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ABSTRACT

The study was aimed at examining the relationship between performance management systems and local government service delivery in Uganda; a case of Bushenyi district local government. The overall objective of this study was to examine the relationship between performance management systems and local government service delivery in Bushenyi local government. The study objectives included; establishing the relationship between setting performance objectives and local government service delivery, establishing the effect of performance measurement on local government service delivery and assessing the impact of performance feedback and reward on local government service delivery all in Bushenyi local government. The study was largely guided by motivational theories notably by Locke’s goal setting theory and Vroom’s expectancy theory. The study used triangulation that is; cross sectional and case study research design was adopted supported by both qualitative and quantitative approaches. Data was gathered from a sample size of 169 respondents on the basis of probability and non-probability sampling strategy. Data was collected using self-administered questionnaires and interviews for key respondents. Qualitative data was analyzed using both thematic and content analysis while quantitative data was analyzed using statistical analysis notably correlation and regression analysis. Results indicate that the two hypotheses that guided the study; performance measurement (.364*) and performance feedback and reward (.435*) which had a greater relationship to local government service delivery were accepted. While setting performance objectives which did not have a statistically significant relationship to LGSD was rejected. It was concluded that employers should set SMART performance objectives, monitor and regularly assess them, provide constructive feedback and also effectively reward employees.
CHAPTER ONE

1.1 Introduction
The study investigated the relationship between performance management systems and local
government delivery in Uganda with particular reference to Bushenyi District local
Government.

Performance management system in this study was conceived as the independent variable
while local government service delivery as the dependent variable. Performance management
system was measured in form of setting performance objectives, performance measurement
and performance feedback and reward as the main performance management mechanisms,
while Local Government Service Delivery was measured in terms of client satisfaction,
efficiency, cost effectiveness and Accessibilities of services; as explained in the conceptual
frame work [fig.1]

This chapter presents the background study, theoretical review, conceptual perspective,
contextual perspective, statement of the problem, objectives of the study, specific objectives
of the study, research hypothesis, scope of the study, justification of the study, significance of
the study and operational definitions of terms and concepts.

1.2 Background of the study

1.2.1 Historical background
Performance management originated in the USA, but in reality there is nothing new about
performance management (Mike et al, 2007). It is an umbrella term to describe not a single
activity but a range of activities that may gather together to enhance organizational
performance (Mike et al, 2007).

Performance management dates back to the late 1980s with commentators such as John and
Den Hartogetal(2004), who described performance management as being concerned with
challenges organizations face in defining measures and stimulating employee performance
with the ultimate goal of improving overall organizational performance(Julie,2010)
Hughes (1998) further indicates that performance management was initially implemented in the private sector but at present this management style is embedded and entrenched in the public sector operations (Cameroon & Sewell, 2003). Over the years we have seen many practices, techniques, tools, systems and philosophies which have as their own aim the management of performance (Richard, 2002).

Uganda’s experience in performance management was one of the major reforms in public service. The initial phase of public service reform program (PSRP) 1992-1997 focused on reducing the size of public service and rationalizing the structure to enhance micro economic reforms. The second phase 1997-2002 aimed at improving efficiency and effectiveness and the third phase 2005-2010 was aimed at creating competent, motivated, committed, result oriented and accountable public service (The integrated performance management framework for Uganda public service, July 2007; Mitala, 2006).

The Public service review of 1989 revealed that the public service was over bloated, inefficient ineffective, unresponsive, demoralized and consequently not delivering the government economic recovery programs. From late 1990s, a number of performance management initiatives have been implemented in the public service the major ones being Result oriented management (ROM) with the objective to institutionalize a result oriented culture in public service by achieving efficiency, improving outcomes, linking individual performance to organizational key out puts hence making public officers more accountable and enhancing resource allocation decisions (Mitala, 2006; African public series: No, 6 2009). Other initiatives include; staff performance, output oriented budgeting tool (OBT), reward and recognition of high performance, standard setting and client charters, and institutionalization of the national integrated monitoring and evaluation system (NIMES) as core components of the approach in order to increase its efficiency and effectiveness in the delivery of public service (The integrated performance management framework for Uganda public service, July 2007; Improving African public service series; No. 6, 2009).

A case study of local government initiative by Martin (2003), states that the constitution of Uganda 1995 and the local government act of 1997 devolved service delivery mandate to local government while the central government retained the mandate of setting national policies and standards regarding the delivery of services such as roads, education, health water, agricultural inputs, markets, transports to the local communities. In order to provide these services effectively, local governments have to fulfill the mandate of planning, financing, and delivering, evaluate and monitor service provision within their Jurisdiction.
Thus performance management system is obligatory for local government and consequently local governments need to comply with legislator requirements and provide frame works through which service delivery can be realized.

The National Development plan for Uganda also places strong emphasis on removing institutional barriers to economic growth through improving the performance of the government in its policy planning and monitoring regulatory and service delivery functions. (National Development plan 2010). In order to improve the wanting levels of service delivery in LGs performance management systems have to be put in place. Therefore managing performance involves monitoring performance in relation to; key performance indicators, the targets of development priorities, objectives as laid down in the integrated development plans and the subsequent measuring and reviewing of performance at least over a year as prescribed by the Municipality system act (Act 320 f 2000).

1.2.2 Theoretical perspective

Various theories have been advanced to explain performance management systems which can as well be applied to local government service delivery in Uganda. The most outstanding one is that advanced by Mabey, (1999). Mabey has prescribed the model of performance management system in the form of performance management cycle. This cycle has 5 elements which suggest how performance management system should be implemented in an organization. These includes; setting objectives, measuring performance, feedback of results, reward system based on performance outcome and amendment to objectives and activities (Mabey et al; 1999) as illustrated in the figure below.
Fig 1: The Performance management Cycle. (Mabey et al, 1999).

This model describes how PMS operates in a cycle; starting with setting objectives, which calls for measurement of performance to determine how objectives are being met, then a feedback is given on how the set objectives have been or not been achieved, which leads to rewarding performance based on outcomes. This will call for amendment of objectives and activities in an effort to improve or increase the level of performance which definitely leads to setting of objectives as amended and so the cycle continues.

Salaman (2005) says there are two theories underlying the concept of performance management. One is the goal setting theory. This had been proposed by Edwin Locke in the year 1968. This theory suggests that the individual goal established by an employee plays an important role in motivating him for superior performance. This is because the employees keep following their goals on modifying the goals and make them more realistic. In case the performance improves it will result in achievement of the performance management system aims (Salaman et al, 2005).

The other theory is the expectant theory proposed by Victor Vroom in 1964. This theory is based on the hypothesis that individuals adjust their behavior in the organization on the basis of anticipated satisfaction of valued goals set by them. The individuals modify their behavior in such a way which is most likely to them to attain these goals. This theory underlies the
concept of performance management as it is believed that performance is influenced by the expectations concerning future events (Salaman et al, 2005).

According to the Uganda Public service standing orders (2010), Performance management in the public service is result based. In other words it is based on result oriented management (ROM). ROM is a management model which seeks to optimize the use of resources available by focusing on the results delivered at institutional and individual level in line with sector plans and the over-arching national development framework. The ROM approach integrates the objectives and outcomes defined within the national planning framework, the national development plan (NDP), with the results framework for each public sector organization. The results framework includes the purpose for which the organization exists, the objectives that it intends to achieve, the key outputs that it aims to achieve, the key outputs that must be delivered and the performance indicators that will be used to measure how well the organization is delivering those outputs. (ROM, individual implementation manual 2010).

Local governments have established a results framework that specify the mission or purpose for which it exists, indicate the national and sector outcomes that the institution contributes to outline the objectives that it aims to achieve, specify the key outputs and outcomes, define the performance indicators that will be used to measure how well the organization is performing and delivering the expected outputs (Uganda Public service standing orders 2010).

Armstrong and Baron (2004) stress that at its best performance management is a tool to ensure that managers manage effectively, that they ensure the people or team they manage know and understand what is expected of them, have the skills and ability to deliver on these expectations, are supported by the organization to develop the capacity to meet these expectations, are given feedback on their performance and have the opportunity to discuss and contribute to individual and team aims and objectives. (Julie B & Tim C, 2010).

Armstrong and Baron also argue that the principle value of performance management is to communicate a shared vision of the purpose of the organization, define expectations of what must be delivery and how, ensure employees are aware of what high performance means and how they can achieve it to ensure level of motivation and enable employees to monitor their own performance and understand what needs to be done to improve their overall levels of performance (Julie B & Tim C, 2010).
The Government performance and result Act of 1993 requires each agency to prepare an annual performance plan covering each program activity set forth in its budget. This organization performance plans establish program level performance goals that are objective quantifiable and measurable describe the operational resources needed to meet those goals, establish performance indicators to be used in measuring the outcomes of each program.

The revision made in 1995 to the government wide performance appraisal and rewards regulations support ‘natural’ performance management. Local government performance management system is primary about the coordination, monitoring and management of the whole government business. Its institutions focus on staffing, managing service delivery system and the leadership (The Government Annual Performance Report 2012).

In addition the ministry of local government is mandated among other duties to inspect, monitor and where necessary offer technical advice / assistance, support supervision and training to all local governments. In order to strengthen the performance of the public sector, performance contracts for category of civil servants were introduced.

1.2.3 Conceptual background

Performance management System (PMS) as conceived by Bevan &Thompson (1991) exhibits the following features. It has a shared vision of its objectives or a mission statement which is communicated to all its employees. It sets individual performance management targets which relate both to operating unit and wider organizational objectives, It conducts regular formal reviews of progress towards these targets, It uses review process to identify training development and reward outcomes, It evaluates the effectiveness of the whole process and its contribution to overall performance to allow changes and improvements to be made (Michael Armstrong 2000).The study based on this concept to see how well the PMS in place exhibits these features.

Performance management is known to be a systematic process of managing the organization and its human resources to achieve a high and steady rate of performance. Curtis,(1992) states that performance management is a set of management practices that are used in many countries around the world such as Britain, performance management is about directing and supporting employees to work as effectively and efficiently as possible in line with the needs of the organization (Walter 1995 sited in Richard 2002).
The concept of performance management is well understood in the Public sector and most organizations have some form of performance management system but successful implementation of such systems is difficult and the quality is currently very mixed. We therefore regard performance management as very important and in October 1999 the civil service management board adopted the key elements of our framework as the new business planning structure for central government (public service productivity panel, 2000 sited in Mike Mill more)

Local government service delivery is the delivery of basic public services such as education, health, roads and Agricultural advisory services as a devolved function of local government. The measure of the performance of local governments largely depends on how well these basic services are delivered to the citizenry.(ACODE, Public service delivery and accountability report service No.3, 2013) Schaeffer, 2000 defines delivery of services in terms of quality services and the overall satisfaction of service users. For purposes of this study, local government service delivery was referred to ratio, quality of services delivered, acceptable quality infrastructure, reliable services, time accomplishment of tasks, coverage ratio, speedy delivery of services, accountability, efficient utilization of resources, image improvement and satisfaction of service users.

Local governments generally have service delivery mandates such as for education, health, housing planning, infrastructure development and maintenance waste management and environmental conservation, creation of opportunities for local economic development, security and to some extent judicial services (UNDP. Local governments In East Africa) generally these mandates are in line with the millennium Development goals and provided in an inclusive gender responsive participatory and sustainable manner.

1.2.4 Contextual background

Uganda Local government performance management system is primarily about the coordination, monitoring and management of the whole government business. Its institutions focus on staffing, managing service delivery system and the leadership. (The Government Annual Performance Report, 2012) According to the Uganda Public services standing orders (2010); It is the responsibility of all responsible officers to manage the performance of their ministries departments or local governments to ensure that performance of organizations and individuals directly contribute to the improved service delivery and attainment of national development objectives (The Uganda Public service standing orders(UPSSO) 2010).
Bushenyi Local Government like any other local government drives its mandate to deliver services from the 2nd schedule (part V) of the Local Government Act (CAP 243). Bushenyi Local Government is viewed as an institutional structural managerial and environmentally influenced mechanism through which the state by virtue of public trust administers and delivers services to the citizens (The integrated performance management framework for the public service July 2007).

As part of the public service reform program, a new performance appraisal scheme has been introduced in the public service. This new scheme is based on the assessment of performance of well-defined resource specific targets and outputs, agreed between appraisers and appraisees. ROM has also been introduced under the reform program to ensure efficiency and effectiveness of the public service. Each local government will define its objectives and outputs. Consequently the new performance appraisal and ROM will mutually support each other (Performance appraisal in the public service).

Performance management in public service shall be result based. Each ministry, department or local government shall establish a results framework that shall specify the mission / purpose for which the organization exists, indicate the national and sector outcomes that the institution contributes to outline the objectives that it aims to achieve, specify the key outputs and outcomes, define the performance indicators that will be used to measure how well the organization is performing and delivering the expected outcomes. (The Uganda Public service standing orders 2010)

Bushenyi Local Government clearly defines the mission statements, strategic objectives with specific and measurable output outcomes and key performance indicators. All responsible officers and individual public officers in the district are required to ensure that all performance related initiatives are managed within the integrated performance management framework. However the adoption of this PMS has not shown any significant improvement towards local government service delivery.

Ministries, departments and local governments are requested to develop and publish service delivery standards with regard to the respective services they provide. On the basis of service delivery standards, all responsible officers shall develop and implement a client charter in order to inform clients and stakeholders of the services in ministries, departments or local government provide, the rights or expectations and obligations of the clients, and the commitments made that the ministry department or local government is making in terms of
service delivery standards, act as a tool for continuous performance improvement through addressing service delivery challenges and periodic revision of the charter to set new standards of performance from time to time that is consistent with the changing demands of the clients and other stakeholders (UPSSO, 2010).

