

OPPORTUNITIES AND CHALLENGES OF RESULTS-BASED PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT IN THE PUBLIC SECTOR***Yusadar Waruwu**

Faculty of Administration Science, University of Indonesia, Depok, West Java, Indonesia

Received 10th November 2023; **Accepted** 15th December 2023; **Published online** 26th January 2024

Abstract

Performance management in the public sector reflects a framework that not only assists government organizations in achieving their strategic goals and missions optimally through resource utilization but also enhances the quality of public services and strengthens interactions between the government and the public, thereby increasing transparency. In recent years, the public sector worldwide has shown a growing interest in adopting a Results-Based Performance Management approach to improve accountability, transparency, and overall achievement of better results. However, organizational culture change and the implementation of this performance management concept in the public sector face various challenges that require in-depth understanding. This research aims to analyze opportunities, identify challenges, and provide recommendations for overcoming challenges and maximizing opportunities arising from the implementation of results-based performance management. This study employs a qualitative analysis method with a descriptive-analytical approach, involving a comprehensive literature review, case studies of public sector organizations that have implemented Results-Based Performance Management, and interviews with key stakeholders. The research findings identify that the implementation of Results-Based Performance Management in the public sector presents several significant opportunities, although accompanied by specific challenges. A profound understanding of these opportunities and challenges can aid organizations in designing more effective implementation strategies, supporting sustainable performance transformation, and enhancing positive impacts on organizational goal achievement.

Keywords: Organizational Learning, Public Sector, Performance Management, Result-Based Performance Management, Public Administration and Management, Public Service Organization.

INTRODUCTION

Performance management in the public sector is a crucial foundation and core element in the sustainability and effectiveness of government organizations. In the context of the dynamics of modern and complex societies today, societal demands, technological advancements, and stakeholder expectations place tremendous pressure on government institutions not only to focus on providing quality services but also to become more accountable, efficient, and responsive to the people's needs. Performance management also useful to optimizes resource utilization, improves the quality of public services, strengthens the bond between the government and the community, and enhances transparency. Through this approach, the government can enhance the quality of life for the public, build trust, and achieve desired outcomes. In this context, results-based performance management becomes a crucial paradigm as global challenges and increasingly complex public issues have driven public organizations to renew their approaches to performance management. According to Evan M. Berman, performance is essential to ensure that policies and programs correlate with the goals expected by society, communities, and the nation. Thus, the performance of public servants must ensure more effective outcomes. Furthermore, Berman emphasizes the importance of equality or justice as a fundamental factor in the public sector, and public management can provide efficiency, good speed, and benefits that may outweigh the costs. Moreover, George R. Terry, in his book *Principles of Management*, explains that management is the process of using scientific and artistic

methods to apply the functions of planning, organizing, directing, and controlling to a group of individuals equipped with resources/production factors to achieve goals effectively and efficiently. Therefore, performance management in the public sector should not be considered merely a supporting system or administrative tool. It is a crucial strategy in achieving the goals and challenges faced by public organizations. Along with the complexity of the environment and the evolving demands of society, public organizations need to adopt a holistic and results-oriented performance management approach. However, results-based performance management is not without its challenges. These aspects need to be carefully considered to optimize the performance of public organizations in line with set goals and values. In this context, understanding the opportunities and challenges of results-based performance management becomes crucial to comprehend the impacts of existing opportunities and challenges. How to mitigate or organize these challenges so that public organizations can provide good effectiveness and efficiency is equally important. This article will discuss these challenges and opportunities for results-based performance management. By understanding these opportunities, public sector institutions or organizations can use them as space or opportunities to improve the quality of public services. Similarly, by understanding the weaknesses or challenges of results-based performance management, a public organization can provide specific planning or mitigation to address these challenges. Thus, performance management in the public sector will yield more beneficial results. Understanding the dynamics will provide in-depth insights into the key success factors of Results-Based Performance Management in the public sector. Therefore, this article is not only descriptive but also analytical and practical in providing a real contribution to

*Corresponding Author: *Yusadar Waruwu*

Faculty of Administration Science, University of Indonesia, Depok, West Java, Indonesia

the understanding of performance management practices in the public sector.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Performance Management

