ANALYSIS OF PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM AS AN APPRAISAL TOOL USED IN BOTSWANA COLLEGES OF EDUCATION

Mooketsi Ramakele
Molepolole College of Education

Setlhomo Koloi- Keaikitse
Department of Educational Foundations
University of Botswana
kolois@mopipi.ub.bw

Abstract

A survey questionnaire was administered to a sample of (N= 60) academic staff in two colleges of Education in Botswana to explore their perceptions, attitudes and level of satisfaction regarding the use of the Performance Management System (PMS) as an appraisal tool. Findings of the study revealed that HODs were more satisfied with PMS implementation than lecturers. Hierarchical regression analysis was computed to examine the extent to which academic staff perception towards PMS, their attitudes towards PMS and their understanding of PMS predicts their level of satisfaction with the use of PMS. Findings showed that academic staff perception towards PMS, their attitudes towards PMS and their understanding of PMS predicted staff's satisfaction with PMS to a statistically significant degree. Policy and practical implications are discussed.

1.0 Introduction

Despite numerous efforts to use PMS as an alternative performance tool by various organizations across the world, its implementation continues to face difficult hurdles. Gotore (2011) notes that 'significant challenges continue to be encountered by organizations that try to implement PMS for the first time or those attempting to change from one system to another' (p.65). Camps (2011) reports that the literature provides numerous examples of problems with PMS that organizations have experienced. For example, Bratton and Gold (2007) argued that "the reality is that performance management appraisal(s) may be less effective in achieving (their) purposes' (p. 34). It is also reported in the Corporate Leadership Council (2002) that despite considerable investment, many organizations expressed disappointment with their PMS outcomes' (p.10). Similarly, Gotore (2011) is of the view that PMS appears to be rarely well understood, let alone properly implemented as many institutions face challenges during its implementation especially when measures have to be cascaded down to employees. The Botswana Directorate of Public Service Management (2002) views PMS as a change and quality management process that facilitates a comprehensive management of performance at all level in an organization. Its major objectives are to improve individual and organizational performance in a systematic and sustainable way; to provide a planning and change management framework which is linked to budgeting and funding process; to enhance capacity of the Botswana Government to achieve the desired level of socio-economic governance; improve

the performance capacity of public officers; focus the efforts of the public service towards the achievement of the national vision goals and to inculcate the culture of performance and accountability to manage at higher levels of productivity so as to provide efficient service delivery.

Before the introduction of PMS, there were accusations of non-delivery of services by Ministries and Departments of the Botswana government. Government was for a long time concerned about this situation and from 1994 to 1997 it conducted investigations into what steps could be taken to put improve productivity in the government. The outcome of the investigation carried out by the Botswana National Productivity Centre (BNPC) with the help of Performance Centre, an American Consultancy Group recommended that a completely modern system be adopted to improve the existing public service way of management if productivity of service were to be restored. The recommendations included, among others, the introduction of a performance management system. This was meant to ensure that the public service delivers on a set and agreed plans, that can improve and sustains productivity at all levels. This was because the Department of Public Service Management (DPSM, 2002) realized that the public service needed a holistic and sustainable approach to improve productivity, manage performance and achieve set goals and objectives.

Researchers have argued that PMS is crucial to organizational performance for reasons such as facilitating the achievement of vision and business objectives, developing a performance culture within the organization, aligning the employees' performance goals with the organization's strategic goals, ensuring the individual has clarity regarding performance expectations, improving employee performance and identifying talented individuals for promotion and reinforcing linkage between pay and performance (Glendinning, 2002; Neary, 2002; Furnham, 2004 & Graham, 2004). There has however been a concern regarding the implementation of PMS and the output it has on productivity. This is because researchers have questioned the effectiveness of the Botswana performance management system since its implementation in 1998 against the backdrop of a continued decline in the productivity levels in the country (Somolekae, 2001; Raditlhokwa, 2006). In a similar vein, Tshukudu (2009) reports that there is an outcry from the business community that the PMS has adversely affected public service delivery because government officials are always out attending PMS seminars and workshops, and leaving junior officials to run the day to day activities of government offices.

2.0 Performance Management Systems in Universities and Colleges

Effective implementation of performance management in colleges of education Botswana was expected to enhance overall performance in terms of students' examination results, quality of teaching, healthy work culture and behavior, effective interpersonal relations and work efficiency. Several research has been done as an endeavour to assess the effectiveness of PMS and its role in institutions of higher education several studies. For instance, Decramer, Christiaens, & Vanderstraeten (2008) conducted a study to determine issues of PMS in a higher education context, with particular attention to the extent to which PMS had been implemented. The study used both theoretical viewpoints and an exploratory case study analysis of PMS implementation in a Flemish Higher Education Institution. The study found out that most of the heads of departments in the university welcomed PMS as a measure that helps them to think about goals and strategic choices. This tool was seen as a framework to avoid excuses of bad-performers, and has helped in managing college personnel. However, the study also notes that considerable problems with

effective implementation within the departments remain a major setback as some were reported as failing to comply with the imposed PMS due to lack of knowledge and training.

Another study by Melo, Sarrico & Radnor (n.d.) was meant to understand the extent to which the introduction of PMS had affected the roles, influences and accountabilities of key actors in the governance of universities. The research was carried out through an in-depth case study approach. Document study and semi structured interviews were used to collect data. Researchers reported that PMS brought some unintended effects, which are recognized by many interviewees. Results of the study showed PMS was implemented in an 'unthought-of' way and one of the respondents calls it 'a force towards mediocrity 'as it puts more emphasis on measures on success than the underlying objective. Participants, particularly academic staff indicated that PMS had resulted in misrepresentation. This is when performance data is misreported to create a good impression; it is a deliberate manipulation of data so that reported behaviour differs from actual behaviour. Some participants in the study showed some level of dissatisfaction with PMS on the basis that it is based on subjective and qualitative, rather objective judgements.

A study by Dzimbiri (2007) at the University of Botswana analysed the change process which the university went through in introducing and maintaining a new performance management system. It identified benefits, challenges and lessons involved in managing PMS. The Dzimbiri study found that even though University of Botswana developed a strategic plan with a vision, mission statement, values and strategic goals, it did not conduct a thorough scanning of its environment to identify factors that would affect the successful implementation of PMS. Junior University academic staff who participated in the study indicated that they were resistant to the adoption of PMS when it was initially introduced because they did not conceptualise its value very well. Participants perceived it as a management tool to control the performance of staff especially since staff was forced to sign performance contracts when they did not fully understand PMS. Senior academic staff felt it was irrelevant to the academic environment, arguing that it was too mechanistic and thereby could reduce the complex work of an academic to a technician. The also revealed that implementation of PMS was taking place at the same time as the development of strategic plans for departments. The challenge was on integrating the development of strategic plans for the entire University and those of departments before designing and signing of individual contracts. In his view, Dzimbiri indicated that "this challenge created a negative feeling against PMS. It was seen as being bulldozed on a very unwilling and cautious academic community" (p.19). This showed that academic staff did not embrace the implementation of PMS and its role as a tool for measuring their job performance.

