thus improving programme and service delivery (Saldanha, 2002). In this context, Public Service managers have a prime responsibility of establishing a foundation to support a strong commitment to results. This can be achieved through the definition of strategic outcomes, regular and objective measurement of performance as well as learning and adjusting to improve efficiency and effectiveness (Treasury Board of Canada Secretariat, 2001). However, successes in the implementation of RBM have been recorded in the development NGO sector and, to a limited extent, in the Public Service (Thomas, 2006).
2.6.1. **Components of RBM**

The RBM strategy comprises two key components namely planning and performance measurement (UNESCO, 2008). AFB (2009) adds learning as a third component while most organizations incorporate the learning aspect into performance measurement. This study will, generally, incorporate learning into the performance measurement and only isolate it where its emphasis is deemed to be necessary.

a) **Planning**

Planning involves the formulation of objectives (results), selection of indicators to measure progress towards each objective and setting of explicit targets for each indicator to judge performance. The results chain facilitates the operationalizing of the planning in RBM and shows the links between the inputs, activities (or processes), outputs, outcomes and impact (OECD, 2002). Monitoring and Evaluation forms an integral part of the implementation of RBM (Farrell, 2009). Elements of the results chain and their links are shown in figure 1 below.

**Figure 1: RBM Results chain**
Adopted from UNDP (2002:7)

The elements of the results chain are used in this study as defined in the OECD Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluation and Results Based Management (2010) to mean the following:

**Inputs**
The financial, human, and material resources used in an intervention to achieve the objectives of the organization.

**Activity**
Action(s) taken or work performed through which inputs, such as funds, technical assistance and other types of resources are mobilized to produce specific outputs.

**Output**
Includes the products, goods and services which result from an intervention.

**Outcome**
The likely or achieved short-term and medium-term effects of an intervention’s outputs.

**Impact**
Positive and negative, primary and secondary long-term effect(s) produced by an intervention, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended.

The results chain has proved to be very helpful in the development and identification of expected results, indicators and risks (Plantz et al, 1997). It also facilitates the conceptualization of programmes inputs, outputs and outcomes, verifying the logical consequences of cause and effect linkages as well as defining the levels of attribution for stakeholders whose familiarity with RBM is low (Meier, 1998).
b) Performance measurement

Performance measurement relates back to Fredrick Taylor’s principles of scientific management of the 20th century (Radin, 2006; Moynihan, 2008). The concept involves the regular collection of data on results, review and analysis, evaluation, reporting as well as use of resulting information (UNDP, 2002). It provides a framework for accountability in programmes under implementation as well as information that is essential for corrective action and replicating best practices (Col et al, 2006).

(i) Monitoring and Evaluation, Reporting and Learning

At the centre of RBM is the Results Based Monitoring and Evaluation (RBME), which is perceived to be a powerful management tool as it can help policy makers track progress and demonstrate the outcomes and impacts of a given policy, program or project (Kusek and Rist, 2001). That is, monitoring and evaluation can effectively contribute to the enhancement of accountability, stakeholder participation and good governance (Ibid). UNJIU (2004) adds that monitoring and evaluation informs key stakeholders on the progress achieved and the lessons learnt in a transparent, accountable and results-oriented manner for purposes of future policy development and decision-making.

Monitoring is a continuous process that generates information for decision making about a programme being implemented (OECD, 2010). The process provides an opportunity to reflect and learn from an activity or a series of them whether or not they are according to plan and if there is any need to adjust the plan. Evaluation is a more in-depth periodic assessment conducted in response to evolving needs for knowledge and learning. It focuses on the overall picture to determine progress towards expected results as well as efficiency and effectiveness (Ibid).
Reporting, also an integral part of M&E, is the systematic and timely provision of essential information at periodic intervals (UNDP, 2002). Closely related to M&E and reporting is learning. This is a continuous process of investigation, through a cycle of experience, feedback into decision making, programme design and strategy development (OECD, 2010). That means appropriate information has to be gathered, analyzed and reported at an appropriate time to improve the implementation process.

(ii). RBM and Economy, Efficiency, Effectiveness and Accountability

RBM is designed to improve programme delivery through performance measurement and reporting with emphasis on the notions of efficiency, effectiveness and accountability in managing the available resources (UNESCO, 2010; White, 2000). The levels at which each of these elements is achieved are shown in Figure 2 below.

Figure 2: RBM Operational Framework

Adopted from RBMG (2003:13)
In the context of RBM, the use of more efficient processes to support project implementation including monitoring, reporting and targeted decisions based on regularly updated information enhances programme delivery (AFB, 2009). Particular attention is paid to efficient resource utilization (inputs), avoiding repeated weaknesses and providing stakeholders with timely feedback. Also, programme impact is enhanced through standardized and regular flow of performance information with emphasis on sharing and disseminating lessons and replicating good practice (Ibid).

2.6.2. RBM and Accountability

“Implementing RBM is a significant public sector management reform which presents new challenges in defining accountability making it necessary to rearticulate the vision of public accountability” (Shergold 1997:303). The traditional notion of holding public servants accountable only for the correct application of government regulations and procedures and work completion appears incompatible with a results and service-oriented public sector (Mayne, 2007). According to the National Performance Review (1999), accountability is multidimensional and often a key enabler of success where the public servant is not only accountable to the supervisor and as an individual but to more stakeholders and in the context of a team.

The communication of a clear definition of the roles and responsibilities of the parties involved in the context of an RBM system as well as an active interaction among the parties are essential for effective implementation (UNJIU, 2004). Such interaction should be through clearly established tools, mechanisms and procedures to enhance accountability as well as trust among the stakeholders (Ibid).
2.6.3. **Implementation of RBM**

RBM calls for new roles, relationships, expectations and approaches for both management and staff in an organization (UNJIU, 2004). That is, a whole new perspective to organisational operations envisaging a set of managerial attitudes and culture that focuses on results (Ibid). Implementation of the strategy entails substantial changes in the management style, activities, roles, responsibilities, relationships and levels of accountability (Saldanha, 2002). Mayne (2007) adds that, in the Public Service, there is again a need for a cultural shift from mere production of services with correct application of government regulations and procedures to making a difference. Emphasis is always on the centrality of the client or customer and accountability for results (UNESCO, 2008).

For the successful implementation of RBM, a clear conceptual framework as well as strategic frameworks that provide vision of the organization in the medium to long term are essential (UNJIU, 2004). Such frameworks need to be shared among all key stakeholders. In addition, the communication of a clear definition of the roles and responsibilities of the parties involved is also vital (Ibid). “Another prerequisite for shifting to RBM is a commitment, at all levels, to the strategy based on a genuine understanding of the scope of changes required” (Ibid:3). Such commitment should be reflected through the interaction between the key stakeholders and translated into precise tools and mechanisms to put RBM into action.

2.6.4. **RBM in the Public Service**

According to Saldanha (2002), Public sector organizations usually tend to lose sight of their mandate, of serving the public, and RBM has been determined to be a possible remedy for this shortcoming. This is because it helps the organization to have a client focus as the key guiding force in its operations (Ibid). Success stories of marked improvements in public service delivery through the implementation of RBM were recorded in several countries including Canada, the United States,
South Africa, Botswana, Malaysia, Kenya, Mauritius, Rwanda, New Zealand and Singapore (Thomas, 2006). According to the Treasury Board of Canada Secretariat (2001), Public Service managers have a prime responsibility of establishing a foundation to support a strong commitment to results when implementing RBM. That is, they are expected to define strategic outcomes, continually focus attention on results achievement, measure performance regularly and objectively, learn from this information and adjust to improve efficiency and effectiveness. In the same context, OMB (1995) adds that management accountability is the expectation that managers are responsible for the quality and timeliness of program performance. That entails increasing productivity, controlling costs and mitigating adverse aspects of the organization’s operations, and assuring that programs are managed with integrity and in compliance with applicable law. The implementation of RBM therefore increases the levels of accountability for both managers and staff.

2.6.5 Implementation of RBM in Zimbabwe

After independence in 1980, the Government of Zimbabwe formulated and adopted a national strategy focussed on the modernisation and reform of the public sector. This was in an effort to develop a service delivery system that enhances the realization of key national development goals (OPC, 2012). To achieve this goal, three phases of planned public sector reforms namely the Economic Structural Adjustment Programme (ESAP 1991-1998), the Zimbabwe Programme of Economic and Social Transformation (ZIMPREST 1996-2000) and the RBM (2005 to date) were adopted (Ibid). The implementation of RBM was introduced in cooperation with the United Nations Development Program (UNDP) in 2005 (OPC, 2012).

The objective of implementing RBM was to enhance public sector efficiency, effectiveness, transparency and accountability as well as improving service delivery to meet national development priority targets (UNDP/ OPC/ MoF, 2007). This was to be achieved through strengthening the capacity of the Public Service to plan, coordinate, implement, monitor, and evaluate policy as well as
establish a direct link between the budget, public sector performance and results (Ibid). This also meant consolidating stand-alone or independent programs on Public Finance Management, Performance Management, and Monitoring and Evaluation that the government was executing and enhance the strategic planning and implementation of programmes to achieve results (Ibid). In addition, RBM was expected to help address challenges emanating from pressures that included increasing stakeholder demands, financial constraints as well as globalization.¹

The system comprised two core components namely Results-Based Budgeting (RBB) and Personnel Performance System (PPS) with Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E) and e-Government (e-G) (OPC, 2012) as support components. Each component is discussed below in detail as defined by OPC (2012).

**Results-Based Budgeting (RBB)**

RBB, a strategic management tool driven by the Ministry of Finance (MoF), designed to improve resource management and enhance accountability. Ministries developed performance frameworks stating expected annual outputs from their budgets as well as a detailed work plan indicating how these outputs were to be achieved. The expected outcomes and impact were also specified. This framework formed the basis for a performance agreement, which was signed by the Permanent Secretary and the Chief Secretary, confirming the ministry’s commitment to produce the spelt-out outputs for the year. The performance agreement was also a tool for monitoring performance where managers uploaded information quarterly. Performance reports were then generated and monitored by the MoF and the Office of the President and Cabinet (OPC). Such reports focused on input application and activity completion.

¹ Source: Report on the Victoria Falls RBM training workshop 11/7/05 - 17/09/05
**Personnel Performance System (PPS)**

This core component, driven by the Public Service Commission (PSC), sought to improve public service delivery through integrating the strategic use of human and financial resources to achieve desired program results. Individual work plans were developed on the basis of the performance agreement prepared under the RBB component highlighting the expected contribution to the production of specific Ministry outputs and outcomes by each employee.

**Monitoring and Evaluation (RBME)**

The Monitoring and Evaluation System, termed the Zimbabwe Integrated Performance Management Solution (ZIPMaS) was managed by OPC. It consisted of the program planning, monitoring and reporting modules and facilitated the generation of timely and accurate information on Ministry outputs. Ministry annual plans were uploaded onto the ZIPMaS while output data was regularly uploaded electronically to the monitoring module to track progress. Quarterly performance reports were then generated from the reporting module.

**E-government**

The e-government component was designed to facilitate the provision of quality service delivery by government to all stakeholders. This component was implemented in the larger context of modernizing public sector business processes where an e-Government framework and implementation strategy for the period 2011-2015 was developed.

A concept, within RBM, called “Quick Wins” (QW) was used to demonstrate immediate positive results at the same time inducing speedy buy-in and commitment to enhance the chances of success. The first phase of QW covered, among others, the Pension Department and the Registrar General’s office. Although success was reported within these units during a review in 2006, there was little
evidence of improvement in the quality of service delivery as evidenced by complains from the majority of stakeholders (Progress Report on Quick Wins, 2006).

Training workshops were conducted in 2005 initially for trainers and then middle and senior managers within the Public Service to introduce and capacitate staff to implement RBM. Participants evaluated each of the workshops on conclusion. However, there was no subsequent evaluation of the results (outcome or impact) of the initiatives, including capacity building, in line with RBM principles (OPC, 2012).

An RBM documentation consultancy organised by the Office of the President and Cabinet (OPC) in 2011 reported that while the strategy was showing an impact on the public sector reforms agenda, the potential of its full impact on service delivery or policy implementation was yet to be realised (OPC, 2012). Several institutional challenges in the implementation process were reported and government was continuously seeking ways of addressing them (Ibid). Also, according to the above-mentioned report, substantive resources were expended in capacity building and development of RBM systems which are in place and sound. However, there had not been any evaluation of the implementation process to determine the progress towards the achievement of the intended results.

2.7. Literature from other research

2.7.1. Factors affecting the implementation of RBM

The Auditor General of Canada (1996), through a review of reports regarding the implementation, within various Canadian and international organizations, identified a number of human and organizational factors that impact on the implementation of RBM. Bester (2012) further classified the human factors into technical and behavioural factors. “Behavioural factors are about people focusing people on the achievement of objectives” (Ibid: 3). The study will focus on the factors as
classified by the Auditor General of Canada. Details of the factors are discussed in the following sections.

2.7.1.1. Human factors

The human factors identified include:

- Availability of human capacity
- Availability and use of performance information
- Culture
- Senior management involvement
- Stakeholder participation
- Level of communication
- Complexity of the RBM system
- Definition and use of key terms and concepts
- Alignment of responsibility and accountability and decision making authority

Availability of human capacity

Successful implementation is dependent on both management and staff having the necessary knowledge, skills and abilities to develop and use RBM systems (USGAO, 1997; Itell, 1998). According to Mascarenhas (1996), the lack of experience and expertise presents a major impediment to the implementation of RBM. Wachira (2013) adds that, if the introduction and implementation is not complemented with a drive to enhance management capacity, then implementation of RBM remains oratory. In the same context, Mayne (2007) identifies the lack of technical capacity, familiarity with the concept itself as well as resistance to change as the most common challenges in the implementation of RBM.
Availability and use of performance information

Successful implementation of RBM calls for consistent availability of useful, valid and reliable information. Also, the extent to which performance information is used by management determines the credibility of the entire performance measurement activity and thus significantly affecting the implementation process (Poate, 1997). In the context of credibility, the mere perception of the presentation of falsified information can significantly diminish the value of the whole RBM system (Atkinson and McCrindell, 1996). Also, the performance information system should be supported by a reliable communication infrastructure. Also, firm commitment by managers and staff concerned to constantly supply as well as effectively use its data and information is essential (UNJIU 2004).

Culture

The ability of an organization's to create a management culture that focuses on results significantly influences the implementation of RBM (Epstein and Olsen, 1996). Wachira (2013) emphasizes the importance of culture, singling it out as a factor on its own rather than just one of the human factors. That is, RBM entails the institutionalization of change management initiatives to instil a major shift in the mindsets of Civil Servants (Epstein and Olsen, 1996). That is, a shift from the traditional administrative culture which focuses on processes to a results management culture focusing on the management of inputs and outputs to provide quality service (Ibid). Thomas (1998) asserts that changing culture, by its very nature, is a daunting process which requires time, consistency, continual refinement and perseverance.

According to Downey (1998), experience of the OECD shows that both developed and developing countries have problems in transforming traditional systems, which focus on inputs and outputs, to results based systems. Similarly, performance reviews in the USA revealed that changing culture for employees to realize that they are accountable for results to the organization, customer and
stakeholder rather than just for output to their supervisor was a very significant challenge (National Performance Review 1999).

**Senior management involvement**

Senior management leadership and support in both the introduction and implementation of RBM is critical for successful implementation (Plantz, Greenway and Hendricks, 1997). Alford and Baird (1997) add that active participation by senior management in the implementation actually demonstrates commitment to the strategy and thus impact on both the level of buy-in and acceptance of the concept and subsequently the implementation process.

The United Nations Joint Inspection Unit (UNJIU) conducted studies on RBM implementation based on the review of reports on managing for results as well as interviews of staff in the UN system. The studies identified the lack of visible management commitment and leadership as some of the major challenges (UNJIU, 2004). The lack of effective leadership was also identified as a significant challenge through opinion data collected from the Canadian Public Service (Schacter, 2004). In addition, literature suggests that heads of organizations can effectively demonstrate commitment through deliberate action (Binnendijk, 2001; Mayne 2007). Such action can include persistence, setting reasonable yet challenging targets for staff, communication of the RBM message internally and externally as well as provision or lobbying for the related resources (Bester, 2012).

**Stakeholder participation**

According to Downey (1998:18), “governments attribute successful implementation to meaningful and effective participation of all staff and key stakeholders in the process.” That is, involving managers and staff in the process of developing the strategic plans, performance measures, among others (Meekings, 1995). Wachira (2013) adds on to this notion of participation by asserting that
because Public Services exist to create public value and it is the stakeholders who can best define their priorities to guide the implementation process. Downey (1998) also adds that stakeholder involvement can help instil a sense of ownership thus increasing the level of commitment.

**Level of communication**

Communication of the purpose of RBM and its related components is essential for successful implementation of RBM (Epstein and Olsen, 1996). Experience in the US showed that well-informed staff adopt new initiatives easily and also perform better (Ibid). Also, the communication with external stakeholders can improve the chances of success as it enhances the levels of buy-in and ownership of the implementation process (Wachira, 2013).

**Complexity of the RBM system**

Over-complexity of systems is one of the biggest risk factors that threaten successful implementation of RBM (Meier, 1998) as it tends to frustrate stakeholders. Also, the complexity can lead to inaccurate reporting or even abandonment of the system altogether (Ibid). UNJIU (2004) adds that the effectiveness a performance monitoring system within RBM depends on the quality of the defined results, the indicators to measure the progress towards those results as well as its simplicity. To address this shortcoming, the performance measurement system should be monitored and improved continuously transforming it to a responsive instrument that reflects its changing environment (Plantz et al, 1997; Epstein and Olsen, 1996).

**Definition and use of key terms and concepts**

The provision of standard definitions of key terms and concepts is essential for minimizing misunderstandings, fostering consistency thus enhancing the implementation process throughout the organization (Nakamura and Warburton, 1998). However, Government agencies usually use
inconsistent definitions that tend to hamper the use of data collected for decision-making (USGAO, 1997). Clark and Swain (2005) add that the introduction of RBM and accountability frameworks is usually poorly handled in most Governments which lead to confusion and frustration. The use of well-defined objectives should lead to better-selected indicators and better designed programmes to meet those objectives. Also such linkages would also lead to a clearer linkage between results at various levels of aggregation (UNJIU, 2004).

Alignment of responsibility with accountability and decision-making authority

For successful implementation, it is essential for key stakeholders to fully understand the system, know what they are responsible for and also how they can influence results (National Performance Review, 1997). Lack of clear expectations and understanding about possible uses for performance data or information presents perhaps the most difficult challenge in the implementation of RBM (OECD, 2002). To overcome this problem, it has been suggested that programs/projects identify their own expected results, indicators and data collection methods (Plantz et al, 1997). In addition, the programs/projects need to be allowed the flexibility and power to utilize resources and manage their programs in line with the responsibility assigned to them (Newcomer and Downy, 1997-98). This was also reiterated by Try, following a research conducted in the Canadian Public Service using case studies and interviewing strategies. The conclusion reached was that “executives can, and will only, accept accountability for achieving or increasing programme results in which they have been provided sufficient discretionary power” (Try, 2006:311).

2.7.1.2. Organizational factors

The organizational factors identified include:

- Adoption of the RBM strategy
- Customization of RBM systems
- Timing of the implementation process
- Alignment of systems
- Availability of resources
- Location of the performance measurement function

Adoption of the RBM strategy

Research on the adoption and implementation of RBM by state governments in the U.S. revealed that many states failed to realize the benefits of RBM because the strategy was only partially adopted (Moynihan, 2006). It is vital to fully develop all the RBM subsystems and also adopt the strategy organization-wide (Ibid).

Customization of systems

According to Joyce (1997), adopting RBM systems deemed successful in other organizations, proved to be ineffective in most cases. OECD (1997) adds that RBM systems need to be developed according to the needs and situations of a specific organization. That is, the level of customization of RBM systems was identified as a factor that significantly influenced the implementation process.

Timing of the implementation process

Risks associated with both taking too long or too little time to implement RBM were also identified in literature. According to the National Academy of Public Administration (1994), a hurried implementation posed the risk of creating fear while a slow implementation process resulted in the loss of momentum. In the same context, Broom (1995) highlighted the need to strike a balance between anticipating resistance and thus allowing more time and also maintaining the momentum. That is both patience and persistence are essential for the successful implementation of RBM (Ibid).
Alignment of systems

It is imperative that management systems effectively support the systematic collection, recording, analysis and reporting of performance information for the effective implementation of the RBM (Olsen 1997; Poate 1997). Downey (1998) adds that success or failure of implementation is determined by the extent to which RBM systems are connected to the business plan and budget. In the same context, according to the Auditor General of Canada (1996), the development of performance measurement systems has proved to be a significant challenge for most organizations. Research conducted by Overseas Development Institute (ODI) on RBM public management in Bolivia, among other nations, identified significant challenges in the integration of results with budget processes, personnel management and organizational reforms (ODI, 2003). It was also concluded that making the target setting process highly consultative among all stakeholders can help to address this shortcoming (Ibid).

Availability of resources

The expectation on organizations to design and implement effective RBM systems should be supported by the provision of the necessary resources to ensure effective implementation (Newcomer and Downy 1997-98). Also, experience in the United States of America suggests that the provision of funds as well as management effort and time gives a strong indication of top management support (Newcomer and Wright 1996-97) which leads to the motivation of staff and thus improve the implementation of RBM.

Location of the performance measurement function

The location and control of the performance measurement function is important as it can to lead confusion over ownership, roles and responsibilities regarding the implementation process (Auditor General of Canada, 1996). Such confusion would have a negative effect on the buy-in as well as
acceptance of the RBM strategy (Ibid). Experience in the Australian Public Service as well as some OECD countries led to the suggestion that it be located in the central monitoring and evaluation units within organizations or a central agency (Poate, 1997).

Empirical evidence shows that these concerns regarding the location of the control function can be addressed through the development of appropriate organizational structures, demonstration high level commitment as well as providing the necessary resources, including skills and real institutional capacity, among other remedies (Kusek & Rist, 2001; ODI, 2003). In line with the provision of capacity, the education of management to take a visible role of leadership as well as providing the necessary environment for capacity building were mentioned as possible solutions to these challenges (Schacter, 2004).

2.8. Institutionalization of RBM

Literature on RBM widely refers to six principles for its effective institutionalization of RBM that were identified by Mayne (2007) in a study of a variety of organizations. These are summarized in table 3 below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principle</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Foster senior-level leadership in RBM.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Promote and support a results and learning culture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Build results frameworks with ownership at all levels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Measure sensibly and develop user-friendly RBM information systems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Use results information for learning and managing, as well as for reporting and accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Build an adaptive RBM regime through regular review and update.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adopted from Bester, A. (2012:4)
In a related development, UNJIU (2004) developed a comprehensive conceptual framework for effective implementation of RBM following a review of the implementation of RBM in the United Nations agencies. The framework, summarized in table 4 below, includes benchmarks identified as critical for effective implementation.

Table 4: Benchmarks for the effective implementation of RBM at the organizational level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benchmark</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Existence of a clear conceptual framework for RBM as a broad management strategy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>The respective responsibilities of key stakeholders clearly defined.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Long-term objectives clearly formulated for the organization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Programmes well aligned with organization long-term objectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Resources are well aligned with its long-term objectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Evaluation findings used effectively.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>RBM effectively internalized throughout the organization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>A knowledge management strategy developed to support RBM.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adopted from Bester, A. (2012:4)

In summary, the main principles of RBM include the following:

- Focus on contribution towards the achievement of desired results
- Centrality of the citizen
- Essence of performance measurement
- Increased accountability to more stakeholders
- Learning and improvement
According to UNJIU (2004), effective implementation of RBM can only be sustained through solid institutionalization and a conviction by the main stakeholders, including management and staff, that the system meets their expectations for improved performance, at both the individual and organizational levels.

2.9. Gaps in knowledge

Although RBM is an evolution of existing management philosophy, its implementation is a recent and significant departure from preceding principles making it a fairly new concept. Relevant literature was, therefore, limited and mostly comprised theoretical and historical assessments of public sector reforms and programme evaluations. The theoretical framework of RBM and its suitability as a management framework derived from a philosophy needed to be explored.

The available literature on RBM implementation was restricted to issues regarding processes while issues relating to individuals appeared to be missing. That is, the phenomenon regarding the knowledge, beliefs, perceptions and attitudes of staff remained “under-explored.” This research was aimed at contributing towards gathering knowledge that would help in closing this gap.

According to the Auditor General of Canada (1996), most systems in RBM have emerged through trial and error. Therefore, the body of knowledge needs to be built through research on experiences of different organizations. This study can, in part, contribute to building this body of knowledge.

In Zimbabwe, reviews of RBM excluded evaluation of the implementation process, including the impact of capacity building efforts (OPC, 2012). Generally, literature from the perspective of individuals appeared to be missing.
The Auditor General in Canada (1996) stressed that the RBM system should be tailored towards the needs and situation of the users as no single system will be appropriate for every organization and public agencies are not all alike. It was deemed necessary to study the case for Zimbabwe in order to gain an in-depth understanding of the factors that impacted on the implementation in this particular environment. The results may also be relevant, to some extent, for the SADC region and Africa where the operating environments are similar.

Try, while studying for a Doctor of Philosophy degree, conducted a research on the implementation of RBM within the Canadian Public Service and concluded that there was potential to improve understanding and value of the concept through further research (Try, 2006). This research was aimed at being a part of the "further research" meant to improve such understanding.

2.10. Chapter Summary

The rationale for the study was discussed before placing the concept of RBM within the context of its origins as an evolution within management science and aimed at improving the performance of Public Services. The components of RBM, requirements for successful implementation as well as its adoption in Zimbabwe were considered. Studies regarding the implementation of RBM from other organizations and nations were examined to assist in guiding the choice of methodology as well as identification of gaps in knowledge. Such gaps identified included the need to build on the relatively limited literature on individual experiences in different organizations particularly Public Services.
CHAPTER 3
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY AND DESIGN

3.1. Introduction
This chapter presents an overview of methodology and methods used in completing the study. First, the philosophy and assumptions underpinning the research are discussed. Then the research design based on the research question is expounded. This includes discussion of the strategy, research instruments developed and utilized as well as the justification for the choice of research methods employed. Details of the analysis and interpretation of research data as well as the development of a suggested model are considered. Issues of validity, reliability, triangulation including the relationships among them are discussed. Finally, the handling of confidentiality and risk is also discussed. To place the methodology and design of this research in context, the research question and objectives are recaptured.

3.1.1 The Research Question and objectives
The research question was:

What have been the main factors affecting the implementation of RBM in the Zimbabwe Public Service?

The objectives of the study were:

• Investigate the factors affecting the implementation of RBM in the Zimbabwe Public Service.
• Recommend a model for improving the implementation of RBM in the Zimbabwe Public Service.
A review of the literature and key informant interviews pointed to the existence of some issues which, if addressed could assist in improving the implementation of RBM within the Zimbabwe Public Service. Other stakeholders were excluded due to the limitations of the research in terms of time and focus.

3.2. Research Paradigm

3.2.1 Positivist and interpretivist paradigms

The Western tradition of science identifies two major research paradigms namely the positivist (sometimes referred to as scientific) and interpretivist or antipositivist (Galliers, 1991). According to positivists, reality is stable and can be observed and described from an objective point of view (Levin, 1988), without any interference on the phenomena being studied. That is, phenomena should be isolated with observations repeatable. This often involves manipulation of reality with variations in only a single independent variable so as to identify regularities in, and to form relationships between, some of the constituent elements of the social world. The positivist philosophy argues that there is one objective reality. Therefore, valid research can only be demonstrated by the degree of proof that can be corresponded to the phenomena represented by that study (Hope and Waterman, 2003). There has been considerable debate on the suitability of the positivist paradigm for the social sciences (Hirschheim, 1985).

Interpretivism is the view that the social realm may not be subject to the same methods of investigation as natural science such as physics or chemistry (Galliers, 1991). That is, interpretivists contend that it is only through the subjective interpretation and intervention that reality can be fully understood. The argument is that scientific methods are inappropriate for the study of human beings who think and reflect unlike objects in the natural world. Therefore, the paradigm emphasizes the need to focus on understanding the interpretations that social actions have on the people being
studied. Consequently, the study of phenomena in their natural environment is key to the interpretivist philosophy, together with the acknowledgement that scientists cannot avoid affecting the phenomena under study (Ibid). Interpretivists admit that there may be many interpretations of reality, but maintain that these interpretations are in themselves a part of the scientific knowledge they are pursuing (Ibid).

The interpretive paradigm is associated more with qualitative methodology which provides an opportunity for the voice, concerns and practices of research participants to be heard (Cole, 2006). It supports the view that there are many truths and multiple realities and focuses the holistic perspective of the person and environment. It is argued that qualitative researchers concentrate more on uncovering knowledge about how people feel and think in their circumstances rather than making judgments about the validity of those thoughts and feelings (Ibid). The results generated by qualitative research are likely to shed light on multiple subjective truths, rather than one right answer.

3.2.2 Rationale for the choice of paradigm

According to Yin (2003), the over-ridding concern in selecting the paradigm should be both relevance to research questions and also rigorous in its operationalization. The primary aim of this study was to inquire into what individual perspectives (thoughts and feelings) existed among Public Service managers and interpreting these findings in the context of literature on RBM. Understanding the managers’ experiences entailed the use of communication and language which interpretivists emphasize more than the positivists. Therefore, the interpretivist paradigm was determined to be more suitable for understanding the managers’ response to the introduction and implementation of RBM than the positivist paradigm.
The study relied on qualitative data collected through semi-structured interviews and document review to discover and understand the individual and shared meaning relating to the implementation of RBM. Qualitative interviews were selected as they attempt to derive meanings from individual accounts and experiences (Kerrmode and Roberts, 2007) to uncover and understand the meaning of experiences with the subjects’ words as the unit of analysis. The research process dealt with subjective rather than objective realities. A summary of the research paradigm for this study is presented in Table 5 below.

Table 5: Summary of the Research Paradigm

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Interpretive View</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beliefs</td>
<td>Many truths and realities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Different people have different perceptions, needs and experiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Method</td>
<td>Interview of participants by the researcher with and recognition of the value and depth of the individual content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Study data based upon descriptive, explanatory and contextual words of interview data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Review of related literature for secondary data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Sample</td>
<td>Representatives willing and able to provide significant views on the implementation of RBM in the Zimbabwe Public Service</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.3 Research Design
The research design shows how the research questions will be connected to the data, and the tools and procedures to use in answering them. It is the basic plan for empirical research and includes the main issues such as strategy, sample, and the tools and procedures to be used for collecting and analyzing empirical data (Punch, 2000). The research design for this study was exploratory because there was limited information on the factors impacting on the implementation of RBM, from an individual’s perspective.

### 3.3.1 Research Strategies

There are several strategies that can be used to conduct research within the social sciences. Such strategies include experiments, surveys, histories, case studies and review of literature. The choice of a strategy depends on the type of research questions, the control that an investigator has over events or subjects as well as the focus on contemporary phenomena (Yin, 2003). The most important among these criteria is the type of research question(s) being addressed because each strategy has its advantages and disadvantages depending on the objectives of the research (Yin, 1989).

For this study, a literature review and semi-structured interviews were adopted for the collection of data. The experimental method was excluded because a laboratory setting was determined to be infeasible while observation was also not possible as the researcher was not part of the system under investigation. Survey questionnaires were determined not unsuitable to fully explore the different perceptions. The Key Informants confirmed that these were not a recommended option as the managers are always busy and were likely to delegate such requests to subordinates. They added that the managers were also unlikely to write negative comments thus reducing the quality of data collected. The case study method was excluded mainly because of its common criticism of case dependency on a single case exploration usually on a small number of subjects which makes it difficult to reach a generalizing conclusion (Tellis, 1997; Yin, 1993).
3.3.2 Methodologies

There are two methodologies for data collection when conducting empirical research namely the quantitative and qualitative. Each methodology has its own strengths and weaknesses as discussed in the following sections.

3.3.2.1 Qualitative methodology

Management Research draws significantly on qualitative methodologies since the qualitative study of labour by Taylor, the Hawthorne experiments on motivation (Easterby-Smith et al., 2002). “Qualitative approaches are used to explore the behaviour, perspectives and experiences of people under study and the basis of qualitative research lies in the interpretive approach to social reality” (Holloway, 1997:2). Things are studied in their natural settings with the researcher attempting to make sense of, or interpret, phenomena in terms of the meaning people bring to them (Denzin. and Lincoln, 2003). It permits researchers to study selected issues in depth and detail, without predetermined categories of analysis that would otherwise constraint the fieldwork. It also promotes openness and detail of inquiry from a limited number of elements thus increasing the understanding of issues and situations being studied (Patton, 1990).

The main disadvantage of qualitative research is that it lacks the statistical precision that is allowed by quantitative research (Easterby-Smith et al., 2002). However, it was determined that statistical precision was not a priority in this study. The qualitative approach was determined to be more suitable for this study which involved exploring individual experiences. This is because the
experiences were expected to be diverse and depending on differing environments and circumstances and thus required richness which, again, the qualitative approach could offer.

The approach permitted the necessary in-depth exploring and understanding of the meaning of individual experiences of managers which would not be possible if a quantitative strategy had been employed. Semi-structured interviews of middle and senior management were conducted by the researcher to obtain primary data on the level of knowledge, attitude and practices in the implementation of RBM while secondary data was obtained through a literature review.

3.3.2.2 Quantitative methodology

The quantitative philosophy, on the other hand, requires the use of standardized instruments so that the varying perspectives and experiences of people can fit a limited number of predetermined response categories, to which numbers are assigned. The advantage of a quantitative method is that it is possible to measure the reactions of a large number of respondents to a limited set of questions which facilitates comparison and statistical aggregation of the data. This gives a broad, generalizable set of findings that can be presented concisely and prudently. However, it was determined that the disadvantages of the quantitative methodology outweighed its advantages in the context of this study.

3.3.3 Methods of data collection

3.3.3.1 Key Informant Interviews

The Key Informant interviews proved very useful for this study particularly during the planning phase. Such interviews helped to confirm the findings from the literature; further understand the implementation of RBM in Zimbabwe; fine-tune the research questions as well as identify potential sources of relevant information. The key informant interviews were conducted between September 2011 and July 2012. These key informants were selected because of their relatively profound
knowledge of RBM, their key roles in the adoption and implementation in the Zimbabwe Public Service as well as practical expertise.

3.3.3.2. Semi-structured Interviews
The questions on whether or not the capacity of managers to implement RBM could explain the low level impact of the implementation of RBM in Zimbabwe were exploratory in nature. Interviews allow respondents to express their views including opinions, insights and other contextual data (Robson, 1999). It was therefore decided that semi-structured interviews were most suitable to understand the impact of the factors on the behaviour of managers in relation to the implementation of RBM. This is because the semi-structured interviews are capable of obtaining dynamic, detailed information on the implementation of RBM from managers in the Public Service within a relatively short period. Data from the semi-structured interviews provided the researcher with a deeper understanding of RBM implementation in the Zimbabwe Public Service. Subsequently, information obtained from the data collected from the interviews was used to develop a suggested RBM model to improve the implementation process.

3.3.3.3. Review of Literature
A descriptive study aims to collect, organize, and summarize data about the matter being studied (Punch, 2000). That is, breaking down complicated issues to make them more understandable. To understand RBM and explore the factors affecting its implementation, a literature review was determined to be appropriate. The review helped to provide a detailed understanding of the concept and its implementation in general and within the Public Service in particular. This answered the question on the factors that impacted on the implementation of RBM.

3.4. The Research Process
3.4.1. Research Sample

Middle and top managers in the Public Service, 1,100 in total, according to the Public Service Commission, constituted the population of this research. These included Permanent Secretaries, Principal Directors, Directors and Deputy Directors. In the original plan, purposive sampling was to be used to select 50 managers from among the 990 who attended the inaugural RBM training workshops in 2005 and were willing to participate in the research. However, due to challenges faced in the selection of the sample, described in the sections that follow, the snowball method was also included and 32 managers were interviewed by the researcher.