Performance Management is a holistic approach that plays a crucial role in optimizing productivity and success for organizations, both in the private and public sectors. In the era of globalization and intensifying competition, these organizations need to implement effective performance management practices to ensure that human resources within their organizations can work efficiently and effectively. For Evan M. Berman (2023), Performance Management is highly beneficial for strategically aligning institutional thinking towards key performance goals and attempting to guide decision-making in policy processes that contribute significantly to learning and improvement. According to Evan, this process becomes a sustainable cycle in performance measurement for three key aspects: effectiveness, efficiency, and equity. Evan realizes that performance management cannot be separated from logical thinking as a strategy in achieving goals. The same understanding is emphasized by Herman Aguinis (2013), who explains that performance management is a process involving the identification, measurement, management, and development of individual or team performance in achieving organizational goals. This includes a continuous and sustainable cycle, including goal setting, continuous feedback, and employee development. Aguinis's definition may lean more towards the private sector, but it is not precluded from being interpreted in the context of performance management in the public sector. On the other hand, for Michael Armstrong and Angela Baron (1998), Performance Management is an integrated approach to ensure that human resource management and business management effectively contribute to the achievement of organizational goals. Their understanding focuses on the human resource management approach to contribute productively and effectively. From the three perspectives related to performance management above, no fundamental differences are found. However, it can be concluded that the main focus of performance management is as a strategic tool and framework that enables an organization to plan, implement, and evaluate individual and collective performance.

Public Sector

Performance management in the public and private sectors does not have a significantly distant difference. Both have the same correlation with the goals they aim to achieve, namely how performance can be measured, organized effectively, and the attainment of set objectives. In fact, not all experts on performance management provide specific definitions about this. However, some literature provides insights into how the concept of Performance Management can be interpreted and applied in the public sector. For instance, Harry Hatry, an expert in public sector evaluation and performance, once offered a perspective on the importance of measuring and improving performance in the public sector. He emphasized the significance of performance measurement to enhance the effectiveness of public organizations and provide better services to the community (Hatry, 2006). According to Hatry, there are four fundamental reasons for the importance of performance measurement in the public sector, including (1)

because performance management is at the center of service delivery; (2) to make public institutions accountable for their results; (3) to enhance the capabilities of employees in serving the public; and (4) to increase public trust in public institutions (government). Therefore, Harry's understanding of performance management in the public sector can be said to be based on performance measurement and reporting. Furthermore, Christopher Pollitt also contributed his perspective on Performance Management in the public sector by discussing how the concept of performance management can be adopted and adapted to the public sector environment. Normatively, a public service organization should be able to measure performance comprehensively through parameters such as efficiency, effectiveness, and quality. However, public service organizations are also required to provide performance measurements using other parameters such as economy, equity, sustainability, relevance, responsiveness, accountability, and control (Pollitt, 2006). Pollitt argued that, performance management should not overlook other important indicators, including budget compliance with the obtained outcomes, relevance, justice, or equality in implementation, accountability, sustainability, accountability, and control. These aspects are also crucial in Pollitt's understanding of performance management in the public sector.

RESEARCH METHODS

This article employs a qualitative analysis method with a descriptive-analytical approach, involving comprehensive literature analysis and case studies of public sector organizations that have implemented results-based performance management. The qualitative approach was chosen because the primary focus of the research lies in the processes, subject interactions, and behaviors exhibited by them. The qualitative method is deemed appropriate for gaining a profound understanding of the dynamics of opportunities and challenges in results-based performance management in the public sector involving informants in that context. Data collection techniques involved observing existing data sourced from secondary data related to performance management, including relevant previous research. The combination of this data is expected to provide a comprehensive and in-depth overview of the opportunities and challenges of results-based performance management in the public sector.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Drivers of Performance Management in the Public Sector

As an organization responsible for public interests, it certainly has the duty to be accountable for its performance to the public, especially if the organization is a government institution. Here are some important factors driving the importance of performance management in the public sector, including:

a. Complex Challenges and Dynamics of the Public Environment

Complex challenges and the dynamic nature of the public environment that is constantly evolving. Globalization, technological advancements, and socio-economic changes are key drivers for performance management. According to

