

Navigating Change: The Journey of Performance Management in the Public Sector

Hafezah Zainudin, Nooraini Othman

Department of Business Intelligence, Humanities and Governance Faculty of Artificial Intelligence, Universiti Teknologi Malaysia Kuala Lumpur, Level 7, Razak Tower, Jalan Sultan Yahya Petra, 54100 Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia
Email: p-noraini@utm.my, hafezahzainudin@yahoo.com

To Link this Article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.6007/IJARBSS/v14-i8/22213> DOI:10.6007/IJARBSS/v14-i8/22213

Published Date: 03 August 2024

Abstract

This study explores the intricate dynamics of performance management in public sector organizations, emphasizing its strategic significance in enhancing organizational efficiency and societal outcomes. Through a comprehensive analysis, the study delves into the evolution of performance management from the early 20th century, highlighting the transition from traditional bureaucratic methods to contemporary dynamic frameworks. It integrates theoretical perspectives from organizational behavior, public administration, and human resources management to provide a multifaceted understanding of performance management challenges in the public sector. This study addresses the inherent challenges and unintended consequences of performance management in the public sector. This article contributes to both academic discourse and practical applications, offering insights for professionals and policymakers in navigating the complexities of public sector performance management.

Keywords: Public Sector, Performance Management, Public Administration.

Introduction

Performance management systems are critical to the success of public sector organizations and the advancement of societal outcomes. As the public sector faces evolving challenges and increasing expectations, enhancing workforce performance has become essential. Performance management in the public sector is crucial for several reasons. Firstly, effective performance management ensures that public resources are utilized efficiently, promoting accountability and transparency in government operations. Secondly, it helps to improve service delivery, thereby enhancing the quality of life for citizens. Thirdly, understanding performance management challenges and solutions can lead to better policy-making and administrative practices, which are vital for sustainable development. This study aims to elucidate the complexities of performance management by exploring its historical evolution, theoretical underpinnings, and associated challenges and critiques.

The journey of performance management in the public sector began in the early 20th century, and was influenced by scientific management and bureaucratic models. Over time, it has transitioned through various paradigms, including New Public Management, adapting to changing societal demands and technological advancements. The integration of private sector techniques and the impact of data analytics have further shaped contemporary performance management frameworks.

Theoretical perspectives on organizational behavior, public administration, and human resources management provide a comprehensive understanding of the unique challenges faced by public sector organizations. Theories such as Goal-Setting Theory, Social Exchange Theory, and the Resource-Based View offer insights into employee motivation, goal alignment, and strategic management of human resources.

Despite the advancements in performance management practices, public sector organizations encounter significant challenges. Defining and measuring performance accurately is complex due to diverse and evolving goals. Political interference, resistance to change, low employee motivation, and budget constraints further hinder effective implementation. This study highlights these challenges, emphasizing the need for a comprehensive strategy that balances quantitative and qualitative measures to enhance public sector performance management.

By examining the evolution, theoretical foundations, and challenges of performance management, this study aims to bridge the gap between academic theories and practical applications. It offers valuable insights for professionals and policymakers striving to enhance performance management practices in the public sector, ultimately contributing to organizational efficiency and societal well-being.

The Evolution of Performance Management

The concept of performance management in the public sector has undergone significant transformation since the early 20th century, evolving from traditional bureaucratic methods to more dynamic contemporary frameworks. This evolution is a testament to the sector's adaptation to meet changing societal demands and expectations.

At the onset of the 20th century, the formalization of performance management in the public sector was heavily influenced by Frederick Taylor's principles of scientific management. Taylor's approach, emphasizing standardized work procedures and efficiency metrics, laid the groundwork for performance evaluation in public services (Taylor 1911). While pioneering, this method has been criticized for its rigidity and limited adaptability, indicating the necessity for more flexible management approaches.

The mid-20th century witnessed the dominance of Weber's bureaucratic model of public administration. This model, known for its organization and predictability, was a significant move away from the rigidity of scientific management. However, it has been criticized for inefficiency and a lack of adaptability, leading to inefficiencies and a deficiency in innovation (Weber 1947; Bourn 2012).