The managers considered for participation in the study were involved in the implementation of RBM since its adoption in 2005. They were selected for his study because of their perceived relatively profound understanding of the concept, from experience, as well as their willingness to participate in this study. They were also conveniently based within the same province as the researcher and thus facilitating a significant reduction of expended time and cost.

Purposive sampling is a non-probability sampling technique that entails a conscious decision about which elements would best provide the desired information (DeVaus, 2002; Burns and Grove, 2007). In this research, this type of non-probability sampling had the advantage over all other sampling methods in that the selected managers, by their willingness to participate gave an indication of commitment to RBM and were thus likely to provide the most useful data. Also, individuals in the group of 990 were perceived to be among the most knowledgeable about RBM as they had been trained and also had been involved in the implementation of the strategy since its adoption.

Snowball sampling is another non-probability sampling technique that is appropriate to use in research when the members of a population are difficult to locate or persuade to participate in a
To select participants, the researcher collects data on the few members of the target population then asks those individuals to provide information needed to locate other members of that population who may be willing to participate. Its main disadvantage is that it is hardly likely to lead a representative sample. However, it was considered to be the only other method available for this research following the emergence of a major challenge in selecting the participants. Also, the willingness to participate was almost confirmed by the referring individuals.

### 3.4.2. Contacting the relevant persons

Following a request to the Public Service Commission (PSC), for permission to conduct the research, the researcher was referred to a department in the Office of the President and Cabinet (OPC) responsible for the overall implementation of RBM. The department was to help the researcher to access data relating to the implementation of RBM. A list of the 990 managers, including their contact telephone numbers, and in some cases email addresses, was provided to the researcher to facilitate the establishment of contact with these managers.

Starting with the most senior managers, a telephone call was made through each manager’s secretary. Once connected to the manager, the researcher briefly explained the purpose of the research and requesting the managers’ participation. When accepted, a request was made for the managers’ email addresses and cellular phone numbers for further contact directly with the manager. The managers usually referred to the researcher by first name since most of them were senior and/or familiar with the researcher. This was because most of the managers were either counterparts or seniors to the researcher at school, college or work place.

Following the initial discussion, an email with more details about the research as well as a list of the questions guiding the interview was sent to the manager. In cases where responses were not received,
a follow-up telephone or cellular phone call was made after ten days. During that dialogue, where applicable, an interview was scheduled usually with relatively long lead times. There were also frequent postponements of appointments due to the managers’ busy schedules. The researcher had made provision for such re-schedules following advice provided earlier by the key informants.

Several challenges emerged in the selection of participants. First, 44 of the managers selected from the list had changed contact details or had left the Public Service and therefore could not be reached. Secondly, 39 of those contacted declined the invitation citing unfamiliarity with RBM to the extent that they felt unqualified to discuss it in any context. They also indicated that they were not applying the principles of RBM at all in their areas of operation. 27 managers agreed to participate.

This challenge led to the addition of the snowball sampling method to the study where those willing to participate referred the researcher to their colleagues who were determined to be likely to have an interest in participating mostly. It turned out that interest to participate in these managers had developed because either they had faith in the RBM concept or were unhappy with its implementation and ready to express their views. With this effort, 5 more managers were selected to participate in the study.

The group of participants comprised 18 male and 12 female university graduates with years of experience in the Public Service ranging from two to over twenty-six years. They included Permanent Secretaries, Directors and Deputy Directors. The Directors and Deputy Director were from both the Finance and Administration as well as programming fields. The sample of 32 participants was determined to be sufficient considering that the 39 managers who declined to participate had provided data to the study in that they had, to some extent, confirmed the assumption of the study. The list of interviewees is attached as Appendix B.
3.5. **Data collection instruments and procedures**

3.5.1 **Semi-structured Interviews**

The design of the semi-structured interviews was based mainly on the research objectives and the research question, extensive RBM literature review, guidance from the researcher’s supervisor, input from colleagues, and previous research conducted by other researchers among them Schacter (2004), UNJIU (2004) and Try (2008). Semi-structured questions were formulated to capture views of managers on significant issues regarding RBM.

The interview questions were pre-tested with key informants and RBM practitioners in other public organizations. A pilot study was also conducted to obtain feedback on the instrument. Following the pre-test and pilot, the interview guide was adjusted accordingly. The number of interviews was determined on the basis of consideration of data required against the cost and time of conducting the semi-structured interviews. Against this background, the sample was determined to be reasonably sufficient for the study.

3.5.1.1. **Process for Semi-structured Interviews**

The semi-structured interviews were conducted by the researcher, within the managers’ business settings, between August and November 2012. The managers had large offices into which the researcher was escorted by the manager’s secretary. The researcher and interviewee sat opposite each other on couches or a conference table, depending on the manager’s choice, with an IC recorder placed on a table between them. The researcher also documented the main points discussed on an iPad. Refreshments were offered and served by the managers’ secretaries during the interviews.
Providing the interview questions to the participants in advance allowed them to prepare for the interview and also helped to obtain data within a short period allowing the interviews to last about half to three quarters of an hour. The questions comprised both semi-structured and open-ended questions derived from a review of literature on RBM implementation and confirmed through key informant interviews. The list of questions is provided in the interview guide attached as Appendix A.

During the interview, the participants were encouraged to highlight issues relating to the implementation of RBM within their respective units. The nine questions asked provided flexibility in conducting the interviews, and allowed the discussion to flow naturally. In some cases managers answered nearly all 9 questions after the researcher posed only the first question. The managers aired out their views freely to an independent researcher, whom they regarded as a junior or counterpart, believing there was no likelihood of victimization. Initially there was concern that the researcher had come through a high level office (OPC) but upon explanation of the procedure, the managers expressed relief and confidence in the research project. Discussion sometimes reverted to the mother tongue (Shona) particularly where participants felt more comfortable or the need for greater emphasis which the language could facilitate.

The researcher summarized and reflected on what the interviewee had said, both during and at the end of each interview, to interpret the meaning given to the data provided by the interviewee. Also, the researcher requested for the interviewee’s participation in the data validation process upon conclusion of the draft report. Where agreed, the interviewee provided or confirmed the email address to which the draft would be sent for review. These actions ensured that the participant’s meaning was accurately captured. Relevant documentation was also provided by some interviewees for reference purposes where necessary.
Upon conclusion of the interview, the managers usually walked the researcher out of the office while discussing a variety of issues other than RBM. Also on the way out, the researcher thanked the secretary for assistance rendered from the time of initial contact to the end of the interview.

3.6. Data analysis, interpretation and presentation procedures

3.6.1. Data Analysis

“Data analysis consists of examining, categorizing, tabulating, or otherwise recombining the evidence to address the initial propositions of a study” (Yin, 2003b:109). In qualitative study, data interpretation occurs from the beginning of the research process to the end (Radnor, 2002), with the researcher thoroughly familiarizing with the data to grasp the details, while simultaneously examining the dataset from a distance, seeking to reveal patterns and explanations. Specifically, data collection and analysis occur as a cyclical or iterative process, with the researcher moving between the literature and field data and back to the literature (Ibid).

Data analysis involved multiple readings and interpretations of the raw data. That is, the findings were derived from both the research objectives and findings arising directly from the analysis of the raw data. Constant comparison was used in the data analysis as part of ensuring rigor in this study. This involved reading and re-reading data to search for and identify emerging themes, in constant search for understanding and the meaning of the data.

The analysis began by transcribing the 32 interviews, from the IC recorder, where text files for each transcript were created in a Microsoft Word computer program. Each transcript was assigned a unique respondent code to ensure anonymity thus prevent attribution of individual comments. This procedure was also meant to minimize potential researcher bias through giving greater weight to
certain transcripts by virtue of the status of the participants. Computer generated line numbers were assigned, in the margin, to the transcript for reference purposes. The copies of transcript were then printed and ready for coding.

3.6.1.1. Coding
Coding involves identification of themes and categories in the interview transcripts, an attempt to verify, confirm and qualify them by searching through the data and repeating the process to identify further themes and categories (Burnard et al., 2008).

A rigorous and systematic reading and coding of the transcripts allowed major themes to emerge. Coding for content analysis was accomplished by reviewing each interview transcript and underlining specific quotes relevant to the research concerns for further analysis. The researcher made notes in the margins of words, theories or short phrases that summed up what was being said in the text to have a summary statement for each element discussed in the transcript. A sample of the analysed transcript is attached as Appendix C.

In the second stage, the researcher collected the words and grouped them into categories that reflected the generalized meaning of the repeating ideas. The upper level or more general categories were derived from the research concerns while the lower level or specific categories were derived from multiple readings of the raw data. Subtopics were identified within each category including contradictory points of view and new insights.

The categories were combined when the meanings were determined to be similar thus reducing the number of categories. Next, the categories were transferred each onto a clean page and reference of each transcript recorded on the relevant category page. The categories were further organized into
themes. The themes were then grouped into more abstract concepts in relation to the research concerns.

3.6.2. Data interpretation and presentation

The summary or top-level categories were used as main headings in the findings with specific categories as subheadings in line with the research concerns. Suitable quotes, referenced to the transcript code, were used to support and/or highlight explanation of the findings. Each quotation is italicized and referenced to the relevant transcript. The reference starts with the symbol P followed by a number, e.g. P1, the identification code for the participant as well as the interview transcript. This is followed by a colon and a number or numbers identifying the line number(s) of the quote on the transcript, all in brackets. For example (P1:4-5) denotes row numbers 4 to 5 in the transcript for the interview with participant P1. The quotations are verbatim except where the researcher added an explanation for clarity, avoided names or titles for confidentiality or the participant expressed himself/herself in the vernacular language and the researcher had to translate. In the case of words added for clarity by the researcher, the text would be normal and in square brackets. Where names were avoided, the text is normal and in round brackets. Regarding the words in vernacular, the text would be normal and in bold font.

The findings were discussed in relation to the research question and conclusions were reached. Recommendations for improving the implementation of RBM in the Zimbabwe Public Service as well as those for future research were made on the basis of issues emerging from this study. The recommendation for improvement in the implementation of RBM in the Zimbabwe Public Service included the development of a suggested model. The development of the suggested model included the following activities:
I. Consolidating findings from the analysis of data

II. Rapid assessments and analyses of the organization based on the analysis of data collected from the interviews to identify gaps in the factors that enhance the implementation process

III. Literature review to identify appropriate model for capacity building

IV. Development and recommendation of a suggested model

3.7. **Validity and reliability issues consideration**

A careful research design, incorporating ethical considerations, is required to arrive at valid, verifiable results, within the context of a given societal model (Easterby-Smith et al., 2002). That is, “methodology texts generally stress maximizing validity and reliability to ensure that findings will be objective, unbiased, consistent and unambiguous” (Mann, 1985:60).

Validity is defined as the extent to which any instrument measures what it is intended to measure while reliability refers to the consistency of a measure. That is the extent to which repeated trials, using a measuring procedure, yield the same results (Carmines and Zeller, 1979). Measurements are used to assess both issues.

3.7.1 **Reliability and validity issues in qualitative research**

It is argued that since the conventional concepts of validity and reliability involve measurements, they therefore have no relevance in qualitative research (Stenbacka, 2001). This is in line with Golafshani (2003) and Mishler (2000) who assert that, in qualitative research, the search for truth through reliability and validity is replaced by concern for trustworthiness, rigor, quality and establishing confidence. Consequently, many researchers have developed their own concepts of validity and have often generated or adopted what they consider to be more appropriate terms (Davies & Dodd, 2002)
3.7.1.1 Trustworthiness

It is in this context that Lincoln and Guba (1985) argue that establishing the trustworthiness of a research report lies at the heart of issues conventionally discussed as validity and reliability, also being central to any conception of quality in qualitative research. It aims to support the argument that the inquiry’s findings are “worth paying attention to” (Lincoln & Guba, 1985:290) which is a departure from the conventional precedent of attempting to show validity, soundness, and significance.

Instead, Lincoln and Guba (1985) propose their own four point criterion list for qualitative researchers to establish trustworthiness namely credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability.

3.7.1.2. Credibility

“For qualitative research, credibility, should replace truth value, which is an evaluation of whether or not the research findings represent a credible conceptual interpretation of the data drawn from the participants’ original data” (Lincoln & Guba, 1985:296). One of the best techniques for establishing credibility is through member checks where materials such as interview transcripts and research reports are shared with participants requesting them to indicate their agreement or disagreement with the researcher’s presentation (Ibid).

That is, the results of a qualitative study are believable and trustworthy from the perspective of a participant or subject in the research itself. Because qualitative research attempts to describe or explain the event, group or phenomenon of interest from the perspective of participants, the participants, who form the subjects of the study, are best placed to judge the credibility of the findings in a qualitative study (Ibid).
Credibility can also be built up through prolonged engagement in the field, persistent observation and triangulation exercises, as well as exposure of the research report to criticism by a disinterested peer reviewer (Ibid).

3.7.1.3. Participant validation

Participant validation allows the identification and correction of both errors of fact and errors of interpretation (Simon, 2011). Emphasis on rapport, trust and participation was used to ensure the quality of data in this study. According to Kvale (1988, cited in Miles & Huberman, 1994:35), both the interviewer and interviewee are authors of the data during an interview.

For this study, both during and at the completion of each interview, the researcher summarized and reflected on what the interviewee was saying to interpret the meaning given to the data by the interviewee. This was co-authoring, which also ensured that the meaning was accurately captured while, at the same time, maintaining the focus of the interview.

Also during the interviews, participants were asked to verify interpretations and data gathered in earlier interviews. Also, the researcher had informal conversations with lower level staff members of the Public service, who were not part of the population under study, to verify the findings. On completion of a draft report of the findings, the researcher forwarded copies to 24 participants who had indicated their interest, during the interviews, in participating in the validation process. There were no changes to the report resulting from the validation process as only comments confirming the data were received.
3.7.1.4. Prolonged engagement

The researcher had previously interacted with most of the managers, as contemporaries and seniors at college. Others were counterparts to the researcher within the workplace. Also, a number of the managers had interacted with the researcher while employed within NGOs, in the context of support for various Government programmes provided by the NGOs, including the implementation of RBM. This long term familiarity as well as informal and social communication that occurred prior to the interviews helped to develop relationships, rapport and trust which enabled the researcher and participants to relate to each other as persons. Understanding and appreciation of the participants’ context as well as co-construction of meaning between researcher and the participants was thus facilitated immensely. This interaction also enabled the researcher to blend in well, rise above own preconceptions while the participants felt comfortable disclosing data thus facilitating the enhancement of the quality of data provided.

3.7.1.5. Expert review

Comments on findings were sought, by the researcher, from individuals in the NGO development sector involved and known to have interest in the RBM implementation program to help further enhance the credibility of the findings.

3.7.1.6 Transferability

In qualitative research, transferability should replace the conventional notions of applicability or external validity (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). That is, the degree to which the findings of the study can apply be generalized to other settings. For this study, transferability was achieved by providing a detailed, thick description of the context of the study that included details of establishing contact as well as the settings for the interviews in the method section. Such detail would provide readers with sufficient information to enable them to judge the applicability of findings to other settings as well as
merge the participants’ lived experiences with the researcher’s interpretation. Long quotations from the interviewer-interviewee dialogue in both the data presentation and discussion sections of this thesis also helped to provide the necessary assurance on the quality of data.

3.7.1.7. **Dependability**

Lincoln and Guba (1985) also propose that dependability should replace the conventional notion of consistency or reliability, which is an assessment of the quality of the integrated processes of data collection, data analysis, and theory generation. Dependability relates to researchers' response to changes in the setting of the study and how these changes affected the research and can be achieved by a procedure called ‘auditing’ (Ibid). The procedure involves ‘auditors’ in examining an ‘audit trail’ for adequacy which consists of the researcher’s documentation of data, methods and decisions made during a project, as well as its end product. Such trail has been provided for this study.

3.7.1.8. **Confirmability**

Finally, confirmability is designed to replace the conventional criterion of neutrality or objectivity and also established through auditing. It is a measure of how well the inquiry’s findings are supported by the data collected (Lincoln & Guba, 1985) and also refers to whether other scholars could corroborate the, researcher's findings.

According to Schurink (2005), there are three strategies that proved to be effective in checking and demonstrating the management of researcher bias and inappropriate subjectivity from an interpretive perspective namely reflexivity, audit trail, and peer debriefing. Throughout the study, the researcher provided a self-critical account of how the research was done, cautioning self not to read into situations what the participants did not see or mean, avoiding imposition of own preferences onto the process as well as through triangulation mentioned in section.
3.7.1.9. Rigor

The development of the interview questions, the measurement items, was based mainly on an extensive review of the literature and as well as contributions from key informants for credibility checking. A digital recorder was used to record the interviews in order to ensure the accuracy of the subsequent transcripts, and to enable the interviewer to focus on the discussion (Fink, 1995) and also, notes were taken during each interview to capture additional details, interpretations as well as other related information (Radnor, 2002). In addition, the recordings on disk were transcribed as soon as possible after each interview to further enhance the completeness and accuracy of data.

As far as possible, the researcher involved participants in the verification of findings including follow-up interviews with selected participants for data validation. Although there was no variation in the findings resulting from these follow-up activities, the effort ensured rigor in the process.

3.7.1.10. Triangulation

A key source of reliability, within qualitative research, is triangulation which is a procedure that involves a search for convergence among multiple sources of data to form themes or categories in a study (Eisenhardt, 1989; Creswell & Miller, 2000; Yin, 2003). It serves to ensure accuracy and the consideration of alternative explanations, increases the confidence that observed differences are in fact grounded in the data rather than the method, with weaknesses of each technique compensated through strengths in the others (Stake, 1995; Todd, 1979). The methods selected in triangulation to test the validity and reliability depend on the criterion of the research (Golafshani, 2003). The most important use is to corroborate and augment evidence from other sources (Yin, 2003b:81). Denzin (1978) echoes this view describing documentary analysis as an expedient form of triangulation. The research design for this study incorporated contribution from documents that were located during the Literature Review, reports and assessments of RBM gathered prior to and during the field research
phase as well as interviews with executives responsible for supervising the implementation process. Additional material gathered during the field research served to validate findings.

3.8. Handling of ethical issues

Bulmer (2001) asserts that ethical considerations are an essential part of research decisions. Resnik (1998) defines ethics as norms for conduct that distinguish between acceptable and unacceptable behaviour. According to the American Psychological Association (APA), such ethics considerations include the need to minimize harm and risks while maximizing benefits, respect human dignity, privacy, and autonomy. This entails ensuring that the participant gives informed consent for the research (Smith, 2003). In this research, human dignity as well as harm and risks were not considered to be relevant issues. The other issues were taken into account as detailed below.

An informed consent is ethically valid when there complete disclosure to the potential participant regarding all issues pertaining to the research; confidentiality or anonymity is assured; the research is fully understood of including an opportunity to ask questions; consent is voluntary, free of any coercion or promises of benefits unlikely to result from participation and the participant is competent to give consent in relation to his/her mental status, disease or emergency (Ibid).

Consent was acquired through the use of an introductory email providing details of the research. The voluntary nature of participation removed the possibility of cohesion on the participants as they were free to decline the request.

Regarding privacy and confidentiality, a commitment was extended by the researcher that attribution of individual comments would not occur. Permission to record the interview was sought before commencement. Also, the data were safeguarded against loss and to ensure confidentiality by
keeping it in a locked cabinet at researcher’s residence. Names were strictly avoided on the documentation with each interview transcript assigned a respondent code.

3.9 Chapter Summary

After the philosophy underpinning the study was considered, this chapter presented the rationale of the selection of an interpretivist approach and the qualitative research methodology. The strategy included a literature review and semi-structured interviews. The semi-structured interviews were used to explore the experiences of managers in the implementation of RBM in the Zimbabwe Public Service. Selected print and electronic reports were reviewed together with other documentation such as minutes of review meetings, reports, policies and guidelines. Contributions on RBM, including internal and unpublished documentation were also included. The researcher’s previous practical experience with RBM contributed a great deal to conducting this research through the facilitated access to relevant literature as well as contacts that already existed. The detailed process of conducting the semi-structured interviews and data analysis were described including the addition of the snowball sampling method to the originally planned simple purposive sampling method as well as the establishment of contact with the interviewees. Steps taken to develop a suggested model to improve the implementation of RBM were also narrated. The issues of triangulation, validity, and reliability were considered. The limited applicability of the notions of validity and reliability in qualitative research and their replacement with notions of concern for trustworthiness, rigor and quality were highlighted. Details of the related processes of data quality check were provided. Finally, the handling of the ethical issues relating to the research was discussed.
CHAPTER 4
DATA ANALYSIS, INTERPRETATION AND PRESENTATION

4.1. Introduction

This chapter presents the findings from the analysis of data collected during the semi-structured interviews as described in Chapter 3. The findings are presented in four broad categories of factors that impacted on the implementation of RBM in the Zimbabwe Public Service. Several themes that emerged, in each category, from the literature review and analysis of data are presented.

The research design included the interviewing of 32 managers comprising Permanent Secretaries, Directors and Deputy Directors in the Zimbabwe Public Service to obtain primary data. At the beginning of each interview, the researcher asked the manager how well RBM was understood and appreciated within the Zimbabwe Public Service. This question took the discussion to the capturing of experiences, views and opinions of individual managers regarding the implementation of RBM. Most managers dwelt a lot on the challenges as well as frustrations experienced from the introduction of RBM to the period of interviews.

Although the interviews were conducted in English, some participants switched to the vernacular language (Shona) to clarify certain points and/ or emphasize their ideas in a more relaxed manner. As indicated in Chapter 3, the participants are identified using codes for confidentiality. In order to retain the voice of the participants and to maintain the integrity of their comments, they are quoted verbatim. Direct quotes are presented in italics and referenced to the interview transcript. Within the quotes, text added by the researcher for clarification or to avoid names is in normal text with square and round brackets respectively. Words spoken by interviewees in vernacular are in bold font. The
related translations, like the narrations to illustrate direct quotes, are in square brackets and not italicized. Dotted gaps within the direct quotations indicate that some text has been removed because it was within a statement relevant to the research concern being handled, but itself not regarded as irrelevant. The data from the interviews were coded following the procedure described in Chapter 3. A sample of the coded transcript is attached in Appendix C.

The term managers in this chapter was used to refer to the managers in the Zimbabwe Public Service who were interviewed by the researcher. For readability and to ensure a reasonable length of this chapter, the findings are only presented in this chapter and discussed in Chapter 5.

The data relevant to the factors that impacted on the implementation of RBM in the Zimbabwe Public Service fell into the following four broad categories. Each category comprises several themes listed and subsequently presented in detail in the following sections.

**Human factors**

- Availability of capacity for implementing RBM
- Availability of information
- Culture
- Senior management involvement
- Stakeholder identification and participation
- Level of communication
- Complexity of the RBM system
- Alignment of responsibility and accountability and decision making authority
Organizational factors

- Adoption of the RBM strategy
- Customization of RBM systems
- Alignment of systems
- Availability of resources
- Location of the performance measurement function

Environmental factors

- The Political environment
- Apparent absence of a shared national vision

Other issues

- The RBM implementation of RBM
- Suggestions for improving the implementation of RBM in the Zimbabwe Public Service

4.2 Human factors

4.2.1. Availability of capacity for implementing RBM

4.2.1.1. Knowledge of RBM within the Zimbabwe Public Service

Thirty-nine managers declined to participate in the study explaining that they were unfamiliar with the RBM strategy to such an extent that they felt unqualified to discuss it in any context. Also, the managers interviewed unanimously agreed that RBM was not well understood or appreciated in the Zimbabwe Public Service to allow for its meaningful implementation. The reason cited for this shortcoming was that the Civil Servants had not been afforded the opportunity to understand the concept itself, the benefits to be derived as well as the implementation process.
• But frankly, I don't think there is 1) a grasp of what RBM stands for. Secondly I don't think there is a grasp of what it intends to do for the Service and thirdly I don't think there is a grasp of how we are supposed to go about it... The point I am trying to make by way of the weak roll-out is to centrally state that the concept is good - what is not good is the comprehension. (P32:3, 63).

• ...... It’s a management tool but what is the expected outcome of using it as a management tool. How much benefit is derived from it? Because I need to understand the benefits so that when I relate to the benefits, I can embrace it. But I don’t know what I am supposed to benefit from it........For us to embrace the thing without me as an individual, appreciating the benefits. I don't think it can work. So when you are not clear, as an individual, then the effort in trying to understand it becomes very difficult (P22:5, 13-7).

• Those people [Accounting Officers] manage the budget and it took some time for them to be really trained and understand what RBM is all about - so understanding is not there to the general people in the Ministry. So I cannot say it is understood in this Ministry. (P13:5).

• There are very few people that were actually trained on RBM, RBB. If I look at our Ministry, maybe there are 4 or 5 people in the Ministry who know what RBM is all about and the rest of the staff don’t - but those are the people we expect to work with the line Ministries to help them - they don’t know anything......Like I said, that even in the (name of Ministry), there are very few people who have an idea what RBM is (P16:7, 37).

• They may have a rough idea [of RBM] but to me, it’s not good enough (P17:7)

• It’s not fully appreciated..... Because right now if you ask some people they ask," What is RBM? "(P25:2, 73).

• It’s not very well understood.....If you were to ask some people, they would even question what RBM is (P2:20, 38).
• There is a forum for Directors and one for technical people. They had a meeting with the Permanent Secretaries and the Secretaries got lost............If it can't sail through Permanent Secretaries, there is no way it can sail downwards. Even the Ministers also don't know..... If the top officials, don't understand what can you expect. Even the permanent Secretary refers it back to you (P19: 42-6).

• I think with RBM, there are areas which are not very clear. Like you want to make an impact, what is impact? What is outcome? I think people are not yet able to quantify their work in Government in terms of outputs. That area is not very clear maybe it's because of the training we are getting it's not very clear...... One, we don’t have adequate information and systems (P30:22, 29).

• Generally, I don't think it's really appreciated at this stage because as a concept, like us here as an office we were not trained in RBM to really appreciate the concept, to really appreciate that it’s a new management program. So, in the end when we begin a year and finish it we are confused on what you are supposed to fill in and whatever information you can put in its because you are guided by somebody else not by the concept itself. ...... Report forms are just imposed on us to complete and we just comply but we don't understand why we are using them. This is the general situation with most of my colleagues (P3:7-8, 76-7).

In this regard, some of the senior managers interviewed reported that it was only staff at the lower levels who did not understand RBM because they had not been trained. The training had reportedly been confined to management.

• Workshops that were held were for the Heads of Departments to appreciate the program but not enough was done to cascade the implementation to the lower ranks. (P18:6).

• The levels that do not appreciate RBM are the lower levels e.g. the office orderlies, the secretaries, not the Permanent Secretaries but the Executive Assistants. Some of them on a
day to day basis they are dealing with the files, typing issues to do with RBM, perhaps participating in activities pertaining to RBM. But it hasn’t gone to that level. (P9:9).

- So the lower levels and some of the middle managers were left out [of the training] (P25:61).
- The other thing was training. The training that was done…..Not all the people were trained especially the lower levels. So they don’t know about RBM…..There is no appreciation…..(P25:9,11,26).

However, according to the majority of managers, all Civil Servants did not understand RBM well enough to implement it. They contended that the training provided was inadequate such that it did not sufficiently equip the civil servants to effectively implement the strategy. As a result, it made no difference whether one had received training or not.

- Well, I don't think training is a matter of routine - training is a matter of digging comprehension. And I think there is a fundamental difference between attending a seminar and comprehending the contents of that seminar. I think that's part of our big problem- we have a very simplistic way of assessing programs which are intended for the Civil Servants. It gets worse when you are dealing with programs that are supposed to be reformatory. When you are talking about "change management" - it's a very delicate process. And there are certain indicators that show you that that concept has been 1) welcomed 2) understood and 3) there is commitment to implement it in the Service. (P32: 5-6).

Inadequate training

Several concerns were raised regarding the training including the quality of both the trainers and training programs. According to the managers, the quality of trainers was perceived to be less than optimal for ensuring full understanding of the concept within the Public Service. This was because the trainers did not possess the necessary knowledge and experience to capacitate others.
• The few people that are very familiar with RBM, the few officers in Ministries, are not able to train others - they are not trainers. You need a trainer to conduct training (P1:20-1).

• So, I think we need to improve the grasp of the concept. And the way to improve the grasp of the concept is to make sure that we have people who deliver it to us, to our minds with the credibility, with the clout to ensure acceptance (P32:63-4).

• And even the people who are training, I think there is that lack of confidence in the system itself. I believe the training needs to be improved…..(P14: 21).

• ….. the people that are training are not well versed, they are not convincing enough…… I think we need better trained resource persons for RBM (P2:38).

• Although I am saying that the trainers as well - we would have trainers from Malaysia …Malaysia which was not really fitting to be practical for Zimbabwe. (Name of department) has trained some locals but maybe they are not up to standard (P25:34-5).

• I will tell you when we were trained by the (name of department), at times we would ask them some questions and these would be thrown back to us, and they would answer with, "I do not know". Those that are implementing it are of high sound but none of them have attended a single training session……. People end up paying lip service which destroys trust ( P5: 35-6, 38).

• The other thing is the people who somehow were meant to manage it, did not contextualize it within the Zimbabwean context…….If you are a teacher and you don’t quite understand what you are supposed to teach then I don’t see you adapting that concept in that environment…No wonder why they couldn’t adapt. Ivo pachavo havazivi (they don’t know it themselves)….Even if we were to discuss the concepts in their presence and you try to ask them then you will realize that you are better off without their help. Wozobvunza iye pachake then you see kuti haa! [then you ask him/ her and realize that he/ she doesn't know] P19: 9, 23, 25, 27).
Also, according to the managers, either the necessary training was not provided or the related programs were not frequent enough to adequately equip civil servants with the necessary capacity to effectively implement the strategy.

- There is no training (P25:25).
- Most of the people that we got since 2009, I don't think there was any organized training across Government to try and get the new people on board in terms of what we are trying to do (P24: 9).
- ....it also needs to be complemented by giving people the appropriate training...a lot of people we have actually came on board in 2009 - certainly on my side that is the situation. They have not had this opportunity to be taken through the formal process. It's just on the job to say this is what you do, this is how we do things so they try and fit in within the arrangement....Give people the appropriate training (P24:6, 17, 47).
- We should also have - maybe we should have had continuous training because you know every day we have new people coming on board others going away especially for the period 2005-8, maybe even 2009 (P16:12)
- It [training] should be continuous, not once in a while (P2:39).
- Well, in our case, it [training] has not been adequate. I mean we have been waiting for training including cascading it to the lower ranks, in my own Department for instance (P29:12).
- The training yes it was there but I don't think it was enough.... So the training itself I don’t think it was sufficient. (P21:16, 19).
- Actually I am saying that interactions, special sessions, updates and the like - they are not there both from the (name of department) and (name of department) (P25:58).
- But you will find that we did receive a bit of training, but maybe it wasn’t enough and maybe we needed refresher courses so maybe we could grasp the concept. But really to say that
there is anyone that I have met and said they have they understood the concept, I will be lying (P31:5-6).

The managers were of the opinion that the content of the training programs were inadequate and attending them did not benefit much in terms of preparing them to implement RBM. Their concerns included the quality of training programs, the material provided including the examples cited by the trainers.

- And I think there is a fundamental difference between attending a seminar and comprehending the contents of that seminar...... The fact that Senior Civil Servants went for some seminars on the concept of RBM yet we still have that paradox where, in spite of that attendance, there is no willingness to apply it on the ground. That in itself must reveal a lot in terms of how much grasp there was from these seminars (P32:5, 7).
- Those who give reports claim to have trained but people have not internalized it (P5:22)
- Maybe it’s the training that we received; maybe it wasn’t enough training that we received from the trainers. We really did not grasp the concept of RBM. And I think that's the first challenge that I encountered and that most of the people encountered ...... (P31:2-3).
- We are trained from time to time, but the trainings are not effective (P2:37).

Also, there was reportedly frustration with the training programs that were perceived to be inadequate in that they concentrated on theory rather than practical issues.

- Mainly they [the trainers] are more theoretical. You know, they were just trained by Malaysian trainers. But In terms of the practice - they just talk and not really practical. So they just got the theory (P25:38).
- Yah! The confidence is there but these guys they are just talking about something they have heard about RBM - but it’s not something they have really used (P14: 23).
• *Even the examples that we get, you know when you go for training, the trainers always say, suppose you are building bridges, suppose you are building houses because that’s the easiest thing. We need something that goes with what we do* (P13:31).

• *And the trainings are sometimes too short to give you the correct depth and knowledge to be able to apply and pass onto others. The danger is therefore in passing on where one may pass on the wrong thing altogether and whether there is a system up there checking on what is sent down line* (P8:36-7).

Another concern regarding the training was the reported mix of participants with diverse backgrounds in training programs. Such arrangement did not ensure that meaningful benefit was derived by all the participants in the training session. According to the managers, the levels of staff as well as their knowledge of RBM tended to be very different among the participants meaning that their training needs were equally different. The training programs thus did not accommodate such differences.

• *I would also want to reinforce this idea when we have training programs. The training programs are held together for everybody from the highest to the lowest level. Like the (name of department), when they conduct training, from Deputy Secretary level - they have this policy of making it across the board. One person wants to learn about what RBM is when you want to learn what PPS is. So it’s taking you backwards…. Maybe let us be grouped according to our levels of comprehension* (P23:30, 33).

• *I can say last year….I think we had a situation where there were mixed participants from all grades really. And the idea was to call a number of people in lower grades including the simplest…..And obviously the training Director couldn’t concentrate and it was not well because the understanding is different. And the approach should also be different. Otherwise, yes, at the end of the day, one group might benefit but two groups or levels will not*
understand what you are saying. So there is that danger which people will not appreciate (P25:40-1).

4.2.1.2. Availability of skills

All the managers interviewed were of the opinion that skills for implementing RBM were generally inadequate. The inadequacy was both in terms of numbers and caliber. Apart from the inadequate training mentioned above, the loss of skills was also cited for this shortcoming.

- And also even the skills, I think there are requirements that you need - the costing, we may not have those skills to do that. (P17:29).
- They [skills] are inadequate (P25: 54).
- It seems difficult because we don't have enough capacity…. It strains managers, it strains the focal point (P8: 52, 60).
- They [skills] may not be adequate in the sense that supposing that the people who are dealing with that [RBM] leave that department obviously the ones coming in won't have adequate knowledge so they have to be retrained……now no one is talking about it [training] so you really wonder if we are not equipping other people who are coming in then it means those who were trained are the only people who know (P17:9, 11).

Some managers added that the inadequacy of skills was not only limited to RBM but management skills in general.

- Skills are limited…..My assessment is we have had workshops with groups of Directors across Government and can see that 1) the numbers are inadequate 2) the capacity not only capacity for RBM but find that if ask a Director about the direction of the national policy, he begins to stammer (P10:131).
4.2.1.3. **Loss of skills**

The managers reported that the lack of skills was a result of loss staff through attrition of the Public Service as well as non-usage of the skills gained earlier by the Civil Servants.

4.2.1.3.1. **Attrition**

He managers attributed the unavailability of skills other reasons, apart from the inadequate training. One such reason was the loss of both momentum and skills due to attrition of the Public Service during the period in which the country faced immense economic challenges (2007-9).

- *You will find that....it's my personal assessment that the economic challenges weakened the government. The caliber of personnel in government as it is now is not up to standard (P10:132).*

- *We went on a capacity building program and we trained just everybody from the Head of Ministry going down. But when we started experiencing challenges from 2008-9. Like everything else, we had challenges. We didn’t keep up the momentum we had gathered - we lost the momentum. You know the Civil Service lost the people who had been trained generally as a country because of the brain drain. We lost some skills. So we are now at a stage where we are retraining.....(P1:7-12).*

- *When this thing started I think a lot of training was undertaken. When we went through the hardship period, we lost a lot of people (P24:7-8).*

- *........that was during the period of the economic meltdown. So, the people left - those who had been trained now left. So there was a gap such that the people who had been trained left and the lower levels who had not been trained remained. So there was that combination - so it's not moving (P25:12-3).*

- *........ the Human Resource element and, in our case, most of the people were leaving the office going to SA, going to the UK - those who had been trained. We had started the "Training of Trainers". It happened. They came back here and started training within their*
Ministries - they started imparting their knowledge. And as a result we had people who were knowledgeable but unfortunately when these people went - true, a lot of people went. (P26:10).