3.0 Attitude of Employees Towards PMS Implementation

Past research showed that employees have negative attitudes towards the implementation of PMS. In their study, Washington & Hacker (2009) examined the path and lessons learnt from the implementation of PMS in Botswana ant the challenges of the recent past caused by an over reliance on public service programs are reviewed. The authors state that one of the biggest benefits of introducing PMS was a shift away from the 'program of the month' to a consistent holistic approach that got at the heart of country level- and organizational level- change. They were mainly interested in the resistance phase of change and the role of knowledge or information on resistance. The researchers showed that numerous reform programs which were introduced by the Botswana government caused confusion amongst workers. They highlighted that without an integrated approach, these programs tend to frustrate the workers and miss the targeted

breakthrough results. The study also showed that implementation of strategic plans in ministries has been a challenging affair making it difficult for these plans to be realized. This was because it was very difficult to develop appropriate measures with targets, cascading the strategy, prioritizing, and effectively linking budget to planning. Washington & Hacker's (2009) study is very useful for the current study as it lays down the historical background of PMS implementation in Botswana from the views of the implementers themselves. In a similar vein, Monnaatlala (2007) conducted another study to find out the extent to which senior management teams in primary schools have capacity and are succeeding in implementing PMS. The study found out that senior management teams have the capacity to implement PMS as they had attended training workshops about its implementation. They also understood the purposes and processes of PMS as they gave teachers timely feedback and understood what was expected of them which enabled them to fulfil their expectations all the time.

Contrary to the arguments raised by other researchers, Munzhedzi (2011) found out that there was a poor understanding of PMS by other public service organisations. This poor understanding is partly as a result of employees' little or no understanding of PMS at all. Most of the employees were limiting PMS to performance bonuses and pay progressions which are only elements of the system. Even some members of the management team showed little understanding of PMS. The researcher felt that this poor understanding of PMS was likely to hinder effective implementation. Gotore (2011) undertook a study based on the implementation of a PMS by XYZ Corporation (Pty) Ltd which was centred on the Balance Score Card (BSC) giving specific focus to the change management processes applied. This study found out that despite the effort by the company to foster participation, respondents still perceived the PMS as being imposed by management. There was lack of commitment on the part of the employees, whilst senior management was committed to the implementation of PMS. There were also perceptions that performance evaluations were not being done fairly and equitably. The company PMS was identified as a source of stress.

Nyembezi (2011) study also showed that participants expressed an attitude of distrust and scepticism towards the PMS, as they felt they had not been properly consulted in its initial stages. Participants in this study felt that this behaviour needed to change if management expected a full buy-in from them. Participants also had a negative attitude towards PMS because they felt that supervisors did not have enough skills or training to evaluate them. Participants expressed the need to have fair monitoring, reward high performers and correct low performers. Nyembezi (2011) study was concerned with exploration and descriptions so it looked to answer 'what' and 'how' questions. Collectively, research studies that have been reviewed showed negative attitude that employees of various organisations have towards the implementation and use of PMS as a tool that can be used to measure their work performance.

4.0 Views of Employees and their Satisfaction with PMS

Nyembezi (2011) explored whether PMS is a tool suitable measuring performance for the South African Broadcasting Company (SABC) by establishing an understanding of employees experiences and perceptions of the previous and proposed PMS and their value to SABC employees. Results of this study revealed that participants perceived PMS as just a tool' and a procedural activity to satisfy line managers. They also felt that the use of PMS in their organisation was not adding any value to their professional development; participants also stated that there was no reward in place for high performers and no action

taken to assist non-performers. Even for the newly proposed PMS, the employees felt that there was inadequate consultation with them and therefore did not want anything to do with it, this caused a deadlock in the planned implementation. Employees were very sceptical with PMS as it was implemented from middle managers down. Employees were also dissatisfied with PMS because it was not linked to career progression, and it was used to manage productivity without offering value to the performer. Employees expressed lack of confidence in the system as they felt it was not transparent.

Dzimbiri (2007) reported that implementation of PMS at the University of Botswana started before most departments had finalised their strategic plans. There were also no mechanisms to incorporate other stakeholders; lecturers, deans, directors and managers were not consulted at the diagnostic stage about their satisfaction with current approaches. Dzimbiri felt that if these stakeholders had been consulted, it would have helped to create a sense of ownership and may also have reduced resistance. Performance grading was also a problem as there was no bench mark against which lecturers would be judged average or excellent. Dzimbiri's study provided valuable information to this current study because it is the only one that has been carried out in a tertiary institution in Botswana. It puts forward a detailed background of PMS implementation in Botswana and highlights challenges that exist in its implementation particularly at tertiary level.

All the above studies explored general constructs such as, implementation of PMS employee attitudes and their satisfaction towards PMS. No research has been conducted to explore existing relationships between these constructs particularly in Botswana. One study reviewed that established relationship between constructs in this particular study was Liao, et al, (2009) who conducted a study to establish existing differences between management's and employees' perspectives of high performance work systems with a view to examine how the two constructs relate to employee performance have been explored. In this study, data were collected from managers, employees and customers. Correlational results showed that employee perspective towards high performance work systems was positively related to individual service performance.

Various authors highlighted numerous challenges which hinder effective implementation of PMS. For instance, Dzimbiri, 2007; Gotore, 2011; Harper, & Vilkinas, 2005; Mundzedzi, 2011; Nyembezi, 2011; Melo, Sarrico & Radnor (n.d), revealed that there is generally resistance by staff regarding PMS, as employees have negative attitudes towards its use. Employees perceived it as being imposed by management on them. There is also lack of understanding of the PMS by both employees and supervisors, some managers were reported to be incompetent as they are unable to implement the PMS effectively and efficiently (Munzhedzi, 2011). Employees felt that PMS was not an effective tool for measuring work their performance (Gotore, 2011; Dzimbiri, 2007; Nyembezi; 2011).

Some major challenges of using PMS have been reported, however, there are some contradicting views regarding the use of PMS as a performance measurement tool. PMS has been found to provide opportunities for individual employees a platform to discuss their work and other challenges with managers (Armstrong, 1991). It has also been found to provide some level of direction to employees from management (Medlin, 2013). A qualitative case study by Washington & Hacker (2009) examined the path and lessons learnt from the implementation of PMS in Botswana. Participants in this study generally indicated that one of the biggest benefits of introducing PMS was a shift away from the 'program of the month' to a consistent holistic approach that got at the heart of country level- and organizational level-

change. To support the above sentiments, Armstrong and Bacon (2004) argued that PMS should be about ownership by everyone in the organization, not just the senior management teams. Armstrong and Bacon observed that although even though teachers are often demotivated by performance ratings as well as the system being over detailed and requiring too much form filling, teachers generally like PMS, especially its emphasis on personal development.