In response to these shortcomings, the late 20th century witnessed the emergence of New Public Management (NPM), which applies private sector management techniques to the public sector with the aim of improving efficiency and effectiveness. This approach has been widely debated, with varying opinions on its success in enhancing public service delivery. NPM has the potential to enhance public service efficiency and effectiveness through professional management, performance monitoring, and decentralization (Indahsari & Raharja 2020; Popa 2021; Makinde 2022). Despite its influence, NPM brought its own set of challenges, such as ethical dilemmas and the necessity to balance efficiency goals with public service principles (Khaltar & Moon 2020). Indeed, NPM's success is context-dependent, facing challenges such as sustainability issues, resource constraints, and corruption, particularly in developing countries (Keane 2020; Bhul 2023).

NPM has incorporated performance measurement and management as a key factor in reform efforts aimed at improving public service efficiency and effectiveness (Garengo & Sardi 2021). Recent research by Furculita (2023), and Thusi (2023), emphasized the integration of both financial and non-financial indicators to enhance operational efficiency and meet stakeholder expectations. In the 21st century, the advent of technology and data analytics has facilitated dynamic and real-time monitoring, utilizing both quantitative and qualitative metrics (Bourne, 2021). Additionally, Kiboi and Maalu (2023), and Yuan et al (2020), discussed significant improvements in organizational capacity and the use of technology in performance management initiatives that enhance performance monitoring and measurement in the public sector. This historical journey from the inception of scientific management concepts to the adaptive techniques of the 21st century illustrates the public sector's ongoing need to prioritize agility and responsiveness in performance management.

Theoretical Foundations

Performance management in the public sector is underpinned by a multifaceted construct, drawing from various theoretical frameworks across organizational behavior, public administration, and human resources management. These theories provide invaluable insights into the unique challenges and opportunities encountered by public sector organizations in their quest for effective performance management.

In the realm of organizational behavior, performance management in the public sector is deeply intertwined with foundational theories. Goal-setting theory developed by Locke and Latham (1990), highlights the significance of setting clear and challenging goals to enhance employee motivation and performance. In public sector organizations, the application of this theory extends to aligning individual and organizational goals, which is a crucial facet of performance management. Additionally, Social Exchange Theory (Blau 1986) offers insights into the reciprocal relationships between employees and their organizations, vital for formulating performance management strategies that bolster employee engagement and commitment.

Public sector organizational behavior has a significant impact on performance management. Cesario and Magalhaes (2017), underscored the influence of employee attitudes and behaviors on enhancing organizational performance. The challenge lies in fostering a culture that aligns individual behaviors with organizational goals, balancing efficiency and adaptability, and promoting innovation (Schnell & Gerard 2022).

Public administration theories contribute significantly to our understanding of performance management in public sector contexts. The NPM framework, which gained prominence in the late 20th century, shifted its focus towards outcome-based approaches and efficiency improvements within public services (Hood 1991; Pollitt & Bouckaert 2017). Later, the integration of New Public Administration (NPA) and New Public Service (NPS) ideals is still evolving, promoting advocacy, empathy, and networking as part of comprehensive reform efforts (Schnell & Gerard 2022). Additionally, Principal-Agent Theory Eisenhardt (1989), explores the dynamics of hierarchical relationships within organizations, which is vital for designing performance management systems that align interests across various levels of public sector operation.

In human resources management, theories such as the Resource-Based View (Barney 1991) suggests that an organization's human capital can be a source of competitive advantage, underscoring the strategic management and development of human resources (HR) as central to effective performance management. Motivation theories such as Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs Maslow (1943), and Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory (Herzberg et al. 1959) inform the design of performance management systems that cater to diverse motivational factors, crucial in the public sector where employee motivation is pivotal. The strategic implementation of HR practices is key to improving organizational performance in the public sector, as shown by studies such as (Chourasia et al., 2023; and Knies et al., 2018). The Ability, Motivation, and Opportunity (AMO) framework indicates that HR strategies aimed at enhancing employee ability are strongly linked to business performance improvements (Chourasia et al. 2023). However, executing these strategies in a traditionally rigid and procedure-driven sector pose significant challenges.

The theoretical foundations of performance management in the public sector are rich and diverse, spanning organizational behavior, public administration, and human resource management. Each area brings its own set of challenges and opportunities, necessitating a thorough and integrated approach to drive reform and innovation in public sector performance management.