- There was also a lot of attrition with people moving away which affected our programs with no people on the ground (P10:8).

- The second issue is when we started in 2005, 2006, then we were also having economic problems and therefore people that were trained in the Civil Service, left for greener pastures. So the people that are there right now are people who are learning by doing. There are very few people that were actually trained on RBM, RBB. If I look at our Ministry, maybe there are 4 or 5 people in the Ministry who know what RBM is all about and the rest of the staff don’t - but those are the people we expect to work with the line Ministries to help them - they don’t know anything (P16:6).

- The skills are inadequate following the increased attrition of trained manpower at the height of the economic meltdown when a number of RBM trained personnel left the public sector to join the private sector or the country altogether in search of greener pastures in the Diaspora (P7: 17).

4.2.1.3.2. Loss of knowledge lost due to non-usage of the system

Another reason cited for the unavailability of skills was loss of knowledge and skills, among those who were trained and remained in the Service, due to non-usage of the system. The non-usage was reportedly more pronounced during the period of economic challenges.

- And then we went through inflation and the RBM was forgotten. In 2008- 2009 it was buried.... People had totally forgotten [about RBM] because of the challenges we had encountered (P6:7-8, 11).

- But that’s when we got to a point where we didn’t even apply it, 2008/2009 (P21:18).
The managers interviewed also added that the non-usage of the system occurred on a day to day basis as well rather than being confined to a period.

- *It's [RBM] understood slightly because it is not being followed. If it was continuously being followed, because of the time we have covered doing RBM, it would have been something we are used to (P2: 21-2).*

- *When it comes to people complaining about the reports are too long, I think it is an issue that we are not using that system daily. If everybody was using it daily, I don’t think it would be a problem. But you will find sometimes you will forget about it. It only comes back after some months when it’s there to do the performance appraisal (P14:28-30).*

It was reported that this challenge regarding capacity was faced by all units including those in the lead implementing agencies who were expected to provide support to other units.

- *It's the issue of capacity now for (name of unit) because when these people bring their documents, sometimes you really have eh..eh. If I gave an Officer a document to say, “Can you analyze it?” Because they don’t know what it is they are looking for, it is very difficult for them to analyze. These are the issues we have been grappling with in the [name of unit] to say how do we build our own capacity (P16:38).*

- *This is the form [performance measurement form] introduced I think last year but it's still a bit weak. But this is the form which is there now. It has not yet been strengthened enough because of the capacity at the (name of department) (P10:143).*

- *So the people that are there right now are people who are learning by doing. There are very few people that were actually trained on RBM. If I look at our Ministry, maybe there are 4 or 5 people who know what RBM is all about and the rest of the staff don’t - but those are the people we expect to work with the line Ministries to help them - they don’t know anything (P16:7).*
Notably, the managers interviewed unanimously agreed that there was a lack of capacity for implementing RBM in the Zimbabwe Public Service.

4.2.2. Availability of information

There was reportedly lack of feedback on performance reports such that the managers were not able to tell whether or not they were implementing the strategy correctly.

- These documents [performance reports] are prepared by a Ministry. They are sent to (name of the ministry). (Name of the ministry, when they receive these documents, there is no feedback to Ministries on the quality of those documents. So the Ministries don't know whether what they sent to the [name of ministry] is good enough (P1: 29-32).
- So what goes on there may not be very much clear but I know that there has not been that feedback in terms of impact and I think that is the problem (P21:25).
- There is nothing that comes back (P18:44).
- No feedback. It's just discussed in the context of the Ministry's management but not as a formal feedback mechanism (P24:44).

This concern regarding the lack of feedback was confirmed and was attributed to the lack of capacity. It was explained that those responsible for the review of documentation on RBM neither understand the concept nor its implementation. As a result, they did not know what to consider in the review process.

- Like I said, that even in the (name of Ministry), there are very few people who have an idea what RBM is. It's the issue of capacity now for (name of Ministry), because when these people bring their documents, sometimes you really have eh..eh. If I gave a desk Officer or (title) a document to say can you analyze it - because they don't know what it is they are looking for, it is very difficult for them to analyze. These are the issues we have been
grappling with in the (name of Ministry), to say how do we build our own capacity. Even our (title), when the documents come, they need to know exactly what is to be done and what they are looking for and they can communicate. Yes, they are right. We have not been communicating. We don't give them feedback....

- Ministries are correct in saying that they send documents to the (name of Ministry) but the Ministry does not respond (P10:81).

The managers were of the opinion that that such feedback would help to improve their understanding of the concept and its requirements.

- .....the fact that even long after implementation or supposed implementation we have not had a review, right, to know how well we are doing or how well the concept is...... This means we must try and have some kind of indaba where we are reviewing that concept and then learning from our own experiences so that we make the necessary adjustments. It is at such a forum that all these weaknesses would then have been raised. So there is a very basic problem of lack of review. (P32:27, 29).

- You cannot tell, there is no feedback from anyone [on performance reports]. People do not tell us what you have done or why you have done it (P2:27-8).

- The thing then is, we never get any feedback. We don't even know what it means to them [name of Ministry] because at the end of the year, we are supposed to rank ourselves (P8:24-5).

There was also concern among the managers regarding inadequacy of capacity building initiatives which were only restricted to training. This inadequacy reportedly contributed to the lack of capacity in the Service.
• What have we done apart from the training? We should have something that keeps engaging your mind until the mindset changes. Such a message is not coming. RBM is really a myth to many (P23:76-7)

• That process of scheming and compiling a toolkit for RBM is so key - is so key to the acceptance and the success of its implementation. It is so key, and I emphasize, to the acceptance of the notion of RBM (P32:37)

• What we should have done - first to come up with a guideline with terms so that we share the same understanding then we can say, objectives what are we talking about, then we say outcome so that my outcome is not different from your reporting. But we didn't do that. Even now we don't have a Guideline. Those are some of the shortcomings. (P16:8).

4.2.3 Culture

The managers also reported that RBM in Zimbabwe was greatly influenced by past experiences with the implementation of initiatives and also an inherent local culture relating to work. Such culture included a generally negative attitude towards work, unlike other nationals as well as resistance to change. They were of the opinion that the culture needed to change for the implementation of RBM to improve.

• ...... if we are serious enough to revise our culture and compare with the Asians. People going to banks, those in offices are attending to personal issues - you don't get such things when you go to any European country. Here sometimes by around quarter past nine one is gone.... If you tell him / her to sit down and work he / she starts to complain... One just goes to the farm - when does this person perform his office work? You see. We are not saying that one shouldn't go farming but when things become blurred. On Monday one turns up for work around 10 because he/ she was looking for fertilizer. Ah...ah..ah! And you want to compete
globally with those Japanese guys whose leave the office at midnight and are back again at 6 am. You can't catch them. (P10:115, 117, 126-7).

- The main challenge in implementing the strategy would be the reluctance by the civil servants to adopt change or departure from the norm (P15:14).
- Ethos, values and the mind set should change (P7: 23).

The absence of a culture of reading among Zimbabweans was also cited particularly regarding the paperwork involved in both the planning and performance measurement phases of RBM. In this regard, it was suggested that the amount of paperwork in the implementation of RBM needed to be adjusted accordingly.

- I think we have to say that our people don't have the nature of reading- we don't have that nature of reading. And so paperwork really - if the documents become too long, people lose interest. People prefer to read very short documents that are less time consuming …..There are questions like "In Australia or Malaysia - how did it work?" ok They are different cultural settings which requires that people are able to fit it into their work….. As Zimbabweans, we mustered cramming (reciting) ideas to pass examination. But to apply the knowledge? - To use that knowledge from Biology is difficult for us (P23: 7, 42, 84).

In addition, the managers believed that past experiences with new initiatives had a bearing on both the adoption and implementation of the strategy. That is, people took RBM to be one of the passing programs that would be replaced without reaching completion. As a result, the strategy was reportedly viewed with scepticism by the Civil Servants.

- We are known, as a country, to have very good plans…. but to operationalize them…. (P17:49).
• *I think we have a culture. There is a culture, I don't know where it comes from such that we get tired in the process. We don't seem to take things to their logical conclusion. I think it has happened in many instances where we start one thing, then we can decide to come up with another one. After a few years, we would be having something new* (P23:71).

• *Then some challenges of a few people who still think like the doubting Thomases - ..... who still think that; well it's because- the resources are not sufficient to implement the RBM in its total form then perhaps like the previous forms there is a time that will come and say “perhaps we have stopped this one we are embarking on another one” so that's another challenge* (P9:54).

• *Systems are dynamic and the system could be on its way out and new ones coming in, in five years’ time!* (P15:19).

However, there was a counter-argument offered that the issue of culture cannot hinder change as the culture itself can be transformed. It was further argued that it was the way RBM was introduced in relation to the relevant culture that presented challenges.

• *Malaysia introduced RBM in spite of its culture. So, the fact that it still found room for or need for RBM, means it did not find its culture supportive enough of its performance. So really that's a dead argument. You can't then suggest that RBM did well in Malaysia because of the culture. Yet that culture still required RBM to transform itself........ There is no culture that cannot itself transform.....There is no culture that cannot itself permit changes. So, there are no cultures that are resistant to RBM. There are only poor ways of introducing RBM to different cultures. And I think that's the starting point* (P32: 73-75).

Notably, both arguments, regarding the issue of culture, converge on the need to change it to one that effectively supports the implementation of RBM.
4.2.3.1. Performance measurement focus

The majority of managers reported that their main focus in performance measurement were the outputs which was different from the underlying principle of RBM where the focus should be on outcomes and impact rather than outputs.

- ....the major thing in RBM is your output. .....So what is important is even when we report every quarter, your outputs would have been planned. Perhaps you have 4 outputs but complete 2 - 1 output per quarter, when you submit reports you are actually focusing on output completion (P1: 65, 72-3).

- So we look mainly at the outputs because outputs are the tangible things for which we give them the money to produce. And we can pinpoint that we gave you money to do 1,2 3 - where is that output?(P16:55).

- Yet, if you look at the appraisal system, it's supposed to appraise me on the basis of how much I have used the budget. Just as an example, I am supposed to be appraised the way I use resources in implementing programs - is a function that will determine whether I am a good manager or bad manager. Have I spent more than I should spend or do I under spend or request more than I need? It's all those dimensions put together. They are supposed to be inputted in the appraisal system in the framework of RBM (P28: 21-3).

- I suppose we will be looking at what we have achieved... Yes. What we have done in relation to what we have planned (P23:53, 55).

- In terms of reporting you are basically looking at progress in terms of what you had planned (P24:35).

- It might be difficult given that we are a centre, we don't implement out there so those who do they report on the output (P21:35).
• Performance reports mainly focus on the initial planning and analysis of the resources available, the regular review of the agreed plan, the achievement of the targets whether there are variances and why (P11:25.)

• So I am saying there are still some people who still want to be associated with the activity based programming rather than RBM….(P9:24).

• What we have done, when we design our work plan we make sure that the outputs are meeting the inputs that we get on the ground. We then match those outputs with timelines so that the outputs we assess in the monetary form are the same outputs that our staff are responsible for at various levels on the ground (P8:21-2).

The focus on outputs further demonstrated the absence of a results culture which could be linked to low familiarity with RBM among the Civil Servants.

4.2.4. Senior management involvement and leadership

Some of the lower level managers interviewed were of the opinion that the involvement of top management in the implementation of RBM was insufficient to ensure effectiveness. They were concerned about issues such as lack of commitment and leadership demonstrated by senior management in the implementation process.

• ….. I think also the same thing also affects the leadership at various levels. The hierarchy after the Directors, the technical Directors. Considerably I don't think they take it seriously. Well, they never. Their function - at the end of the day what should happen is the Chief Secretary should call the Permanent Secretary and say, this year we want to do 1, 2, 3, 4” , and they sign the Performance agreement - Key Result Areas agreed. Then a Performance agreement is signed between the Permanent Secretary and the Chief Secretary with Key Result Areas for the Department. He should come down and say, “This is done by so and so
and this by so and so and then we also sign the performance agreement. That does not happen. At Some point during the year you are just told, "What happened to the budget according RBM system? What then is supposed to be RBM. .... So I think that it needs full uptake by all the leadership to be fully behind it. I think that is the reason it's not fully accepted. (P28:30-5, 39).

- Everybody should be involved and this thing should start from the top. That's my opinion. If the people at the top will appreciate it and then that way it can work (P14:34).

- That is the greatest weakness causing problems to the extent that Senior Management are not motivated to look at it. .... If you are to innovate big things that affect planning, that affect appraisal, that affects budgeting, that affects everything then you have to do it holistically....(P28: 17, 61).

- To me RBM is like an overall of the performance appraisal system, overall. If it's overall, the leadership should be there. It's very necessary but it's not there (P23:76).

- Well for it to work, well I look at it as working by cascading it. So it has to start from the top and then cascade downwards (P29:21).

- Yes, it should have gone down, from the top to the bottom (P25:63).

- I think that at the lower level you will find that the whole system is really appreciated. But now the problem is at the higher level. This thing is just being given to the lower levels to start doing the things (P14: 4).

The lack of appreciation and commitment was attributed to low familiarity with the concept. Some of the senior managers explained that they needed to understand the concept and its benefits before they could try to understand or demonstrate their appreciation of it.

- There is a forum for Directors and one for technical people. They had a meeting with the Permanent Secretaries and the Secretaries got lost.....Even the Ministers also don't know
[RBM]. They have never been introduced. If the top officials, don't understand what can you expect. Even the permanent Secretary refers it back to you (P19:42, 45-6).

- My assessment is we have had workshops with groups of Directors across Government and can see that 1) the numbers are inadequate 2) the capacity not only capacity for RBM but find that if ask a Director about the direction of the national policy, he begins to stammer (P10:132)

- And the importance of it has to be appreciated.......It's a management tool but what is the expected outcome of using it as a management tool. How much benefit is derived from it? Because I need to understand the benefits so that when I relate to the benefits, I can embrace it. But I don’t know what I am supposed to benefit from it. In fact I think it's a tool or some research that is coming from elsewhere. For us to embrace the thing without me as an individual, appreciating the benefits. I don't think it can work. So when you are not clear, as an individual, then the effort in trying to understand it becomes very difficult. (P22: 7, 13-7)

4.2.5. Stakeholder identification and participation

In the context of RBM, stakeholder identification appeared to be a challenge as the majority of managers interviewed identified only their employer, direct clients, donors and the Government as their main stakeholders, excluding other groups such as citizens and politicians.

- Our main stakeholders are the entrepreneurs - those are our main stakeholders (P3:25).

- Internal clients would be within government. Then the stakeholders, who are they? Internal stakeholders - Government. We haven’t really exhausted it as a ministry (P6:21-4).

- In my area of operation it's [main stakeholders] the financial sector players The Reserve Bank, insurance and pension commission and security (P17: 22).
However, two of the managers interviewed considered the general public as main stakeholders in line with the principles of RBM which is a highly participatory approach.

- I consider the general public to whom we apply service delivery as the main stakeholders. I am accountable to them in as much as they receive government service delivery (P15:7-8).
- The main stakeholders in particular area of operation are: Treasury, Ministries and Departments, local authorities, members of the public, sporting and cultural bodies and members of the department (P11:20).

It can be argued that the identification of only a limited number of groups of stakeholders, in the context of RBM, also points to the level of understanding of the concept.

4.2.6. Level of communication

In line with the literature reviewed on the implementation of RBM in Zimbabwe, the interviews revealed that there was limited stakeholder involvement in the implementation of RBM in the Zimbabwe Public Service. Such stakeholders included staff and citizens. Consequently, there was limited communication and interaction among stakeholders in relation to the demands of RBM. This shortcoming could be closely linked to the issue of stakeholder identification, which was not adequately comprehensive.

- Check on it. We have a very interesting element where a concept which is participatory is exclusive in its implementation (P32: 55).
- In fact, all those clients/ stakeholders are identified clearly in our RBM documents, but I think most Ministries are doing desk exercise. Those clients out there, don't even know they are in our documents. We have not reached a stage where we go to our clients and find out if we have made a difference…….. we will get there, it's a process…. Hence we don't even go to them to assess whether we have met their needs, whether we have made a difference, we do not. We do our own assessment and I think that is a stage where we must quickly leave and
go to the next stage where we engage our clients through a survey questionnaire. But at this stage we have client chatters, but we have not engaged them, we have made assumptions that this is what they need and we have proceeded to craft client chatters (P1:79-83).

• And we need to have strategic plans because whatever should come from our stakeholders. So I think that gap in between maybe the bottom is the one that is to do with the understanding - I don't know there is something missing somewhere, I don't know what it is but there is something missing. That something which is missing needs to be addressed because we need to move together. If you notice it’s a program for [name of Ministry] - the Government on the other side. Everybody must buy-in to it (P16:29).

• Everybody. In fact, we should carry it outside. Everybody in terms of Government - internal and also when you go outside to the stakeholders. Yes just brought to us. And I am saying once you do that, people develop resistance. Or maybe top managers thought it was not necessary. But then if there is really no one to implement it, you see there are challenges. For the people will say, "You think you can do without us. So can you deliver the service" and you notice you can’t.....People don’t know and they don’t care when you use that word [RBM] because they have been left out. So there is this feeling that "It's for you, not for us." So as long as you have that "us and them" issue then you have problems. You have problems. (P25:64, 66, 74-5).

• When you talk to the managers, they say that is it [RBM] is effective. They are not listening to the people. They have what they want and believe they have introduced a system that should be accepted at all costs. Fine, we will accept it all costs....... Any efforts to adapt it [the RBM system] at lower levels are met with resistance, people are asked to work so as to see the outcome. That is not the way to do things (P5:45-8, 92-3).
• But the people at the top, when they want things done they are telling you to do it this way. “You do it this way”. So whatever you come up with at the lower level you can’t push it up (P14: 7).

• They should have a think tank, where they find out from civil servants what can be done, what is effective to us as Zimbabweans, putting into consideration our resources (P2:43).

• So what they [top executives] ought to do is when they want the views of public servants, they should hold out research programs….. When you talk to the managers, they say that is it [performance measuring system] is effective. They are not listening to the people. (P5:37, 45-6).

• What is lacking is ownership by the public servant. The top management thinks they own the program but they are not the ones that do the job. It is done by those below them……. The top management publicly proclaims they own it but the truth of the matter is - those below them, are resistant. They are living in cocoon land (P5:80-3, 88-90).

It can be argued that the limited communication and interaction with internal stakeholders as well as the absence of external stakeholder participation can help to explain the reported less than optimal implementation of the RBM strategy.

4.2.7 Complexity of the RBM system

The majority of managers expressed frustration with the RBM system tools that they described as complicated and cumbersome, among other descriptions. In the same context, the paperwork was deemed to be excessive and time consuming to such an extent that the Civil Servants dreaded the execution of the related planning and reporting functions.

• Now in a concept of what we have presently, the only significant tool you find in RBM, outside of course the human tool, by way of those that introduced it, is the heavy, long and, in some respect, circuitous form that we are required to fill I think it’s quarterly, right? That form, just from the sheer size of it, is forbidding. …. and remember you are dealing with
Senior Managers who have lots of work to do……. Now, you have a whole form that asks of you no less than 2 hours to fill and even then, in very contentious circumstances .... That form in itself is a headache. You have this sense of fatigue running down your spine from the start, right? So that is the problem..... So I must say - to me, the most dreadful exercise in RBM is filling in that form. It's an inappropriate tool (P32:39-41, 46).

- One, it's complicated (P19: 3).

- But, you find it has been a challenge when it comes to the tablets. Those are good but it's a challenge when filling in those tablets. You find that most people really feel harassed and you find that as times go on, people have fatigue when it comes to filling them..... So in terms of time it is very difficult. Given that it has been a challenging aspect, people tend to postpone it.....Most people also say it's a bit complicated (P21: 4, 30, 47).

- The other issue that I can see is that, of course, it [RBM] requires a lot of time because system is cumbersome (P8:13).

- But I think it is a bit challenging maybe as you get to the lower levels because of the nature of the paperwork - becomes complicated, very complicated for the ordinary person to integrate it in everyday work. It has got its own challenges..... But I think there is something wrong - there are challenges concerning, I think the paperwork. There is a lot of paperwork - go from one to the other. It's very challenging......But this work on RBM on its own - just completing the form is time wasting .... Maybe we need to come up with one or two papers that is comprehensive.... There is something that needs to be done to make it user-friendly. Maybe not so many papers....I think what is very time consuming is the Departmental work plan...... why I am saying it needs to be adapted- it has challenges. Like if you look at our office - there are Departments where we don’t even handle our own budgets..... Ahhh! Yes, very cumbersome...Simplify that thing. You know people are scared of those things.... Because the
minute you finish the RBM paperwork, you don't want to see it again. (P23:3, 5, 8, 17, 21, 23, 25, 27, 40, 43).

- It’s cumbersome and boring (P2: 10).

- …- it is cumbersome and needs to be simplified and still achieve the same objectives… For me those are the real issues - simplification in terms of the paperwork - make it less cumbersome for people to understand (P24:4).

- It’s [the performance report] just too detailed. It’s just too cumbersome (P19: 3).

- You spend so much work on paperwork (P19: 3).

- A lot of information. So much repetition. It has the same information. You have got to end up with or 15 or whatever pages of the information you want - one single thing (P19: 4-6).

- And the paperwork, unfortunately, ended up being a challenge to everyone. Really, even some of us who were... who went through the mill, if you asked me to go through the documentation, I would struggle to complete it. What about a line ministry, that became a major challenge…. But really look at it - the documentation we have - there are many repeating heads. You do something here, you find that in the work plan, you also have to put in the same information. They you say, “Why are we repeating this same information?” We really need to simplify it and make sure it's easier for people to understand (P26:15, 42-4).

- Then the paperwork - the paperwork is just too much. It takes time and at the end of the day you don't see where you are going. Yah! You don't see where you are going. So what? You don't see actually the outcome after all the effort and all the paperwork….There is too much paperwork (P25:14-5, 27).

- But I think it is a bit challenging maybe as you get to the lower levels because of the nature of the paperwork - becomes complicated, very complicated for the ordinary person to integrate it in everyday work. It has got its own challenges..... But I think there is something wrong - there are challenges concerning, I think the paperwork. There is a lot of paperwork - go from
one to the other. It’s very challenging......But this work on RBM on its own - just completing the form is time wasting......(P23:3, 5, 8).

- And in the documents themselves, I think they are asking for a lot of information. Maybe we should have streamlined what we make sure that we get information for decision making. I think we should have tried to streamline the documents because you find that the information is kind of repeating itself within the integrated, departmental, the work plan blah, blah - this information is repeating itself (P16:9-10)

- Given that it has been a challenging aspect, people tend to postpone it.....(P21:30).

The time consuming nature of the planning and monitoring tools was also cited as a major concern as it consumed the time that the managers needed to execute their daily functions.

- You can’t spend so much time planning and monitoring instead of doing the real work......(P19:29).

- When you say RBM, it is no different from the old system, but the greatest disadvantage with RBM is the paperwork. You spend so much time doing paperwork and costing irrelevant things....... The old form is very easy to use, the current one, is too time consuming. I will not have time to do it. You spend more time doing paperwork...When you compare the old performance management, if you sat down wanting to agree then maybe in 15 minutes you would have completed it, with the RBM it takes days  (P5:16-18, 26-8, 67).

- ....... the forms which we use are time consuming......So what’s the purpose of this document? (P6: 27).

- I think what is very time-consuming is the Departmental work plan.....Because the minute you finish the RBM paperwork, you don’t want to see it again (P23: 23, 43).
The managers were also of the opinion that RBM system tools had too many facets, included too much detail as well as a lot of repetition in both the planning and reporting documents. They attributed the excessive amounts of paperwork to the existence of such detail and repetition. The managers argued that these system tools made understanding of the concept rather difficult for them.

- *I think those that are talking about the documents being bulky, detailed - they are right. ....... the Integrated, Performance Agreement, the Departmental Performance Agreement, and the work plan, the reporting....... Really, for people who are starting to implement RBM?..... And in the documents themselves, I think they are asking for a lot of information. Maybe we should have streamlined what we make sure that we get information for decision making. I think we should have tried to streamline the documents because you find that the information is kind of repeating itself within the integrated, departmental, the work plan blah, blah - this information is repeating itself (P16:4, 9-10).*

- *Another thing that I think I have realized is that there is too much work involved in coming up with the preparation of RBM. There are so many documents - the Ministry documents, the Department documents and on top of that there is another one - the performance contract that was introduced I think about two years ago. (P31:8).*

- *And in the documents themselves, I think they are asking for a lot of information. Maybe we should have streamlined what we make sure that we get information for decision making. I think we should have tried to streamline the documents because you find that the information is kind of repeating itself within the integrated, departmental, the work plan blah, blah - this information is repeating itself (P16:8).*

Also, the challenge with the system were compounded by the fact that these tools were all introduced at once without giving the Civil Servants ample time to familiarize with each of them.
• It just came with all these facets, components that they were supposed to comply with (P17:38).

• Then the paperwork - the paperwork is just too much. It takes time and at the end of the day you don’t see where you are going. Yah! You don’t see where you are going. Then there are all these things. So what? You don’t see actually the outcome after all the effort and all the paperwork (P25:13-4).

Regarding the issue of complexity, a group of managers were of the opinion that introducing the system through a pilot project or in phases as well as provision of the necessary guidelines could have helped alleviate this challenge regarding the complexity of the RBM tools.

• … there was not piloting of the program. It was just introduced Government wide. It should have been a pilot project. To do it maybe in a few Ministries, see how it's working, see the challenges, collect those and then now to other Ministries when we are knowledgeable about the problems and possible solutions (P25:3, 7-8).

• My view is, we were not sensitive enough. We should have at least started implementing the ground work which will then make implementation easier, in phases, yes. At least we should have done it in phases. But we started with the performance agreement, the work plan, the reporting, and so forth e......everything..... So, in other words, we could have helped the situation by having guidelines but again the guidelines were not there. So, at the end of the day, you find we introduced it as a system but later on we evaluate it and say," Please, let's simplify the documentation" (P26: 13, 16).

4.2.8. Alignment of responsibility and accountability and decision making authority

There, reportedly, was resentment among the Public servants, to the increased accountability that is inherent in RBM.
RBM comes with accountability - something which was not there. So it's a challenge to make sure that it's in people's minds. That's a challenge (P10:119).

It [RBM] is, however, not fully appreciated because it is sometimes taken as a tool for repression by management where they monitor the day to day operation of an individual (P15:3).

In the same context, some interviewees expressed frustration with the situation where they were reportedly held accountable for issues that they did not totally control. Such demands reportedly led to high levels of anxiety and de-motivation.

It doesn't make sense to me to pretend that we are doing what we are supposed to be doing because you cannot hold me accountable, as a manager, to say you must do 1,2,3 when I am not fully responsible for the resources also. I am not fully responsible for the resources - the resources are managed by the (name of ministry) - our Finance departments are an extension of (name of ministry) keeping tight control on the budget. Sometimes if you are not a strong you cannot perform..... But it can't work now because I am not the one who is controlling the resources. The resources come they are pooled under Finance department. The assignment, I am not fully in control of it. I am in control of it to the extent that I have the concept and the idea but the finance and other things are completely out of my control - completely out of my control. So I am asking, “Can I be held accountable for something that I can’t control?” (P28:19-0, 24-7).

In terms of management of the resources, it tends to be centralized. So even though you have got an input in the budget process, there is an envelope that has been made available, it's available to the Ministry not to individual components. That's another challenge (P24:31)

It can be argued that all the managers agreed that capacity, including the culture, to implement RBM was a major factor that impacted on the process. They were of the opinion that there was need for
ensuring full appreciation of the concept as well as adjustments that included adapting the tools, change in culture as well as levels of management control.

4.3 Organizational factors

4.3.1. Adoption of the RBM strategy

There was broad consensus regarding the generally limited progress in the adoption of RBM within the Zimbabwe Public Service. It was also revealed that when adopted, the strategy was not consistently used. 39 managers contacted with a request to participate in the research declined the invitation indicating that they did not understand RBM and were not applying its principles in their areas of operation. The managers who participated reported that although they were aware of the existence of RBM, it was yet to be fully adopted and implemented within the Public Service.

- Well, RBM is a proverbial ghost – many talk about it but very few have seen or understood it. It's a folk term in the service and we know it's something that improves the service; it's something that we must move towards. And now we have a commitment to implement it .......
  (P32:1).

- In the Public Service, people have heard about it as a concept and as a tool that Government wants to put in place. But to take it as a management tool that we use on a day to day basis. Ah...ah! That has not happened (We are aware of RBM, we are aware that it's a management tool but we have not embraced it as a tool because we don't use it on a day to day basis. And the importance of it has to be appreciated.... As a result, we don’t use it. So given that it’s not helping in the management strategy, at the end of the day, it has lost its critical role as a management tool (P22:4-7, 9-10).

- And the implementation process has not yet started. I can safely say that: 1) it has to do with perhaps inadequate information or appreciation of what RBM stands for....... Well, we are hoping that the economic fortunes will come in the not so distant future so to speak. If that
were to happen, let’s say next year, then we can begin to implement it…. That should indicate that the roll-out is yet to happen… Well, I don’t have any other challenges that I can talk about now until we get into it [RBM] or attend to it. (P29:4, 10, 13, 15).

- Perhaps the only other challenge has to do with seeing, perhaps, where it is working in other Government Departments. That is if there are already other Departments which have started implementing it (P29:16).

- RBM is really a myth to many….. (P23:78).

- They [Civil Servants] know there is something called RBM but have not yet started using it (P13:5).

- …….. in terms of implementing RBB[Results Based Budgeting], if I put it on a scale of 1 to 100 I can say it’s still less than 20 percent. Just putting in the systems that are supposed to be put in place so we can say we have a semblance of a Results Based Budgeting system….. In terms of implementation, we haven’t reached 20 percent (P10: 77, 101).

It was also reported that, within those units that had adopted the strategy, implementation was not comprehensive as some groups or individuals, in the top management, were not involved. According to the middle managers, their supervisors left the implementation to the lower levels and only referred to the concept when performance reports were due for submission.

- In most departments the understanding of the strategy is left to a few ‘RBM Specialists’ (P15:15).

- It’s only when they want now to start to complete the performance agreement. It’s mainly done by the lower level not the management ……. (P14:4, 10).

- So my conclusion is that those that deal with it [RBM] maybe understand. So it will be like a particular department and the rest of the Ministry don’t know RBM ……. It is not surprising that if you ask some of our officials who have been here for 1 to 2 years, they have never
heard of RBM. .......What we are doing now is, when our Director of Finance wants a report, that's when we think of RBM (P17:6, 13, 16).

- I don't see 100 percent uptake by the boss, I don't see the Senior management itself is fully behind the project to the extent that all in the Ministry are fully trying to follow.... (P28:35).
- My main one [challenge] is when you are doing something like RBM, it should be embraced by everyone. Everyone should be involved. And when you are saying, "This is what we are doing," As a unit or department everyone is working on the same thing. But if there are some people who when it comes to RBM, they say, "You guys are doing it! " then it becomes a problem (P14:25-6).

The managers added that RBM was not implemented consistently even within those units that had reportedly adopted the strategy.

- It's just an exercise to please the Commission that we have done the exercise, but otherwise people are not following it through and through (P2:16).
- What we are doing now is, when our Director of Finance wants a report, that's when we think of RBM (P17:16)

Although RBM was meant to be implemented Government-wide since 2005, to replace earlier systems, some interviewees indicated that their units were still using the old management systems. The main reason cited for this anomaly was unfamiliarity with the new RBM tools.

- We are reporting on appropriations, which is a financial statement that's states the allocations and how it was spent. Mine are in line with the parliament acts. Maybe there are RBM reports that I have not been taught. Aripo zvawo asi hatisati tashika ipapo [they exist but we have not got to the stage where we use them] (P6:32-4).
The other component of RBM is PPS [Personnel Performance System] which has not been put into operation. Up to now it has not been operationalized. There has been attempt to operationalize it but because no one understands it, it has not been done….The PPS has never been used - I have never seen it…. We are using old Public Performance Program…Here I would want to use them [RBM forms] for my subordinates but then, like I said the PPS was not implemented. (P18:7, 12, 17, 30).

Another reason provided for not adopting the system fully was that the managers reportedly found it impossible to implement the system or certain parts of it.

- It is therefore de-motivating for someone to start to try & do the cumbersome procedures when in actual fact at the end of the cumbersome task nothing happens. The procedures, the reports and the systems might be involving but does it pay me, does it make sense to me to invest time to understand those when I know that eventually I will not operate according to them. I think that, to me, that is the major disincentive...Certain parts of it are not implementable P28:15-6, 18).

- I look at our monitoring reports, I look at our PPS monitoring plan and the design of it, it seems to make total sense. But I know it doesn't work because sometimes we have people, especially lower down who are working without a work plan because they do not see the point of it (P8:31-2).

As a result of failure to use some of RBM the tools, the managers reportedly abandoned the implementation of RBM altogether.

- I tried it for last year, when I was told you should fill in that thing. I was wasting my time honestly. The whole morning I wasted honestly I would have covered 2 to 3 pages of the real work (P19:7-8).
4.3.2. **Customization of RBM systems**

The majority of the managers interviewed questioned the suitability of the RBM strategy for the Zimbabwe Public Service. They were of the opinion that the system had not been adapted to the local environment generally and also within different units in the Public Service. They asserted that failure to acknowledge and accommodate the significant differences between the local and foreign environments, where RBM was deemed successful, resulted in the perception that it was not suitable for Zimbabwe.

- *After all, this is not a concept developed by Zimbabwe - it is a concept being transplanted onto Zimbabwean soil. It has to adapt itself isn't it?.....This is a concept developed elsewhere in Malaysia, in the west, right, which has to be adapted to our circumstances. And the process of adaptation itself creates or confirms tools. If the tools developed elsewhere are appropriate then those are confirmed. If the tools that are required to deal with unique situations that arise in an African setting have to be found, then those have to be developed (P32:28, 36).*

- *In fact, I think it's a tool or some research that is coming from elsewhere ....... people think it is a foreign thing that is being introduced. If they cannot see how it relates to their work (P22: 4, 21).*

- *I think it comes from Malaysia, from the background. I think there was not much of adapting it to the Zimbabwean environment. I mean, people just take what was happening in Malaysia - where it was working.......But, those people are different from us. Just take the concept into Zimbabwe for almost immediate implementation?.... And we need to adapt it to the Zimbabwean situation so it becomes more comfortable to use and relevant to us. Yah! It must be relevant to us (P25:4, 6, 52).*
• The problem we have is that we adopted it, instead of adapting it to our conditions……. If we adapt it, we will move, but if we continue in this we are not going anywhere. At the end of every year people will still do it half-heartedly….. (P5:52, 73-4).

• I think there is need for some trimming or adaptation to our Zimbabwean environment. But there is some adaptation that is needed to be done make RBM user-friendly. (P23:7, 10).

• Unfortunately it [RBM] was duplicated from somewhere else and then applied to us….We need to adapt it and not adopt it and all indications are that it was adopted (P5:34, 91).

• We borrowed from Malaysia following the reforms that the Government had put in place right from the beginning (P10:18).

• We should at least have included adaptation instead of taking it wholesome (P17:41).

• When we started training I questioned why RBM, why they had decided to embark on a program from Malaysia, where they have adequate resources in contrast to our government with no resources ….. (P2:23).

• If you adopt it, people will cheat and not understand it. But if you adapt it becomes user friendly and each ministry is focused on agreement on what has to be done……. We need to adapt it and not adopt it and all indications are that it was adopted (P5:78-9, 91).

• Why should we do something chatakangonyamura [that we just uplifted] from Malaysia? Can't we make it user friendly for use here? (P6:47-8).

