Pakistan Journal of Commerce and Social Sciences
2019, Vol. 13 (3), 620-634
Pak J Commer Soc Sci

Evaluating Result Based Management and the Need for Complexity Aware Management Approach for International Development Agencies

Sami Ullah Bajwa (Corresponding author)
University of Management and Technology, Lahore, Pakistan
Email: sami.bajwa@umt.edu.pk

Naveda Kitchlew
University of Management and Technology, Lahore, Pakistan
Email: naveda.kitchlew@umt.edu.pk

Abstract

Result Based Management (RBM) is a widely used management approach in international development agencies. During the last two decades, there have been growing concerns regarding the rigidity of this approach; and both the scholars and practitioners have been calling for an alternate complexity aware adaptive approach. However, there remains a lack of empirical evidence to support this criticism. The objective of this study is to contribute towards this end by undertaking an empirical evaluation of the efficacy of the RBM approach and assessing the need for a flexible and adaptive approach. Since the tool to measure the implementation of RBM is not available, we at first developed and validated a tool for measuring the implementation of RBM. Subsequently, by collecting data from 206 middle and senior levels employees of development agencies, the relationship between RBM and the ability of agencies to adapt has been tested. The validity of the instrument was established through exploratory factor analysis and hypotheses were tested by regression analysis. The findings showed that RBM negatively affects the adaptability of development agencies and hence calls for developing an alternate flexible and adaptive approach hold merit.

Keywords: result based management (RBM), international development agencies, complexity aware management approach (CAMA), evaluation of development initiatives, project complexity.

1. Introduction

On average US$ 135 billion aid money is spent annually (OECD, 2015) for undertaking interventions to reduce poverty, protect the environment; and improve economic, social, educational, health, and governance situation in under-developed and developing countries of the world (UN, 2015). These interventions are undertaken through multilateral development agencies like United Nations (UN); International Non-government Organizations (INGOs) like Care Foundation; and state agencies of donor

countries like United States Aid for International Development (USAID). Collectively, these agencies are referred to as International Development Agencies (IDAs).

During the last few decades, the concerns regarding the effectiveness of these interventions have been on the rise (Dann & Sattelberger, 2015; Groves & Hinton, 2013). Increasingly, the donors have posed hard questions about the way their aid money was being utilized by IDAs and the extent to which interventions have been effective in achieving the envisaged targets and goals (Chianca, 2008). To satisfy these accountability concerns, IDAs adopted a management approach which enabled them to set those measurable goals and performance indicators which can be tracked through quantifiable data (Bester, 2012; Binnendijk, 2000). The approach is referred to as Result Based Management (RBM).

A systematic review of the literature on RBM shows that there are two strikingly opposite strands regarding its efficacy and usefulness (Bajwa & Kitchlew, 2019). At one hand, researchers and practitioners have applauded it for promoting result culture in IDAs (Bester, 2012) and helping them improve operational excellence (Mulongo et al., 2015). Whereas on the other hand, there is criticism that RBM is inappropriate management approach as it impedes IDAs to achieve their objectives (Eyben et al., 2015; Mayne, 2007; Mowles et al., 2008). To some authors, it is inappropriate because it begets overwhelming technical and organizational challenges during implementation (Schatteman & Ohemeng, 2008). Others, however, take a rather hard stance and suggest that fundamental assumptions and core processes of RBM are flawed because they make IDAs rigid and inept in adapting to rapidly changing circumstances (Eyben & Savage, 2013; Mowles et al., 2008).

Since interventions of IDAs target social problems – which are inherently complex (Glouberman & Zimmerman, 2002), emerging, ill-defined, ambiguous, controversial, and interlinked with other problems (as poverty is linked with gender issues) (Ferraro et al., 2015) – inflexible and rigid approach becomes an intrinsic obstacle for agencies to achieve their goals. Thus, the success of these interventions, which consume US$ 135 billion annually, is largely dependent on the management approach of IDAs. Assessment of the efficacy of RBM, therefore, is significant for judicious use of donor money and success of IDAs in combating the grand challenges of the world.

While a plethora of literature furnishes arguments for and against RBM, it is worth noting that these arguments are based on personal experiences of practitioners and theory-based criticism by scholars. Eyben (2013) and Mowles et al. (2008), for example, have criticized RBM based on assertions of complexity theory. However, it is surprising to note that there is still a lack of systematic evaluation that whether or not the criticism on RBM holds merit. We argue that partially this lack of empirical investigation is because the measure of RBM has not been developed so far.