The guiding principles of the IPMF at both institutional and individual level include a holistic approach which means achieving effective performance management in public service through integration of management in public service through integration of management processes at all levels. Secondly, integrated approach is where every institution adopts a sector wide approach (SWAP) for planning and prioritizing interventions into sectoral strategies. Thirdly; result oriented approach where Institutions and individual public servants establish outputs which have a link with national goals and institutional objectives. (The IPMF, 2007)

According to the 2nd Deputy prime minister and minister of public service Honorable Henry Kajura Mugarwa, Public service reform program was designed / aimed at enhancing performance management by strengthening the linkage between Result Oriented Management (ROM) and budget frame work process rolling out the open performance appraisal system across government and inculcating a high performance management culture in public service.

Although the various performance management components may be implemented individually, the framework emphasizes a holistic approach to performance management based on ROM Principles which provide guidelines to managers and individuals on what Performance management activities they expect to carry out which include planning, budgeting, performance reviews, Rewards and recognitions of performance, capacity enhancement, monitoring and evaluation and standard setting and client charter (The IPMF, for the public service July 2007).

The primary service regulation serves as a primary guide to all government ministries in developing and implementing performance management systems. The regulation requires each executing authority to determine a system of performance management and development for employees in that department / ministry.

One of the recommendations the Public Service Reform Programme (PSRP) provides guidance on performance management. This guidance is based on the integrated performance

Government introduced performance agreements for senior managers in the public service under circular standing instruction number of 2010 in order to address the shortcomings of service delivery and hence transparency and accountability (Establishment notice number 1 of 2011).

Performance planning which is guided by National Development Plan (NDP) under sector strategic plan begins with the review of the previous year’s performance followed by the production of the policy statement. Each sector identifies priority output to be delivered in the medium term at the vote level, Public service institutions develop annual performance plans based on policy objectives and priority outlines in the NDP. The Plans articulate objective and output to be achieved. For each key output performance measures and indicators are to be identified to guide periodic assessment of the level of accomplishment of activities and standards.

The review process enables MDAs and Local Governments to identify performance gaps and priorities for the next planning period. Planning at individual level is guided by the plan outlined in the performance appraisal. Individual performance planning is carried out at the beginning of every financial year immediately following the annual planning and budget cycle. Each individual staff is required to agree with the supervisor of what is to be achieved with in the financial year based on the available resources. The individual plan indicates the key outputs, targets and performance indicators which are linked to the annual work plan of the Local Government Individual performance reviews are carried out through performance appraisal system, the supervisor and supervisee agree on the individual performance plan based on the application of MDA or Local Government and Department plans, which indicates the key outputs, performance indicators and targets against which the individuals performance is assessed. (The IPMF for Uganda Public Service July 2007).

For quality assurance all local governments are expected to monitor their performance, provide support supervision and promote compliance with policies, standard rules regulations and procedures to improved service delivery Responsible officers of a local government that is inspected shall be required to implement the recommendation of the inspection to improve performance and service delivery (UPSSO, 2010).
1.3 Statement of the problem
One of the key government interventions through PSRP was to implement performance management systems (PMS) aimed at delivering high quality services and building public confidence and trust (The IPMF for the Uganda public service July 2007). As a result there is improved transparency and accountability across government institutions as evidenced by the annual performance plans and reports. However, the National service delivery survey conducted in 2008, established that clients were not yet fully satisfied with the quality of service delivered, such as roads, education, health, and agricultural advisory services which are said to be inadequate and untimely despite some improvement in transparency and accountability (The IPMF for Uganda public service 2007). In addition, a review of selected service delivery indicators for Bushenyi district show that despite the advances made in various areas the level of service provision remains below target levels at 53% as indicated in the district budget frame work paper 2014. This therefore calls for a need to address the short comings in service delivery otherwise more resources will continue to be spent at the dissatisfaction of clients which would lead to the collapse of systems in the district.

It’s on this background that the researcher investigated the performance management system implementation process and local government service delivery in Bushenyi with a view to establish if performance management systems have a visible and tangible impact on local government service delivery in terms of enhancing quality, increasing efficiency, effectiveness, accessibility, and client satisfaction of service provision.

1.4 General Objective
The study aimed at establishing the relationship between the performance management systems and local government service delivery in Bushenyi District.

1.5 Specific objectives

1. To establish the relationship between setting performance objectives and local government service delivery.

2. To establish the effect of performance measurement on local government service delivery.

3. To assess the impact of performance feedback and reward on local government service delivery.
1.6 Research Questions

RQ1. What is the relationship between setting performance objectives and local government service delivery?

RQ2. What is the effect of performance measurement on local government service delivery?

RQ3. What is the impact of performance feedback and reward to local government service delivery?

1.7 Hypotheses of the study

H1; There is a significant relationship between setting performance objectives and local government service delivery

H2; Performance measurement has a positive significant effect on local government service delivery.

H3; Performance feedback and reward have a positive impact on local government service delivery

1.8 Conceptual frameworks

Fig.2 Conceptual frame work illustrating the relationship between performance management systems and local government service delivery.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDEPENDENT VARIABLE</th>
<th>DEPENDENT VARIABLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT</td>
<td>LOCAL GOVERNMENT SERVICE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DELIVERY</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SETTING PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES**
- Performance planning
- Establishment of performance Agreements
- Performance competence

**PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT**
- Performance appraisal
- Reviewing performance progress
- Monitoring and evaluation
- Supporting performance

- Cost efficiency
- Effectiveness
- Client satisfaction
- Accessibility of services

**PERFORMANCE FEEDBACK AND REWARD**
- Performance outcomes
- Reward and Re
cognition of performance
- Improving performance
The conceptual framework was adapted from the performance management cycle by Mabey et al 1999. This cycle has 5 elements which suggest how PMS should be implemented in an organization. These elements are setting performance objectives, performance measurement, performance feedback and performance reward based on outcomes.

Setting performance objectives involves a conscious process of establishing levels of performance in order to obtain desired outcomes. The decision to set these objectives results from dissatisfaction with current performance levels thus the goal provides a structure to direct actions and behaviors to improve the unsatisfactory performance. If an employee is committed to the goal, has the requisite ability to attain it and does not have conflicting goals then such an employee is more likely to be productive at work place.

Allowing an employee to participate in the process of goal establishment will increase the chances of goal acceptance which will eventually lead to goal commitment. The difficulty of a goal affects the motivation and commitment of the individual. In that it pushes him / her to put in more effort thus being more effective .The basic idea is that the more challenging the goal, the more committed and motivated with the person must be and thus the better the resultant performance hence improved service delivery.

A manager assess if employees are actually meeting the set objectives through performance measurement .This looks into employee effectiveness. The same process also measures how the employee has achieved these objectives and this answers the question of efficiency. For example have the right processes and procedures been followed? Have the company’s resources been minimally used in the process of achieving targets? Feedback is necessary in order for goals to remain effective and retain commitment without feedback people are unaware of their progression or regression and it becomes difficult to gauge the level of effort required to pursue the goal effectively.

Additionally feedback allows for individual and teams to spot any weaknesses in their current performance and it will be more effective when it’s directed at setting more challenging goals. It could be on going or outcome orient ed with the basics in place, the reward scheme is
implemented to motivate employees who constantly improve their productivity levels so that they may perform even better. The rational for the scheme is to establish a standard procedure and practice for helping employees grow to higher levels of performance and excellence. This would inspire, encourage, motivate, celebrate and reward employees to build a culture of success and excellence in organization.

The conceptual framework has the independent variable of the study as performance management systems which are about mechanisms about directing and supporting employees to work as effectively and efficiently as possible in line with the needs of the organization. The frame work shows objective setting as one of the mechanisms, which involves establishment of performance targets objectives basis for measuring performance. This provides direction initial energizing of behavior.

The frame work also brings up performance measurement as another mechanism which involves reviewing performance progress, supporting performance, appraising performance and monitoring and evaluation. Finally feedback and reward is another mechanism which is based on performance out comes.

The dependent variable is local government service delivery which is all about providing a diversity of public needs like education heath, roads, and agricultural advisory services and ensuring the provision of services to the community in a sustainable manner. This involves acceptable quality infrastructure, reliable services, timely completion of tasks, and effective utilization of resources and accessibility of these services by end users.

### 1.9 Significance of the study

The significance of this study was to establish the relationship between performance management systems and local government service delivery in Bushenyi District. It was hoped that the research would assist managers in Bushenyi District to have a better understanding of the implication of performance management system vis-à-vis local government service delivery. It was to benefit the entire strategic administration of Bushenyi local government and other Local Government in the sense that the findings would be used to improve their levels of service delivery. The findings of this study would help to come up with appropriate interventions to overcome some of the current performance management system problems to ensure excellence in service delivery in Local Governments.
It was also hoped that the research will facilitate effective performance management systems/mechanism that would enable local governments to plan, finance delivery, evaluate and monitor service delivery/provision in their jurisdictions.

1.10 Justification of the study
Service delivery in Bushenyi local government has been an issue for some time and remains a contentious issue known to top management that requires immediate interventions. A review of selected service delivery indicators for Bushenyi district show that despite the advances made in various areas the level of service provision remains below target levels. Senior managers have been required to sign annual performance agreements since it’s their responsible to ensure that performance of organizations and individuals directly contribute to improved service delivery.

This study therefore intended to establish the relationship between performance management systems and Local Government service delivery since the main justification for the existence of local governments is the delivery of public services which services government cannot risk entrusting entirely to the private sector or free market forces. It’s on this background that the researcher had investigate the performance management system implementation process and local government service delivery in Bushenyi with a view to establish if performance management systems have a visible and tangible impact on local government service delivery in terms of enhancing quality, increasing efficiency, effectiveness, accessibility, and client satisfaction of service provision.

1.11. Scope of the study
Content scope
The study investigated the relationship between performance management systems and Local government service delivery in Bushenyi District. The independent variable was performance management systems and the dependent variable is local government service delivery.

Geographical scope
The study was based in Bushenyi District Local government in western Uganda. This district was selected due to its continued noticeable decline in service provision.
Time scope
The research covered the period between 2009 -2013. The research considered this period adequate for the implementation of performance management systems and for the assessment of the effectiveness of local government service delivery. This period was chosen because there has been adoption of different / public service review programmes on service delivery systems of the citizenry.

1.1 Operational definitions
The key concepts to be used in the study will be clearly defined as under listed.

1. **Service delivery** is providing a diversity of public needs to the community in a sustainable manner. It refers to the actual performance output or results of an organization measured against its intended performance outputs or goals and objectives. It is referred to performance in this study.

2. **Performance management**. Managers and employees working together to plan monitor and review an employees work objectives and overall contribution to the organization. Providing ongoing coaching and feedback to ensure employees are meeting their objectives and career goals.


4. **Reward**: Employee benefits and compensation to ensure that the contribution of people in the organization is recognized by both financial and non financial means.

5. **Performance planning**: Setting performance expectations and goals for groups and individuals to channel their efforts towards achieving organizational objectives. It also includes measures that will be used to determine objectives are being met.

6. **Performance agreements**: A method of which establishing expectations accountability and consequences for not meeting a set standard of execution excellence. Parties agree on the actions the performers will execute and agree on the expected results from execution of those actions. Often times these are consequences if the performer does not deliver as agreed.
7. **Performance measurements**: A process by which organizations establish the parameters which in the programs are reaching the desired results.

8. **Performance targets**: A measure of the intended level of performance to be achieved within a specified period.
CHAPTER TWO:
LITERATURE REVIEW

2.0 Introduction

This chapter presents a review of literature on performance management systems and service delivery based on logical observation and previous works especially of academic and policy interest in as far as this study takes direction. That is scholarly and seminal works on relevant theories publications and proceedings of work and topical discussions around performance management systems and local government service delivery were reviewed. This section is constructed in such a way that theories are integrated into existing literature so as to ensure the hypothesis is well formed.

2.1 THEORETICAL REVIEW

From a theoretical review perspective the study was largely based on Locke’s goal setting theory and Vroom’s expectation theory as shown.

Various theories (notably ‘Goal setting theory’ by Locke) have been evolving over time to explain the occurrence of events and issues in the field of performance planning and employee performance. This has consequently had far reaching benefit in positively impacting the process of selecting, developing and using performance planning tools and solutions to reverse employee performance related problems.

The goal setting theory (Locke & Latham 1990, 2002) was developed inductively with industrial and organizational psychology over a 25 years period based on some 400 laboratory and field study. These studies show that specific, high, (hard) goals lead to a higher level of task performance than do easy goals or vague abstract goals such as exhortation to “do ones’ best” as long as a person is committed to the goal, has the requisite ability to attain it, and does not have conflicting goals there is a positive linear relationship goal difficulty and task performance. Locke coined the goal setting theory, his works combined with other scholars (Latham & Locke, 2006, 1990); Indicate that specific agreed goals yield higher performance than when people strive to simply do their best to achieve ambiguous goals. They further provide empirical evidence of performance benefits where specific goals have been achieved in hundreds of laboratories and field studies (Locke and Latham 1990, 2002).
Edwin Locke in his goal setting theory as sited by Salaman, et al 2005, suggests that the individual goal established by an employee plays an important role in motivating him for superior performance. This is because the employees keep following their goals on modifying the goals and make them more realistic. In case the performance improves it will result in achievement of the performance management system aim (Salaman et al, 2005)

Locke & Latham, (2002), in their study show that goals set the primary standard for self satisfaction with performance. Higher or hard goals are motivating because they require one to attain more in order to be satisfied than do low or easy goals. Because performance is a function of both ability and motivation, goal effects depend upon having the requisite task, knowledge and skill.

Locke & Latham (2006) highlight a direct linear relationship between goal difficulty, level of performance and effort involved. Therefore, in order for performance to increase, goals must be challenging specific and concrete.