Challenges and Critiques

In recent decades, there has been an increasing demand for the public sector to adopt performance management systems that are both efficient and effective. However, extensive research has highlighted notable difficulties and limitations associated with this endeavor. This section consolidates and synthesizes these challenges and critiques to offer insights for enhancing public sector performance management practices.

Challenges in Measuring Performance

Defining and measuring public sector performance is a complex and multifaceted issue. One of the primary difficulties lies in establishing clear, objective performance metrics that accurately capture the broad spectrum of public sector outcomes. The public sector must balance various goals, including efficiency, effectiveness, equity, and social value. This complexity is further compounded by the ambiguous and evolving nature of public sector goals, which can vary widely across different contexts and over time (Boykin et al. 2024). Additionally, the dynamic environment influenced by political decisions, economic conditions,

and societal changes makes performance measurement even more challenging (De Waele et al. 2021).

Various studies have emphasized the inherent difficulties in measuring performance in the public sector. Van Elten et al (2021), and van der Kolk (2022), highlighted how performance measurement systems (PMSs) often fail to capture the full scope of public sector activities and may lead to unintended consequences such as increased bureaucratization and stress among staff. Hill and Plimmer (2024), Wang et al (2019), and De Waele et al (2021), discussed the complications introduced by competing goals and red tape, which can hinder the effective measurement of employee performance in public sector settings.

The challenges of defining and measuring performance in the public sector are exacerbated by the need to consider a wide range of stakeholders and objectives. Traditional performance metrics often focus on easily quantifiable aspects of public sector work, such as the number of services delivered or the speed of service delivery. However, these metrics may not adequately reflect the true value and impact of public sector activities, leading to a misalignment between measured performance and actual outcomes.

Cope et al (2023), emphasized that traditional performance measures in public health, such as those used to evaluate disease intervention specialists (DIS), often fail to capture the broader impacts of their work. They argue that while these measures focus on quantifiable activities, such as the number of interviews conducted or contacts notified, they overlook the less tangible but equally important aspects of DIS work, such as their contributions to public health knowledge and community trust. Elten et al (2021), further elaborated on the consequences of performance measurement in hospitals, noting that different uses of PMSs can lead to varying outcomes in terms of process quality, patient-oriented care, and operational performance. Additionally, De Waele et al (2021), argued that performance measurement systems need to be flexible and adaptive to the specific contexts of different public sector organizations to be effective.

Defining and measuring performance in the public sector remains a significant challenge because of the complex and multifaceted nature of public sector objectives and activities. Traditional performance metrics often fail to capture the full scope of public sector work, leading to a misalignment between the measured performance and actual outcomes.

Political Interference and Influence

Political interference significantly hinders the performance management of public sector organizations. This issue is rooted in the tendency of political leaders to prioritize personal or party interests over organizational efficiency and effectiveness. For instance, political meddling in bureaucratic operations can lead to the appointment of underqualified personnel in key positions, thereby diminishing institutional competence and morale. Studies have shown that such interference is pervasive and has severe implications for governance and service delivery (Aslam et al. 2023; Masoud 2023). The consequences of political interference extend to altering policy directions, undermining the autonomy of public institutions, and fostering an environment of uncertainty and instability, all of which cumulatively impair the execution of public policies and programs (Aslam et al. 2023).

Numerous researchers have highlighted the detrimental effects of political interference on public sector performance. Mngomezulu (2020), Fuenzalida and Riccucci (2019), and Abane and Brenya (2021), mutually underscored that political leaders often manipulate administrative processes to serve their interests, leading to strained relationships between political and administrative officials, resulting in poor service delivery. These studies provide a comprehensive overview of various forms of political interference, including the arbitrary appointment and dismissal of officials, manipulation of procurement processes, and imposition of unrealistic performance targets that serve political rather than public interests. Christensen and Læg Reid (2021), and Chigudu (2020), supported these findings, underlining similar patterns of political interference and its negative impact on performance management in various contexts.

Political interference remains a persistent challenge in the management of public sector performance worldwide. It affects all levels of the government, from local to national, and impedes the ability of public institutions to function effectively and deliver quality services to citizens. The presence of political meddling often results in a misallocation of resources, corruption, and a lack of accountability, which together contribute to the poor performance of public sector organizations.