In view of the foregoing, the objective of this study was twofold. First, we developed a tool to measure the implementation of RBM in an agency. Subsequently, by using this tool, we empirically tested the effectiveness of RBM. Since biggest criticism on RBM is its rigidity, the litmus test of its efficacy, or otherwise need of a new adaptive approach, is whether or not it makes IDAs less adaptive. Accordingly, we tested the relationship

between various components of RBM and adaptability of IDAs. The study makes an important contribution towards recurring debate regarding the need for adopting a flexible approach which could cater to the complexity and uncertainty surrounding IDAs. The tool to measure implementation of RBM is another contribution because it will enable scholars of the field to measure the relationship between RBM and strategic and operational outcomes like learning management, human resource practices, and organizational performance, etc.

The manuscript is structured as follows. To begin with, based on a review of literature on conceptual underpinnings of RBM, we delineated essential components of RBM which were then used for developing the instrument to measure implementation of RBM. Subsequently, hypotheses have been formed regarding the relationship between adaptability of IDAs and various dimensions of RBM. The methodology section explicates the process of developing the tool and testing the proposed hypotheses. Finally, the practical and theoretical implications of findings have been discussed.

2. Literature Review and Hypothesis Development

2.1 Conceptualization of Result Based Management

Although, focus on results and outcomes in IDAs became widespread in the 1990s, its roots go back to 1970s when USAID developed the Logical Framework Approach (LFA) for management of development interventions. LFA had an explicit focus on goal/objective-oriented planning. Earlier, Druker (1954) had coined a term Management by Objectives (MBO) to emphasize that objectives should be central to the entire planning process in organizations, and managerial performance should be measured based on 'objective evidence'. Since early 1980, a similar focus on "evidence" sparked in realms of public policy, with the name of "evidence-based management" (Rousseau, 2006). Some authors suggest that result-orientation in IDAs also took inspiration from the theoretical foundation of MBO and evidence-based management (Vähämäki et al., 2011). Furthermore, planning and management of these interventions closely relate to the lifecycle approach of project management discipline (Arif et al., 2015; Landoni & Corti, 2011). The mantra of project management is to breakdown a project into smaller parts/phases, create causal links between various parts and activities, allocate resources according to the requirement of each phase, and undertake regular monitoring to ensure that intended targets are met in time (Kirk, 2001). All these principles are prevalent in RBM.

IDAs work in isolation to each other and have their preferences regarding development agenda. Consequently, the journey of adopting a result-oriented management approach embraced a foray of initiatives, terminologies, and frameworks, used by different IDAs. Examples include use of multiple tools like LFA, Program Logical Model (PLM), Result Framework (RF); and tendency to alternately describe 'goals' and 'sub-goals' as 'results' and 'intermediate results', etc. Nonetheless, these tools mainly differ in terminologies but build on a similar premise of focusing on results and demonstrating cause-and-effect relationship between intended outcomes/goals of interventions, sub-goals, and activities. As noted by Cummings (1997) "all [these approaches] have elements of a hierarchy with societal goals at the top and activities or resources at the bottom".

In the early 1990s, RBM emerged as an overarching term to denote result-oriented management practices of IDAs. It endured usage of different frameworks, models and terminologies in development agencies as long as they adhere to basic principles – including measurable goals, causal links between goals, sub-goals and activities, and commitment to rigorous monitoring and evolution. In 2001, Development Aid Committee (DAC) Working Party on Aid Evaluation surveyed development agencies (including, USAID, UNDP, UNICEF, AusAID, DFID, AFD, GTZ, Sida, etc.) to review and synthesize the experience of implementing RBM (Binnendijk, 2000). The report concluded that these agencies were at different stages of RBM implementation. It was also highlighted that agencies were implementing RBM at the project, country (office), and agency levels.

Literature abounds that in its basic conception, RBM is a management approach which holds that an agency should (Batliner, Felber, & Günther, 2011; Bester, 2012; Binnendijk, 2000; Ika & Lytvynov, 2009; Meier, 2003; Vähämäki et al., 2011)

- Articulate intended results in terms of SMART (specific, measurable, attainable, relevant, time-bound) goals.
- Create causal links between the main goals (results/impact), sub-goals (strategic goals/outcomes), further sub-goals (intermediate-results/outputs), and activities (inputs/resources) of interventions. RBM, therefore, allows agencies to use LFA, PLM, RF, or any other framework for the pictorial display of hierarchal relations between activities, sub-goals, and goals. These causal links serve as a strategy to achieve the ultimate goal.
- Allocate resources and organize day to day operations around the activities and goals.
- Develop indicators for each level of goals and activities. Also, identify "means of verification" and "source/means of collecting data" to measure performance against the indicators.
- Regularly collect data for monitoring performance of intervention as well as employees and periodically undertake evaluation studies. Whilst monitoring is undertaken to track how an intervention or agency is performing against set indicators, evaluation is conducted to review the performance and impact of interventions in a broader context. The evaluation also aims to draw lessons for future planning.