Based on the contradictory arguments raised in the literature regarding the employees' perceptions, attitudes, and views regarding the implementation of PMS as a performance tool, researchers in this study felt there was a need to pursue the current study. Most of the reviewed literature was research studies on PMS in other countries hence the need to further explore other issues relating to PMS implementation further in Botswana. Out of all reviewed studies, only 4 were conducted in educational institutions. This shows that there is need for college based studies to add onto existing literature on implementation of PMS in Botswana and with main focus on educational institutions. Besides, most of the reviewed literature only used a qualitative approach. Only one used a quantitative analysis. Even that study used only descriptive statistics. The current study intended to explore the understanding of PMS, attitudes towards PMS and satisfaction with PMS by academic staff using both descriptive and inferential statistics to ensure deeper and more detailed analysis. Published literature particularly those in Botswana have focused on implementation of PMS employee attitudes and their satisfaction towards PMS. None of the studies used correlational approaches to try to establish the prediction value of constructs on general job satisfaction. It is hoped that results may go a long way in informing the interested stakeholders regarding employee level staff perceptions about PMS their understanding of PMS and their perceptions regarding the value PMS has on productivity are somehow related to their job satisfaction. For Mosadeghrad, (2004), employee job satisfaction is an attitude that people have about their jobs and the organizations in which they perform these jobs. It is an employee's affective reaction to a job, based on a comparison between actual outcomes and desired outcomes. It is therefore very important to establish a relationship of job satisfaction with other important constructs that can have an impact on it such staff perceptions on the use of performance measures such as PMS, hence the need of this study.

5.0 Purpose of the study

The purpose of this survey study was to examine the lecturers' perceptions and level of satisfaction about the implementation of PMS as an appraisal tool in Botswana Colleges of Education. Specifically, this study was meant to:(a) find out if there was a significant difference between lecturers' and HOD's understanding of PMS (b) find out whether there is any significant difference between lecturers and HOD's in their attitudes towards PMS implementation, (c) find out the extent at which staff are satisfied with the use of PMS as an appraisal mechanism/tool, (d) assess the extent at which academic staff's perceptions on the influence of PMS on productivity predict their level of satisfaction with the use of PMS over and above their attitudes and understanding of PMS.

6.0 Research questions

In order to fulfill these specific objectives, the following research questions were addressed: Is there a significant difference between lecturers and Heads of Department in their understanding of PMS? Is there any significant difference between lecturers and heads of department attitudes towards PMS implementation? Is there any significant difference between lecturers and heads of departments in their

level of satisfaction with PMS implementation? Do lecturers' beliefs that PMS has an influence on productivity predict their level of satisfaction with the use of PMS over and above their attitudes and understanding of PMS?

7.0 Methodology
7.1 *Research Design*

A survey design was used to gather descriptive and comparative data in order to understand views of the colleges' academic staff about PMS implementation. The study pursued a quantitative approach, but a little qualitative data was also collected, meaning it was predominantly quantitative and to a lesser extent qualitative. Surveys are often used to assess thoughts, opinions and feelings (Hair, Bush & Ortinau, 2002). These authors pointed out that with a representative sample, a researcher can describe the attitudes of the population from which the sample is drawn. One can also compare attitudes of different groups in the sample. Its advantages are that it has the ability to distinguish small differences between diverse groups, easy to administer and provides increased capability of using advanced statistical analysis (Hair, Bush & Ortinau, 2002). Hence, the survey design fits very well within the framework of this study.

8.0 Population and Sampling

The population included Heads of Departments, Senior Lecturer 1's, Senior lecturer 2's and Lecturers. The academic staff in colleges of education has different levels of training. Most of the lecturers have Masters Degrees; currently all Senior Lecturer 1's and Heads of Departments have at least a Master's degree. Heads of departments are the ones responsible for appraising all the lecturers using performance reviews.

There are currently five operational colleges of Education in Botswana. Two of these ($n = 1$) for primary teacher training and ($n = 1$) for secondary teachers training were randomly selected and used in the study. All lecturers and heads of department who have been appraised using PMS at some stage whilst working in the colleges were eligible to participate in the study. To ensure that college lecturers who participated in the study represented all relevant subgroups, all lecturers based on their training, operational level, and gender were asked to participate in the study and ($n = 43$) or 30% of total number lectures from two selected colleges agreed to participate. Purposive sampling was used to select heads of department in each of the selected colleges ($n = 17$) or 57% of total number HOD's from two selected colleges agreed to participate. The subject population of this was ($N = 60$), all selected from the two sampled colleges of education (see Table 1).

Table 1: *Sampling frames of college staff*

College	Total		Sampled	Percentage
Tonota	HODs	16	9	56%
	Lecturers	95	28	30%
Francistown	HODs	14	8	57%
	Lecturers	50	15	30%

9.0 Data Collection Instrument

The Assessment of Performance Management System (APMS) was used as the data collection instrument. The APMS instrument has five subsections with a total of (N = 63) items. The first section (*n* = 8) items asked lecturers to provide their demographic information such as operational level and teaching experience. The second subsection (*n* = 20) was designed in order to find perceptions of the academic staff understanding and attitudes towards PMS. Items in this section were adapted from Solomon (2006). Solomon's was study conducted in South Africa to critically evaluate the Performance Management System used by the Nampak Research and Development division. The Solomon's' (2006) instrument consists of (N= 40) items measured on 4-point rating scales from (strongly disagree) to (strongly agree). Relevant revisions were made on the Solomon's instrument. Only (*n* = 20) items were adopted for use in this study and these were modified by changing some of the words to make them content and context relevant to the population of lecturers in Botswana colleges. Items in this section were measured on a five point Likert-Scale response format with options ranging from (Strongly Disagree) to (Strongly agree).

In the third section, items 21-30 (*n* = 10) sought to establish the academic staff attitudes towards how PMS influences their productivity. Items 31-40 (*n* = 10) were designed to find out academic staff perceptions towards PMS and rewards. All these 20 items were adapted from the Performance Management Questionnaire (PMQ) (Dingwayo, 2006). Items in (PMQ) had been used by Dingwayo to collect comprehensive understanding of performance management issues that need to be addressed. The PMQ had 64 items measured on 7-point Likert scale rating from (Completely Disagree) to (Completely Agree). The wording of the items was modified slightly to make them content relevant. This was done by changing the items from a 7 point to a 5-point Likert scale so that the scale could be consistent with other items in the instrument.