Kelly Martocchio&Frink (1994) build on this theory further when they introduced team theory. According to them, team goals which are specific and difficult have consistently positive effect on team performance. They also stress the importance of participation in setting goals as a way of enhancing performance by increasing goal commitment. This is also supported by Latham Ezra and Lock. (2009)

The centre of this theory is that specific difficult goals lead to higher performance (Locke &Latham 1990) to build on the assumption, Klein Wesson, Hollenback&Alge, (1999) revealed that difficult goals lead to higher performance especially when the team is committed to their goals. Goals commitment can be increased through cultivating self efficacy. (Bandura 1997; Heslin&Klehe 2006, Heslin&VandeWalle 2008)

According to O’Neil &Drillings, (1994), goal acceptance, goal commitment, goal difficulty and goal specificity are important if goal setting is supposed to improve performance

Goal setting is a general theory that can be applied in a multitude of work situations. Support for the theory comes from individual and group setting, laboratory and field studies across different cultures and involves many different tasks (Locke & Latham, 2002). The strongest support relates to the relationship between specific and difficult goals and task performance. A Meta analysis performed by Tubbs (1986) supported the concept that specific difficult goals are positively correlated to improve performance. Other research shows similar
conclusion and further states that if there is ever to be a viable candidate from organizational sciences for the lofty status of a scientific law of nature, then the relationship between goal specificity and task performance are most worthy of serious considerations (Mento et al., 1987).

De Walt, et al (2009) found a direct correlation between those who achieve goals and the motivation to create additional goals or add more challenging aspects to the current goal based on feedback. Within this idea is the vision and structure that goal setting provides, which helps to motivate individuals and teams to perform better. (Sorrentino, 2006).

Goal setting is not without its critics; Ordonez, Scheiteitzer, Galinsky and Bazerman (2009), state that the theory is over-prescribed and can potentially cause harm to an organization. Care should be taken in applying goal setting due to the possible unintended side effects. The arguments levied against the theory are not new and have been discussed by other researchers. For example, Ordonez et al (2009), argues that unethical behavior can result from motivating employees to meet the specific and challenging goals. In an effort to reach a certain performance level, employees may forge results, minutes, activities in order to meet the minimum performance requirements. According to the author, this focus on goal attainment can actually promote unethical behavior by creating focus on ends rather than means. (Ordonez et al., 2009). Not only is the negative behavior addressed by Locke & Latham; but the means to mitigate this issue is offered as well, such as offering progressive awards towards goal attainment, organizational control systems and an ethical workplace culture.

The predominance of empirical research supporting goal setting theory illustrates its utility as a method to motivate individual and improved organizational outcomes. While some caution may be in order, Locke & Latham (2002), argue that failures resulting from the theory are usually due to errors in its application and can often be prevented.

The expectation theory has its roots in 1976 by Victor H Vroom, an international expert on leadership and decision making. Vroom’s expectancy theory addresses motivation and management. The theory suggests that an individual’s perceived view of an outcome will determine the level of motivation. It provides an explanation of why individuals choose one behavioral option over others. ‘The basic idea behind the theory is that people will be motivated because the decision will lead to their desired outcome.’ (Redmond, 2009). The theory states that individuals have different sets of goals and can be motivated if they believe that; there is a positive correlation between efforts and performance, Favorable performance
will result in desirable rewards, and the reward will satisfy an important need. The desire to satisfy the need is strong enough to make the effort worthwhile (Lawler, Porter, L, Vroom, 2009).

Victor Vroom’s expectation theory as sited by Salaman et al 2005 is based on the hypothesis that individuals adjust their behavior in the organization on the basis of anticipated satisfaction of valued goals set by them. The individuals modify their behavior in such a way, which is most likely to them to attain these goals. This theory underlies the concept of performance management as it is believed that performance is influenced by the expectations concerning future events (Salaman et al, 2005).

This reveals that employees make decisions among alternative plans of behaviors based on their expectations of degree to which a given behavior will lead them to desired outcome. It is also observed that performance management practices have challenges which include systematic performance planning, identifying critical performance objectives for each staff member so that they clearly understand their duties, defining what is expected of employees and how well their work is linked to the overall goals of the organization.

Theoretical basis for performance management lie in motivational theory and in particular, goal setting theory and expectancy theory. Goal setting theory by Locke & Latham suggests that not only does the assignment of specific goals leads to increased motivation and increases the performance; while expectation theory by Vroom hypothesizes that individuals change their behavior according to their anticipated satisfaction in achieving certain goals. Both of these theories have important implications for the design of performance management processes. (Mitchell et al, 2000).

The basis of this theory is that: individual choose behavior based on the outcomes they expect and the values they ascribe to those expected outcome. Individuals choose from a variety of alternatives and thus must examine a variety of expectations before choosing to engage in behaviors (Borders et al, 2004). Borders et al, (2004), found out that individuals choose from a variety of alternatives and thus examine a variety of expectations before choosing to engage in behaviors. Among the potential alternatives of decisions that can be made, some appear more attractive than others.

Building on this literature are works of Mabey et al (1999) who has prescribed the model of performance management systems in form of performance management cycle of 5 elements
which suggest how performance management system should be implemented in an organization as: Setting objectives, Measuring performance, Feedback of results, Reward system based on performance outcomes and amendments to objectives and activities (Mabey et al 1999).

Building on Mabey’s literature are the works of Brown(2005) who offers different reasons for introducing performance management as to; provide information on organizational and employee’s effectiveness, improve organizational / employee effectiveness, provide information on organizational or employee efficiency, employee’s level of motivation, to link employee’s pay with perception of their performance, raise level of employee accountability and align employees.

The above literature combined with works of Wang & Berman,(2001) and Fryer et al, (2009) points out the key features of a successful performance management system to include; alignment of the PMS and existing system and strategies of the organization, leadership commitment, a culture in which it is seen as a way of improving and identifying good performance and not a burden that is used to chastise poor performance, stake holder involvement and continuous monitoring , feedback dissemination and learning from results. There is also the challenge of reviewing an employee’s over all achievement, based on a clear understanding of his / her previously established performance objectives with constructive feedback both positive and negative. Several motivation theories attest that positive feedback is more effective for motivating goal pursuit than negative feedback because it increases outcome expectancy of goal and perceived self efficacy of the pursuer. (Ray & Deci. 2000).

According to this theoretical approach, positive feedback increases people’s confidence that they are able to pursue their goals leading people to expect successful goal attainment. Negative feedback in contrast undermines people’s confidence in their ability to pursue their goals and their expectations of success. Because positive feedback is effective, various social agents use positive feedback to encourage individuals to internalize or integrate new goals to their self-concept with the expectation that these individuals will then be more committed to pursue the goals on subsequent occasions. (Ray & Deci. 2000)
1.2 2.2 CONCEPTUAL REVIEW

This study examined the relationship between performance management systems and local government service delivery.

1.3 2.2.1 PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT

The concept of performance management has developed over the past two decades as a strategic integrated process which incorporates goal setting and performance appraisal and development within a unified and coherent framework with specific aims of aligning individual performance goals with the organization’s wider objective. (Dessler, 2005: Williams 2002). Consequently, it is concerned with how people work, how they are managed and developed to improve their performance and ultimately how to maximize their contribution to the organization.

According to Armstrong& Baron (2005), performance management underpinned by the notion that sustained organization’s success will be achieved through a strategic and integrated approach to improving the performance and developing the capabilities of individuals and wider teams.(Armstrong & Baron, 2005). It is a means of settings better results from an institution’s team individuals by understanding and managing performance with in an agreed framework of planned goals, standards and competence requirements.

Therefore managing performance involves monitoring performance in relation to; Key performance indicators, the targets of development priorities, objectives as laid down in the integrated development plans ,the subsequent measuring and reviewing of performance at least once a year as prescribed by LG Act. (Municipal systems act 32 Of 2000).

According to Alan Fowler (1988) the performance of employees can be much more variable than that of plant or equipment, Overtime it can also improve or deteriorate. People learn by experience and  even if no positive action is taken to help new employee improve most will raise their performance levels as they become more knowledgeable and discover for themselves ways of getting their jobs done more efficiently. But leaving performance improvement to chance has at least four serious sort comings; Employees may eventually reach an acceptable standard but will take far longer to do so than if positive development action was taken, the standard which become the norm may well be below the level which could be achieved given positive action, employees response to change in the organization’s needs may be very slow, the performance of some employees will deteriorate as they lose
interest to fail to adjust to changing circumstances. Positive action to raise and maintain employee standard of performance in their present jobs and to develop the qualities required for the future is one of the most vital management tasks.

1.4 2.2.2 PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS

A Performance management system (PMS) is a process that begins by translating overall institutional objectives into clear individual objectives that will be set as targets for individual employees on quarterly or annual basis (Amos et al., 2008). The performance targets of individual employee also set the agenda for supervisor and individual employees regarding the monitoring and reviewing of performance. It is those set performance targets and requirements that the satisfactory or non-satisfactory performance of employees will be determined. After such a determination, good performance may be rewarded and poor performance may be improved through appropriate improvement measures.

Several studies about PMS have been undertaken, obviously focusing on its different dimensions. However the necessary elements of PMS entail performance improvement and productivity to ensure effective and efficient service delivery.

A number of authors (Brown & Armstrong 1990, Rademan & Vos 2001, Furnham 2004, Harzard 2004) have leveled criticisms at PMS including among other things staff demotivation, unfair application, too subjective, unethical and very time consuming. Another noted criticism is that although it might be easy to devise a good performance management process on paper, the reality is that the system might actually be very difficult to implement (Brown & Armstrong 1999, Furnham, 2004).

A “text book” performance management system as conceived by Bevan & Thompson (1991) exhibits the following features; It has a shared vision of its objectives or a mission statement which it communicates to all its employees, It sets individual performance management targets which related both to operating unit and wider organizational objectives, It conducts regular process to identify training development and reward outcomes, It evaluates the effectiveness of the whole process and its contribution to overall performance to allow changes and improvement to be made (Bevan & Thompson 1991).

But Bevan & Thompson suggested that this text book definition placed too much emphasis on a top down approach particularly objective setting which can underplay the extent to
which training development and reward system are driven from the bottom up. This in turn raises questions about how easily corporate objectives can integrate with individual goals and the extent to which reward system which are introduced to support a PMS can frustrate the training and development objectives of the purpose. They also criticized the belief that a PMS model can fit all situations and suggested that many process issues involved in making performance management work were under emphasized.

Fletcher (1992) commented that the real concept of performance management is associated with an approach of creating a shared vision of the purpose and aims of the organization, helping each individual employee understand and recognize their part in contributing to them and in so doing manage and enhance the performance of both individuals and the organization. (Fletcher & William 1992, sited in Michael Armstrong 2000. Pp15).

Fletcher & William (1992) suggested four underlying principles of effective performance management namely: It is owned and driven by line management and not by the human resource department. There is an emphasis on shared corporate goals and values, Performance management is not a packaged solution but something that has to be developed specifically and individually for each particular organization. It should apply to all staff not just part of managerial group (Michael Armstrong, 2000).

2.2.3 LOCAL GOVERNMENT SERVICE DELIVERY

Local Government service delivery is the provision of basic public services such as education health roads and agricultural advisory services. Delivery of such basic public services is a devolved function of local governments. The measure of the performance of local governments largely depends on how well these basic services are delivered to the citizenry. (ACODE Public service delivery and accountability report series NO_3, 2013).Local Government service delivery is ensuring the provision of services to communities in a sustainable manner. Monitoring customer focused service delivery could therefore be a critical input means to affect quality service delivery in Local Government.

It is the responsibility for all responsible officers to manage the performance of their ministries, departments or local governments to ensure that performance of organizations and individuals directly contribute to improved service delivery and the attainment of national development objectives. (The Uganda Public Services standing orders, Jan 2010).
The Local Government Act 1997 places responsibility of delivery of most public services with the local governments who are supposed to have part of their budget funded by local revenue collection. They should ensure that their delivery is more responsive to local needs and through this limited resources can be used in the most efficient and effective manner.

Studies on the relationship of organizational missions and employee perceptions have also revealed that a good match between employee and organizational values predict original commitment and job satisfaction (O’Relly et al,1991). The latter are very critical to quality service delivery.

In this respect it is pertinent to confirm whether as indicated Local Government have made their entire staff aware of its mission, whether if they are aware of its mission, whether they are aware they identify with the mission and what effect this has had on service delivery. In which case there are notable positive effects, identify what mechanism is in place to uphold better service provision.

On the other hand the essence of Performance management lies in its professed ability to focus attention of organizational members on a common objective and galvanize them towards attainment of this objective (Balgun 2003).

It should be noted that once an organization has set a mission, vision and objectives it will be necessary to identify key output and targets that it wants to attain. Where organizational key outputs and performance targets are clear for all levels of operation, it becomes easier to make choice for improved service delivery and assess performance.

In his report, targets and results in Uganda, Williamson (2003) indicates that the appreciation of the relevance of performance targets and indicators by organizational staff especially politicians and managers lead to a feeling of ownership and induces use of performance information in decision making. These aspects are key determinants of responsiveness to client needs and provision of value for money services.

There is indication that staff involvement at all levels and in all aspect including the identifying of key outputs performance indicators and targets is of great importance in attainment of organizational performance targets set as well as sustainable program, implementation (Williamson 2003). It is for this reason that achieving ‘buy in’ of all stakeholders has become a critical factor in performance management. This is emphasized
further by Mabey (2005) who points out the fact that the result based management is getting a reasonable degree of consensus on key results to be achieved.

Before any service could or should be delivered it is necessary to find out whether policies have the desired impact and how citizens respond to them. The main tradition in the analysis of public service provision has been a study how people respond to policies and to gauge who are the beneficiaries from various public programmes.