• Maybe so that we customize the program, what type of people are in Zimbabwe? Our clients, our Public Service, where can RBM fit? (P30:28).

• I'm not so sure but we also say, “It's tailor made for a certain city but for us it's so taxing.”…..There is a challenge however. (P21:13).

The managers also contended that, within the Government units, the functions and backgrounds of the Civil Servants were so varied that it was necessary to adjust the tools of the system accordingly.
• When it comes to Public Service, the same standards that are being given to people serving the Ministries are the same for teachers, the same for finance, but we are different. Some of these principles are just being applied without giving thought to the work that is being done (P5: 41-2).

• That thing RBM is supposed to be used - you are looking at all levels - the highest to the lowest. But you are looking at maybe the level of a gardener outside - his the level of education and his level of comprehension is different (P23:29).

• ……… when you look at the areas that the form takes against the realities and your own experience as a manager, sometimes you feel ridiculed. It is putting effort. It is not tailor-made to deal with unique departments, right? And it doesn’t know when it’s asking for what, right? So that you find it’s almost like a merry-go-round. You keep asking the same questions to a sense where you the person asking the questions begin to be struck by the sheer absurdity of it (P32:42).

• Now there are other institutions where this thing can work but when you are dealing with non-tangibles, say when you are dealing with Ministry of Health, you are dealing with figures, we need to build 5 clinics. At the end of the day we managed to build 2, why? The RBM then comes in. But when you are talking of intangible things like (expected output from a Ministry), you cannot assess (name of output). It will take you 10 years to know what you did last year is producing results…… It is like you are going into a straight jacket, because you see the way which we were training RBM - everything is put into figures and percentages but we don’t work like that. How do you assess the change in behaviour and put it into percentage? Where are you starting from? And how do you measure? You know it’s not something you can put into figures like I said the clinics or a company that produces vehicles where you can say we produced 10 vehicles instead of 15, where did we go wrong? You can quantify that one…. This is coming from external, like I said this would work in other
institutions. Because you need set standards and you also need time frames. We need to do it here in the house… Yah, I think if we can model it along our requirements. It’s a very good tool… (P13:14-5, 17-20, 29, 34).

- And also need to simplify that paper [RBM report form] for the ordinary people. Why can’t just say someone who does not deal with paperwork but gardening, just understand that, at the end of the day, vegetables must be available for consumption here. "What is it that I am supposed to do?". You know that adaptation is very important rather than ask him/her fill in paperwork because it’s a management tool in Government…. He/ she may not understand. Just help him understand- teach him the basics only. (P23:34, 36).

4.3.3. Alignment of systems

Managers were of the opinion that the existing environment, including management systems, was not compatible with the requirements for effective implementation of RBM. They added that they found some of the sections on the related RBM documentation impossible to complete due to the absence of certain pre-requisites that such as the structures of related departments and units.

- … my basic postulate is that view; the broader macro environments is not supportive to the implementation of RBM. And the key component that defines that broader macro environment is the budget itself. If I, on the basis of RBM, set certain strategic goals for my department, the general expectation is that my budget must begin to dialogue with those strategic goals that I have lined up. It might not able to match all the goals and that's expected. We have to prioritize, isn’t it? But when we have a budget that is tangential to those objectives, then clearly it is very difficult for one to try and follow the concept of RBM (P32:14-6).

- It’s a standalone. It’s just doing it. Why can’t we integrate it into the whole system? (P23:81).

• *Its deficiency is based on practice because we are implementing it in a very wrong way because of the structural problems* (P28:64).

• *Have we looked at how our Ministries are 1) defined 2) structured. We have Ministries that are still structured around old concepts of British bureaucracies. You have your Human Resources, you have your Finance, you have your Administration, right? And minimally, you have a Program. Are you being Results Based structurally? So you now have a basic clash between the organizational-structural logic of bureaucracy vs. a Results-Based structure* (P32: 68).

• *What is challenging in that process is that there is a lot of work that people do to plan for it but, come implementation, there is no reference to it because of a host of challenges around the issues or the pre-requisites that are not in place* (P22:8).

• *When it came I think during hyperinflation people were saying, "Look here our systems are not working properly." And it looks likely we simply took something from Malaysia where the systems are working and they have resources and then they bring this something here* (P17:40).

• *The training aspect. To me I don’t see it as functional. If the program was implemented in a way that creates enthusiasm, the training should have been easy but it becomes an issue if people are not seeing anything on the ground, structures are not in place. It means you will be forced even if you don’t have the resources....... It’s [RBM] supposed to be a meticulous planning tool that helps planning and implementation of programs but it can’t because of all these weaknesses. Weaknesses that derive from the fact that all the structural requirements of RBM are not available in the country.....It’s to do with the structure...As long as the requirements are not there - even if you re-launch, it will fail.....Re-launching is good enough if you put the structure there.* (P28:44, 51-2, 54, 80, 86).
• But if you look at it, even the structures that are were supposedly put in place under RBM. Like when we send out the circular to say, "We now want you to submit those documents," I don't know where the papers go. They just end up in the (title of an individual)’s office who will sit down, do something something, gives it to the (title of an individual), does the work planning. I don’t know what happens in line Ministries but that’s really with us it’s an anomaly (P16:60).

The planning aspect, a major component of RBM, was also not closely aligned to the processes and structures such as the budget. This was attributed, primarily, to the limited knowledge relating to the strategy.

• .......... there is no alignment. (Name of ministry), their plan for the country- if you are talking of the plan it’s more like the vision 2020, the MTP. They must also be very RBM compliant, very RBM compliant.....So there must be an alignment between the plan and the budgetary process and even the structures, the organizational structures, they must all be aligned to the vision, the budgetary process.......it’s just still a challenge where the (name of ministry), perhaps its budgetary process is not really informed by the planning process....There is need for alignment. That could be a strategic thing that we need to talk of and to look at. The vision of the country, the vision 2020, the medium term plan, the budgetary process, they must also be aligned. So at the moment that can be another challenge because the budget and the plans they must be talking to each other. ((P9:57-9, 71-2).

• And also all those things are also because the macro-planning is still weak. It's the one that is supposed to direct these people and point to them that this is your path. So that aspect is still weak then people cannot articulate clearly what they want to do (P10:122-3).

• Even the work planning - when we put RBM in place, we realized that our planning is very weak because the instruments of RBM are based on planning.....Otherwise you will find that
before the (name of ministry) will be talking about this and that and that and that but if you ask them, "Where is the plan?" you will not find it....They are still in a vacuum. So even when you start implementing within the line Ministries, you need to connect a lot of other things because the line Ministry is also asking, "Where is the macro-plan for the country so that we can fit into that. And when you need to answer that question that plan was not there. . . . . . So you will find that the development plan is there but still we are saying it is not RBM compliant (P10:65, 67, 69-71).

The budgeting process was reportedly not aligned to RBM in terms of:

- Structure where the budgeting system was item and/or job based instead of results based.
- Cash based rather than results based.
- The flow of resources was not in line with the expected results both in terms of timeliness and quantity.

Implementation challenges were reportedly encountered as a result of this shortcoming making it difficult to implement RBM. The managers attributed this absence of alignment mainly to the inadequacy of necessary capacity.

- If we go to the budget - at the budget level is where there are many challenges....You will find that there are many challenges with budgeting. The challenges are emanating 1) because of the politics, 2. I can say many because of the politics. (P10:74-5).

- And the other issue I think is if you look at our budget, it's still line item based. Now to marry the results that Ministries say they are going to evo with the resources that are allocated by line item, it's difficult.... Now it's very difficult to match the resources, outputs and outcomes - it's very difficult. (P16:4,52).
• It's more or less a job based [budgeting] system. It's almost like line item budgeting……People should be able to align that aspect to the estimates that are believed to be available (P26:22, 24).

• The Recurrent budget department is currently holding workshops on Program Based Budgeting which is a part of the RBM system. Whether it interfaces with the system or not - I am not sure up to now. I'm still to be educated on it (P18:23).

• But the major problem now that I find with RBM is - Government surviving on a cash basis. That is for every assignment that you do, you have to go to Finance & ask that I need to do this can you get money. We try to budget using the cash available - we then call it theoretical RBM. RBM is not theoretical in the sense that what it purports for or stands for in theory is not what is happening in practice because in practice, we are focusing on assignments. So even if an assignment requires $200 000 according to my own judgment, Finance can just say you are using $40 000 or there is no money. So I am asking for that money assignment by assignment. So this whole issue of departmental targets or unit targets and I give performance agreement between 1, 2, 3 doesn’t work........... And that in practice, the way it is implemented; it's not supported by capital availability. (P28:8-10, 14).

• I am hard pressed, in the absence of a budget which is not a tool (laughs) but which has become a dictate you know, it's not a tool - it's dictating to me how my RBM must be modified. You see that now the difference -RBH must have its own tools, one of which is the budget. Ironically, we have a top seated situation where budget which is supposed to be a tool, becomes itself a definer of RBM. So the RBM becomes a tool of the budget. There is reversal of roles there, right? So in the absence of a budget as a tool, in the absence of an appropriate assessment mechanism, it is difficult for one to see how RBM can be implemented (P32:47-8).
Similarly, the motivation and reward system, particularly the lack of incentives, was cited as a challenge that was significantly impacting on the implementation of RBM. According to the managers, Civil Servants were not motivated to implement RBM due to the absence of incentives and/or change factors that would encourage them to embrace the new system.

- *It's not practical to our environment because people have not been rewarded accordingly.*
  
  Right now because of the financial situation that we were in, we have to start afresh because right now people don’t believe in it. For no matter how much they perform, they are not being paid (P5:26, 84-5).

- *Is it possible to introduce RBM in a context of low wages and therefore no motivation? Such a key question you have to deal with. Meanwhile RBM is also supposed to raise the fortunes of the economy so that it's better able to pay its Civil Servants. So it's an egg and hen situation. Where do you begin? How do you break the cycle of de-motivation (P32: 82).*

- *According to change management principles, there should be certain things that act as reminders every day. Those things are not there. If there is no training, there is no reminder, if you are not filling in the forms, there is no reminder. So there must be change favours that you move with. The way you do your work every day, they have never been attached for people to internalize RBM…. They have tried but there should be something that you just run with that remains on your mind. What have we done apart from the training? We should have something that keeps engaging your mind until the mindset changes. Such a message is not coming. (P23: 75, 77).*

- *But also on the whole area of reward, right, how do you make RBM a living tissue in the career prospects of the assessed, right? You assess me first year, I respond with enthusiasm because I expect that the grade I score, has a bearing, a direct bearing on my prospects as a Civil Servant, right? That doesn’t happen first year, right? Ahh secondly, you do it for the second year, again the motions repeated since still to no prospects, right. The poor ones are*
not punished, the good performers are not promoted, the middle performers are not threatened, right? So, it's an assessment process that leads to nowhere. But what is more, when there are openings anywhere in the Civil Service for your grade, right? You still go through the same standard motion we had in 1980, we had in 1985, we had in 1995, we had in 2000, we had in 2010, we will have in 2013. There is a panel set for you by the (name of office). It does not in any way refer to your assessment. It still asks or props you as if you are "a virgin" in the Civil Service right? (P32:49-50).

Also, according to the managers, RBM was not adequately integrated into the human resource development system for the Civil Servants to regard concept with value or as a priority amongst their functions. As a result, the Civil servants regarded activities relating to the implementation of RBM as inferior to their other functions and thus did not conduct them with the necessary diligence and care.

- So we have failed to integrate the RBM process into the career path of the very target of RBM, right? So, I am more compelled to prepare more for my interview with the (name of office) than to have a steady performance which cumulatively decides my fate in the Service which is not RBM literate. So you know, it's a concept that has already denied itself all the tools (P32:51)

- So for someone who has other duties and you are given this other task that’s not even my job description, it’s not even one of my Key Result Areas. So, for me really to concentrate and focus on that whilst I know that there are other duties that have deadlines I am supposed to meet ,it becomes too much……..And the fact that it’s not included in my Key Result Areas it’s difficult to take it seriously. (P31:11-2, 28).

- We always leave it for right at the end... (P21:13).
• I have been very busy and I had to prioritize the work. Sometimes you can’t fill in the RBM form that is wanted yet I understand that its important. But I can’t be seen completing RBM forms when my work is behind (P23:51).

• And you have got other duties to perform that you are supposed concentrate on, it becomes too much for the department and then for the person who is doing that (P31: 12).

4.3.4. Availability of resources

The availability of resources, both in terms of quantity and timing, was cited as a major challenge in the implementation of RBM. The managers reported that their units were finding it difficult, and in some cases impossible, to implement their plans as well as assess performance because the resources were neither guaranteed nor available timely.

• You have RBM which is a concept in which is basically Results- based, performance based - that’s on one hand. On the other hand, you have a budget which must itself underpin the notions of RBM. Yet you have a basic contradiction where the dictates of RBM go to the east while the realities of budgeting go to the west. Once you begin to have that cross-purpose then necessarily even your own understanding of the concept gets undermined by the realities of the way the bureaucracy works. And you rid your willingness to implement that concept against the outward fact of a budget which is, in fact, the fulcrum of all bureaucracies.... Basically, when you talk about RBM- it is a project devised budget, this is a program based budget. And the budget is not there (P32:11, 20).

• But at the moment if you have got plans, it has to be supported by resources. But one challenge that we are facing is inadequate resources from (name of Ministry). So, most Ministries don’t have resources. Even if they have got their plan in place, the resources are quite a challenge. At the end of the day even when they report, they don’t report major
progress in terms of attaining their goals.... Then because at the moment the challenges- we can’t train continuously because of resources (P9:34-5, 70).

- **RBM also requires resources and we are lacking, like right now we do not have internet services because they have not been paid for because there is no funding (P2:40-1).**

- **It doesn't work in the context that we are agreeing on assignments that need to be done but the resources are not yet guaranteed and the resources are only going to be made available on condition that they become available... So until such time as we have got resources - resources will never be enough but until Government has resources to meaningfully plan and come up with a way of distributing or allocating resources in a fashion like the way we used to do before during the dollar time before this crisis.... Then it requires resources - then these resources are never available (P28: 11, 47, 79).**

- **I think it’s tied to the issue of resources. ..... To have an effective RBM, people should plan within a given resource envelope. To the extent that that envelope is also assured (P24:54).**

- **And the challenge which I think affects people across the board is one of finance because when you are working on your work plan for a particular year, you are basically looking at how much has been availed within the budget (P24:22).**

- **........ you have pledged your objectives and goals at the beginning of the year and you don’t have enough money to do all that (P3:12).**

- **Like this year the (name of Ministry) has got to reduce the budget downwards. So assuming that a Ministry had said they were going to achieve 1,2,3,4 it means that Ministry is now thrown into disarray (P16: 16).**

- **If we act within the means it will only result in a half done task. For those getting funds, they are not enough as what needs to be done and the amount provided are not enough. Planning and availability of resources are the major issues we face (P21:39-40).**
• ..... our Government does not have a budget for it. We know RBM requires resources. When there are ways of implementing them. But the fact that the activity has been planned but not implemented. Up to now, people have been saying Zimbabwe is implementing RBM but on the ground, it's something else (P18:36).

Regarding the availability of resources, the managers also cited the timing of disbursements as another major challenge that was hampering the implementation of RBM as it did not facilitate the timely implementation of projects to produce results.

• But you find the actual resource disbursement is not consistent with the requirements. It's not only the amount but you cannot assure a Ministry to say when the funds will be available (P26:48).

• First it's difficult to plan because you don't know when the when you will get the funds ...if you get them…. (P24: 27).

• When you prepare that document you are supposed to put figures on budget. You will find that what you get and what you would expect becomes different and you would have to review and you have no time (P31:18).

• The budgetary allocations are inadequate and un-assured in terms of timely disbursement (P11:36).

• And even in terms of the release of resources, you don't know how much you are going to get and when you will get it. Not because Ministry of Finance does not want to give Ministries some money but because the cash is also not available. So it's a tricky situation that we are in (P16: 17).

• ... you might find if you look at the budget from a global basis, you might actually meet your target of how much you expect to get as revenue but the challenge is - most of that is coming in November/ December. So you have gone for ten months without anything. So practically
you can't implement what you have planned because resources are not available (P24: 27, 29).

Also, according to the managers, the inadequacy of resources was hampering the implementation of RBM in the Zimbabwe Public Service as it was reportedly de-motivating to both staff and management.

- To the extent that you go through all these processes, at the end of the day when you want to implement, the resources are not there, it's very demoralizing (P24: 48).

- ........and I have done my RBM, come December 2012 and I don't have that money, there are no achievements. So what's the purpose of this document? That's the major challenge that we have (P6:41-2).

- And I am sure that most Ministries have not been given their allocation. And then you ask yourself, you have put so much effort in coming up with a plan but you don't operationalize it (P17:33).

- I could safely say, I mean those that I have talked to simply say it doesn't work as long as it is not accompanied by resources (P29:17).

- And even now with dollarization, the uncertainty of resource availability is also impacting on achievement of results. We still have not reached a stage where we can say to Ministries your budget is $5 you are assured get $5 (P16: 15).

- Like now it's being a problem because there is no resource that comes in without you asking and justifying.......But sometimes, the timing is off especially when you are dealing with emergency issues. So when you are faced with an emergency, you don't want to count minutes and days and weeks. But what tends to happen is you have a need today it will be a long time before you get any releases and by the time you want to solve the problem you have a much bigger responsibility than you had initially (P8:41, 43-4).
Regarding the timing of the provision of financial resources, its effects were more pronounced during the period of hyperinflation in which RBM was implemented.

- And unfortunately that situation where you have got hyperinflation, people become short-term in their thinking, in their planning and in everything. So you have twin challenges there - the planning aspect which is a key component of RBM. Because everyone is thinking, "What do I do tomorrow?". Is not thinking, "What do we need to do for the future." That is wrong. You also have the 2nd key component which is even that small resource which you have said to the Ministry is available - it had to be a resource with buying power. But at the time when we were implementing the program, I would release money from Treasury. It took 3 days for it to reach the Ministry. By the time it reaches the Ministry, it's gone. There were so many cases where people would then phone you and say, "By the way it's ok, we have received the money but it's no longer sufficient. Can you supplement it. Then when I supplement - it becomes a cycle. So you will find that it hampered the implementation of key projects and programs which people could hold on to and say, "RBM has managed to do this." So, that becomes a major challenge (P26: 5-9).

However, on the same factor relating to the unavailability of resources, two of the managers interviewed shared a different viewpoint. They pointed out the need to demonstrate the notions of efficiency and effectiveness, in the context of RBM, on the allocated budget regardless of the amount provided.

- One of the principles underlying RBM is that you achieve your outputs within the budget that has been given. Unlike the traditional system where a ministry goes to bid for funds and then they come back and try to work the allocated budget. RBM, even when we submit bids, as a Ministry, the envelope of resources that you get should be the envelope within which you must work. So if within that envelope they are only able to implement 10 outputs, that is what
you are going to do. There is no crying about more resources because if you are assessed on the 10 outputs that you had planned to undertake within the resource envelope. So RBM tries to avoid a situation where a Ministry spends a lot of time going to Treasury asking for more resources. RBM encourages people to work within the resources that they have been given (P1:46-52).

- We do not want to have this initiative hindered because of the excuse of resources, which is why there is the word in the dictionary called resourceful. If you have the initiative and heart you must always find a way around to make sure the initiative is put in place (P12:47-8).

4.3.5 Location of the performance measurement function

The location of the performance measurement function was identified as a significant concern in the implementation process as the roles and responsibilities for both individuals and units in the implementation of RBM were reportedly not clear. This led to confusion, the questioning of the significance of the concept as well as issues relating to the related levels of accountability and authority involved.

- ...... we have the Office of (name). But you are also aware that we have the Office of (name). And to us, that is our employer. The employer has a vision of a new direction for his Company in this case called Bureaucracy. The question is, “Where do you house, generate the momentum for change in your bureaucracy- is it the (name of office) or it is the (name of office). Where is the appropriate institution for the project? Or is it both? And if it is both, who does what? How do we harmonize, how do we distinguish? Because the real risk you have (1) having people asking questions about a concept you want embraced....(P32:25).

- The issues of performance contracts have areas that need tightening as well. There are issues on signature with (name of office), there are issues of the (name of office). That if the (name
of office) has employed somebody and the (name of office) has to have that person sign the performance contract and what it implies and all that (P10:107-9).

- But you also have a very practical question, right, the person who defines conditions of service, the person or the office who hires and fires is not the office which is compelling RBM. Yet we are talking about the fate of the whole establishment. If it is not part of my conditions of service, if it is not part of my own assessment and if also the disburser of resources is not aligned to the implementer of the concept, and I'm giving you now a triangle, you have the (name of office), (name of office), you have (name of office). How do those three pillar offices converge or fail to converge on the concept of RBM? Just where to place the concept was problematic. Just who to implement or introduce the concept to the Civil Service was problematic (P32:26).

- Issues on governance the we need to attend to - how the Civil Service should be like, structures then you need to fill duties where have to determine who is more senior between the (title of an individual) or (title of an individual) and get to know. So RBM continues and once you see that you might not be able to deal with that at that particular moment but you will have them as items that need to be attended to. And this is where the difference comes - that if you go to other countries these things are very very clear (P10:110).

4.4. Environmental factors

Apart from the human and organizational factors that impact on the implementation of RBM, two factors relating to the general environment in which the Public Service was implementing RBM in Zimbabwe also emerged. Political issues as well as the apparent absence of a shared national vision or awareness of it are discussed in detail below.

4.4.1. The Political environment
The political environment was cited as one of the significant factors that was negatively affecting the implementation of RBM in the Zimbabwe Public Service. It was explained that political developments that occurred around the period in which RBM was introduced significantly affected the administration of the Civil Service and hence RBM.

- *It still has its challenges because of the political environment that we have where some people think this is not important..... But for us now, our challenge is that the environment is so political. You will find that if you go to Kenya, because they were never under sanctions, it is more advanced than us in terms of RBM.... Again because of the political environment we are in. ...... Our problem is politics. The political environment is the one affecting everything.* (P10:36, 39-40, 52-3, 147).

- *My other factor which I want to raise, which I feel decided the fate of RBM is about more or less about the time at which we introduced the notion of RBM. You then had certain changes of a political nature, we had elections in 2008 which gives a hung result. And that then eventuates into an inclusive government. One key issue that was raised in politics of inclusive inclusivity was the issue of ghost workers. And that issue of ghost workers then spotlighted the bureaucracy. What was the bureaucracy in numerical terms because the issue of ghost numbers implied there were people that were unfit, unskilled that had been incorporated in the Civil Service for political reasons. It raised the issue of numbers, it raised issue of placement, it raised issue of even the agenda in the whole service. Because this was raised as a political issue and not as a public administration issue. Any talk about reforming the civil service then assumed a political resonance. And where you have a public management issue that's highly politicized. Right? It immediately triggers certain reflexes in those that are supposed to give political cover to the processes, in those that are supposed to implement the processes and in the receiving agents of the whole process. So there is a key political dynamic which kicked in to cloud the environment* (P32:30-3).
• The challenges are emanating 1) because of the politics - I can say many because of the politics. (P10:75).

• So it's this environment we got into is the one giving problems..... And some of them cannot be dealt with right now administratively because of the politics. We have to wait. We have problems with the politicians because they are looking at leadership. They are still looking at personalities (P10:104, 106).

4.4.2. Apparent absence of a shared national vision

According to the managers interviewed, the apparent absence of a common national vision shared by all Zimbabweans was impeding the acceptance and effective implementation of RBM. They argued that the sharing of such a vision would facilitate the acceptance and buy-in of RBM as a tool to implement the related strategy towards achieving a common goal.

• It must come from the Government to say that we want to achieve 1, 2, and 3. It comes from decisions according to the RBM system. There is a needs assessment to see which direction the country should go and then they identify the key inputs. This is going to be done by this Ministry, this by this Ministry then that becomes the basis on which a Performance Agreement is signed between the Chief Secretary and the head of the Ministry, the Permanent Secretary. The Permanent Secretary - what it means is to help us understand the Key Result Areas that we need to achieve. But that does not happen. I have never seen it happen (P28:36-8).

• We have a very retrogressive situation in Zimbabwe of false binary - at one level we have the so called Public sector, then there is the Private sector. Yet the two, on a day to day basis, operate in an intertwined fashion. I don't think there is any life that is compartmentalized between one half public, another half private, right? Which means even when we are dealing with RBM as a concept, right. The private sector must have input
because when we successfully implement it in the bureaucracy, it must now cascade, it must now radiate to embrace the whole economy. What issues were raised, you know, are larger macro-environmental factors. And those must be addressed (P32:79-81).

- I think there are three tablets and the problem comes with planning. Sometimes you find that you start planning and you have not met as a Ministry and there is no mission, vision whatever whatever, then we zero in (P21:8).

- Right now there are a lot of problems with RBM compliance. In countries such as Malaysia, Singapore, you ask a grocery shop attendant how things are going, then ask a doctor they will both tell you the same thing - that in these countries that things are like this like that. With us you ask a person where we are heading and one talks about land and another says no we are past issues of land (P10:97-9).

- In other words we are saying, there must be a vision - those are the requirements of RBM. Then what Government is to achieve 1,2,3,4 then appropriate structures (P28: 79).

4.5 Other issues on the implementation of RBM in the Zimbabwe Public Service

4.5.1. The implementation of RBM

The managers unanimously agreed that the RBM system had had limited impact, if any, on the quality of public service delivery in Zimbabwe.

- …..but for now it doesn't seem to be working for us (P29:8).

- You then wonder, we have invested so many resources, but how come things are not moving (P5:25).

- I don't know if it has an impact (P21:14).

- Because over the years we have spent so much money but if people were to be asked, “What have you done with that money in that year or the other?” They would not be able to answer (P16: 62).
According to the managers, part of the reason for the shortcoming was the faulty and/or partial or implementation of RBM.

- *Its deficiency is based on practice because we are implementing it in a very wrong way……*(P28:64).
- *But certainly, we think it is workable if it is applied religiously* (P29:8).
- *Because if we were to get to 20 percent, in reality of implementation, you will see a lot of difference on the ground. You will see a lot of difference on the ground* (P10: 102-3).
- *We would have been somewhere if we had kept the momentum* (P1: 92).

4.5.2. Introduction of the RBM strategy

Almost all the managers were of the opinion that the introduction of the strategy brought in significant challenges to the implementation process. A major concern cited was that the Civil Servants were not given an opportunity to understand and appreciate the need for change from the old management system to RBM as well as how RBM would satisfy the shortcoming that had necessitated the change.

- *I am talking about how the concept was introduced in the Service… You see you must understand the psychology of transformation. If you are inviting me to change from my old ways, there is an implicit package of telling me essentially that we have been doing the wrong things in the past. So much like everyone gets defensive* (P32:22).
- *So the challenge is the initial introduction. For us to say, “What is the expected outcome, what is it that we want to achieve by this tool?” Yes, it’s a management tool but at the end of the day how am I benefitting? How am I doing it differently from what I am doing currently?* (P22:18-9).
- *Firstly, this is about Change Management - and Change Management is never a function of juniors or contemporaries of those people who are supposed to be themselves - champions of*
the Change. .. So when you are introducing a new approach to the Civil Service, who is the Change Agent - can he be my line Officer which means my contemporary? Or this has to be someone above, right? And what does someone above mean in practical terms? Does it mean housing a concept in a higher Office, or it means making the burden of articulating the concept in a person who represents that higher Office. There is difference between getting a Permanent Secretary, place him/ her in a higher Office - it could be that of the Chairman, it could be that of the Chief Secretary and then using that same Permanent Secretary to minister to his/ her contemporaries. Immediately you run one risk of attitudes in the process. And I thought that was a key mistake (P32:22-4).

- It's not fully appreciated. Maybe it's the dissemination when the concept was introduced. (P25: 2 - 3).

Closely linked to this perceived absence of an opportunity to appreciate RBM, the managers expressed dissatisfaction with the subsequent apparent lack of effort by the relevant authorities to reach a consensus with the Civil Servants on the introduction of the system. They were of the opinion that some of the challenges that were being faced in the implementation process were a result of resistance some form of coercion perceived by the Civil Servants. The managers explained that Civil Servants perceived that they were being forced to implement RBM.

- It’s like now (name of department) is facing problems. Because the take- off was not good - it’s like they have forced people. People are being forced. (P25:23).

- You keep asking the same questions to a sense where you the person asking the questions begin to be struck by the sheer absurdity of it, right. And this arises from the fact that there was a top- down approach to the implementation of RBM. The implicit message in shoving that form down our throats was to say ask no questions. See no evil, do as heeded/ And you know it riles you- you are not a junior Officer (P32:43-4).
• Unfortunately, as Government we adopted a...a..a......top- down approach or whatever whereby you are introducing almost everything to people. My view is, we were not sensitive enough. We should have at least started implementing the ground work which will then make implementation easier, in phases, yes (P26:13).

• I think the way it was implemented - It created issues - we were just told that it has already been adopted. So it's like you are not supposed to question, you are not supposed to offer any ideas - it has already been received and passed. Take what's there and do that. (P23:11).

• The framework is forcing the Minister and he/she may not even know that it is RBM that we are implementing......... So even when not aware, as long as we have prepared a work plan, he/she will be implementing RBM unknowingly (P10:53, 138).

• I am saying RBM is not an activity- it's a whole ethos. We are transforming the strength and reality of governance in the bureaucracy. And I think that's the message. I mean these are key things that we have to do and do them collaboratively so that we have maximum buy-in. And the issue of collaborating is so key. Not the top- down approach (P32:71).

• They have what they want and believe they have introduced a system that should be accepted at all costs. Fine, we will accept it all costs...P5:41-2).

• The way we are looking at is we are not really sitting down and saying we are doing this because of RBM. No. This is something we have taken on board from the time it was introduced....So you are basically looking at each member's contribution - where do you come in, what is your work plan to achieve your component of the team's effort? (P24:13, 15).

4.5.3. **Low buy in and resistance to implementing the system**

In the same context of introduction and institutionalization of RBM, there was reportedly low buy-in to the implementation of the strategy among Civil Servants at almost all levels of the organization.
... I think, with regards to buy-in at top levels, there may have been challenges with the Accounting Officers (P26:3).

There is no buy-in of the concept (P19:47).

Yes I think buy-in we have buy-in at the highest level but somehow I think as you come down from the Office of the President and Cabinet, I think there is a gap there that needs to be filled because...ok there are a few Ministries I think that bought in I think very well but the rest, I think it became a task (P16:27).

I suppose they appreciate this thing but maybe the technicalities on the ground are not appreciated (P23:11).

So I think that it needs full uptake by all the leadership to be fully behind it. I think that is the reason it's not fully accepted (P28:39).

In addition to the low buy-in mentioned above, there reportedly was also some resistance to the implementation of the system and several reasons, among them, lack of knowledge and appreciation of the concept itself.

... there is some resistance - I know there is some resistance..... So people are resisting.... And like I said earlier on, there is resistance. And the resistance is coming from non-appreciation. So the problem, let's make sure it goes further down (P25:24, 28, 62).

The Public Service has tried to implement it from the Deputy Director upwards. But most Ministries resisted because they have not had an opportunity for training. Although they just comply- it's just an internal exercise (P18:9).

We are resisting it [RBM implementation]......... (P28:82).

After realizing that implementation was problematic, that's where we said if we have a performance contract, it's now a tool to enforce implementation.....So the contract is now
there as a way to make sure that items of Results Based Management are being done (P10:57, 61).

- The way it came to people - I think probably that's why people resisted it (P17:37).
- And if you find some tools developed elsewhere which are completely inappropriate to our circumstances, it therefore means that those tools are inappropriate. That process of scheming and compiling a tools kit for RBM is so key - is so key to the acceptance and the success of its implementation. It is so key, and I emphasize, to the acceptance of the notion of RBM. Which means the way you develop the tools must itself not trigger controversy around the concept (P32:37).
- The top management publicly proclaims they own it but the truth of the matter is - those below them, are resistant. They are living in cocoon land. ....Any efforts to adapt it at lower levels are met with resistance, people are asked to work so as to see the outcome ( P5: 89-92).
- Some managers, however, attributed the element of resistance to RBM to the common resistance to change inherent in all people who usually want to maintain the status quo.
- Any reforms are normally faced with resistance.......So there is that element of resistance even in terms of the senior managers .... (P9:16-7).
- You know, people do not want to change. They are afraid, they want to maintain the old system (P12:24).
- The main challenge in implementing the strategy would be the reluctance by the civil servants to adopt change or departure from the norm (P15:14).

4.5.4. Performance measurement and reporting

According to the managers, frustration with the performance measurement component of RBM led to the development of a negative attitude towards the system. The reasons for the frustrations included
the structure and content of the related tools such as the use of the same forms for very varied professions and units within the service as well as the complexity of the system.

- We can’t use the same yard stick for a medical doctor and a veterinary surgeon who is vaccinating cows…….When it comes to public service, the same standards that are being given to people serving the ministries are the same for teachers, the same for finance, but we are different. Some of these principles are just being applied without giving thought to the work that is being done…. (P5:37-9).

- We are not in a factory, this is a service. So this is the major challenge……we are not in a flag producing factory and unfortunately this is the approach on those forms …… Even the top officials do not believe in this too much paperwork which is not related to what we do (P5:23-4, 44, 62).

- That’s the major challenge that we have……because people are terrified of this document, all these columns……It’s not user friendly (P6: 42-4).

- If I can finish that thing within one hour or 30minutes rather than come up with a book (P19: 39).

- ………It’s [performance reporting] a useless exercise (P2:30).

- This RBM is just an academic exercise (P23: 84).

As a result of the above-mentioned frustrations and resulting negative attitude, inadequate practices were reported among nearly all Civil servants to complete the documentation. Such practices included untimely reporting (once at the end of the year instead of quarterly).

- ….. But because we don’t have time to do those things, what happens is that we just fill the RBM form like now for the whole year. That’s what most of the people do. They will be lying to you when they say they fill the forms every quarter and then really follow it up……..What I have noticed with most people, they just fill it in December, when it is wanted (P2: 5-6, 9).
• So at one time you find that you will be reporting for two quarters, when you are supposed to have reported previously. Or in some cases you will be reporting right at the end first quarter we did this, second quarter we did that. But you find that that one report will be much later. They are not timely reports because even as we are coming in now at the end of the year there are no reports..... (P21:31, 33).

Apart from the negative attitude towards performance reporting, there was reluctance to execute the function, the main reason being that the data provided in the report was not used.

• But the other problem is even if I say I have failed, I want to do this Key Result Area but I don't have any money, I am not given the money. So what is the point of wasting my time to fill in the form? (P2: 16-8).

• The procedures, the reports and the systems might be involving but does it pay me, does it make sense to me to invest time to understand those when I know that eventually I will not operate according to them. I think that, to me, that is the major disincentive (P28: 16-7)

4.5.4.1. Quality of data in RBM reports

In addition to the inappropriate timing of reports mentioned above, the managers reported that there were Civil Servants merely complied with the reporting requirement through the recording of invalid data. Such data included a repeat of data previously submitted, an individual writing performance reports for everyone in a unit as well as guesswork. There were reportedly cases where supervisors resorted to submitting average performance data (instead of actual), to avoid the request for supporting evidence from the authorities.

• But it [performance reporting] is not done accurately but for the sake of having the report done. (P21: 33).

• It's just like an exercise to fill in the form. It's not an exercise to do RBM (P2:10).
• You just sit and do the paperwork and not believe in it........In fact, what was happening with performance in the past is you work so hard, you do the first year papers correctly, and as the years progress, you just copy as has been happening (P5:23, 76).

• You find that the same form which was done 3 years ago was just adjusted here and there and submitted. And very few people look back again at these papers, normally (P18: 32).

• ........... Even with the monitoring, what we do here, we give one person the task of writing everyone’s key results, and they do everything and then we just sign...... (P2: 9).

• ... when we begin a year and finish it we are confused on what you are supposed to fill in and whatever information you can put in - it’s because you are guided by somebody else not by the concept itself (P3:8).