Spenkuch et al (2023), explored the ideological influences on public sector performance, indicating that political ideologies can shape policy implementation in ways that are not always aligned with the best interests of the public. Similarly, Masoud (2023), contended that political interference in procurement processes within Tanzanian parastatals leads to inefficiencies and resource misallocations. Furthermore, Aslam et al (2023), discovered a detailed account of political interference in Pakistan, emphasizing how undue political pressure on bureaucrats undermines the effectiveness of public sector performance management.

The pervasive nature of political interference poses significant challenges for the effective management of public sector performance. This undermines the principles of meritocracy, transparency, and accountability, leading to inefficiencies and a decline in service quality.

Resistance to Change and Lack of Motivation Among Public Sector Employees

Resistance to change and low motivation among public sector employees significantly impede the implementation of performance management systems. These issues are often exacerbated by entrenched organizational cultures and rigid hierarchical structures that are typical of public sector organizations. Employees may resist change because of fear of the unknown, perceived threats to job security, or dissatisfaction with how changes are communicated and implemented. This resistance can manifest as passive non-compliance or active opposition, severely hindering the effectiveness of performance management efforts (Alenezi et al. 2021; Danquah 2021).

Several studies have underscored the persistent difficulties in addressing employee resistance to change and lack of motivation in the public sector. Paulikas and Paulikienė (2022); Alenezi et al. (2021); and Furxhi (2021), underlined the importance of effective communication and leadership in mitigating employee resistance to change. These researchers indicate that clear, consistent communication and inclusive leadership styles are crucial in reducing fear and

uncertainty among employees. Additionally, Escobar-Segovia et al (2021), and Drejeris and Drejeriene (2022), noted that resistance to change is influenced by organizational factors such as hierarchical structures and the lack of psychological safety, which can demotivate employees and impede successful change implementation.

Public sector organizations frequently encounter resistance to change due to the deeply rooted nature of their bureaucratic cultures. This resistance can lead to significant delays and increased costs, ultimately affecting the overall effectiveness of performance management systems. Alenezi et al (2021), observed that leaders in the Saudi public sector faced significant challenges during change initiatives due to hierarchical structures, bureaucracy, and high power distance, contributing to employee resistance. Danquah (2021), highlighted that resistance to change in the Volta River Authority and Ghana Maritime Authority was mainly due to inappropriate leadership styles, which created a lack of trust and increased employee resistance. Fuxhi (2021), emphasized the importance of understanding the underlying causes of resistance, such as fear of job loss or dissatisfaction with leadership, which significantly impact employees' attitudes toward change.

Addressing resistance to change and low motivation among employees is critical for the successful implementation of performance management systems in the public sector. Deeply entrenched bureaucratic cultures and rigid structures create significant barriers, and understanding these challenges is essential for improving overall performance management effectiveness.

Budget Constraints and Resource Allocation

Budget constraints and resource allocation present significant challenges in public sector performance management. These issues are often exacerbated by fluctuating budgetary allocations and the need to balance the limited resources across various public services. Public sector organizations must navigate these constraints to ensure effective service delivery while maintaining efficiency and accountability. Chang (2021) indicated that changes in budgetary resources significantly impact the performance of public agencies. In particular, budget cuts may not directly correlate with performance declines, while budget increases do not always lead to expected improvements, indicating complexities in managing additional resources effectively.

Studies by Amin et al (2020); Homauni et al (2023); and Purwanto et al (2022), emphasized the pervasive challenge of budget constraints and resource allocation in the public sector. These researchers note that public sector entities often struggle with limited financial resources, which affects their ability to implement performance management systems effectively. For instance, Amin et al (2020), found that socioeconomic and political factors significantly influence public spending allocations, whereas Homauni et al (2023), and Purwanto et al (2022), identified the complexities of managing budget resources in healthcare and local government contexts.

Public sector organizations frequently encounter budget constraints that require careful and strategic resource allocation. These constraints can lead to inefficiencies and hinder the effective implementation of performance management systems, thereby impacting the overall quality of public service delivery. Chang (2021), found that government agencies'

performance is significantly influenced by budgetary changes, with an asymmetric impact where resource gains do not always translate into improved effectiveness. Similarly, Algozhina (2020), emphasized that optimal public investment in resource-rich low-income countries should focus on domestic investment rather than saving abroad, addressing the need for strategic resource allocation to enhance public sector performance. Keogh et al (2020), spotted that resource constraints significantly narrow decision-making processes in dementia care, illustrating how budget limitations can impact service delivery and care quality.