Milakovich (2012), the rapidly changing dynamics of the public environment require public organizations to have agile performance management capabilities that can adapt to these changes, including policy changes, societal demands, and global environmental shifts.

b. Accountability and Transparency in Public Resource Management

Accountability and transparency in the management of public resources drive the need for more effective performance management. According to Bovens (2007), increasing pressure for accountability and transparency in public sector organizations ensures that their performance can be measured, assessed, and clearly accounted for.

c. Optimizing Limited Resources in Budgets and Workforce

Optimizing limited resources, both in budget and workforce. According to Pollit (2017), performance management can assist public organizations in efficiently allocating resources, identifying areas that need improvement, and ensuring that limited resources are used optimally to achieve organizational goals.

d. Enhancing the Quality of Public Services Impacting the Community

Improving the quality of public services that directly impact the community. According to Ferlie et al. (2017), performance management can help public organizations enhance the quality of public services through employee performance monitoring, measuring community satisfaction, and implementing best practices in service delivery.

e. Development of Personnel or Employees

According to Olsen (2006), a good performance management system provides opportunities for employees to enhance their competencies and creates a work environment that supports professional growth.

f. Monitoring and Evaluating Public Policies

According to Bryson (2018), a well-designed performance management system can provide the necessary data and information to evaluate the effectiveness of government policies and programs.

The factors above can be concluded as the moral responsibility of public service organizations towards the work or needs of the public. Additionally, these factors have a positive impact on every individual working and serving in a public organization to enhance their capacity and professionalism. In this context, civil servants or employees can compete to improve performance. This competitiveness also significantly influences the creation of new, more innovative ideas to achieve better performance.

Implementation Process of Performance Management

Performance management based on results certainly involves a series of processes in its implementation. According to Theodore H. Poister, there is a series of processes in the implementation of performance management, including:

- Clarify the system's objectives
- Assess organizational readiness
- Identify external stakeholders
- Organize the system development process
- Identify key goals and parameters to initiate performance management
- Determine the components of the performance management system, performance criteria, and their use
- Define, evaluate, and select indicators
- Develop data collection procedures
- Determine the system design
- Conduct a trial if necessary
- Implement the full-scale system
- Use, modify, and evaluate the system
- Share the results of modifications and evaluations with stakeholders.

Performance management is inseparable from the aforementioned series of processes. Therefore, the implementation process of performance management must carefully consider this. Additionally, organizations should be assessed based on their readiness, allowing for varying levels of system complexity in management performance (Van Dooren, Bouckaert & Halligan, 2010). In this context, each level of public organization presents different complexities of issues that also need to be objectively and fairly assessed based on the complexity of the issues at each level.

Criteria for Performance Management

Performance management has several crucial criteria that must be understood. According to Niven (2003), there are several criteria that can be used to evaluate the readiness of an organization in implementing and maintaining performance management. These criteria include:

- Clear strategy
- Strong commitment (strong, committed sponsorship or a champion)
- Clear and urgent needs
- Support from managers at every level, from middle to upper management
- Clearly defined scale and scope
- Strong team and available resources
- A culture of performance measurement
- Alignment between management and existing information technology
- Availability of quality and accurate data
- Technical and robust infrastructure

Additionally, in his book "Balanced Scorecard Step-by-Step: Maximizing Performance and Maintaining Results," Niven establishes more detailed and particularly significant criteria for performance management, especially concerning the Balanced Scorecard approach. Here are the criteria for performance management:

1. **Relevance:** Information and metrics used in performance management must be relevant to the organization's goals and strategies. This ensures that each measured element directly contributes to the achievement of strategic objectives.
2. **Timeliness:** Performance information should be available promptly to support quick and responsive decision-making. Delays in providing information can hinder the

organization's ability to respond to changes in society, markets, or the business environment.