2.2 Need for Adaptability and RBM in Development Interventions

Rittel and Webber (1973) were among the pioneers who explicated that social problems are different from the problems being faced by natural scientists and engineers. The authors argued that social or policy planning caters to the problems which are ill-defined and inherently 'wicked'. These problems have neither clearly known reason(s) nor criteria to assess proposed solutions. Moreover, there is no trial and error in the solution of such problems because one action leads to another and becomes irreversible; and there is no way to assess if all possible solutions of the problem have been considered. Every wicked problem is equivocal and may become consequence of another wicked problem, leaving

planners with little margin to hypothesize solutions and develop preplanned goals and strategies (Howlett et al., 2017; Ramalingam et al., 2014; Ricker-Gilbert et al., 2013; Termeer et al., 2015). If an intervention to deal with one wicked problem is repeated in two different situations, the outcome of both would be different because the produced result is the outcome of various activities and interaction of the broader system in which the interventions are made. In such uncertain and complex situation, flexibility to change goals and strategies and vis-à-vis allocate resource becomes imperative (Eyben, 2005; Jones, 2011; Mintzberg, 2000; Ramalingam, 2013; Ramalingam et al., 2008; Stacey, 2007). Whereas RBM requires setting up explicit and quantifiable goals and strategies, well before the implementation of interventions. Accordingly, we hypothesize that;

- **H_1:** Goals setting in RBM negatively affects the adaptability of IDAs
- **H_2:** Resources allocation pattern in RBM negatively affects the adaptability of IDAs

The management of interventions, to deal with wicked problems, becomes complex because of non-linear causality, emergence, and temporal and spatial divergences (Garcia and Zazueta (2015). In such conditions understanding cause and effect relationships, and hence developing log-frames, becomes very difficult (Britt & Patsalides, 2013). It has been suggested that log-frame is one of the main reasons for rigidity in RBM (Eyben, 2013), impracticality and failure to deal with attribution problem (Gasper, 2000). In an attempt to reduce the complex social issue to one or a few key goals, log-frames ignore underlined political issues and conflicts (Bakewell & Garbutt, 2005; Hummelbrunner, 2010). Furthermore, while double-loop learning is utmost important for development sector (Perrin, 2015), log-frame hinders the process of double-loop learning and encourages agencies to work in isolation to each other (Eyben, 2005). According to Lowe (2013), linear thinking is a poor way of conceptualizing the opportunities, challenges, and experiences in the development process. Perrin (2015) has also suggested that linear logic of RBM makes RBM a rigid management system which cannot handle complexity and uncertainty of the environment. Accordingly, we hypothesize that;

- **H_3:** Causality among main goals, sub-goals, and activities in RBM negatively affects the adaptability of IDAs

The development work is also complex because it aims to bring social transformation (Mowles et al., 2008) which necessarily involves a large number of stakeholders (Diallo & Thuillier, 2004), uncertainties in proposing solutions and strategies, emerging outcomes, and non-linear interplay of various factors (Patton, 2011). RBM, however, is overwhelmingly focused on ensuring accountability through setting-up measurable goals, causal links between activities and goals, and indicators for monitoring and evaluation (Britt & Patsalides, 2013). Pre-determined goals and explicit causal links, drawn between activities and goals, require IDAs to follow the course as defined in the project plan. If agencies undertake any intervention that was not envisaged in the project plan, or perform it differently than the way it was mentioned in the project plan, monitoring and evaluation would raise red-flag. There would be no reward; rather the agency would be held responsible for deviating from the plan. Thus, the approach caters to the accountability concerns of the donors, but at the expense of making development initiatives less flexible and adaptive towards changing conditions (Eyben, 2008; Eyben,

2011). Accordingly, we hypothesize that monitoring and evaluation components of RBM have an inverse relationship with the propensity of IDAs to adapt.

- **H_4:** Monitoring elements of RBM negatively affect the adaptability of IDAs
- **H_5:** Evaluation element of RBM negatively affects the adaptability of IDAs

3. Methodology

Given that a validated measure of RBM implementation does not exist, the first objective of the study was to develop this instrument. Benson and Clark (1982) have devised a step by step process to develop an instrument. Following this approach, we started by explicating the purpose and scope of the instrument. RBM is used by IDAs as well as state departments of member countries of the Organization of Economic Cooperation and Development (Bester, 2012). Though the premise and the main thrust of RBM remain the same whether it is used in IDAs or state departments, its modalities and scope become substantially different. Scope of the instrument, therefore, was set to measure the extent to which RBM has been implemented in a given International Development Agency.