Another key pre condition for service delivery is adequate funding. Although it is difficult to get numbers on a comparable basis, there is a wide range of spending levels across countries. An important theme of recent research on public service delivery is the need to spend resources on evaluating policies. Policy evaluation a critical part of effective public service provision where missions are too weak or not aligned and frontline actors cannot be made directly accountable by the beneficiaries.

2.3.1 SETTING PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT SERVICE DELIVERY

Setting performance objectives is based on the goal setting theory. This theory assumes that difficult goals lead to higher performance that people strive to simply ‘do their best’ (Locke & Latham, 1990, 2002). Baum & Locke, (2004), suggest that challenging goals positively affect performance of individuals. Blanchard Zigarmi & Zigarmi (1985) developed the ‘SMART’ goal system as an emphasis on the value of setting goals. The term SMART is a short form of specific measurable attainable Relevant and time bound.

Robust support has been demonstrated for the efficacy of setting performance objectives as an intrinsically motivating tool to enhance task performance at both individual and organizational level (Wright, 1991). Locke & Latham, (1990) suggest that goals are associated with emphasized performance because they mobilize effort, direct attention and encourage persistence and strategy development. This enhances and boosts productivity. It is worthy nothing however that employee productivity may be negatively affected if objectives are too easy to achieve (Locke and Latham, 1990, 2002).

On the other hand if the strategy used by the person is inappropriate then a difficult performance outcome goal leads to worse performance than an easy goal (Audia, Locke & Smith, 2000;). The results from objective setting depends critically on issues pertaining to goal commitment, task complexity, objective forming and team goal and feedback (Locke &
Latham, 2002; Wood & Locke, 1990, Reder and Wallin, 1984). Some researchers go as far as to suggest that objective setting without feedback is ineffective (Locke et al, 1981). A study conducted by Shalley, (1991); Staw and Boettger, (1990) criticizes objective setting by suggesting that strong emphasis placed on prescribed behavior may reduce occurrence of other behavior. For example an employee may be driven to achieve a particular target that he may abuse interpersonal relationship.

Locke & Latham (1990, 2002), showed that specific, high (hard) goals lead to higher level of task performance than do easy goals or vague, abstract goals such as exhortation to “do ones’ best” as long as a person is committed to the goal, has the requisite ability to attain it, and does not have conflicting goals there is a positive linear relationship goal difficulty and task performance. The scholars examined the behaviour effect of goal setting concluding that 90% of laboratory and field studies involving specific and challenging goals lead to higher performance than did the easy or no goals at all. However there are times when having specific goals is not a best option; this is the case when the goal requires new skills or knowledge. It is commonly referred to as the ‘Tunnel Vision’ which is a consequence of specific goals, when one is too focused on attaining a specific goal, they intend to ignore the need to learn new skills or acquire new information. In such a case the employee will be focused on achieving the set targets (being effective) without caring on how they achieve them. (Being efficient).

Participation in objective setting was in support by Kelly, Martocchio & Frank, and (1994) who stress the importance of participating in setting goals as a way of enhancing performance by increasing commitment. The same is also supported by Latham, Erez, & Locke, (1998). Much of the literature and underpinning theory supports the idea that goal setting should be a joint activity involving the individual and his line manager. Employees get more committed to the company if they are involved in setting their own performance targets. Participation brings about more acceptance and ‘buy-in’ of the set targets so the chances are higher that employees will strive to work towards achieving those targets.

Stanley, (2004) also states that MBO emphasizes the importance of a supervisor and employee working together in order to craft individual goals (Stanley, 2004).

Through objective setting, performance planning is necessary. Performance planning involves setting performance expectations, goals, how performance will be measured, and competencies needed to channel efforts of teams and individuals towards achieving
organizational objectives (Armstrong, 2001). By defining expectations in terms of targets, it means the measures will guide in managing. However these plans have to be done jointly by the supervisor together with the employee, but are the employees usually involved with their supervisors in planning goals and expectations. To carry out jointly planning there is need to define roles in terms of key areas, knowledge skill and behavior.

Pulaakos, (2004) advocates for performance planning to be done with the employees in order to set their performance expectations, including both the behavior employees are expected to exhibit and the results they are expected to achieve during the upcoming rating cycle. Behaviors and results expectations should be tied to the organization’s strategic directions and corporate objectives as behaviors are in reflecting how an employee goes about getting the job done through team work communication mentoring others etc.

Performance planning is often the most difficult phase in which involves identifying, clarifying, and agreeing upon expectations, identifying how results will be measured, agreeing on monitoring process and documentation of the plan. Managers need to ensure that that the objectives are a good representation of the full range of duties carried out by the employees, especially those everyday tasks that can take time but are often overlooked as significant accomplishments. Performance planning is seen as a collaborative effort involving both managers and employees during which they will; review employee job description to determine if it reflects the work that the employee is currently doing; identify and review links between employee job description, work plan and organization objectives and strategic plan; develop a work plan that outlines the tasks to be accomplished, expected results and measures that will be used to evaluate performance; identify key result areas determined by the organization’s strategic plan which is critical to the overall success of the position; identifying objectives that will help employee road map for design for each employee, specifically, detailing what they are expected to do.

The goal setting process should result in performance agreements which provides a basis for managing/planning performance throughout the year and for guiding improvement and development plans as advocated for by Armstrong (2006). The performance agreements as the performance planning stage defines expectations in terms of what an individual has to do to achieve in the form of objectives, how performance will be measured and the competencies needed to deliver the required results (Armstrong, 2006).
Targets may be so demanding in terms of effort required to achieve it but the emphasis in the output statement is on the fact that it is achieved rather than how it is achieved. Latham & Locke, (2006) concur that goals regulate the direction of our action by focusing attention on goal-relevant behavior and the intensity of our actions are dependent upon the importance of the goal to us. The more difficult a valued goal, the more intense our effort to attain it, and the more success we experience following attainment. A valued goal affects our persistence and commitment. People do not quit until the goal is attained and that goals encourage people to search for task relevant knowledge, though hard goals may be viewed as threatening hence limiting their effectiveness unless there is ownership and very often goals generate pressure(Kanfer, 1990) as cited by (Verhulp, 2006).

Employee goals should be aligned with the organizations business goals and consistence with the organization mission and vision statement through providing the employee with clear linkage on how their performance supports the organization’s performance objectives (Coleman, 2009). There is a need to find out if the employees understand the organizational goals and how these goals will contribute to local government service delivery

2.3.2 Performance measurement and Local government service delivery

Performance measurement is a process of collecting and reporting information regarding the performance of an Individual, group or organization. It can Involve looking at process / strategies in place as well as whether outcomes are in line with what was intended or should have been achieved Wikipedia. Neely et al., (1995) defines performance measurement as the ‘process of quantifying the efficiency and effectiveness of action’. The output of every organization depends on how well and how much the performance of the employee is appraised and evaluated.

According to Patricia &Bernard, (no date) in their guidebook for performance management argue that “performance measurement is the regular collection and reporting of date to track work and results achieved” several performance measurement systems are in use today, each with its own group of supporters. For example the balanced score card. Kaplan & Norton, 2004 defined a balanced score card as a framework to facilitate the translation of the business strategy into controllable performance measures, designed for business wide implementation. Performance measurement is a fundamental building block of total quality organization. Measuring performance is not a goal on itself. The final purpose is to use the performance information to better motivate managers for performance improvement and effective strategy.
implementation. (Kaplan & Norton, 2001). The purpose is to become a strategy focused organization. That is, an organization that puts strategy at the centre of all management processes. (Kaplan & Norton, 2001). A simple performance measurement framework which includes defining and understanding metrics collecting and analyzing data, prioritizing and taking improvement action (Patricia & Bernard consultants (no date)). There are two often quoted statements that demonstrate the importance of performance measurement; “when you can measure what you are speaking about and express it in numbers, you know something about it” (Kelvin), “you cannot manage what you cannot measure” (Anon). These demonstrate the importance of performance measurement which plays a critical role in identifying the tracing process against the goals, identifying opportunities for improvement and comparing performance against set targets.

Smith, (1995) highlights one of the threats in performance management and he calls it the funnel vision. This he defines as an excessive emphasis by management and the workforce on objectives that are quantified in the performance management scheme, at the expense of non-quantified aspects of performance. There is a danger that by tightly focusing on certain targets (Commonly those with easily measurable outcomes), other immeasurable are neglected and performance in these areas may suffer. This distorting effect may be heightened in situations in which certain targets achievements are rewarded, at the cost of those that are not (Weyman 1999).

Olsen, Zhou, Lee et al, (2009) that the linkages between performance measurement and strategy appear to be weak in practice. Schneiderman, (2006) emphasizes that a company’s strategy should be obvious when one looks at its measures but this is not always the case. Some authors also identify the lack of guidance and practical advice at the design and implementation phase of performance measurement tools (Tangen, 2004: Bourne, Millswillcox, Nilly & Platts2000). According to Meyer, (2007) and Neely & Kennerly (2000) performance measures change continuously and lose variance which makes it difficult to discriminate the good from the bad.

Performance measurement should be forward looking and concerned with performance improvement in service delivery if it’s to be useful. This theory has been widely studied by other scholars and this study in particular will get help from it by analyzing its applicability to PMS where target objectives have been set under which performance is measured.
2.3.3 Performance Feedback and local government service delivery

Feedback gained from measuring performance can help to present the opportunity to modify objectives, to reflect new insights and may highlight issues for improvement (Hale & Whitlam 1998, Portelli et al, 1997). The manner in which employees receive feedback on their job performance is a major factor in motivating employees to high productivity (Harris, 1998). The feedback intervention theory as suggested by Kluger & Denisi (1996), holds that feedback that focuses on self is likely to undermine performance. Because feedback can strike at the core of an employee’s personal belief system, it is critical to set conditions of feedback so that the rate is able to tolerate, hear and own discrepant information (Dalton, 1996).

According to Wise, (1998), it is very risky to give too complex feedback. The more complex the feedback the more likely recipients will distort it by focusing on results that match their self-perception and ignore contradictory ones. Roberts, (2003) states that to be maximally effective, there must be ongoing formal and informal performance feedback because employees and their supervisors often find feedback sessions both painful and demotivating. Davis & Lana, (1999) argue that practice of informal regular communication between supervisors and employee is far more desirable and more effective feedback should be timely, specific and behavioral in nature and presented by a credible source. Employees use feedbacks to develop accurate performance, set achievable goals, learn and apply new behavior and accomplished valued tasks. A number of authors claim that receiving feedback on performance level can provide positive reinforcement and improve performance (Robertson et al, 1999, cooper et al, 1994, Peter & Waterman 1982). Employees strive to increase their performance when they find out through feedback that their performance is below expectations (Matsul, Okada & Inoshita, 1983).

Furthermore, Algera, (1990) advises that objectives must be accompanied by feedback to be effective in improving performance. Pritchard et al (1988) emphasizes the significance of performance feedback by claiming that the positive effect of feedback on performance has become one of the most accepted principles in psychology.

However, people are not always receptive of feedback, sometimes it takes considerable negative feedback from a number of people over time to have a meaningful effect (Kaplan & Palus, 1994). Although feedback plays a role in influencing motivation it is likely that the form it takes will affect its efficacy and thus the effect on service delivery.
According to Elain (no date) for feedback to work well, it must be a two way communication and a joint responsibility of managers and employees. Research has shown that for feedback to have most value, it needs to be given in close proximity to the event. Effective feedback should provide immediate positive and developmental feedback in a private location, ask for the employee’s view about what could have been done differently, be specific about what behaviors were effective or ineffective, focus on what the person did or did not do, not personal characteristic, collaboratively plan steps to address development needs and offer help in addressing development needs and providing resources. (Wexley, 1986; Cederblom, 1982).

Scholars (Bandara&Cervone, 1983) argue that combination of goals and feedback is more effective than goals alone. For challenging goals to lead to high performance, they need to be accompanied by adequate, timely and responsive feedback. Employees strive to increase their performance when they find out through feedback that their performance is below expectation. (Matsui et al 1983)

Major gaps remain in feedback literature as to what feedback improves in regards to service delivery. According to the study by Kluger&Denisi, (1998) feedback may be viewed as a double edged sword. Care should be taken to know which feedback interventions increase performance and service delivery, and under which conditions. Bangert et al, (1991) using Meta-analysis studies found generally weak effects of feedback on achievement. The main conclusion is that feedback can improve performance if it is received mind fully. Conversely it can inhibit performance if it is encouraged mindlessly. Knowledge of results is very important and should be provided as it keeps people on track and provides a signal that a goal is still important and that it provides information and learning values. This study identified how often feedback on performance in regards to service delivery is given and how improvement or reward of performance is considered.

2.3.4 Performance Rewards and local government service delivery

Leopold, (2002) defines reward as a desired outcome of task. Reward management deals with strategies, policies and processes required to ensure that the contribution of people to the organization is recognized by both financial and non financial reward such as recognition, learning and development opportunities and increased job responsibility.
Bratton & Gold (2007) indicate that reward systems have three main objectives to attract new employees to the organization to elicit good work performance and to mention commitment to the organization. Rewarding performance involves recognizing employees, individuals, and members of teams for their performance and acknowledges their contributions towards achievement of organizations objectives.

According to Becker & Gerhart, (1992) compensation is associated with enhanced business performance. Reward and compensation systems motivate employees to maximize their efforts towards achievement of objectives and can deliver legal compliance, labor cost control, perceived fairness towards employees hence enhancement of employee performance to achieve high level of performance and customer satisfaction (Marie & Nick, 2002). Consistence with reinforcement theory, according to Robbins, (2001) rewarding a behavior with recognition immediately following that behavior is likely to encourage its repetition. However Armstrong, (2001) points out that caution has to be exercised in cause of status symbol as they are divisive. Virtually all informal rewards form zero sum game. One person’s recognition also implies an element of non-recognition of the other and the consequences of having winners and losers while almost inevitable needs to be carefully managed.