• The other thing is you are supposed to be assessed by your supervisor, but people just fill in what they want and just give the supervisor to sign, because the form is too cumbersome (P2:29).

• So eventually what you end up putting on those documents is guesswork - yes guesswork (P17: 30).

• What it has become now is an irritating paper which I am supposed to fill, because it is being assessed whether to give you a 4 or a 5. If you get a 5 you are called at the Commission, to find out how they got a 5. If you get a 2, you are called at the Commission why you got a 2. And people to avoid going to the Commission, all they do is they just give average of 4 so that everyone is happy. Usually it is said 3.4 will round down to a 2, so they usually give people a 3.5+ so it rounds up to a 4 (P2: 11-14).

• As long as it is not implementable it doesn’t motivate me. I know I cannot go to work to do things that will not make any difference. So people end up producing dampened work (P28: 56-7).
The lack of knowledge of the concept of RBM mentioned earlier in this chapter reportedly contributed to this reporting of invalid data as the necessary capacity to complete the relevant forms.

- We also assist each other on those forms on performance. But unfortunately, to be honest, this is just an academic exercise because of lack of aptitude, lack of training (P18: 31).

- You are basing on the people that have acquired knowledge on RBM and you don’t have that kind of knowledge that you are using. You are referring to the next person or somebody who knows not to your own. I think training to every member or official is crucial it would help to have a background on how to come up with your objectives that on your own you can come up with Key Results Areas. Otherwise I am just putting things as expected from start to finish off the ground ..... Report forms are just imposed on us to complete and we just comply but we don’t understand why we are using them. (P3: 9-11, 76).

The submission of invalid data was confirmed by some managers from the units responsible for reviewing the reports. Some of the data submitted reportedly did not make sense at all.

- Sometimes it is also very depressing when you look at a document and you can't make head or tail out of that document. So you say to yourself, how do I start because the information that is there - it could be a thick document like this and the information that is contained there you can't make head or tail out of that information. Now for you to go back to them and say, “Your information, I don't know what you are trying to say.” I am not exonerating ourselves (P16:44)

It can be argued that, according to the interviews, the function of performance measurement was executed rather inadequately

4.5.5. Appreciation of RBM within the Zimbabwe Public Service
Despite the challenges and shortcomings regarding the implementation of RBM in the Zimbabwe Public Service, the majority of managers contended that RBM was an effective tool for improving program management. However, they were quick to point out that the value and benefits of the strategy could only be realized with improvement in the implementation process. For most of these managers, the basis of their assertion was information gained from reading reports from other organizations and nations as well as their own research on the concept. They explained that this was because the concept had not been implemented enough in Zimbabwe to demonstrate its benefits.

- Everybody, in fact, in Government knows that RBM is a very good system. If it has worked for other countries, and it is going to work for us (P1:40-1).
- But despite those problems, I would say we have implemented a program which is appreciated and understood. It is a useful program which has been implemented across the globe..... So, it is a system that has been internationally recognized. (P10:16-7, 23).
- It's [RBM] a world class thing which is why the government embraced it (P12:26).
- But generally I think RBM is a good tool (P18:47).
- RBM, without doubt, is an effective tool for improving program management. It is in use in many other countries with outstanding success. The Malaysian Government and U.S Government are two cases in point (P11:13-5).
- RBM itself is very noble....... I think to us the idea is noble....... ....It empowers .the issue of mission command.... That's more or less what I see in RBM, it's good, it gives initiative, it gives room for initiative, it gives room in fact it gives room for feeling authority by the smooth functioning (P28:5, 13, 73, 75).
- I think at my level, it's acknowledged that RBM is a good tool. People acknowledge that it is a good tool... People at the higher level - at the management level people comprehend and say it's a good tool.. (P23:2, 4).
• *It's quite a good program because it is talking about results. How do you ensure that citizens are happy?* (P9:77).

• *This is a good tool for government service* (P6:52).

• *It's a very good tool…* (P13: 35).

The qualification made by the managers regarding the quality of implementation mentioned above included issues raised earlier in this chapter such as adapting the system to the local environment and as well as addressing the related challenges namely timely provision of resources, training as well as general the other challenges detailed in earlier sections of this thesis.

• *RBM in terms of concept is very good, but let us adapt it to our practical environment and conditions. That is what the top officials in government want to do but they have no clue as to what is happening below them* (P5: 21-2).

• *RBM – there is nothing wrong about it, right. But also there is nothing cut and glide about it. Like all concepts, it has to be adapted to our own circumstances* (P32:59).

• *It is a good tool in principle but when we come back to the other challenge that is on the ground in terms of implementation* (P24:19).

• *If we address these issues, RBM can still be successful because we are only making sure that the resource is availed timely. Those are the key issues. How do we match the resources that we are disbursing with the impact. And I think it's something that can be done* (P26:57).

• *Of course if you are looking at it holistically, it can work, it can work ..... If embraced by all, it can work if the economic environment is stable because, before, it was affected by the period of economic challenges* (P14:9, 36).

• *So maybe if people could be trained properly and understand exactly what they are supposed to do* (P31:36).
4.5.5.1. The future of RBM in the Zimbabwe Public Service

In the same context of appreciation of RBM, the managers interviewed were of the opinion that the concept had a future in the Zimbabwe Public Service as a management tool to help improve performance, irrespective of the name given to it.

- I don't think Zimbabwe can avoid the concept of RBM. Even if you don't call it that, it has all the key elements you need in management let alone Public Administration, right? The key is "Don't kill the concept- kill the bad practices that destroy its prospects."….But the question is RBM or no RBM, there are key tools in RBM which we must introduce in this country, right? And that's what we must worry about. Don't worry about the name - worry about the tools that come with a name. And sometimes it might mean we might have to unpack RBM, you know. Isolate those core components that we still find relevant here and then proceed on the basis of that. We are living tissue, living society. Our ambition is not to purge, right? Which means, one way or the other RBM, either in its present form or in its radically revised form, will find root in our bureaucracy. And you and me are sitting here, not to speculate on the day when that will happen. But to exhort the bureaucracy to make that day happen soon. And that's basically my point. (P32:57-8, 95-6, 98).

- To me, if you look at the concept – it’s very promising - very very promising, very good (P28:70).

- …If these issues are addressed yah! I would like to think that it will have a future….. I’m sure I think it could have a future (P31:32, 37).

- It's something good and it's something that we must embrace and definitely not say it’s a mystery or whatever. Of course when we re- launch it, I am sure we will be somewhere by the year 2020. Something positive is going to happen (P25:78).
The managers were also of the opinion that there was little choice for Zimbabwe not to adopt RBM because stakeholders were increasingly becoming more demanding, and implementing such responsive strategies had become a global trend and as well the fact that Government was committed to its implementation.

- Yes, it [RBM] has got a great future. And we are living in a global village, we can’t remain saying we cannot implement RBM. Our citizens are no longer of yesterday, they are educated and want results. (P9:77-8).

- …. RBM will not go. The international environment, I think, everywhere will dictate that. There is no other way whether people like it or not. ….So there is no way it can go anywhere (P10:149-0, 152).

- [RBM] Has potential with improvement………. It will improve service delivery.  P6:51, 53).

- To me the only thing is to move forward. We need to revisit the implementation process (P18:46).

- RBM is a system that will improve service delivery, that will improve utilization of resources so that we get better value for our money. (P1:89).

- RBM is here to stay………. the initiative is followed because there is no going back on it (P12:57, 16).

4.6. Suggestions for improving the implementation of RBM in the Zimbabwe Public Service

Against this background of appreciating the value of RBM, there were several suggestions, from the managers, for improving the implementation of RBM within the Zimbabwe Public Service. Such suggestions included the need to “get to basics” or a possible re-launch of the implementation process.
• So I think the first thing for us is to get back to basics. What is it that we want to achieve? What is the expected result, what is the benefit of this whole thing so that practically, I can understand, I can appreciate then I can embrace it. But the pre-requisite of any management tool has to be understood, conceptualized and embraced at the end of it.....So if you don’t address the fundamentals and the pre-requisites of such a management tool then it becomes another academic exercise. And academically if you are not going to get anything out of it there is no point. (P22:22, 26).

• And for me, the appropriate way of approaching the whole program would have been to 1) get Senior managers to understand the concept of RBM 2) see its serviceability in our circumstances 3) want to utilize it in their own management process. Right? Second phase for me would have been to say, "Fine, we have now seen this new concept. We have adjusted it, we have embraced it, we want to apply it, how do you think we must go about it? Then jointly we develop the appropriate tool..... (P32: 38).

• So I think we need to go back to the drawing board and almost start on how to do the work. Almost start anew. Re-launch the program..... This may be the right moment to re-launch so we start afresh and step by step. (P25:19, 29)

• We can now start re-launching.......I think we really need to re-launch the program. We really need to re-launch (P26:26, 28, 30).

• I don't know, maybe it needs revisiting (P21:12).

Another suggestion made was the need to simplify the RBM system tools in order to facilitate understanding as well as making the system more user-friendly, was suggested.

• There is something that needs to be done to make it [the RBM system] user-friendly. Maybe not so many papers... Simplify that thing. You know people are scared of those things (P23:17, 40).
• Really I think the documents - on the documentation, we should have tried to simplify (P16: 8)

• ….it is cumbersome and needs to be simplified and still achieve the same objectives… For me those are the real issues - simplification in terms of the paperwork - make it less cumbersome for people to understand (P24:4).

• Perhaps if it was to be streamlined, rationalized and put in a simplified way that would enable people to monitor their project, report it (P17:20).

• One, simplify it … (P19:31).

The managers also pointed out the need to adapt the program to the local environment as well as provision of the necessary knowledge and guidance.

• We need to revisit the process and make it suit our environment. (P21: 46).

• …… two, adapt it to what we have…………(P19:31).

In the same context of ensuring adequate understanding of the concept, the provision of quality training was suggested by a number of managers.

• …… if we re-launch, we should train the people (P25: 43).

• I think we need to improve the grasp of the concept (P32: 63).

• …….three, get people who are knowledgeable to train (P19:31).

• In my opinion, I think that the Government should invest in it - training people and making follow- up with the Heads of Ministries - how far are you, how far are you? Of course there are challenges like capacity. The onus is on program to evaluate it and see if things are happening (P18:34).
What we should have done - first to come up with a guideline with terms so that we share the same understanding then we can say, objectives what are we talking about, then we say outcome so that my outcome is not different from your reporting….. Even now we don’t have a guideline (P16:8).

Evaluation of the implementation process to determine the level of progress and, in the process, obtain information for possible improvement was also suggested.

Third point, we have failed enough. Let’s have the humility to come together as a whole in the Service and review. Review what has happened. And what has happened must have taught us how not to do it. Let's use that how not to do it, to find how best to do it. So review it, review the script where we are looking, where are brave enough to face the ugly realities of RBM as it has been carried out to date. In a no-holds barred session where people are dissecting RBM as we have sought to implement and saying all the things—saying in proverbial English, “lot and all.” Revealing everything - the spirit being not to fault find but to establish how to re-apply the concept in our situation (P32:63).

In the context of institutionalizing RBM, the managers suggested the setting up of an entity to provide direction and steer the implementation of RBM as well as the setting up of appropriate organizational structures.

What would bad about us, in the context of building on RBM, creating some Committee that would then entrap the means of practitioner - Senior Civil Servants who would then say, "now this is RBM, now these are our circumstances, how do we assess it quarterly. Let’s work the tools together. It starts off your buy-in, right. (P32: 45).
There is much more that needs to be done which I cannot say now. I think we need a think tank - much more needs to be done to integrate RBM into everyday work, to make it a culture, internalize it (P23:79).

It's about putting in place a system of bureaucracy - a Government system for the country (P28:78).

…… let's find an appropriate house or houses for it. But hey! Those houses, if there are many, must have interconnected goals (P32:63).

My fourth point is, let's integrate our systems, right? The way to validate a new concept in change management is to make all facets of an institution, refer to it. If I want money, I must know that my RBM must be right. If I want promotion, I must make sure that my RBM is right. If I want a salary review - and you note that a lot of salary reviews in Zimbabwe are a matter of union, not of performance. I must make sure that my RBM is right. If I want to book an appointment with my superiors, I must make sure that it's happening in the context of RBM implementation, right? RBM must be the "be all and end all" of our practices in the bureaucracy. Once you make it that pervasive, right? It therefore follows that it becomes unavoidable, it becomes a compulsion, it becomes a necessity for operations in all departments (P32: 65-7).

The managers were of the opinion that a gradual and more participatory approach to implementation process would help to ensure meaningful appreciation of the concept and subsequent buy-in.

My thinking is that what we should have done is to take gradual approach instead of the big bang that we did. All we did was tell people that there is a Performance Agreement - you are going to be filling the Departmental, the integrated, there will be the work plans, there will be the monitoring and there will be the monitoring, there will be everything. And we are
doing this to people that are seeing this concept for the first time. I think the issue is - we should have made it a phased-in implementation (P16:5).

- Let’s do it piecemeal, in phases so that we really pick problems as we go. It’s easier when you know the problems, you quickly follow them……..if you do it in phases, make sure phase 1 is appreciated, there is buy-in then you move to the next stage - 2nd stage, 3rd stage. That way I think it will be a success (P25:43, 46).

- Ok the phasing in I think, I think eh…eh because when you phase in, you learn from experience, you correct whatever needs to be corrected so that when you move onto the next step you know what things to avoid, what you need to be mindful of. Because what we did was to take all the 30-something Ministries. Reforms, I think, generally would need to phase in (P16:57-8).

- It should be training for Departments then you stereotype what obtains in that particular department. (P21: 21).

- ……..don't confine RBM to a sub-sector. It might start in a sub sector, right. I have no problems with that. But we must know that it has to radiate to become a standard, to become a new culture of an economy, right? Which means even if we were to successfully implement RBM in the bureaucracy without a matching program for the private sector you will still have a mismatch. You won't get the best results because the its only that the bureaucracy is there to service the economy (P32:77-8).

It can be argued that the findings generally point to shortcomings in the capacity and implementation of RBM in the Zimbabwe Public Service which could explain lack of its impact on the quality of service delivery. A broad consensus was that improving the implementation process could help enhance the impact of the strategy.
4.7. **Chapter Summary**

In this chapter, findings from the analysis of data were presented using categories derived from research literature and the themes that emerged from the data itself. The discussion of the findings, taking into consideration what is contained in literature regarding the implementation of RBM and the research question, is presented in chapter 5.
CHAPTER 5
DISCUSSION

5.1. Introduction

This chapter presents a discussion of the findings, from the analysis of data, identified and described in Chapter 4. Literature on RBM presented in Chapter 2 and the research concerns are taken into consideration. The discussion is organised around the themes relating to factors affecting the implementation of the RBM strategy in the Zimbabwe Public Service, which in turn affected the implementation process and subsequently effectiveness of the strategy. In this chapter, italics continue to be used to denote direct quotes from the interview transcripts as described in Chapter 4.

5.1.1. Research question and objectives

The research question and objectives are restated below to put the discussion into context.

What have been the main factors affecting the implementation of RBM in the Zimbabwe Public Service?

The objectives of the study were to:

- Investigate the factors affecting the implementation of RBM in the Zimbabwe Public Service.
- Recommend a model for improving the implementation of RBM in the Zimbabwe Public Service

Several human, organizational and environmental factors as well as other issues that impacted on the implementation of RBM were identified. Other issues were noted but they were less frequent and determined to be less crucial to warrant attention in this study.
5.1.2.1. Human factors

- Availability of capacity for implementing RBM
- Availability of information
- Culture
- Senior management involvement
- Stakeholder identification
- Level of communication
- Complexity of the RBM system
- Alignment of responsibility and accountability and decision making authority

5.1.2.2. Organizational factors

- Adoption of the RBM strategy
- Customization of RBM systems
- Alignment of systems
- Availability of resources
- Location of the performance measurement function

5.1.2.3. Environmental factors

- Apparent absence of a common national vision
- The Political environment

5.1.2.4. Other issues

- The implementation process
- Suggestions for improvement of the implementation of RBM in the Zimbabwe Public Service
Each of the factors identified is discussed in detail in the following sections.

5.2. **Human factors**

5.2.1. **Availability of capacity for implementing RBM**

All the managers interviewed acknowledged that the lack of capacity was one of the most significant factors that had impacted on the implementation RBM within the Zimbabwe Public Service. *It seems difficult because we don't have enough capacity…. It strains managers, it strains the focal point and you don't know what's happening down there* (P8: 52, 60). It can be argued that this shortcoming was also confirmed by the thirty-nine managers who declined to participate in the study citing lack of understanding of the concept.

According to Groot and Moolen (2001), capacity encompasses knowledge, skills, attitudes and other capabilities that lead to sustained performance improvement in individuals and groups of people. All these elements of capacity emerged as factors that had negatively impacted on the implementation of the strategy in the Zimbabwe Public Service. According to the managers, the concept was not understood in the whole Public Service. *But frankly, I don't think there is 1) a grasp of what RBM stands for. Secondly I don't think there is a grasp of what it intends to do for the Service…. (P32:3, 63).*

Secondly, the skills to implement the strategy were not available. ….. *I don't think there is a grasp of how we are supposed to go about it… The point I am trying to make by way of the weak roll-out is to centrally state that the concept is good - what is not good is the comprehension (P32:63).* It can be argued that these findings indicate that both knowledge and skills for implementing RBM were inadequate.
According to Poate (1997), effective implementation of RBM is dependent on managers and staff having the necessary knowledge, skills and abilities to develop and use the system. It can be argued that the absence of these elements negatively impacted on the implementation of RBM.

The findings also revealed that Civil Servants had developed a negative attitude towards RBM. *We have filled it in [RBM report form] so many times but nobody has come back to us. It's a useless exercise (P2:30). And the fact that it's not included in my Key Result Areas it's difficult to take it seriously (P31: 24, 26).* Several reasons were cited for the existence of such attitude including the lack of knowledge, unavailability of training, absence of adaptation of the system to local and/or individual situations as well as limited participation in the development of the system itself. Details of such reasons are discussed in sections relating to the reasons themselves. It can be argued that there were shortcomings in all the elements of capacity, as it is defined by Groot and Moolen (2001). It can be further argued that such level of inadequacy significantly impacted on the implementation of RBM in the Zimbabwe Public Service.

Regarding this lack of capacity, a minority group of senior managers reported that the lack of capacity to implement RBM was only limited to lower level staff who had not received any training. The training on RBM had reportedly been confined to the middle and senior managers. *So middle management going up to the senior management, Permanent Secretaries, Directors, Deputy Directors, Chief Accountants, all those have been trained The levels that do not appreciate RBM are the lower levels e.g. the office orderlies, the secretaries......For middle to senior management, they are fully conversant with RBM. Unless there are new entrants in the civil service because they have been trained and even what we are doing, our planning now is based on RBM (P9:8-9, 13).*
training that was done......Not all the people were trained especially the lower levels. So they don’t know about RBM.....There is no appreciation....(P25:9,11,26).

However, another group of managers that comprised both senior and lower level managers argued that the lack of knowledge of RBM was prevalent in the whole Public Service including among those had received training. The reason provided for this shortcoming was that the training provided was not effective. And I think there is a fundamental difference between attending a seminar and comprehending the contents of that seminar...... The fact that Senior Civil Servants went for some seminars on the concept of RBM yet we still have that paradox where, in spite of that attendance, there is no willingness to apply it on the ground. That in itself must reveal a lot in terms of how much grasp there was from these seminars (P32:5, 7). Even the Ministers also don't know..... If the top officials, don't understand what can you expect. Even the Permanent Secretary refers it back to you (P19: 44-6). Thirty-nine managers from the Zimbabwe Public Service, who were listed among those who had received training, declined to participate in the study citing complete lack of knowledge of RBM. It can be argued that this pronunciation by the thirty-nine managers can help to confirm this inadequacy of the training programmes. This view, shared by most of the managers interviewed, regarding the training, gives an indication of the significance of the quality of training as a factor that impacted on the implementation of RBM in the Zimbabwe Public Service. This finding is supported by literature where according to Cherrington (1995), the aim of any training programme should be to develop the competencies rather than merely putting staff through training without results (outcome and impact). It can be argued that the training appears not to have made a difference in capacitating the Civil Servants to effectively implement RBM.

5.2.1.1. Quality of training

Several shortcomings, which were deemed to have rendered the training ineffective, were cited by the managers. Such shortcomings included the unavailability of competent trainers, training
programmes that were reportedly deficient in terms of content, composition of participants as well their frequency. *We are trained from time to time, but the trainings are not effective* (P2:37). According to the managers, the trainers were not adequately qualified to provide sound training to the Civil Servants. *The few people that are very familiar with RBM, the few officers in Ministries, are not able to train others - they are not trainers* (P1:20). I think we need better trained resource persons for RBM (P2: 40). Also, According to Plantz et al (1997), experience shows that it is vital to provide sound training for all Civil Servants responsible for implementing RBM. Literature also reveals that improving the quality of trainers can help improve the implementation of RBM (Ibid). Such improvement can include obtaining guidance from a technical expert on RBM (Ibid).

**Content of training programmes**

In terms of content, the managers reported that the training was rather too theoretical to be effective in building capacity. *Mainly they [the trainers] are more theoretical. You know, they were just trained by Malaysian trainers. But In terms of the practice - they just talk and not really practical. So they just got the theory.* (P25:38). Also, some of the theory provided during training was reportedly not relevant for certain units within the Public Service because of the diversity of the Public Service. *It is also like you are going into a straight jacket, because you see the way which we were training RBM, everything is put into figures and percentages but we don't work like that.....Even the examples that we get, you know when you go for training, the trainers always say, suppose you are building bridges, suppose you are building houses because that's the easiest thing. We need something that goes with what we do* (P13: 17, 31). Cherrington (1995) suggests that capacity building requires a systematic approach that includes the development of a sound education and training programs guided by the systematic gathering of data about the employees’ or organization needs. Also, according to UNJIU (2004), training in RBM requires a rich blend of experience in both the training and implementation processes for it to be effective. To these suggestions, Col et al (2006) add that it
can be useful if provision is made for training participants to design their own case studies and role-play the scenes to bring an element of practicality into the training. It can be argued that there was a mismatch between what literature calls for and the practice in the Zimbabwe Public Service, relating to training, which could have compromised the quality of training.

**Composition of participants in training sessions**

The managers expressed were of the opinion that the target groups for training sessions were inappropriate as participants with very different backgrounds were mixed. As a result, the benefits from the sessions would be minimized as the content would not be suitable for all the different groups. *I would also want to reinforce this idea when we have training programs. The training programs are held together for everybody from the highest to the lowest level. Like the (name of department), when they conduct training, from Deputy Secretary level - they have this policy of making it across the board. One person wants to learn about what RBM is when you want to learn what PPS is. So it's taking you backwards…. Maybe let us be grouped according to our levels of comprehension (P23:30, 33).*

**Frequency of training programmes**

The other issue reported by the managers regarding the inadequacy of training was its frequency. Some departments reportedly had not received any kind of training since 2005 while others attended some sessions, albeit inconsistently. *Quite frankly it's an area of concern to some amongst us in the Management team. Starting with ourselves, although we were exposed to it [RBM] and there was some initial training some 3 years ago. Subsequent meetings were not followed through…. I mean we have been waiting for training including cascading it to the lower ranks, in my own Department for instance. We were waiting for an opportunity for another workshop to be run for us; including all*
the Provincial [name of office] Officers and the District [name of office] Officers. That is yet to happen (P29: 2-3, 12). It [training] should be continuous, not once in a while (P2: 40)

Educational background

One manager reported that the level of education and understanding of staff was influencing the effectiveness of training programmes for some Civil Servants. It was explained that some Civil Servants had low levels of education such that they could not cope with the training curricula which was perceived to be unnecessarily detailed for them thus making some training efforts redundant.

That thing RBM is supposed to be used - you are looking at all levels - the highest to the lowest. But you are looking at maybe the level of a gardener outside - his level of education and his level of comprehension is different.......And also need to simplify that paper for the ordinary people. Why can’t just say someone who does not deal with paperwork but gardening. Just understand that, at the end of the day, vegetables must be available for consumption here. "What is it that I am supposed to do?". You know that adaptation is very important rather than ask him/her fill in paperwork because it’s a management tool in Government. It’s a management tool. He/she may not understand. Just help him understand- teach him the basics only (P23:29, 34-6). It can be argued that such shortcomings were a result of inadequate assessment of training needs as suggested by UNJIU (2004) above. It can also be further argued that such inadequacy may have been linked to the unavailability of the necessary capacity in the Zimbabwe Public Service.

In the same context of the educational background, the manager pointed out that Zimbabweans are generally not comfortable with a lot of reading and they also find it difficult to apply knowledge gained from the education system. Therefore, it was difficult for the Civil Servants to put the material provided from the training into practice. I think we have to say that our people don’t have the nature of reading- we don’t have that nature of reading. And so paperwork really - if the
documents become too long, people lose interest. People prefer to read very short documents that are less time consuming .....There are questions like "In Australia or Malaysia - how did it work?" ok They are different cultural settings which requires that people are able to fit it into their work..... As Zimbabweans, we mustered cramming (reciting) ideas to pass examination. But to apply the knowledge? - To use that knowledge from Biology - is difficult for us (P23: 7, 42, 84). It can be argued that if this assertion were to be confirmed, then the need for other additional capacity building initiatives apart from training increases. It can be further argued that the notion points towards the importance of more profound needs assessments for capacity building purposes.

5.2.1.2. Inadequate capacity building initiatives

Notably, training was the only RBM capacity building initiative undertaken in the context of implementing RBM. We went on a capacity building program and we trained just everybody from the Head of Ministry going down. But when we started experiencing challenges from 2008-9 P1:7-12). What is needed is just to- you know a reform process is not like one of those were you say “we have trained we have stopped”......So there is continuous learning that is needed so that we sharpen the skill.....I think the key for the success of RBM is capacity building. (P9:47, 50, 68). This inadequacy of capacity building efforts was also acknowledged by some managers and they believed it contributed to the lack of capacity. What have we done apart from the training? We should have something that keeps engaging your mind until the mindset changes. Such a message is not coming (P23: 77). Actually I am saying that interactions, special sessions, updates and the like - they are not there both from the Public Service and OPC (P25:58).

According to the World Bank (2005), building human capacity entails a comprehensive approach to human resource management, with training being just one of the components (World Bank, 2005). Bester (2012) adds that, for effective RBM capacity building, it is necessary to employ a
combination of consistent, quality training programs, engagement of experts as well as encouraging hands-on experience. The finding indicates that there may be a mismatch between what was taking place in the Zimbabwe Public Service and what should be done according to literature. Against this background, it can be stated that, generally, the capacity building efforts were inadequate as they were only confined to training.

Improvement initiatives that focus on strengthening the institutional and individual capacities on the implementation of RBM are always vital for stakeholders to appreciate the strategy (Bester, 2012). Such initiatives can include the provision of clear RBM policies and guidelines, toolkits, quality assurance measures to enhance the quality of strategic planning and reporting as well as opportunities for knowledge sharing. UNJIU (2004) also adds the strengthening of knowledge networks as well as the development of techniques for planning, measuring and reporting results as necessary for effective capacity building purposes.

From what the interviewees said, less attention than was expected was been given to some aspects of capacity building efforts albeit in the context of training. For example, the absence of guidelines on the implementation of RBM was a major concern among managers cited it as a significant challenge. You can't have people come to work and have not give them guidelines on what needs to be done e.g. guidance for budget, value for money (P5:69). That process of scheming and compiling a tool kit for RBM is so key - is so key to the acceptance and the success of its implementation. It is so key, and I emphasize, to the acceptance of the notion of RBM (P32:37). What we should have done - first to come up with a guideline with terms so that we share the same understanding then we can say, objectives what are we talking about, then we say outcome so that my outcome is not different from your reporting. But we didn't do that. Even now we don't have a Guideline. Those are some of the shortcomings. (P16:8). Such guidelines, they believed should have been a major component of the
capacity building initiatives as they were perceived to be determinants of success in the implementation of RBM. This belief among managers is supported by literature.

According to Cooley et al (2000), supporting activities for effective training should include the development of a bank of RBM materials, instruments and tools that include training materials, guidance notes, budgeting guides and information on best practices for staff to use in institutionalizing the RBM system. UNJIU (2004) adds that early priorities in implementing RBM include the development of a handbook for use throughout the organization with both prescriptive guidelines and practical advice for implementation.

There were several other concerns that were cited, by the managers interviewed, for the inadequacy of capacity apart from the issues regarding training. Such concerns included the loss of skills reportedly due to the brain drain that occurred during the period of economic meltdown within the country (2007-9)........ the Human Resource element and, in our case, most of the people were leaving the office going to SA, going to the UK - those who had been trained (P26:10). That was during the period of the economic meltdown. So the people left - those who had been trained now left. So there was a gap such that the people who had been trained left (P25:12-3). It can be stated that the loss of skills through attrition may have been a factor but probably not as significant as it appeared to be. This is against the background of both the inadequacy of capacity building efforts which were reportedly confined to training. Also, the fact that there was unanimous evidence against the effectiveness of that one and only capacity building initiative points to the inadequacy of skills even without such loss.

In the same context, there was reportedly the issue of loss due to non-usage of the knowledge and skills generally as well as during that same period of economic meltdown in particular........ I think it
is an issue that we are not using that system daily. If everybody was using it daily, I don’t think it would be a problem. But you will find sometimes you will forget about it. It only comes back after some months when it’s there to do the performance appraisal (P14:28-30). And then we went through inflation and the RBM was forgotten. In 2008-2009 it was buried.... People had totally forgotten [about RBM] because of the challenges we had encountered (P6:7-8, 11). Again it can be argued that the failure to keep the momentum, contrary to what is emphasized in literature, had a significant effect on the implementation process. This reported loss of skills through non-usage and loss of momentum as a negative factor in the implementation is supported by literature. According to Poate (1997), maintaining momentum is crucial for success in the implementation of RBM which is a long-term process where systems take time to develop and use. It can be argued that the capacity to implement RBM was inadequate at all levels of the Zimbabwe Public Service and also emerged as one of the main factors that impacted on the implementation of RBM. Also, according to some managers, such unavailability of capacity was not only confined to the implementation of RBM but management in general. Skills are limited......My assessment is we have had workshops with groups of Directors across Government and can see that 1) the numbers are inadequate 2) the capacity not only capacity for RBM but find that if ask a Director about the direction of the national policy, he begins to stammer (P10:131). Again, this finding is supported by literature where the lack of capacity to support, facilitate, and mobilize RBM exists at both practitioner and senior management levels (CMP, 2011).

5.2.2. Availability of information

The data suggested a near complete absence of sharing information on performance, which should be derived from data submitted by units or ministries through the reporting component of RBM. This was because there was generally no feedback on performance reports when they are meant to be the source of information for decision-making purposes.....There is no feedback to Ministries on the
quality of those documents [performance reports]. So the Ministries don't know whether what they sent to the (name of office) is good enough. I think (name of office) must come back to the Ministries and engage with them with to discuss those documents. Right now I am not even sure if there is a team that is dedicated in the (name of office) to look these documents - I am not sure if they are doing that then they are collecting this information for their own use & not giving it back to Ministries. That is a challenge that needs to be addressed. What I am pleased about is that the (name of office) without fail, every year, request for these documents so we have to submit them. So I think right now the main challenge is that these documents when they go to the (name of office) there is no feedback (P1:32-8). Feedback was reportedly provided only in some cases where some interest had developed on an issue reported on. Yah, we sometimes do [get feedback]. People will give you feedback. If you produce something and people come following it up, then you know that they have read and understand then ask how they can benefit from this (P23:59). The finding points to the non-usage of performance information. According to literature, the use of performance information for decision-making is one of the basic elements in the implementation of RBM (UNJIU, 2004; RBMG, 2003). Provision of feedback as well as the use of performance information creates enthusiasm among the stakeholders to provide more information when they know it will be used (Poate, 1997).

Managers from controlling units responsible for review of the reports and provision of feedback attributed the absence of feedback mainly to lack of capacity within those units. Like I said, that even in the (name of Ministry), there are very few people who have an idea what RBM is. It's the issue of capacity now for (name of Ministry), because when these people bring their documents, sometimes you really have eh..eh. If I gave a desk Officer or (title) a document to say can you analyze it - because they don't know what it is they are looking for, it is very difficult for them to analyze. These are the issues we have been grappling with in the (name of Ministry), to say how do we build our
own capacity. Even our (title), when the documents come, they need to know exactly what is to be done and what they are looking for and they can communicate. Yes, they are right. We have not been communicating. We don't give them feedback (P16:38-40). This finding indicates the impact that the unavailability of capacity had on almost every function relating to the implementation of RBM.

According to literature, RBM requires timely, relevant, complete and accurate information about performance at all levels of implementation (from inputs and activities through to outcomes) to be shared among stakeholders (Schacter, 2004). Such information helps stakeholders to improve performance through adjustments to programs or processes as necessary (Hatry, 1997). The approach also facilitates organisational learning as performance information to decision-makers is channelled through nested feedback loops from consistent performance monitoring, evaluation and audit (RBMG, 2003). It can be argued that the implementation of RBM in the Zimbabwe Public Service did not generate the necessary dialogue among stakeholders and which could have had a negative impact on the effectiveness of the implementation.

The use of performance information influences the quality of RBM implementation as it helps to identify strengths and weaknesses as a basis for making such adjustments (UNJIU, 2004). Also, according to RBMG (2003), greater efficiencies and effectiveness can be enhanced when management decision-making processes are informed by valid and reliable performance information. Bester (2012) adds that the lack of feedback on reports is a major disincentive in the implementation of RBM. Again, it can be argued that the unavailability of information on performance in the Zimbabwe Public Service may help to explain the quality of implementation of the RBM). It can therefore be argued that unavailability of information together with the reported incidents of submitting invalid data reported in section 5.5.1.8 of this thesis significantly compromised the quality of implementation of RBM.
5.2.3. Culture

The data revealed that performance measurement still focussed on outputs rather than outcomes, contrary to RBM principles. Perhaps you have 4 outputs but complete 2 - I output per quarter, when you submit reports you are actually focusing on output completion. Completing an output within the time (P1:73-4). Yet, if you look at the appraisal system, it's supposed to appraise me on the basis of how much I have used the budget....Have I spent more than I should spend or do I under spend ....? It's all those dimensions put together. They are supposed to be inputted in the appraisal system in the framework of RBM (P28: 21-3). We are reporting on appropriations, which is a financial statement that's states the allocation and how it was spent (6:32). I suppose we will be looking at what we have achieved. Yes. What we have done in relation to what we have planned (P23:53, 55).

According to RBM (USGAO, 1997), the shift in focus and the development of systems that are linked to outcome is key to the success of implementing RBM. It can be argued that the performance management focus on outputs was an indication that the majority of Civil Servants had not yet adopted a results oriented culture. Schacter (2004) adds that focusing on the longer-term social or economic effects is a basic premise of RBM. This implies that the absence of such focus would compromise the quality of implementation.

Literature also reveals that the traditional notion of holding public servants accountable only for the correct application of government regulations and procedures and work completion appears incompatible with a results and service-oriented public sector (Mayne, 2007). That is, successful implementation of RBM depends on an organization’s ability to create a results culture which is more than adopting new administrative and operational systems (Epstein and Olsen, 1996). Consistent reference to results is also essential to induce acceptance and commitment to the RBM
implementation process which, in turn, helps to develop the necessary results culture (Ibid). It can be stated that there was a mismatch between the existing culture and the conditions that promote successful implementation of RBM, according to literature. According to Bester (2012), the continued demand for reports on outputs, in performance measurement, and ignoring outcome information serves as a disincentive and hampers staff from putting in the effort required for effective RBM. It can be argued that this focus on outputs negatively impacted on the implementation of RBM in the Zimbabwe Public Service.