3. **Accuracy:** Data and information used in performance management must be accurate and reliable. Inaccuracy can lead to incorrect decision-making, ultimately negatively impacting organizational performance.
4. **Validity:** Information or data used in measuring performance must be valid and aligned with the operational reality of the organization. Valid measurements ensure that results derived from performance management reflect actual conditions or facts.
5. **Measurability:** Selected performance metrics and indicators should be easily, clearly, and objectively measurable. This is crucial to enable the organization to gauge progress or improvement in outcomes, assess achievements, and make continuous improvements.
6. **Accountability:** There should be clarity and accountability in the relationship between actions taken and outcomes achieved (output – outcome). This aspect creates individual or team responsibility for achieving performance goals.
7. **Simplicity:** The performance management system should be designed as simple as possible and easily understood by all involved parties. Simplicity helps facilitate implementation and understanding throughout the organization.
8. **Integration:** Performance criteria and indicators should be integrated as a whole, covering various aspects and functions of the organization. Integration ensures there are no conflicts between metrics and that all elements support the achievement of strategic goals.
9. **Ease of Understanding and Use:** Performance information should not only be relevant but also easily understood by all levels within the organization. This supports effective use by stakeholders.
10. **Flexibility:** The performance management system should be adaptable to changes in the organization's strategy or the business environment. Flexibility allows the organization to remain relevant and responsive to market dynamics.

The criteria mentioned above serve as a reference for performance management. However, to create alignment and a positive balance in the outcomes derived from the generated outputs in performance management, it needs to be specifically and sequentially designed from very general goals to more specific indicators. Mapping specific goals tends to help focus energy and attention on creating the desired results in a certain amount, rather than being scattered across various activities that may not be as necessary (Carroll & Tosi, 1973). The strategy of concentrating on these more specific goals can be viewed from the perspective depicted by Poister and Streib (1999).

Performance management model strategy

The model strategy is crucial for establishing the relationship or correlation between the main objectives in specific programs, making it easier to select suitable indicators to achieve these goals. According to Poister and Streib, these objectives are a broad depiction of the organization's values, vision, and mission. Subsequently, an outline related to these values, vision, and mission will be developed to be applied in a work program plan, serving as a reference for setting performance indicators. This model will easily provide a brief overview of performance management and its success level through analysis of outputs and outcomes obtained.



Results-Based Performance Management

Results-based performance management offers a framework that focuses on achieving specific goals and positive impacts on society. Performance management plays a central role in achieving organizational goals and enhancing overall performance. There are several key aspects of performance-based management according to experts, including:

1. Kaplan, R.S., & Norton, D.P (1996):
 - Identify and develop clear and measurable organizational strategies.
 - Establish strategic objectives related to the organization's vision and mission.
 - Set Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) for each objective.
 - Communicate objectives and KPIs throughout the entire organization.
2. Armstrong, M., & Baron, A. (2004). In their book "Managing Performance: Performance Management in Action," CIPD:
 - Communicate objectives and KPIs throughout the entire organization.
 - Provide training and education to employees to understand the concept of results-based performance management.
 - Offer regular feedback to employees about their performance.
 - Conduct regular evaluations of the achievement of objectives and KPIs.
3. Fletcher, C. (2001):
 - Identify training needs to support the achievement of goals.
 - Implement training and development programs as needed.
4. Neely, A., Adams, C., & Kennerley, M. (2002):
 - Implement a performance measurement system that covers the established KPIs.
 - Ensure that performance measurements are conducted regularly and in accordance with the plan.

5. Dessler, G. (2019) in his work "Human Resource Management," Pearson:

- Provide recognition and acknowledgment to individuals or teams that achieve high performance.

Although this concept is believed to be promising, its implementation in the public sector is often confronted with various opportunities and challenges that need to be addressed. Nevertheless, by understanding these opportunities and challenges, organizations can prepare specific plans or mitigations, so that results-based performance management can have a positive impact.

Opportunity Performance Management Implementation Results-Based Concept

The design of Performance Management Implementation Results-Based has become a concept for strategic planning, human resource management, and organizational culture development. This, of course, presents an opportunity because the characteristics of results-based performance management are inherently rigid and comprehensive. The following are characteristics of the results-based management concept as opportunities, including:

1. Goal and Strategy Achievement Orientation:

The concept of results-based management helps organizations focus on achieving strategic goals. By establishing measurable performance indicators related to the organizational vision, this approach ensures that every action supports the achievement of long-term goals (Kaplan & Norton, 1992).