Budget constraints and resource allocation are critical challenges in public sector performance management. Effective management of these constraints is essential to ensure that public sector organizations can deliver services efficiently and maintain accountability. Understanding and addressing these issues can lead to more effective implementation of performance management systems and improved public service outcomes.

In conclusion, the implementation of performance management in the public sector faces numerous obstacles, such as challenges in measuring performance, political interference and influence, resistance to change and low motivation among public sector employees, and insufficient resources and funding. Overcoming these hurdles necessitates a comprehensive strategy that acknowledges and addresses these complexities, fostering continuous improvement and the delivery of high-quality services.

Conclusion

The significance of performance management in the public sector lies in its profound impact on organisational efficiency and societal outcomes. Effective performance management systems ensure that public resources are utilized efficiently, promoting transparency and accountability within government operations. This, in turn, leads to improved service delivery, directly enhancing the quality of life for citizens.

The evolution and theoretical foundations of performance management in the public sector illustrate a dynamic landscape in which traditional methods intersect contemporary demands for public service provision. This study provides a comprehensive understanding of the challenges and opportunities in public sector performance management, and offer valuable insights for both academic and practical applications.

Over the past century, performance management in the public sector has undergone a significant transformation. From the early 20th-century principles of scientific management proposed by Frederick Taylor to the bureaucratic model advanced by Max Weber, the public sector has continuously adapted to meet changing societal demands and expectations. The mid-20th century witnessed a shift towards NPM, which introduced market-based approaches, decentralization, and a focus on results-oriented management. These historical milestones highlight the sector's capacity for evolution, driven by the need for greater efficiency, accountability, and responsiveness in public service delivery.

The integration of theoretical perspectives from organizational behavior, public administration, and HR management has enriched our understanding of performance management in the public sector. The Goal-Setting Theory, Social Exchange Theory, and

Resource-Based View, among others, offer valuable insights into employee motivation, goal alignment, and the strategic management of human resources. These theories underscore the importance of setting clear and challenging goals, fostering reciprocal relationships between employees and organizations, and leveraging human capital as a source of competitive advantage.

Despite these advancements, public sector organizations have encountered numerous challenges in implementing effective performance management systems. These include difficulties in measuring performance, political interference and influence, resistance to change, low motivation among employees, and a lack of sufficient resources and funding. The historical foundations of public administration, typically marked by rigid hierarchical structures, foster a culture resistant to performance-oriented approaches. Furthermore, the complexity of aligning diverse and often conflicting goals within public sector organizations adds to the difficulty of implementing performance management systems. Therefore, by addressing the inherent challenges in performance management, this study aims to provide insights that can lead to better policy-making and administrative practices, fostering sustainable development.

The importance of this study is underscored by the necessity to adapt performance management practices to meet evolving societal demands and technological advancements. By integrating both financial and non-financial indicators, as highlighted by recent research, public sector organizations can enhance operational efficiency and meet stakeholder expectations more effectively. The advent of technology and data analytics facilitates dynamic and real-time monitoring, utilising both quantitative metrics and qualitative assessments, which are crucial for contemporary performance management frameworks. Furthermore, this study is beneficial to a wide range of stakeholders, including public sector professionals, policymakers, and researchers. For public sector professionals, understanding the challenges and solutions in performance management can lead to improved practices and outcomes. Policymakers can utilise the insights from this study to develop more effective policies and frameworks that promote efficiency and accountability in public sector operations. Researchers can build on the theoretical foundations and empirical findings of this study to further explore and address the complexities of performance management in the public sector.

In conclusion, this study not only contributes to the academic discourse on performance management but also offers practical insights for public sector professionals and policymakers. By examining the historical evolution, theoretical foundations, and challenges of performance management, this study provides a comprehensive framework for understanding the complexities of public sector performance management. This highlights the critical importance of effective performance management in achieving the primary goal of the public sector: serving society effectively and efficiently. As public sector organizations navigate the increasing demands for transparency, accountability, and innovation, robust performance management practices are essential in driving positive organizational outcomes and enhancing societal well-being.