Subsequently, following the deductive approach of instrument development (Hinkin, 1995) we conducted an integrated review of manuscripts published on RBM in Science Direct, Wiley Online Library, Emerald Insight, and Taylors and Francis, between the year 2000 and 2017. An integrated literature review is a systematic process of creating new knowledge through literature (Rocco & Plakhotnik, 2009; Torraco, 2016). It is particularly useful for synthesizing contradiction in the literature (Torraco, 2005; Torraco, 2016) or identifying patterns of literature and directions for future research (Callahan, 2010). We searched articles by using a combination of the word "Result Based Management" in abstracts, titles, and keywords in above-mentioned repositories. A total of 711 manuscripts were found and read by both the authors separately, keeping in view two criteria. First, those papers were shortlisted which had RBM as the main phenomenon of interest. 104 papers met this criterion. Secondly, only those papers were selected which were focused on RBM in IDAs, leaving 47 papers for detailed analysis.

The first author reviewed the selected manuscripts and developed a list of twenty-seven items, covering five components of RBM, including goals, causality, monitoring, evaluation and resource allocation. The list was then shared with fifteen experts, which included staff members of leading IDAs at three hierarchical levels (i.e. head office level, country office level, and project level). The experts belonged to the United Nations, United States Agency of International Development, Islamic Development Bank, The World Bank, Overseas Development Institutions, and Australian Agency of International Development. Four of these experts were working in counterpart agencies of aid beneficiary countries. In terms of origin, the experts belonged to the United States of America, United Kingdom, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, Latin America, Pakistan, Germany, and Australia. Experts were identified from Linked In contacts of the first authors, who had over ten years of experience of working on RBM in IDAs. Introduction and invitation to participate in the research were sent to thirty identified experts. First fifteen experts, who agreed to participate, were selected. The scope of research and list of twenty-seven items were shared with them and subsequently, in-depth interviews were conducted. The objective of the interviews was to ensure content validity. Experts were

asked to furnish critique on the items, identify confusing words, underline double-barreled statements, and assess the comprehensiveness of the items in measuring implementation of RBM. Based on the input of experts, the items were revised and reduced to nineteen items. Exploratory factor analysis was conducted, so that items that do not load significantly could be omitted, which reduced items to fifteen. Details of the statistical process are given in the result section.

To test the hypotheses, data were collected from 206 (N=206) employees of IDAs, working at the head office, country office and project levels in different countries of the world. The diverse background of respondents was deemed helpful in generalizing the findings across different types and origins of IDAs. Five hundred target respondents were identified from Linked In contact list of the first author. Linked In message request and link of the online questionnaire was sent to them. The message included the purpose of research and assurance of anonymity. It helped to deal with social desirability bias (Spector, 2006). Respondents were also informed that they can leave the questionnaire anytime they feel uncomfortable. A total of two hundred and seventeen responses were received with a response rate of forty-three percent. Initial screening of data was made to check if data is complete and finally two hundred and six questionnaires were finalized. The data showed that fifty-seven percent of respondents were male and the remaining forty-three percent were females with a mean age of forty-three years. Since employees of IDAs are well-educated professionals, minimum qualification of respondents was Masters' degree. The respondents had at least five years of experience, with a mean average of eleven years.

4. Results

The data were fed and coded through SPSS 24. To refute the possibility of any potential problem, the data were checked for missing values, normality, and multicollinearity. There was no considerable issue found related to missing value and normal distribution of the data. Normal scores of Shapiro-Wilk test, and variance inflation factors statistics further confirmed that the data was normal and free of any potential problem that could affect the health of further analysis and findings.

Since the instrument for RBM was developed for the very first time, it was imperative to apply factor analysis technique to explore the underlying factorial mechanism. Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) through the varimax rotation was deployed. High KMO scores established the initial validity of the factor model. By using the parameters of eigenvalue greater than value and factor loading score greater than 0.60, a five-factor model of RBM was explored which explained 72.27% of the variance. 15 items measure found 5 dimensions i.e. Goals Settings, Causality, Monitoring, Evaluation, and Resources Allocation. Table 1, shows the factor loadings of each item on its respective factor.