Therefore for feedback to be complete, reward and recognition of good performance has to be done while poor performance has to be aided with mentoring, training, so as to improve the levels of performance and hence improved service delivery. This derives to the reason why feedback has to be combined with reward and recognition in this study.

2.4 SUMMARY OF LITERATURE

From this literature, it is reviewed that the fundamental goal of performance management is to promote and improve delivery of services through improved employee performance which is a continuous process where managers monitor and review work objectives and employees over all contribution to the organization’s service delivery.

The fundamental goal of performance management is to promote and improve employees’ performance in service delivery which should be a continuous process where managers must work together with their employees to plan, monitor, and review work together with their employees’ overall contribution to the organization.
Whereas the goal setting theory is considered to be one of the most effective theories in performance management, it should be noted that specific and challenging goals do not necessarily lead to desirable outcomes but rather the result from goal setting depend critically on issues pertaining goal commitment (Helsin, Carson & VandeWalle, No date). There was a need to find out if the employees understand the organizational goals and how these goals would contribute to local government service delivery.

The literature also revealed to employees how to make decisions among alternative plans of behavior based on their expectancies of degree to which a given behavior will lead to a desired outcome. It is also here that literature showed PMS challenges which included systematic performance planning, identifying critical performance objectives for each staff member, so that they clearly understand their duties, defining what is expected of employees, and how their work is linked to the overall goals of the organization. There was also the challenge to review an employee’s overall achievement based on a clear understanding of his/her previously established performance objectives with constructive feedback both positive and negative. From this literature it can be concluded that performance management needs a holistic approach and purpose.

Armstrong and Baron (2005) suggest that a performance management system should be entirely developmentally focused in order to reduce the tension associated with allocating intrinsic and extrinsic rewards. The effective management of individual performance is the central requirement for the attainment of organizational goals. Not only is it important to set targets that encourage desired behavior, it is also important to make those targets appropriate for the employees.
CHAPTER THREE:
METHODOLOGY

3.0 Introduction
This chapter explains the methodology to be used in the study. It represents research design, study population, sample size and selection sampling techniques and procedures, data collection methods, data collection instruments, pre testing validity and reliability, procedure of data collection, measurement of variables (Qualitative studies) and data analysis.

3.1 Research Design
The study used a cross sectional survey and a case study research design. This design was preferred due to the limited time of the research period. Case study involves the Depth contextual analysis of similar situations in other organizations where the nature and definition of the problem happens to be the same as experienced in the current situation (Sekaran, 2003). Stake (1995), Yin( 2009, 2012), say case studies are bound by time and activity and researchers collect detailed information using a variety of data collection procedures over a sustained period of time (John, 2014).

In addition the study used both qualitative and quantitative methods using questionnaires and interview guide in order to acquire detailed information from a large number of respondents. The mixed approach was applied in sample selection and data collection. Qualitative methods were mixed with quantitative research to enable the researcher gather in-depth explanations to issues under study. (Punch, 2000).The combination of qualitative and quantitative approaches provides a more complete understanding of a research problem than either approach alone (John, 2014).

Amin (2003) supports the use of a mixed approach because multiple methods help research a problem from all sides, usage of different approaches also helps to focus on a single process and confirm the data occupancy. Qualitative research enables us to explore more new areas, deal with value laden questions, build theories and do in depth examination of phenomena. In addition, borrowing from Amin (2005), the qualitative approach will permit the researcher to go beyond statistical results since human behavior can best be explained in qualitative approach. While quantitative approach explains phenomena in numerical form. Quantitative
research allows the researcher to measure and analyze data. It also makes the research findings more objective (Amin, 2003).

The data was gathered in a specified time and used to answer the research questions at hand.

3.2 Study Population

The study consisted of a population of 308. The population consisted of the District Administrative heads (CAO, Deputy CAO, principal Assistant Secretary and assistant CAO), Heads of departments and other staff under different departments in the district and sub counties. The researcher believed that this category of people was knowledgeable enough representation about the area of study and would be able to avail the researcher with the necessary data about the study. In accordance with Ezani (2002) the study population should be able to provide the researcher with the necessary data.

3.3 Sample size

The study was based on a sample size of 169 that is drawn from a population of 308. The sample size of 169 was seen to be sufficient and this was chosen basing on the sample size determination table by Krejcie & Morgan, (1970) with a confidence interval of 95% and margin error of 0.5% to come up with a reliable sample size. Furthermore, Krejcie, Robert V, Morgan, & Daryle. W in their work (1970) asserts that, treat each sub group as a population and then use the table to determine the recommended sample size for each sub group.

Table 1 Distribution of population and sample size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Sample size</th>
<th>Sample technique</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.CAO, Deputy CAO, Principal Assistant CAO,</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Purposive sampling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.Heads of departments</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Purposive sampling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 OTHER district and Sub County staff</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>Simple random sampling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>169</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source; Bushenyi District staffing levels June 2014
3.3.2 Sampling Procedures and Techniques

Both probability and non-probability sampling strategies were used. Probability sampling strategy was used in order to give all employees an equal opportunity of being selected as study elements. Simple random sampling was used to allow everyone an equal opportunity of being selected under all departments. Best & Khan (2003) explain that this type of technique ensures that all the elements in the population have equal chances of being selected. This was done to eliminate bias and offer generalizability in study (Sekaran 2003).

The key informants were selected purposively because the researcher believed they would contribute expert knowledge and experience in relation to the study. These included the district administrative heads and heads of departments.

Mugenda & Mugenda (1999) purposive sampling focuses on particular characteristics of a population that are of interest which best enables the researcher to answer her research questions. Those people who are unsuitable for the sampling study or who do not fit the bill are always eliminated, so only the most suitable candidates remain.

3.4 Data collection methods

The study utilized both quantitative and qualitative data collection methods. Primary and secondary data was used. Primary data was obtained from interviews and questionnaire. Secondary data was obtained through the use of historical analysis of already existing literature on performance management systems and local government service delivery.

The research relied primarily on primary data. Primary data helps the researcher directly interact with the source of information and get the data that is original and not analyzed to suit specific premises, Amin (2003).

Secondary data was obtained from journals, books, previous researches done on performance management and service delivery, guidelines from the ministry of Local government (MOLG). The local government Act and Public service standing orders and other documents considered useful for the research were used.

According to Sekaran (2003) secondary data is considerably cheaper and faster than going original studies. It is very flexible and the best to use where a network of data achieves in which survey data files are collected and distributed is readily available.
3.5 Data collection instruments

The data collection instruments used in this study included questionnaire and interview guide.

3.5.1 Questionnaire

Self-administered questionnaires were used to gather data from District staff and Sub County staff. According to Mugenda & Mugenda (1999) the questionnaire is considered the most convenient way of collecting data from respondents because it is easy to administer and obtain data within a short time from a large number of respondents. The questionnaire consisted of close ended questions. The researcher was inspired by Oppenheim (1992) to use closed ended questions because they are easy to answer, process, without provisions for respondents to give explanations (John, 2014).

A five likert standardized questionnaire was used in data collection using rating scales of strongly agree (5), Agree (4), non committal (3), disagree (2), strongly disagree (1). As recommended by (Mugenda & Mugenda 2003)

3.5.2 Interview guide

The researcher used open ended face to face interviews to collect data qualitative from 10 key informants to obtain more detailed information concerning the study variables. Interviews were used because they have the advantages of ensuring probing for more information clarification and capturing facial expressions of the interviewees (Amin, 2005). In addition they also gave an opportunity to the researcher to revisit some of the issues that had been an oversight in other instruments and yet they are deemed vital for the study.

The key informants, who are regarded to be conversant with the subject under study, were interviewed by a designed interview guide; the obtained information was complemented with that obtained from the responses got from the questionnaires. Interviews helped the researcher to learn about things that were not directly observed and added an inner perspective to outer behavior. The researcher may easily pursue in-depth information around a topic and also follow up to some respondents to further investigate their responses (MC Namara, 1999).

The unstructured interviews were used to bring out some preliminary issues to the surface so that variables that needed further in depth investigation could be identified (sekaran 2003).
3.6 Data quality control

3.6.1 Validity of the instruments

For qualitative data the researcher ensured that the data recorded from interviews reflected the actual facts responses during data collection exercise. The researcher also made multiple measurements to check the truth of record with an expert to verify response consistency and customize questions so that only appropriate questions are asked, confirm responses against previous answers were appropriate and detect inadmissible responses.

The researcher tested the validity of the research instruments with view of ascertaining the appropriateness of the instrument and its ability to measure. The researcher ensured that result obtained from the analysis of the data actually represent the phenomenon under study. The researcher used professional experts in the field of performance management to assess the concept the instrument is trying to measure and was able to determine whether all items reflected accurately represented the concept under study. Content validity was established by subjecting the amended instrument to my academic supervisor for modification. Content validity was tested using SPSS. The study instrument was given to four experts to advice on the content with reference to very relevant and not relevant.

A pretest of the instrument in a time lapse of 4 weeks to establish consistence in responses was done. According to Amin (2005), test – retest reliability can be used to measure the extent to which the instrument can produce consistent scores when the same group of individuals is repeatedly measured under same conditions. The results from the pretest were be used to modify the items in the instrument. Lastly the content validity index was used and results that showed 0.7 and above were considered valid. Validity was determined using Content Validity Index (C.V.I). C.V.I=Items rated relevant by the judges divided by the total number of items in the questionnaire as shown hereinafter.

\[
CVI = \frac{\text{No. of items rated relevant}}{\text{Total no. of items}} = \frac{26}{32} = 0.81
\]

The instrument was therefore found to be valid, since the CVI of 0.81 is much greater than 0.7 as recommended by Amin (2005), that for the instrument to be valid, the C.V.I should be at least 0.7.
3.6.2 Reliability of the instruments

Reliability is the extent to which a research instrument yields consistent results across the various items when it is administered again at a different point in time (Sekaran, 2003). To establish reliability, the instruments were pilot-tested twice on the same subjects at a time interval of four weeks. According to Amin (2005), test-retest reliability can be used to measure the extent to which the instrument can produce consistent scores when the same group of individuals is repeatedly measured under same conditions. The results from the pretest were used to modify the items in the instruments.

To ensure reliability of quantitative data, the Cronbach’s Alpha Reliability Coefficient for Likert-Type Scales test was performed. In statistics, Cronbach’s alpha is a coefficient of reliability. It is commonly used as a measure of the internal consistency or reliability of a psychometric test score for a sample of examinees. According to Sekaran (2003) some professionals as a rule of thumb, require a reliability of 0.70 or higher (obtained on a substantial sample) before they use an instrument. Upon performing the test, the results should be 0.7 and above to be considered reliable. Below are the values of Cronbach’s alpha for each variable and for the entire instrument.

Below are the alpha Cronbach’s coefficients computed using SPSS

Table 2 Reliability Analysis findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1.4.1.1.1.1 Alpha Cronbach’s coefficient</th>
<th>1.4.1.1.1.2 No. items retained</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance objective setting</td>
<td>0.729</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance measurement</td>
<td>0.811</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance feedback and reward</td>
<td>0.788</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local government service delivery</td>
<td>0.747</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entire data collection tool</td>
<td>0.860</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Source: Primary Data

The table above shows a Cronbach’s alpha of 0.729 for performance objective setting with 5 items, 0.811 for performance measurement with 7 items, 0.788 for performance feedback and reward with 6 items, 0.747 for local government service delivery with 8 items and 0.860 for all the variables under study totaling 26 items. The tool therefore passed the test of reliability for each of the variables and for all the variables since they were all greater than 0.7, given that the level of Cronbach that is adequate is any value equal to or greater than 0.7 (Amin, 2005). The instruments were therefore suitable for data collection.

3.7 Data analysis

3.7.1 Quantitative data
Data was coded and entered in SPSS package for analysis. The dependent variable was entered against the independent variable for analysis. The results were summarized using descriptive statistics of frequencies in percentages for comparison for each statement to measures variables. Pearson’s product moment correlation was used to test the degree and direction of the relationships between the independent variables and the dependent variable. According to Sekaran (2005), a correlation study is most appropriate to conduct the study in the natural environment of an organization with minimum interference by the researcher and no manipulation. Further quantitative analysis was done in linear regression analysis to establish the extent to which the independent variables affected or impacted on the dependent variable.

3.7.2 Qualitative data
Qualitative data was analyzed using both thematic analysis and content analysis. This is because the two approaches complement each other since the theme emerges from the researcher and the description summaries from the respondent. Data was organized in themes according to objectives.

3.8 Measurement of variables
The relationship between performance management systems and local government service delivery was measured on a five point likert type scale (1.strongly disagree, 2-Disagree, 3-non commital,4.Agree and 5.Strongly agree). The choice of this measurement is that each point on the scale carries a numerical score which is used to measure the respondent’s attitude and it is the most frequent used summated scale in the study of social attitude.
According to Mugenda (1999) and Amin (2005), the likert scale is able to measure perception, attitudes, values and behaviors of individuals towards a given phenomenon.

3.9 Ethical considerations
The ethical considerations pursued during this study focused on what Neuman (2004) upholds in social research, namely: anonymity or confidentiality and informed consent of the respondents. During this study various respondents were approached and their permission to participate and provide information appropriately elicited. Assurance on confidentiality of information obtained was guaranteed. This was done by ensuring that all information sources remained anonymous unless a respondent wished to be quoted.
CHAPTER FOUR

PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF FINDINGS

4.0 Introduction

This chapter presents the analysis and interpretations of the study findings arising from the data collected from the respondents using questionnaires and interview guides. The first section presents the response rate and demographic characteristics followed by a presentation and analysis of the study findings in relation to specific objectives. The general objective of the study was to establish the relationship between the performance management systems and local government service delivery in Bushenyi District with specific objectives that looked at relationships between the independent variable and the dependent variables.