The fourth section (n =10) was designed to find out academic staff satisfaction with the PMS as an appraisal mechanism. All ten items in this section also adopted from Solomon's (2006) questionnaire referred to above. The scale of the items was modified from the 4 point to the 5 point -Likert scale so that it could be consistent with the other items in the instrument. The fifth and last section of the questionnaire, which comprises of five open ended items, was adopted from Munzhedzi (2011). Munzhedzi's study used the instrument in South Africa to establish the influence of the Performance Management System on productivity at the Department of Local Government and Housing in Limpopo. The instrument had 22 items, but only 5 were adopted and modified to make their wording more content relevant to the current study. These open ended items gave the respondents an opportunity to give reasons for some of their answers in the closed ended section of the questionnaire. Their answers also provided in depth data about the academic staff perceptions on the implementation of PMS in colleges of education. The items asked the respondents about their opinions regarding their understanding of PMS, PMS's contribution to productivity; support from the PMS technical team, what they felt could be done to improve PMS implementation and challenges facing PMS implementation. Upon completion of the data collection instrument, The Assessment of Performance Management System-(APMS), it was pilot tested by giving it to the Tlokweng (*n*=15) and Molepolole (*n* = 15) Colleges of Education lecturers and Heads of Departments (*n* = 12) to complete as they would not be participating in the study. A reliability analysis was also performed in the piloted instrument with coefficient alpha (α = 86) showing levels of consistency.

10.0   Data Analysis

An Independent Sample t-test procedure was computed was computed to answer the first three research questions that asked if there were any significant difference between lecturers and heads of department understanding of PMS, their attitudes towards PMS implementation, and if there is any significant difference between lecturers and heads of departments in their level of satisfaction with PMS implementation. To ensure the appropriateness of the independent sample t-tests for each research questions, assumptions of parametric statistics, normality, homogeneity of variances of data, independence were examined.

Hierarchical regression analysis was computed to examine the extent at which academic staff perception towards PMS on productivity, their attitudes towards PMS and their understanding of PMS predicts their level of satisfaction with PMS. In this study, staff perception towards PMS on productivity, their attitudes towards PMS and their understanding of PMS were entered in the prediction models as past research has shown that when employees have positive attitudes towards productivity; their attitudes towards PMS and their understanding about the value and use of PMS all these can lead to job satisfaction (Seibert, Silver & Randolph, 2004). Most studies in a meta-analysis of study meant to establish the existing relationship between job satisfaction and job performance revealed existing relationships between the two constructs (Judge, el al, 2001).

11.0   Results

To find out if there was a significant difference between lecturers and HOD's in their understanding of PMS, an Independent Sample t-test procedure was computed. Prior to the main analysis parametric assumption of normality, independence, and homogeneity equality of variance between groups were computed, and all assumptions were met. The Independent Sample t-test using the alpha level of $\alpha= .05$ was computed, results showed that there is a significant difference in the understanding of PMS between HOD's ($M = 35.56$, $SD = 7.42$) and lecturers ($M = 25.18$, $SD = 6.98$); $t(58) = 5.01$, $p = 0.001$. These results suggest that understanding of PMS differs according to levels of operation. Specifically, the results suggest that HOD's have a better understanding of PMS than lecturers.

To find out if there were any significant difference between lecturers and heads of department attitudes towards PMS implementation Independent Sample t-test procedure was computed after assessing and making sure that parametric assumptions are met. The Independent Sample t-test using the alpha level of .05, results showed that there is a significant difference in attitudes towards PMS implementation between HOD's ($M = 58.31$, $SD = 13.42$) and lecturers ($M = 42.89$, $SD = 10.63$); $t(58) = 4.63$, $p = 0.001$). These results suggest that attitudes towards PMS implementation differ according to levels of operation. Specifically, the results showed that those in the management team such as HOD's have a better attitude towards PMS implementation than lecturers.

To find out if there was a significant difference between lecturers and HOD's in their satisfaction with PMS, an Independent Sample t-Test using the alpha level of .05, procedure was computed. Independent Sample t-test results showed that there is a significant difference in satisfaction with PMS between HOD's ($M = 29.25$, $SD = 7.49$) and lecturers ($M = 21.46$, $SD = 7.15$); $t(58) = 3.69$, $p = 0.00$. These

results showed that satisfaction with PMS implementation differs according to levels of operation. Specifically, the results showed that HOD's are more satisfied with PMS implementation than lecturers.

Hierarchical regression analysis was computed to examine the extent at which academic staff perception towards PMS on productivity, their attitudes towards PMS and their understanding of PMS predicts their level of satisfaction with PMS. A hierarchical regression analysis was computed, with academic staff perception towards PMS on productivity entered first in the block (Model 1) in the regression model. This was meant to assess the amount of variance explained by staff perception towards PMS on productivity in predicting their level of satisfaction towards PMS if variances explained by their attitudes and towards PMS and their understandings of PMS were held constant. Therefore, staff attitudes towards PMS and academic staff understanding of PMS was entered second as a block (Model 2).

Hierarchical regression analysis results showed that in Model 1 (Academic staff perception towards PMS on productivity) explained 50% of total variance of staff satisfaction with PMS. By adding staff attitudes towards PMS and academic staff understanding of PMS to Model 2 there was some additional variance of (14%) that was accounted for - an indication that staff attitudes towards PMS, and academic staff understanding of PMS collectively added some value to the prediction of their satisfaction with PMS.

Regression results showed that academic staff perception towards PMS on productivity was the strongest and the most important predictor to job satisfaction it was statistically significant in Model 1 (β =.71, p = 001), Model 2 (β =. 333, p = 001). Positive slopes meant that as staff perception towards PMS on productivity improve; their satisfaction about the use of PMS as a performance tool also increases. This showed that staff attitudes towards PMS played a major role in predicting whether or not they were satisfied with the use of PMS as job performance tool.

This was followed by academic staff attitudes towards PMS towards PMS in model 2 (β =.46, p = .001). Positive slopes meant that as staff attitudes towards PMS increases, their satisfaction about the use of PMS also increases What can then be inferred from these results is that academic staff attitudes on influence of PMS on productivity and attitudes of academic staff towards PMS are related to their satisfaction and thus can positively influence satisfaction with PMS. Results showed that academic staff understanding of PMS was not significant and therefore not important in the prediction of their satisfaction with the use of PMS (see Table 2).

