AN ORGANIZATIONAL SUCCESS STORY

PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT SYSTEM IN A SWEDISH PUBLIC ORGANIZATION

TAREQ AL FAR

SALAM ADEEB

Bachelor Thesis
Stockholm School of Economics 2020

An Organizational Success Story: Performance Measurement System in a Swedish Public Organization

Abstract:

Researchers in public sector management depict the design and implementation of PMSs as problematic in the sense of members oftentimes opposing these systems due to high institutional pressure. Consequently, PMSs are decoupled from the operational activities and used in a symbolic manner since they are perceived to threaten identities and cultures in organizations. Our thesis sheds light on how the examined organization has managed to design and implement PMS which has been accepted and perceived by members to be functional and appropriate. The aim of our study is to explore the design of the system in a Swedish District Court. In addition, we examine how institutional pressure and leadership through sensegiving efforts can affect the design and implementation of the system. A single-case study was conducted in which data was collected through eight semi-structured interviews with employees in one of Sweden's most effective courts and The Swedish National Court Administration (SNCA). We found that, based on the perception of our interviewees, low institutional pressure has allowed for bottom-up leadership, strong sensegiving efforts and involvement of employees to design and implement PMS that fits the organizational needs. This is characterized by limited measures, suitable structure and targets that are not imposed but rather designed by involving members. This in turn enabled the organization to achieve its objectives in term of effectiveness and efficiency.

Keywords: Performance Measurement System, PMS in Public Sector, Institutional Pressure, Leadership Behaviors

Authors: Tareq Al Far (24073) and Salam Adeeb (24068)
Tutor: Marek Reuter, Assistant Professor, Department of Accounting

Table of Contents

1. Introduction

Management control systems (MCSs) which consists of budgeting, planning, management accounting, information reporting and performance measurement systems (PMSs) aim to influence the behavior of the employees in order to make them work towards the objectives of the organization and thus increasing effectiveness and efficiency. In the public sector, PMSs have gained an increased interest since the introduction of New Public Management. Taxpayers have put more pressure on public organizations to become more efficient and effective while considering and improving the quality of the services (Brignall & Modell, 2000). In addition, businessmen have called for better public management since they must interact with the public organizations for different reasons (Bower, 1977). In Sweden, politicians are more concerned about the effectiveness in public organizations than ever before. The Swedish Migration Board and Employment Services are examples of public organizations that have been criticized and pressured to improve effectiveness (Svt, 2016; Sverigesradio, 2019; Di, 2019).

Consequently, public organizations have turned to the private sector and their PMSs to increase efficiency and effectiveness (Sawhill & Williamson, 2001). However, the issue of designing and implementing formal structures or PMSs in public sector has been viewed as complicated and challenging (Brignall & Modell, 2000; Meyer & Rowan, 1977; Oaks et al., 1998; Dent, 1991). Specifically, there are situations where PMSs are opposed by members, evocative for organizational identity conflicts and implemented in a decoupled manner. One apparent problem for public organizations seems to be that strong institutional pressures impose formal structures, such as PMSs, which are not in line with the internal needs of the organizations. This problem is derived from the New Public Management literature which highlights that institutionally driven pressures for 'modern' management practices are problematic and might force organizations to decouple the formal structures.

However, we present a case study where PMS was, based on the perception of members in the organization, functional and appropriate for the operational activities. The designed PMS was accepted and remodeled by members in the organization. This resulted in a fully integrated system which was line with the organizational goals for increased effectiveness and efficiency. This study also deep dives into the relationship between institutional pressure, its impact on

designing PMS and investigate the cascade-effect that occurs in between, such as the institutional pressure impact on leadership and sensegiving.

Our study explores the design of PMS in one of Sweden's most effective courts. In addition, we examine how institutional pressure, leadership and strong sensegiving efforts affect the design and implementation of the system. Given the context above, our research questions are formulated as followed: *how to design performance measurement system in courts to achieve the organizational goals; and how institutional pressure, leadership and strong sensegiving efforts affect the design and implementation of the system?*

To address the research questions, a qualitative, abductive and in-depth single case study approach has been used. We conducted interviews with employees and managers in the examined court and at the Swedish National Court Administration (SNCA) to explore how the system is designed and what makes it, based on the perception of the employees, successfully implemented and designed. We found that low institutional pressure and leadership affect the implementation of PMS positively. Low institutional pressure allowed for bottom-up leadership, strong sensegiving efforts and involvement of the members in the court to design a PMS that fits the organizational needs. Consequently, a well-designed PMS contributes, based on the perception of the interviewees, to increased effectiveness and efficiency.

Given our findings, we believe that our study contributes to the existing literature on PMS in public organizations and more specifically in juridical systems by adding insight perspectives, documenting and specifying *why* and *how* in the process of designing and implementing PMSs in courts. In addition, our study enriches and extends the literature by exploring how low institutional pressure, bottom-up leadership and strong sensegiving efforts contribute to modeling a PMS that fits the organizational needs.

The reminder of this paper is structured as follows. The literature review and theoretical development underlying this study are developed in the following sections where the theoretical framework is identified. The subsequent sections address the research method, empirical findings, discussion and conclusion to the study.

2. Literature review

PMSs serve as a tool that help aligning the interest of employees with organizational goals. Therefore, PMSs enable managers to monitor the behavior of their employees. In private sector, the design and implementation of PMSs have been widely examined and many frameworks have emerged and addressed the issue of designing PMSs. The performance measurement matrix developed by Keegan, Eiler & Jones (1989) was one of the first frameworks in this area. Many other frameworks have developed since then, such as the SMART pyramid by Lynch & Cross (1991), the results–determinants framework by Fitzgerald et al. (1991) and the input–process–output–outcome framework by Brown (1996). All these frameworks have treated strategy implicitly. The Balanced Scorecard (BSC) by Kaplan & Norton (1992) was the first framework to link measures to strategy more explicitly (Neely, 2007). Later, based on BSC, several frameworks have developed and aimed to answer questions about strategy and its links to measures. In addition, Ferreira & Otley (2009) developed a framework to help those who are interested to investigate the design process of PMS by answering twelve questions.

Furthermore, researchers have examined the factors affecting the implementation of PMS. Tangen (2003a) has explained how management involvement, employee's education and their involvement in designing the system can impact the implementation. Nishii & Paluch (2018) have investigated four important implementation leadership behaviors that managers should emphasize when implementing systems in the organization.

On the other hand, organizations in public sector have turned to companies and their models to respond to the call from New Public Management for more effective, efficient and accountable organizations (Dreveton, 2013). The BSC by Kaplan & Norton (1992) and Performance Prism by Kennerley & Neely (2002) have been examined and designed for public and non-profit organizations (Micheli & Kennerley, 2005). However, the issue of designing PMS in public sector has been described as complicated, problematic and difficult due to the complexity in the missions of public organizations and the huge variety of stakeholders who have different interests (Radno & McGuire, 2004; Camona & Grönlund, 2003; Northcott & Taulapapa, 2012; De Bruijn 2002; Sawhill & Williamson, 2001). Furthermore, the implementation of PMS in public sector has been under investigation and was even here described as problematic. Cavalluzzo & Ittner (2004) examined the relationship between the factors that affect the implementation of PMS in public sector and the outcome of the system where they highlighted

the issue of institutional pressure. Brignall & Modell (2000) and Meyer & Rowan (1977) also addressed the effect of institutional pressure on the development and implementation of formal structures such as PMSs. They proposed that high institutional pressure will lead organizations to decouple or disintegrate these imposed structures from the operational activities. Thus, PMSs will be used in a symbolic and decoupled manner. Oaks et al. (1998) and Dent (1991) suggested that formal structure are problematic. They emphasized that such structures are, since they are imposed, perceived by members to threaten cultures and identities in organizations.

Accordingly, research aimed to explore and investigate the forces behind a well-designed and implemented PMS in public sector has been scarce. In addition, no research to our knowledge has even yet explored how PMSs are designed and how low institutional pressure and leadership affect the implementation of the system in courts. Ostrom & Kleiman (2010) research is concerned about what courts should measure. They have developed the PMS CourTools to assist the American courts in the evaluation of their performance. Although, this system summarizes *what* courts should measure and does not provide any details about the goals setting and the link to rewards which are important factors to consider when designing such a system. Furthermore, little attention has been given to examine which factors affect the implementation of their PMS in courts. In later research, Lepore et al. (2012) extended the way CourTools can be used by integrating the indicators in the BSC. Another research by Maayan et al. (2012) at the University of Tel Aviv aimed to create a framework based on mathematical model that combines all the relevant indicators in one in order to make it simple to measure performance in court.

Overall, there are few contemporary papers on PMS in juridical system that conduct in-depth case studies to explore the design and implementation of the system. In addition, PMSs in public sector management have been criticized to be symbolic, problematic and decoupled. Our case study enriches and extends the literature of PMS in public sector by adding insight perspectives on how low institutional pressure allows bottom-up leadership to flow in organizations and results in engaging members to design accepted and functional PMSs.

3. Theoretical development

3.1. The design of performance measurement system

Within the field of PMS, several frameworks have emerged to assist companies and organizations in the process of designing and implementing the systems. Based on the previous research within the area of PMS, we mainly chose to focus on the most important elements to consider when designing the system which researchers such as Kaplan & Norton (1992; 1996a), Kaplan (2001) and Ferreira & Otley (2009) have emphasized. This includes (1) identifying the structure (2) defining the strategy (3) selecting measures (4) setting targets (5) linking measures and targets to rewards. While Kaplan & Norton (1992; 1996a) emphasize the importance of linking strategy to meaningful measures, setting targets and incentives, Ferreira & Otley (2009) highlight the role of structure when designing PMS. At the same time, Kaplan (2001) explains how PMS can be designed for public organizations. Therefore, these conceptualizations and theories together enable us to understand how PMS is designed and perceived by members in the examined organization. We found it important to begin with exploring how the system is designed and perceived to be later able to investigate the factors that affects the employee's perception about the design and implementation of the system.

Strategy: Strategy is defined as a general plan or idea about how the organization can fulfill and reach the goals of its stakeholder and is the link between the goal of the organization and the control system (Anthony et al., 2014). Therefore, it is important to take strategic considerations when designing PMS. The strategy needs to be well-defined in order to develop a structure that serves to the fulfillments of the goals. Moreover, one of the purposes of designing PMS is to implement the strategy.

Kaplan & Norton (1996a) emphasize the importance of strategy as a key factor that enables organizations to extract critical strategic objectives and meaningful measures. In public sector, the same implications regarding strategy exists. According to Sawhill & Williamson (2001) and Kaplan (2001), strategic alignment is important for the development of meaningful measures. However, developing a strategy in public organizations might be perceived to be difficult due to the complexity of the organization's mission and the huge variety of its stakeholders. Northcott & Taulapapa (2011) highlight strategic concerns as one of the main issues for designing and implementing PMS in public organizations and recognize the need to clarify

strategy for a successful implementation of the system. Consequently, strategy is the starting point for the execution of the designing process and choosing measures in organization (Kaplan, 2001).