2. Clear and Measurable Performance Measurement:

Through the results-based management concept, organizations can identify and measure performance more clearly. Measurable performance indicators assist in effective monitoring of goal achievement, providing a basis for informed decision-making (Bourne *et al.*, 2003).

3. Accountability and Responsibility:

Results-based management creates accountability throughout the organization. By setting goals and measuring performance outcomes, organizations can determine who is responsible for goal achievement, fostering a culture of responsibility (Kaplan & Norton, 2001).

4. Increased Productivity and Efficiency:

The results-based management approach helps organizations enhance productivity and efficiency. By monitoring results and work processes, organizations can identify areas requiring improvement and innovation to achieve higher efficiency (Neely, Adams, & Kennerley, 2002).

5. Employee Development:

The results-based management concept provides a foundation for employee development. By providing measurable feedback, organizations can help employees understand their performance, identify development opportunities, and design relevant training programs (Fletcher, 2001).

6. Flexibility and Adaptability:

Results-based management assists organizations in becoming more flexible and adaptive to change. By continuously monitoring performance, organizations can respond quickly to changes in the business environment or strategy (Kaplan & Norton, 2006).

7. Innovation and Organizational Learning Enhancement:

With results-based management, organizations create an environment that supports innovation and learning. By evaluating performance outcomes continuously, organizations can identify innovation opportunities and build learning capacities (Neely, Gregory, & Platts, 2005).

8. Improved Service Quality:

Results-based management helps improve the quality of services provided by organizations. By focusing on results and customer satisfaction, organizations can enhance services and meet customer expectations (Pike, 2004).

9. Increased Transparency and Trust:

Through results-based management, organizations can enhance transparency and trust. Open and measurable performance measurements provide a clear picture of organizational achievements, building stakeholder trust (Bourne *et al.*, 2000).

10. Enhanced Competitiveness:

Results-based management can enhance organizational competitiveness. By focusing on results and superior performance, organizations can position themselves as leaders in the industry and achieve competitive excellence (Kaplan & Norton, 1996).

Performance Management Implementation Challenges

Ambition must be realistic and bound by time (Broom, Harris, Jackson & Marshall, 1998), as cited in Evan M. Berman. This realistic measurability is crucial because a policy or program will always face its own challenges. Every work program, whether in the public or government sector, business organizations, or the social sector, is always confronted with various challenges that can impact its success and effectiveness. Many factors influence the occurrence of these challenges, including:

1. Resource limitations. Most work programs face resource constraints, whether in terms of budget, personnel, or infrastructure. This can limit the ability to implement programs optimally (Ansell, C., & Gash, A. 2007).
2. Policy changes. Changes in government policies or organizational management can be significant challenges, requiring adjustments and restructuring of ongoing work programs (Sabatier, P. A. 1986).
3. Environmental uncertainty. A dynamic and uncertain external environment can make planning and program implementation difficult. Factors such as economic, political, or social changes can impact program sustainability (Bryson, J. M., & Bromiley, P. 1993).
4. Low participation levels. Low levels of participation from involved parties, whether it be the community or

employees, can hinder program implementation. Lack of support and involvement can reduce implementation effectiveness (Arnstein, S. R. 1969).

5. Technological changes. Rapid technological advancements can pose a challenge, especially if a work program relies on specific technology. Understanding and adapting to technological developments are key to program success (Rogers, E. M. 2003).

The conditions mentioned above have become factors influencing challenges in results-based performance management. These challenges can arise from various aspects, including internal and external factors, as well as complexity in program implementation. The following are challenges in the implementation of performance management in the public sector, including:

a. Difficulty in Establishing Relevant Performance Indicators:

One of the main challenges is establishing relevant and measurable performance indicators. This process requires a deep understanding of organizational goals and how to measure the real impact of their activities.

b. Organizational Culture Change:

The implementation of results-based performance management often requires a change in organizational culture. This challenge includes resistance from internal stakeholders who may face discomfort with new changes and adjustments.

c. Resource Limitations:

Many public sector organizations face challenges in terms of resources, both financial and human. Implementing results-based performance management requires investments in information technology, training, and performance measurement systems, which can become an additional burden.

d. Stakeholder Resistance:

External stakeholders, such as the community, often have different expectations and may resist changes resulting from results-based performance management. Effective communication and stakeholder engagement are crucial to overcoming this resistance.