Data was presented using percentage tables from results obtained from Pearson’s correlation product moment and regressions were run to ascertain whether the independent variable had a relationship with the dependent variable and to determine the strength of the relationship.

4.1 Response Rate

A total of 155 questionnaires were distributed and a total of 135 questionnaires were fully filled and returned. In addition, 5 key respondents were interviewed successfully giving an overall response rate of 82.8% as shown in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Sample size</th>
<th>Actual Respondents</th>
<th>Response Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAO, Deputy CAO, &amp; Principle Assistant CAO</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heads of departments</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other district and Sub County staff</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>87.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>82.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary field data

Table1 shows a summary of the response rate for both the questionnaires and interview guides considered for this study. This response rate indicates that data was collected from a reasonable number of respondents; hence the collected data and the findings from it can be relied upon to give a framework within which conclusions can be made. According to
Mugenda and Mugenda (2009) a response rate of 50% is adequate for analysis and reporting; a rate of 60% is good and a response rate of 70% and above is excellent.

4.2 Demographic Characteristics of Respondents

In this section, data is presented on the socio-demographic composition of the sample obtained through the questionnaire, which included; Age, Qualification, Gender, Department and Experience at Bushenyi district local government. The purpose of collecting demographic data on respondents was to help in establishing the respondent sample characteristics and be able to form appropriate opinions about the research findings. The detailed analysis of these characteristics and interpretation are presented in the following subsections:

4.2.1 Distribution of respondents by Age

The study aimed at establishing the age of the respondents and below are the findings.

Table 2: Distribution of respondents by Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20-30</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>51.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>85.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-60</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary data

Table 2 shows that most of the respondents who participated in the study were in the age bracket 31 – 40 years, a representation of 46.7% of the respondents, 34.1% of them lay in the 41-50 years age bracket, 14.1% were aged 51 - 60 years and 5.2% were aged 20 – 30 years and. This implies respondents were mature enough and likely to give honest and accurate opinions which can be relied upon.
4.2.2 Distribution of respondents by qualification

The study also sought to establish the qualification of the respondents who participated in the study.

Table 3: Distribution of respondents by qualification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualification</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>42.2</td>
<td>49.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>49.6</td>
<td>99.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary data

Table 3 shows that most of the respondents in the study held postgraduate qualifications, 49.6%, followed by Degree holders, 42.2%, Diploma, 7.4% and PhD, 0.7%. This implies that most of the respondents were able to appropriately respond to questions put to them since they were well qualified.

4.2.3 Distribution of respondents by gender

The study aimed at establishing the gender of the respondents and below is the findings.

Table 4: Distribution of respondents by gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>52.6</td>
<td>52.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>47.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary data

Table 4 shows that the majority of the respondents, 52.6% were male, compared to 47.4% of them who were female. This implied that there was a good representation in terms of gender.
since there was just a margin difference hence opinions registered were representative enough in terms of gender.

### 4.2.4 Distribution of respondents by department

The study also sought to establish the department where each of the respondents worked and below is the findings.

**Table 5: Distribution of respondents by department**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Admin</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>37.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>53.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Works</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>78.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Primary data*

Table 5 shows that most of the respondents, 37.8% worked in the Administration department, while 21.5% were in other departments, 15.6% were in Finance, 13.3% were in Works and 11.9% were in Education. This implied that the response given were reliable as much of performance management system activities originate from the department of administration.

### 4.2.5 Distribution of respondents by experience

The study aimed at establishing the experience of the respondents and below is the findings.

**Table 6: Distribution of respondents by experience**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-3yrs</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-7yrs</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>37.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>above 10yrs</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>63.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Primary data*
Table 6 shows that majority of the respondents who participated in the study had experience of above 10 years, a representation of 63.0%, 14.8% had experience of 8-10 years, 11.9% had 1-3 years and 10.4% had 4-7 years. This implies that majority respondents were able to understand the gist of the study having been in serves for over ten years and knew the performance management system in place and therefore responses given were reliable.

4.3 Empirical findings on the relationship between the performance management systems and local government service delivery in Bushenyi district

The findings are presented objective by objective using descriptive statistics of frequencies, mean and standard deviation; and inferential statistics of correlation coefficients and linear regression analysis. All the variables were measured on a five point Likert scale ranging from 5-Strongly Agree (SA), 4 – Agree (A), 3 – Non-committal (NC), 2 – Disagree (D) and 1 - Strongly Disagree (SD). In this study Strongly Agree and Agree were taken to mean Agree while Strongly Disagree and Disagree were taken to mean Disagree. A mean of approximately 5 or 4 implies respondents’ agreement on the statement, while a mean of approximately 1 or 2 implies respondents’ disagreement on the statement and a mean of approximately 3 implies that the respondents were non-committal. A standard deviation of approximately equal to zero (0) indicates that the respondents’ opinions on a statement do not vary a lot, while a standard deviation far away from zero (0) indicates that the respondents’ opinion on a statement vary a lot.

4.3.1 Findings on local government service delivery in Bushenyi district

Local government service delivery in Bushenyi District was measured by use of questionnaires, where respondents were required to show their level of agreement or disagreement. A total of eight statements were used to measure local government service delivery in Bushenyi district and the findings are presented in the table below.
Table 7: Views of respondents on local government service delivery in Bushenyi district

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements measuring local government service delivery in Bushenyi district</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>NC</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The quality of goods and services delivered in my sector is satisfactory</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>65.2</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is timely delivery of services in my sector</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The beneficiaries of public services have easy access to these services</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>65.2</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The performance management system in place addresses the effectiveness of services in terms of quality and quantity</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>52.6</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community priority needs are considered during service delivery</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>67.4</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The performance management system in place addresses minimum cost implications for providing services</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>47.4</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clients are satisfied with services delivered by Local Government in terms of quality, Quantity and Cost</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>42.2</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clients are aware of the services they expect to receive</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Source:** Primary data

Table 7 shows that the majority of the respondents were in agreement on seven out of the eight statements used to measure service delivery in Bushenyi district; with 70.4% in agreement that the quality of goods and services delivered in their sector is satisfactory, while 62.3% were in agreement that there is timely delivery of services in their sector, 72.6% were in agreement that the beneficiaries of public services have easy access to these services and 60.7% were in agreement that the performance management system in place addresses the effectiveness of services in terms of quality and quantity.

An additional 80.0% were in agreement that community priority needs are considered during service delivery, while 54.1% were in agreement that the performance management system in place addresses minimum cost implications for providing services and 53.4% were in agreement that clients are aware of the services they expect to receive. This is in agreement with one of the key respondents x who stresses that, “*Each employee is given work tasks to accomplish with in a given period of time which brings efficiency and reduces costs of delivering services.*” There was however mixed reactions on whether clients are satisfied with services delivered by Local Government in terms of quality, Quantity and Cost, with 24.5% in agreement, while 25.9% were non-committal and 49.6% were in disagreement. The key respondent x says, “*clients are subjective in that they expect big quantities with in a shortest time yet the quantity of services are comparison to the available resources both human and finances.*” This justifies the reason why respondents had mixed reactions.

**4.3.2 To establish the relationship between setting performance objectives and local government service delivery in Bushenyi district**

In order to understand the attitudes and perceptions of the respondents on setting performance objectives, so as to establish whether there is a relationship between setting performance objectives and local government service delivery in Bushenyi district, respondents were asked to reveal their views setting performance objectives in relation to local government service delivery in Bushenyi district. The elicited responses from of five statements were summarized in table 8.
Table 8: Views of respondents on setting performance objectives;

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements measuring setting performance objectives</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>NC</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I participate in setting goals and performance</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>59.3</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expectations for my work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have a clear understanding of the level of</td>
<td>43.0</td>
<td>50.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>performance that is expected of me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I understand how my job roles contribute towards</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>58.5</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the achievement of strategic objectives of the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am given enough time to achieve the set individual</td>
<td>47.4</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>goals and objectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have the necessary skills and competencies to</td>
<td>50.4</td>
<td>42.2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>achieve the set individual goals and objectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary data

Table 8: shows that the majority of the respondents were in agreement on all the five statements used to measure setting performance objectives; with 91.9% in agreement that they participate in setting goals and performance expectations for their work, while 93.4% were in agreement that they have a clear understanding of the level of performance that is expected of them, 80.7% were in agreement that they understand how their job roles contribute towards the achievement of strategic objectives of the organization, 94.1% were in agreement that they are given enough time to achieve the set individual goals and objectives.
and 92.6% were in agreement that they have the necessary skills and competencies to achieve the set individual goals and objectives.

4.3.3. Testing hypothesis number 1

The researcher proceeded to statistically establish whether there was a relationship between setting performance objectives and local government service delivery in Bushenyi district. The researcher was guided by the following hypothesis:

**Hypothesis:** There is a significant relationship between setting performance objectives and local government service delivery.

The hypothesis was tested at a 95% level of significance (two-tailed) using Pearson’s correlation coefficient, which measured the degree and direction between setting performance objectives and local government service delivery. This means that the significance of correlation coefficients shall be tested using a p-value of 0.025 since they are two-tailed. The results are presented in the table below.

**Table 9: Correlation matrix for setting performance objectives and local government service delivery**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Variables</th>
<th>Setting performance objectives</th>
<th>Local Government Service Delivery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Setting Performance Objective</td>
<td>Pearson CorrelationSig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>1 .151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>135 .081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Government Service Delivery</td>
<td>Pearson CorrelationSig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>.081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>135 135</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9: shows that there is a very weak positive relationship between Setting performance objectives and Local Government Service Delivery, given that r=0.151. The relationship is however not statistically significant at 95% confidence level since p-value>0.025 (=0.081).

Regression analysis was further used to establish the extent to which setting performance objectives affects Local Government Service Delivery. The coefficient of determination was used and the results are presented in the table below.

### Table10: Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.151</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>.54902</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10: shows that the coefficient of determination (Adjusted R Square) is 0.015. This implies that Setting performance objectives accounts for 1.5% of the variance in Local Government Service Delivery.

To assess the overall significance of the model, analysis of variables (ANOVA) was done and the results presented in the table below.

### Table11: Analysis of Variables (ANOVA)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>.931</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.931</td>
<td>3.087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>40.090</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>.301</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>41.020</td>
<td>134</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), Setting performance objectives  
b. Dependent Variable: Local Government Service Delivery

In determining whether a model is significant, the decision rule is that the calculated p-value (level of significance) must be less than or equal to 0.05. Since the calculated p-value of 0.081 is greater than 0.05, the model was found not to be statistically significant (F=3.087, df = 1, p>0.05 (>=0.081)). This means that setting performance objectives has no significant effect on Local Government Service Delivery in Bushenyi district.
Conclusion

Research findings established that setting performance objectives does not have a statistically significant positive relationship with Local Government Service Delivery. The findings further affirmed that setting performance objectives does not have a significant effect on Local Government Service Delivery. Therefore the hypothesis that stated that: There is a significant relationship between setting performance objectives and local government service delivery was rejected and the alternate accepted.

4.4. To establish the effect of performance measurement on local government service delivery in Bushenyi district

In order to understand the attitudes and perceptions of the respondents on performance measurement, so as to establish whether performance measurement has an effect on local government service delivery in Bushenyi district, respondents were asked to reveal their views on performance measurement in relation to local government service delivery in Bushenyi district. The elicited responses from the seven statements were summarized in table below.
Table 12: Views of respondents on performance measurement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements measuring performance measurement</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>NC</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My supervisor regularly monitors my performance against set targets</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>51.1</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My supervisor conducts quarterly reviews on my performance</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>48.9</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During performance review meeting I always agree with my supervisor on action plans for the next period</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>48.1</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance appraisal is carried out annually</td>
<td>69.6</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The performance appraisal reflects my performance in regards to service delivery</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My performance is measured against the communicated targets</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>57.0</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have enough budgetary allocation to execute my targets</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary data

Table 12: shows that the majority of the respondents were in agreement on six out of the seven statements used to measure performance measurement; with 74.1% in agreement that their supervisor regularly monitors their performance against set targets, while 66.7% were in agreement that their supervisor conducts quarterly reviews on their performance and 71.1% were in agreement that during performance review meeting they always agree with their supervisor on action plans for the next period.

An additional 93.3% were in agreement that performance appraisal is carried out annually, while 81.5% were in agreement that the performance appraisal reflects their performance in regards to service delivery and 85.1% were in agreement that their performance is measured against the communicated targets. This was affirmed by administrators, who were the key...
informants that “performance appraisal in the organization is carried out annually and the targets for the next assessment period are agreed upon during the appraisal meeting.”

However, a majority of the respondents, 64.4% were in disagreement on whether staffs have enough budgetary allocation to execute their targets. This was confirmed by the key respondents x; who said that “the system over depends on external sources of funding which delays implementation and at times what is budgeted is not what is received.”

4.4. 1 Testing hypothesis number 2

The researcher proceeded to statistically establish whether performance measurement has a positive significant relationship with local government service delivery in Bushenyi district. The researcher was guided by the following hypothesis:

Hypothesis: Performance measurement has a positive significant effect on local government service delivery.

The hypothesis was tested at a 95% level of significance (two-tailed) using Pearson’s correlation coefficient, which measured the degree and direction between performance measurement and local government service delivery. This means that the significance of correlation coefficients shall be tested using a p-value of 0.025 since they are two-tailed. The results are presented in the table below.