Structure: Research emphasizes the importance of structure when designing PMS. Andersen & Faugerland (2009) stress that organizations should start by understanding the structure when designing such systems. Structure is a fundamental control element and is a constraint for the design and use of performance management systems (Ferreira & Otley, 2009). Furthermore, organizational structures are formed as a means of creating specification of the individual's tasks (Chenhall, 2003). Therefore, it is almost impossible for individuals in organizations to achieve and fully commit to their tasks if a structure in the organization does not exist or even being described as dysfunctional. Since establishing a structure in organizations clarify for individuals their tasks, they will be empowered and able to act within the areas they are responsible for. Consequently, structure is the foundation for determining the responsibility and accountability for individuals in the organization (Ferreira & Otley, 2009). When responsibility is identified, employees will be able to determine what they can influence and control. Therefore, structure has an impact on the design of control systems (Chenhall, 2003).

Selecting Measures: After identifying how organizations can reach their goals and creating a structure that support the strategy, managers can now determine how performance can be measured. This is done by selecting meaningful measures that reflect the strategic objectives of the organization. Financial measures or outcome measures have been criticized for their inability to ensure goal congruence and successfully executed strategy (Kaplan & Norton, 1992). These measures encourage short term actions that are not in line with the organization's interest in the long run (Anthony et al., 2014). Outcome measures are lagging indicators that tell what happened. Meanwhile driver measures are leading that indicate and explain how the outcome is affected (Anthony et al., 2014). Therefore, key performance measures that combine outcome and driver measures are warranted to follow the progress of the implemented strategy in the organization (Kaplan & Norton, 1992).

Setting targets: The evaluation of an organization is not feasible without identifying targets. Therefore, target setting is important to ensure the functionality of the system and to take actions. If an organization has implemented meaningful measures without setting targets, the whole system will be useless since no action can be taken.

When setting targets, organizations need to determine the *purpose of targets* and the *effect on performance*. Targets can be used whether for planning or/and motivational purposes. Merchant (1998) found that if the achievability to reach the performance target is perceived to be impossible, the motivation and performance of the employees will suffer. Furthermore, unrealistic targets in public organizations may force individuals to manipulate measures and trigger gaming responses to mitigate the decline in performance (Heinrich & Marschke, 2010). Nonetheless, targets should be challenging to push people for higher performance. Merchant & Manzoni (1989) found that targets tend to be 80 to 90 percent achievable. However, in public sector, the use of targets is primarily to guide employees' efforts (Newberry & Pallot, 2004).

Rewards: In private sector, guiding compensation plans is one of the purposes of PMS and rewards should be linked to meaningful measures and targets. However, incentives have an impact on the behavior of employees and dysfunctional incentives based on financial rewards may encourage managers to manipulate data to reach the targets and receive the desired compensation (Anthony et al., 2014). Although, the relationship between rewards and performance is complex (Ferreira & Otley, 2009). Jenkins et al. (1998) found a positive relationship between incentives and the quantity in the performance. However, this relationship does not exist with the performance quality.

The agency theory assumes that agents (employees) will act in their own self-interest. Therefore, the principle (managers) need to design incentives system and reward agents for their performance to deal with the divergent objectives (Anthony et al., 2014). Therefore, it relates to external needs and rewards. Consequently, the agency theory emphasizes the importance of external motivation for achieving goals. Meanwhile, the motivation crowding theory emphasizes the importance of both intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. According to this theory, extrinsic rewards may have a crowding in/out effect on the intrinsic motivation and this depends on how individuals perceives the extrinsic reward (Anthony et al., 2014). Thus, motivation theorists emphasize the importance of intrinsic motivation on employee's behavior and their ability to achieve the organization's goals (Heinrich & Marschke, 2010). However, in public organizations, the stewardship theory is also important to understand the motivation of the employees. According to this theory, the individual's goals are reached by achieving the goals of the organization (Heinrich & Marschke, 2010).

3.2. Factors affecting the design and implementation of PMS

3.2.1. Institutional pressure

Cavalluzzo & Ittner (2004) suggest that institutional pressure can affect the implementation of PMS. Politicians and top management might set targets that need to satisfy the taxpayer's requirements about efficiency, effectiveness and accountability. However, these measures might not be the ultimate choice for the managers to reflect the operational perspective and improve performance in the organization. Therefore, managers will be forced to only focus on lagging or outcome indicators that satisfy the requirement for resource allocation.

Cavalluzzo & Ittner (2004) are not alone to highlight the implications of the institutional theory on the design and implementation of PMS. Brignall & Modell (2000) developed an advanced framework to address the effect of institutional pressure on the development and implementation of PMS. They suggest that institutional pressure is associated with three stakeholders: funders, professional groups and purchaser of the services. In addition, they argue that the reforms in the public sector resulted in a focus on the financial performance metrics to satisfy the pressure from the funding bodies for more efficiency. Consequently, these three stakeholders put much pressure on the implementation of the PMS since they have different interests that disturb the balance and integration between the different adopted perspectives in the system. Moreover, they suggest that funders are interested in outcome/lagging indicators (e.g. financial result and resource utilization). Meanwhile, purchasers of the services care about leading indicators (e.g. quality, satisfaction). The same applies for professional groups who are concerned about metrics linked to employee satisfaction and well-being, learning, innovation and quality.

Brignall & Modell (2000) found that tensions between the different groups and the degree of pressure has a serious impact on the implementation of PMS. Consequently, they propose that top management will emphasize and integrate the outcome/lagging measures if the pressure exerted from the funders is greater than the other two groups. Contradictory to this result, they suggest the emphasize on implementing and integrating leading indicators would increase if the pressure exerted by the professional groups within the organization is greater than the funder's pressure.

Other studies by Oaks et al. (1998) and Dent (1991) show that institutional pressure, such as implementing formal structures to ensure goal congruence, is problematic. It is perceived that control planning and PMSs are threats to cultures and identities in organizations specially when individuals are expected to act in line with the implemented systems. Therefore, organizations tend to decouple or disintegrate these formal structures, such as PMS, from their operational activities in order to minimize the institutional pressure (Meyer & Rowan, 1977). This occurs when managers believe that the formal structures are inconsistent with their goals and the members are not able to influence the imposed structures. Decoupling signals unbelief and dissatisfaction of individuals with the implemented formal structure. A decoupled formal structure or PMS is costly for any organization since an integrated system is warranted to achieve the organizational goals. Therefore, a low institutional pressure is necessary to allow individuals remodel and design PMS that fits the needs of the organization without being decoupled (Brignall & Modell, 2000).

3.2.2. Leadership and sensegiving efforts

The involvement of top management to implement PMS is an important factor of the success of the system. Managers need to follow up and support the development and changes in the system and make sure to communicate the aimed strategy with their employees. In fact, Klammer & Mcgowan (1977) found that employees will view changes positively if top management show strong support for the system. Cavalluzzo and Ittner (2004) found that performance measurement development and outcomes are affected by the management commitment and support for the system. Furthermore, Nishii and Paluch (2018) have introduced a framework regarding important leadership behaviors needed for a successful implementation of systems.

Nishii & Paluch (2018) highlight four leadership behaviors that create strong HR system and practices. The purpose of HR practices is to help organizations achieving their organizational goals through constructing and adding a fair evaluation- and reward system, creating a positive workplace etc. This is closely interlinked to the purpose of using a PMS as a tool. As mentioned earlier, PMS is used in order to align the employee's incentives with the goals and objectives of the organization. In that way, HR practices and PMS are tangible as their purposes are used to achieve the same outcome, namely, improved task performance. From that point of view, the research introduced by Nishii & Paluch (2018) is relevant when analyzing the presence of

leadership behaviors when implementing systems such as HR-systems or PMSs. Therefore, they are highly relevant to our study.

Articulating intended messages: Within the strategic human resource management literature, there is an indirect assumption that explains that if the organizational goals are correctly aligned with the strategy, individuals will understand how to work towards these goals. In certain situations, employees will build up a deviant interpretation of these goals. When this occurs, it is important for managers to emphasize their view of what is important for the organization in order to enhance the employees' understanding. Managers also need to engage in *sensegiving,* a process through which they shape the development of followers' cognitive schemas that make the retention and later application of learned information possible. A part of the sensegiving-process is to break down the whole communicated strategy and practices into more task-related goals. This will enable the employees to understand how their work contributes to the organizational objectives and facilitate the understanding of the strategy. This means employees' comprehension of strategy-related messages is enhanced when they understand not just *what* the strategy goals and practices are designed to achieve (Den Hartog et al., 2013), but also *why* the outcomes are important for the organization, and for each individual employee.

Role modeling expectations for behavior: The behavioral expectations that are formulated by managers need to correspond with their own actions in the organization since it can be perceived by employees to have greater *validity* and *legitimacy* (Bowen & Ostroff, 2004). Therefore, the desired behavioral responses from the employees will be more likely to be seen. (Simons, 2002; Simons & McLean Parks, 2000). This means that if managers do not "walk the talk", they risk to indirectly communicate to employees the system practices (in this case PMS) is nothing more than a symbolic paper product. (Nishii et al., 2018; Pfeffer, 1981; Zajac & Westphal, 1994).

Reinforcing expectations for behavior: Managers play an important role when it comes to shaping the desired behaviors of the employees. For the employees, feedback from the manager, in the form of rewards or punishment, has an important role in modifying the employee's behavior in order to achieve the goals of the organization. It is natural that the more positive feedback employees receive from their managers for a behavior, the more effort they will spend on recreating these behaviors and mastering them (Wood & Bandura, 1989).

Assessing followers' understanding of messages: Assessing followers understanding regarding the strategy is a challenge that requires both an ability to find eventual cues and then make the adjustments needed in order to enhance the outcomes wanted. These cues can be evident through the employees' expression of confusion and dissatisfaction regarding a specific practice. Whatever these disagreements might be about, it is important for the manager to keep an open conversation regarding this and what behaviors that are expected from the employees. This means the opportunity to be able to maintain an open conversation in order to facilitate the employees' understanding of the strategy. Through this conversation, managers will gain an insight on how they can improve the system and make it clearer for the employees, and therefore improving it. This is not in line with managers who tend to only focus on things from solely their perspective, restricting employees to contribute with their thoughts and opinions.

3.3. Theoretical framework

Our research aims to explore the design of PMS in one of Sweden's most effective courts. We also examine how institutional pressure, leadership and sensegiving efforts affects the design and implementation of the system. The theoretical framework upon which the theoretical findings are discussed, adopts primarily research on the area of designing and implementing PMS. Since many public organizations turned to private sector to develop such systems, frameworks from private sector are appropriate and therefore have been used.

