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ABSTRACT

The aim of the study was to analyse the framework for measuring parliamentary performance in South Africa. The researcher wanted to assess the current system challenges and gaps for measuring performance of the Parliament of the Republic of South Africa with special reference to the core business of Parliament and to provide a performance management model and tools that can be adopted by Parliament to address the core business of Parliament challenges and problems. In this study, relevant literature was reviewed. The researcher dwelled on the concept of performance management, historical perspective, elements of performance management and benefits derived from the system. The critical issue that was discussed under this section was the comparison amongst countries. It was evident that there are countries that are measuring both administrative and political arm of government.

The data collection instruments that were used were questionnaires and interviews. Questionnaires were distributed to The Secretariat to the National Parliament, Chief Directors, General Managers and Senior Managers. Interviews were held with Presiding Officers: Speaker, Deputy Speaker, Chairperson of Chairpersons, and Deputy Chairperson of Chairpersons, Chief Whips, Whips of Committees and Chairpersons of Committees. A thematic analysis was employed and the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) was used. After analysing the data, the researcher arrived at conclusions and thereafter suggested recommendations. The researcher proffered a model by examining different best models of the world and selecting some of those components. The model indicates performance outcomes, which are; accountability, responsiveness, representativity, transparency and impact as well as parliamentary mandates, which are the Constitutional mandates in a matrix.
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CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION AND GENERAL ORIENTATION

1.1 Introduction

Performance measurement offers an effective method of determining whether an institution is meeting its goals and achieving its mission. Within the context of the “value for money” approach within the public sector, the measurement of institutional performance is important in as far as, it strives to promote accountability and justify the allocation of resources. Legislatures are normally subjected to performance measurement in order to gauge personal performance as key democratic institutions, particularly in performing individual roles of oversight, legislation and representative body. The issue of what is being measured in the case of Legislatures can be explained in two ways. Firstly, performance is measured in terms of how the Legislature contributes to democratic governance as well as how it relates to citizens; and secondly, the performance of the Legislature as an institution can be measured in specific reference to how well it works administratively. According to the *Parliamentarian Publication*, 2007, this will have reference to issues, such as, effectiveness and efficiency of parliamentary services and the ways, in which parliamentary committees work. These two dimensions make a clear distinction between what is specifically being measured in Legislatures. The first dimension refers to measuring the performance of the Legislature’s political component, while the second dimension measures the Legislature’s administrative branch.

This proposal presents an oversight of the measurement of performance in Parliament. It provides a brief summary of the four generic categories, into which performance measures can be categorised. It further gives details of the benefits of performance measurement. It sketches a framework for measuring parliamentary performance. The important issues discussed are the determinants of performance, the criteria of performance and the structure of performance. There is a special focus on the
indicators of performance, and furthermore, it provides an oversight of four untested approaches that can be considered in measuring the performance of Parliament.

1.2 Statement of the problem

The Parliament of the Republic of South Africa is established in terms of Chapter 4 of the Constitution of the Republic of South Africa, 1996. The Constitutional mandate of the Parliament is as follows:

- To pass laws (Legislation);
- To oversee and scrutinise executive action (oversight);
- To facilitate public participation and involvement;
- To participate in, promote and oversee co-operative government; and
- To engage in, participate in, and oversee international participation.

The Parliament consists on the one hand of the administration wing that deals with issues of administrative support, such as, human resource management, information technology, communication services and related services. On the other hand, the political wing comprises the issues outlined above as the Constitutional mandate, which is conducted through committee work, House debates, Sectoral Parliaments, site visits, and public hearings.

For the administrative side of Parliament, there are prescribed policies, such as, the Public Financial and Management Act, 2000, Treasury Regulations as well as the proposed bill called Financial Management of Parliament Act, whose purpose is to:

- Regulate the financial management of Parliament in a manner consistent with its status in terms of the Constitution;
- Ensure that all revenue, expenditure, assets and liabilities of Parliament are managed efficiently, effectively and transparently;
- Provide for the responsibilities of persons entrusted with financial management in Parliament;
• Provide financial management norms and standards for Provincial Legislatures;
and
• Provide for matters connected therewith.

The objectives of the Act are:

• Promote and maintain a high standard of professional ethics in the financial management of Parliament;
• Promote the efficient, economic, and effective use of resources allocated to Parliament;
• Ensure the transparent, accountable and sound management of the revenue, expenditure, assets and liabilities of Parliament.

The problem is that these pieces of regulations only deal with the administrative and management part of Parliament, but fail to create a framework that will provide for planning, performance measurement as well as monitoring and evaluation on the political side, which is the core business of Parliament. There is no adopted framework in Parliament that provides a mechanism for institutional performance in discharging its Constitutional mandate. This means, there is no instrument that can be used on a regular basis to measure the performance of Parliament.

1.3 Research objectives

The objectives of the study are to:

• Explore and assess the current system challenges and gaps for measuring performance of the Parliament of the Republic of South Africa, with special reference to the core business of Parliament;
• Determine the extent, to which the framework for measuring parliamentary performance affects the citizens in the constituencies; and
• Attempt to develop a performance management model and tools that can be adopted, by Parliament, to address the core business of Parliament challenges and problems.

1.4 Hypothesis
The performance management framework, currently used by the Parliament of the Republic of South Africa, is not relevant to the core business as well as the Constitutional mandate of Parliament. In addition, it poses serious challenges of evaluating parliamentary performance in context.

1.5 Significance of the study
The study adds value to the newly established Legislative sector (Association of all nine Provincial Legislatures and the National Parliament) as an instrument and framework. The aforementioned can be used in measuring the performance of Parliament as well as the Legislatures, with specific consideration of the core business and Constitutional mandate.

1.6 Delimitation and limitation
The research focuses on the National Parliament of the Republic of South Africa; Chief Officials of Parliament, which are the senior management and officials dealing with planning, performance management, monitoring and evaluation; as well as Members of Parliament; and the members of the Parliamentary Oversight Authority, which is a committee responsible for the oversight of Parliament. Due to time constraints, the researcher will not be able to focus on all nine Provincial Legislatures and therefore will concentrate on the National Parliament.
1.7 Ethical considerations

In conducting the research, permission was requested from the supervisors to ensure maximum cooperation. All information gathered during this research, was treated with strict confidentiality. The researcher respected the human dignity and protocol of the different institutions.

1.8 Chapter outline

Chapter One - Introduction and general orientation
This chapter provides the introduction, background and problem of interest to the researcher. Furthermore, it also outlines the objectives of the research, research questions and ethical considerations and delimitation. In conclusion, it will clarify and highlight the significance of the research.

Chapter Two - Literature review
A theoretical framework on parliamentary performance measurement is provided. In addition, it introduces the reader to the relevant literature, regarding performance monitoring and evaluation. It dwells on comparative studies.

Chapter Three - Research design and methodology
The research design and procedure is explicated. The researcher also explains how information was gathered and how interviews and discussions were arranged and conducted. Issues regarding reliability and validity of the data are addressed and finally, obstacles and hindrances experienced, in the data collection process, discussed.

Chapter Four - Data analysis
The analyses of the data assessed, is expounded in this chapter. Moreover, it describes in terms its setting and background.
Chapter Five - Conclusion and recommendations

This chapter summarises the main findings of the study. The researcher draws conclusions and discusses these in relation to the literature. Lastly, recommendations are offered.

1.9 Conclusion

The foregoing introduction, by the researcher, gave a brief description of the National Parliament of the Republic of South Africa. The statement of the problem, research objectives, significance of the study and hypothesis were explicitly elaborated. The researcher further expatiated on the literature reviewed with a comparative analysis. In addition, during research, the researcher employed quantitative and qualitative approaches, utilising questionnaires and interviews. The researcher elucidated on delimitations and limitations of the study and lastly gave a brief outline.
CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

Performance measurement offers an effective method of determining whether an institution is meeting its goals and achieving its mission. Within the context of the “value for money” approach within the public sector, the measurement of institutional performance is important in as far as; it strives to promote accountability and justifies the allocation of resources. Legislatures are normally subjected to performance measurement in order to gauge personal performance as key democratic institutions, particularly in performing the individual roles of oversight, legislator and representative body. The issue of what is being measured in the case of Legislatures can be explained in two ways. Firstly, performance is measured in terms of how the Legislature contributes to democratic governance as well as how it relates to citizens; and secondly, the performance of the Legislature as an institution can be measured in specific reference to how well it works administratively. This will have reference to issues, such as, effectiveness and efficiency of parliamentary services and the ways, in which parliamentary committees work. These two dimensions make a clear distinction between what is specifically being measured in Legislatures. The first dimension refers to measuring the performance of the Legislature’s political component, while the second dimension measures the Legislature’s administrative branch.

This study also presents an oversight of the measurement of performance in Parliaments. It consists of four sections.

- Section 1 provides a brief summary of the four generic categories, into which performance measures can be categorised. This section also provides details of the benefits of performance measurement.
- Section 2 sketches a framework for measuring parliamentary performance. The important issues discussed under section two are the determinants of performance, the criteria of performance and the structure of performance.
• Section 3 focuses on the indicators of performance, and provides an oversight of four untested approaches that can be considered in measuring the performance of Legislatures.

• Finally, Section 4 presents a comparative study of the Australian, Scottish, United States and Belgium governing systems, as well as a brief discussion of the Japanese and United Kingdom governing systems.

2.2 The concept performance management
Walters (1995:20) define performance management as an approach to management that seeks to harness the endeavours of individual managers and workers towards an organisation’s strategic goals. Firstly, performance management assists defining goals to be achieved. Secondly, it defines the outputs needed to achieve those goals and gains the commitment of individuals or teams to achieve those outputs. Thirdly, it monitors outcomes.

2.3 Historical perspective of performance management system in the public sector African
Before amalgamation and rationalisation in 1994, there were many systems and procedures of appraisal for different purposes in the public service, with detailed rules and regulations. Major reforms occurred in 1999, when the new management framework was introduced. The management of departments was devolved to the political and the administrative heads of departments. Each department was allowed to develop its own human resource policies and systems, within a framework of uniform norms and standards. The Public Service Regulation of 2001 serves as a primary guide to developing and implementing individual departmental performance management systems. The regulations require the executive authority of each department to determine a system for performance management and development for employees in that department.

In order to promote performance management in national and provincial governments, the Public Financial Management Act, 1999 (Act 29 of 1999) (PMFA) and the Treasury
Regulations (Section 5.2.2 (d) of 2002) require the accounting officer of an institution to prepare a strategic plan with measurable objectives as well as the expected outcomes, indicators and targets of the institution’s programme. In terms of Section 40 (1) (d) of the PFMA, the accounting officer must prepare an annual report based on a strategic plan. In terms of Section 18.3.1 (d) of the Treasury Regulations, the annual report must include information: about the institution’s efficiency, economy and effectiveness in delivery programmes; and about achieving the objectives and outcomes against the measures and indicators set out in the strategic plan for the year under scrutiny.

2.4 Elements of performance management

Fox and Uys (2001:105-106) highlight the following as three elements of performance management:

- Performance planning: forms part of the overall strategic planning of an institution with a view to allowing employees to perform optimally in order to reach organisational goals.

- Performance monitoring: has to do with day-to-day supervision of performance, recording actual performance on the job and pre-empting performance problems.