References

- Abane, J. A., & Brenya, E. (2021). The relationship between organizational environment antecedents and performance management in local government: evidence from Ghana. *Future Business Journal*, 7(1), 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s43093-020-00049-2>
- Alenezi, H., Higgs, M., & Snowden, N. (2021). Challenges facing Saudi public sector leaders during change. *International Journal of Advanced and Applied Sciences*, 8(12), 14–24. <https://doi.org/10.21833/ijaas.2021.12.003>
- Algozhina, A. (2020). *Optimal Public Investment in Resource-Rich Low-Income Countries* (No. 2020–04). <https://hdl.handle.net/10419/297881>
- Amin, B., Ul-Haq, H., & Bhatti, A. (2020). Socioeconomic and Political Determinants of Public Spending Allocations: A Panel Data Analysis of Aggregate and Sectoral Spending. *Pakistan Social Sciences Review*, 4(1), 1072–1085. [https://doi.org/10.35484/pssr.2020\(4-i\)82](https://doi.org/10.35484/pssr.2020(4-i)82)
- Aslam, A., Zahra, S. F., Aslam, T., & Naseem, M. A. (2023). Political Interference and Bureaucratic Performance in Pakistan: A Perspective of Civil Servants. *Pakistan Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 11(2), 986–993. <https://doi.org/10.52131/pjhss.2023.1102.0407>
- Awasom, S. Y. C. (2023). New Public Management Practices and Financial Performance of Local Governments in Cameroon. *Developments in Administration*, 5(1), 21–33. <https://doi.org/10.46996/dina.v5i1.8197>
- Barney, J. (1991). Firm resources and sustained competitive advantage. *Journal of Management*, 17(1), 99–120. <https://doi.org/10.1177/014920639101700108>
- Blau, P. (1986). *Exchange and Power in Social Life* (2nd ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203792643>
- Bourn, S. J. (2012). *Public Sector Auditing: Is it Value for Money?* John Wiley & Sons. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119208938>
- Bourne, M. (2021). Performance measurement and management in a VUCA world. *International Journal of Production Research*, 59(24), 7311–7316. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00207543.2021.2004042>
- Boykin, E., Lofaro, R. J., McCue, C., & Prier, E. (2024). Advancing the practice of public procurement performance measurement: a framework for conceptualizing efficiency and effectiveness. *Public Money and Management*, June, 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09540962.2024.2361832>
- Bhul, B. (2023). New Public Management Reform: Implementation experiences of developing countries and Nepal. *Prashasan*, 55(1), 52–70. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.3126/prashasan.v55i1.56440>
- Cesário, F., & Magalhaes, S.D. (2017). Human Resources Management, Citizenship Behavior, and Turnover Intention in the Portuguese Public Administration. *International Journal of Public Administration*, 40, 979 – 988. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01900692.2016.1242609>
- Chang, A. (2021). Resource Stability and Federal Agency Performance. *American Review of Public Administration*, 51(5), 393–405. <https://doi.org/10.1177/02750740211005046>
- Chigudu, D. (2020). Public sector corporate governance: Zimbabwe’s challenges of strategic management in the wake of sustainable development. *Academy of Strategic Management Journal*, 19(1), 1–13.
- Chourasia, A., Bahuguna, P. C., & Raju, T. B. (2023). Strategic human resource management, a road to organizational performance: Evidence from public sector organizations in the