Table 1: Factor Analysis and Loadings

Dimensions	Sr.	Items (Total variance explained = 72.27%)	1
Goals	1	Project document of my intervention has set precise goals	.846
	2	Goals set in Project document of my intervention have a precise time frame	.763
	3	Project document of my intervention has set time bond quantifiable sub-goals	.836
Causality	4	Project document of my intervention has clearly articulated how project activities are linked with sub-goals and goal(s)	.774
	5	Project document of my intervention clearly explains how the achievement of sub-goals will lead to achievement to respective project goal(s)	.804
	6	No change in activities, sub-goals, and goals can be made by the project team unless approved by the concerned authority at the agency Head Office level	.833
Monitoring	7	Project document has set indicators for measuring performance against activities, sub-goals, and goals	.796
	8	Project document of my intervention has set a source of data collection for monitoring and evaluation purpose	.851
	9	The mechanism to collected data against set indicators has been set in Project document of my intervention	.659
Evaluation	10	Project document of my intervention has set means of verification	.828
	11	Periodic evaluation studies are conducted for assessing project effectiveness	.753
	12	Project performance is assessed based on achieving sub-goals and goals, as defined in Project document	.856
Resources Allocation	13	Resource allocation is made against activities specified in Project document	.873
	14	Human Resources requirement for project is determined in Project Document	.878
	15	Job description and specification (qualification of human resources required to perform the job) are stipulated in Project document of my intervention	.790

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy (KMO): .840
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity: Significant @ .000, df:153
Total Variance Explained: 72.27%

To test hypothesis H_1 through H_5, the regression technique was used. The first hypothesis states that "goals setting in RBM negatively affects the adaptability of the IDAs". The second hypothesis states that "causality among main goals, sub-goals, and activities in RBM negatively affects the adaptability of the IDAs". The third hypothesis states that "monitoring elements of RBM negatively affect the adaptability of the IDAs". The fourth hypothesis states that "evaluation element of RBM negatively affects the adaptability of the IDAs". The fifth hypothesis states that "resources allocation pattern in RBM negatively affects the adaptability of the IDAs".

Table 2: Mean, Standard Deviation, Reliability, and Correlation Scores of Variables

Variables		M	SD	A	1	2	3	4	5	6
1	**Goals**	4.21	1.10	.809	1					
2	**Causality**	4.29	1.29	.892	.654**	1				
3	**Monitoring**	4.40	1.19	.924	.734**	.733**	1			
4	**Evaluation**	4.21	1.40	.867	-.010	-.050	-.011	1		
5	**Resources**	3.24	1.07	.887	.041	.079	-.115	-.318**	1	
6	**Adaptability**	2.57	0.664	.902	-.048**	-.077	-.141**	-0.069**	.098**	1

* Correlation is significant at 0.05 level (two-tailed)

** Correlation is significant at 0.01 level

Table 3: Regression Results of RBM Components and Adaptability

Coefficients						
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	**(Constant)**	3.840	.562		8.497	.000
	Goals	-.126	.075	-.106	-.087	.042
	Causality	-.187	.087	-.112	-.450	.219
	Monitor	-.233	.072	-.195	-.458	.003
	Evaluate	-.218	.073	-.115	-.627	.002
	Resource	-.255	.103	-.220	-.530	.001
a. Dependent Variable**: Adaptability**						

As can be seen in Table 3, except H_2 (which says "causality negatively affects adaptability), all hypotheses H_1, H_3, H_4, and H_5 are accepted. Beta values and a significance level of the found relationship indicate that rigid Goal settings, Monitoring, Evaluation, and Resource Allocation aspects of RBM are negatively and significantly related to the adaptability of the IDAs. Therefore H_1, H_3, H_4, an H_5 were accepted. However, in H_2, though the relationship between causality and adaptability is still negative, the relationship is not significant. Therefore, H_2 could not be accepted and thus considered for further discussion.

5. Discussion

Findings of the study show that RBM augments inflexibility and lack of adaptability among IDAs because measuring performance of interventions on the bases of predetermined goals and strategies hinders improvisation and making necessary changes during the course of implementation. The finding is consistent with Ika and Lytvynov (2009) who have suggested that top-down orientation in setting goals, in project plans, instigates rigidity in RBM. In project plans quantifiable goals and sub-goals are developed along with precise strategies, and indicators to evaluate the success of interventions. Once the project plan is developed, the primary role of the project team

remains the achievements of these goals. As the project goes into implementation, stakeholders are engaged which often propose changes in goals and strategies (Hummelbrunner, 2010). There could also be changes in the environment which require such revision. However, changing goals is highly discouraged activity in the development sector and entails such cumbersome processes that agencies find no other option but to stick to previously decided goals instead of adapting to changing the situation (Perrin, 2015).

Literature suggests that log-frames of RBM underpin a focus on pre-planned strategies instead of improvising according to the changing conditions on the ground (Hummelbrunner, 2010). However, our findings did not find a strong correlation between log-frames and lack of adaptability of IDAs. This could be because of the reason that log-frames draw logical links between activities and goals and hence a sense of clarity for practitioners (Ssegawa & Muzinda, 2016). Keeping in view human psychology, it is plausible to postulate that practitioners would prefer clarity, amidst the uncertain and complex milieu they operate in, even if it is at expense of oversimplified version of reality and rigidity (Jacobs, Barnett & Ponsford, 2010).