- Performance appraisal: comprises the application of a system of measuring performance. There are many such systems available, none of them perfect.

2.5 Benefits of effective performance management

According to Van Der Waldt (2004:41), performance management provides the organisation with the following benefits:

- Top management: it should enable members of top management to get on with the task of setting objectives for the organisation, whilst managing relationships with external bodies – customers, politicians, regulatory bodies, and stakeholders – translating respective requirements into objectives for the organisation.

- Managers: it should help managers to gain a full understanding of the organisation’s mission, to set targets and standards for each team and to
delegate work. This would render managers free to concentrate on strategic planning and continuous improvement and development of respective operations and work teams.

- **Staff:** improved management of performance should result in clearer targets and the freedom to work autonomously to achieve individual targets, with the required level of support from respective management that is improved personal self-development.

- **Support functions:** objectives, which come from a centrally agreed business plan, are more likely to give support functions an alternative reason for existence rather than the pursuit of individualistic specialised agendas.

- **Community:** clear performance management should enable the organisation to deliver on its promises to communities more consistently by converting customer needs into workable plans of action.

### 2.6 Requirement of effective evaluation of performance management

Reddy *et al* (2003:195) write that the criteria used for appraising employee performance must be job-related. More information should be determined through job analysis, subjective factors, such as, initiative, enthusiasm, loyalty and measurement. Factors like these should not be used for informal evaluation.

In addition, Reddy *et al* (2003:195) clarify that managers should explain performance expectations in advance of the appraisal period. The authors also state that it is not fair to evaluate employees using unfamiliar yardsticks. It is best that results are not withheld so that each employee knows which areas need performance improvement.
2.7 Performance measurement

According to De Bruijn (2002:579) performance measurement has a number of functions and these are described as follows:

- **Transparency**: an organisation can make clear what it intends to do and, by means of an input-output analysis, the costs involved.

- **Learning**: an organisation takes a step further when it uses performance measurement to learn. The transparency created may teach an organisation what it does well and where improvements are possible.

- **Appraising**: a performance-based appraisal of the functioning of an institution can be given.

- **Sanctioning**: appraisal may be followed by a positive sanction if performance is good or by a negative sanction if performance is inadequate.

2.7.1 Categories of performance measures

Performance measures are of specific significance to Legislatures. Management of Legislature, specifically, find various uses in performance measures. According to Moore and Teskey (2006:67) on the one hand, internally, performance measures can be used to establish a clear, significant mission and goal for the Legislature, while fostering a strong sense of internal accountability. In addition, Moore and Teskey (2006:68) state that, on the other hand, externally, performance measures can be used to help meet the demands for external accountability towards the electorate. Duncan (2004:121) alludes that the employment of performance measures in institutions essentially makes provision for management to clarify and focus on long-term goals and strategic objectives. Epstein (2004:83) writes “… the application of performance measures further allows management to provide performance information to stakeholders. Generally, performance measures fall into five categories”. Furthermore,
Epstein (2004:84) explains that these five categories are input measures, output measures, efficiency measures, outcomes measures and quality measures.

Input measures are useful in illustrating resources or efforts used to provide services. Within the context of Legislatures, input measures refer to the resources that the institution deploys to provide services. Performance measures expressed in terms of inputs do not give an indication of effectiveness, but rather provide an expression of economy, that is how much input an institution’s money can buy. Output measures refer to the number of products produced or services produced. The measurement of performance in terms of output does not always reveal information on quality and efficiency. This means that within the context of the Legislatures, certain services could be provided inefficiently or poorly.

Outcome measures provide an indication of the impact of a programme, activity or service. Within the context of Legislatures, these measures are used to assess the actual impact of the institution’s actions. Efficiency measures are intended to measure the unit cost and productivity associated with a given output and outcome. Pet-Armacost (2000:101) states that these measures are geared towards measuring productivity and cost effectiveness. Quality measures are intended to measure reliability, accuracy, courtesy, competence and responsiveness; in addition, these are beneficial in measuring the effectiveness in meeting customer expectations.

According to Epstein (2007:87), performance measures offer certain benefits, including the following:

- Enhanced decision making;
- Improved internal accountability; and
- Strategic planning and goal setting.
2.7.2 Framework for measuring parliamentary performance

The development of an institutional framework for measuring parliamentary performance is necessary in order to assist those who measure institutional performance when gathering and organising information about activities within an institution, and most importantly, the manner, in which institutional arrangements are holding the system in place and shaping the institution. According to the World Bank Institute [sa], a performance framework for measuring the performance of Parliaments must contain three variables. These are determinants of performance, criteria of performance, as well as structure of performance.

2.7.2.1 Determinants of parliamentary performance

A referral to the determinants of parliamentary performance has reference to the factors or variables, which play a role in determining how well Parliament is performing. According to the World Bank Institute [sa], the performance of Parliament is determined by three variables, namely the governance context, parliamentary culture and organisational capacity.

Parliament, as a popularly elected and representative political assembly, is surrounded by a governance context. Moreover, Parliament, the judiciary and the executive are the three important components of national governance systems. Hudson and Wren (2007:83) elucidate that in performing its key functions of legislation, oversight and representation, Parliament can contribute to the elements of effective governance: state capability, accountability and responsiveness. The governance context, as a key determinant of parliamentary performance, refers to the external environment of Parliament, specifically to relations between the State, the market and civil society, the extent of political space and support for active citizenship, as well as the impact of the global village. According to the Inter-Parliamentary Union, “civil society” in this context does not only refer to non-governmental organisations (NGOs), but also to the body of
active citizens, working together to solve common problems, promoting and defending common interests.

The governance context can have a negative impact on parliamentary performance. According to Hudson and Wren (2007:85), political systems, including electoral rules, Constitutions and the nature of political parties may not always facilitate a strong Parliament, whilst in many countries the Parliament could find itself dominated and marginalised by the executive. The duo further indicates that the wider social and cultural environment, including citizens’ expectations of the designated representatives, may not always foster an effective Parliament.

The culture within a Parliament is another determining factor in the performance of the Parliament. According to the World Bank Institute [sa], parliamentary culture refers to a set of motivating and constraining beliefs and practices. In essence, it describes the attitudes, experiences, beliefs and values of an institution. It further refers to the specific collection of values and norms shared by people and groups in the institution, and that controls the way members interact with each other and with role-players outside of Parliament (Hill & Jones, 2001:96). These norms could be regarded as both fixed and flexible in nature, and effectively serve the purpose of guiding institutional behaviour.

The final determinant of parliamentary performance is that of capacity, which essentially refers to the strengths and weaknesses of the political and administrative side of Parliament. The two most important constraints to parliamentary performance relate to lack of capacity and lack of resources. The shortcomings in terms of capacity, such as, lack of skills and knowledge can hinder Members of Parliament (MPs) and parliamentary staff in executing the duties of respective positions, effectively.

Parliamentary culture and organisational capacity are internal variables within the microenvironment. The microenvironment represents Parliament itself with its core objectives and internal functions. An important relationship between the external and internal environment is that Parliament can control its internal environment, but not its
external environment, although variables in the external environment of Parliament can influence the internal workings of the institution.

Having considered the key determinants of parliamentary performance, the focus now shifts to criteria of performance. A discussion on criteria within performance management is important as it encompasses the question of “yardsticks”, against which actual performance is to be compared.

### 2.7.2.2 Criteria of performance

Criteria of performance provide the basis for establishing how performance against a particular measure is to be compared and judged. These represent an agreement about desired levels of performance based on the expectations of clients and key stakeholders. Essentially, performance criteria represent the measurement and context, within which a specific "standard" is assessed in order to ensure that the standard has been met. Further translated, it refers to an explanation of characteristics that will be considered when a specific activity is judged. The most common performance criteria are effectiveness and efficiency.

Performance criteria enable the organisation to identify the characteristics that will be considered when a performance task is judged. In other words, in order to make a judgement on performance, actual performance must be compared to certain characteristics (criteria of performance). The World Bank Institute [sa] has identified several criteria (characteristics) against which parliamentary performance can be judged. These are:

- **Financial** (Does Parliament operate according to acceptable standards of financial administration?)
- **Compliance** (Does Parliament operate according to the laws of the land and its own rules and procedures?)
- **Effectiveness** (Does Parliament make a difference; that is, does it have an impact on government and society?)
• Efficiency (Does Parliament organise itself and carry out its activities in ways that are reasonably efficient and dependable?);
• Relevance (Does Parliament make the difference that is specifically required? Does it tackle and influence the important decisions?); and
• Sustainability (Is Parliament on the rise or on the decline, does it have the resources - political and otherwise - to play its part in promoting good?).

2.7.2.3 Structure of performance

According to the World Bank Institute [sa], the structure of performance describes the institutional means, by which parliamentary performance takes place. It includes inputs, activities, outputs, outcomes and impacts. An important characteristic of performance measures is that these are connected to each other. For example, the relationship between inputs and outputs is explained as efficiency (whether the institution is getting the most outputs from inputs); while the relationship between outputs and outcomes are explained by effectiveness (whether the institutional outputs are achieving the outcomes and planned impact). For example, the performance measure of “outcomes” would measure how effective inputs have been converted to outputs through activities to achieve outcomes, and outcomes in the parliamentary context could be accountability, transparency and participation.

Table 2.1 provides a generic definition of performance measures, as well as a description of performance measures within the parliamentary context. The table consists of three parts as defined by its columns. In column one, the different performance measures are stated. The relationships between the three performance measures can be explained by what is commonly referred to as the three E’s value for money – economy, effectiveness and efficiency. In this regard, “economy” relates to whether the institution is getting the right inputs at the best possible price. “Efficiency” has reference to whether the institution is getting the most output from its inputs, and “effectiveness” relates to whether the institutional outputs are achieving the outcomes and planned impact. For example, the performance measure of “outcomes” would measure how effective inputs have been converted to outputs through activities to achieve outcomes, and outcomes in the parliamentary context could be accountability, transparency and participation.
### Table 2.1: Description of performance measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance measures</th>
<th>Explanation of measures</th>
<th>Measures within the parliamentary context</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inputs</strong></td>
<td>Inputs refer to the resources that are used by the institution to do the work required to deliver the product or service.</td>
<td>Input measures include human, financial and physical resources, such as, Members of Parliament (MPs), staff, equipment, et cetera.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Activities</strong></td>
<td>Activities refer to the activities undertaken by the institution in order to reach its goals, i.e. the actions taken to convert inputs to outputs.</td>
<td>Activity measures explain the actions/work done by MPs in houses of parliament, parliamentary committees, caucuses and constituencies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outputs</strong></td>
<td>Outputs refer to the goods and services that are being produced or delivered.</td>
<td>Outputs are the results of actions. It could be debates, laws, resolutions, reports and assistance to constituents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcomes</strong></td>
<td>Outcomes refer to that which the institution wishes to achieve.</td>
<td>Outcomes refer to the direct effects of parliamentary activities on the outside world, such as, accountability, transparency and participation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impacts</strong></td>
<td>Impacts refer to the results of the specific institutional outcomes.</td>
<td>Impacts refer to the longer term and more indirect influence of Parliament on the set of good governance, specifically democracy, rule of law, clean as well as effective government and peaceful resolution of conflict.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.8 Indicators of performance

This section presents an oversight of two approaches that explain the indicators of parliamentary performance. The first approach is the one propagated by the World Bank Institute [sa], while the second approach is contained in the work of Rosenthal (1999:101).