Table 2 *Summary of Multiple Regression Analysis*

Predictors	R^2	R^2 change	B(SE)	β
1. Productivity	50**	50**	.61(0.81)	.71**
2. Productivity	64**	14**	.30(0.11)	.35**
Attitudes			.26(.06)	.46**
Understanding			.09(.11)	.10

Note: **p <.05, Dependent variable; Satisfaction with PMS: *(N=60)*

12.0   Results of Open-ended Question

A general open ended question was asked to collect academic staff additional views regarding their understanding of PMS, satisfaction with PMS as a performance tool. The respondents were asked to discuss what they regarded as challenges facing PMS in their colleges. Their responses revealed numerous challenges and these are shared by both the lecturers and heads of departments across the two colleges. Below are the key challenges as observed by the responds:

13.0   Irrelevance to Core business

Most of both lecturers and heads of departments feel that PMS as it is currently implemented is not relevant to their core business; as a result, a majority of them have a negative attitude towards PMS. Along the same line, one head of department noted that government has failed to blend PMS into the colleges' operations hence the perception that it is 'excess baggage to their mandate'. Another HOD commented that 'PMS is not applicable in the teaching area'.

14.0   Limited understanding of PMS by Lecturers, Heads of Departments and Technical Team Members

The respondents expressed limited understanding of PMS leads to various departments implementing PMS differently. One also noted that 'most of the lecturers in my college are still in confusion about PMS issues'. Further responses which showed lack of understanding were that there was inconsistency in the way PMS was implemented in various departments. One lecturer said, "the PMS tools kept changing all the time, people only doing PMS because it is a requirement and government policy, and not because of understanding". Some expressed that even the PMS technical team does not know what is to be done. Some heads of department lament that there is inconsistent information coming from different sources. This implies that if academic staff has adequate information and understand PMS they are likely to have a positive attitude towards PMS.

15.0   Lack of Rewards and Incentives

Another thorny issue is the absence of rewards or incentives. Both lecturers and heads of departments felt that most of the academic staffs are not motivated to take PMS seriously because even if one achieves their objectives with high marks, they will not be rewarded as consequence most do not value PMS highly. One lecturer commented that 'PMS may not be a motivating factor since there is no reward; i.e. promotion when you perform well but have reached the top notch of your operational level' whilst another remarked that 'awards for good performance need to be sponsored so that meaningful incentives could be provided to staff'.

16.0   Dissatisfaction with the Review Method

A high number of both heads of departments and lecturers who were unhappy with the review methods used in PMS. There were reports that the review methods used in PMS were divisive, subjective, biased, and inconsistent and dominated by favouritism and nepotism. Even heads of departments reported that their fellow workers who conducted the reviews lacked objectivity and usually the scores they gave to the lecturers did not reflect the true performance of lecturers whilst in some cases there was extreme over

scoring in order to appease the lecturers. One HOD remarked that 'reviews are subjective and objectives that we draw are not relevant to our job descriptions'. This dissatisfaction with PMS review methods is also observed in the literature reviewed. Decramer, Christiaens & Vanderstraeten (2008) found out employees complained of being judged on results which have never been defined, reviewed and developed in advance. As a result, the respondents felt PMS was not credible. Melo, Sarrico & Radnor (date unknown) also report interviewees in their study being dissatisfied with problems that emerge from subjective and qualitative judgements. Respondents suggested that judgements should be more objective for PMS to be more effective. Furthermore, Mapesela & Strydom (n.d) reported that staff members had perennial arguments about the rating scales and this appeared to complicate the system.

17.0   Lack of Capacity by Technical Team and Heads of Departments

Most of the participants felt that the technical teams did not have the capacity to assist them because they lacked the necessary technical skills and training necessary to offer support services to the various departments. One HOD observed that 'the Performance Improvement Coordinator is a full time lecturer as such he does not have much time to share most of the information with the academic staff'. One lecturer commented that 'the technical team in the college is not conversant with PMS and most of them have a negative attitude', whilst another lecturer noted that 'certain heads of departments do not satisfactorily do their work due to their limited PMS knowledge; therefore, it is absurd to expect them to drive PMS towards productivity. The coordinators are also not specialists in PMS. They have not received any extensive training on PMS and consequently lack the knowledge and hence the confidence to resource the academic staff.

The PMS coordinators and technical team members are also not remunerated for their roles in PMS as such they may not be very motivated to undertake their responsibilities. This may explain their negative attitudes and unfriendliness which was reported by the lecturers and heads of departments. These views evidently show that all the structures in the college have limitations when it comes to PMS. Gotore (2011) also reported that there was dissatisfaction and discontentment with performance appraisals to a lack of adequate understanding of the PMS by supervisors and implementers.

18.0   Constant Changes in Approaches to PMS

Almost every year the PMS implementation strategy changes. Respondents felt that it was very difficult to keep up with the changes that were happening during implementation of PMS. These changes resulted in lack of continuity and PMS not being taken seriously by both lecturers and heads of department. One HOD remarked that 'PMS is like a chameleon, it keeps on changing now and then. We have given up on trying understanding it'.

19.0   Cascading of Objectives from the Ministry of Education

Both lecturers and heads of department viewed this as a problem because most of the objectives which came from the ministry were not relevant to the lecturers' operations, as they played no part in formulation those objectives, there is no ownership and acceptance of the colleges' strategic plan. This lack of ownership is exacerbated by the top down approach used in colleges, where the heads of departments and principals go on a week-long retreat to construct the annual strategic plan. Upon coming back, lecturers

will be expected to understand what the former discussed in a week in a meeting taking only a few hours. This results in some lecturers feeling that the objectives do not belong to them but to the senior management team. From the literature reviewed, it is quite clear that this top down approach is a problem with most organisations.

20.0   Shortage of Resources

There is also a belief in the colleges that PMS wastes time and resources meant for core business and as such delays and stifles productivity of the academic staff. Wasted resources that the staff complain about is mainly stationery for the extensive paperwork and money consumed by hosting workshops and retreats. One lecturer commented that 'PMS takes a lot of time but adds no value to performance' while another one wrote that 'PMS is not relevant to our core business and therefore a waste of the meagre resources that we have'.

The adverse shortage of resources in colleges, more especially money, results in most employees failing to implement intended initiatives. This causes conflicts between the heads of departments and the lecturers at review times because lecturers would appear as if they failed to achieve their objectives whilst this would have been caused by factors beyond their control. One lecturer gave an example of failing to conduct a mini workshop for quantitative research skills after being told there was no money. During the review, his HOD gave him low marks because he failed to host the workshop. This results in lecturers being bitter, losing interest and commitment and developing hatred towards PMS activities. They feel that PMS is not really aiding them to achieve their objectives.