Our findings also suggest that Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) components of RBM invoke rigidity in IDAs. Under RBM, the performance and effectiveness of interventions are measured based on consistency between actual quantifiable results and previously developed targets. Therefore, even if the intervention has done a remarkable service for the uplift of the targeted sector, if that service is not inlined with the project plan, it will get no acknowledgment and reward. IDAs, therefore, do not invest resources on any such activity, which might be highly useful for the targeted sector but has not already been listed in targets of the project plans. Thus, M&E promote rigidity, tunnel vision and measure fixation (Smith, 1995). Tunnel vision means focusing on quantifiable phenomena and ignoring the ones which are not quantifiable; while measure fixation denotes measuring project achievement based on predeveloped goals and indicators while leaving aside any achievement beyond the already developed goals.

6. Theoretical and Practical Implications

Findings of this study echo ongoing efforts to highlight the limitations of RBM by taking help from theoretical underpinnings of complexity theory. Leading work in this regard has been done by Rihani (2005), Mowles et al. (2008), Ferraro et al. (2015), Eyben (2012), and Patton (2011). These authors have convincingly argued that problems with RBM are underpinned in its basic assumption of log-frames, monitoring systems and planning approach. Moreover, since complexity based criticism on RBM puts lack of flexibility as a central issue, findings of this study provide empirical evidence to this criticism. The study also has far-reaching practical implications. In response to growing apprehensions about the efficacy of RBM, leading agencies like USAID and Overseas Development Institute (OD) are already looking for an alternative management approach which is flexible and adaptive. The RAPID initiative of the Overseas Development Institute has published a series of working papers (Hummelbrunner & Jones, 2013a, 2013b; Jones, 2011; Ramalingam et al., 2008; Valters, 2015; Warner, 2001), which have done spadework in outlining such adaptive approach. This study provides empirical

support to this work and further highlights the need for a paradigm shift in the development sector. Since the development sector has invested huge resources and commitment to make RBM mainstream approach of IDAs, the shift to a radically different approach inextricably requires empirical evidence that the shift is needed. Moreover, the study shows that the main problem with RBM are inflexibility and rigidity, so flexibility and adaptability are rightful central tenets of efforts to develop a complexity aware management approach of IDAs. Tool for measuring implementation of RBM would assist development researchers and scholars to investigate other organizational outcomes like performance and learning, and the role of moderating and mediating variables in the relationship between RBM and criterion variables.

REFERENCES

Arif, M., Jubair, M., & Ahsan, A. (2015). Use of Result Based Management (RBM) Framework for Monitoring Projects of Public Sector in Pakistan - A Case Study. *International Journal of Innovation, Management and Technology, 6*(2), 130-135.

Bajwa, S. U., & Kitchlew, N. (2019). *Result Based Management (RBM) as Distinctive Management Approach for International Development Agencies: An Integrated Literature Review*. Paper presented at the AIRAANZ Conference 2019, Melbourne, Australia.

Bakewell, O., & Garbutt, A. (2005). *The use and abuse of the logical framework approach*. Stockholm: SIDA.

Batliner, R., Felber, R., & Günther, I. (2011). A primer on results-based management. SECO Economic Cooperation and Development. [ONLINE] Available at: http://www. seco-cooperation. admin. ch/themen/01100/index. Html (March 15th, 2019).

Bester, A. (2012). Results-based management in the United Nations Development System: progress and challenges. *A report prepared for the United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs, for the Quadrennial Comprehensive Policy Review*, 27-30.

Benson, J., & Clark, F. (1982). A guide for instrument development and validation. *American Journal of Occupational Therapy, 36*(12), 789-800.

Binnendijk, A. (2000). Results-Based Management in the Development Cooperation Agencies: A Review of Experience. Background Report, DAC OECD Working Party on Aid Evaluation, Paris.

Britt, H., & Patsalides, M. (2013). Complexity-aware monitoring. *Discussion Note, Monitoring and Evaluation Series. Washington, DC: USAID, December*.

Callahan, J. L. (2010). Constructing a manuscript: Distinguishing integrative literature reviews and conceptual and theory articles. *Human Resource Development Review, 9*(3), 300-304.

Chianca, T. K. (2008). International Aid Evaluation: An Analysis and Policy Proposals. Dissertations. 758. [ONLINE] Available at https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/dissertations/758 (September 14th, 2018).