The analytical framework results in a stepwise process that consists of two stages. First, we start by exploring how the system is designed in the court and take the framework of Kaplan (2001), Kaplan & Norton (1992; 1996a) and Ferreira & Otley (2009) as a starting point to explore how members in the organization perceive the designed system. The frameworks mentioned above contribute to expand our understanding about strategy, structure, measures, targets and rewards in the examined organizations. Hence, they enable us to investigate the functionality of the system based on the employee's perception. Other literature about this area was also considered including Anthony et al. (2014) and Neely (2007). Secondly, we map out and analyze the factors that affect the employee's perception about the success of the system. *If the system is well-designed, based on the perception of the employees, what makes it well-implemented?* In other words, we examine how institutional pressure and leadership behaviors affect the design and implementation of the system in the organization since these forces have been emphasized and highlighted in our empirical data. Brignall & Modell (2000) framework is used to examine how the institutional pressure affect the development and implementation of

PMS in the court. Other studies related to this area by Oaks et al. (1998), Dent (1991), and Meyer & Rowan, (1977) have also been employed. In addition, we also examine the impact of leadership on implementing the system by using Nishii & Paluch framework (2018). Their framework is originally applied on HR practices (implementing a fair evaluation system, reasonable targets etc.) but since these practices are tangible to the purpose of a PMS, the behaviors highlighted in this framework are highly relevant for this study.

Following these steps, we can map how the system is designed and investigate how institutional pressure, leadership and sensegiving efforts affect the design and implementation of PMS. This in turn will enable us to answer our research questions.

4. Research methodology

4.1. Research design and approach

Our research aims to explore how PMS is designed in one of Sweden's most effective courts. We also analyze how the institutional pressure and leadership behaviors affect the implementation and design of the system in the examined organization. Therefore, we will conduct a qualitative, abductive and in-depth-single-case study. By interviewing participants to discover variables, qualitative approach allows researchers to understand how meanings are shaped (Corbin & Strauss, 2008). The concepts, use, balance and integration of the examined area are complex and a deep understanding for the complexity and details of designing and implementing PMS is enabled in a qualitative approach. Since we aim to explore a contemporary phenomenon to gain insight perspectives about how PMS is designed and the factors that affect the implementation of it, a qualitative methodology is preferred due to its ability to discover important details and nuances that the quantitative approach is unable to discover. Although the inability to provide scientific generalization is the main drawback of qualitative studies (Yin, 1994), this problem has been recognized later as an opportunity to interpret specific situation and learning from specific case. According to Dubois & Gadde (2002), should be considered as a strength.

Furthermore, we used abductive approach in our study. The study is based on empirical data acquired from interviews. However, theories linked to PMS have been studied and compared to the findings e.g. the empirical data. Later, it has been analyzed and the theoretical framework has constantly changed and developed to link it to the observations from the empirical data.

Therefore, we allowed for the development of the theories throughout the process. The theoretical development, empirical enquiry and analysis have all resulted in an iterative manner (Dubois & Gadde, 2002).

In addition, the study was conducted through an in-depth-single-case- study approach since our research questions are directed toward exploring and revealing a phenomenon in a specific situation and a continuous movement between empirical world and model world exists (Dubois & Gadde, 2002). In our study we seek to understand *how* PMS in court is designed and how some forces affect the design and implementation. Therefore, our questions fall under process theory where case study approach is well suited (Maxell, 2013). In addition, Ying (2009) argued that the suitability of case study raises when the researcher has (1) little or no control over events; and (2) the focus is on a contemporary phenomenon within real life context. Since our study seek to examine PMS in a real-life context where we have no control over the events, a case study approach was preferred.

A single-case approach was selected in order to gain a deep understanding of the examined situation. Conducting a multi-case approach might enable the opportunity of generalization. However, it would affect the quality of our study since the variables will increase. Thus, details and nuances might not be explored thoroughly, and the focus will be shifted towards drawing an analysis on differences and similarities which is not the purpose of our study. Overall, a qualitative, abductive and in-depth-single-case approach is preferred to examine the design and the factors affecting the design and implementation of the system in court.

4.2. Data collection

In the case study, the design and implementation of PMS is based on the information received by employees working within this area and who are affected by the implemented system. Interviews were the primary source of our qualitative research. We aimed to conduct all the interviews through personal meetings. However, phone interviews were used where it was unfeasible to conduct face to face interviews. The sample objects for our interviews were chosen based on their position in the court.

4.2.1. Primary data

Data has been collected by semi-structured interviews with employees from different levels in the hierarchy. A list of interviews can be found in Appendix A. Semi-structured interviews allow for open-ended questions (Silverman, 2010; 2011) to follow up statements that the interviewees believe to be interesting and relevant to our research. The interview questions were based on theories related to the area of designing, implementing and using PMS. This includes the 12-question PMS framework by Ferreira & Otley (2009), the BSC by Kaplan & Norton (1992; 1996a), factors affecting the implementation of PMS by (Brignall & Modell, 2000; Nishii & Paluch, 2018). We have designed four different interview guides. Two different interview guides were used in our interviews with the strategist and chief judge because we had specific questions which were related to their job on how the design and the implementation of the system is affected. The third interview guide was designed for the interview with the analyst at SNCA. The other five participants have received another interview guide where we focused on their perceptions about the implemented PMS. In addition, all interviews guides were sent in advance in order to reduce the interviewer and interviewees bias (Saunders et al., 2012). However, we were prepared for deviations from the guides in order to get a narrative from the interviewees and we allowed discussions that they believed to be interesting and relevant to our topic.

More specifically, Gillham's (2005) guidelines were used for the overall process of conducting interviews. In the preparation phase, we introduced ourselves and informed about the aim of our thesis and about the purpose of the interviews. We communicated the message by mail and in the beginning of every interview. In addition, interviewees have even been informed about their right to be anonymous, to verify their quotes and we asked for their permission to record the interviews. The second phase, initial contact phase, involved starting the interview by asking the interviewees to introduce themselves by describing a typical working day, how long they have worked in the organization and why. We then moved to the orientation phase where we started to ask open-ended questions that were directed toward our research questions "Would you describe how the strategy is communicated in your organization?". Afterwards we moved to the substantive phase where we asked follow-up questions directed toward our analysis *"What affect the implementation of performance measurement system in your organization?"* or *"Why do you believe this factor is so important?"*. Then, we ended the interviews by asking the interviewees if they have any question or any comment.

Data was collected, transcribed and translated on February 2020. We started by conducting an interview with an analyst in order to gain better understanding about the measures used by SNCA to evaluate courts. Exploring the role of SNCA was essential to our study since the organization is one of the main stakeholders to the examined court that might affect the implementation of the system according to institutional theory. He then forwarded us to a strategist at SNCA who was engaged in the process of designing the new PMS. The purpose was to understand how the process of designing such a system is carried out considering that it must be applicable for 82 independent courts. SNCA is responsible for developing a strategy and designing an aggregated PMS for The Swedish Courts (Sveriges Domstolar). This include 82 courts ranging from districts courts to supreme courts. Furthermore, the new designed system named as The Strategic Guideline (Strategisk Inriktning) was released on January 2020.

Thereafter, we conducted six interviews with employees at the examined court. This includes the chief judge, middle manager, two law clerks, administration manager and administration case officer. The purpose of these interviews was to understand how PMS is designed and what factors that affect the implementation and design. Due to this, we were interested in exploring how strategy is communicated, which measures are used in court, how employees perceive the targets and measures. Hence, understanding their perception about the PMS was crucial to explain the success phenomenon and answer our research questions.

Totally, we have conducted eight interviews. Two of them were conducted over a phone call and the other six interviews were conducted in person. Both researchers were present at the interviews. The interviews were conducted in Swedish since the interviewees have this language as their mother tongue. In addition, they work in a public organization where Swedish is the main language in speaking and writing. The duration of the interviews varies from 25 to 100 minutes (Three interviews were roughly 85-90 minutes).

4.2.2. Secondary data

Secondary data consisted mainly of reports from the SNCA's homepage, where information such as the financial report of The Swedish Courts was collected. From there, information about the strategy, goal, benchmarking between courts and some measures were extracted. In addition, we have received other data for internal users. This includes a description about the process of developing the new strategic guideline and PMS.

We have also received measures report and operational plan for the court where the central measures and target are included together with the court's strategic objectives. In addition, we received an analysis from SNCA related to the performance at our examined court in order to observe how the institutional pressure is applied.

4.3. Data analysis

When conducting the research, an abductive method was used, and the development theoretical framework remained dynamic. In the early stages of the study, the analytical part mostly consisted of discussions between the researchers. It was vital for both researchers to deep dive into the existing literature in order to gain an insight of what information that exists in our field of research and how it can potentially be applied and added to the theoretical framework. After finishing conducting an interview, there was always a discussion between the researchers regarding the data collected and how it can relate to the theoretical framework of the project. The process of transcribing data is an important step for the researchers in order to become familiar with it (King et al., 2019). Therefore, the data was transcribed either instantly, or 1-2 days after the interviews. It was considered important to transcribe verbatim in order to not lose anything and instead highlight what was relevant for the research. It is important to mention that all the quotes in this paper have been translated to English since the interviews were conducted in Swedish.

As the research progressed with all the interviews done, relevant data could now be sorted into different categories derived from the theoretical framework. For instance, if the interviewee answers a question about the difficulties of their PMS by emphasizing that they use too many measures, then this type of data would fall under the category "design" or more specifically, "selecting measures". Same method was used when data was distributed to the implementation-part. Through this method, we could more easily analyze the data and assess the relevance of it. From there, we took decisions regarding what data to include and exclude in our empirical findings. Data that was considered highly relevant for this study was included in the empirical findings and later analyzed.

4.4. Quality of research

When conducting the qualitative research, focus was on creating a sense of reliability and validity for the reader. External reliability refers to the possibility to reach the same conclusion if other researchers used the same method mentioned above. For instance, a high external reliability indicates that one can expect with good certainty that the same conclusion will be reached if the study would be recreated identically. The aim is to therefore minimize the possibility for eventual bias and errors (Yin, 2009). Internal reliability refers to whether the researchers agree on what they have heard (Flick, 2009). In this study, Gillham's model (2005) has been used when designing the interviews and therefore try to increase the internal reliability. After each interview, there was extensive discussions between the researchers in order to ensure the reasonableness of what was said and how it can be linked to the theoretical framework. In this way, eventual errors were countered. It is also important to mention that is impossible to achieve perfect reliability due to circumstances that continuously change (Fidel, 1984). This is something of high relevance for this study due to its method being based on semi-structured interviews with open questions. This makes it possible for the interviewees to give different answers depending on changes in behavior. Another possibility if this study is replicated could be that you instead must interview another individual within the organization that might not share the same opinion and beliefs.

The internal validity refers to the reasonableness of the conclusion, i.e. that the data collected is reasonable given existing theory of this area. The internal validity can be strengthened by creating a clear picture of the problem and this can be done by recordings of the interviews (Maxwell, 2013). In this study, all interviews were recorded and transcribed verbatim. In addition, this study has used the same interview design for five employees in different hierarchies in the district court which would further support the data through repetition. Lastly, the external validity focuses on the aspect of generalization in a social context. The common problem with case study is the external validity due to the reason of a single study being insufficient for generalization in society. For instance, the PMS design of the district court might be effective for its personnel but might not be optimal for another court due to other circumstances. Hence, generalization is very difficult, both in society but also in the court system the study focuses on. One way to tackle this problem is by encouraging researchers to conduct identical studies with bigger samples, in this case analyzing more courts (Silverman, 2010; 2011).