21.0   Discussions

The results of the study showed that understanding of PMS differed according to level of operation. The quantitative results showed that school management teams (HOD's) showed a significant and better understanding of PMS than lecturers. While opened ended question results showed that academic staff generally feels they do not have a clear understanding of PMS which lead to some level of dissatisfaction with the use of PMS as a performance assessment tool. This lack of understanding due to lack of training in PMS is proved by the revelations that some departments were not even conversant with formulating of performance development plans, structure and expectations of performance reviews and individual work plans which resulted most employees submitting false data during reviews. Gotore (2011) argues posits that dissatisfaction and discontentment with PMS was due to a lack of understanding of PMS by employees, their supervisors and to some extent the implementers. Some expressed that even the PMS technical team does not know what is to be done. These views are consistent with those of Decramer, Christiaens & Vanderstraeten (2008) who reports that workers failed to comply with PMS because of lack of knowledge and training as well as those of Dzimbiri (2007) who reported that workers at the University of Botswana were not initially receptive to the idea of PMS because it was little understood.

The other reason of poor understanding by lecturers as observed by the HOD's was that the colleges' strategic plans are drawn up by the senior management team (principals and heads of departments) over an extended period, but the lecturers are given only limited time (usually one 3-hour meeting) to familiarize themselves with the strategic plans, understand and implement it. Findings of this study do show that most lecturers and heads of department express that they do not understand PMS as they do not get

regular training. The literature reviewed also confirms the existence of this challenge as discovered by Ravhuna (2006), whose study found out that there was poor understanding of PMS by the workers and also recorded that training and awareness about PMS were lacking at the Department of Education in the Limpopo Province and this affected implementation negatively.

The results of the study showed attitudes towards the implementation of PMS differed according to levels of operation. The results showed that school management teams (HOD's) showed significant and better attitudes towards PMS implementation than lecturers. Results of open-ended questions revealed lecturers indicated that some HOD's were not helpful because they lacked understanding of PMS. The lecturers also felt that some of the HOD's have negative attitudes, lack knowledge in PMS and are unfriendly, as such they are seen not to be doing enough to assist junior staff members. Some were of the view that HOD's do not understand PMS as they regularly offer conflicting views during PMS workshops.

Management teams were viewed as lacking some level of confidence in assisting the academic staff because they realize that some officers who are not part of the HOD's are more knowledgeable than them in PMS issues. This also implies that lecturers doubt the capabilities of the technical team to assist them in PMS issues, as such the technical team members should be regularly resourced about PMS implementation and challenges. However, there were lecturers who had a positive view of the technical teams. Most of these expressed that PMS technical teams conducted workshops at the beginning of the year and at the end of the year. These workshops were meant to update the colleges' strategic plans. Management teams were also reported to be trying their best in assisting when needed but the lecturers were not welcoming as the latter were resentful of all PMS business. Some HOD's felt that the technical teams were helpful as they always availed themselves to help and conducted workshops, gave departments and individual lecturers' guidance on PMS matters and even assist in training college staff.

The approach currently used in the colleges contradicts Bourne, Franco & Wilkes (2003) who advise that setting up a good performance management system should not be done overnight. They advise that the PMS design need to be carefully considered, and how it will work should be carefully planned before managers begin using it to evaluate employees. They also point out that a performance management system should provide employees with at least these four basic benefits: (1) a clear understanding of job expectations, (2) regular feedback about performance, (3) advice and steps for improving performance, and (4) rewards for good performance or else a corrective mechanism. Most of these basic benefits are not evident in the PMS implemented in the colleges of education and this could be contributing to the complaints and dissatisfaction with PMS.

Matiza (2001) submits that performance appraisal is viewed with mixed feelings. These divergences in perceptions about the same technical teams can be explained by differing attitudes of academic staff towards the technical teams, further supporting one heads of department's view that some lecturers just have a negative attitude towards PMS and 'claim' not to understand it. Findings of this study are consistent with those of Dzimbiri, 2007; Gotore, 2011; Melo, Sarrico & Radnor (n.d); Nyembezi; 2011) who revealed that employees have negative attitudes towards PMS. This is because employees perceive PMS as being imposed by management and felt they were not consulted in its implementation. In addition,employees felt that PMS was not an effective tool for measuring work performance.

Findings of the study showed that there is a significant difference in satisfaction with PMS between HOD's and lecturers. The results have shown that satisfaction with PMS implementation differs according to levels of operation and that HOD's are more satisfied with PMS implementation than lecturers. This could be explained by the fact that heads of department are given much more time to understand PMS whilst the lecturers are given very limited time. Results of open-ended questions showed that Lecturers complain that they are always hurried to cascade their departments' annual strategic plans from the college's strategic plan in only one day when the HOD's are given a whole week to design the college strategic plan. Heads of departments are also the drivers of PMS, they are responsible for cascading it down to their staff, as consequence they are motivated to do their best to understand it. Every year, heads of departments go on a week-long retreat to construct their college's strategic plans. They also have monthly reporting meetings on the progress of their objectives. These activities lead to enhanced understanding of PMS and hence better satisfaction. Lecturers were also not satisfied with PMS because they felt that the grading system was unfair and HOD's were biased. They were also dissatisfied because they felt PMS was imposed on them and performance was not linked to any reward even if one achieved all their objectives. This dissatisfaction with PMS by lecturers is consistent with the findings of Nyembezi, (2009; Dzimbiri, (2007) whose studies found out that management teams were more satisfied with PMS than employees. Reasons for the dissatisfaction were the same as those of the current study; respondents from both Nyembezi and Dzimbiri's studies felt PMS was imposed on them and lamented the lack of rewards. Academic staffs at University of Botswana where Dzimbiri conducted his study resisted PMS as they felt that it was irrelevant to academic institutions, a view shared by the colleges' academic staff. The lecturers were also dissatisfied with the constant changes to approaches of PMS implementation. This concurs with Monnaatlala (2007) as she indicated that frequent changes in implementation plan was disruptive to the already laid down objectives. The implication here is that policy makers should explore the linking of PMS to rewards and try to establish ways in which lecturers could have ownership of PMS as an appraisal tool.

The study also found out that academic staff attitudes on influence of PMS on productivity and attitudes of academic staff towards PMS are related to satisfaction with PMS and thus can positively influence satisfaction with PMS. They can play an important role in informing policy makers about academic staff satisfaction with PMS. These findings imply that if academic staff have a positive attitude towards PMS and also believe that it can contribute positively to productivity, then they are most likely to be satisfied with it.

In the situation of the colleges, most of the academic staff felt PMS does not contribute positively to productivity and have a negative attitude towards it for various reasons. As a result, they are not satisfied with PMS as an appraisal tool. Implications to policy makers are that if lecturers could be adequately trained on the importance and benefits of PMS, they may have a more positive attitude to it and appreciate how it could positively influence productivity; this could lead to more satisfaction with PMS. This is supported by the views of Miller, Johnson & Grau (1994) who point out that the quality of information employees received impacted their willingness to change. Information that was seen to be as useful and timely concerning the change favourably impacted employee attitudes about a planned change.