Conclusion

In the context of the public sector, performance management is not merely a management concept or practice. It is an urgent necessity that provides the foundation for the government to achieve its goals, improve the quality of public services, and build public trust. By strengthening accountability, improving efficiency, replacing decisions with evidence, empowering human resources, and fostering innovation. So, performance management in the public sector is not only relevant but also critical for success and sustainability. Public organizations require sustained efforts to continuously assess performance to enhance their effectiveness. The implementation of results-based performance management is not solely related to performance measurement. In some cases, it serves as a proactive step to address organizational shortcomings in achieving goals, enhance accountability, and provide

responsive services to community needs. This concept is strategic because the characteristics of results-based performance management, being rigid and comprehensive, present significant opportunities for public organizations. Results-based performance management also comes with its own weaknesses driven by resource limitations such as budget, personnel, or infrastructure, policy changes, environmental uncertainty, low levels of participation, and technological changes. To address these challenges, a holistic and strategic approach is needed, involving coordination among stakeholders, careful planning, and quick adaptation to changing conditions. Furthermore, involving those who are engaged in the formulation and implementation of programs is also important to enhance participation levels and acceptability.

Recommendation

As we have previously discussed in this study, the implementation of Results-Based Management poses challenges involving changes in organizational culture, systems, and policies that may not always be easy. However, this does not mean undermining the performance management system based on results, which has many other advantages as opportunities. Therefore, Results-Based Performance Management should continue to be implemented while considering and exploring some of the best solutions or recommendations to address these challenges, including:

1. Building Effective Communication

Effective communication is crucial during the process of change. In this context, organizations need to articulate the goals of Results-Based Management, its benefits, and how it will positively impact employees or members of the organization, both in private and public organizations. According to Aghdasi, Shakerian, and Mortazavi (2016), effective communication can reduce resistance to change and enhance employee understanding. Additionally, organizations should coordinate among existing stakeholders.

2. Employee Engagement

Involving employees in the planning and implementation of Results-Based Management can enhance their support for the occurring changes. Engaging relevant parties in the formulation and execution of programs is crucial to improve participation and acceptability. Therefore, organizations need to involve them in setting goals both individually and as a team. According to Lawler III (2011), employee engagement can enhance individual and overall organizational performance.

3. Training and Development

Organizations need to provide adequate training for employees so that they can develop the skills necessary to achieve their performance goals. Effective training can enhance employee performance and facilitate the implementation of Results-Based Performance Management (Armstrong and Baron, 2005).

4. Clear Performance Measurement

Clear and measurable performance metrics need to be established by the organization so that employees can clearly

measure their achievements. At this point, the organization must have a well-thought-out plan. Effective performance measurement provides a better understanding of employees' contributions to organizational goals (Aguinis, 2009).

5. Continuous Feedback

Organizations are considered to provide continuous and constructive feedback. Use feedback as a means for development, not just as an evaluation. Effective feedback can enhance employee performance and motivation (DeNisi and Kluger, 2000).

6. Flexibility in Goal Setting

At the very least, organizations need to provide flexibility in goal setting so that they can adjust these goals according to changing conditions or needs. Organizations must be capable of adapting quickly to changes in conditions or an unpredictable environment. Flexibility in goal setting can enhance motivation and performance (Locke and Latham, 2002).

7. Periodic Evaluation and Adjustment

Conduct periodic evaluations of the implementation of Results-Based Performance Management and adjust policies or processes if necessary. According to Aguinis (2013), periodic evaluation and adjustment are the keys to the long-term success of the Results-Based Performance Management system.