Indicators of performance can be described as methods used for measuring an institution’s performance with the purpose of external comparison to other organisations or for internal use as a way of measuring effectiveness and efficiency. Good indicators indicate to the institution what to change, when to change, and how much to change. Essentially, indicators illustrate how well an institution is doing in terms of meeting its objectives or achieving its stated outcomes. To refine the definition, an indicator of performance is aimed at measuring important components in an institution. This measurement could be expressed as a percentage, index, or rate. In order for performance indicators to be regarded as meaningful, it must be monitored at regular intervals and compared to one criterion that is or more criteria that are compared to other criteria, such as, financial, compliance, effectiveness, efficiency, et cetera.

As explained by the Applied Fiscal Research Centre (Afrec) (2007:22), indicators of performance are statements that describe the dimension of performance to be measured. These dimensions include timeliness, quality, quantity and cost. In other words, in terms of the dimensions of quality and quantity, qualitative and quantitative information can be used to determine an institution’s success in achieving its objectives.

Within the parliamentary context, qualitative and quantitative indicators can have the following meaning: qualitative indicators can refer to measuring the effectiveness and relevance of outcomes, while quantitative indicators have reference to measuring the volume and efficiency of inputs. In stating indicators of performance, one should not lose focus that the dimensions mentioned above are not the actual indicator. It merely represents a dimension forming part of an indicator.
2.9 The World Bank Institute

The World Bank Institute [sa] identified a set of four indicators, against which the performance of a Parliament could be measured. These are the governance context, parliamentary culture, parliamentary organisation and capacity, as well as parliamentary performance. Table 2.2 on p. 20 provides details of the World Bank Institute’s indicators of performance for Parliaments, and it consists of three aspects. The first column highlights the broad indicators of parliamentary performance. In essence, it defines the broad areas of performance, which, when measured, provides an evaluation of its critical institutional processes. The second column provides a description of what the indicator intends to measure. For example, parliamentary performance as an indicator sets out to measure the specific aspects, which are partially defined in the core objectives of Parliament, namely legislation, the budget, oversight and representation. The third column contains a sample of key questions that can be posed in order to elicit information on the performance of Parliament vis-à-vis the four indicators.

For example, in order to measure the performance of Parliament regarding the governance context indicator, the following question can be posed: “Does Parliament have constructive relations with the different spheres of government?” In the same way, aspects related to the indicator of parliamentary culture can be measured through posing questions that will reflect the performance of Parliament apropos to the specific indicator. The World Bank Institute [sa] poses the following question in measuring Parliamentary performance concerning the indicator of Parliamentary culture: “Do MPs consult their constituents and represent their interests in the budget process?”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>The focus of the indicator and what the indicator intends to measures</th>
<th>Key questions to elicit information on performance levels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Governance context                | Governance context measures important aspects of the relationship between Parliament and its external environment, and specifically highlights in particular the structure of state power, key non-governmental actors and global influences.                                                                                                                                   | • Does Parliament have constructive relations with different spheres of government?  
• Does Parliament have a recognised Constitutional role in the budget process?  
• Does Parliament have a tradition of parliamentarians playing an active role in the budget process?  
• Do MPs consult respective constituents and represent those interests in the budget process? |
2.10 Rosenthal approach

Rosenthal’s (1999:101) approach moves from the premise that for a Legislature to be good, it must carry out the functions expected of it in a system of representative democracy, which are balancing power, representing constituencies and making laws. In addition, Rosenthal (1999:102) essentially argues that in considering whether a Legislature is executing its duties, it is important to examine how well it performs these three functions. The following sub-section summarises the three functions mentioned by Rosenthal (1999:102):

- **Balancing power:** the basic argument in this regard relates to the balance of power between Parliament and the executive. The degree of power can be regarded as a function of statutory and constitutional factors, as well as political and cultural factors. Rosenthal (1999:105) argues that an assessment of where the balance of power lies, can be done through an examination of the body or institution that initiates and enacts legislation and budgets;

- **Representing constituencies:** In assessing whether a Legislature is performing its role in being a body of representatives of the people, Rosenthal (1999:105) explores how well the Legislature performs its representational tasks. Performance of the Legislature in terms of this function is judged against the following questions, as advanced by Rosenthal (1999:106):
  - Does the constitutional system and the legislature provide for substantial political equality?
  - Are previously excluded groups now represented in the Legislature?
  - Does the Legislature provide a service to constituents and constituencies?
  - Does the Legislature provide to ensure that citizens, as well as groups, have access, i.e. access to members, to committees, and to the general process?
- Does the Legislature provide civic education on representative democracy, the legislative institution and the legislative process?
- Is the Legislature responsive, at least to some degree, to what citizens want?

- **Law making**: The basic premise under this function, which relate directly to assessing the performance of the Legislature in making laws, can be phrased in the following way: what should be expected of the law making process? Performance of the Legislature in terms of this function is judged against the following questions as advanced by Rosenthal (1999:106):

  - Is an opportunity provided for individuals and groups to participate in the law making process?
  - Is there a senior Member of Parliament present to ensure that the legislative process works well?
  - Are the parties in the law making process cohesive enough to ensure that all parties play a decisive role on important issues vis-à-vis the making of laws process?

In addition to listing the functions, which describe how well a Legislature performs, there are also factors that assist a Legislature in performing these functions. Rosenthal (1999:107) refers to these factors as facilitating factors. These include capacity and institutionalism (parliamentary culture).

### 2.11 Comparative analysis

The world political landscape is changing significantly, as it is becoming further susceptible to global pressures. Parliaments are undergoing considerable change as all seek to adapt to the challenges of a new era. The past few years have witnessed numerous efforts across many Parliaments to engage more effectively with the public
and to improve the way work is executed. Failure to establish a national Legislature with far-reaching powers can lead to disillusionment among the people that personal votes do not count and individual voices are not heard. In this regard, there is growing recognition that elections cannot be meaningful if the Legislature does not function democratically or lacks the authority to represent the citizenry effectively. Hence, the strength of the national Legislature is the institutional key to democratisation. Therefore, there is a growing realisation that international standards and benchmarks for Legislatures should be developed. A framework that sets out what constitutes effective democratic practice in contemporary Parliaments can help these institutions measure the reform and modernisation efforts, thus making these more effective. In addition, benchmarks may also serve as a useful tool for Parliaments working to establish independence and powers relative to the government.

Parliaments perform similar functions of law-making, budgetary scrutiny and oversight as well as public participation worldwide, but there are marked differences in the way each operate. These differences are attributed to a number of factors, such as, the political culture, socio-economic, as well as the electoral systems. However, there are common benchmarks applicable to all democratic Legislatures. These include:

- The manner Members of Parliament are elected.
- Legislators should have immunity for anything said in the course of the proceedings.
- Parliamentary business is transacted in accordance with the rules of procedure or standing orders established by the House.
- Parliaments are normally presided over by persons popularly elected from among its Members, or by persons qualified to be Members.
- Legislature should have mechanisms to impeach or censure officials of the executive branch.
- Committee hearings should be part of the law-making process, since these are the “driving forces” of Parliamentary business.
• Committees should have powers to summon persons, papers, records and civil servants. Moreover, these committees should have the mandate to hire independent think tanks, consultants and experts to assist in relevant business.

• Legislatures should be accessible and open to the public through the print and electronic media.

• Parliaments should have adequate non-partisan staff for proper functioning. This can only be achieved if Parliament itself has autonomy as regards recruitment, promotion and discipline of its own staff.

To this end, one can argue that the development of a model to measure parliamentary performance involves putting together various components, which define and inform each other. The generic performance management approach starts from the premise that the first interrogation of performance within an institution begins with inputs and concludes with impact. The impact that Parliament strives for includes respect for the rule of law, democratic government as well as clean and effective government. In striving to make this impact, Parliament, like other institutions also encounters internal and external challenges that essentially determine its performance. In the same way, Parliament employs the same yardsticks (effectiveness, efficiency, compliance, relevance, etc.) to measure performance.

The fundamental difference in terms of how to measure parliamentary performance centres on indicators of performance. Table 2.3 on p. 25 summarises the indicators mentioned earlier.
Table: 2.3: Indicators of parliamentary performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>World Bank Institute</th>
<th>Parliamentary Centre</th>
<th>Uhr</th>
<th>Rosenthal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governance context</td>
<td>Level and range of activity</td>
<td>Political equality</td>
<td>Law making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parliamentary culture</td>
<td>Openness and transparency</td>
<td>Popular control of government</td>
<td>Representing constituencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parliamentary organisation and capacity</td>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>Civil liberties and human rights</td>
<td>Balancing power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parliamentary performance</td>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>Public deliberation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Policy and programme impact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The significance of these indicators is that not all indicators can be placed against a specific parliamentary activity/service (legislation, oversight, representation and the budget). In other words, in some instances the degree of comparison is non-existent between indicator and parliamentary service. For those indicators that can be compared individually against all four parliamentary services, it is possible to measure the performance of Parliament through a process of phrasing questions (i.e. questions that will elicit responses, which will indicate the level of performance) through stating the individual indicator vis-à-vis the four parliamentary services.

Performance regimes appear to be strongly shaped by the institutional environment, within which it is enacted. Different institutional arrangements exhibit clear differences in performance policies and practices, which seem to be largely attributable to these differences. In almost all cases of performance management, it is clear that the intention is to change only the content of existing processes and even make some small procedural changes, but the overall institutional context is not modified, and in fact shapes the way that the reforms are implemented. The most important question in this regard is whether there are clear advantages of one type of institutional set-up over another, as well as whether some policies work better than others do, within a given institutional framework. Another question relates to the real flexibility in choices about performance policies (Parliamentary Centre [sa]).
2.11.1 Canadian Parliamentary Centre

The approach taken by the Parliamentary Centre in dealing with institutional performance measurement is to further develop and utilise existing indicators in full context. The Centre’s analysis suggested that there might be just two sets of aggregated indicators:

- Parliament and democratic governance (the reaching out indicators), under which would be aggregated those indicators measuring how Parliament contributes to democratic governance and relates to citizens. These are the indicators measuring the interface between Parliament and the wider system of governance, what might be called “the reaching out indicators”. This entails the measurement of political performance.

- Parliamentary performance, organisation and political culture (the drilling down indicators), under which would be aggregated those indicators measuring how well Parliament works as an institution. These are the indicators that “drill down” into such things as the effectiveness and efficiency of parliamentary services as well as the ways, in which parliamentary committees work. This entails the measurement of administrative performance.

The Canadian Parliamentary Centre [sa] has developed tools to measure the political performance of Parliament. Its objective in developing these tools is to provide stakeholders with a practical means to evaluate parliamentary performance against general standards. Furthermore, the Parliamentary Centre [sa] indicates that the tools should be regarded as useful in preparing baseline studies, establishing benchmarks of progress and making comparisons between parliaments.

In essence, the approach followed by the Parliamentary Centre refers to “performance tests” instead of “indicators of performance”. The performance tests for measuring
parliamentary performance are the level and range of activity, openness and transparency, participation, accountability, as well as policy and programme impact.