5. Empirical findings

5.1. The case organization

The juridical system of Sweden is complex and could be described as a hierarchical ladder where the general courts can be divided into three level: District Courts, Courts of Appeal and Supreme Courts. Note that the Patent and Market Courts and the Land and Environmental Courts also belong to the Swedish Courts. The SNCA's role is to provide support to all the courts with everything from IT-support to HR-related issues. When conducting our research, we chose to deep dive into the examined case organization, *district court X*, but we also included SNCA since we aim to investigate the institutional pressures exercised by upper bodies in the organization.

5.1.1. District Court X

In the Swedish District Court reform 1971, our examined organization was founded and has since then been an important component of the juridical system. In 2009, the court merged with district court Z and the organization today has around 40 employees with different academic backgrounds, working in different levels in the hierarchy. The structure mainly consists of 4 different levels in the following order: case officers, law clerk, judges and chief judge. The office consists of two floors, each floor has one judge as a unit responsible.

Case officers are responsible for the administration of the cases. They make sure that people are present on the interrogations, that the judges have the documentation they need, and they can also make suggestions for action before handing over the case to the lawyers. Law clerks provide direct assistance to judges where they make research on the cases and therefore, they influence the decisions taken by judges. Meanwhile, judges are responsible for issuing a ruling after collecting all the necessary information and evidence. The court provides an educational platform for law clerks as they are only there for a limited time. Judges spend a lot of their time on negotiations. The rest of the time is spent at the desk or at meetings, where cases are often discussed together in teams. The unit-responsible judges have a few more responsibilities. In addition to what has been mentioned, a small portion of their time is spent on talking to the staff and making sure that everything is up to date, answering eventual questions from staff etc.

The chief judge has various tasks. Even though his focus is to lead the organization, time is spent on negotiations and participation in solving cases. Much of the time is also spent on administrative work and meetings.

While the hierarchical levels exist, it is important to mention that they work in what is called rotel-systems e.g. divisions. These rotel-systems or teams consists of employees from each of the first three levels of the hierarchy, meaning case officers, law clerks and one judge. Each group works together from the moment a case is registered and handed to them, until a ruling has been issued. In this way, the employees maintain a high level of self-responsibility, incentivizing them to finish their tasks as fast as possible and with high quality. This working structure is something that has been implemented internally and is not used by all the other 47 district courts in Sweden. In fact, many of them use something called unit-systems or departments. The design was described by one case officer as *"working in units where you have a large room with documents of cases. You are a part of a big unit and do not specifically work with any judge"*.

Beyond the merger with District Court Z, our examined organization has experienced some major changes since it was founded in 1971. One of the major ones is when the existing chief judge took over the chief-role in 1998. Before his arrival, the court was one of the most inefficient district courts in Sweden. "*Before he arrived, it was not so good. It was a pretty difficult position in court at that time" (Administrative manager).*

This changed when the existing chief judge took over. He changed the internal PMS and implemented strict continuous monitoring of the rotel-teams, making sure that *"all the wheels in the organization were working and not stuck"*. Each year, the chief judge, together with his employees form the strategic objectives of the organization. In addition, concrete goals are determined, such as the 40-20-10-goal, which states that each rotel-team should strive to maintain a maximum of 40 criminal, 20 civil and 10 errand cases as pending cases. These types of targets are something that the chief judge has constructed himself internally together with his personnel and is something that he monitors regularly. Another example is the implementation of "shame lists" for cases that have exceeded to preferred maximum turnaround time. Given the change in PMS, the court went from being one of the most ineffective to effective district courts in Sweden. In 2018, there were only a few other district courts with a shorter turnaround time, while the cases pending at the end of 2018 was among the lowest.

"In 2018, when it came to criminal and civil cases, only a few district courts had shorter processing time than district court X. At year-end 2018/19, we had cases pending of criminal cases and disputes that were lower than almost all other district courts. We strive to continuously belong to the absolute fastest district courts" (Chief judge).

5.1.2. The SNCA

In general, the SNCA is a support-organization for the 82 independent courts called The Swedish Courts. The strategic guideline for The Swedish Courts, where all courts are included is designed by the SNCA and representatives from different courts, is the organizational strategy. Meanwhile, courts themselves can have their own operational strategy that contributes to achieving the goals of the Swedish Courts. It is also worth mentioning that the strategic guideline serves as a PMS that is supposed to measure the performance of the courts on an aggregated or organizational level representing the 82 courts. Aggregated refers to the measures being calculated by taking all the courts into account. As of now, February 2020, they have 35 preliminary measures, both quantitative and qualitative. The individual courts will also be able to implement some of these measures into their operational strategy and PMS. Guidelines will be provided by SNCA. In addition, SNCA have controllers and analysts that helps them decide the yearly budget for the courts. Even basic help such as IT-support and answering HR-related questions are examples of what the SNCA can contribute with.

5.2. Considerations of the design of PMS

Strategy: As mentioned before, SNCA is the authority that has the responsibility to design strategy for the Swedish Courts which include 82 independent courts. In addition, the goals of courts will be followed up by SNCA on a strategic level. When we conducted our interviews, we found that SNCA has released a new strategic guideline, Den Strategiska Inriktningen, for the Swedish Courts. In order to develop a feasible strategy, a strategist at SNCA believes that a continuous cooperation with court managers and employees in different levels of the hierarchy was warranted.

"We realized early on in this project if the strategic guideline will become a reality and if we will really use it, it is number one from experience and success terms to put it as a change project. This made us realize that we will need to bring the courts to work. Of

course, the managers, the heads of the court, but also other employees to get different angles on the strategic guideline" (Strategist).

The old strategic guideline has been implemented for ten years between 2010-2020. However, it turned to a "paper product" due to the low level of participation and involvement from the employees and managers at courts. It mainly focused on what SNCA should do, without being clear about how courts can achieve their goals and implement the system.

"The old strategic guideline consisted of 9 goals, and they are impeccable. They are very good and many of them are clear, but the strategies were very much focused on SNCA, SNCA should develop…., SNCA should work for…. etc. It is clear that we have an important role to lead and coordinate the organization and must be the engine, but there was nothing that mention the courts had to do different things to achieve the goals. Here you can say that we should have had a process and forms for how we should deal with the directions and work with the courts, and we did not" (Strategist).

The new strategic guideline is different this time. It is based on the mission of the courts and four goal areas has been identified. Within these four areas, key success factors have been developed in order to explain and clarify how the courts can succeed in each goal area. Furthermore, performance indicators have been identified in order to measure how courts can contribute to the achievement of the aggregated goals and targets have been linked to those measures.

The strategy is communicated through different channels. SNCA under the process of developing the strategy has work systematically to inform all the employees in courts about this process and the new strategic guideline. First, they communicated the strategy to the managers who were involved in the development of the strategic guideline in several meeting any occasions. Later, the managers are responsible to inform the court employees. In addition, the strategy has been communicated through digital channels.

On an operational level, the strategy is cascaded down to the courts who are free to follow the strategy as its designed by SNCA and determine their own strategic objectives. Court managers are responsible to determine which key success factors they want to follow up and which measures to implement. Therefore, it was important for SNCA to involve court managers in the

development of the strategy. From our interviews in the court, we found that the new strategic guideline will be discussed in meetings where all employees from different levels are involved to discuss how it will be implemented. In addition, it will be added to the operational plan for the court. However, the chief judge believes that no big changes will take place in the way the court operates, and the way managers follow up performance. *"This means that this operation plan for 2020 we will settle it in April. Then we will use the new strategic guideline and make it locally anchored. So, this the old strategic guidance, is also locally anchored"*.

Structure: Courts are independent authorities and can determine how to structure the organization in the best possible way. Our case organization unlike many other courts has developed a structure that employees believe it increases personal responsibility and hence performance. One case officer describes the structure when we asked about it as follows:

> "The division system is originally an old organization, where judges, case officer and law clerks work together. When I started 10 years ago, SNCA started by working in units where you have large rooms with files. Then you are a large unit and do not work specifically with any judge. Then I was told that everyone will work in units, but the chief judge…. But now the train goes back as it does in all organizations, now division systems come back but may not be as pure. Now you might be working with two judges or three judges but trying to narrow it down again because personal responsibility plays a role. When you have your own cases, you take responsibility for them in a different way than if the files are in another room" (Case officer).

Other courts have different departments where a distance is established between employees in the hierarchy and the possibility to assign personal responsibility is almost impossible. The old management in this court did not prioritize administration and management. It focused solely on the operations. As mentioned before, when the new chief judge took over in 1998, he implemented a division or team structure. According to him, this structure facilitates communication and makes it easier to follow up and assign personal responsibility. It would be much more difficult to follow up a department that consists of case offices for example since there are no specific quantitatively measures for their performance. Their work affects others in the organization and by integrating them with law clerks and judges, it is easier to control and follow up their performance. Other interviewees agreed on the chief judge's perception of the structure and believe it is fun to work in this way.

Measures: The most common used indicators to measure performance in the court are *turnaround time* referring to how long time it takes to process a case and issue a ruling and the *cases pending* referring to the total number of cases. As law clerk B expresses it: *"We never talk about measures. We talk about cases pending and turnaround times. How quickly we should determine or settle a case and how many of those cases we have."*

The first measure was enforced by the government where 75 percent of crime cases may not take longer than five months and 75 percent of civil cases may not take longer than seven months. The management believes that the government goals have some flows. First, 75 percent might incentivize employees to start with the easy cases to reach the goal and ignore the complex cases. In this case, statistic is deceptive.

> "After all, they [SNCA] measure everything in the 75th percentile. It is very easy to have a number in the 75th percentile. If you get 10 cases, then 90 percent of them are easy to get rid of. But then you have that last case, but that case is never measured by the court because they do not care about the 25 percent most difficult cases, but I DO" (Chief judge).

Second, civil cases might take much longer time and the time constraint might be sometimes unfair. Therefore, management finds it crucial to complete this measure by other ones to prevent manipulating the numbers and achieve effectiveness. Thus, the management follow up the age of the cases to ensure that no team is ignoring the complex cases.

Strategy, measures and goals of the organization are discussed in different meetings in the year and the chief judge himself is very engaged in setting targets and discussing the difficulties to reach goals and make improvement. However, management is fully aware of the importance of employee well-being and quality. Therefore, it encourages employees to take breaks when needed. In addition, they receive the maximum amount of wellness grant allowed by the government. The central measures mentioned above send signals about the well-being of the employees. If a team does not reach the assigned targets and the reason is well-being, management try to address the problem and solve it. Measures such as illness frequency and employee satisfaction are used.