**TABLE 13: Correlation matrix for performance measurement and local government service delivery**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Variables</th>
<th>Performance Measurement</th>
<th>Local Government Service Delivery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance Measurement</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Government Service Delivery</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.364*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).*
Table 13 shows that there is a weak positive relationship between Performance Measurement and Local Government Service Delivery, given that \( r = 0.364 \). The relationship is statistically significant at 95% confidence level since \( p \)-value < 0.025 (=0.000).

Regression analysis was further used to establish the extent to which Performance Measurement affects Local Government Service Delivery. The coefficient of determination was used and the results are presented in the table below.

**Table 14: Model Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.364</td>
<td>.133</td>
<td>.126</td>
<td>.51719</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14 shows that the coefficient of determination (Adjusted R Square) is 0.133. This implies that Performance Measurement accounts for 13.3% of the variance in Local Government Service Delivery.

To assess the overall significance of the model, analysis of variables (ANOVA) was done and the results presented in the table below.

**Table 15: Analysis of Variables (ANOVA)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>5.445</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.445</td>
<td>20.354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>35.576</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>.267</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>41.020</td>
<td>134</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), Performance Measurement  
b. Dependent Variable: Local Government Service Delivery

In determining whether a model is significant, the decision rule is that the calculated \( p \)-value (level of significance) must be less than or equal to 0.05. Since the calculated \( p \)-value of 0.000 is less than 0.05, the model was to be statistically significant (\( F = 20.354, \text{df} = 1, p < 0.05 (=0.000) \)). This means that Performance Measurement has a positive significant effect on Local Government Service Delivery.
Conclusion

Research findings established that Performance Measurement has a statistically significant positive relationship with Local Government Service Delivery. The findings further affirmed that Performance Measurement has a positive significant effect on Local Government Service Delivery. Therefore the hypothesis that stated that: Performance measurement has a positive significant effect on local government service delivery was accepted.

4.4.2 To assess the impact of performance feedback and reward on local government service delivery Bushenyi district

In order to understand the attitudes and perceptions of the respondents on performance feedback and reward, so as to assess whether performance feedback and reward have an impact on local government service delivery in Bushenyi district, respondents were asked to reveal their views on performance feedback and reward in relation to local government service delivery in Bushenyi district. The elicited responses from of six statements were summarized in table below.
Table 16: Views of respondents on performance feedback and reward

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements measuring performance feedback and reward</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>NC</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I get feedback on my performance after my appraisal</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>48.1</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I discuss with my supervisor ways of improving my performance toward improved service delivery</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>50.4</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is a reward system for good performance</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outstanding performance is always recognized</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non- performance is sanctioned in the organization</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>43.0</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am provided with the required training needs so as to improve my performance</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary data

Table 16 shows that the majority of the respondents were in agreement on three out of the six statements used to measure performance feedback and reward; with 53.3% in agreement that they get feedback on their performance after their appraisal, while 61.5% were in agreement that they discuss with their supervisor ways of improving their performance toward improved service delivery and 51.9% were in agreement that non-performance is sanctioned in the organization. In an interview with key respondents, it was revealed by respondent Y that “Non performance did not immediately lead to dismissal, but rather informed and helped to improve. Culpable behaviors like insubordination are punished while non culpable behaviors like lack of resources are not punished but helped on how to improve.”
However, the majority of the respondents were in disagreement on two out of the six statements measuring performance feedback and reward; with 63.7% in disagreement that there is a reward system for good performance and 54.8% in disagreement that outstanding performance is always recognized. This was confirmed further in an interview with one of the key informants who stated that; ‘The organization has a reward policy but has not yet been customized.’ that justifies why most respondents were in disagreement that there is a reward system for good performance. Further still on the statement if outstanding performance was always recognized, it was also confirmed by the key informant, that “During meetings some people are recognized by mention of names but issuance of certificates of recognition, be stickers or reserved parking is never done.”

There were mixed reactions on whether staffs are provided with the required training needs so as to improve their performance, with 46.7% in agreement, while 11.9% were non-committal and 41.5% in disagreement. This was cleared out by the key respondent that: “The organization makes training needs assessments of staff has always been made through questionnaires however a few return them for consideration. However a number of staff have been supported through capacity building.” This was supported by the high percentage of respondents with postgraduate qualifications who at the time of entry in the organization were degree holders and had been supported under the district capacity building grant.

4.2.3 Testing hypothesis number 3

The researcher proceeded to statistically assess whether performance feedback and reward have a positive significant impact on local government service delivery in Bushenyi district. The researcher was guided by the following hypothesis:

**Hypothesis:** Performance feedback and reward have a positive impact on local government service delivery.

The hypothesis was tested at a 95% level of significance (two-tailed) using Pearson’s correlation coefficient, which measured the degree and direction between performance feedback and reward and local government service delivery. This means that the significance of correlation coefficients shall be tested using a p-value of 0.025 since they are two-tailed. The results are presented in the table below.
Table 17: Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Variables</th>
<th>Performance Feedback and Reward</th>
<th>Local Government Service Delivery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance Feedback and Reward</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.435*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Government Service Delivery</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.435*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Table 17 shows that there is a weak positive relationship between Performance Feedback and Reward and Local Government Service Delivery, given that \( r=0.435 \). The relationship is statistically significant at 95% confidence level since \( p \)-value<0.025 (=0.000).

Regression analysis was further used to establish the extent to which Performance Feedback and Reward impacts on Local Government Service Delivery. The coefficient of determination was used and the results are presented in the table below.

Table18: Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.435</td>
<td>.189</td>
<td>.183</td>
<td>.50019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 18 shows that the coefficient of determination (Adjusted R Square) is 0.183. This implies that Performance Feedback and Reward accounts for 18.3% of the variance in Local Government Service Delivery.

To assess the overall significance of the model, analysis of variables (ANOVA) was done and the results presented in the table below.
Table 19: Analysis of Variables (ANOVA)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Regression</td>
<td>7.745</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.745</td>
<td>30.956</td>
<td>.000a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>33.275</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>.250</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>41.020</td>
<td>134</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In determining whether a model is significant, the decision rule is that the calculated \( p \)-value (level of significance) must be less than or equal to 0.05. Since the calculated \( p \)-value of 0.000 is less than 0.05, the model was to be statistically significant \( (F=30.956, \text{df} = 1, p<0.05 (=0.000)) \). This means that Performance Feedback and Reward has a positive significant impact on Local Government Service Delivery.

**Conclusion**

Research findings established that Performance Feedback and Reward has a statistically significant positive relationship with Local Government Service Delivery. The findings further affirmed that Performance Feedback and Reward have a positive significant impact on Local Government Service Delivery. Therefore the hypothesis that stated that: Performance feedback and reward have a positive impact on local government service delivery was accepted.
CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, DISCUSSION, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.0 Introduction

This chapter presents the summary, discussions, conclusions and recommendations got from the research findings guided by the research general objective and specific objectives. The specific objectives were as follows: To establish the relationship between objective setting and local government service delivery; To establish the effect of performance measurement on local government service delivery; To assess the impact of performance feedback and reward on local government service delivery.

5.1 Summary of the findings

The main objective of the study was to establish the relationship between the performance management systems and local government service delivery in Bushenyi District. There were three independent variables, namely; setting performance objectives, performance measurement and performance feedback and reward, while local government service delivery was the dependent variable. Data was analyzed by use of frequencies, Pearson’s product moment correlation coefficients and linear regression analysis and findings from the study indicated that:

5.1.1 To establish the relationship between setting performance objectives and local government service delivery

The findings indicated that setting performance objectives does not have a statistically significant positive relationship with local government service delivery. The p-value for setting performance objectives is greater than 0.025 (=0.081), given r=0.151, the researcher therefore rejected the relationship as statistically significant. Furthermore findings from regression analysis indicated that setting performance objectives does not have a significant effect on local government service delivery. This implies that improvement in setting performance objectives does not necessarily translate into improvements in local government service delivery. Similarly, decline in setting performance objectives does not necessarily translate into a decline in local government service delivery.

5.1.2 To assess the effect of performance measurement on local government service delivery

The findings indicated that performance measurement has a statistically significant positive relationship with local government service delivery. The p-value for performance
measurement is less than 0.025 (=0.000), given \( r=0.364 \), the researcher therefore accepted the relationship as statistically significant. Furthermore findings from regression analysis indicated that performance measurement has a significant effect on local government service delivery. This implies that improvement in performance measurement translates into improvements in local government service delivery. Similarly, decline in performance measurement translates into a decline in local government service delivery.

5.1.3 To assess the impact of performance feedback and reward on local government service delivery

The findings indicated that performance feedback and reward has a statistically significant positive relationship with local government service delivery. The p-value for performance feedback and reward is less than 0.025 (=0.000), given \( r=0.435 \), the researcher therefore accepted the relationship as statistically significant. Furthermore findings from regression analysis indicated that performance feedback and reward has a significant effect on local government service delivery. This implies that improvement in performance feedback and reward translates into improvements in local government service delivery. Similarly, decline in performance feedback and reward translates into a decline in local government service delivery.

5.2.0 Discussion of the findings

In this section the researchers discusses the findings of the study according to the study objectives.

5.2.1 To establish the relationship between setting performance objectives and local government service delivery

The findings indicated that setting performance objectives does not have a statistically significant positive relationship with local government service delivery and furthermore that setting performance objective does not have a statistically significant effect on local government service delivery. This is in agreement with some scholars such as Staw & Boettger, (1990) who criticize objective setting by suggesting that strong emphasis placed on prescribed behaviour may reduce occurrence of other behaviour. For example an employee may be driven to achieve a particular target that may abuse interpersonal relationship. The key moderators of goal setting are feedback, which people need in order to track their progress. Commitment to the goal which is enhanced by self efficacy and viewing the goal as important; task complexity, to the extent that task knowledge is harder to acquire on
complex tasks and situational constraints. With regard to Brown, et al (2005), role overload (excess work without the necessary resources to accomplish a task) moderates goal effects: goals affected performance only when overload was low.

Setting performance objectives was derived from the goal setting theory by Locke & Latham, (1990, 2002). This theory assumes that difficult goals lead to higher performance that people strive to simply do their best. According to this theory, goal setting involves establishing specific, measurable, achievable, realistic and time bound (S.M.A.R.T) goals.

Most respondents agreed with the statement that “they participated in setting goals and performance expectations for my work.” A goal becomes more specific through quantification and enumeration (should be measured) such as by defining certain tasks that must be completed. Defining objectives is not sufficient in itself. There has to be some agreement and understanding of how performance is to be measured, and this may be problematic. (Fenwick, 2004). Much of the literature and underpinning theory supports the idea that goal setting should be a joint activity involving the individual and his or her line manager. However the idea of employee participation in the process is essentially a western concept which does not readily transfer across cultures; particularly those with high power distance. (Fenwick, 2004).

Results show that employees have a clear understanding of the level of performance that is expected of them. To elicit some specific form of behaviour from employees, it’s important that employees have a clear view of what is expected of them. The performance goals become vital and important because it facilitates an individual in focusing his or her effort in a specified direction. In any business, goal setting encourages participants to put in substantial effort. Service delivery is therefore increased as long as expectations of our roles are defined.

It should be observed that managers cannot constantly keep track of employee’s work on a constant basis as the goals become an important tool since they have the ability to function as self regulatory mechanisms that help employees to optimize tasks. In this regard, Locke & Latham, 2012, identify four mechanisms through which goal setting can affect individual performance and these are.

1-Goals focus attention towards goal relevant activities and away from goal irrelevant activities.
2-Goals serve as energizers. Higher goals induce effort, while low goals, and induce less effort.

3-Goals affect persistence; constraints with regard to resources affect work pace.

4-Goals activate cognitive knowledge and strategies that help employees cope with the situation at hand.

In addition with the above, results show that defined objectives for employees were measurable in terms of time resources, quality and quantity. This can be corroborated with Price, (2000) who suggested that successful performance management must include individual objectives and goals that are clearly defined and measurable.

The factors discussed above, Are slightly in contrast with the study findings which point out a weak positive relationship between performance management systems and local government service delivery.

5.2.2 To assess the effect of performance measurement on local government service delivery

The findings indicated that performance measurement has a statistically significant positive relationship with local government service delivery and furthermore, that performance measurement has a statistically significant effect on local government service delivery. Performance measurement being a process of quantifying the efficiency and effectiveness of action, it’s important to note that without targets a manager has nothing to measure because goals set the standard against which service delivery can be measured.

The majority of employees agreed that their performance was regularly monitored against set targets by their supervisors. Related to this statement are; Rademan & Vos (2001) pointed out one of the advantages of continuous review that it ensures that staff perceive the process to be fair. This can be corroborated with the statements where most of the respondents agreed that performance review was conducted on a quarterly basis towards achievement of set targets. Regular reviews simplify the work of the manager when employees accept their performance results because they can work on their weaknesses in order to boast their service delivery levels.

However it is common criticism that performance measurement is unfair. In line with Chan & Renee (1997) conclude that having a fair performance measurement process within
the organization shows respect and value for the individual employee. They consider three principles in form of engagement (allowing communication and discussion around ideas), explanation (after a decision has been made), feedback to employees as to why a decision was taken, and expectation clarity (clear targets and milestones that radiate from decision).

Brown & Armstrong (1998) support the view that it is important that what is being managed can actually be measured in a consistent and accurate manner. It is important that employees know what ever is being discussed with their managers, would be treated with strictest of confidence and also ensure that the employee is assisted in acquiring the newly required knowledge of skill to perform better in service delivery.

Basically if performance is measured regularly, objectively and if employee’s development goals are put into consideration among other factors, service delivery is likely to increase. This shows that performance measurement has a significant impact on service delivery.