- oil and gas sector. *International Journal of Organizational Leadership*, 12(First Special Issue), 66-90. <https://doi.org/10.33844/ijol.2023.60365>
- Christensen, T., & Lægred, P. (2021). Performance management: Experiences and challenges. In *Handbook of Public Administration* (4th eds., pp. 210–222).
- Cope, A. B., Mobley, V. L., & Samoff, E. (2023). Measuring Success: Disease Intervention Specialists Performance Metrics and Outcome Assessments. *Sexually Transmitted Diseases*, 50(8S), 18–22. <https://doi.org/10.1097/HMR.0000000000000261>
- Cutler, T. (2011). Performance Management in Public Services ‘Before’ New Public Management: The Case of NHS Acute Hospitals 1948-1962. *Public Policy and Administration*, 26(1), 129-147. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0952076710375785>
- Danquah, V. B. (2021). Review of the main sources of organisational resistance and how such resistance could be managed: Critical Analysis of Volta River Authority and Ghana Maritime Authority. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3878336>.
- De Waele, L., Polzer, T., & van Witteloostuijn, Arjen Berghman, L. (2021). “A little bit of everything?” Conceptualising performance measurement in hybrid public sector organisations through a literature review. *Journal of Public Budgeting, Accounting & Financial Management*, 33(3), 343–363. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1108/JPBAFM-05-2020-0075>
- Doherty, T.L., Horne, T., & Wootton, S. (2013). *Managing Public Services - Implementing Changes: A thoughtful approach to the practice of management* (2nd ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315887432>
- Drejeris, R., & Drejeriene, E. (2022). Novel Approach to the Actions for Causes Elimination of Staff Resistance to Innovative Change. *Journal of Multidisciplinary Healthcare*, 15(April), 1011–1022. <https://doi.org/10.2147/JMDH.S354329>
- Eisenhardt, K. M. (1989). Agency theory: An assessment and review. *Academy of Management Review*, 14(1), 57-74. <https://doi.org/10.2307/258191>
- Escobar-Segovia, K., Alvarez-Mero, M., Arroyo-Mite, M., & Guzman-Cadena, D. (2021). Resistance to Change and Job Satisfaction Among the Staff of the Public Health Research Institution (IPIS) in Guayaquil – Ecuador. In *Advances in Intelligent Systems and Computing: Vol. 1327 AISC* (Issue April, pp. 313–325). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-68083-1_24
- Fuenzalida, J., & Riccucci, N. M. (2019). The Effects of Politicization on Performance: The Mediating Role of HRM Practices. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 39(4), 544–569. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0734371X18758378>
- Furculita, T. (2023). Performance management models in the public sector. *Management Strategies and Policies in the Contemporary Economy*, 187–194. <https://doi.org/10.53486/icspm2023.28>
- Furxhi, G. (2021). Employee’s Resistance and Organizational Change Factors. *European Journal of Business and Management Research*, 6(2), 30–32. <https://doi.org/10.24018/ejbmr.2021.6.2.759>
- Garengo, P., & Sardi, A. (2021). Performance measurement and management in the public sector: state of the art and research opportunities. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, 70(7), 1629–1654. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJPPM-03-2020-0102>
- Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., & Snyderman, B. (1959). *The Motivation to Work*. John Wiley.