Nonetheless, quality is difficult to measure and until now there is no measure that can be used to measure it. The difficulty to measure quality depends on the perception of what quality is. The court uses *amendment rate* to reflect the amendments made in verdicts.

However, in many cases this rate does not tell much about quality. Sometimes, an amendment is made because a paragraph is missing. According to the chief judge, this does not say anything about quality. He believes that quality and effectiveness are related to each other. In order to make his point more concrete, he analyzed the number of cases for a court with approximately the same size of his court. In comparison with the other court, his organization had 800 pending cases less than the other court. According to him, if judges know that 800 cases are waiting, this has an implication on the quality of their work. Analyst from SNCA agrees on the connection between quality and effectiveness as they "work side by side" according to him. In order to be granted funds, SNCA follows up primarily the number of incoming cases to the court. We asked an employee at SNCA to provide us with an analysis about the examined court to observe what they perceive to be important when analyzing the performance. We found that SNCA is not only interested in the number of incoming cases, measures such as turnaround time and number of cases waiting for verdict or cases pending were also part of the provided analysis.

Targets: Due to the flows in the government targets and its insufficiency, the court management decided to develop its own targets regarding the turnaround time. If the teams manage to satisfy these targets, the number of crime cases should not exceed 40, 20 civil cases and 10 for other cases. These number are followed on a monthly basis. However, as mentioned before, the number of cases per team might incentivize employees to first process the relatively easy cases and neglect the complex ones. Therefore, the chief judge himself asks unit managers twice a year about possible delay reason. In this case, management ensures that no cases are neglected. In addition, we found that the turnaround time and cases pending are communicated strongly in teams and effectiveness is highly emphasized. One employee mentions that cases pending is what the employees focus most on and therefore they try to close the cases fast. In addition, the employees perceive the targets to be fair and achievable. In order to enable the teams to reach their targets, external resources are used where complex and time-consuming cases appears. In this case, the operations and units are protected from any disruption that may cause a deviation from the targets.

"Each division should handle its own cases and drive itself and that happens so as long as the cases are not huge. But then a very big case comes. Now we have an eight-day case. Then we have a pensioner who sits every day this week with that case. Then we protect the ordinary operations so that they can continue. Should I put out an ordinary judge on that case, then the effectiveness of that division would go down during this time. Then I control this case and place it on an external force. In this way, I maintain the effectiveness of the divisions. All the divisions spin at full speed and this case does not sable. At another district court, however, they do not have money and then they assign it to someone who is ordinary in the District Court. Then they will not get this boost from that judge during that time. Then their efficiency declines. Much is not to interfere with ordinary operations. Ordinary operations must be protected at all times and be able to operate normally" (Chief judge).

Targets related to employee satisfaction are reviewed less frequently. However, the management emphasizes the importance of satisfied employees. In addition, the number of cases per team is used in a way that can signal the well-being in the team. If the number of the cases is beyond above the targets, a discussion with the team will occur to understand the reason. Moreover, the management is interested in the perception of the visitors about the court and the service provided. Therefore, they have a team that work with these issues to collect feedback from the visitors and try to implement it the organization.

Rewards: Monetary rewards are not used in the court. However, management emphasizes the importance of intrinsic motivation as an incentive. Teams that fell below the targets are rewarded by recognition and appraisal. In addition, management notices the employees, walks around and establishes personal relationships. Furthermore, the management shows appreciation for the employees of the court by granting the maximum amount of well-being grants allowed by the government and breakfast Fridays.

"Then we have different activities to keep the joy up. After all, we have big meetings to get to know colleagues, always celebrate when someone leave, breakfast on Fridays. The small action, it requires so little but gives so much. This is something created locally. Here we have a lot of the positive parts; we also have a good health grant and so on. This with the breakfasts is completely local" (Law clerk A).

The chief judge is aware about the importance of incentives to monitor the behavior of the employees. For instance, he mentioned that good performance cannot be punished by requiring more from the teams or individuals who manage to hold a low number of cases on their desks. According to him, this might incentivize individuals to be less effective since they know that they will always have a lot to do. Therefore, it is important that they enjoy their time while they do not have much to do.

5.3. Considerations of the implementation of PMS

When constructing the PMS and choosing measures, the management do not have any pressure from the SNCA forcing them to include any indicators. Instead, they can freely build a PMS that fits the organization. When interviewing the strategist at SNCA, she stated:

> "This is not really about having a lot of measures used in the courts, but if they ask for it, we would like to support them with it in order achieve an effect. […] There are not automatically 31 measures that are sent down to each court and that they are forced to follow up. Instead, this is about finding a model that fits for them, 'This is how you could do for your individual court'" (Strategist).

Even though the courts are being evaluated on lagging measures such as "cases closed" by the SNCA, they are not obligated to include them in their measurement system and to communicate them. The examined court have emphasized the operational perspective, meaning that they have focused a lot on leading measures. Given their freedom to construct PMS, it was present throughout the interviews that the employees and managers believe in their PMS as it impacts the work environment positively. It promotes involvement for everyone in the organization and according to the employees, it opens possibilities for self-responsibility and leadership from the bottom to the top of the organization. One example from the interviewees was that the team managers get to practice leadership together with the chief judge and assisting him with the leadership role. The PMS creates involvement and the employees are continuously engaged in working to further develop the system when room for improvement or necessary adjustments can be made.

After interviewing the court employees, it was very clear that the management commitment in the organization is very high. There is a lot of effort from managers to ensure that the employees thrive in the workplace, that they are appreciated, and they can participate and influence some

relevant organizational decisions. The commitment does not stop there, as the management is committed to communicating the strategic objectives and organizational goals to ensure that it permeates throughout the hierarchical levels in the court. Everyone interviewed emphasized the importance of the goals and that they are communicated and reinforced during their major meetings that are held five times a year. When law clerk A was asked about the communication of strategy and goals, he responded:

> "We have different major meetings, 3 in the spring and 2 in the autumn. After all, it is a forum for addressing these types of issues and questions. Also, we have lots of other meetings such as legal meetings, management team, etc. At the big meetings, you always look at it [the goals]. What does it really look like?" (Law clerk A).

Similar responses were received by other interviewees, which indicates that a lot of effort is spent on communicating the strategy to all employees within the organization. Strong communication of strategy and goals will require a management that is consistently observing the organizations current position and how far they are from reaching their objectives. When interviewing the employees, many emphasized that the chief judge, together with other managers are very committed to monitoring the success of the court. *"We have pretty clear goals that the chief judge, at all major meetings presents them. He loves statistics. He always presents data of the cases pending and at the first annual general meeting, we look through the business plan together." (case officer).* The administrative manager complements the case officer's answer when describing the chief judge by adding *"He is incredibly good at seeing what you can improve by doing in a certain way. After all, he meets many of his fellow judges. He is very good, after all. He loves statistics."*

Much of the responses from above insinuates that the performance measurement and follow-up within the organization is quite high due to a genuine interest and involvement from the management, but most importantly, from the chief judge himself. The interest might perhaps be derived from the fact that he is active in the operational part of the court, making it easier for him to understand processes and how they should be measured properly.

The chief judge's activity in operational part of the court, is being responsible for one of the ten rotel-systems in the organization. This can be of high importance as he is the one that have constructed the PMS and according to some interviewees, can be important in order to set

relevant goals. *"chief judge is a team player [...]. In addition, chief judge participates and judges, so it is good that he is involved in setting the goals, as it will be anchoring when he can relate to the work we do." (Law clerk A).* As he was the one constructing the internal 40-20-10-goal explained above, it is highly likely that the goal is carefully customized for the court to increase effectiveness by not being too difficult to achieve. Furthermore, as the chief judge has his own team, this goal also applies for him and his team. This was noticed during our interview with him, *"[Pointing at the evaluation-paper]. Then if I calculate this, it only sums up to 15 and not 20. This means that me and my team is 'off the hook' right?"* when giving us a walkthrough of how he follows up the 40-20-10 goal.

As mentioned above, the chief judge is aware of the importance of giving feedback to employees in form of rewards. To complement what has been said, we received an internal email that was sent recently to all employees in the organization, stating that they once again were the most effective court in Sweden and all employees would be rewarded with ice cream. This type of benchmarking is done monthly where he compares how the court is doing statistically compared to other courts in Sweden. From there, he takes the initiative to email out the results and reward his co-workers with ice cream and such for their hard work.

6. Discussion

6.1. The designed performance measurement system in District Court X

Strategy: Strategy is the starting point of any PMS where strategic objectives are identified and quantified (Kaplan, 2001). Strategy has been used as the point of departure when SNCA designed the new PMS together with 82 courts. The mission of the courts has been identified and five different perspectives have been created. Within these perspectives, strategic objectives and critical success factors have been recognized and were linked to measures. Therefore, the ideas discussed by Kaplan (2001) and the findings by Sawhill and Williamson (2001) about linking the measures to strategy are highlighted when designing PMS in public organizations. The communication of the strategy is facilitated by its links to critical success factors and measures, which enables individuals to understand what and how they can achieve the goals of the organization according to one of the interviewees. Consequently, we found that huge emphasis has been put to communicate the strategy in terms of strategic objectives, critical success factor and measures.

Structure: The structure implemented in the organization is a business unit structure. Each team in the court is responsible for almost all the necessary functions to reach a verdict. These teams consist primarily of case officers, law clerks and judges. The assignments of the employees in each team are well defined and they are held accountable for their performance by following up the targets. Therefore, they can determine what they can influence and control. Judges in each team have the responsibility to follow up their cases and to coordinate with the team members to make sure that the cases pending are at minimum levels. According to our interviewees, functional structure is still adapted in many other courts. Several employees suggest that the business unit structure highlights personal responsibility and accountability.

Therefore, the structure implemented in the organization is one of the main factors to increase effectiveness. By breaking down the organization to small teams, this structure also enables the management to control performance. This is done by assigning each team goals to reach. In addition, integrating employees from different level in the hierarchy can also facilitate learning in the organization which contribute to better quality. Thus, our study supports the notation that structure is the foundation to determine responsibility and accountability in organizations. Furthermore, our study shows that the structure has an impact on the design of PMS and the motivation of the employees and hence performance. A functional structure in our examined court is perceived by our interviewees as dysfunctional since it does not enable managers to assign their employees personal responsibility. Consequently, performance cannot be controlled or measured since responsibility is collective and employees in this case perceive that they cannot control or influence performance individually. According to the chief judge, assigning personal responsibility is important for effectiveness and employees will be more motivated when their performance can be evaluated on this basis.

Measures: Kaplan (2001) suggests that public organizations should quantify and measure the strategy to reduce ambiguity about the objectives of the organization. Therefore, these organizations must focus their resources on limited objectives. The purpose of the new PMS is to be implemented and followed up on a strategical and aggregated level. Moreover, it is not compulsory for courts to implement it. This system includes primarily 35 measures linked to critical success factors where several measures cannot even be implemented in a specific court.. However, according to SNCA some measures can be implemented in individual courts and managers are free to determine which measures they find necessary to implement in their organization.