The majority of managers interviewed believed that local culture, characterised by weak commitment to work in general and to new initiatives, in particular, was hampering the effective implementation of RBM. One aspect is that our African culture is different from the Asian and Western world. In fact this is why you see.....you take this system and go with it to China they will use it in factories.... That is my answer is that if we are serious enough to revise our culture and compare with the Asians and People going to banks, those in offices are attending to personal issues - you don't get such things when you go to any European country. Here sometimes by around quarter past nine one is gone... If you tell him / her to sit down and work he / she starts to complain (P10: 112, 115, 117). I think we have a culture. There is a culture, I don't know where it comes from such that we get tired in the process. We don't seem to take things to their logical conclusion. I think it has happened in many instances where we start one thing, then we can decide to come up with another one. After a few years, we would be having something new would have forgotten the earlier one. We don't build on it - we just take a new thing (P23:71). We are known, as a country, to have very good plans but to operationalize them (P17; 49). Then some challenges of a few people who still think like the doubting Thomases - .....who still think that; well it's because the resources are not sufficient to implement the RBM in its total form then perhaps like the previous forms there is a
time that will come and say “perhaps we have stopped this one we are embarking on another one” so that’s another challenge (P9:54).

This finding is supported by literature regarding experiences in other countries. According to Wachira (2013), shared values such as dedication to quality service, perseverance and commitment to innovation are not very common in the Public service in Africa. In the same context of the Public Service in Africa, Agere & Mendoza (1999) assert that such elements were actually disappearing.

In the same context, Fulmer (1992) contends that RBM calls for a total overhaul of culture that entails new and different ways of thinking, behaviour and new business skills. Similarly, OECD (1994) asserts that a consistent results-based culture must permeate all levels of the organization with effort made to consistently inculcate and sustain such a culture. Cooley et al (2000) also add that the introduction of RBM requires a consistent long-term process of “cultural change” within the organization, and the application of RBM principles needs to be “championed” throughout the system. Effort to instil a result culture includes the identification and provision of suitable incentives for implementing RBM, the removal of disincentives (if any), investment in the necessary capacities and competencies for RBM as well1 as periodic reviews of the related RBM systems (Bester, 2012). Also, reinforcing an RBM culture throughout the organization should be highly prioritized beginning from the top, and reflected in the organization’s principal functions that include planning, control and decision-making (Cooley et al, 2000).

According to one manager, there was need to integrate RBM into the functions and work process in the Zimbabwe Public Service. Much more needs to be done to integrate RBM into everyday work, to make it a culture, internalize it (P23:79). This finding is supported by literature. According to Wachira (2013), for RBM to succeed, every aspect of the organization should be results-oriented.
That includes how the organization is structured, its objectives as well as how it is led or managed (Ibid). It can be further argued that the absence of change in culture, towards results orientation, significantly determined the level and quality of RBM implementation in the Zimbabwe Public Service.

5.2.4. Senior management involvement

There was reportedly limited involvement of senior managers in the implementation of RBM which the lower levels perceived as a disincentive. The hierarchy after the Directors, the technical Directors…..Considerably I don’t think they take it seriously. Well, they never…..I don’t see 100 percent uptake by the boss, I don’t see the Senior management itself is fully behind the project to the extent that all in the Ministry are fully trying to follow (P28:31, 35). According to the loser level and middle managers, this limited involvement also affected the quality of leadership. Well for it to work, well I look at it as working by cascading it. So it has to start from the top and then cascade downwards (P29:21). Also, such limited involvement had implications on the implementation as the necessary leadership and commitment was perceived to be missing. So I think that it needs full uptake by all the leadership to be fully behind it. I think that is the reason it's not fully accepted (P28:39). This thing is just being given to the lower levels to start doing the things of which I think the training was supposed to be done from the higher levels and then they appreciate what is required in the hierarchy and then they come down to the lower levels so that they can implement it (P14:5). The top management thinks they own the program but they are not the ones that do the job. It is done by those below them (P5: 81-2).

This finding regarding senior management involvement and leadership is supported by literature. Studies on RBM that include those conducted by Binnendijk (2001), the Joint Inspection Unit (2004), (Schacter (2004) and Mayne (2007) explore the issue of leadership extensively through
literature review, opinion data collection as well as interviews. The studies identify the lack of visible management commitment and leadership in general as well as that required for change in the culture from output to results orientation as major challenges. This is because such commitment always appears to be missing (Mayne, 2007). According to Bester (2012), it is essential for senior managers to appreciate the value, be conversant with RBM terminology and tools as well as fully support and actively participate in the implementation process. By actively participating in the implementation, the managers demonstrate their commitment to the implementation of the strategy (Alford and Baird, 1997). This is also because their level of commitment sets the tone for the entire organization (Treasury Board of Canada, 1996). In the same context, Bester (2012) classifies the attitude and behaviour of managers who do not appreciate the value of RBM as an informal disincentive for its implementation.

Strong leadership from the most senior level of government as well as demonstration of commitment through deliberate action can effectively improve the RBM implementation process (Cooley et al, 2000). That is, clear, consistent and visible participation by senior managers as well as implementation of strategies to overcome resistance to change is crucial. Literature also reveals that commitment to RBM can be effectively demonstrated through deliberate action (Bester, 2012. Such action includes persistence, the setting of reasonable but challenging expectations for staff, communication of the RBM management message internally and externally as well as securing the timely availability of resources (Ibid). Also, a sense of ownership and commitment can be developed by involving managers and staff in the process of developing the strategic plans, performance measures, among others (Meekings, 1995). It can be argued that the limited senior management involvement in the Zimbabwe Public Service contributed to both limited acceptance and implementation of RBM.
Some managers attributed the absence of leadership to the lack of capacity at all levels, including the senior managers, to implement RBM in Zimbabwe. *Even the Ministers also don't know [RBM]. They have never been introduced. If the top officials, don't understand what can you expect. Even the Permanent Secretary refers it back to you* (P19:45-6). The managers argued that the senior management and Ministers could not lead the implementation when they did not fully appreciate the concept themselves. It can be stated that the argument is sound given that the lack of capacity was reportedly prevalent throughout the Public Service.

In the same context, a senior manager confirmed that it was impossible to demonstrate appreciation of a concept that was not understood. *And the importance of it has to be appreciated......It's a management tool but what is the expected outcome of using it as a management tool. How much benefit is derived from it? Because I need to understand the benefits so that when I relate to the benefits, I can embrace it. But I don't know what I am supposed to benefit from it. In fact I think it's a tool or some research that is coming from elsewhere. For us to embrace the thing without me as an individual, appreciating the benefits. I don't think it can work. So when you are not clear, as an individual, then the effort in trying to understand it becomes very difficult.* (P22: 7, 13-7). It can be further argued that the resulting improper performance was linked to this lack of knowledge at all levels of the Public Service.

According to Epstein and Olsen (1996), for RBM implementation to be effective, it is essential to establish training and capacity building for staff development and education at all levels of government. Such an inclusive arrangement can also assist in changing the organizational culture as it permeates the whole organization. To this, Bester (2012) adds that the training of managers in RBM to update their knowledge and understanding and appreciation of the concept can help them to
become more supportive of staff training and information sharing. Such effort appeared to be missing in the Zimbabwe Public Service and hence the lack of capacity.

It can be further argued that the capacity to implement RBM was lacking among almost all the key stakeholders including the trainers, all levels of management and staff. *There is a forum for Directors and one for technical people. They had a meeting with the Permanent Secretaries and the Secretaries got lost............If it can't sail through Permanent Secretaries, there is no way it can sail downwards. Even the Ministers also don't know..... If the top officials, don't understand what can you expect. Even the permanent Secretary refers it back to you (P19: 42-6).* Also, the data indicates that such lack of capacity affected the quality of leadership as well as the implementation process.

5.2.5. **Stakeholder identification**

From the data, most managers were not able to identify the full list of key stakeholders in the context of RBM. *The issue of filling in forms, should be followed, checking that your RBM has been done, and agreeing with your boss (P2:45). Our main stakeholders are the entrepreneurs - those are our main stakeholders. We also have others like the financial sector (P3:25, 26).* Again, it can be argued that the identification of only a limited number of key stakeholders pointed to the limited knowledge of the concept. Such limited knowledge could also explain the resulting limited communication with stakeholders as well as their participation in the whole implementation process as detailed in section 5.2.6. below. Within the framework of RBM and the related accountability, a public servant is not only accountable to the supervisor, and as an individual, but is a team member accountable to a number of stakeholders and in the context of a team (USGAO, 1994). It can be argued that there was a mismatch between what was expected in the context of RBM and reality, which could have significantly impacted on the implementation. Again, it can be further argued that the issue of capacity as a factor influenced another compound factor, stakeholder identification and subsequently
participation. It can be argued that the implication of such interrelatedness magnifies the impact of the related factors on the implementation of RBM.

5.2.6. Level of communication and stakeholder participation

Although the managers were reportedly aware of the principles of RBM regarding stakeholder participation, there was limited or no communication and interaction with both internal and external stakeholders. *We are very much aware that that we should find out from our clients whether we have met their needs have made a difference in what we have been doing. In fact, all those clients/stakeholders are identified clearly in our RBM documents, but I think most Ministries are doing a desk exercise. Those clients out there I don't even know they are in our documents (P1:78-80).*

Literature reveals that such a shortcoming could have had a significant and negative impact on the implementation and its effectiveness. According to Wachira (2013), the Public Service exists to create Public value (as defined by the public) through its programmes. That means citizens’ problems rely partly on themselves for positive outcomes and thus their active participation in the production of public value cannot be overemphasized (Ibid).

In the case of internal stakeholders, the lack of communication was pointed out as one of the factors that was hampering the effective implementation of RBM. *Everybody. In fact, we should carry it outside. Everybody in terms of Government - internal and also when you go outside to the stakeholders. Yes just brought to us. And I am saying once you do that, people develop resistance. Or maybe top managers thought it was not necessary. But then if there is really no one to implement it, you see there are challenges. For the people will say, "You think you can do without us. So can you deliver the service" and you notice you can’t…..People don’t know and they don’t care when you use that word [RBM] because they have been left out. So there is this feeling that "It's for you, not for us." So as long as you have that "us and them" issue then you have problems. You have
problems.... And like I said earlier on, there is resistance. And the resistance is coming from non-appreciation. So the problem, let's make sure it goes further down. (P25:64, 66, 74-5, 62). So what they ought to do is when they want the views of public servants, they should hold out research programs. People end up paying lip service which destroys trust (P5: 36-7). The data indicated that the non-involvement of staff was leading to the development of a negative attitude as well as resentment among civil servants, both of which could have presented themselves as major disincentives in the effective implementation of RBM.

Similarly, according to literature, the involvement of stakeholders throughout the RBM process is crucial. This is because decision-making should be primarily guided by feedback acquired through establishment of effective communication channels with all stakeholders (Wachira, 2013). Also, according to Col et al (2006), effective institutionalization of RBM involves making all key stakeholders (who include politicians, government officials, as well as individual citizens) aware of the results management process and the increase in results that evolves from this practice. In the same context, adaptive responses to stakeholder needs require active participation of management and staff, the internal stakeholders. Increased involvement of these internal stakeholders in the development of missions, goals, objectives, and measures can help to establish maximum concurrence and induce ownership of the implementation process (Ibid). Col et al (2006) add that the development of sound performance frameworks and measurements can facilitate effective communication with most groups of stakeholders.

It can be argued that the issue of limited staff involvement was leading to the lack of ownership of the performance measurement system which was, in turn, impacting on the implementation process. There were suggestions, from the managers, for addressing this challenge that was reportedly hampering the implementation. *They should have a think tank, where they find out from civil...*
servants what can be done, what is effective to us as Zimbabweans….. (P2:43). They are not listening to the people….. What is lacking is ownership by the public servant. The top management thinks they own the program but they are not the ones that do the job. It is done by those below them……. (P5: 46, 81-3). The managers were of the opinion that more involvement of the civil servants was likely to improve the implementation.

Literature also reveals that Governments that report successful implementation of RBM attribute it to full participation of staff at all levels (Downey, 1998:18). Artley et al (2001) add that increased involvement of individuals in development of their missions, goals, objectives, and measures can help to establish maximum concurrence and induce ownership of the measuring process. Such participation also contributes towards the identification of realistic results-oriented performance measures and targets (Downey, 1998). Also, effective communication can help in the development of capacity among citizens to effectively communicate with Government on performance frameworks and measurements which is vital to ensure quality service delivery (Ibid).

Results Based Monitoring & Evaluation (RBME), a major sub-component performance measurement, emphasizes stakeholder consultation and involvement throughout the implementation process (UNESCO, 2008). Also, according to Col et al (2000), maintaining a close relationship with the customer to fully determine his/ her needs as well as obtain feedback on the extent to which those needs are being met is key to the provision of quality service. This is regardless of the nature of feedback. For example, customer complaint information helps the organization to seek opportunities to improve service quality (Ibid). UNJIU, (2004) adds that communication should therefore be treated as top priority in improving customer focus efforts. Also, according to Plantz et al (1997), the establishment of multilateral communication channels between all key stakeholders that include government and policy makers at all levels is crucial for the success of RBM. Such practice can avail
different perspectives likely to reveal important issues that may not have occurred to a limited number or group of stakeholders (Ibid). Also, the inherent participatory nature of RBM calls for a vital flow of information on performance to all stakeholders (National Performance Review, 1999). Regarding the level of participation of stakeholders, Wachira (2013) contends that both politicians and civil servants complement each other in the implementation of RBM. They, therefore, need to understand their respective roles and responsibilities to act as effective partners. Politicians are meant to provide political will and leadership while Civil servants provide functional leadership to the implementation process. Also, the need for mutual respect and high level buy-in in both groups cannot be overemphasized (Ibid). It can be argued that the limited communication and stakeholder participation had a significant and negative impact on the implementation process due to the limited input from key stakeholders.

5.2.7. Complexity of the RBM system

The managers reported that they found the RBM system tools cumbersome and difficult to use such that it was deemed inappropriate for its purpose. *That form in itself is a headache. You have this sense of fatigue running down your spine from the start, right? So that is the problem..... So I must say - to me, the most dreadful exercise in RBM is filling in that form. It's an inappropriate tool* (P32: 41, 46). The complexity led to the in the development of an attitude towards RBM. *It’s cumbersome and boring* (P2: 10). There were reportedly cases where civil servants just entered data that they did not understand on the RBM reports due to complexity of the forms as well as limited understanding of the concept itself. *So eventually what you end up putting on those documents is guesswork - yes guesswork* (P17:30). It can be argued that the complexity of the RBM tools was negatively impacting on the implementation of the strategy. Also, this finding can be closely linked to the lack of capacity that prevailed in the Service. Literature reveals that, generally, very limited attention is paid to the enormous capacity building effort required to change the management culture and
practices necessary to facilitate the generation of credible and useful performance information (RBMG, 2003). Again, it can be further argued that the limited understanding RBM as well as insufficient capacity building efforts, may have introduced an element of exaggeration in the level of complexity of the system.

The finding is also supported by literature where stakeholders elsewhere have had similar experiences. According to the Office of the Auditor General (1996), the development of RBM systems proved to be a significant challenge for most organizations. UNJIU (2004) adds that literature identifies over-complexity of RBM system tools as one of the biggest risk factor threatening its successful implementation. This is because the complexity usually leads to implementation problems and frustration among stakeholders (Ibid). Artley et al (2001) add that focussing on a minimum number of performance measures that are critical to the organisation’s success assists in sharpening focus while avoiding distraction. This also makes the performance measurement process more manageable and less cumbersome (Ibid). In the same context, PricewaterhouseCoopers (1999) emphasizes the need to adopt a balanced set of measures that provides adequate information on which to base decisions. Regarding the nature of RBM systems, Mayne (2007) adds the need for their being user-friendly. The key is to keep the number of indicators and required details to the vital few for continuous monitoring (Epstein and Olsen, 1996).

Besides the general complexity of the system, there was reportedly duplication of effort in preparation of the performance reports as the same or closely related questions had to be addressed. The managers expressed frustration with such complexity and repetition regarding the RBM system tools which resulted in excessive time consumption. A lot of information. So much repetition. It has the same information. You have got to end up with or 15 or whatever pages of the information you want. One single thing (P19: 6).I think we should have tried to streamline the documents because
you find that the information is kind of repeating itself within the integrated, departmental, the work plan blah, blah - this information is repeating itself (16:10). According to Plantz et al (1997), any form of duplication on RBM functions negates acceptance of the system. They add that it is essential for organizations to consistently examine RBM systems to avoid such duplication and ensure acceptance. It can be argued that the nature of the RBM tools significantly contributed to the level of acceptance as well as quality of implementation of the strategy in the Zimbabwe Public Service.

5.2.8. Alignment of responsibility and accountability and decision making authority

There was reportedly a perceived absence of alignment of responsibility, accountability and decision-making functions in the implementation of RBM in the Zimbabwe Public Service. The managers indicated their unwillingness to accept accountability for performance when they were did not control the related resources. *It doesn't make sense to me to pretend that we are doing what we are supposed to be doing because you cannot hold me accountable, as a manager, to say you must do 1,2,3 when I am not fully responsible for the resources also. I am not fully responsible for the resources, the resources are managed by the (name of ministry)...... But it can't work now because I am not the one who is controlling the resources. The resources come they are pooled under Finance department. The assignment, I am not fully in control of it. I am in control of it to the extent that I have the concept and the idea but the finance and other things are completely out of my control - completely out of my control. So I am asking, “Can I be held accountable for something that I can’t control?”* (P28:9, 24-7). The finding is supported by literature which shows the need for significant adjustments in the organization structure when implementing RBM. According to Nakamura and Warburton (1998), the designing and building of an RBM system entails a close alignment of accountability and decision-making authority to ensure that individuals are held accountable for issues that they can influence.
Atkinson and McCrindell (1996) add that, certain conditions relating to the alignment of responsibility and decision-making authority must exist for individuals to accept accountability for results. Conversely, the absence of such conditions presents the risk of having the whole system resented (Ibid). This is because managers may be unwilling to commit to achieving results when they are not allowed the necessary flexibility to manage their programs (USGAO, 1997). Such alignment and conditions were reportedly missing within the Public Service in Zimbabwe. It can be argued that the perceived non-alignment of the necessary conditions contributed to the reluctance of the managers to fully accept and effectively implement RBM.

In summary, it can be stated that among the human factors, the lack of capacity most significantly impacted on the implementation of RBM as it influenced, to some extent, all the other factors. Those factors influenced most included senior management involvement, stakeholder participation, culture, availability of information, level of communication and to a limited extent, the alignment of responsibility, accountability and authority. In the case of complexity of the system, as stated earlier in this section, an element of exaggeration due to limited knowledge could not be ruled out.

5.3. Organizational factors

5.3.1. Adoption of the RBM strategy

The analysis of data as well as responses from the thirty-nine managers who declined to participate in the study revealed that RBM was only partially implemented in the Zimbabwe Public Service. Some units had reportedly not started implementing RBM while others were only implementing parts of it. In the Public Service, people have heard about it as a concept and as a tool that Government wants to put in place. But to take it as a management tool that we use on a day to day basis. Ah...ah! That has not happened. We are aware of RBM, we are aware that it's a management tool but we have not embraced it as a tool because we don't use it on a day to day basis (P22: 4-6).
It's a folk term [RBM] in the service and we know it's something that improves the service, it's something that we must move towards. And now we have a commitment to implement it as Accounting Officers and Heads of Ministries move towards it (P32: 2). In terms of implementation, we haven't reached 20 percent. Because if we were to get to 20 percent, in reality of implementation, you will see a lot of difference on the ground. You will see a lot of difference on the ground (P10: 101-3). Well, we are hoping that the economic fortunes will come in the not so distant future so to speak. If that were to happen, let’s say next year, then we can begin to implement it...... the roll-out is yet to happen......Perhaps the only other challenge has to do with seeing, perhaps, where it is working in other Government Departments. That is if there are already other Departments which have started implementing it (P29:10, 13, 16).

Partial implementation of RBM

The managers reported that in some units, RBM was partially implemented only by certain individuals or for selected functions only.......from our side, I was involved in the preparation of the RBM like for the Permanent Secretary as well as for the Department and also coming up with the Monitoring and Evaluation.......So I with the other Deputy Directors were involved in preparing that document........The other subordinates were not involved - it was just me performing, Deputy Director level going upwards (P31: 4, 5, 7).

This was reportedly because parts of the system were deemed to be impossible to implement. Certain parts of it are not implementable......If you look at it they will say, “From this level to this level, appraise according to RBM. From this level to this level continue to appraise according to the old system. What they are failing to recognize is - it's not something that you apply piecemeal RBM - you can’t. You can't apply it piecemeal, you can't (P28:18, 66).
The lack of knowledge regarding the concept was also cited as one of the reasons for the partial implementation. For example, in some ministries the Personnel Performance System (PPS) had not been implemented because it was not understood. Managers also expressed frustration with the requirement to use a tool that they did not understand. *The other component of RBM is PPS which has not been put into operation. Up to now it has not been operationalized. There has been attempt to operationalize it but because no one understands it, it has not been done. Even labour law states that one cannot be governed by law at the employee does not understand. It, however, is not fair for the Government to force a system on a person that it has not taught (P18: 7-8).*

As a result of these shortcomings, the system was only used for some parts of the national programmes being implemented while the old system was used for the other parts. *The other component of RBM is PPS [Personnel Performance System] which has not been put into operation. Up to now it has not been operationalized. There has been attempt to operationalize it but because no one understands it, it has not been done....The PPS has never been used - I have never seen it....We are using old Public Performance Program...Here I would want to use them [RBM forms] for my subordinates but then, like I said the PPS was not implemented. (P18:7, 12, 17, 30). We are reporting on appropriations, which is a financial statement that's states the allocations and how it was spent. Mine are in line with the parliament acts. Maybe there are RBM reports that I have not been taught. *A rio poro zvawo asi hati sati tasvika ipapo* [they exist but we have not got to the stage where we use them] (P6:32-4).

The managers attributed failure of the strategy to this partial implementation. *What makes it fail in the first place is that that they are applying certain of its parts when they are supposed to apply it fully. So because those areas are not possible, it therefore means that overall the thing doesn't function (P28:66). This finding is supported by literature where RBM should be adopted by all*
organizational units and programs without exception, to maximize its relevance and effectiveness (UNESCO, 2011). Another prerequisite for shifting to RBM is a commitment, by all levels, to the strategy (UNJIU, 2004). Such commitment is then translated into precise tools and mechanisms that effectively put RBM into action (Ibid).

It can be argued that the partial or non-implementation of RBM by some individuals or units impacted on the implementation process and subsequently its effectiveness. It can be further argued this partial implementation was consequence of the lack of knowledge, and therefore capacity to implement RBM.

5.3.2. Customization of RBM systems

The analysis of data revealed that the managers unanimously agreed that the RBM system had not been adequately adapted for use in the Zimbabwe Public Service. RBM in terms of concept is very good but let us adapt it to our practical environment and conditions.... The problem we have is that we adopted it, instead of adapting it to our conditions (P5: 21, 51). I think it comes from Malaysia from the background. I think there was not much of adapting it to the Zimbabwean environment. I mean, people just take what was happening in Malaysia - where it was working, I think it is still working to this day......But, those people are different from us. Just take the concept into Zimbabwe for almost immediate implementation? (P25:4-6).

As a result of this opinion regarding adaptation, the system was regarded as foreign and was, therefore, not fully accepted by the Civil Servants. Such perception led to the development of a negative attitude towards RBM and thus negatively impacting on the implementation. Why should we do something chatakangonyamura [that we just uplifted] from Malaysia? Can't we make it user friendly for use here? (P6:47-8). This is a concept developed elsewhere in Malaysia, in the west,
right, which has to be adapted to our circumstances. And the process of adaptation itself creates or confirms tools. If the tools developed elsewhere are appropriate then those are confirmed. If the tools that are required to deal with unique situations that arise in an African setting have to be found, then those have to be developed (P32:36). In fact, I think it's a tool or some research that is coming from elsewhere (P22:4). According Schacter (2004), perceptions and attitudes of civil servants public are critical aspects in the implementation of RBM as these factors determine the quality of implementation. It can be argued that the above-mentioned perception by the Civil Servants had a significant impact on the implementation.

The managers were also of the opinion that the RBM system needed to be customized at unit level to suit the needs of the users rather than using the same standards and measures which may be inappropriate for certain situations. When it comes to Public Service, the same standards that are being given to people serving the Ministries are the same for teachers, the same for finance, but we are different. Some of these principles are just being applied without giving thought to the work that is being done…We can’t use the same yard stick for a medical doctor and a veterinary surgeon who is vaccinating cows, you know they are 4000 cows and you can say each doctor should deal with 4000 cows in a day. When it comes to a doctor attending to human beings, you don’t give numbers. You can only judge performance by the number of people that have recovered (P5: 41-2, 38-40). Now there are other institutions where this thing can work but when you are dealing with non tangibles, say when you are dealing with Ministry of Health, you are dealing with figures, we need to build 5 clinics. At the end of the day we managed to build 2, why? The RBM then comes in. But when you are talking of intangible things like (expected output from a Ministry), you cannot assess (name of output) (P13:14).

The managers interviewed reported that the Public Service Commission was in the process of adjusting the evaluation system to improve its effectiveness as well as accommodate the differences
in the nature of functions and expected results. The appraisal system was a problem. You cannot appraise a Driver and an Office Orderly who cleans these offices using the same form - same wording and everything. So that is changing. So, I think we need a bit more time such that when you ask that person where his/ her performance appraisal is. The performance appraisal must be based on a work plan and those are the RBM principles. So that person will need time and the question will be, "Where is your work plan?" (P10: 136 – 7).

In the same context of adaptation of the system, there was reportedly some resistance, from top management, towards any attempts by lower level managers to adapt the systems to suit their working environments resulting in frustration among the lower level managers. Any efforts to adapt it at lower levels are met with resistance, people are asked to work so as to see the outcome. That is not the way to do things (P5: 91-2). But the people at the top, when they want things done they are telling you to do it this way. You do it this way. So whatever you come up with at the lower level you can’t push it up (P14:7).

This finding regarding the adaptation of RBM systems is supported by literature where it is shown that many organizations get tempted to simply adopt RBM systems deemed successful elsewhere (Joyce, 1997). Kusek et al (2001) add that each country is unique in its socio-cultural and political context as well as its views on the feasibility of RBM. Therefore, in practice, countries may need to combine approaches, adapt and test experiences from other countries to their own circumstances (Ibid). In the same context, at the organizational level systems need to be differentiated as far as possible to accommodate the needs and situation of the users (Office of the Auditor General in Canada, 1996). This is because no single system will be appropriate for every organization (Itell, 1998). UNJIU (2004:2) adds that “there is no single road map to RBM such that each organization
has to adapt the system to its specificities and mandates”. Also, according to Bester (2012) such adaptation should take place throughout the whole organization including at unit levels.

According to Poate (1997), to achieve such adaptation, consensus needs to be reached on details of implementation through effective stakeholder participation. In the same context, RBMG (2003) suggests an approach to performance management where the organization uses the Results Based Management techniques and tools in combination with traditional monitoring systems or components of such systems to ensure acceptance. In the long term, an RBM system should be monitored and improved continuously transforming it into a responsive instrument in line with the demands of its environment (Plantz et al, 1997). It can be argued that the lack of adaptation and resulting negative attitude influenced the level of buy-in as well as the quality of implementation. This was despite the fact that most managers believed that RBM was a sound tool for improving programme management. Good program but badly managed (P5: 88). It's an effective tool but probably the way it is done ........ (P17:19).

5.3.3 Alignment of systems

According to the managers interviewed, systems in the Public Service were generally either not aligned to RBM or did not support its implementation. It’s a standalone. It’s just doing it. Why can’t we integrate it into the whole system? (P23:81). Even the Standards of Operations procedures of the Service do not uphold RBM. ..... you have a basic contradiction where the dictates of RBM go to the east while the realities of budgeting go to the west.....And my basic postulate is that view; the broader macro environments is not supportive to the implementation of RBM (P32: 53, 11).

The budgeting and compensation systems emerged as some of the systems that were mostly not aligned to RBM but even tended to be against the implementation process. I am hard pressed, in the
absence of a budget which is not a tool (laughs) but which has become a dictate you know, it's not a tool - it's dictating to me how my RBM must be modified. You see that now the difference -RBM must have its own tools, one of which is the budget. Ironically, we have a top seated situation where budget which is supposed to be a tool, becomes itself a definer of RBM. So the RBM becomes a tool of the budget. There is reversal of roles there, right? So in the absence of a budget as a tool, in the absence of an appropriate assessment mechanism, it is difficult for one to see how RBM can be implemented (P32:47-8).

In the same context, the majority of managers acknowledged the absence of links between results and budgets, particularly with the cash budget that was in place at the time of research. This shortcoming was reportedly making it difficult, and in some cases impossible, to implement RBM in the Zimbabwe Public Service. And the challenge which I think affects people across the board is one of finance because when you are working on your work plan for a particular year, you are basically looking at how much has been availed within the budget. When it comes to implementation, the situation you are now looking at is - we are operating with cash budget. The first priority is to meet the employment costs and after that the recurrent expenditure then after that you then get whatever remains for operations. If you look at the envelope which ends up going to each Ministry having taken that out it’s not something you can really use to plan and implement......First it’s difficult to plan because you don’t know when the when you will get the fund...if it comes. And then even for the little that is available, there are so many other competing demands - routine operational issues. So to that extent it becomes difficult yah....... In terms of management of the resources, it tends to be centralized. So even though you have got an input in the budget process, there is an envelope that has been made available, it's available to the Ministry not to individual components. That's another challenge (P24: 22-7, 31). If you are resourced, you can then plan, then implement and evaluate it. But unfortunately, I think for the system, 2-3 years ago because of the economic down turn, I think
that is what appears to have perhaps interfered of scuttled implementation. Right now, we have no resources to talk about, even if I wanted to be assessed on it, I can't because I have no budget which I can manage, over which I can be judged. So that is the biggest challenge I think (P29:6-7). If I, on the basis of RBM, set certain strategic goals for my department, the general expectation is that my budget must begin to dialogue with those strategic goals that I have lined up. It might not able to match all the goals and that’s expected. We have to prioritize, isn’t it? But when we have a budget that is tangential to those objectives, then clearly it is very difficult for one to try and follow the concept of RBM. What is more- when you have budget which is probably something like 80% are salaries based, and some 15 or so percent based on recurrent expenditure and then a mere 5%, and I being very generous, related to capital projects. You realize that in terms of weighting, a combination of salary expenses and recurrent expenditure implies that that budget tells you to be static (P32: 15-8). But the major problem now that I find with RBM is - Government surviving on a cash basis. That is for every assignment that you do, you have to go to Finance & ask that I need to do this can you get money. We try to budget using the cash available - we then call it theoretical RBM. RBM is not theoretical in the sense that what it purports for or stands for in theory is not what is happening in practice because in practice, we are focusing on assignments. So even if an assignment requires $200 000 according to my own judgment, Finance can just say you are using $40 000 or there is no money. So I am asking for that money assignment by assignment. So this whole issue of departmental targets or unit targets and I give performance agreement between 1, 2, 3 doesn’t work.......... And that in practice, the way it is it implemented; it’s not supported by capital availability. (P28:8-10, 14).

From above findings, it can be argued that the non-alignment between the budget and the RBM system was a major concern among the managers as it reportedly impacted very significantly on the implementation of their programmes and subsequently RBM. It can be further argued that the issue
of budget also appears more significant than other factors regarding its impact on the implementation. Such significance is demonstrated by the fact that the budgetary process was impacting on the implementation of RBM from two angles namely the system itself not really RBM compliant and also in the context of the availability of resources discussed in section 5.3.4. of this thesis.

5.3.3.1. The Planning system

According to the managers interviewed, there were challenges in the alignment of the national planning function and the national budgetary process in the context of RBM. Such non-alignment reportedly led to the production of a national development plan that was not RBM compliant. ........ there is no alignment. (Name of ministry), their plan for the country- if you are talking of the plan it’s more like the vision 2020, the MTP. They must also be very RBM compliant, very RBM compliant.....So there must be an alignment between the plan and the budgetary process and even the structures, the organizational structures, they must all be aligned to the vision, the budgetary process........it’s just still a challenge where the (name of ministry), perhaps its budgetary process is not really informed by the planning process....There is need for alignment. That could be a strategic thing that we need to talk of and to look at. The vision of the country, the vision 2020, the medium term plan, the budgetary process, they must also be aligned. So at the moment that can be another challenge because the budget and the plans they must be talking to each other. ((P9:57-9, 71-2). So you will find that the development plan is there but still we are saying it is not RBM compliant..... (P10:71). It's [RBM] supposed to be a meticulous planning tool that helps planning and implementation of programs but it can't because of all these weaknesses. Weaknesses that derive from the fact that all the structural requirements of RBM are not available in the country.....It’s to do with the structure (P28: 51-2). Such lack of alignment was reportedly causing significant
challenges to the implementation of RBM in the Zimbabwe Public Service. This finding is supported by literature as planning is a primary function of RBM (UNESCO, 2008).

The managers attributed this absence of the alignment in the planning and budgetary functions to the lack of capacity to implement RBM. And also all those things are also because the macro-planning is still weak. It's the one that is supposed to direct these people and point to them that this is your path. So that aspect is still weak then people cannot articulate clearly what they want to do (P10:122-3) Even the work planning - when we put RBM in place, we realized that our planning is very weak because the instruments of RBM are based on planning...... Otherwise you will find that before the (name of ministry) will be talking about this and that and that and that but if you ask them, "Where is the plan?" you will not find it..... So even when you start implementing within the line Ministries, you need to connect a lot of other thing because the line Ministry is also asking, "Where is the macro-plan for the country so that we can fit into that. And when you need to answer that question that plan was not there. But despite the plan not being there we say let's just implement what is implementable whilst we fix this plan looking for direction. So you will find that the development plan is there but still we are saying it is not RBM compliant...... (P10: 122-3, 65-7, 69-71). Again it can be argued that this shortcoming, like many others relates to the unavailability of capacity in the Zimbabwe Public Service to implement RBM.

The findings regarding the alignment of systems are also supported by literature. A research conducted by Overseas Development Institute (ODI) on RBM public management in Bolivia, among other nations, identified significant challenges in the integration of targets with the budget process, personnel management and organizational reforms (ODI, 2003). Cutt (1995) contends that failure to realign and integrate the planning, budgeting and reporting systems with existing systems can make the implementation of RBM burdensome. Literature also reveals that most organisations faced
challenges when they attempted to link performance levels with budgetary allocations before the RBM system is sufficiently developed (RBMG, 2003). This often resulted in the related link being perceived as inappropriate (Ibid). It can be argued that the finding gives an indication of such perception in the Zimbabwe Public Service.

Wachira (2013) adds that experiences in Africa show that such lack of alignment among systems when implementing RBM often led to poor results. Also, according to UNJIU (2004), RBM techniques can only have a meaningful impact when they are supplemented by organizational systems, such as human resources, information management and learning. The realignment of systems can also be replaced or combined with abandoning tools that no longer work (Cutt, 1995). Wachira (2013) further emphasizes the need to ensure that every element of the Public service system is results-oriented. That includes its structure, objectives as well as, how it is led and/or managed in order to ensure it.

It can be argued that the incompatibility of systems impacted on the implementation of RBM in Zimbabwe. It can be further argued that the failure to align the systems or ensure RBM compliance can again be linked to the limited knowledge and hence lack of capacity to implement RBM in the Service.

5.3.3.2. Human Resources management and Compensation system

Notably, among the systems, the compensation system was unanimously pointed out as one of those that most significantly impacted on the implementation of RBM. The main reason cited was the lack of incentives, financial or in kind, to implement RBM. It’s not practical to our environment because people have not been rewarded accordingly........For no matter how much they perform, they are not being paid (P5:25, 84). But you also have a very practical question, right, the person who defines
conditions of service, the person or the office who hires and fires is not the office which is compelling RBM (P32:26). Because there was no recognition or reward for successfully implementing RBM, it was not considered a priority by the Civil Servants and thus not given full attention. So for someone who has other duties and you are given this other task that’s not even my job description, it’s not even one of my Key Result Areas. So, for me really to concentrate and focus on that whilst I know that there are other duties that have deadlines I am supposed to meet ,it becomes too much...........Just throw it into any department like the Department of Finance and Admin, we are busy people - for us now to focus really more on that.  (P31:11-2, 26). It can be argued that issues of human resources management and compensation systems negatively impacted on the implementation of RBM.