The tests relate to levels and range of activity, policy and programme impact. These address traditional concerns about the level of activity and the level of influence a Parliament has. Moreover, openness and transparency, participation and accountability judge the contribution of Parliament to the core values of good governance.

In order to record the “score” of different performance tests, the tests (indicators) are placed in a matrix against four lines of service or activities, i.e. services that are typical of a parliamentary environment, namely legislation, oversight, representation and the budget. Table 2.4 below, illustrates an example of what the Parliamentary Centre commonly refers to as the parliamentary report card.

**Table 2.4: The parliamentary report card**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance tests</th>
<th>Parliamentary services/activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Legislation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level and range of activity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness and transparency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy and programme impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Parliamentary Centre [sa]

The approach followed by the Parliamentary Centre, in measuring parliamentary performance, is at base level similar to that advanced by the World Bank Institute. The Parliamentary Centre, however, goes further by placing parliamentary activities and performance tests in a matrix. At the intersection of individual parliamentary services (displayed in columns) and individual performance tests (displayed in rows), questions are posed and answered in the specific cell, which represents the intersection between the specific column and row. For example, the performance test of openness and
transparency could be applied to the parliamentary service of the budget. Within these cells, key questions can be posed vis-à-vis the performance test and parliamentary service.

The Parliamentary Centre has formulated specific questions to gauge the performance of Parliament in the budget process. In other words, utilising the Parliamentary report card, the Parliamentary Centre has formulated a series of questions, which test the performance of parliament in the budget process and its other functions in respect of the above-mentioned listed five performance tests. According to Sherlock (2007:122) the following provides examples of questions that can be posed when applying the performance test of “participation” (i.e. testing for participation) to the budget process (in the parliamentary report card, the questions are posed at the point where the asterisk [*] appears):

- Does Parliament ensure public input and participation during the budget process?
- Does Parliament ensure that the poor are able to participate when it reviews the government's diagnosis of poverty and setting of priorities?
- Does Parliament consult the poor in carrying out its evaluations of poverty reduction programmes?
- Does Parliament employ gender analysis in seeking to influence budget priorities and/or in monitoring the budget?
- Does Parliament consult women's groups during the budget process?
- Does Parliament consult civil society organisations and business in its review of the budget?
- In reviewing the budget, does Parliament consult policy experts and utilise this knowledge?

The parliamentary indicators framework should accommodate the variety of indicators and exploit complementarities among these indicators. A framework should be built
around the life cycle of Parliaments, typically lasting several years and consisting of four distinct stages:

- Election of Members of Parliament: the electoral system determines the legitimacy, and largely the authority, of Parliament, and thus sets the parameters for Parliament’s contribution to democratic governance.
- Formation of the government and selection of parliamentary leaders: the formation of the government and the selection of parliamentary leaders have a major bearing on how relations will be conducted between Parliament and the executive as well as on the style and effectiveness of parliamentary performance.
- The business of Parliament: day-to-day law-making and oversight activities along with the parliamentary services to support these are the routine of parliamentary performance.
- Dissolution of Parliament: the manner in which Parliaments are dissolved has a significant impact on the capacity and authority. The framework features a set of aggregated parliamentary indicators that would be employed within a framework suggested by the parliamentary life cycle (53rd Commonwealth Parliamentary Conference, 2007:324).

2.11.2 Australia

Uhr, (2005:103) states that the Australian Parliament comes from the premise that the management and administration of parliaments, by presiding officers and clerks, is becoming more complex and time consuming. Whilst the procedural issues appear to be under control, administrative issues are increasingly taking presiding officers’ and clerks’ time. Presiding officers and clerks must not only be custodians of parliamentary practice and procedure, but also, more than ever before, have at its disposal an array of management tools to ensure that resources (human, financial, and technological) are being deployed in order to produce optimal outcomes. In recent years, performance measurement and benchmarking have come to the fore in the Australian public sector
as a means of gauging how well organisations perform against targeted objectives, as well as where these are placed in a spectrum of similar organisations in terms of performance.

The Australian approach on the use of indicators of performance for parliament is derived from the work of Uhr (2005:103-105). In addition, this author advances four (performance) standards. These are:

- **Political equality** (the contribution Parliaments make to strengthen democratic citizenship through promoting equal opportunities for political participation and political representation). In essence, it refers to how Parliament is a representative of people of diverse political backgrounds and the fact that Parliament should represent its constituents equally. According to Uhr (2005), a Parliament can be judged based on its protection of the democratic value of political equality.

- **Popular control of government** (the contribution Parliaments make to strengthen public accountability of government, protecting the public interest against undue private interests, dominating the processes of government). This relates to accountability, and specifically to the public accountability that governments accept when responding to parliamentary demands for information, explanation and action. Uhr (2005) is of the opinion that Parliament, in managing instruments of accountability and subjecting governments to investigation in various arenas of accountability reach high into the realms of democratic relevance.

- **Civil liberties and human rights** (the contribution Parliaments make to strengthen civil liberties through effective scrutiny of legislative proposals and through timely review of threats to human rights by holders of executive power). This relates to the rule of law, especially to the parliamentary processes of law-making and legislative scrutiny of government initiatives: regulations and Bills. The Inter Parliamentary Union points out that while respect for human rights is the responsibility of all citizens, it is the particular responsibility of Parliament as
the legislative power to ensure that the formulation and mode of protection in practice conform to international human rights standards, and that these are not undermined by other legislation (Inter Parliamentary Union, 2006:326).

- **Public deliberation** (the contribution Parliaments make to strengthen processes of public deliberation by promoting opportunities for balance and diversity in arenas of opinion-formation in the public sphere). This standard reflects the growing importance of concepts of deliberative democracy, and relates especially to Parliament’s ability to model political deliberation and to strengthen wider public deliberation. Deliberation is an important feature of the legislative process. It necessitates a give and take and an exchange of information and ideas.

The Australian Parliament has also placed tremendous focus on benchmarking as an important influence on its performance as a Parliament. Benchmarking takes place through several forms, including conferences and training workshops, where the Parliaments of the Australian and Pacific Regions gather once a year to compare performance of duties and exchange ideas on the role and functions of presiding officers and clerks. Through these conferences, participants become aware of practices and issues that have arisen in other parliaments, as well as become accustomed with how issues were handled. The annual Commonwealth Parliamentary Association (CPA) and the Inter Parliamentary Union (IPU) conferences are examples of forums for discussion and learning.

Another form of benchmarking has gained momentum over recent months. Many Australian and some United Kingdom parliaments are linked to the Canadian Clerks at the Table Server (CATS) email service. This email service enables clerks of the various Canadian parliaments to pose procedural and administrative questions to respective colleagues.

These methods could be described, as a form of benchmarking, albeit a minimalistic form. It provides the opportunity to share different approaches to a range of similar issues confronting parliamentary departments and the further understanding of any best
practices that emerge from the Australian Parliament. In addition, to these somewhat formal comparisons, there is a continual informal benchmarking process, where officers of the various jurisdictions contact each other directly to discuss the procedure followed by a jurisdiction to handle a certain issue. However, benchmarking is not a panacea of performance reporting, it is simply another tool, which can be used alongside other performance tools, such as, surveys, independent audits/reviews et cetera. It has serious limitations in some service areas and processes, particularly when it comes to comparing quality versus quantity. However, the question of whether benchmarking is worthwhile is a decision that each Parliament must make for itself. The benefits of benchmarking could include cost reduction, better value for money, improved ‘customer’ satisfaction, achievement of targets, and implementation of good practice.

In determining what it is that needs to be measured, there should be a willingness amongst the various parliamentary departments to undertake benchmarking exercises, choosing meaningful and feasible service delivery areas for comparison. Activities to be benchmarked should be tightly defined, as it is difficult to cover a wide area in a single benchmarking review without losing focus, or the review becoming superficial. It has been suggested by the Australian Public Service Commission, that what an organisation should benchmark, should depend largely on the strategic objectives and the critical success factors of that organisation. Examples of what could be benchmarked include:

- Quality of advice to government (Members) and community;
- Resource costs of programmes and services;
- The quality of programmes and services;
- Outputs and outcomes of programmes; and
- Productivity and financial performance.

It is also important to measure only those activities, over which parliamentary departments have some degree of control. For example, the amount of legislation that a parliament passes in any one year does not necessarily reflect the performance of the bureaucracy supporting the parliament, nor is it something that presiding officers and
clerks have any control over. Possible programmes to measure could include the core functions of most parliaments, such as, chamber support services, Committee support services, Hansard services, and corporate support services (including Members’ services). Other possible programmes are inter-parliamentary services, building management services, and parliamentary education services.

The usual performance measures that are utilised across most parliaments are cost, timeliness, quantity and quality. Whilst the first three are easier to measure, the last one is difficult to operationalize, because it is linked to outcomes or the impact of services on citizens’ lives. It should be noted that assessing organisational or activity performance is usually not done utilising only one indicator. Rather, a whole suite of indicators is necessary to give a more comprehensive picture of organisational or work unit performance.

2.11.3 Scottish Parliament

The Scottish Parliament operates from the premise that the Parliament needs to be managed effectively, and there needs to be forward planning. In order for this to be achieved, both the political leadership and parliamentary staff should have a clear vision of what is to be achieved. In this regard, the Chief Executive and his staff draw up a management plan to guide the Parliament towards that vision over a few years (see Table 2.5 on p. 34). This plan sets out the Scottish Parliament’s most important aims in running the Parliament, and lists the Parliament’s expected output (achievements), as it works towards its aims. The aims come from Parliament’s understanding of the essential purpose of its work, which is to build an effective Parliament that contributes to delivering democracy and good government in Scotland (World Bank Institute [sa]).

Achieving democracy and good government in Scotland is the key objective of the Scottish Parliament, and the manner in which the Parliament is run has been highlighted as being important to delivering that broad aim. A well-run Parliament will
Table 2.5: Scottish Parliament management plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AIM</th>
<th>EXPECTED OUTPUTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| A Parliament, which can meet its constitutional role.               | • Processes that promote parliamentary business that is relevant, constructive and respected by others.  
• Parliamentary processes which meet legal requirements.  
• Parliamentary business that is well ordered and accessible to the public.  
• Information and support provided to MPs so they can contribute to public affairs.  
• Parliamentary processes which allow MPs to scrutinise the Executive effectively.  
• Processes that help Parliament produce high-quality reports, debates, legislation. |
| A Scotland, which is well informed about its Parliament.             | • Readily accessible, accurate, timely and relevant information about the Parliament that is available to the public.  
• A Parliament, which promotes and enables access to its proceedings and use of its facilities.  
• The public understand Parliament's role in public affairs and do not confuse it with the Executive. |
| A Parliament, in which the people of Scotland can be involved.       | • A culture and arrangements that help members of the public get involved in the Parliament's business.  
• Scrutinising the Executive, informed by appropriate expertise and experience from within the Parliament, as well as externally.  
• Members can carry out their responsibilities with the benefit of appropriate knowledge and experience.  
• The public are committed to the success of the Parliament.  
• The public take the opportunities that are available to them. |
| A Parliament that is well run.                                      | • A parliamentary administration, which can respond to business demands, but which considers available resources into account.  
• Working within the budget, sharing resources effectively and achieving good value for money.  
• Motivated, well-trained, productive and loyal staff.  
• Work is done in the best interests of the Parliament as a whole.  
• Having the support of staff, MPs and the public.  
• Culture and conditions where we can achieve an appropriate balance between work and private life.  
• A Parliament, which operates within its legal framework.  
• Administrative procedures, which are practical and easy to understand. |
provide a high-quality service to its main clients, that is, the Members of the Scottish Parliament and the public that the parliamentary members and staff serve. Every directorate of the Parliament needs to share in the work of achieving each of the aims in the plan. Directorates work on more detailed plans, which identify what is needed to meet the broad objectives of Parliament. This is done in order for Parliament to keep track of its progress towards achieving its aims and expected outputs. Parliament measures certain aspects of its performance, and constantly looks for the best way to do this. This is likely to involve some ‘quantitative measurement’, for example, measuring the amount of business that is carried out in the chamber as well as in the committees, and the level of contact Parliament has with the public. Parliament also solicits feedback on the quality of its performance and it may carry out surveys or interviews with MPs and other people who use the Parliament.