In our examined court, we found that employees believe that 35 measures are too much. However, they are aware that they do not need to implement them all. The new strategic guideline is not cascaded down yet in the operational plan for the court which will be done later this year. However, we analyzed the operational plan for year 2019 since we have been told that no big change will occur even when the new strategic guideline will be introduced. We found that critical success factors are formulated in a simple way which is easy to comprehend and remember. Three main points were mentioned: (1) to ensure high quality, fast processing and uniformed application of the law (2) to maintain high confidence among the public about the organization (3) to have fun at work. Based on these success factors, we found that few quantitative measures have been mentioned. This includes the turnaround time or process time, cases pending and employee satisfaction. We found that quality for example is qualitatively followed since it is difficult to measure, suggesting that a meaningful measure has not been developed. In addition, the public opinion is measured with a survey and the feedback is discussed and implemented. The fact that the organization mainly focuses on a few measures is not a problem. According to Kaplan & Norton (1992), measures overload may cause manager to lose focus when they try to follow many different measures. In fact, the court managers that we have interviewed perceived measurement overload as serious problem and believe that the measures used are enough approximate of the operations in court and balance is maintained between the different perspectives.

Kaplan (2001) suggests a balanced approach for public organizations that align the interest of the different stakeholder where mission is placed at the top of the BSC. In addition, he suggests placing customers at the top of the perspectives instead of having the financial perspective at the top. In our examined court we found a huge emphasis on the value of the services which the organization provides to the individuals and society. From the strategic objectives in the operational plan, the customers are at the top of the priorities. It is worth to mention that customers in public sector are the people receiving the services and the fund provider (Kaplan 2001). Furthermore, outcome indicators should be completed with driver measures (Kaplan & Norton, 1992).

We found that the examined court prioritizes mainly driver or leading indicators and since it is a non-profit organization, the financial perspective is not prioritized. The court receives funds on the basis on incoming cases which the employees cannot control and influence. In addition,

the number of processed or closed cases are not that relevant for the funding body (SNCA) when granting funds. Therefore, outcome measures are not emphasized in court. Meanwhile, turnaround or process time and case pending reflect the internal business perspective in the BSC because management attempts to identify the necessary activities to reduce the waiting time, increase effectiveness and hence contribute to the organization's strategy.

Moreover, employee satisfaction and retention rate reflect the innovation and learning perspective. The court management believes that the employees are the most asset and their well-being is crucial for effectiveness. Furthermore, we found that the management uses cases pending as an indicator of the employee's well-being. An acceleration in the number of cases send a signal to the management to interfere to investigate the well-being and satisfaction in the team.

With regards to the customer perspective, SNCA and the society are the main customers for the court. SNCA is interested in the number of processed cases during the year to ensure that funds have been used in a right way and to analyze the performance of the organization. However, the court mainly focus on turnaround time or process time to make sure that the number of processed cases is achieved. For society, quality is important and until now, no measure has been identified to fully describe the quality in the organization due to different perception about what quality is. Our interviewees believe that effectiveness has an impact on quality and if the court is effective, quality risks are eliminated. In addition, to understand the perception of the society about the services, a questionnaire is used, and the feedbacks of individuals are considered and later implemented for improvements.

Given the context above, our study supports the notation that measures should be linked to a critical success factor and a balanced approach in the PMS is preferred in order to help organizations to reach their goals. Our examined organization has simplified and identified the most relevant critical success factors together with meaningful measures. In addition, a balanced approach that enables it to bridge the gap between the strategic statement and the daily operations is adapted implicitly. Furthermore, this study supports the notation that organizations should avoid measurement overload and to mainly focus on the most meaningful measures linked to the strategic objectives. We found that focusing on few measures has facilitated the communication of the organization's strategy and its goals. In addition, it shifted the focus of the employees towards reaching these goals. "*Attempting to be everything for*

every- one virtually guarantees organizational ineffectiveness" (Kaplan, 2001, p. 359). Moreover, the links between measures have been established and the court management believes employee satisfaction has an implication on the quality and the number of processed cases. However, these links have not been tested. Overall, we found that mangers at our examined court determine key success factor and meaningful measures that they can control and influence. Hence, the measures used in the court have been accepted by employees are perceived as functional and useful.

Targets: we found that targets are used for planning purposes where managers can discuss with their teams how to allocate the cases and understand the reason for delays and hence working to improve the operational processes. In addition, we found that the targets are perceived to be challenging and achievable. The performance of the examined court is relatively higher than many other courts in Sweden despite the sharp increase in the number of incoming cases. According to a report from SNCA, the court management believes that this is attributed by "recruiting and internal control". Merchant (1998) found that the motivation and performance of the employees will suffer if the achievability to reach the performance target is perceived to be impossible. The relationship between performance and targets is complicated in our case since performance is affected by many other variables. Nonetheless, targets are perceived to be achievable.

Furthermore, we found that the court management prefers to benchmark both externally and internally. The internal benchmark is achieved by comparing the performance of the teams in the organization where the operational goals related to cases pending are mainly the standard. Meanwhile, external benchmark is done by comparing the performance of the court with other courts in the country where the cases pending are also the standard. SNCA releases the number of all courts which are presented alphabetically. Therefore, the external benchmarking is done manually by the management. However, based on our interviews and observations, we found that the benchmarking is exclusively used to compare the operational targets concerning the turnaround time, processed cases and cases pending. Thus, other aspects related to employees and quality are not considered in the benchmarking.

Rewards: Despite the nature of the organization where monetary incentives are not used and the employees are perceived to act in the interest of the organization according to Stewardship theory, we found that the court management emphasizes the importance of incentives.

According to the chief judge, the incentives of the employees should be considered since they have an impact on the behavior of the employees and eventually on the effectiveness of the organization. According to motivation crowding theory, extrinsic incentives does not crowd out intrinsic motivation if the reward is collective and perceived as way to support individuals. The monetary incentives in the organization is the relatively high well-being grants. Court managers believe that their employees deserve the highest possible grants since they contribute to the relatively higher performance of the organizations and because it is important for their motivation. Several courts according to the interviewees receive lower grants. Therefore, the reward is perceived to be special, since it is higher than what they would receive in other courts, and supportive. Intrinsic motivation is crowded in by showing appreciation to the employees and establishing relationships. In addition, the management is involved in the daily work and supports the employees in different ways to reach the goals.

Given the context above, our findings support that notation to link rewards and incentives to PMS since rewards have an impact in the behavior of the employees even if employees in public organizations are assumed to act in the organization's goals. In addition, it provides an evidence to the importance of both intrinsic and extrinsic incentives to motivate the employees and hence increase performance in public organizations.

6.2. Important implementation factors in District Court X

Based on our empirical finings, we found that the institutional pressure on the development and implementation of the PMS is perceived as low due to two reasons. Firstly, Brignall & Modell (2000) concluded that when high institutional pressure is present in an organization, management tend to put more emphasis on the outcome indicators such as financial metrics. In addition, Meyer & Rowan (1977) proposed that high institutional pressure will lead organizations to decouple or disintegrate these imposed structures from the operational activities. Thus, PMSs will be used in a symbolic and decoupled manner. This was not the case in the examined court. In fact, their internal PMS mostly focused on leading indicators even though the external evaluation by the SNCA includes some lagging measures. This makes it possible for the management to more freely construct a well-designed PMS that fits the individual court. In addition, the employees are highly involved in designing and remodeling the measures.

Secondly, the SNCA are ware that 82 courts have different needs. The strategic guideline is adjustable and enable the courts to choose the measures they want to use and that might fit their internal organizational strategy to ensure the integration of the system with the operational activities. In that way, the SNCA is working on maintaining a low institutional pressure and allow the court managers to freely construct what they believe would be an appropriate PMS for their court. Therefore, our study supports the suggestion that low institutional pressure from the funding body (SNCA in this case), enables the examined court to emphasize the leading measures and construct a PMS that fits their organization and to avoid decoupling the system.

The low institutional pressure presented in the examined organization allowed for developing and emphasizing bottom-up leadership and sensegiving efforts. In our study, we found that the chief judge together with team managers are highly committed to follow up and support the development and changes in the system. In addition, continuous communication of the aimed strategy to members is emphasized in different ways. As mentioned earlier, they have many different meetings in the court and in all these gatherings, the chief judge is trying to reinforce the organizational strategy and ensuring that everyone is aware of their objectives and how they can be achieved.

Since low institutional pressure opens the possibility for leadership in the organization, it is interesting to understand how it affects the design and implementation of PMS. When analyzing this, we used the framework by Nishii and Paluch (2018). As mentioned earlier, this framework is appropriate because a part of this study has been focusing on how leadership can impact the implementation of important systems in the organization. The framework focuses on HR-practices, which is more about how to reach organizational goals, implement a fair evaluation system and create a positive workplace etc. These factors are closely interlinked to the implementation of a PMS as it basically is used a tool for reaching organizational goals by using a fair evaluation and feedback-system.

 In addition, the behaviors described are appropriate for general implementations of different systems such as PMS. Hence, this framework is very relevant and is used in this study for analyzing how the chief judge together with members in the court successfully, based on the perception of the interviewees, implemented the system. Consequently, this would help us to explain why the PMS in the examined court is implemented so well and how the leadership role

is contributing to its success. Each behavior has been investigated in the examined court and the following analysis was done:

The first behavior that was present in the court is *role modeling expectations*. In theory, the expectations that are formulated by managers need to correspond with their own managerial actions. In practice, this is exactly what is being done by the chief judge. As he is responsible for one of the ten teams in the court, working like any other judge, he is sending signal to the other employees showing them that he is highly involved in the operational part of the court, just as they are. Furthermore, there are additional empirics that further strengthen this claim as the chief judge evaluates his team just like he would evaluate the other ones. This means that when he looks at the cases pending per team and how they are doing relative to the 40-20-10 goal, he is also evaluating his own team. This behavior shown by the chief judge can be perceived by employees to have a greater validity and legitimacy (Bowen & Ostroff, 2004).

Therefore, the desired behavioral response from the employees in the court will be more likely as they believe the chief judge do "walk the talk". In addition, as it is the chief judge that is mainly responsible for constructing the internal goals such as the 40-20-10-goal, the employees will believe that they are reasonable as their manager is directly involved in their work and is aware of what is considered to be achievable targets. All these findings support that this behavior from the chief judge will likely lead to desired behavioral responses from employees and hence, strengthening the implementation of PMS.

The second behavior that was noted was about r*einforcing expectations*. As mentioned earlier, managers play an important role when it comes to shaping the desired behaviors of the employees because they are the ones who evaluate their performance and consistently need to act upon them if there is a need for it. In the court, the chief judge is constantly evaluating the performance of the individual teams and ensuring that they are working to contribute to the organizational goals. More specifically, he makes sure that the teams do not exceed the amount of cases pending (40-20-10-goal) and if this is the case, he quickly acts upon these red flags. At the same time, team managers monitor and follow up the team performance by using the implemented measures which indicates high reliance and integration of the system in the operational activities.