According to Wachira (2013), the quality of implementing RBM is dependent on professional human resources management that is closely aligned to strategic goals and objectives because people management, like budget, is a key resource to the delivery of results. Also, the related staff selection, compensation and career development should be based on merit (Ibid). There is also evidence to suggest that providing incentives, whether financial or non-financial causes individuals to change their behaviour and helps communicate what is important to the organization (PricewaterhouseCoopers, 1999). Rewarding successful employees is necessary to complete the accountability framework (National Performance Review, 1999). This is because accountability is a two-way process where the organization must reward individuals who perform their obligation in the context of the performance contract (Ibid). It can be further argued that the provision of incentives can enhance the motivation to implement RBM and thus positively impact the process.

5.3.4. Availability of resources
The majority of managers interviewed cited the unavailability of resources to implement projects and programmes as a major challenge in the implementation of RBM. The challenge relating to the unavailability of resources was in terms of both quantity and timing. If I, on the basis of RBM, set certain strategic goals for my department, the general expectation is that my budget must begin to dialogue with those strategic goals that I have lined up. It might not able to match all the goals and that's expected. We have to prioritize, isn't it? But when we have a budget that is tangential to those objectives, then clearly it is very difficult for one to try and follow the concept of RBM (P32: 15-6).

Analysis of the data gave an indication that the unavailability of resources was making it difficult for the Civil Servants to achieve their objectives in the context of RBM. And the challenge which I think affects people across the board is one of finance because when you are working on your work plan for a particular year, you are basically looking at how much has been availed within the budget. When it comes to implementation, the situation you are now looking at is - we are operating with cash budget. The first priority is to meet the employment costs and after that the recurrent expenditure then after that you then get whatever remains for operations. If you look at the envelope which ends up going to each Ministry having taken that out it’s not something you can really use to plan and implement (P24: 22-5). Right now, we have no resources to talk about, even if I wanted to be assessed on it, I can't because I have no budget which I can manage, over which I can be judged. So that is the biggest challenge I think (P31: 7). Like this year the Finance Minister has got to reduce the budget downwards. So assuming that a Ministry had said they were going to achieve 1,2,3,4 it means that Ministry is now thrown into disarray. And even in terms of the release of resources, you don't know how much you are going to get and when you will get it. Not because Ministry of Finance does not want to give Ministries some money but because the cash is also not available. So it’s a tricky situation that we are in. (P16:16-7).
Regarding the timing, funds were reportedly not received or not receive timely to facilitate the implementation of projects and produce results. *Eh..., you might find if you look at the budget from a global basis, you might actually meet your target of how much you expect to get as revenue but the challenge is - most of that is coming in November/December. So you have gone for ten months without anything. So practically you can't implement what you have planned because resources are not available* (P24: 27, 29). The challenge reportedly led to failure by most units to achieve their objectives set out in the performance agreement thus failing to implement RBM.

In the same context, the effects of the timing in the provision of financial resources were most pronounced during the period of hyperinflation where even slight delays resulted in the loss of buying power for the limited funds available. Such situation reportedly posed very significantly challenges leading to the failure to implement programmes in the context of RBM. *You also have the 2nd key component which is even that small resource which you have said to the Ministry is available- it had to be a resource with buying power. But at the time when we were implementing the program, I would release money from Treasury. It took 3 days for it to reach the Ministry. By the time it reaches the Ministry, it's gone. There were so many cases where people would then phone you and say, "By the way it's ok, we have received the money but it's no longer sufficient. Can you supplement it. Then when I supplement - it becomes a cycle. So you will find that it hampered the implementation of key projects and programs which people could hold on to and say, “RBM has managed to do this.” So, that becomes a major challenge. (P26: 7-9).*

According to the managers interviewed, the unavailability of resources was regarded as a major disincentive in the implementation of RBM, by the Civil Servants. This was reportedly because Civil Servants were not motivated to relate to RBM, including trying to understand its principles, when they knew there would the necessary resources to put the knowledge into action would not be
available. It is therefore de-motivating for someone to start to try & do the cumbersome procedures when in actual fact at the end of the cumbersome task nothing happens. The procedures, the reports and the systems might be involving but does it pay me, does it make sense to me to invest time to understand those when I know that eventually I will not operate according to them. I think that, to me, that is the major disincentive. That is the greatest weakness causing problems to the extent that Senior Management are not motivated to look at it..... There are a few formats and procedures there but does it help me to really follow it through when we are not implementing it (P28:15-7, 29).

Similarly, the Civil servants were also reluctant to execute the planning and reporting functions in the context of RBM because they believed these elements of the system would be redundant without the necessary resources and other pre-requisites to facilitate their usage. What is challenging in that process is that there is a lot of work that people do to plan for it but come implementation, there is no reference to it because of a host of challenges around the issues or the pre-requisites that are not in place. So as a result, we don’t use it. So given that it’s not helping in the management strategy at the end of the day it has lost its critical role as a management tool (P22: 8-10).

In the same context, the managers reported that there was also reluctance to complete the reports because the information provided in the performance report reports was not used to assist them to access resources despite having reported on their needs. But the other problem is even if I say I have failed, I want to do this Key Result Area but I don't have any money, I am not given the money. So what is the point of wasting my time to fill in the form? (P2: 16-8). According to literature, organizations require adequate resources as well as management and accountability systems to be in place for the successful implementation of RBM (Thomas, 1998; Bester, 2012). Col et al (2006) add that linking performance measurement systems to the budget process has proven to be vital to sustaining the performance aspects of management. Literature also shows that if performance
information is not used as an input in making the most important decisions that include the allocation of scarce resources, among competing claims, stakeholders are likely to lose interest in the performance measurement function (Poate, 1997).

Although most managers were concerned about the unavailability of resources, two of the managers interviewed shared a different viewpoint. They pointed out the need to demonstrate the notions of efficiency and effectiveness, in the context of RBM, where one has to achieve some level of results using the budget allocated regardless of the amount. *One of the principles underlying RBM is that you achieve your outputs within the budget that has been given (P1:46). We do not want to have this initiative hindered because of the excuse of resources, which is why there is the word in the dictionary called resourceful. If you have the initiative and heart you must always find a way around to make sure the initiative is put in place (P12:47-8).* This assertion is supported by literature. According to Artley et al (2001), emphasizing the need to demonstrate how one has contributed towards the achievement of results as per the work plan despite the quantity of resources available is critical for effective implementation. This is because the requirement helps to make the process both challenging and motivating (Ibid). This is also in line with an assertion by Mayne, (1997) that the key issue regarding RBM and accountability is for individuals and units to demonstrate the outcome (difference of significance and value) they have accomplished.

It can be argued that the unavailability of resources significantly impacted on the implementation. However, concern about resources expressed by the majority of managers could be again linked to the lack of adequate knowledge of RBM particularly this principle regarding achievement of the best results with the available resources thus ensuring efficiency. It can be further argued that providing such knowledge may be useful in removing this apparently very high level of frustration expressed by the majority of managers regarding the unavailability of resources.
5.3.5 Location of the performance measurement function

The roles and responsibilities for both individuals and units in the implementation of RBM were reportedly not clear leading to challenges relating to the coordination of the RBM implementation process. Also, the units that controlled (monitoring and evaluation) the implementation of RBM were not the offices that were responsible for human resource management. This meant that such units did not exercise the reward and punishment functions which would be necessary to compel the civil servant to effectively implement RBM. But you also have a very practical question, right, the person who defines conditions of service, the person or the office who hires and fires is not the office which is compelling RBM. You follow? Yet we are talking about the fate of the whole establishment. If it is not part of my conditions of service, if it is not part of my own assessment and if also the disburser of resources is not aligned to the implementer of the concept……you now a triangle, you have the [name of office], the [name of ministry], you have [name of office]. How do those three pillar offices converge or fail to converge on the concept of RBM? Just where to place the concept was problematic……let’s find an appropriate house or houses for it. But hey! Those houses, if there are many, must have interconnected goals (P32:26, 65).

In the same context of roles and responsibilities of different units within the organizational structure for implementing RBM, challenges also emerged regarding the issue of seniority. Issues on governance the we need to attend to - how the Civil Service should be like, structures then you need to fill duties where have to determine who is more senior between the (title of an individual) or (title of an individual)…. (P10:110).

This finding was also supported by literature. Clark and Swain (2005) assert that the introduction of RBM and accountability frameworks is usually poorly handled in most governments resulting in
confusion and frustration. Also, according to Poate (1997), the choice of unit(s) to control the implementation is crucial as it significantly impacts the implementation of the strategy. Suggested locations include the program level as well as the to facilitate buy-in from line-managers as well as within central M&E units of organizations for the necessary technical and analytical expertise (Ibid; Newcomer and Downy, 1997-98). Also, Mayne (1997) asserts that extensive consultations among key stakeholders to determine the best structure for implementing RBM within a particular organization can be helpful to facilitate effective implementation. In the same context, it can be argued that literature is not conclusive on the ideal location of this very important function of control. This is because the function is one of the two main pillars of RBM (UNESCO, 2008).

It can also be argued that the location of the measurement systems impacted the implementation of RBM as there was a lack of clarity regarding issues of responsibility, accountability and authority. It can be further argued that the functions may not have been optimally located, in the absence of extensive stakeholder consultations, as suggested by literature. The absence of stakeholder participation was noted in section 5.2.6. of this thesis.

5.4. Environmental factors

In addition to the human and organizational factors identified in literature, this study also identified other factors, relating to the environment within which RBM was implemented.

5.4.1. The Political environment

In Zimbabwe, political issues reportedly found their way into most aspects of life including programs of national development. The implementation of RBM was not spared as challenges emerged when public management issues became politicized. But for us now, our challenge is that the environment is so political..... You will find that there are many challenges with budgeting. The challenges are emanating 1) because of the politics - I can say many because of the politics. There is a policy which
is not RBM compliant…. These are challenges. So that political meddling still has challenges (P10:39, 75, 158). The political issues reportedly influenced the environment in which RBM was being implemented introducing challenges to the implementation process. My other factor which I want to raise, which I feel decided the fate of RBM is about more or less about the time at which we introduced the notion of RBM. You then had certain changes of a political nature……And where you have a public management issue that’s highly politicized. ……So there is a key political dynamic which kicked in to cloud the environment. (P32:30, 32-3).

This finding is also supported by literature. According to Wachira (2013), RBM is deemed to be a political process with technical dimensions where politicians and Civil Servants have distinct but complementary roles to play. However, Cohen & Wheeler (1999), assert that politicization of Public Service programs can lead to demoralization of public servants and also reduce their effectiveness. It can, therefore, be argued that, from the perspective of the managers interviewed, the political environment significantly impacted on the implementation of RBM.

5.4.2. Apparent absence of a common national vision

The managers interviewed identified the apparent absence of a common vision among all Zimbabweans as a significant factor that was impeding the implementation of RBM. In countries such as Malaysia, Singapore, you ask a grocery shop attendant how things are going, then ask a doctor they will both tell you the same thing - that in these countries that things are like this like that. With us you ask a person where we are heading and one talks about land and another says no we are past issues of land (P10:98-9). This lack of a common vision reportedly made planning in the context of RBM difficult. Sometimes you find that you start planning and you have not met as a Ministry and there is no mission, vision whatever whatever…..(P21:8.) Literature reveals that this finding was not unique to Zimbabwe. Wachira (2013) contends that the probability of finding anyone
in Africa who is aware of his or her country’s vision is almost negligible. However, in the context of RBM, it is vital that a clear national vision, shared and owned by all sectors, is communicated to all stakeholders to ensure a common focus and thus enhanced quality of implementation (Ibid; Downey, 1998).

In the same context Downey (1998) asserts that the existence of a strategic plan clearly indicating the organizational goals and objectives that reflect a long-term vision or mission is critical for the successful implementation of RBM. From literature, it was noted that successful implementation requires strong political will, leadership and strong institutional capacity (Wachira, 2013). Also, the success of implementing RBM is premised on strong political will and leadership that ensures a shared vision, and co-creation of public value through effective engagement and involvement of citizens (Ibid). The same view is also supported by Col et al (2006) who argue that a key issue in the establishment of a comprehensive government-wide RBM system is the linking the actions of all stakeholders to the desired results for the unit as well as to government-wide results. That is, both individual planning efforts and performance emphasizes the extent to which individuals contribute towards the achievement of desired results (Bester, 2012). According to the majority of managers interviewed, this was a missing element in the Zimbabwe Public Service and was negatively impacting on the implementation process.

It can be argued that the general environment in which the Zimbabwe Public Service was implementing RBM also had its own significant influence on the process. The Public Service could control such environmental factors but could influence them. Literature reveals that, in the context of RBM, such factors also needed to be accommodated, as risks in the development of programmes.

5.5. Other issues
On analyzing data, two issues regarding the implementation process emerged as having significantly impacted on the process itself as well as the effectiveness of the strategy. The first issue was the introduction of the strategy into the Zimbabwe Public Service and the second issue relates to some improper practices in the execution of the monitoring and evaluation function of RBM.

### 5.5.1. The implementation process

The managers unanimously agreed that RBM was being implemented wrongly in the Zimbabwe Public Service leading to its failure to make a difference in the quality of service delivery. *Its deficiency is based on practice because we are implementing it in a very wrong way (P28: 64). RBM, the way we are implementing it is a process.....We would have been somewhere if we had kept the momentum.....after some years, as RBM we will be confident enough to invite our clients to get their views, because right now we are too scared because they would be saying everything is wrong (P1:75, 84, 97). 27. But the quality of those documents, the time it takes for ministries to produce documents is not up to standard (P1: 27). But certainly, we think it is workable if it is applied religiously, but for now it doesn't seem to be working (P29: 8).* According to RATN (2011:2), “RBM is a whole system which includes the culture of an organization; its values; operational systems and decision making procedures; staff and their skill and capacity”. The finding indicates a mismatch between literature and reality where RBM was implemented in parts rather than a whole system. It can then be argued that the assertion by the managers that RBM was wrongly implemented is confirmed in the light of literature available on the implementation of RBM.

The data reveals that the managers interviewed were of the opinion that the wrong implementation led to failure of the RBM programme to improve the quality of programme management and service delivery as was expected. *You then wonder, we have invested so many resources, but how come things are not moving (P5:25). I am aware there are concerted efforts to make it work with the little resources that are there. That's not very visible or very encouraging. I could safely say, I mean those...*
that I have talked to simply say it doesn't work....(P29:17). What is the difference between expectations and implementation? That answers why RBM is not functioning (P28:88).

It can be argued that the inadequacy of capacity as well as the absence of other benchmarks for the effective implementation of RBM, discussed in Chapter 2 of this thesis, in the Zimbabwe Public Service led to the poor implementation. Such poor implementation includes the issue of partial implementation discussed in section 5.3. of this thesis. It can be further argued that, according to the managers interviewed, this poor implementation contributed to the limited effectiveness of the strategy.

Regarding the implementation, the managers reported that some of the components of RBM that were inadequately implemented included the introduction of the strategy as well as the execution of the performance measurement functions. Details of these inadequacies are discussed in the following sections.

5.5.1.1. **Introduction of the RBM strategy in the Zimbabwe Public Service**

There was reportedly no effort to inform the Civil Servants to appreciate the need to change from the old tools of programme management to RBM. According to the managers, such lack of effort led to resentment and subsequently low buy-in of the concept as well as resentment towards the implementation process. *One expected that the powers that be would have thought through the process of introducing RBM. I am talking about how the concept was introduced in the Service. You see you must understand the psychology of transformation. If you are inviting me to change from my old ways, there is an implicit package of telling me essentially that we have been doing the wrong things in the past. So much like everyone gets defensive (P32:22). I think the way it was implemented - It created issues - we were just told that it has already been adopted. So it's like you are not*
supposed to question, you are not supposed to offer any ideas - it has already been received and passed. Take what's there and do that (P23:11). How am I going to do it differently from what I am doing currently? (P22: 19). According to literature, lessons from Europe and the United States of America reveal that the starting point for an improvement initiative is to ensure the realization that the current position is unsatisfactory and there is a better and achievable option (PricewaterhouseCoopers, 1999). It can be stated that the assertion implies that the absence of such realisation would be detrimental to the introduction and implementation of the new initiative.

Also, the “agents of change” involved in the process were perceived to be inappropriate by some Civil Servants. This is because the Civil Servants were of the opinion that such function should have been assigned to more senior and experienced individuals rather than their counterparts or juniors. The assignment of such responsibility to “change agents” reportedly led to a low buy-in of the concept as well as some resentment......this is about Change Management - and Change Management is never a function of juniors or contemporaries of those people who are supposed to be themselves - champions of the change......So when you are introducing a new approach to the Civil Service, who is the Change Agent - can he be my line Officer which means my contemporary? Or this has to be someone above, right? And what does someone above mean in practical terms? Does it mean housing a concept in a higher Office, or it means making the burden of articulating the concept in a person who represents that higher Office. There is difference between getting a Permanent Secretary, place him/ her in a higher Office - it could be that of the Chairman, it could be that of the Chief Secretary and then using that same Permanent Secretary to minister to his/ her contemporaries. Immediately you run one risk of attitudes in the process. And I thought that was a key mistake......And the way to improve the grasp of the concept is to make sure that we have people who deliver it to us, to our minds with the credibility, with the clout to ensure acceptance. (P32:22 3, 64). This finding is supported by literature. Senior management involvement is essential to
provide impetus for change as well as help overcome resistance to change (Epstein and Olsen, 1996).

It can be argued that the involvement of lower level managers could have negatively impacted on the acceptance of RBM as literature reveals the need for senior management.

During this same introductory phase, there was reportedly inadequate effort and information provided to help Civil Servants to appreciate the benefits of implementing RBM. This reportedly made it difficult for Civil Servants to appreciate and embrace the tool that was meant to improve programme management without fully understanding the expected benefits.

*I think it's the introduction of it, which was another issue. It's a management tool but what is the expected outcome of using it as a management tool. How much benefit is derived from it? Because I need to understand the benefits so that when I relate to the benefits, I can embrace it. But I don't know what I am supposed to benefit from it. In fact I think it's a tool or some research that is coming from elsewhere. For us to embrace the thing without me as an individual, appreciating the benefits. I don't think it can work. So when you are not clear, as an individual, then the effort in trying to understand it becomes very difficult. So the challenge is the initial introduction. For us to say, “What is the expected outcome, what is it that we want to achieve by this tool?” Yes, it's a management tool but at the end of the day how am I benefitting from it? (P22:12-8). It's not fully appreciated. Maybe it's the dissemination when the concept was introduced (P25:2-3).* Literature reveals that there is a mismatch between this finding and the principles of implementing RBM.

According to Epstein and Olsen (1996), all key stakeholders need to appreciate the benefits of RBM to the organization and its programs to ensure buy-in of the strategy. In this context, there are suggestions to review past and current systems, before implementing new procedures, to better understand why the former systems have failed to achieve their objectives (Poate, 1997). Also, sharing lessons learned from past experiences may facilitate acceptance of the new initiative (Ibid).
Cooley et al (2000) also add that the application of RBM principles needs to be “championed” throughout the system to ensure acceptance and sustainability.

It can be argued that the absence of appreciation of the strategy by key stakeholders including managers, from the beginning, significantly stifled the adoption and implementation RBM in the Zimbabwe Public Service. Also, according to OPC (2012), these managers were expected to “sell” and cascade the concept to their subordinates thus facilitating effective implementation. This did not happen reportedly because there was not enough capacity building effort to facilitate such cascading. Workshops that were held were for the Heads of Departments to appreciate the program but not enough was done to cascade the implementation to the lower ranks (P18:6). Well for it to work, well I look at it as working by cascading it. So it has to start from the top and then cascade downwards (P29:21).

In the same context, the introduction of all facets of the system at once reportedly made it difficult to understand the concept. The way it came to people - I think probably that's why people resisted it. It just came with all these facets, components that they were supposed to comply with (P17:37-8). Some managers were of the opinion that it should have been introduced gradually to make it easier for the Civil Servants to understand. My thinking is that what we should have done is to take gradual approach instead of the big bang that we did. (P16:5). This finding is supported by literature where the introduction of all the concepts at once can make hamper the processes of learning and building support Cooley et al (2000). They suggest that phased roll-out or pilot initiatives can prove to be more effective. That is, the introduction of fewer concepts at a time and then deepening implementation selectively and incrementally with input from evaluation of early phases or pilot efforts. The input will include problems and solutions identified for some or all components (Ibid).
There was reportedly lack of buy-in as well as resistance to RBM as a result of the way the concept was introduced where the Civil Servants felt they had been coerced into implementing the strategy. Because the take-off was not good - it’s like they have forced people. People are being forced (P25:23). They have what they want and believe they have introduced a system that should be accepted at all costs. Fine, we will accept it all costs...P5:41-2).... there is some resistance - I know there is some resistance.... So people are resisting.... And like I said earlier on, there is resistance.

And the resistance is coming from non-appreciation. So the problem, let's make sure it goes further down. Yes just brought to us. And I am saying once you do that, people develop resistance. Or maybe top managers thought it was not necessary. But then if there is really no one to implement it, you see there are challenges. For the people will say, "You think you can do without us?" (P25: 24-5, 28, 62, 64).

According to some managers the implementation of RBM was based on compliance rather than appreciation. The appreciation in ministries is there because it is a requirement that every ministry must produce RBM documents every year (P1: 26). It’s just an exercise to please the Commission that we have done the exercise, but otherwise people are not following it through and through (P2: 16). The data indicates that appreciation was not genuine and the implementation was just to fulfil a requirement. It can be argued that the improper practices discussed in section 5.5.1.2. could be linked to the fact that implementation was on the basis of the need to comply with a requirement.

As literature suggests, acceptance and ownership of the RBM implementation programme are vital as they ensure the necessary enthusiasm and support (Poate, 1997). It can be argued that the absence of such acceptance and ownership could have contributed to the reported resentment as well as resistance among the Civil Servants. It can be further argued that the perceived inappropriate introduction process may be also linked to the issue of inadequate capacity for change management.
in general and the implementation of RBM, in particular, that existed in the Zimbabwe Public Service.

5.5.1.2. Improper practices in the implementation of RBM

The reported prevalence of improper practices in the implementation of RBM where invalid performance data was submitted may also have impacted on the implementation process. According to the managers, such invalid data was submitted when performance reports were completed on behalf of other staff or supervisors. The reasons cited for such improper practices reportedly ranged from lack of knowledge, the complicated nature of the documentation for performance reporting as well as the little regard for the implementation of RBM. *Even with the monitoring, what we do here, we give one person the task of writing everyone’s key results, and they do everything and then we just sign….The other thing is you are supposed to be assessed by your supervisor, but people just fill in what they want and just give the supervisor to sign, because the form is too cumbersome* (P2: 9, 29).

*I was involved in the preparation of the RBM like for the Permanent Secretary as well as for the Department and also coming up with the Monitoring and Evaluation……So I with the other Deputy Directors were involved in preparing that document…..The other subordinates were not involved - it was just me performing, Deputy Director level going upwards* (P31:4,5,7).

Another reason for the submission of invalid data was reportedly the negative attitude towards RBM discussed in sections 5.2.1. and 5.3.2. of this thesis. Such attitude resulted in the Civil Servants not paying full attention the performance reporting exercise. The unit supervising the performance reporting exercise was reportedly not taking any action against this improper practice. *At the end of every year people will still do it [performance reporting] half heartedly. And the inspectorates from the Commission will continue to do nothing. In fact, what was happening with performance in the past is you work so hard, you do the first year papers correctly, and as the years progress, you just*
copy as has been happening. Or you can have the hardest working person do the whole exercise. If you adopt it, people will cheat and not understand it. But if you adapt it becomes user friendly and each ministry is focused on agreement on what has to be done. (P5:73-8).

The submission of invalid data was confirmed by some managers from the units responsible for the review of such reports. Such reports reportedly did not make sense to such an extent that they made the review impossible. Sometimes it is also very depressing when you look at a document and you can't make head or tail out of that document. So you say to yourself, how do I start because the information that is there - it could be a thick document like this and the information that is contained there you can't make head or tail out of that information. Now for you to go back to them and say, “Your information, I don't know what you are trying to say.” I am not exonerating ourselves (P16: 44). According to literature, performance measurement is one of the major the pillars of RBM (UNESCO, 2008). Also, performance information derives its value from validity and reliability such that even the perceived possibility of data falsification can impair destroy the value of the whole system (Atkinson and McCrindell, 1996; Nakamura and Warburton, 1998). That meant a shortcoming in this function was negatively impacting on the whole system.

It can be argued that the quality of implementing one of the pillars of RBM (performance measurement) was less than optimal in that it focused primarily on output completion rather than outcomes. Also, the submission of invalid performance data and the subsequent lack of feedback further aggravated the quality of implementing RBM.

5.6 Suggestions for improving the implementation of RBM in the Zimbabwe Public Service

Within the admittedly limited knowledge of RBM, some of it gained through personal reading, the majority of managers acknowledged that it was a good tool for improving programme management that has been adopted worldwide. They also believed that the concept could be successfully
implemented in the Zimbabwe Public Service. Personally, through my own reading, I think I have a fair amount of knowledge on RBM. I know what it means and does...... I don't think Zimbabwe can avoid the concept of RBM. Even if you don't call it that, it has all the key elements you need in management let alone Public Administration, right? The key is "Don't kill the concept- kill the bad practices that destroy its prospects (P32: 9,57-8). It's [RBM] a world class thing which is why the government embraced it (P12:26). Everybody, in fact in Government knows that RBM is a very good system. If it has worked for other countries, and it is going to work for us (P1: 40-1).

At the same time, the managers placed emphasis on the need to adapt the RBM system which they believed was essential for the strategy to work. If we adapt it, we will move, but if we continue in this we are not going anywhere....We need to adapt it and not adopt it and all indications are that it was adopted (P5: 72, 90).

As a result of the above-mentioned appreciation, several wide-ranging suggestions were proposed for improving the implementation of RBM in the Zimbabwe Public Service. Most of the suggestions, summarized below, hinged around the issue of institutionalizing RBM as well as building the necessary capacity to implement it.

A. Instil understanding and appreciation of the concept. This was suggested because the managers acknowledged the near complete lack of understanding of the concept of RBM that prevailed in the Service at the time of research. We really did not grasp the concept of RBM. And I think that's the first challenge that I encountered and that most of the people encountered .......
(P31:2-3). 3. But frankly, I don't think there is 1) a grasp of what RBM stands for. Secondly I don't think there is a grasp of what it intends to do for the Service and thirdly I don't think there is a grasp of how we are supposed to go about it (P32:3). The proposed action to improve the situation
included improving the grasp, instilling appreciation of the concept as well as understanding how to implement it. So I think the first thing for us is to get back to basics. What is it that we want to achieve? What is the expected result, what is the benefit of this whole thing? (P22:22, 26). 1) get Senior managers to understand the concept of RBM 2) see its serviceability in our circumstances 3) want to utilize it in their own management process..... I think we need to improve the grasp of the concept. (P32:38, 63).

This suggestion is supported by literature where according to Epstein and Olsen (1996:42), once managers and staff understand how RBM works, they start to appreciate its potential. That means there is need to clearly explain what RBM is and why RBM was adopted and what it will do for the Public Service and the nation at large. *The major challenge is to make everybody knowledgeable to the same level then you can say you are driving it together* (P8: 57). It is also vital to continuously stress that the organization has fully accepted the implementation and will be committed to it. Understanding and appreciation of benefits will reduce resistance and promote acceptance of accountability (Ibid).

B. Develop the necessary human and institutional capacity. *I think that the Government should invest in it - training people and making follow-up with the Heads of Ministries - how far are you, how far are you?* (P18:34). ... *get people who are knowledgeable to train* (P19:31). *It's about putting in place a system of bureaucracy- a Government system for the country* (P28:78). It can be argued that this suggestion is very important against the background of the very pronounced lack of capacity in the Zimbabwe Public Service. The finding which indicates that necessary initiatives for capacity building need to be broader than training is supported by literature. According to Sonnentag (2002), increasing the levels of knowledge, through learning and influencing attitudes and behaviour
can improve staff performance and hence the impact of RBM. The training programmes can be improved on using lessons learned as well as suggestions from the managers as input.

C. Review the implementation process to learn and improve from the lessons learned. Review what has happened. And what has happened must have taught us how not to do it. Let's use that how not to do it, to find how best to do it. …..Revealing everything - the spirit being not to fault find but to establish how to re-apply the concept in our situation (P32:66).

The need for a review is strongly supported by literature. According to Poate, (1997), an important lesson from literature is the implementation of RBM remains work in progress even after successfully adopting the strategy. This is because the related system needs to be constantly reviewed and improved to ensure that it is adequately responsive to its environment, which is always changing (Ibid). Also, reviews are essential as they provide the necessary in-depth analysis necessary to offer explanations regarding the progress or lack of it in the implementation process. In addition, learning from past mistakes and using shared experiences may help gain acceptance and consensus of new initiatives which can also transform an institution into a learning organization (Ibid). To this, Bester (2012) adds that including the commissioning of an independent evaluation in the RBM Action Plan can help in determining the effectiveness of the capacity building initiatives as well as the necessary action to enhance this effectiveness. That is, M&E needs to be emphasized for all the stages of the implementation process. In addition, literature also reveals that managers and staff learn best through trial and error as well as a hands-on-approach (Meier, 1998) meaning such reviews can help to them to learn and improve. Also, according to (Poate, 1997) periodic reviews of the RBM implementation process can transform an institution into a learning organization that uses performance information to identify its weaknesses and strengths as a basis for making adjustments in its processes. Such adjustments can lead to improved performance (Ibid).
D. Institutionalize RBM within the Zimbabwe Public Service with the necessary adjustments to meet the specific need of the local environment as well as integrate it into existing systems. Second phase for me would have been to say, "Fine, we have now seen this new concept. We have adjusted it, we have embraced it, we want to apply it, how do you think we must go about it? Then jointly we develop the appropriate tool.... let's integrate our systems, right? The way to validate a new concept in change management is to make all facets of an institution, refer to it. RBM must be the "be all and end all" of our practices in the bureaucracy. Once you make it that pervasive, right? It therefore follows that it becomes unavoidable, it becomes a compulsion, it becomes a necessity for operations in all departments (P32: 38, 67). According to change management principles, there should be certain things that act as reminders every day. Those things are not there. If there is no training, there is no reminder, if you are not filling in the forms, there is no reminder. So there must be change favours that you move with...... They have tried but there should be something that you just run with that remains on your mind.....The way you do you work be done to integrate RBM into everyday work, to make it a culture, internalize it (P23: 75, 77, 79).

The opinion of the managers is supported by literature. As Cutt (1995) recommends, systems relating to the implementation of RBM need to be aligned and integrated with existing organizational systems to promote efficiency as well as acceptance of the RBM system. In the same context of institutionalizing RBM, the suggestion by Cherrington, (1995) to ensure that all upcoming training activities include at least one module on RBM to help inculcate a results culture also supports this notion.

Also, the managers recommended that the development and implementation of the system needed to have increased participation of stakeholders than before to ensure ownership and thus help foster
commitment among Civil Servants. Any change situation demands that. If you are implementing any new innovations the best way is to carry everyone (P8:58-9. So what they ought to do is when they want the views of public servants, they should hold out research programs. People end up paying lip service which destroys trust (P5: 36-7). Again, literature reveals that meaningful involvement of stakeholders helps to increase their commitment as well as develop a sense of ownership necessary for effective implementation (Epstein and Olsen, 1996).

E. A re-launch of the RBM implementation program was suggested because the managers were of the opinion that the quality of implementation from 2005 up to the period of research (2012) was difficult to improve on such that it was best to re-start the implementation process from the beginning. So I think we need to go back to the drawing board and almost start on how to do the work. Almost start anew. Re-launch the program..... This may be the right moment to re-launch so we start afresh and step by step. (P25:19, 29). We can now start re-launching.......I think we really need to re-launch the program. We really need to re-launch (P26:26, 28, 30).

It can be argued that the suggestion is sound considering that there were reportedly weaknesses numerous enough to almost render the implementation impossible. RBM is a way of methodical and meticulous planning at Government level. It's supposed to be a meticulous planning tool that helps planning and implementation of programs but it can't because of all these weaknesses. Weaknesses that derive from the fact that all the structural requirements of RBM are not available in the country (P28:50-2).

It was also suggested that after the re-launch, the implementation process should take a gradual approach, in phases, rather than introduce all facets of the strategy at once and at the beginning. In the same context, the use of pilot projects. Let's do it piecemeal, in phases so that we really pick
problems as we go......if you do it in phases, make sure phase 1 is appreciated, there is buy-in then you move to the next stage - 2nd stage, 3rd stage. That way I think it will be a success. (P25:43, 46)...... because when you phase in, you learn from experience, you correct whatever needs to be corrected so that when you move onto the next step you know what things to avoid......(P16:57-8).

This suggestion regarding piloting projects is supported by literature where it has been determined that such practice presents an opportunity to test new management systems. This is because potential problems can be identified cost-effectively and solutions obtained within components or for the whole project (Auditor General of Canada, 1996). Cooley et al, (2000) add that phased roll-out or pilot initiatives that receive intensive technical assistance including assistance in documenting best practices and disseminating learning can be helpful in maximizing learning as well as building support. That entails introducing fewer concepts at a time and then deepening implementation selectively and incrementally with input from evaluation of early phases or pilot efforts. The input would include problems and solutions identified for some or all the components (Ibid).

**Summary of the findings**

It can be stated that the lack of capacity (both individual and institutional) for implementing RBM significantly impacted on the implementation of RBM in the Zimbabwe Public Service as it appeared to be most prominent among the findings. In fact, there appeared to be a causal relationship between this lack of capacity and the majority of the other factors identified particularly those relating to the institutionalization of RBM. This finding is supported by literature where, according to the World Bank (2005), human capacity, organizational processes, and institutional frameworks are closely interrelated and will always influence each other.

As stated in Table in Chapter 2, the main constructs of RBM in the Public Service include:

- Focus on contribution towards the achievement of desired results
• Centrality of the citizen (stakeholders)
• Essence of performance measurement
• Increased accountability to more stakeholders
• Learning and improvement

It can be further argued that, according to all the findings all the constructs were missing in the Zimbabwe Public Service and resulted in the wrong implementation of RBM.

What emerged from the study was that, according to the managers, there was no commitment, among both managers and staff in the Zimbabwe Public Service, to implement RBM in its state at the time of research. In fact, most of the suggestions made by the managers were aimed at improving the capacity and subsequently the implementation process giving an indication to confirm the lack of capacity as well as poor implementation of RBM. On a very positive note, it can be stated that the managers were willing to implement RBM if the relevant resources, structures and support systems were available. It's something good and it's something that we must embrace and definitely not say it’s a mystery or whatever. Of course when we re-launch it, I am sure we will be somewhere by the year 2020. Something positive is going to happen (P25: 78).

It also emerged that, generally, RBM was narrowly perceived and equated to performance appraisal in the Zimbabwe Public Service. Because the minute you finish the RBM paperwork, you don't want to see it again. You say "I have done their papers. Here are your papers!"And then that's it. You move away....To me RBM is like an overall of the performance appraisal system, overall (P23: 43, 77). Now in a concept of what we have presently, the only significant tool you find in RBM, outside of course the human tool, by way of those that introduced it, is the heavy, long and, in some respect, circuitous form that we are required to fill I think it's quarterly, right? That form, just from the sheer size of it, is forbidding (P32:39-40). So I don't know for some but for us it's difficult to fill in those
forms. It's not like we are not performing, it's when it comes to putting it on that particular paper. I don't know, maybe it needs revisiting (P21:10-2). But you will find sometimes you will forget about it. It only comes back after some months when it’s there to do the performance appraisal (P14:30).