Over time, the Scottish Parliament expects its performance planning and measurement system to become more sophisticated, setting targets that are more specific to measure its progress against, and thereafter use the information it gathers to report on its performance in its annual reports (World Bank Institute [sa]).

2.11.4 The American System

The Government of the United States of America is subject to performance measures under the Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) of 1993, which provides for performance of all governance institutions within the United States. The purposes of this Act are to:

- Improve the confidence of the American people in the capability of the Federal Government by systematically holding Federal agencies accountable for achieving programme results.
- Initiate programme performance reform with a series of pilot projects in setting programme goals, measuring programme performance against those goals, and reporting publicly on their progress. Improve Federal programme effectiveness
and public accountability by promoting a new focus on results, service quality, and customer satisfaction.

- Assist Federal managers to improve service delivery, by requiring planning for meeting programme objectives and by providing the managers with information about programme results and service quality.
- Improve congressional decision-making by providing more objective information on achieving statutory objectives, and on the relative effectiveness and efficiency of Federal programmes and spending.
- Improve internal management of the Federal Government.

The Government Accountability Office (GAO) provides GPRA report on these performance measures so that Congress (who authorises and appropriates the budget for all Federal Government functions) is aware whether it gets value for money. Although legislative branch agencies are not currently subject to GPRA review, these agencies have internal performance measures that are similar to GPRA.

The Senate Report 109-89 written by the Senate Committee on Appropriations, attached to the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act of 2006, includes the following section:

“The Committee supports the applicability of many Government Performance and Results Act [GPRA] principles to the Legislative Branch. GPRA encourages greater efficiency, effectiveness, and accountability in Federal spending, and requires agencies to set goals and use performance measures for management and budgeting. While most Legislative Branch agencies have developed strategic plans, several agencies have not effectively dealt with major management problems and lack reliable data to verify and validate performance. While Legislative Branch agencies are not required to comply with GPRA, the Committee believes the spirit and intent of the Results Act should be applied to these agencies. The Committee intends to monitor agencies' progress in developing and implementing meaningful performance measures, describing how such measures will be verified and validated, linking performance measures to day-to-day activities, and coordinating across `sister' agencies. The Committee directs all legislative branch agencies to submit their plans for achieving this goal within 90 days of enactment of this Act”.
However, it is very difficult to find evidence of these plans, since these are all internal. It is also not clear from the report what the nature or indicators of these plans are.

According to the Guide to Congress, (2008:689-693), in terms of political performance, performance measures of Members of Congress are implied by the election system – if the elected do not perform, the elected get voted out of office. Members of the House of Representatives have two-year terms, and Senators have six-year terms. Civil society and constituents watch designated representatives closely and speak up if the representatives do not perform according to the specified mandates. In addition, Members of Congress have an individual budget to hire personal staff, while Committees hire committee staff. Staff to Members of Congress is hired directly by the Members and serve at the pleasure of the Member or Committee Chair. Furthermore, each Member of Congress has an individual employment system, and there are no set uniform job descriptions, benefits, salary levels, etc. Each Member can then decide whether to apply performance measures within the office, as well as how this will function. This is suggested by the fact that the Congressional Management Foundation, a private consultant group, who assists members of Congress to manage each office, has recommended procedures for performance reviews. However, this is not a requirement, and it is not policy across Members’ offices.

In terms of congressional support staff (such as, the Human Resources Department) and legislative agencies (such as, the Congressional Research), this constitutes the employment sector within Congress, where performance measures are most likely to be applied. Jeff Ventura, the Communications Officer in the CAO (Chief Administrative Office) of the House of Representatives indicated that personal performance measures are about to go through a major overhaul. In addition, the latest CAO semi-annual report indicates that there is some kind of performance rating carried out among respective staff.
In a 2004 report, assessing GPRA after a decade of implementation, GAO concluded that the statutory requirements under GPRA had established a solid foundation of results-oriented performance planning, measurement, and reporting in the federal government. In addition, GAO said GPRA had “also begun to facilitate the linking of resources to results”, although significant implementation challenges remained. The Government Accountability Office (GAO), Government Printing Office (GPO), the Architect of the Capital, the Library of Congress and all the legislative branch agencies apply the GPRA-like performance standards. However, the Congressional Budget Office, which functions more like a congressional committee office, does not apply the GPRA-like performance standards. It is therefore safe to assume that support staff working for Congress (but not staff working directly for Members of Congress) are subject to performance reviews.

The American embassy has indicated that there is not much to measure performance at a political level, and that it is left to the electorate to observe the level of service delivery by Members of Congress. Moreover, there are no performance requirements for political staff. There are, however, standard performance measurements in place for the administration (Guide to Congress, 2008:320–321).

2.11.5 Comparison of the Belgian and United States Governments and Parliaments

There is increased focus on measuring performance in government and public organisations within the domain of contemporary public administration. Performance measurement is an important issue in nearly every public management reform. The eight reasons managers might have for introducing performance management systems are evaluation, control, budgeting, motivation, promotion, celebration, learning and improvement. There is, however, little knowledge about the practice of measuring the performance of Human Resource Management (HRM) in government, especially on a government-wide basis. Because interest in this field has only developed recently in
Belgium, very little is known about its empirical nature and underlying dynamics. Common knowledge, regarding this field, primarily originates from the private sector where it is also applied, without further consideration.

This section presents a comparison of the introduction of a performance measurement system for HRM in the U.S. Federal Government and the state of Flanders in Belgium. The aim is to describe both cases within a similar framework. Although the cases seem to be very different in scope - there were 1.8 million civil servants in the United States versus 35,000 civil servants in Flanders, when the respective measurement systems were introduced; there are various reasons why the cases can be compared. Firstly, both cases are examples of decentralisation, where power was shifted from the central administration to agencies (as is South Africa). In this respect, both are both examples of the New Public Management trend. Second, both cases are also actively developing and using HRM indicators. In the United States, measurement of HRM is applied within the framework of the President's Management Agenda (PMA). This is a management reform aimed at achieving strategic HRM as one of its principal objectives, and using indicators is a central feature of the PMXs framework. In Flanders, measurement of HRM takes place within the framework of Beter Bestuurlijk Beleid (BBB), which is a general government reform aimed at improving general government performance and increasing political accountability (Talbot, 2005:8).

2.12 Conclusion

The concept “performance management” was explicitly discussed. The researcher gave a brief description of the historical perspective of performance management and outlined the legislations that guide its implementation. The requirements for effective evaluation of performance management were dealt with. The researcher further explained the term “performance measurement”, framework and its categories. In analysing the countries that have been considered for comparison, it is clear that some form of legislative or policy guideline is required to guide parliament in measuring its own institutional performance. Some parliaments, such as, the Australian Parliament,
measure both political and administrative performance, while other parliaments, such as, the United States Parliament, only measure administrative performance, and leave the measurement or judgment of political performance to constituents in terms of service delivery. It is also evident that all the countries observed have laws similar to the *Public Finance Management Act*, which provide similar guides to performance measurement of governance bodies, e.g. Annual Reports, Strategic Plans, et cetera. In addition, it is important for the organisation to have its own operational measures that will also assist in performance management.
CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

This study seeks to explore and assess the current system challenges and gaps for measuring performance of the Parliament of the Republic of South Africa, with special reference to the core business of Parliament. This chapter provides a description of the study methods used to determine the extent, to which Parliament measures performance. The researcher used both quantitative and qualitative methods. The research was conducted utilising interviews and questionnaires. This chapter is divided into six sub-categories:

- research design;
- target population and the sample used for the purpose of this study;
- procedure used in selecting the sample;
- data collection methods;
- plan for data analysis; and
- conclusion.

3.2 Research design

Nachmias and Nachmias (1987:75) view the research design as the programme that guides the investigator in the process of collecting, analysing and interpreting observations. It is a logical model of proof that allows the researcher to draw inferences concerning causal relations among the variables under investigation. Mouton (1996:107) defines a research design as a set of guidelines and instructions to be followed in addressing a research problem. Bless and Higson-Smith (2002:156) outline the research design as a set of procedures, which guide the researcher in the process of verifying a particular hypothesis and excluding all other possible hypotheses or
explanations. A research design is simply a plan or blueprint to allow the researcher to test the validity of a hypothesis or to answer research questions, taking into account the factors that might affect the relationship between dependent and independent variables. There are various types of research designs. Some are qualitative, and others are quantitative, and some combine both quantitative and qualitative approaches (Auriacombe, 2005:383-384). Research design was designed and arranged in such a way to suit the nature of the study. In this study qualitative and quantitative approaches are utilised to ensure thoroughness, accuracy and to gather as much information possible, relevant to the study.

3.2.1 Qualitative approach

According to Struwig and Stead (2004:196), qualitative research employs methods, such as, participant observation, archival source analysis, interviews, as well as focus groups on content analysis. Leedy and Ormrod (2001:147) further stipulate that qualitative research methods are the ways of collecting information on the knowledge, attitudes, beliefs and behaviours of target population. In general, information gathered using qualitative methods is not given a numerical value. This is an important form of field research. Qualitative approach does not manipulate numbers, as is the case with quantitative research. In qualitative research, patterns of similarities and differences in all cases or relationships are examined and general ideas and concepts are utilised as tools for generalising. Bless and Higson-Smith (2000:156) delineate qualitative research as a range of methods, which use qualifying words and descriptions to record and investigate aspects of social reality. Babbie (2004:370) defines qualitative research as “…the non-numerical examination and interpretation of observations, for the purposes of discovering underlying meanings and patterns of relationships”. In this study, the researcher applied unstructured interviews as a technique of the qualitative approach to gather relevant information.
3.2.2 Quantitative approach

Struwig and Stead (2004:04) state that quantitative research is a form of conclusive research involving large representative samples and fairly structured data collection procedures. It is an exploration, which describes the phenomena under study in numbers and presents results using statistics and makes inferences about the population. In this approach the raw data is reorganised into a form compatible for computers and can be presented in a chart or graph, as well as interpreted to give meaning to the results (Neuman, 2003:331). Bless and Higson-Smith (2000:156) describe quantitative research as research conducted using a range of methods, which use measurement to record and investigate aspects of social reality. It involves the collection and analysis of data in numeric form. Babbie and Mouton (2001:49) advocate that the best way to measure the properties of phenomena is through quantitative measurement, which is by assigning numbers to the perceived qualities of things. In this regard the researcher’s role is that of an objective observer, whose involvement with the phenomena under study is limited to what is required to obtain necessary data. In this approach the researcher employed a questionnaire survey, in which close-ended questions were computed and graphically analysed.