The chief judge and other team managers are aware of the importance of the feedback from the organizational environment, in the form of rewards or punishment and how this can modify the employee's behavior in order to achieve the goals of the organization. The reward-system has been discussed earlier, but in short, as the court is an organization in the public sector, monetary rewards are not possible. Instead, he rewards the teams by not giving them additional work if they were efficient and well below the 40-20-10 goal. Additional rewards such as showing appreciation to the court employees will with time lead to them spending more effort on recreating these behaviors and mastering them. The only "punishment" that was noticed was their shame-list, where old cases that have taken too long are registered. In contrast to the rewards, the purpose of this shame-list is a way of showing the employees that this is not a part of the desired expectation for the organization.

When analyzing our findings, we found interesting connections to the behaviors regarding *articulating intended messages*. The theory emphasizes the importance of aligning the PMS with the strategy, and when this is not clear enough and left for interpretations, individuals of the organization will create their own interpretation that might deviate from what is seen as important. In these cases, it is important for the manager to reinforce and communicate their views of what is important, and this is what the chief judge in the court emphasizes.

When communicating the strategy and objectives of the organization, there is a possibility for the employees to ask questions if something remains unclear and the supreme manager can contribute with clarification. The chief judge and team managers are also making sure that they are engaged in *sensegiving* where they break down the communicated strategy and practices into more task-related goals such as the 40-20-10 goal or their internal goals related to the turnaround time. By doing this, the employees will not just understand the *what* of the strategy, but also the *how* and *why*.

For instance, as the chief judge communicates how each separate case officer affects the metric for turnaround time, they will understand how their work can contribute to reaching the objectives and why their work is important for the organization, but also for society. Same reasoning can be applied for the other hierarchical levels. Through the chief judge's engagement in sensegiving, he is adding the *how* and *why*, making it easier for the court employees to form an idea of how their work contributes to the strategy.

The final behavior regarding *assessing followers' understanding of messages* is closely interlinked to what has already been discussed. Team managers in the examined organization put a lot of effort on identifying eventual cues that may arise from the employees when it comes to understanding the strategy. These cues could be confusion, dissatisfaction due to unachievable targets etc. The chief judge ensures that they can keep an open conversation with the employees' in order to facilitate their understanding of the strategy

To summarize this, there is a lot of findings supporting that the organization is characterized with bottom-up leadership behaviors. The chief judge and other managers are a role-model for the employees by strictly acting in terms with the preferred behaviors and expectations of the management. They continuously reinforce the strategy and objectives when possible and lastly, they break down the strategy into task-related levels for the employee, facilitating their understanding of how their work contributes to the objectives. According to theory, these behaviors are important and necessary in shaping and building these strong systems.

Therefore, this study supports the suggestion of Nischi and Paluch (2018) that these four behaviors are present and strongly contributing to a better implementation of strategic objectives and hence reinforcing the design and implementation of an accepted and functional PMS in the examined court. However, it is important to highlight that bottom-up leadership and sensegiving efforts have essentially been enabled by low institutional pressure. This allowed court managers together with members in the organization to design PMS that fits their needs.

7. Conclusion and limitations

Most research depicts the implementation of PMSs as problematic specially when these systems are challenged by members in organizations since they are perceived to threaten the organizational identities and cultures (Oaks et al., 1998; Dent, 1991). In addition, research shows that control systems in public sector are mainly used to increase legitimacy and gain resources. Therefore, these systems are often decoupled from the operational activities and used in a symbolic manner (Meyer & Rowan, 1977). Moreover, research of PMS in juridical systems has been narrowed to mainly describe what measures to use without exploring how institutional pressure and leadership can affect the implementation of them.

This study explored the design of PMS in one of Sweden's most effective district courts where the system has been perceived as well-designed and implemented. Furthermore, this study also sheds light on how institutional pressure, leadership and sensegiving efforts affect the design and implementation of the system. We have been able to provide empirical findings supporting and extending the literature of PMS in public sector and new empirical insights to the literature of PMS in juridical systems has been added.

First, we found that low institutional pressure and leadership can affect the implementation of PMS positively. The empirical findings supported the importance of applying low institutional pressure when designing and implementing PMS, as it enables managers to construct a locally adapted system that they believe fits their organizational goals. This encourages them to focus more on leading measures, instead of solely getting fixated on the financial metrics, which is preferred when constructing a well-designed PMS (Brignall & Model, 2000). In addition, low institutional pressure in our case organization allowed for bottom-up leadership, strong sensegiving efforts and involvement of the organizational members to remodel the system. Therefore, PMS has been accepted by employees and perceived as useful and functional.

Given the context above, institutionally driven pressures for modern management practices are problematic and they need to mediate in a way that allows for a local adaptation to ensure that PMS is incorporated and not being decoupled. Consequently, leadership practices will stream in organizations to implement the system that is specific to the organizational needs.

Second, we found that a well-designed PMS which is allowed by low institutional pressure and bottom-up leadership and sensegiving contributes, based on the perception of the interviewees, to increased effectiveness and efficiency. Our empirical findings provided support for the importance of a well-defined strategy that is translated to strategic objectives and meaningful measures (Kaplan, 2001). In addition, our study supported the notation that structure is the foundation to determine responsibility and accountability in the organization. Thus, our study showed that structure has an impact on the design of PMS and the motivation of the employees and hence performance (Chenhall, 2003). Furthermore, this study supported the suggestion that organizations should avoid measurement overload and to mainly focus on the most meaningful measures linked to the strategic objectives (Kaplan & Norton, 1994; Kaplan, 2001).

Moreover, we found that focusing on few measures that really fits the organizational needs and that are not imposed but designed and implemented by involving the employees has facilitated the communication of the organization's strategy.

Our study contributes to the earlier literature of PMS in public sector management and more specifically in juridical system in several ways. First, this study contributes to the earlier literature by documenting and exploring how PMS is designed and the factors affecting the implementation of the system in courts. Previous literature has not explained and addressed the issue of how to design a PMS and how leadership affects the implementation. Indeed, research in juridical system was mainly concerned in what to measure without explaining the nuances of the process.

Second, contradictory to earlier research suggesting that the process of designing and implementing PMS in public organization to be complex and challenging, our study is a story of organizational success in this area and provides insights about successful implementation based on the perception of the employees. Therefore, our study extends the literature of PMS in public sector management by explaining the positive effects of low institutional pressure and leadership on the design and implementation of PMSs.

Finally, we acknowledge the limitation of our case study. We based our empirical findings on the perception of individuals in one signal-case organization to establish analytical generalizations (Yin, 2009). We were not able to conduct multi-case study since this was beyond the scope of our research and would shift the focus toward similarities and differences. Therefore, a potential development of our study is to increase the number of courts to compare how PMS is designed and implemented where institutional pressure and leadership are emphasized.

8. References

Literature

Andersen, B., & Faugerland, T. (2006). Mät företagets prestation, SIS Förlag AB, Stockholm.

Anthony R., Govindarajan V., Hartmann F., Kraus K., Nilsson G. (2014). Management Control Systems,1st ed., London: McGraw Hill.

Bourne, M., Mills, J., Wilcox, M., Neely, A., & Platts, K. (2000). Designing, implementing and updating performance measurement systems. International Journal of Operations & Production Management, 20(7), 754-771.

Bowen, D.E., & Ostroff, C. (2004). Understanding HRM-firm performance linkages: The role of the "strength" of the HRM system. Academy of Management Review, 29(2), 203–221.

Bower, J.L. (1977). Effective public management. Harvard Business Review, 131-140.

Brignall, S., & Modell, S. (2014). An institutional perspective on performance measurement and management in the 'new public sector. Management Accounting Research, 11, 281-306.

Brown, M.G. (1996). Keeping Score: Using the Right Metrics to Drive World-Class Performance. New York: Quality Resources.

Carmona, S., & Grönlund, A. (2003). Measures vs Actions: The Balanced Scorecard in Swedish Law Enforcement. International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management, 12, 1475-1496.

Cavalluzzo, K. S., & Ittner, C. D. (2004). Implementing performance measurement innovations: evidence from government. Accounting, Organization and Society, 29, 243–267.

Chenhall, R.H. (2003). Management control systems design within its organizational context: findings from contingency-based research and directions for the future. Accounting, Organizations and Society, 28, 127–168.

Coman, A., Ronen, B., & Maayan, E. (2012). Assessing the Performance of a court System: A Comprehensive Performance Measures Approach. International Journal of Public Administration, 730-738.

Corbin, J., & Strauss, A. (2008). Basics of Qualitative Research: Techniques and Procedures for Developing Grounded Theory, 3rd ed., Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

De Bruijn, H. (2002). Performance measurement in the public sector: strategies to cope with the risks of performance measurement. International Journal of Public Sector Management, 15(7), 578-594.

Den Hartog, D.N., Boon, C., Verburg, R.M., & Croon, M.A. (2013). HRM, communication, satisfaction, and perceived performance: A cross-level test. Journal of Management, 39(6), 1637–1665.

Dent, J.F. (1991). Accounting and organizational cultures: A field study of the emergence of a new organizational reality. Accounting, Organization and Society, 16(8), 705-73.

Dreveton, B. The advantages of the balanced scorecard in the public sector: beyond performance measurement, Public Money & Management, 33(2), 131-136.

Dubois, A., & Gadde, L.E. (2002). Systematic combining: an abductive approach to case research. Journal of Business Research, 55(7), 553-560.

Emmanuel, C., Otley, D.T., & Merchant, K.A. (1990). Accounting for management control, 2nd ed., London: Chapman and Hall.

Emmanuel, C.R., & Otley, D.T. (1985). Accounting for management control. Worcester: Van Nostrand Reinhold Co.

Fidel, R. (1984). The Case Study Method: A Case Study. Library & Information Science Research, 6(3), 273-288.

Fitzgerald, L., Johnston, R., Brignall, T.J., Silvestro, R., & Voss, C. (1991). Performance Measurement in Service Businesses. London: Chartered Institute of Management Accountants.

Flick, U. (2009). An Introduction to Qualitative Research, 4th ed., London: SAGE Publications.

Franco-Santos, M., Lucianetti, L. and Bourne, M. (2012). Contemporary Performance Measurement Systems: A Review of Their Consequences and a Framework for Research. Management Accounting Research, 23(2), 79-119.

Gillham, B. (2005). Research Interviewing: The Range of Techniques, Maidenhead: Open University Press.

Grafton, J., Lillis, A., & Widener, S. (2010). The role of performance measurement and evaluation in building organizational capabilities and performance. Accounting, Organizations and Society, 35, 689-706.

Hanson, R.A., Ostrom, B.J., & Kleiman, M. (2010). The Pursuit of High Performance, International Journal for Court Administration, 1-1.

Heinrich, C.J., & Marschke, G. (2010). Incentives and their dynamics in public sector performance management systems. Journal of public Analysis and Management, 29(1), 183-208.

Jenkins, G.D.J., Mitra, A., Gupta, N., & Shaw, J. (1998). Are financial incentives related to performance? A meta-analytic review of empirical research. Journal of Applied Psychology, 83, 777–787.