Cummings, F. H. (1997). Logic models, logical frameworks and results-based management: contrasts and comparisons. *Canadian Journal of Development Studies/Revue Canadienne D'études Du Développement*, *18*(1), 587-596.

Dann, P., & Sattelberger, J. (2015). The concept of accountability in international development co-operation. *Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development, Development Co-operation Report*, 67-74.

Diallo, A., & Thuillier, D. (2004). The success dimensions of international development projects: the perceptions of African project coordinators. *International Journal of Project Management, 22*(1), 19-31.

Drucker, P. (2001). Management By Objectives and Self-Control. In The Essential Drucker (1st ed., p.112). New York: HarperCollins

Eyben, R. (2005). Donors' learning difficulties: results, relationships and responsibilities. *IDS bulletin, 36*(3), 98-107.

Eyben, R. (2008). Power, mutual accountability and responsibility in the practice of international aid: A relational approach (Working Paper 305). *Brighton, England: Institute of Development Studies*.

Eyben, R. (2011). The sociality of international aid and policy convergence. *Adventures in Aidland: The Anthropology of Professionals in International Development, Berghahn, New York*, 139-161.

Eyben, R. (2012). *Relationships for aid*. London: Routledge.

Eyben, R. (2013). *Uncovering the politics of 'evidence'and 'results': A framing paper for development practitioners.* Paper presented at the conference on Big Push Forward. [ONLINE] Available at: http://bigpushforward. net/wp-content/uploads/2011/01/The-politics-of-evidence-11-April-20133. Pdf (April 11th, 2013).

Eyben, R., Guijt, I., Roche, C., & Shutt, C. (Eds.). (2015). *The politics of evidence and results in international development: Playing the game to change the rules?*. Rugby: Practical Action Publishing.

Eyben, R., & Savage, L. (2013). Emerging and submerging powers: Imagined geographies in the new development partnership at the Busan fourth high level forum. *The Journal of Development Studies, 49*(4), 457-469.

Ferraro, F., Etzion, D., & Gehman, J. (2015). Tackling grand challenges pragmatically: Robust action revisited. *Organization Studies, 36*(3), 363-390.

Garcia, J. R., & Zazueta, A. (2015). Going beyond mixed methods to mixed approaches: A systems perspective for asking the right questions. *IDS Bulletin, 46*(1), 30-43.

Gasper, D. (2000). Evaluating the 'logical framework approach'towards learning-oriented development evaluation. *Public Administration and Development*, *20*(1), 17-28.

Glouberman, S., & Zimmerman, B. (2002). Complicated and complex systems: what would successful reform of Medicare look like? *Romanow Papers, 2*, 21-53.

Groves, L., & Hinton, R. (2013). *Inclusive aid: Changing power and relationships in international development*. London: Routledge.

Hinkin, T.R. (1995), 'A Review of Scale Development Practices in the Study of Organizations. *Journal of Management, 21*, 967–988.

Howlett, M., Wu, X., Ramesh, M., & Fritzen, S. A. (2017). *The public policy primer: managing the policy process*. London: Routledge.

Hummelbrunner, R. (2010). Beyond Logframe: Critique, Variations and Alternatives. In N. Fujita (Ed.), Beyond Logframe; Using Systems Concepts in Evaluation (pp. 1-33). Tokyo: Foundation for Advanced Studies on International Development.

Hummelbrunner, R., & Jones, H. (2013a). A guide for planning and strategy development in the face of complexity. *Background Note, Overseas Development Institute, London*.

Hummelbrunner, R., & Jones, H. (2013b). A guide to managing in the face of complexity. *London: ODI*.

Ika, L.A., Lytvynov, V., 2009. RBM: a shift to managing development project objectives. *Journal of Global Business Administration 1 (1*), 55–76.

Jacobs, A., Barnett, C., & Ponsford, R. (2010). Three approaches to monitoring: Feedback systems, participatory monitoring and evaluation and logical frameworks. *IDS Bulletin, 41*(6), 36-44.

Jones, H. (2011). Taking responsibility for complexity. *Briefing Paper 68*. London: ODI.

Kirk, C. (2001). Evaluating development aid: issues, problems and solutions edited by Basil Edward Cracknell. Sage, Newburg Park, CA, 2000: Wiley Online Library.

Landoni, P., & Corti, B. (2011). The management of international development projects: moving toward a standard approach or differentiation? *Project Management Journal, 42*(3), 45-61.

Lowe, T. (2013). New development: The paradox of outcomes—the more we measure, the less we understand. *Public Money & Management, 33*(3), 213-216.

Mayne, J. (2007). Best practices in results-based management: A review of experience (A Report for the United Nations Secretariat). New York, NY: UN Secretariat.