3.3 Target populations

The target population for a study is a specified group, usually people, who researchers require to draw conclusions from (Babbie, 2007:111). The population in this study refers to the subjects, whom the researcher wishes to research, in order to establish or glean knowledge. Population does not refer to the population of a country but to all, subjects, objects, phenomena, cases, events or activities, which the researcher wishes to research. According to Nachmias and Nachmias (1987:294), a population is the aggregate of all cases that conform to some designated set of specifications. In this study, the population consisted of public servants of the National Parliament of the

### 3.4 Sample

Kumar (2001:65) regards the sample size as the number from whom you obtain the required information and is usually denoted by the letter (n). The sizes of the sample determine the findings; as a rule, the larger the sample size, the more accurate the findings, thus larger samples proffer more reliability than those based on smaller ones. The researcher selected a sample on the basis of personal knowledge regarding the population, its elements and nature of the research objectives. The researcher managed to draw results from 150 respondents; who comprise 7.5% of the population. The respondents targeted were the Presiding Officers, namely Speaker, Deputy Speaker, Chairperson of Chairpersons, Deputy Chairperson of Chairpersons, Chief Whips and Whips of Committees as well as Chairpersons of Committees. Chief Officials included in the study were The Secretariat to the National Parliament, Chief Directors, General Managers and Senior Managers.

Huysamen (1997:37) distinguishes between probability and non-probability samples. In probability samples, like random, stratified and systematic as well as cluster samples, the probability results that all elements in the population will be included in the sample, can be determined. On the other hand, in non-probability samples, like accidental, quota and snowball samples, the probability cannot be specified. In this study the researcher employed a non-probability sampling technique, namely purposive sampling.
3.5 Data collection methods and procedures

Methodology refers to the methods of collecting data; it necessitates a thorough reflection on the planning, structuring and execution of the research in order to comply with the demands of truth, objectivity and validity. The researcher utilised the primary data collection methods. To collect the primary data the researcher used questionnaires and interviews.

3.5.1 Questionnaire survey

A questionnaire is defined as a formal, written, set of close-ended and open-ended questions, directed at every respondent in the study. The researcher applied a combination of close- and open-ended questions and this enabled respondents to fully express viewpoints as well as opinions and to give detailed and precise information. The researcher designed self-administered questionnaires and 50 sets of questions were distributed to the Members of Parliament; another 50 sets of questions were circulated among the Chief Officials of the National Parliament of the Republic of South Africa. All questionnaires were used to gain first-hand information from 100 respondents. The first part of the questionnaire comprised detailed information about the researcher and also highlighted the intentions for undertaking the study. The purpose was to minimise anxiety and discomfort and ensure anonymity. To reinforce the undertaking of confidentiality, respondents’ names were not required. Out of 50 questionnaires distributed to the Members of Parliament, only 31 (62%), were completed and returned to the researcher, whereas a more promising 37 (74%) questionnaires were completed and returned by the Chief Officials. This amounted to a total of 68% response to the questionnaires.

Conducting a research of this volume in the field of work, where people have individual programmes, proved to be problematic. A great deal of effort and explanation was required, before respondents saw the value in participating and responding to the questions. Engaging chairpersons of committees, proved to be the best approach,
where an announcement could be made during meetings. Benefits of participating in the research were clearly explained. Over a period of time, both Chief Officials and MPs made time and responded to the questions.

Another interesting observation was the realisation that most respondents shared the same views on most issues raised in the questionnaire survey. The respondents with different opinions may have been influenced by different issues, such as, negative attitudes, due to unpleasant experiences, and lack of exposure to some sources of information. A contributing factor to limited knowledge, which could influence opinions, is the fact that some respondents only recently joined Parliament and therefore lacked institutional memory of Parliament's progress in achieving its objectives, since its inception. This imbalance did not affect the study, as such views triggered fresh insight in the organisation.

3.5.2 Interview survey

As a follow up to the interview survey, the researcher used unstructured interviews because these are more flexible and more likely to yield information the researcher did not intend asking. Interviews were used to obtain information from 50 Members of Parliament. However, due to busy schedules, such as, International Trips and a congested Parliamentary programme, the researcher only managed to interview 30 of the targeted 50 Members of Parliament. The researcher ensured respondents were fully aware that information gleaned would not be used for any other purposes, than to aid the research under study. The appointments for these interviews were either telephonically pre-arranged or through personal contacts. Offices at the National Parliament were the venues for these interviews.
3.6 Data analysis

According to Welman, Kruger and Mitchel (2007:210) data analysis is a paramount procedure in the research process. The purpose of this procedure is to provide feedback on the tenability or unattainability of the originally formulated hypothesis and, consequently, on the theory, if deduced; is either provisionally supported or refuted. Statistical and interpretative methods are utilised in the analysis of data. The researcher utilised statistical methods to determine the frequency of particular experiences and responses. The interpretative method was used to summarise qualitative data. All the information was summarised, analysed, filtered and arranged in order to produce a well-balanced mini-dissertation, which would be scientifically logical and easy to comprehend.

3.7 Conclusion

This chapter dwelled on the methods utilised to accumulate the required information. Quantitative and qualitative methods were used. In this regard the researcher utilised both interviews and questionnaires. Unstructured interviews were used as these are more flexible to garner information. More than 60% of the total targeted respondents were interviewed. The researcher also elucidated problems encountered when data were collected. A combination of close- and open-ended questions where compiled into a questionnaire to be used during the research. Hundred questionnaires were distributed to Members of Parliament and Chief Officials of the National Parliament of the Republic of South Africa. The response in this regard was 68%. The target population and sample was explained. The researcher used non-probability sampling, namely purposive sampling. Finally, in dealing with this chapter, an analytical and interpretative method was employed.
CHAPTER FOUR

DATA ANALYSIS

4.1 Introduction

This chapter deals with the interpretation and analysis of the data gathered during the research process in the National Parliament of the Republic of South Africa. The researcher collected information through questionnaires from Chief Officials, such as, The Secretariat to the National Parliament, Chief Directors, General Managers and Senior Managers of National Parliament and interviewed Members of Parliament. This chapter provides the interpretation and implications of the research findings. The demographic details of respondents are explained and thereafter the focus of the chapter is on presenting the findings of the quantitative and qualitative analyses.

4.2 Demographics

The following diagrams show age, gender, level of education, marital status and occupation of the respondents within the National Parliament of the Republic of South Africa. It should be noted that the demographics reveal the total picture of the Parliamentary population rather than the office bearers and the Chief Officials of Parliament.
4.2.1 Age group

Figure 4.2.1 Distribution according to age group

The majority of the respondents were between 41 and 50 years of age, with 10% of the respondents above 50 years of age and 30% of respondents ranging between the ages of 31 to 40. Of interest is the fact that most of the respondents were middle aged. The younger respondents were much more willing to participate in the study. In actual fact, the researcher had 100% response from the younger respondents between the ages of 31 to 40. It was also observed that the majority of the parliamentary community took an interest in the research; since thus far; minimal research has been undertaken in this field of study. Most respondents also expressed an interest in the findings of the study, and how such findings could be applied to address some of the identified shortcomings of South Africa’s parliamentary system.
4.2.2 Gender

Chief Officials who participated in this study in the National Parliament of the Republic of South Africa comprised 90% males and 10% females. These statistics reveal a gap is still evident in terms of addressing the imbalances of the past. However, as indicated in the previous chapter, the profile of the respondents does not represent the total number of MPs and senior officials of Parliament. The sample was constituted from top officials among MPs and senior officials. It is true that the top level of Parliament is not fully representative of all females in this arena. Nonetheless, one benefit arising from this study is sensitising parliamentary authorities on the obligation to address the issue. In terms of the views of the respondents, no difference was observed in the way Parliament and the manner in which the institution performs its mandatory functions was regarded.
4.2.3 Level of education

Concerning degrees, 20% of respondents have obtained a Junior Degree. 50% of the respondents are in possession of an Honours Degree and 30% obtained a Master’s Degree. Once again, this might not necessarily be the true reflection of the level of education of all the Members of Parliament; however, it offered the true picture of the current educational profile of the office bearers of Parliament. This finding also provided insight on what the capacity building strategy of Parliament has achieved thus far, as well as what it still needs to achieve. It is also important to note that some Members of Parliament obtained respective qualifications after joining Parliament through the capacity building programmes of Parliament. The institution insisted all training programmes had to be accredited and accumulated into a module that would lead to a particular qualification. This approach has had a direct positive impact on the manner in which Members of Parliament perform individual duties.
4.2.4 Marital status

Figure 4.2.4 Marital status

The statistics on marital status revealed that 90% of the respondents are married whereas only 10% are single. None of the respondents were widowed nor divorced. Due to the age of the respondents, it is understandable that most of the respondents would be married. Most males from the age of 30 and above are married. Considering the fact that only 10% of the respondents were females, it naturally followed that the larger number of the respondents would be married. Tracing the normal trend, one would expect to find more single females than males at the age covered by the study. The findings further demonstrated the need for more transformation in addressing the imbalances of the past. The female gender has been oppressed both politically and traditionally and has always been reminded that a woman’s place is in the kitchen. It, therefore, needs deliberate effort, especially by institutions, such as, Parliament to address this matter and lead by example.
4.3 QUANTITATIVE ANALYSIS

4.3.1 Public participation in budget processes

Figure 4.3.1 Public participation in budget processes

A majority, 67% of the respondents were of the view that the public do have an input during the budget process, whilst 33% differ in opinion. A higher figure of 83% of the respondents stated that the poor are able to participate when National Parliament reviews the government diagnosis of poverty and setting of priorities. On the contrary, the remaining 17% disagreed with the latter statement. A somewhat lower 66% of the respondents were of the view that the budget process is not open and or accessible to the media. The media is invited only when the departments are tabling policy speeches and this hinders any chances of influencing decisions from the budget formulation stages.
4.3.2 Standards of administration

Figure 4.3.2 Standards of administration

A convincing 83% of the respondents felt that the National Parliament of the Republic of South Africa is operating within the acceptable standards of financial administration, whereas 17% indicated otherwise. The governance of the public sector is highly regulated in South Africa and there is little chance that any public institution can operate outside the acceptable standards of financial administration. Parliament operates under the dictates of the Financial Management of Parliament Act. This Act has a number of provisions that seek to ensure good corporate governance. The violation of any provisions of the Act should always be picked up by the Auditor General, who would call Parliament to book. It should also be noted that since Parliament oversees the Executive on good governance and spends tax payers’ money, it should always lead by the example.
4.3.3 Laws, rules and procedures

Another majority, 85% of the respondents, agreed that the National Parliament of the Republic of South Africa operates according to laws prescribed in the Constitution of Republic of South Africa, 1996 as well as to its rules and procedures. Conversely, 15% indicated that the National Parliament always defy the prescribed laws of the land and its rules and procedures. As indicated earlier, there are pieces of legislation, which regulate the operations of Parliament leaving little chance for deviations. Apart from the Constitution of the Republic of South Africa, 1996, there are also Rules of Procedure that provide specifics on how the officials of Parliament should operate. The Treasury Regulations further offer more specifics on planning, reporting and management standards within the public sector. It is on the basis of this framework that the majority of respondents feel that the institution operates within the prescribed laws, rules and procedures.
4.3.4 Impact on society