5.2.3 To assess the impact of performance feedback and reward on local government service delivery;

The findings indicated that performance feedback and reward have a statistically significant positive relationship with local government service delivery and furthermore that performance feedback and reward have a statistically significant effect or impact on local government service delivery. It is important that employees who fail to achieve as expected are not made to feel inadequate particularly if there are extenuating factors such as lack of funding, poor communication, and personnel among others. At the end of each assessment period inadequacies should be discussed and the organisation offers support to the employees particularly in terms of relevant resources to do the job properly and with identification of areas for development. Only when the organization has fulfilled their duty to the employee can performance be laid at the feet of the employee.

Good performance feedback acts as a boosting agent which utilizes an employee’s ability to perform next time. Feedback is the only process through which employees get a chance to improve themselves and levels of service delivery. It is the responsibility of the managers to give developmental reviews which the employees should undertake to improve their performance in service delivery. It is important to present feedback in a way that can be accepted by employees to adapt to the required behaviour. Therefore feedback helps
managers to keep track of performance to allow employees to see how effective they have been in attainment of their goals.

Goal setting and feedback go hand in hand because without feedback goal setting is unlikely to work. Feedback is the perfect accompaniment to goal setting. The two are so intertwined and so fundamental that the very first pocket blog started with an important experiment by Albert Bandura & Daniel Cervone (2015) that showed the power of these two in combinations.

Several motivational theories attest that positive feedback is more effective for motivating goal pursuit than negative feedback because it increases outcome expectancy of goal and perceived self efficacy of the pursuer. According to theoretical approach, positive feedback increases people’s confidence that they are able to pursue their goals and their expectations of success. Because feedback is effective, various social agents use positive feedback to encourage individuals to internalise or integrate new goals to their self concept with the expectation that these individuals will then be more committed to pursue the goal on subsequent occasions. (Ray & Deci 2000). Locke, assert that setting goals in itself is not sufficient without feedback on performance. In the opinion of the researcher feedback should be provided on strategies followed to achieve the goals and the final outcomes achieved as well. Feedback on strategies used to obtain goals is very important especially for complex work, because challenging goals put focus on outcomes rather than on performance strategies so they impair performance which affects service delivery. Feedback gained from measuring performance was found in tandem with findings that helped to present an opportunity to modify objectives to reflect new insights and may highlight issues for improvement. (Hale & Whitlam, 1998; Portelie et al, 1997). A strong feedback culture in an organization is one when individuals continuously receive solicit and use formal or informal feedback to improve their performance towards service delivery.

Feedback goes hand in hand with reward as well as confirmed by Armstrong (2001), who urges that people not only need to know how well they have achieved their objectives or done their work, but also that their achievements are appreciated. He further argues that recognition takes the form of praise, office parties, long service awards, hand written note email message acknowledging something positive, all of which is part of reward system. Other actions may include promotion and other and other status symbols.
Results show that there is a general dissatisfaction with the way performance rewards are administered in local governments. Respondents disagreed on the statement that the organisation had a reward system and disagreed that good performance was always recognised. However respondents agreed to the statement that non-performance was sanctioned in the organization.

According to Becker & Gerhart (1992) compensation is associated with enhanced business performance. All employees should know what is expected of them and how they would be rewarded for services they render. Once expectations have been clarified and individual goals outlined and integrated, the individual needs to be motivated to achieve these goals and one way is through rewards. It is important to give credit where credit is due. When an individual or staff members are performing well or above level, it is important to acknowledge this and give it necessary recognition. Giving the necessary acknowledgment for good performance encourages and promotes improved service delivery. The significance of the impact of feedback reward and recognition cannot be denied so the reward system needs to be customised in order to increase the strength of the impact of reward and recognition on local government service delivery.

5.3.0 Conclusions.

The study made the following conclusions

5.3.1 To establish the relationship between setting performance objectives and local government service delivery

Based on the findings of the study, it is concluded that setting performance objectives is not statistically significantly related to local government service delivery. However, setting performance objectives is seen to be key to all other performance management variables that have got significant impact on local government service delivery. This therefore implies that if setting performance objectives is improved, local government service delivery in Bushenyi district will consequently improve. There is therefore need for the system to come up with a different way of addressing the setting of performance objectives in order to appreciate its effect on local government service delivery in Bushenyi district.
5.3.2 To assess the effect of performance measurement on local government service delivery

The study concluded that performance measurement has a significant relationship with local government service delivery and further that performance measurement has a significant effect or impact on local government service delivery. This therefore implies that if performance measurement is improved, local government service delivery will consequently improve. There is therefore a need to continuously improve on performance measurement in order to improve on local government service delivery in Bushenyi district.

5.3.3 To assess the impact of performance feedback and reward on local government service delivery

The study concluded that performance feedback and reward is significantly related to local government service delivery and further that performance feedback and reward have a significant effect or impact on local government service delivery. This therefore implies that if performance feedback and reward are improved, local government service delivery will consequently improve. There is therefore a need to continuously improve on performance feedback and reward in order to improve on local government service delivery in Bushenyi district.

5.4. Recommendations

During the course of the study, the researcher identified gaps. The following are some of the recommendations in relation to findings and conclusions

Based on the findings of the study, it is concluded that setting performance objectives is not statistically significantly related to local government service delivery. However, setting performance objectives is seen to be key to all other performance management variables that have got significant impact on local government service delivery. This therefore implies that if setting performance objectives is improved, local government service delivery in Bushenyi district will consequently improve. There is therefore need for the system to come up with a different way of addressing how setting performance objectives could best be done in order to be able to have relations or finally an effect on local government service delivery in Bushenyi district.
The researcher therefore recommends that objectives on which local government service delivery will be evaluated should be established through process of consultation between the individual and supervisor and should be clearly documented in form of performance agreements for approval by both subordinates and supervisors. The performance agreement should specify targets that are S.M.A.R.T (specific, measurable, achievable, realistic and time bound) so that employees feel a sense of accomplishment as it is easy to check whether a target has been attained.

Performance should be monitored and assessed regularly in order to modify the objectives and targets to achieve a level of service delivery. Supervisors should liaise with their staff monthly to review their performance agreements for timely corrective measures. Supervisors should provide timely, constructive and systematic feedback on subordinates’ performance and level of service delivery over a specific period of time. When providing feedback, focus should be put on behavior and not on the person and should be given continuously.

The two parties (supervisor and employee) need to discuss ways of improving performance and both parties sign in acceptance of what has been discussed.

The reward system should be customized in the system and communicated to staff. It is crucial to have systems in place to identify, recognise, reward and retain their top performers to achieve sustained service delivery.

It is important to recognize outstanding performance and sanction non-performance.

5.5. Limitations of the study

Although this research was carefully prepared, it had some short comings. The following were the study limitations:

First of all, the research was conducted in only one district of Bushenyi in western Uganda. The findings may therefore not be generalized to all districts of Uganda.

Secondly, the research considered only objective setting, performance measurement and performance feedback and reward. There are many other factors that could have been included in the study to examine how they affect local government service delivery.

The researcher was limited by the amount of information received. This was attributed to the fact that some of the respondents were hesitant to give information to a third party because they were uncertain about the consequences of releasing confidential information. However
the researcher managed to convince the respondents by availing them with the UMI field attachment letter which indicated that data collected was purely for academic purpose.

5.6.1 Contributions of the study
The study made some contribution to the body of knowledge in the field of local government service delivery. Theoretically the study summarized the relationship between setting performance objectives, performance measurement and performance feedback and reward and local government service delivery and its proponents, and influence as interconnected and interrelated.

Conceptually all the dimensions of the dependent variable and independent variables were adapted from the scholars in Chapter one, indicating that the study labored to link related concepts of setting performance objectives, performance measurement and performance feedback and reward and local government service delivery in Bushenyi district.

The following are the specific contributions of the study.

1. A number of studies have been done in relation to local government service delivery. However, no such study has been found to have been carried out on how setting performance objectives, performance measurement and performance feedback and reward in relation to local government service delivery. This study has therefore made tremendous contribution in that area.

2. This study has contributed to policy changes and the direction in the area of local government service delivery. It can be a reference point for local governments and central government and other policy makers especially in regards to improvements in local government service delivery.

5.7. Further Research should be done on:
The study concentrated on the relationship and effect of setting performance objectives, performance measurement and performance feedback on local government service delivery in Bushenyi district. However other factors like, government policies and corruption were not part of this study. These are possible areas of further research. Specifically the following should be further study perspectives;

The same study should be replicated in other districts of Uganda.

A study should be carried out on the effect of corruption on local government service delivery.

A study should be carried out on the effect of government policies of financial centralization on local government service delivery.
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APPENDIX 2

Table for determining sample size from a given population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>2800</td>
<td>338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>3500</td>
<td>346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>4000</td>
<td>351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>1100</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>4500</td>
<td>354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>1300</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>6000</td>
<td>361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>1400</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>7000</td>
<td>364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>8000</td>
<td>367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>9000</td>
<td>368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>1700</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>10000</td>
<td>370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>15000</td>
<td>375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>20000</td>
<td>377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>30000</td>
<td>379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>2100</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>40000</td>
<td>380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>2200</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>50000</td>
<td>381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>2300</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>75000</td>
<td>382</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INTRODUCTION

Dear Respondent,

I am a student on a masters Degree at UMI in management (Public Administration). This Research is being undertaken as part of the requirements for the award of a masters Degree in management studies in public administration at UMI Institute. The study topic is performance management systems and local government service delivery in Uganda. You are one of the few selected participants to this research project, so I kindly request for your honest opinion and all the information given will be treated with the highest level of confidentiality and shall only be used for study purposes.

Name Tumwebaze Robinah  
Reg: 13/MMS/PAM/007  
Research student

Section A: Respondents Personal Data

1. Gender  
   Male □  Female □

2. Age Bracket

   18-30  31-43  44-56  57-69  70 and above

3. Qualification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Certificate</th>
<th>Diploma</th>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Masters</th>
<th>PHD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

4. Department

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Others specify</th>
<th>Finance</th>
<th>Administration</th>
<th>Human Resource</th>
<th>Community based</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

5. Period in service with local government

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1-3 years</th>
<th>4-6 years</th>
<th>7-9 years</th>
<th>10-12 years</th>
<th>13 and above years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

6. Management level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top management</th>
<th>Middle management</th>
<th>Lower management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

For section B to E, Please tick a statement that you agree with on a scale of 1-5 as described in the key table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree (SA)</th>
<th>Agree (A)</th>
<th>Non committal (NC)</th>
<th>Disagree (D)</th>
<th>Strongly Degree (SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**B. Objective setting**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>I participate in setting goals and performance expectations for my work</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I have a clear understanding of the level of performance that is expected of me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I understand how my job roles contribute towards the achievement of strategic objectives of the organization.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I am given enough time to achieve the set individual goals and objectives.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I have the necessary skills and competencies to achieve the set individual goals and objectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**C. Performance Measurement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>My supervisor regularly monitors my performance against set targets</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>My supervisor conducts quarterly reviews on my performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>During performance review meeting I always agree with my supervisor on action plans for the next period.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Performance appraisal is carried out annually</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The performance appraisal reflects my performance in regards to service delivery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>My performance is measured against the communicated targets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I have enough budgetary allocation to execute my targets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### D. Performance feedback, reward and Recognition

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I get feedback on my performance after my appraisal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I discuss with my supervisor ways of improving my performance toward improved service delivery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>There is a reward system for good performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Outstanding performance is always recognized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Non-performance is sanctioned in the organization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>I am provided with the required training needs so as to improve my performance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### E. Service delivery

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The quality of goods and services delivered in my sector is satisfactory.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>There is timely delivery of services in my sector.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The beneficiaries of public services have easy access to these services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The Performance management system in place addresses the effectiveness of services in terms of quality and quantity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Community priority needs are considered during service delivery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>The performance management system in place addresses minimum cost implications for providing services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Clients are satisfied with services delivered by Local Government in terms of quality, Quantity and Cost.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Clients are aware of the services they expect to receive.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 4

INTERVIEW GUIDE

A. SETTING PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT SERVICE DELIVERY

1. What performance management system does the organization have in place?

2. Is this performance management system known to the employees? If yes how is it communicated to the employees?

3. Does the organization have a shared vision of objectives if yes state it?

4. How is it communicated to the employees?

5. What measures are in place to ensure / enable the performance of individuals is aligned to the vision of objectives.

6. How has the establishment of performance agreements increased the level of service delivery in the organization?

7. What performance competencies are considered during objective setting?

B. PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT SERVICE DELIVERY

9. What performance measures does the organization have in place?

10. What aspect of service delivery is emphasized during performance measurement?

11. How does the organization review the performance of its employees?

12. How often is performance review done?

13. How does monitoring and evaluation of performance ensure realistic achievement of targets and standards of service delivery?
C. PERFORMANCE FEEDBACK AND REWARD

14. Do you provide feedback to individual staff about their actual performance? If yes, how is it done?

15. Does the organization have a reward policy? If yes how I it.

16. How is outstanding performance recognized?

17. What corrective principles are applied to employees who are not performing to the expectations of the organization?

18. How has performance feedback and reward linked to local government service delivery.

d. LOCAL GOVERNMENT SERVICE DELIVERY

20. What description of service delivery are clients entitled to?

21. Are clients aware of the quality of services they are expected to receive? If yes, how has this been communicated to them?

22. How has the present performance management system in place addressed specific service delivery aspects as under listed?

   a) Cost efficiency

   b) Effectiveness of service

   c) Accessibility of service to beneficiaries.

   d) Client satisfaction

23. In case of any gaps what mechanism is in place / could be put in place to adjust the performance management system to address local government service delivery requirements?

24. There has been an introduction of new performance appraisal system, where senior managers are required to sign annual performance agreements, what has this got to do with Local Government service delivery?
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