- Hill, K., & Plimmer, G. (2024). Employee Performance Management: The Impact of Competing Goals, Red Tape, and PSM. *Public Personnel Management*, 1–28. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00910260241231371>
- Homauni, A., Markazi-Moghaddam, N., Mosadeghkah, A., Noori, M., Abbasiyan, K., & Jame, S. Z. B. (2023). Budgeting in Healthcare Systems and Organizations: A Systematic Review. *Iranian Journal of Public Health*, 52(9), 1889–1901. <https://doi.org/10.18502/ijph.v52i9.13571>
- Hood, C. (1991). A public management for all seasons? *Public Administration*, 69(1), 3–19. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9299.1991.tb00779.x>
- Indahsari, C. L., & Raharja, S. J. (2020). New Public Management (NPM) as an Effort in Governance. *Jurnal Manajemen Pelayanan Publik*, 3(2), 73–81. <https://doi.org/10.24198/jmpp.v3i2.25342>
- Keane, S. (2020). Smart hybridity: Potentials and challenges of new governance arrangements. *Administration*, 68(3), 69–73. <https://doi.org/10.2478/admin-2020-0018>
- Keogh, F., Pierse, T., O’Shea, E., Fitzgerald, C., & Challis, D. (2020). Resource allocation decision-making in dementia care with and without budget constraints: a qualitative analysis. *HRB Open Research*, 3(69), 1–24. <https://doi.org/10.12688/hrbopenres.13147.2>
- Khaltar, O., & Moon, J. (2020). Effects of Ethics and Performance Management on Organizational Performance in the Public Sector. *Public Integrity*, 22, 372 - 394.
- Kiboi, A. W., & Maalu, J. . K. (2023). Management Awareness of Performance Contracting in State Corporations. *Journal of Business and Strategic Management*, 8(2), 62–77. <https://doi.org/10.47941/jbsm.1306>
- Knies, E., Boselie, P., Gould-Williams, J., & Vandenabeele, W. (2018). Strategic human resource management and public sector performance: context matters. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2017.1407088>
- Locke, E. A., & Latham, G. P. (1990). *A Theory of Goal Setting & Task Performance*. Prentice-Hall.
- Makinde, W. A. (2022). Is New Public Management an Option for Post-Pandemic Public Service Delivery in Nigeria? *Journal of Management Studies and Development*, 1(02), 79–95. <https://doi.org/10.56741/jmsd.v1i02.128>
- Maslow, A. H. (1943). A theory of human motivation. *Psychological Review*, 50(4), 370–396. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0054346>
- Masoud, Y. (2023). The effects of political interference on procurement performance in the parastatal organizations in Dar es Salaam Region. *International Journal of Research in Business and Social Science*, 12(2), 158–169. <https://doi.org/10.20525/ijrbs.v12i2.2419>
- Mngomezulu, S. (2020). Political Interference in the Administration of Service Delivery in UMLALAZI Local Municipality of KwaZulu-Natal, South Africa Sengiwakhile. *Journal of Economics and Behavioral Studies*, 12(1), 38–45.
- Paulikas, J., & Paulikiene, B. (2022). Impact of the communicated information content on employee resistance to change. *Insights into Regional Development*, 4(3), 61–75. [https://doi.org/10.9770/ird.2022.4.3\(4\)](https://doi.org/10.9770/ird.2022.4.3(4))
- Pollitt, C., & Bouckaert, G. (2017). *Public Management Reform: A Comparative Analysis-into the age of austerity* (4th ed.). Oxford University Press.

- Purwanto, Indrawan, R., & Heryanti, A. N. (2022). Capital Expenditure Allocation Analysis Of Local Governments. *International Journal of Science, Technology & Management*, 3(2), 453–460. <https://doi.org/10.46729/ijstm.v3i2.479>
- Sanderson, I. (2001). Performance Management, Evaluation and Learning in ‘Modern’ Local Government. *Public Administration*, 79(2), 297-313. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9299.00257>
- Schnell, S., & Gerard, C. (2022). From Bureaucrats to Entrepreneurs to Networkers, Advocates, and Empaths: Reappraising Human Resources Management Ideals and Practices in Public Administration. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 43, 652 - 676. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0734371X2211117>
- Spenkuch, J. L., Teso, E., & Xu, G. (2023). Ideology and Performance in Public Organizations. *Econometrica*, 91(4), 1171–1203. <https://doi.org/10.3982/ecta20355>
- Taylor, F. W. (1911). *The Principles of Scientific Management*. Harper & Brothers.
- Thusi, X. (2023). Performance Management Systems (PMS): Challenges and Opportunities in the Public Sector. *International Journal of Social Science Research and Review*, 6(6), 19–31.
- Kolk, B. (2022). Performance measurement in the public sector: Mapping 20 years of survey research. *Financial Accountability and Management*, 38(4), 703–729. <https://doi.org/10.1111/faam.12345>
- Van Elten, H. J., Van Der Kolk, B., & Sulz, S. (2021). Do different uses of performance measurement systems in hospitals yield different outcomes? *Health Care Management Review*, 46(3), 217–226. <https://doi.org/10.1097/HMR.0000000000000261>
- Wang, M., Zhu, C. J., Mayson, S., & Chen, W. (2019). Contextualizing performance appraisal practices in Chinese public sector organizations: the importance of context and areas for future study. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 30(5), 902–919. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2017.1292537>
- Wartick, S. L., & Cochran, P. L. (1985). The evolution of the corporate social performance model. *Academy of Management Review*, 10(4), 758-769. <https://doi.org/10.2307/258044>
- Weber, M. (1947). *The Theory of Social and Economic Organization*. The Free Press.
- Yuan, J., Li, X., Ke, Y., Xu, W., Xu, Z., & Skibniewski, M. (2020). Developing a building information modeling–based performance management system for public–private partnerships. *Engineering, Construction and Architectural Management*, 27(8), 1727–1762. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ECAM-06-2019-0328>