A convincing 84% of the respondents were of the opinion that the National Parliament does have an impact on government and society; however, 8% differed on the above opinion, while another 8% were uncertain on the stated issue. Between 1994 and 2009 the Parliament has enacted 1400 pieces of legislation, the intention of these are to address the imbalances of the past, bring equality and eradicate poverty. All these pieces of legislation have one thing in common and it is to transform society and bring about the improvement of the people as well as create a better society. In the view of this study Parliament has impacted the society positively although there is still room for improvement. This is underwritten by the majority of respondents, who view that Parliament has indeed risen to the challenge, but 8% still wants to see more improvement.
4.3.5 Efficiency and effectiveness
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**Figure 4.3.5 Efficiency and effectiveness**

On the aspect of conducting of its affairs, 75% of respondents agreed that the National Parliament organises itself and carries out its activities in ways that are reasonably efficient and effective. Opposing this view, 16% of respondents were uncertain about the way the National Parliament conducts its activities, while 9% indicated dissatisfaction with the way the National Parliament is conducting its affairs. It is clear from the responses that some respondents were unsure of the areas on which to focus attention when assessing the institution. The way in which Parliament accounts for its programmes makes it more efficient and effective in its operations. There are regular meetings between the Accounting Officers (Secretary of Parliament) and the Executive Authority of Parliament (Speaker of National Assembly as well as the Chairperson of the National Council of Provinces). However, it was observed that members of opposing political parties tended to engage in opposition politics when responding to questions.
4.3.6 Accessibility to Parliament

A convincing majority, 91% of respondents confirmed that the National Parliament provides mechanisms to ensure that citizens, as well as interest groups, have access to Members of Parliament and Portfolio Committees. A mere 9% of respondents disagreed with the said statement. Parliament hosts a number of events, called Sectoral Parliaments, where relevant stakeholders are invited to discuss issues of common interests. The example of this is special gatherings, such as, the People Assembly, Women’s Parliament, Youth Parliament, Religious Parliament, and Worker’s Parliament. Members of the public are also invited to observe all Parliamentary sittings, such as, the State of the Nation address by the President of the Republic of South Africa.
4.3.7 Human resources development

Figure 4.3.7 Human resources development

Once again, the majority, 83% of respondents agreed that Members of Parliament are provided with opportunities to improve individual knowledge and skills. Conversely, 17% of respondents showed dissatisfaction with human resources development initiatives that seeks to empower the Members of Parliament. The programme of Parliament caters for a period of Member training, where different training areas are identified. Members are at different levels of education as there is no minimum qualification for being a Member of Parliament, because most of the time, the lack of equity in educational levels results in irreconcilable differences. For some Members, an area of training may be too basic, whilst some members view it differently. In that case, it is not always easy to satisfy people of different levels. The point on which all respondents agreed is the presence of a training programme on Parliament and said programme does enhance the capacity of members in performing their duties.
4.4 Qualitative data analysis

All the respondents reciprocally agreed that at present, in the National Parliament of the Republic of South Africa, there is no system to measure the performance of the Members of Parliament. The existing performance management system does not measure the core business of law making, public participation and oversight. It is only meant for the administrative arm of government. There is an absence of clear targets. Parliament does not totally comply with government priorities. The Parliamentary budget process is not an activity based budgeting process, which considers priorities and spending patterns. The strategic plan of Parliament is not aligned to the budget vote programmes that form the basis of budget appropriation. Parliament’s performance is measured by an electorate every five years through elections.

The previously disadvantaged people are extensively represented in the National Parliament and Provincial Parliaments. This sector of the population’s existence is informed by the proportional representation. Most political parties follow a representative formula that reflects the demographics of the country when candidates selected to be Members of Parliament, are deployed. The demographics of the country are measured along gender, race, abilities, geographical area, age and other related considerations. The current majority party in the South African politics has adopted the principle of 50:50 gender representations. In addition, the ward and district approach contribute towards ensuring that all the areas of the country are represented in Parliament. The proportional representative electoral system is a very effective instrument in ensuring that even the smallest political parties, representing minorities, are represented in Parliament.

Parliament tries its best to address the needs of the people through an oversight process. Public hearings, site visits, attending to submitted petitions are ways of ensuring that the needs of the citizens are taken into account and addressed
accordingly. It should be noted that public participation is the Constitutional mandate of Parliament. The resolution taken in the Sectoral Parliaments, such as, the People Assembly, Women’s Parliament and other related gatherings are processed through the Parliamentary processes until there is feedback to the people, who raised the issue. A resolution or petition from the public gets received by the office of the Speaker of Parliament, recorded and referred to the relevant portfolio committee. The committee will research the matter, call the relevant executive department if need be, and forward the report back to the House through the Office of the Speaker, until the response or solution is sent back to the complainant. Members of the public are free to attend committee meetings, where respective complaints are debated and presentations to the portfolio committees of Parliament are welcomed.

Parliament has a sound relation with other spheres of government through the National Council of Provinces. All Provinces are provided with an opportunity to have an input before particular legislation has to be passed. It is clearly spelled out in the Constitution that Parliament should consult all relevant stakeholders in any given legislation. Parliament has the Constitutional responsibility to interact with other spheres of the government. The National Council of Provinces has the responsibility to deal with all matters related to the Provinces and the local government. This House has responsibility to consult Provinces and local government in all Bills classified as Section 76 in terms of the Constitution. Section 76 Bills are bills, which deal with issues affecting the Provinces and the local sphere of government. Even bills that deal with national issues (Section 75), such as, Department of Defence, for example, are also referred to the National Council of Provinces for concurrence. There are also pieces of legislation that promote the interaction between the national sphere and the other spheres of government. Those Bills include the Intergovernmental Relations Act and the Intergovernmental Relations Framework Act.

Members of Parliament are of the view that the Constitution describes the budget processes under Section 77 as Money Bills and gives the Parliament authority to legislate how it wants to deal with such processes. In the past, the National Treasury
would do the budget and present it to Parliament, without expecting the Parliament to make any amendments. It is only this year, 2010 that Parliament has enacted a piece of legislation called the Money Bills Amendment Procedure and Related Matters Act, which authorises it to amend Money Bills. This Act requires Parliament to establish two committees in both Houses. The committees will therefore conduct public hearings and involve the public in the process of budgeting. Parliament has established constituency offices in all towns of the Republic of South Africa as an attempt to reach the citizens.

4.5 Conclusion

This chapter presented and analysed the data that were collected. The researcher elucidated the demographic of the study showing age, gender, level of education, marital status and occupation of respondents. On the quantitative analysis, the researcher gave a synopsis on the following sub-themes; public participation in the budget processes, standards of administration, laws, rules and procedures, impact on society, efficiency and effectiveness, accessibility to Parliament and Human Resource Development. The information both on quantitative and qualitative analyses elicited that only public officials’ performance is being measured. The performance of Members of Parliament is measured only through elections every five years. In this instance, a question one should ask is what is happening in between the five year period when one’s performance is not assessed. It is worth noting that the previously disadvantaged people are extensively represented in National and Provincial Parliaments. Parliament addresses the needs of the people through an oversight process, such as, public hearings, site visits, petitions and holding meetings with relevant departments as and when necessary. Parliament has a sound relation with other spheres of government through the National Council of Provinces.
CHAPTER FIVE

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction

In democratic countries, such as, South Africa, the legislature or Parliament plays a very important role. The members of Parliament are elected to represent the people of the country, in essence, the voice of the people. Parliament, therefore, is accountable to the people of South Africa. Every five years the people of South Africa get an opportunity to cast individual votes for a new Parliament. Each new Parliament is numbered. For example, in the elections of 1994 people voted for the First Parliament. The Second Parliament came into existence after the general elections in 1999 and the Third Parliament in 2004. In 2009, people again voted and that Parliament is called the Fourth Parliament. Parliament consists of two Houses called the National Assembly and National Council of Provinces. Each House has its own distinct role and functions, as set out in the Constitution. However, there are many instances when the two Houses act together to conduct what is called “joint business”. In this chapter, general conclusions are drawn from the preceding chapters of the research. In each chapter, key issues were raised in order to render context to the researcher’s recommendations, based on the critical issues revealed. Additionally, these recommendations highlight areas for further research.

5.2 Concluding issues

The first chapter of the study dealt with the introduction to and orientation of the study. The statement of the problem, objectives, significance, limitations and delimitations, clarification of key concepts and ethical considerations were clearly stated. In the introduction to the study the researcher raised the following critical issues:
Measurement of institutional performance is important in as far as it strives to promote accountability and justify the allocation of resources. Legislations, such as, the Public Financial Management Act, 2000, Treasury Regulations and Financial Management of Parliament Act only deal with the administrative and management part of Parliament and fail to create a framework that will provide for planning, performance measurement as well as monitoring and evaluation on the political side, which is the core business of Parliament. The first chapter also outlined the objectives of the study and the objectives were to:

- Explore and assess the current system challenges and gaps for measuring performance of the Parliament of the Republic of South Africa, with special reference to the core business of Parliament;
- Determine the extent to which the framework for measuring parliamentary performance affects the citizens in the constituencies; and
- Attempt to develop a performance management model and tools, which can be adopted by Parliament to address the core business of Parliament challenges and problems.

The aforementioned objectives have been achieved in that the researcher has extensively argued the lack of a parliamentary model and tools that measure the core business of Parliament. The respondents of the research have also overwhelming identified the gap caused by the absence of the tool, which measures the core business of Parliament. In addition, through the respondents, it has been observed that accountability to the citizens is not adequate, given the absence of an appropriate tool, which measures the performance of Parliament on an on-going basis. Elections, conducted once every five years cannot be enough to ensure that Parliamentarians are fully accountable.

In the second chapter, the relevant literature was reviewed. This chapter provided an appropriate background and the current state of scholarship in the area of performance management, which underpinned the study. This part of the study investigated the opinions, research, findings, conclusions and recommendations of other scholars who
had written about parliamentary performance systems. While reviewing the literature it became evident that there are Parliaments like the Australian Parliament, which measure both political and administrative performance, while other Parliaments, such as, the United States Parliament, only measure administrative performance. It is clear that some form of legislative or policy guideline is required to guide Parliament in measuring its own institutional performance. The yardsticks used in measuring Parliament’s performance are effectiveness, efficiency, compliance and relevance. All countries considered in the literature review, have laws similar to the *Public Finance Management Act*, which provides similar guidelines to performance measurement of governance bodies. In examining how well Legislatures execute relevant duties, it is significant to check the following functions, which are; balancing power, representing constituencies and making laws. A performance framework for measuring the performance of Parliament must contain three variables. These are the determinants of performance, criteria of performance, as well as structure of performance.

Chapter three discussed the research design and methodology used in collecting data from the respondents. The researcher used the purposive sampling method and quantitative research method in the form of questionnaires. The questionnaires comprised close- and open-ended questions. Qualitative research methodology was also utilised as an appropriate method in conducting epistemological research. In this regard interviews were held with Members of Parliament and senior officials of Parliament.