REFERENCES

- Aghdasi, M., Shakerian, M., & Mortazavi, S. (2016). The Impact of Change Management Models on the Organizational Performance. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 230, 22-29.
- Aguinis, H. (2013). *Performance Management* (3rd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.
- Ammons, D. N. (2020). *Leading Performance Management in Local Government*. CRC Press.
- Ansell, C., & Gash, A. (2007). Collaborative Governance in Theory and Practice. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 18(4), 543–571.
- Armstrong, M., & Baron, A. (1998). *Performance Management: The New Realities*. London: Institute of Personnel and Development. CIPD.
- Behn, R. D. (2003). Why Measure Performance? Different Purposes Require Different Measures. *Public Administration Review*, 63(5), 586–606.
- Bouckaert, G., & Halligan, J. (2008). *Managing performance: International comparisons*. Routledge.
- Bouckaert, G., Peters, B. G., & Verhoest, K. (2022). *The Coordination of Public Sector Organizations: Shifting Patterns of Public Management*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Bryson, J. M., & Crosby, B. C. (1992). *Leadership for the common good: Tackling public problems in a shared-power world*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Bryson, J. M. (2011). *Strategic planning for public and nonprofit organizations: A Guide to Strengthening and Sustaining Organizational Achievement* (4th ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- DeNisi, A. S., & Kluger, A. N. (2000). Feedback effectiveness: Can 360-degree appraisals be improved? *Academy of Management Executive*, 14(1), 129-139.
- Dessler, G. (2019). *Human Resource Management*. Pearson.
- Ercan, T., Ünal, F., & Alkan, M. (2019). *Performance Management in Public Organizations*. IGI Global.
- Evan M. Berman, and Moghrabi I.H. (2023). *Performance and Innovation in the Public Sector: Managing for Results*. Routledge 4 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon.
- Fletcher, C. (2001). Performance Appraisal and Management: The Developing Research Agenda. *Journal of Management*, 27(3), 463–485.
- Hatry, H. P. (2006). *Performance measurement: Getting results*. Urban Institute Press. Washington, DC: Urban Institute Press.
- Hood, C. (1995). The “New Public Management” in the 1980s: Variations on a Theme. *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, 20(2–3), 93–109.
- Hood, C. (2011). *The blame game: Spin, bureaucracy, and self-preservation in government*. Princeton University Press.
- Kaplan, R. S., & Norton, D. P. (2006). *Alignment: Using the Balanced Scorecard to Create Corporate Synergies*. Harvard Business School Press.
- Lawler III, E. E. (2011). *Effective human resource management: A global analysis*. Stanford University Press.
- Locke, E. A., & Latham, G. P. (2002). Building a practically useful theory of goal setting and task motivation: A 35-year odyssey. *American Psychologist*, 57(9), 705-717.
- Moynihan, D. P., & Pandey, S. K. (2007). Finding workable levers over work motivation: Comparing job satisfaction, job involvement, and organizational commitment. *Administration & Society*, 39(7), 803-832.
- Mulgan, R. (2018). *Collaborative Public Management: New Strategies for Local Governments*. Princeton University Press.
- Neely, A., Adams, C., & Kennerley, M. (2002). *The Performance Prism: The Scorecard for Measuring and Managing Business Success*. Financial Times/Prentice Hall.
- Nursam Nasrullah. (2017). Manajemen Kinerja. *Journal of Islamic Education Management*. Vol.2, No.2 Oktober 2017, Hal 167 – 175, ISSN : 2548 – 4052.
- Osborne, D., & Gaebler, T. (1992). *Reinventing government: How the entrepreneurial spirit is transforming the public sector*. Penguin.
- Pollitt, C. (2006). *Performance Management in Practice: A Comparative Study of Executive Agencies*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Pollitt, C. (2003). *The Essential Public Manager*. Maidenhead: Open University Press.
- Pollitt, C., & Bouckaert, G. (2017). *Public Management Reform: A Comparative Analysis - Into The Age of Austerity*. Oxford University Press.
- Sabatier, P. A. (1986). Top-Down and Bottom-Up Approaches to Implementation Research: A Critical Analysis and Suggested Synthesis. *Journal of Public Policy*, 6(1), 21–48.
- Theodore H. Poister, Maria P. Aristigueta, Jeremy L. Hall. (2015). *Managing and Measuring Performance in Public and Nonprofit Organization – an Integrated Approach*. Jossey-Bass. San Francisco.