Meier, W. (2003). Results based management: Towards a common understanding among development cooperation agencies. *Documento de discusión preparado para la Agencia Canadiense para el Desarrollo Internacional, División de Evaluación del Desempeño, para ser considerado por el Grupo de Trabajo de CAD sobre la Eficacia de la Ayuda y la Armonización, Ottawa, Canadá*.

Mintzberg, H. (2000). *The rise and fall of strategic planning*: Pearson Education.

Mulongo, G., Sindi, K., Okello, J., Wanjohi, L., Mudege, N., & Quinn, S. (2015). Improving performance tracking, knowledge generation, and learning for effective result-based management: Sub Saharan Africa monitoring, evaluation & learning (ME&L) strategy.

Mowles, C., Stacey, R., & Griffin, D. (2008). What contribution can insights from the complexity sciences make to the theory and practice of development management? *Journal of International Development, 20*(6), 804-820.

OECD. (2015).Development aid stable in 2014 but flows to poorest countries still falling. [ONLINE] Available at: http://www.oecd.org/dac/stats/development-aid-stable-in-2014-but-flows-to-poorest-countries-still-falling.htm (April 17th, 2019).

Patton, M. Q. (2011). *Developmental evaluation: Applying complexity concepts to enhance innovation and use*. London: Guilford Press.

Perrin, B. (2015). Bringing accountability up to date with the realities of public sector management in the 21st century. *Canadian Public Administration, 58*(1), 183-203.

Ramalingam, B. (2013). Aid on the Edge of Chaos. *Rethinking International Cooperation in a Complex World. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.*

Ramalingam, B., Jones, H., Reba, T., & Young, J. (2008). *Exploring the science of complexity: Ideas and implications for development and humanitarian efforts* (Vol. 285): Overseas Development Institute London.

Ramalingam, B., Laric, M., & Primrose, J. (2014). From best practice to best fit: understanding and navigating wicked problems in international development. *London: Overseas Development Institute*, 1-44.

Ricker-Gilbert, J., Jayne, T., & Shively, G. (2013). Addressing the "wicked problem" of input subsidy programs in Africa. *Applied Economic Perspectives and Policy, 35*(2), 322-340.

Rihani, S. (2005). Complexity theory: a new framework for development is in the offing. *Progress in Development Studies, 5*(1), 54-61.

Rittel, H. W., & Webber, M. M. (1973). 2.3 planning problems are wicked. *Polity, 4*, 155-169.

Rocco, T. S., & Plakhotnik, M. S. (2009). Literature reviews, conceptual frameworks, and theoretical frameworks: Terms, functions, and distinctions. *Human Resource Development Review, 8*(1), 120-130.

Rousseau, D. M. (2006). Is there such a thing as "evidence-based management"? *Academy of Management Review, 31*(2), 256-269.

Ssegawa, J. K., & Muzinda, M. (2016). Using RBM approach in managing projects beyond the development sector. *International Journal of Managing Projects in Business, 9*(2), 337-363.

Schatteman, A., & Ohemeng, F. (2008). *RBM and public sector performance in Ontario: A revolutionary advance or passing fancy.* Paper presented at the annual conference of the American Society for Public Administration (ASPA), Dallas, Texas.

Smith, P. (1995). On the unintended consequences of publishing performance data in the public sector. *International Journal of Public Administration, 18*(2-3), 277-310.

Stacey, R. D. (2007). *Strategic management and organisational dynamics: The challenge of complexity to ways of thinking about organisations*: Pearson education, London.

Termeer, C. J., Dewulf, A., Breeman, G., & Stiller, S. J. (2015). Governance capabilities for dealing wisely with wicked problems. *Administration & Society, 47*(6), 680-710.

Torraco, R. J. (2005). Writing integrative literature reviews: Guidelines and examples. *Human Resource Development Review, 4*(3), 356-367.

Torraco, R. J. (2016). Writing integrative literature reviews: Using the past and present to explore the future. *Human Resource Development Review, 15*(4), 404-428.

UN. (2015).*The Millennium Development Goals Report 2015*. [ONLINE] Available at: http://www. un. org/millenniumgoals (March 17th, 2019).

Vähämäki, J., Schmidt, M., & Molander, J. (2011). Review: results based management in development cooperation. *Riksbankens Jubileumsfond, Stockholm*.

Valters, C. (2015). Theories of change. Time for a radical approach to learning in development. London: Oversease Denelopment Institute.

Warner, M. (2001). *Complex Problems--Negotiated Solutions: The Practical Applications of Chaos and Complexity Theory to Community-based Natural Resource Management*: Overseas Development Institute London.