After analysing the data in Chapter four, it is evident that the majority of respondents were middle aged. The top management of the Parliament of the Republic of South Africa is male dominated. This indicates that there is still more to be done in addressing gender parity. Most respondents are in possession of an Honours degree, although this may not be a true reflection of the level of education of all Members of Parliament. However, it gives the true picture on the educational profile of the office bearers of Parliament. This provides an insight into the successes achieved with the capacity building strategy of Parliament, because most members obtained the necessary
qualifications after having joined National Parliament. Most respondents were married males.

The respondents held the opinion that the public do have an input during the budget process. The poor citizens are also given an opportunity to participate when the National Parliament reviews the government diagnosis of poverty and setting of priorities. The media is invited when the departments are tabling policy speeches. The National Parliament of the Republic of South Africa is operating within the acceptable standards of financial administration as well as within the laws prescribed in the Constitution of the Republic of South Africa, 1996 and according to its Rules and Procedures. Most of the respondents feel that Parliament does have an impact on society and address issues, such as, poverty, et cetera. The National Parliament is efficient and effective in its day to day operations. Members of Parliament are provided with opportunities to improve personal knowledge and skills through human resources and development programmes. All the respondents were in agreement that currently the National Parliament of the Republic of South Africa has no system to measure the performance of the Members of Parliament. Parliament’s performance is measured only through the process of elections, by the electorate every five years.

5.3 Recommendations
In view of all the observations, findings and shortcomings identified in the previous chapters of this research work, the researcher has developed a model that is well thought out, analysed, adapted and adjusted to the South African system of government. This model takes into consideration the Constitutional mandate of Parliament, which is that of legislation, oversight, public participation, promoting cooperative governance and participation in international relations. The development of the model is also based on carefully selected relevant components of various successful models of the world.

The suggested model of measuring performance of the core business of parliamentary mandates is reflected in Table 5.1 below.
Table 5.1 Measuring performance of the core business of parliamentary mandates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Outcomes</th>
<th>Parliamentary Mandates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Legislation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsiveness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transparency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The model encompasses performance outcomes, which are; accountability, responsiveness, representativity, transparency and impact as well as parliamentary mandates, which are the Constitutional mandates in a matrix. At the intersection of the individual parliamentary mandate (displayed in columns) and individual performance outcomes (displayed in rows), questions are posed and answered in the specific cell, which represents the intersection between the specific column and row. For example, the performance outcome of accountability could be applied to the parliamentary mandate participation. Within these cells, key questions can be posed vis-à-vis the performance outcomes and parliamentary mandate.

The parliamentary indicators framework should accommodate the variety of indicators and exploit complementarities among them. A framework should be built around the annual basis, mid-term and at the end of the five-year political term, typically lasting several years and consisting of four distinct stages:

- Election of Members of Parliament: the electoral system determines the legitimacy, and largely the authority, of Parliament, thus it sets the parameters for Parliament’s contribution to democratic governance.
- Formation of the government and selection of parliamentary leaders: the formation of the government and the selection of parliamentary leaders have a
major bearing on how relations will be conducted between Parliament and the executive as well as on the style and effectiveness of parliamentary performance.

- The business of Parliament: day-to-day law-making and oversight activities in tandem with parliamentary services to support these are the routine of parliamentary performance.
- Dissolution of Parliament: the manner in which Parliaments are dissolved has a significant impact on its capacity and authority. The framework features a set of aggregated parliamentary indicators that would be employed within the suggested framework.

5.4 Issues for further research
It has become clear through this research, as well as this chapter that Parliament needs a scientific tool to measure its performance in order to promote accountability, responsiveness, openness, transparency, and to demonstrate the impact of the policies processed and passed by the Parliament. This framework enables the Parliament to realise all these objectives based on its constitutional mandate, which is that of law making, oversight, public participation, cooperative government and international relations. This is realised through questioning in order to reveal the true picture of Parliament’s actual performance. This kind of the intervention needs to be done on a regular basis in order to promote efficiency and effectiveness of the legislative sector. According to the researcher, this process should realise the aspiration of the people of South Africa and democracy will be entrenched.
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ANNEXURE A: PERMISSION LETTER

TO: The Deputy Speaker of National Parliament
P.O. Box 15
Cape Town
8000

FROM: Vuyani Welcome Mapolisa
P.O BOX 1337
Cape Town
8000
CELL: 0836544026

SUBJECT: REQUEST FOR PERMISSION TO CONDUCT RESEARCH

Dear Sir/Madam

I hereby request permission to undertake some research work in the National Parliament of the Republic Of South Africa. I am enrolled for Masters in Public Administration at the University of Fort Hare. My research interests are in Public Sector Human Resource Management and I am undertaking a study to “analyse the framework for measuring parliamentary performance in South Africa…” I believe that this study will be of benefit not only to me but to the National Parliament of the Republic of South Africa as well.

I promise that all the information obtained will be treated with strict confidentiality and will only be used for the purposes of the study.

Anticipating your favourable response
Yours sincerely

Vuyani Welcome Mapolisa (Mr)
ANNEXURE B: GUIDED QUESTIONNAIRE
The Secretariat to the National Parliament, Chief Directors, General Managers and Senior Managers
Impact Assessment Tool
Questionnaire Guide
Chief Officials

General
Oversight
Legislatures are normally subjected to performance measurement in order to gauge their performance as key democratic institutions; particularly in performing their roles of oversight, legislator and representative body. The issue of what is being measured in the case of Legislatures can be explained in two ways. Firstly, performance is measured in terms of how the Legislature contributes to democratic governance and how it relates to citizens; and secondly, the performance of the Legislature as an institution can be measured in specific reference to how well it works administratively. This will have reference to issues, such as, effectiveness and efficiency of parliamentary services and the ways in which parliamentary committees work. These two dimensions make a clear distinction between what is specifically being measured in Legislatures. The first dimension refers to measuring the performance of the Legislature’s political component, while the second dimension measures the Legislature’s administrative branch. The purpose of this tool is “... to analyse the framework for measuring parliamentary performance in South Africa”.

Respondents
This questionnaire has been prepared for the participation of the individuals responsible for carrying out administrative arm of National Parliament of the Republic of South Africa.

Guidelines
Please note that the information gathered during this research will be handled in a responsible manner within the confines of research ethics.
**Process**
The researcher and/or field assistants will administer the questionnaire based on the direct engagement with respondents.

**Communication**
The researcher and/or field assistants will engage the respondents in both Xhosa and English. However, all responses will be captured in English.

**Disclaimer**
*This questionnaire has been prepared for a research project undertaken to fulfill the requirements of Master’s Degree in Public Administration at the University of Fort Hare.*

Your participation will be greatly appreciated.
**SECTION A**

Please mark with X in the appropriate box

1. Gender

| MALE | FEMALE |

2. Age

| -21  | 22-30  | 31-40 | 41-50 | 50+ |

3. Marital status

| Married | Divorced | Widow | Single |

4. Highest qualification obtained

| Matric | Diploma | Junior Degree | Honours | Masters | Ph.D. |

5. Position

(Please specify your job title)

............................................................................................................
SECTION B
QUESTIONS

1. Does Parliament ensure public input and participation during the budget process?

Yes  No

2. Does Parliament ensure that the poor are able to participate when it reviews the government’s diagnosis of poverty and setting of priorities?

Yes  No

3. Does Parliament open the budget process and make it accessible to citizens, civil society organisations, and the media?

Yes  Uncertain  No

4. Does Parliament operate according to acceptable standards of financial administration?

Yes  No

5. Does Parliament operate according to the laws of the land and its own rules and procedures?

Yes  Uncertain  No

6. Does Parliament make a difference; that is, does it have an impact on government and society?

Yes  No

7. Does Parliament organise itself and carry out its activities in ways that are reasonably efficient and dependable?

Yes  Uncertain  No

8. Does the Parliament provide to ensure that citizens, as well as groups, have access, i.e. access to members, to committees, and to the general process?

Yes  Uncertain  No
9. Does Parliament provide opportunities for MPs to improve their knowledge and skills?

| Yes | No |

10. Is the Parliamentary budget process relevant and to what extent does it address the critical issues of the day (e.g. fighting corruption and poverty reduction)?

| Yes | No |

Elaborate on the above given answer

11. What general problems are experienced when measuring parliamentary performance?

| Yes | No |
ANNEXURE C: INTERVIEW GUIDE

Presiding Officers: Speaker, Deputy Speaker, Chairperson of Chairpersons, Deputy Chairperson of Chairpersons, Chief Whips, Whips of Committees and Chairpersons of Committees

Impact Assessment Tool

Interview Guide

National Parliament of the Republic of South Africa

General

Oversight

Legislatures are normally subjected to performance measurement in order to gauge their performance as key democratic institutions, particularly in performing their roles of oversight, legislator and representative body. The issue of what is being measured in the case of Legislatures can be explained in two ways. Firstly, performance is measured in terms of how the Legislature contributes to democratic governance and how it relates to citizens; and secondly, the performance of the Legislature as an institution can be measured in specific reference to how well it works administratively. This will have reference to issues, such as, effectiveness and efficiency of parliamentary services and the ways in which parliamentary committees work. These two dimensions make a clear distinction between what is specifically being measured in Legislatures. The first dimension refers to measuring the performance of the Legislature’s political component, while the second dimension measures the Legislature’s administrative branch. The purpose of this interview guide is “… to analyse the framework for measuring parliamentary performance in South Africa”.

Respondents

This interview guide has been prepared for the participation of the individuals responsible for conducting vigorous oversight over national departments.
Guidelines
Please note that the information gathered during this research will be handled in a responsible manner within the confines of research ethics.

Process
The researcher and/or field assistants will administer the interview guide based on the direct engagement with respondents.

Communication
The researcher and/or field assistants will engage the respondents in both Xhosa and English. However, all responses will be captured in English.

Disclaimer
This interview guide has been prepared for a research project undertaken to fulfill the requirements of Master’s Degree in Public Administration at the University of Fort Hare. Your participation will be greatly appreciated.

Questions
1. What are current system challenges and gaps for measuring performance of the Parliament of the Republic of South Africa?
2. Does the constitutional system and the Parliament provide for substantial political equality?
3. Are previously excluded groups now represented in the Parliament?
4. Does the Parliament provide a service to constituents and constituencies?
5. Does the Parliament provide civic education on representative democracy, the legislative institution and the legislative process?
6. Is the Parliament responsive, at least to some degree, to what citizens want?
7. Is an opportunity provided for individuals and groups to participate in the law making process?
8. Is there a senior Member of Parliament present to ensure that the legislative process works well?

9. Are the parties in the law making process cohesive enough to ensure that all parties play a decisive role on important issues vis-à-vis the making laws process?

10. Does Parliament consult the poor in carrying out its evaluations of poverty reduction programmes?

11. Does Parliament employ gender analysis in seeking to influence budget priorities and/or in monitoring the budget?

12. Does Parliament consult civil society organisations and business in its review of the budget?

13. In reviewing the budget, does Parliament consult policy experts and utilise their knowledge?

14. Does Parliament have constructive relations with different spheres of government?

15. Does Parliament have a recognised Constitutional role in the budget process?

16. Is there a tradition of parliamentarians playing an active role in the budget process?

17. Do MPs consult their constituents and represent their interests in the budget process?

18. Do political parties assign Parliamentary budget responsibilities to Members based on their knowledge and skills?
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