This finding is supported by literature where according to RBMG (2003), limited understanding of the concept of RBM leads to its perception as just an exercise in performance reporting, rather than an essential component of good governance and improved programming. The finding also indicates the existence of a mismatch between the principles of RBM, as revealed in literature and the reality regarding the perception of RBM in the Zimbabwe Public Service. According to the World Bank (1997), RBM provides a coherent framework for strategic planning and management based on learning and accountability. It is first a management system and second, a performance reporting system.\(^2\) DANIDA (2011) adds that the primary purpose of RBM is to improve efficiency and effectiveness while the fulfilment of accountability through performance reporting is secondary. Similarly, according to RATN (2011), RBM is a complete system with subsystems that include the culture, systems as well as business processes of an organization. It can be argued that, as supported by literature, the misconception can be attributed to the low familiarity with RBM that prevailed in the Service which could be addressed through action to improve on the level of knowledge.

5.7. Chapter Summary

The discussion in this chapter indicates that several human and organizational factors impacted on the implementation of RBM in the Zimbabwe Public Service. Among these factors, the unavailability of capacity to implement RBM emerged as the most significant factor. Such capacity was lacking at all levels of staff in the Zimbabwe Public Service. There was an indication that the human factors that included the availability of information, the level of communication, senior management and stakeholder involvement as well as the complexity of systems were closely linked

\(^2\) Note on Results Based Management, Operations Evaluation Department, World Bank, 1997
to the issue of capacity. The environmental factors, namely the political influence as well as the apparent absence of a common national vision also gave an indication of a close link to the lack of capacity. Capacity building efforts were mostly confined to training activities, which were deemed ineffective, and thus consequently not helping to address the shortcoming. Regarding the training, data showed that it was not effective as both managers who had received training and those who had not did not have the capacity to implement RBM. Also, among the organizational factors such as the adoption of the strategy, customization as well as the alignment of RBM systems of systems could also be linked to this central issue of capacity where inadequacies resulted. The data also indicated that RBM was yet to be institutionalized into the Zimbabwe Public Service which may also explain the quality of implementation. The managers interviewed acknowledged that the implementation of RBM in the Zimbabwe Public Service was wrong and also attributed the ineffectiveness of the implementation to this poor implementation. However, in the context of limited knowledge of RBM, the managers interviewed acknowledged the value of RBM as a tool for improving programme management although it had not worked in the Zimbabwe Public Service because of poor implementation. Such poor implementation was attributed mostly to lack of capacity. Against this background, suggestions, centred on the building of capacity, were offered for improving the implementation. Generally, the findings indicate the importance of building capacity to implement RBM. Final conclusions about the findings and the related recommendations are presented in the Chapter 7.
CHAPTER 6
DEVELOPMENT OF A SUGGESTED MODEL FOR CAPACITY BUILDING IN THE
ZIMBABWE PUBLIC SERVICE

6.1. Introduction
In this chapter, a suggested model for improving the implementation of RBM in the Zimbabwe Public Service is developed and presented in line with the objectives of the study. Details of the processes involved in the development of the model as well as the justification for the selection and execution of these processes is narrated. Notes relating to the implementation of the suggested model are also provided.

The objectives of the study were to:

- Investigate the factors affecting the implementation of RBM in the Zimbabwe Public Service.
- Recommend a model for improving the implementation of RBM in the Zimbabwe Public Service.

To develop the model, it was deemed necessary to assess some elements regarding the implementation of RBM in the Zimbabwe Public Service to determine the necessary input. As discussed in Chapter 5, a re-launch of the implementation programme was strongly suggested. To achieve second objective, rapid assessments of the adequacy of capacity to implement RBM as well as the level of institutionalization of RBM in the Zimbabwe Public Service were conducted. The assessments were conducted on the basis of models developed by UNJIU and Mayne, discussed in section 2.8. of this thesis, with the data available from the study. Following the assessments, a suggested 2-phase model for capacity building was developed, one focussing on senior management and the other focussing on all Civil Servants. The model is two-phased in line with the indications...
from the findings that capacity was not available at all levels in the Zimbabwe Public Service. Cognisant of the fact that strategies aimed at other stakeholders are important over the long-term, the study determined that an initial focus on Civil Servants will lead to more near-term results. The initiatives can then be cascaded to include other groups of stakeholders.

6.2. Rapid assessments

Rapid assessments of capacity and the institutionalization of RBM in the Zimbabwe Public Service are summarised in tables 6 and 7 below.

**Table 6  Assessment of the adequacy of capacity available to implement RBM in the Zimbabwe Public Service**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Finding(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existence of a clear conceptual framework for RBM as a broad management strategy.</td>
<td>As discussed in section 5.3.1., such a framework for RBM was not yet in place in the Zimbabwe Public Service and RBM was still to be fully accepted as a management tool for the service. <em>In the Public Service, people have heard about it as a concept and as a tool that Government wants to put in place. But to take it as a management tool that we use on a day to day basis, Ah...ah! That has not happened. We are aware of RBM, we are aware that it's a management tool but we have not embraced it as a tool because we don't use it on a day to day basis (P22:4-6).</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearly defined responsibilities of key stakeholders</td>
<td>The issue of stakeholders, as discussed in section 5.2.5, emerged as a major challenge as there was an indication of weaknesses in most aspects relating to it from the identification, participation to the clarity of roles. <em>In fact, all those clients/stakeholders are identified clearly in our RBM documents, but I think most Ministries are doing desk exercise. Those clients out there I don't even</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearly formulated organizational long-term objectives with programmes well-aligned to them</td>
<td>In the case of objectives the managers interviewed were of the opinion that the long term objectives may have been in place but were not shared among stakeholders. It's about putting in place a system of bureaucracy - a Government system for the country. In other words we are saying, there must be a vision - those are the requirements of RBM. Then what Government is to achieve 1,2,3,4 then appropriate structures (P28:79). In countries such as Malaysia, Singapore, you ask a grocery shop attendant how things are going, then ask a doctor they will both tell you the same thing - that in these countries that things are like this like that. With us you ask a person where we are heading and one talks about land and another says no we are past issues of land (P10: 98-9).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources are well aligned to long-term objectives.</td>
<td>According to the managers, these elements were missing as the objectives were not clear and also the resources to execute programmes were not available making it nearly impossible to implement RBM. In other words we are saying, there must be a vision - those are the requirements of RBM. Then what Government is to achieve 1,2,3,4,... then it requires resources - then these resources are never available. As long as the requirements are not there.....it will fail. It doesn't work because the requirements of RBM are such that the system should allow for the requirements (P28: 79-0, 83)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>As discussed in sections 5.2.7 and 5.5.1.2., the performance monitoring</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Performance monitoring system in place. | System was not effective as it reportedly was resented by the Civil Servants and reportedly led to improper practices and thus diminishing its credibility.  

 It's just like an exercise to fill in the form [RBM report]. It's not an exercise to do RBM. What it has become now is an irritating paper which I am supposed to fill, because it is being assessed.... It's just an exercise to please the Commission that we have done the exercise, but otherwise people are not following it through and through (P2: 10-1). But it [performance reporting] is not done accurately but for the sake of having the report done. (P21: 33).  

 Non-usage of the information derived from the performance reports was reportedly frustrating the Civil Servants leading to reluctance to completing the report forms. But the other problem is even if I say I have failed, I want to do this Key Result Area but I don't have any money, I am not given the money. So what is the point of wasting my time to fill in the form? (P2: 16-8).  

 The procedures, the reports and the systems might be involving but does it pay me, does it make sense to me to invest time to understand those when I know that eventually I will not operate according to them. I think that, to me, that is a major disincentive (P28: 16-7) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RBM effectively internalized throughout the organization.</td>
<td>The discussion in section 5.3.3. revealed that RBM was yet to be internalized as it was perceived to be a standalone project. Let's integrate our systems, right? The way to validate a new concept in change management is to make all facets of an institution, refer to it. If I want money, I must know that my RBM must be right. If I want promotion, I must make sure that my RBM is right. If I want a salary review- and you note that a lot of salary reviews in Zimbabwe are a matter of union, not of performance. I must make sure that</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
my RBM is right. If I want to book an appointment with my superiors, I must make sure that it's happening in the context of RBM implementation, right? RBM must be the "be all and end all" of our practices in the bureaucracy. Once you make it that pervasive, right? It therefore follows that it becomes unavoidable, it becomes a compulsion, it becomes a necessity for operations in all departments (P32:67). According to change management principles, there should be certain things that act as reminders every day. Those things are not there. If there is no training, there is no reminder, if you are not filling in the forms, there is no reminder. So there must be change favours that you move with. The way you do you work every day, they have never been attached for people to internalize RBM (P23:74).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A knowledge management strategy developed to support RBM.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

As discussed in section 5.2.1.2., there were inadequate initiatives for building capacity within the Zimbabwe Public Service and the absence of initiatives such as knowledge management contributed to such inadequacy. What have we done apart from the training? We should have something that keeps engaging your mind until the mindset changes. Such a message is not coming (P23: 76). But you will find that we did receive a bit of training, but maybe it wasn’t enough and maybe we needed refresher courses so maybe we could grasp the concept (P31:5).

It can be argued that, from the rapid assessment there appeared to be a mismatch between all the criteria and the reality that emerged from the analysis of data. This mismatch points towards confirmation of the inadequacy of capacity to implement RBM in the Zimbabwe Public Service. The results of the assessment helped towards the development of the model through the close identification of shortcomings.
As discussed in chapter 5, the level of consensus regarding the need to re-launch the programme was high enough to compel the study to take an additional step towards attempting to determine the justification for such action. The additional action determined to be both reasonable and practical was the rapid assessment of the level of institutionalization of RBM in the Zimbabwe Public Service. The assessment was conducted using the criteria identified by Mayne (2007) as discussed in Chapter 2. The findings from the rapid assessment are presented in table 7 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Finding(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Fostering senior-level leadership in RBM | As discussed in section 5.2.4, the majority of lower level managers interviewed expressed frustration with the absence of senior leadership commitment to the implementation of RBM. *I don't see 100 percent uptake by the boss, I don't see the Senior management itself is fully behind the project to the extent that all in the Ministry are fully trying to follow not that the trigger mechanism must come from the bottom saying, "I want to do this"* (P28: 35). *To me RBM is like an overall of the performance appraisal system, overall. If it's overall, the leadership should be there* (P23:75). Consequently, the managers interviewed stressed the need for increased visible senior management involvement and leadership in the implementation of RBM as per the principles of the strategy. They argued that the principles were known but were not being followed. *The Permanent Secretary - what it means is to help us understand the Key Result Areas that we need to achieve. But that does not*
As a result a step by step suggestion of how the senior managers should be involved in the implementation of RBM in the Zimbabwe Public service was made offered. Below is a summary of the suggestion:

I. Conduct a national needs assessment exercise to guide strategic planning. *It must come from the Government to say that we want to achieve 1, 2, and 3. It comes from decisions according to the RBM system. There is a needs assessment to see which direction the country should go* (P28: 36-7).

II. Identify the related requirements *and then they identify the key inputs* (P28: 37).

III. Assign responsibility of execution to Ministries which forms the basis for the related Performance agreement. *This is going to be done by this Ministry, this by this Ministry then that becomes the basis on which a Performance Agreement signed between the Chief Secretary and the head of the Ministry, the Permanent Secretary* (P28:).

IV. Signature of the Performance Agreement by the Chief Secretary and Permanent Secretary of each Ministry........*at the end of the day - what should happen is the Chief Secretary should call the Permanent Secretary and say, this year we want to do 1, 2, 3, 4" and they sign the Performance agreement - Key Result Areas agreed. Then a Performance agreement is signed between the Permanent Secretary and the Chief Secretary with Key Result Areas for the*
V. Permanent Secretary takes the agreement to his/ her Ministry and assigns the responsibility for the Key Result Areas. *He should come down and say, “This is done by so and so and this by so and so” and then we also sign the performance agreement (P28: 33).*

According to the managers interviewed, the Permanent Secretary should take a leading role in the implementation of RBM. *The Permanent Secretary - what it means is to help us understand the Key Result Areas that we need to achieve.....So I think that it needs full uptake by all the leadership - to be fully behind it (P28: 38-9)*

| Promoting and supporting a results and learning culture. | The analysis of data revealed that the managers viewed the need for a cultural change as paramount for the successful implementation of RBM in the Zimbabwe Public Service. This was because the managers were aware of the challenges, emanating from the then existing culture, faced in the implementation and thus the need to have it changed. *Ethos, values and the mind set should change (P7: 23).* Any reforms are normally faced with resistance. People, they change slowly. It’s a mind-set game. It’s difficult to change people who have been doing their programs in a certain way to shift to the new thinking. So there is that element of resistance even in terms of the senior managers but they are not many..............So what needs to be done is to come up with a change management module which will address those things (P9:16-8). Suggested action included inculcating a results culture as institutionalizing training in RBM. *Inculcate a culture because that is what we want to do in RBM.* |
RBM is very simple - we are working with people to attain who are we accountable to, who is our client, what are the outcomes that are expected? How do we get there – simple….. much more needs to be done to integrate RBM into everyday work, to make it a culture, internalize it P23: 38-9, 78). What would have been more ideal would have been if we had institutionalized training in RBM in our civil service training centres. That would have been perfect (P1: 22).

Building results frameworks with ownership at all levels
According to the managers interviewed, the element of ownership of the RBM system was missing among the Civil Servants. There is need to adapt it so that people own it (P5: 79). I am saying RBM is not an activity- it’s a whole ethos. We are transforming the strength and reality of governance in the bureaucracy. And I think that’s the message. I mean these are key things that we have to do and do them collaboratively so that we have maximum buy- in. And the issue of collaborating is so key. Not the top- down approach (P32:71).

Measuring sensibly and developing user-friendly RBM information systems.
The managers interviewed unanimously agreed on the need to develop as well as simplify appropriate and user friendly systems. One, simplify it; two, adapt it to what we have............. (P19:31). So it’s a two-pronged approach I think on that one - you want to the extent possible to simplify it without losing the necessary detail (P24:9) This is a concept developed elsewhere in Malaysia, in the west, right? Which has to be adapted to our circumstances (P32:36). I think there is need for some trimming or adaptation to our Zimbabwean environment. But there is some adaptation that is needed to be done make RBM user- friendly. (P23:7, 10).

Using results
The shortcoming regarding the near complete absence as well as non-usage of
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building an adaptive RBM regime through regular review and update</th>
<th>Such review was reportedly missing leading the suggestion for a phased implementation process with regular reviews to obtain information to improve on subsequent processes. <em>To do it maybe in a few Ministries, see how it's working, see the challenges, collect those and then now to other Ministries when we are knowledgeable about the problems and possible solutions.... Let's do it piecemeal, in phases so that we really pick problems as we go. It's easier when you know the problems, you quickly follow them</em> (P25: 8, 43).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The managers interviewed were of the opinion that the RBM approach should be used fully adopted to enhance accountability. *It should be fully adhered to and a mandatory programme for accountability in the public sector including parastatals and government agencies as well as local authorities* (P7: 25).

It can be argued that there was a fairly wide mismatch between the findings from the data and all the criteria for ensuring effective implementation of RBM. The suggestions confirm the absence of such
institutionalization but give an indication of the willingness to implement RBM. It can be further argued that the results from the rapid assessment again confirm the unavailability of capacity which emerged from the discussion in Chapter 5.

6.3. Development of a suggested model for Capacity Building in the Zimbabwe Public Service

The assessments above gave an indication that RBM was yet to be institutionalized in the Zimbabwe Public Service and the capacity to implement RBM was inadequate enough to justify the recommendation for a re-launch thus supporting the findings in Chapter 5, regarding the universal lack of capacity to implement RBM in the Zimbabwe Public Service. Against this background, the study developed a suggested two-phased RBM models for capacity building. The two-phased nature was meant to accommodate some of the shortcomings pointed out by managers regarding the composition as well as the content of training programs that could not adequately meet the needs of all participants. It is also suggested that the target audience for training programs be selected according to their needs. *Maybe let us be grouped according to our levels of comprehension (P23: 33).* For example training can be arranged for leadership or general staff. The content of training as well as program interaction and duration should thus depend on target audience.

Development of the model borrowed heavily from the one developed by the Conservation Measures Partnership (CMP) in 2011 as part of the organization’s implementation of its 2010 Summit Capacity Building initiative. This was because the study determined that the needs of CMP were very similar to those identified within the findings. The first model, shown in Figure 3 below focuses on a capacity building programme aimed at the Senior Management level with the related M&E plan is shown in Table 8 below.
Figure 3 Suggested model capacity building program for the Senior Management level

Programme & Cross organizational Exchange

- a) Senior management aware of the benefits of RBM from Programme and Cross organizational Exchange
- b) Senior management better understand how to apply RBM techniques

Senior management adopt RBM for priority programmes/projects

Senior management appreciate benefits of RBM

Senior management allocate more resources for RBM capacity building

Organizational support for incorporating RBM principles

Enhanced capacity to implement RBM

Civil Servants Capacity Building Activities

Sound implementation of RBM

Legend

- or - Outcome
- - Activity

Results Based M&E
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**Table 8 Monitoring & Evaluation Plan for Capacity Building among Senior Management**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Objective: By (date), All members of the Senior management are fully aware of how to incorporate principles of RBM as a core institutional business practice</td>
<td>Change in knowledge among members of the Senior management team who attended RBM outreach program</td>
<td>Methods determined via consensus</td>
<td>Period determined via consensus</td>
<td>Determined by consensus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Goal: By (date), every unit in the Zimbabwe Public Service adopts RBM principles in the following elements of the core business:
- Strategic planning frameworks
- Performance management frameworks
- IT systems

*Adopted from CMP (2011)*

The following terms relating to the suggested model are used as defined in the OECD Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluation and Results Based Management (2010) to mean:

**Assumptions**

Assumptions are hypotheses about factors or risks which could affect the progress or success of a development intervention

**Goal**

A goal is a higher-order objective, to which an intervention is intended to contribute.
The second model, shown in figure 4 below focuses on a capacity building program, initially, aimed at all Civil Servants and eventually key stakeholders involved in the implementation of RBM in Zimbabwe Public Service. The related M&E plan is shown in Table 9 below.

**Figure 4 Suggested Model for Capacity building for in the Zimbabwe Public Service – All Civil Servants**

- Increased access to more affordable training opportunities
- Availability of distance training material and systems
- More training available to Civil Servants

Increased no. of Civil Servants receive more adequate training

Increased no. of Coaches qualified to support and review projects

Increased awareness among Civil Servants about availability of coaches to support & review projects

Increased number of Civil Servants receive increased support & review of RBM processes

Civil Servants receive increased support & review of RBM processes

Improved capacity to implement RBM

Improved implementation of RBM

***An important assumption made here is that the Civil Servants will utilise the improved capacity acquired to implement RBM

---

**Results Based M&E**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legend</th>
<th>- Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□</td>
<td>or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□</td>
<td>- Outcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Adopted from CMP (2011)*
An important assumption made while developing this model is that the Civil Servants will utilise the improved capacity acquired to implement RBM. This also implies the assumption that all the other factors including the will, the mandate as well as the necessary resources will be available to facilitate the effective implementation of RBM.

The related M&E plan for the model focussing on all Civil Servants is shown in Table 9 below

Table 9 Monitoring & Evaluation Plan for Capacity Building - all Civil Servants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Objective : By (date), All members of the Senior management are fully aware of how to incorporate principles of RBM as a core institutional business practice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By (date), % of managers in the Zimbabwe Public Service received formal training in RBM.</td>
<td>Training attendance records</td>
<td>Frequency to be determined jointly</td>
<td>To be determined jointly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By (date), % of managers in Zimbabwe Public Service received support and review of their RBM products (including at least the related strategic and monitoring plans) by trained colleagues (trainers or trained peer-reviewers).</td>
<td>Coordination records Supervisor’s Periodic Performance review records</td>
<td>Frequency to be determined jointly</td>
<td>To be determined jointly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By (date), a number of coaches have been identified, trained, and designated such that they can adequately support the Civil Servants to at least develop quality strategic and monitoring plans</td>
<td>Methods determined jointly</td>
<td>Frequency to be determined jointly</td>
<td>To be determined jointly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal: By (date), all managers understand RBM with all high-priority projects actively and consistently using RBM tools in the implementation of national programmes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adopted from CMP (2011)
6.3.1. Notes relating to the suggested model

The related capacity-building planning needs to build upon successful past collaborations and relationships to foster acceptance and buy-in. In this context, a conference or summit can be considered to initiate discussion among diverse stakeholders.

In the Zimbabwe Public Service, capacity building is likely to be needed at two levels namely the introduction of the basic concepts and operational support. The introduction phase entails familiarizing with the basic concepts linked to the underlying principles of RBM which can be achieved through briefings and explanatory material. The operational support phase is to help Civil Servants to develop the capacity to handle more in-depth functions of the implementation process. Such functions include defining objectives, constructing performance indicators and using them for monitoring, evaluation and reporting as well as using results for decision-making and learning and communicating results to stakeholders beyond the outputs usually provided in reports.

The related capacity building activities, indicated in the model, can include, but not limited to, the following:

- Training with differentiation in program interaction and duration based on target audience
- Coaching
- Mentoring that is practice based and entails the selection, placement and compensation of the mentors
- E-learning – internet based resources
- Availing independent access to information resources for professionals, usually through the internet, at little or no cost.
Experimenting through pilot projects as discussed among suggestions by the managers in Chapter 5

Networking among civil servants as well as other organizations implementing RBM

Conferences

Seminars

Securing expert support

As suggested in literature, training and coaching can also be complemented by strengthening knowledge networks and communities of practice for RBM across the Public Service (Bester, 2012). Such fora provide opportunities for sharing lessons learned and best practices (UNJIU, 2004). In the same context, the need for provision of manuals, guidelines, toolkits information on best practices cannot be overemphasized (Col et al, 2006). Initially, the capacity building initiatives can be targeted at key stakeholders and ultimately expended to include, as far as possible, other groups stakeholders.

According to UNJIU (2004), early priorities in implementing RBM include the development of a handbook for use throughout the organization with both prescriptive guidelines and practical, “how-to” advice for the incorporation of RBM into the entire programming/reporting cycle. This may prove useful in the Zimbabwe Public Service as the managers interviewed reported that guidelines for the implementation process of RBM were not available.

According to CMP (2011), it is vital that there is a focus on sound monitoring and evaluation (M&E) as a main contributor to RBM capacity building. Methods for collecting data for M&E purposes in these capacity building programs need to be highly participatory and can include, but not limited to, the following; interviews, group discussion, facilitated workshops and role play exercises.
In the same context, the strengthening of RBM capacity should include strengthening M&E capacity (Ibid). Such investment in M&E for capacity building can also be used as a starting point to move towards a full-fledged RBM approach in the Zimbabwe Public Service (Ibid).

According to Farrow and Gardner (1999), a basic element for success in any initiative is to aim at demonstrating some form of success early in the implementation process. That entails including both short and long-term objectives to enable stakeholders some experience early successes and thus ensure a degree of motivation and sustainability. Including short-term objectives in the strategy for capacity building can prove to be useful for enhancing the necessary motivation and support.

6.3.1.1. Information sharing and learning

Information sharing and learning should be regarded as integral processes of each step in the implementation of RBM (AusAID, 2006). Learning is defined as the ability and willingness to engage in learning or knowledge seeking activities at the individual, group or team, and organizational levels (Anderson et al., 1994a). It involves more than exposure to new ideas and ways of solving problems to include the development or deepening of skills, knowledge, understanding, values, ideas, feelings attitudes and behaviours. Effective learning leads to change, development and the desire to learn more. This makes it a critical feature of capacity building initiatives which need to be developed into a culture for sustainability.

According to AusAID (2006:13), capacity building strategies that can be adopted to operationalize information sharing and learning include:
a) Individual work specific learning processes
   • structured on the job training
   • coaching and mentoring
   • leadership/modelling appropriate behaviours
   • subscription to learning journals
b) Work group learning processes
   • team learning and learning circles
   • project work
   • job placements/job rotation
   • study tours
   • process, work group and organisational reviews
   • critical incident learning
   • customer, organisational climate / culture surveys and follow-up action
   • team building and retreats
   • development of ‘model’ responses such as checklists for regular tasks, standard responses to common enquiries, examples of common documents..
   • pilot activities to test new ideas
c) Training and Education
   • tertiary studies (including employer funded programs)
   • off job training (in house courses, external courses)
   • guided reading
   • self and distance learning
d) Technical assistance
   • short and long term technical assistance
The strategies can be adopted individually or in combinations that are most suitable for the organization.

6.4. Chapter Summary

As discussed in Chapter 5, the managers were of the opinion that RBM was a good management tool if implemented properly and had a future in Zimbabwe. Against this background, the managers provided suggestions for improving the implementation of RBM mainly focussed on capacity building and also the consideration of a re-launch of the RBM implementation programme. The level of institutionalization of RBM in the Zimbabwe Public Service as well as the adequacy of capacity that was available to implement RBM was rapidly assessed. Models developed by UNJIU and Mayne, discussed in Chapter 2, and findings from the study were used for these assessments. The model developed by UNJIU (2004) was used to assess the capacity while the one developed by Mayne (2007) was to assess the level of institutionalization of RBM in the Zimbabwe Public Service. This was done to facilitate the development of a suggested model for capacity building including as well as consideration of the suggestions made by managers for improvement in the implementation of RBM. The suggested model was developed and notes relating to its implementation provided. Use of the model is recommended in chapter 7.
CHAPTER 7
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

7.1. Introduction
This chapter summarizes the thesis, considers the contribution made by the study and concludes by linking the objectives identified in Chapter 1 to what has been achieved. Recommendations for solutions to the problem identified by the study are addressed to the Zimbabwe Public Service while those for further research are also highlighted. Concluding remarks to the thesis are also provided.

7.2. Thesis summary
This study was conducted for the purpose of identifying the factors that impacted on the implementation of RBM in the Zimbabwe Public Service. The descriptive method of research was utilized. Interviews and document review strategies were used for gathering data. Semi-structured interviews of 32 managers, selected through purposive sampling, were conducted by the researcher. The population comprised managers in the Zimbabwe Public Service based at Ministry headquarters, who had received training in RBM and were involved in the implementation process. The interviews were conducted during the period between September and November 2012.

7.3. Summary of findings
The question to be addressed was:
What have been the main factors affecting the implementation of RBM in the Zimbabwe Public Service?
The primary contribution, to theory, of this thesis is on the impact that different factors have on the implementation of RBM. Human, organizational as well as environmental factors were identified. Among these factors, the lack of capacity to implement RBM was most significant and also influenced most of the other factors identified. Several reasons were cited for this inadequacy of capacity and resources. They included inadequate capacity building efforts, attrition as well as loss of skills due to non-usage. The absence of a results culture, partial implementation, non-alignment of system to RBM, the location of the controlling unit for the implementation, introduction of the strategy as well as faulty implementation were among the other main factors that impacted on the implementation, according to the managers interviewed. The managers expressed confidence in the strategy, albeit from a point of limited exposure and also stressing the need for quality of implementation, offered suggestions for improvement. Rapid assessments of the capacity to implement as well as the level of institutionalization of RBM in the Zimbabwe Public services supported the earlier findings which indicated inadequacies.

7.4. Conclusion

Based on the preceding findings, the study concludes that inadequate capacity was the main factor that impacted on the implementation of RBM in the Zimbabwe Public Service. It also concluded that RBM was poorly implemented as it was either implemented partially, and improperly, or not implemented in most units. This inadequate implementation subsequently had a marked impact on the effectiveness of RBM on the quality of service delivery that was expected of it. That is, the factors influenced each other and subsequently the whole implementation process.

In the same context of limited knowledge RBM, it also emerged that RBM was narrowly perceived as being an equivalent of performance management rather than a whole tool for governance.
From the study, it also emerged that theory on RBM remains weak regarding the location of the controlling function (including performance measurement) where the ideal location has not yet been identified but leaves it to consensus. Performance measurement is one of the two main pillars of RBM (UNESCO, 2008). It is therefore necessary to make efforts towards more research to ensure that all components relating to it are clear for improved implementation of RBM.

7.5. **Recommendations for improving the implementation of RBM in the Zimbabwe Public Service**

Against the background of the conclusion stated above, it is recommended that the Zimbabwe Public Service considers the reinforcement and building of capacity to improve the implementation of RBM. In the same context, the two-phase model for capacity building developed in Chapter 6 of this study is recommended. The ideal strategy recommended would to focus on both capacity building and institutionalization of RBM incorporating suggestions made by the managers who were interviewed. Such consideration can help to foster buy-in and ownership of the RBM system. The model can only be used as a part of the strategies for improving the implementation process as all the other pre-requisites for implementation discussed in Chapter 2 need to be in place.

The study also recommends a broader focus on the implementation rather than mostly reporting, as was the case. In the same context regarding the limited understanding of RBM among Civil Servants, it is recommended that these Civil Servants be encouraged to be more active in seeking learning opportunities and information to develop their capacity in the implementation of RBM. This can be achieved through continuous professional development independently or collaboratively. Adopting a learning culture that includes actively participating in knowledge networks is one way of informal capacity development. That is Civil Servants should be encouraged not to solely depend on the formal training provided by the government in developing their capacity for implementing RBM.
However, capacity building programs will most likely not be easy to implement as they are ordinarily pitted as competitors for resources with the mainline programs. Also, they entail change in the way things are done which usually invites resistance as people, generally, hate change. Remarks from some of the managers demonstrated that such resistance existed in the Zimbabwe Public Service.

While addressing the above-mentioned challenges relating to capacity building, it would be important to note that the implementation of RBM is a long term programme that requires resources, commitment, persistence and patience as well as champions to spearhead the efforts (Cooley et al, 2000). Because human capacity, organizational processes, and institutional frameworks are interrelated and take time and effort to change, the related capacity building initiatives need to be long-term and universal (World Bank, 2005). However, it is necessary to break down these long term initiatives to short term periodic objectives for the realisation of early successes which usually enhance motivation of the Civil Servants. It is also vital to build consensus and maintain the momentum, throughout the process, to ensure success (Poate, 1997).

In the long term, it may be worthwhile to consider the inclusion of RBM modules in the curricula of tertiary institutions in Zimbabwe. This is because the concept of RBM is fast gaining popularity across the world. The concept is also involving everyone including the private sector where focus has expanded from just the bottom line to include social responsibility. Social responsibility can be best managed using RBM principles.

All components of the RBM system need to be adapted to the unique environment in which the strategy is implemented. It is my hope that this thesis will be able to contribute, in a small way,
towards the improvement of implementing RBM in the Zimbabwe Public Service. Although the model and recommendations are aimed at implementation in the Zimbabwe Public Service, other organizations may find them useful for reference purposes.

7.6. Recommendations for future research

Against the background of limitations of the research stated in Chapter 1, it is recommended that similar studies be conducted with a larger sample and/or in other places within the Zimbabwe Public Service such as Provincial and District offices. Also, the investigation should be done among lower level staff and other stakeholders so that if similar problems and deficiencies are found, concerted efforts may be exerted to improve the implementation of RBM in the country. Other countries in Africa, where the environments tend to be similar, can also be considered for research.

Regarding theory on RBM, it may be necessary for more research to be conducted in an effort to identify the ideal location for the controlling function particularly performance measurement and related activities.

The following are some of the several issues that emerged and could open up avenues for possible research in future.

It is noted that a number of the managers declined to participate in the research citing that they do not use the principles of RBM at all. It would also be interesting to find out what they are using instead. This is a possible area for future research.

Also, the managers who underwent training were expected to cascade the knowledge (information and skills) that they gained to their subordinates to ensure active participation by the whole
organization in the implementation of RBM. Another area of possible research would be to explore the level of awareness regarding RBM among the lower level staff. In the same context of assessing awareness, expanding the list of stakeholders to include politicians and citizens may also help to determine the nature of capacity building efforts required.

The absence of information sharing and learning was noted in the context of RBM. The question that follows is one of trying to establish where managers obtain information for decision-making. This area is generally under-researched and can prove to be useful for improving the implementation of RBM.

7.7. Concluding remarks

It can be argued that increased documentation and sharing of success stories in the design and implementation of RBM in different organizations and countries may be found to be helpful. This is because literature, though limited, shows that there is a wealth of experience in the implementation of RBM albeit with mixed results. According to Col et al (2006), lessons learned and best practices were determined to be among the most credible tools to promote learning as well as the adoption of management strategies that have shown potential. It is the author’s belief that RBM is a journey worth taking in every aspect of life.

7.8. Chapter Summary

In this chapter, a thesis summary and conclusion were presented followed by recommendations for improving the implementation of RBM in the Zimbabwe Public Service as well as those for future research. The objectives of this study were to investigate the factors that impacted on the implementation of Results Based Management (RBM) in the Zimbabwe Public Service as well as to suggest a model to improve such implementation. The first objective has been achieved through the
application of research methodologies to collect data, rapid assessment of the organization regarding its capacity to implement as well as the level of institutionalization of RBM. This was followed by the development of a two-phased model to improve the implementation of RBM in the Zimbabwe Public Service. The suggested model was developed on the basis of existing structures in literature as well as incorporating fresh ideas from the findings relating to the implementation of RBM.
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Appendix A

*Interview Guide and Questions*

I. **Introduction (5 minutes)**

   a) Thank participant for consent
   
b) Explain the purpose of the research
   
c) Provide assurance regarding confidentiality and non-attribution of data
   
d) Explain the intention for further contact after the interview – data validation, sharing of findings
   
e) Request Permission to record

II. **Interview questions (25 minutes)**

1. Generally, how far is RBM understood and appreciated within the Zimbabwe Public Service?
2. Do you find RBM an effective tool for improving programme management?
3. Who do you consider to be the main stakeholder(s) in your area of operation and what are you accountable for to these stakeholders?
4. How different is RBM performance measurement and reporting from the other earlier systems?
5. How do you embrace the concepts of learning and information sharing? How effective are the methods?
6. How would you rate the adequacy of available skills to effectively implement RBM? How effective are meetings and the briefing sessions in RBM?
7. What are the main challenges that you face in the implementation of the strategy?
8. In your opinion, what should be done differently in the implementation of RBM to enhance its impact?
9. Where do you see RBM in future, say 5 years from now?

Appendix B

List of Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Qualification</th>
<th>Years of Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td>Permanent Secretary</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Postgraduate</td>
<td>10+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>10+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3</td>
<td>Deputy Director</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>5-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P4</td>
<td>Deputy Director</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>5-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P5</td>
<td>Principal Director</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Postgraduate</td>
<td>10+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P6</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Postgraduate</td>
<td>10+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P7</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Postgraduate</td>
<td>10+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P8</td>
<td>Principal Director</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Postgraduate</td>
<td>10+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P9</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Postgraduate</td>
<td>10+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P10</td>
<td>Principal Director</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Postgraduate</td>
<td>10+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P11</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Postgraduate</td>
<td>10+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P12</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>10+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P13</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Postgraduate</td>
<td>10+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P14</td>
<td>Deputy Director</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Postgraduate</td>
<td>10+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P15</td>
<td>Deputy Director</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>10+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P16</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Postgraduate</td>
<td>10+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P17</td>
<td>Deputy Director</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Postgraduate</td>
<td>10+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P18</td>
<td>Deputy Director</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Postgraduate</td>
<td>10+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P19</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Postgraduate</td>
<td>10+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P20</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Postgraduate</td>
<td>10+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P21</td>
<td>Principal Director</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Postgraduate</td>
<td>10+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P22</td>
<td>Permanent Secretary</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Postgraduate</td>
<td>10+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P23</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Postgraduate</td>
<td>10+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P24</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Postgraduate</td>
<td>10+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P25</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Postgraduate</td>
<td>10+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P26</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Postgraduate</td>
<td>10+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P27</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Postgraduate</td>
<td>10+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P28</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Postgraduate</td>
<td>10+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P29</td>
<td>Principal Director</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Postgraduate</td>
<td>10+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P30</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Postgraduate</td>
<td>10+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P31</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Postgraduate</td>
<td>10+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P32</td>
<td>Permanent Secretary</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Postgraduate</td>
<td>10+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>