The results of the study have shown that there are numerous challenges facing PMS implementation and these have major implications for policy and practice. These challenges have been identified by both the lecturers and heads of departments across the two colleges and most of them are consistent with those

identified in the reviewed literature. Most of the lecturers and some of the Heads of Departments felt that PMS as it is currently implemented was not relevant to their core business; as a result majority of them have a negative attitude towards PMS. This challenge of PMS being irrelevant confirms Dzimbiri (2007) argument that senior lecturers at institutions of higher learning was irrelevant to the academic environment, arguing that it was too mechanistic and could reduce the complex work of an academic to a technician. This implies that lecturers are dissatisfied with the current PMS as they cannot identify with its requirements. It could then be suggested that PMS be tailored to the lecturers working conditions for them to accept it.

Limited understanding of PMS leads to various departments implementing PMS differently. Some heads of department lament that there is inconsistent information coming from different sources. Lowstedt (1993) argued that organizational change is personal. He points out that the quality of information employees received impacts on their knowledge to change. Information that employees view as timely and useful concerning the change favourably impacts employee attitudes about the change. This implies that if academic staff have adequate information and understand PMS they are likely to have a positive attitude towards its implementation. Castetter (2001) concurs with this view as he points out that 'training and development activities are those planned programs of institutional improvement to bring about a relatively permanent change in the employee's knowledge, skills and attitudes' (p.381). It can then be assumed that if the knowledge of employees about PMS is improved, they will be encouraged to reach the full potential of their responsibilities.

Another thorny issue is the absence of rewards or incentives. Both lecturers and heads of departments felt that most of the lecturers are not motivated to take PMS seriously because even if one achieves their objectives with high marks, they will not be rewarded, as consequence most do not value PMS highly. This concern about lack of rewards is supported by Gotore (2011) who argues if performance is not adequately recognized and rewarded, there will lack of motivation to be productive in the work place. Nyembezi (2009) shared the same sentiments by indicating that lack of rewards for high performers and no action taken to assist non-performers is linked to career progression. There were reports that the review methods used in PMS were divisive, subjective, biased, and inconsistent and dominated by favouritism and nepotism. Even heads of departments reported that some of their colleagues who conducted the reviews lacked objectivity and usually the scores they gave to the lecturers did not reflect the true performance of lecturers whilst in some cases there was extreme over scoring in order to appease the lecturers. This dissatisfaction with PMS review methods concurs with results in Decramer, Christiaens & Vanderstraeten (2008) who found that employees complained of being judged on results which have never been defined, reviewed and developed in advance. As a result, the respondents felt PMS was not credible.

All these imply that as long as PMS is practiced with inconsistent and confusing review methods, then lecturers will continue having a negative attitude towards it. It could then be suggested to policy makers to design clear and consistent review processes in order to improve lecturers' attitudes towards PMS as an appraisal tool. Lecturers felt that it was very difficult to keep up with the changes that were happening during implementation of PMS. These changes resulted in lack of continuity and PMS not being taken seriously by both lecturers and heads of department. Monnaatlala (2007) support this view by stating that frequent changes in implementation of PMS were disruptive to existing plans. This implies that if the policy makers could construct a long lasting PMS implementation strategy, the employees' attitude and satisfaction towards PMS may improve.

22.0   Conclusion

The findings of the study clearly show that there is a strong connection between lecturers' understanding and attitudes towards PMS and their influence on their satisfaction with PMS. It can be safely concluded that if lecturers are resourced more on PMS and made to feel they own it from its inception, made to understand its importance and how it could contribute to their productivity, they may change their attitude and be more receptive to PMS. This will hence improve their satisfaction with PMS and ultimately lead to productivity in the work place. The other major challenges identified with use of PMS were; (1) irrelevance to core business, (2) limited understanding of PMS by lecturers, heads of departments and technical team members, (3) lack of rewards and incentives, (4) dissatisfaction with review methods and (5) continuous changes in approach. (6) Irrelevance to core business

The study provided a valuable opportunity to explore the status of the performance management system already in place in Botswana Colleges of Education. From the findings, it became clear that performance management is a complex and difficult reality. The study shows that PMS has highlighted tensions between lecturers and Heads of Departments during appraisals. It is evident that attitudes and satisfaction with PMS differ according to level of operation. Heads of Departments seem to have a more positive attitude and are better satisfied by PMS implementation than the lecturers in the colleges of education. If departments are serious about improving productivity in the work place, it is very critical that they address the implementation of PMS. These tensions need to be critically looked into by addressing the needs of staff members

The findings of the study also suggested that typical business approaches to performance management would not work in colleges of education with the current status of PMS implementation and the views held by staff members. Therefore, it is suggested that the existing performance management model and approaches used in the colleges need to be adapted to the needs and conditions of tertiary educational institutions and followed by the gradual introduction of a system that allows for a process of an all-inclusive institutional transformation.

The other important factor which may positively influence PMS implementation is the introduction of rewards to motivate academic staff to be more productive. The study indicated that educators wanted PMS to be linked to a rewards outcome. Lecturers need to be rewarded for outstanding work, as well as be provided with incentives to boost morale and raise the standard of education provided in colleges of education. Personal development where lecturers are found lacking should also be infused into PMS as an incentive. It is hoped that the findings and recommendations made in this study will be a challenge to educators, policy makers and educational practitioners.

23.0   Limitations

Although this research study achieved its aims, there are some unavoidable limitations. The study was conducted only on two out of four education colleges. One college was used for a pilot study the other college was left due to financial constraints. Only two colleges were used where all lecturers were asked to participate. The response rate of lecturers in the two selected colleges was very weak which resulted in

small sample size. Therefore, to generalise the results to the entire population of lecturers in all colleges of education the study should have used a larger sample size.

24.0   Recommendations

Findings from the study have revealed that most of the lecturers are dissatisfied with the use of PMS as an appraisal tool. They also believe that PMS has not contributed to their productivity. The researcher suggests the following recommendations for the lecturers, heads of departments and policy makers;

- Both lecturers and heads of departments from the two colleges felt that if PMS was to continue, it should be revised and made relevant to educational institutions. So, policy makers should align PMS to the teaching and learning process. The academic staff also felt that the strategic plans and objectives as well as review of lecturers should be based on their core business; that is academic performance.
- The majority of respondents also felt that all stakeholders in the colleges should be trained on PMS issues. They suggested that PMS coordinators and technical team members should be formally trained on strategic management and all staff members be resourced at length in order to improve understanding and value of PMS. The researchers suggest that the Department of Training and Development in the Ministry of Education must ensure that all stake holders are adequately trained about PMS.
- There should be a change in approach from top-down to bottom up in PMS implementation. The Department of Training and Development as well as the colleges senior management teams and PMS technical teams must ensure that all stakeholders are involved in the initial stages of PMS and future change initiatives. This would allow the academic staff to participate in the drawing up of objectives and hence ensure ownership of PMS. The respondents felt that colleges should craft their own objectives based on SWOT analysis conducted within the colleges rather than align objectives to the Ministry of Education.
- The Ministry of education should ensure that PMS has an attractive rewards and incentives package in order to improve staff commitment and motivate them to work harder and take PMS seriously.
- The PMS technical teams and Senior Management teams must review and improve staff appraisal methods to make them fair, more objective and transparent in order to reduce resistance and disgruntlement from lecturers.
- The Department of Training and Development should ensure regular evaluation of PMS so that timely solutions could be provided to challenges experienced during PMS implementation.
- Further research with the aim of improving the implementation of PMS and future reform programs is highly recommended.

References

Armstrong, M & Baron, A. (2004). *Managing performance: Performance management in action*. London. Chartered Institute of Personal Development.

Babooa, S.K. 2008. *Public participation in the making and implementation of policy in Mauritius with reference to Port Louis' Local Government*. Unpublished Doctoral thesis. Pretoria: University of South Africa.

Bourne, M. Franco, M. Wilkes, J. (2003). Corporate performance management'. Measuring Business Excellence, 7 (3), 15-21.

Bratton, J. & Gold, J. (2007). *Human resources management, theory and practice.* Palgrave Macmillan.

Burnes, B. (2009). *Managing change*. London. Prentice Hall.

Castetter, W. (2001). *The human resources function in educational administration*, 6th Edition. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Camps S. (2011, June). *Performance management including measurement, monitoring and evaluation*: A management guide for African public service managers. Kenyatta International Conference center. Nairobi, Kenya.

Corporate Leadership Council (2002), *Closing the Performance Gap*. Washington, D.C.

Decramer, A., Christiaens, J., & Vanderstraeten, A. (2008). *The implementation dynamics of performance management in higher education*. Presented at the 21st EIASM Workshop on Strategic Human Resource Management. Aston, Birmingham. UK.

Dingwayo, M.S. (2007). *An evaluation of a performance management and development system with reference to the Department of the Premier, Provincial government; Western Cape*. Unpublished master's research project. Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University.

Directorate of Public Service Management. (2002). *The PMS Philosophy*. Government Printer. Botswana.

Dzimbiri, L.B. (2009). Challenges in managing change: the case of performance management system at the University of Botswana. *RHEA*, 1-2.

Furnham, A. (2004). Performance management systems. *European Business Journal,* 16(2), 83-94.

Glendinning, P. M. (2002). Performance Management: Pariah or Messiah. *Public Personnel Management*, 161-178.

Gotore, M.M. (2011). *Evaluating XYZ's performance management system implementation*. (Polytechnic of Namibia and Leeds), Namibia.

Government of Botswana (2004). *PMS Evaluation report*. Gaborone: Government Printer.

Graham, J. (2004). Developing a Performance-Based Culture. *Journal for Quality & Participation*, 27(1), 4-8.

Hair, F.J., Bush, R.P. & Ortinau, D.V. (2002). *Marketing research*. (2nd Ed.) New York: McGraw-Hill Irwin.

Harper, S., & Vilkinas, T. (2005). Determining the impact of an organisation's performance management system. *Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources*, *43*(1), 76-97.

Judge, T. A., Thoresen, C. J., Bono, J. E., & Patton, G. K. (2001). The job satisfaction–job performance relationship: A qualitative and quantitative review. *Psychological Bulletin*, 127(3):376-407

Liao, H., Toya, K., Lepak, D. P., & Hong, Y. (2009). Do they see eye to eye? Management and employee perspectives of high-performance work systems and influence processes on service quality. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *94*(2), 371-376.

Lowstedt, J. (1993). Organizing frameworks in emerging organizations: A cognitive approach to the analysis of change, *Human Relations*, 46 (4), 501-526.

Mbanjwa, S.G. (2011). *The implementation of a performance management system in the Northern Cape Department of Environment and Nature conservation*. Unpublished (Rhodes University), South Africa.

Melo, A.I., Sarrico, C.S. & Radnor, Z. (n.d). *The effect of Performance Management Systems on the governance of universities: the case study of an English University*.

Medlin, C. J. (2003). Relationship performance: a relationship level construct. In *IMP Conference Proceedings*.

Monnaatlala, S.M.R. (2007). *An investigation into the extent to which Senior Management teams in Botswana primary schools have the capacity to implement PMS. A case study of Selibe-Phikwe.* Unpublished masters project from the University of Botswana

Miller, V.D., Johnson, J.R., and Grau, J. (1994). Antecedents to willingness to participate in a planned organizational change, *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 22 (1), 59-80.

Misener, T.R., Haddock, K.S., Gleaton, J.U. and Ajamieh, A.R. (1996), "Toward an international measure of job satisfaction", *Nursing Research*, 45, 87-91.

Mosadeghrad, A.M. (2004), *The Handbook of Hospital Professional Organization and Management,* 2, Dibagran Tehran, Tehran.

Munzhedzi, P.H. (2011). *Performance management system and improved productivity: a*

Case of the department of local government and housing in the Limpopo Province. Unpublished master's research project. University of South Africa.

Neary, D. B. (2002). Creating a company-wide, on-line, performance management system: A case study at TRW Inc'. *Human Resource Management*, 491-498.

Nyembezi, V. (2011). *Development of a Performance Management System for the SABC (Port Elizabeth).* Unpublished Masters' research project. Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University Business School.

Raditlhokwa, L. (April 2006). *Productivity in the 21st century: A Botswana case study.* Sunday Standard. Business section. Gaborone: Morula Printers.

Seibert, S. E., Silver, S. R., & Randolph, W. A. (2004). Taking empowerment to the next level: A multiple-level model of empowerment, performance, and satisfaction. *Academy of Management Journal*, 47(3), 332-349.

Solomons, N. (2006). *A Critical Evaluation of the Performance Management System used by Nampak Research and Development*. Unpublished Master of Business Administration degree thesis at Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University.

Somolekae, T. (2005). *Training and development in the Botswana context.* Gaborone: Morula Printers.

Terpstra, D. E. & Honoree, A. L. (2008). Faculty Perceptions of Problems with Merit Pay Plans in Institutions of Higher Education. *Journal of Business and Management*, (14)1, 43-59.

Tshukudu, T.T. (2009). *A model for evaluating training and development initiatives in the Botswana Public Service*. Unpublished Master's Degree thesis in the Faculty of Business and Economic Sciences at the Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University.

Washington, M & Hacker, S. (2009). Leaps in performance: Botswana's transformation story, *International Journal of Business Research*, 9 (3): 166-176.

Zhang, Y. (2012). The impact of performance management system on employee performance -Analysis with WERS 2004. Master's thesis, University of Twente.