Kaplan, R.S. (2001). Strategic Performance Measurement and Management in Nonprofit Organizations. Nonprofit Management & leadership, 11(3), 353–370.

Kaplan, R.S., & Norton, D.P. (1992). The balanced scorecard — Measures that drive performance. Harvard Business Review, 70(1), 71–79.

Kaplan, R.S., & Norton, D.P. (1996a). Translating strategy into action: The balanced score-card. Harvard Business School Press.

Keegan, D.P., Eiler, R.G., & Jones, C.R. (1989). Are your performance measures obsolete? Management Accounting, 70(12), 45–50.

Lepore, L., Metallo, C., & Agrifoglio R. (2012). Evaluating Court performance: Findings from Two Italian Courts. International Journal for Court Administration, 1-12.

Lynch, R.L., & Cross, K.F. (1991). Measure Up: The Essential Guide to Measuring Business Performance. London: Mandarin.

Maritan, C.A. (2001). Capital investment as investing in organizational capabilities: An empirically grounded process model. Academy of Management Journal, 44(3), 513–531.

Maxwell, J.A. (2013). Qualitative Research Design: an interactive approach, 3rd ed., Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications.

McGowan, A.S., & Klammer, T.P. (1997). Satisfaction with activity-based cost management implementation. Journal of Management Accounting Research, 9, 217–237.

Merchant, K. A. (1998). Modern management control systems: text and cases. Prentice Hall.

Merchant, K.A., & Manzoni, J.F. (1989). The achievability of budget targets in profit centers: a field study. The Accounting Review, 64, 539–558.

Meyer, J.W. (1997). Institutionalized Organizations: Formal Structure as Myth and Ceremony, American Journal of Sociology, 83(2), 340-363.

Neely, A. (2007). Business performance measurement: Unifying Theory and integrating Practice, 2nd ed., New York: Cambridge University Press.

Newberry, S., & Pallot, J. (2004). Freedom or coercion? NPM incentives in New Zealand central government departments. Management Accounting Research, 15, 247–266.

Nishii, L., & Paluch R. (2018). Leaders as HR sensegivers: Four HR implementation behaviors that create strong HR systems. Human Resource Management Review, 28, 319-323.

Northcott, D., & Taulapapa, T.M. (2011). Using the balanced scorecard to manage performance in public sector organizations Issues and challenges. International Journal of Public Sector Management, 25(3), 166-191.

Oakes, L.S. (1998). Business Planning as Pedagogy: Language and Control in a Changing Institutional Field. Sage Publications Inc, 43(2), 257-292

Otley, D., & Ferreira, A. (2009). The design and use of performance management systems: An extended framework for analysis. Management Accounting research, 20 (4), 263–282.

Pfeffer, J. (1981). Power in organizations. Marshfield, MA: Pitman Publishing Corp.

Preble, J.F. (1992). Towards a comprehensive system of strategic control. Journal of Management Studies, 29(4), 391–409.

Radnor, Z., & McGuire, M. (2004). Performance management in the public sector: fact or fiction? International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management, 53(3), 245-260.

Saunders, M., Lewis, P., & Thornhill, A. (2012). Research methods for business students (6th ed.). Essex, England: Pearson Education.

Sawhill, J.C., & Williamson, D. (2001). Mission Impossible? Measuring Success in Nonprofit Organizations. Nonprofit Management & leadership, 11(3), 353-370.

Silverman, D. (2010). Doing Qualitative Research: A Practical Handbook, 3 ed, London: SAGE Publications.

Silverman, D. (2011). Interpreting Qualitative Data: A Guide to the Principles of Qualitative Research, 4 ed, London: SAGE publications.

Simons, T. (2002). Behavioral integrity: The perceived alignment between managers' words and deeds as a research focus. Organization Science, 13(1), 18–35.

Simons, T., & McLean Parks, J. (2000). The sequential impact of behavioral integrity on trust, commitment, discretionary service behavior, customer satisfaction, and profit- Ability. Academy of management conference proceedings.

Speklé R., Verbeeten F. (2014). The use of performance measurement systems in the public sector: Effects on performance. Management Accounting Research, 25, 131–146.

Tangen, S. (2003b). Utformning av framgångsrika prestationsmått, Bättre Produktivitet med Plan-nytt, No.4.

Widener, S. (2014). Researching the Human Side of Management Control: Using Survey-Based Methods. Management Control and Uncertainty, 69-82.

Wood, R., & Bandura, A. (1989). Social cognitive theory of organizational management. Academy of Management Review, 14(3), 361–384.

Yin, R.K. (2009). Case Study Research: Design and Methods, 4th ed., London: SAGE Publications.

Zajac, E.J., & Westphal, J.D. (1994). The costs and benefits of managerial incentives and monitoring in large U.S. corporations: When is more not better? Strategic Management Journal, Vol. 15, 121–142.

Electronic Resources

Evans, J (2019). Kritik mot Arbetsförmedlingens matchning i ny rapport. Sverigesradio. Retrieved from: https://sverigesradio.se/sida/artikel.aspx?programid=83&artikel=7236233

Ohlin, J. (2016). Migrationsverket: Färre asylbeslut är curlade 80-talisters fel. Svt Nyheter. Retrieved from: https://www.svt.se/nyheter/inrikes/miragtionsverket-skyller-allt-farre-asylbeslut-pa-curlade-80-talister

Wikström, T. (2019). Teatralisk kritik av Arbetsförmedlingen. Dagens Industri. Retrieved from: https://www.di.se/ledare/teatralisk-kritik-av-arbetsformedlingen/

9. Appendix

Appendix A: Conducted interviews

Role	Country	Quantity	Physical/Phone	Date
Analyst	Sweden	1	Phone	2020/02/05
Law clerk A	Sweden	1	Physical	2020/02/10
Law clerk B	Sweden	1	Physical	2020/02/10
Case officer	Sweden	1	Physical	2020/02/10
Administrative manager	Sweden	1	Physical	2020/02/10
Unit-responsible Judge /Middle manager	Sweden	1	Physical	2020/02/10
Chief Judge	Sweden	1	Physical	2020/02/10
Strategist	Sweden	1	Phone	2020/02/12

Appendix B: Interview questions

Interview questions for the analyst at SNCA

Tell us about yourself.

What do you work with?

What is the vision and mission of the Swedish courts and how is this brought to the attention of managers and employees?

What are the key factors that are believed to be central to the organization's overall future success and how are they brought to the attention of managers and employees?

What strategies and plans has the organization adopted and what are the processes and activities that it has decided will be required for it to ensure its success?

Which are the key performance measures used in the Swedish court and how are they communicated?

Do you like the idea of having a performance measurement system (PMS) in government agencies?

What type of PMS is used in the SNCA in order to evaluate the district courts of Sweden?

What measures do you believe to be the most appropriate?

Why do you use these measures? What is the idea behind it?

What factors can affect the implementation of these measures?

How involved are you in the implementation of the measures?

Do you prefer to only use qualitative measures, or do you also use quantitative ones? Are there any measures that you think are not appropriate, but they are used anyway? What do you compare these measures with?

Do you have any type of reward-system?

Do you think that there is a need for monetary rewards?

Can the district court affect the measures that they are being evaluated on?

Do you have any difficulties with measuring some measures?

How often does the managers look at these measures in district courts?

Do you educate managers about PMS?

The financing from SNCA, what measures is it based on?

Interview questions for the court employees

Tell me a bit about yourself

Describe an ordinary working day.

How often do you have follow-up meetings with your superior?

What is discussed during the meeting?

How often is the strategy and goal of the organization communicated?

How do you contribute to achieve the goals of the organization?

How involved are you when the organization is creating new future goals?

What processes do you consider necessary for you to achieve the objectives of your work?

How is your performance measured and evaluated?

What performance measures do you feel that the management mainly focuses on when discussing strategy and goals?

Do you understand these measures?

Do you feel that the organization goals are reasonable?

Have you been educated or informed on how these measures are used?

Do you think there are some measures missing and might be useful?

Do you feel like you can control and affect the measures that are used to evaluate the district court?

What factors do you think can affect the implementation and use of relevant measures? i.e limited technology, time-consuming work etc.

How do these measures affect your work performance?

How does these performance measures affect the work environment in the office?

Do you feel like your work contribution is being fairly measured given the existing performance measures?

How can the SNCA affect your work?

How is your reward-system constructed?

What do you think of it?

In what way do you want your superiors to show their appreciation for your work?

Have you ever heard about the Balance Scorecard framework?

Interview questions for the chief judge

Describe an ordinary working day.

How do you set targets for your organization?

Do you experience that the organization's goals are easily achievable? Why/ Why not?

How do you communicate strategy and targets with your employees?

Do you think that your employees perceive the organization's strategy and targets as clear and easy to grasp?

How do you follow up your employees' results?

Describe the performance measurement system in use.

Tells us about the props and coins with performance measurement system in court

Are there any challenges with your implemented performance measurement system? How do your employees perceive it?

Do you think that the implemented measures are linked to the strategy? Explain How.

Which are the most common measures that you communicate with your employees?

How involved are you and your co-workers in the design of the PMS?

What factors can affect the implementation of different measures in your PMS?

Are there any reasonable measures that you do not use, if so, why?

What do you compare these measures with? I.e. are they compared with another district court or do you do a historical comparison?

How do you proceed when the objectives are not achieved?

What do you think of having a PMS in a public organization?

What perspectives do you think should be included in PMS? I.e. financials, satisfaction etc.

How is the reward-system constructed?

In your operation plan, point 2 and 3, there is a description of your goals and strategies. We have noticed that you are carefully keeping track of the balances with help of data. We have noticed that you also have strategies concerning service but there are no measures showing if you are successful in that field or not. What is the cause behind this?

How does the SNCA affect your work?

How is your contribution measured by SNCA?

Do you feel that the internal performance measurement system is in line with the measurement system used by the SNCA to judge your district court?

What demands do the SNCA require from you? Are they reasonable?

Do you feel like you can affect the measures that you are being judged by?

Interview questions for the strategist at SNCA

Describe an ordinary workday.

Can you describe what activity control is?

Tell us freely about the new strategic guidance.

How was the old strategic guidance?

Why is it important with commitment and leadership? Why do you want people to be committed with the new strategic guidance?

How will you make sure that the chief judges really works with implementing the new strategy?

The feedback received from the examined court was that 31 measures were too many. How did you think regarding this aspect? Are the courts supposed to implement all the 31 measures?

Do not the managers need to continuously follow up and make sure that they are achieving good numbers with the measures?

Is it possible do design templates in order to follow up more difficult measures?

This template that you are talking about, will it be more specific towards the district courts in Sweden?

The new strategic guidance has an uneven amount of measures connected to each key aspect. Have you thought of creating a balance in order to not put too much emphasis in one area?

Some measures are not possible to measure today, have you thought of how you can implement these and start measuring them?

What challenges did you face when choosing measures? What criteria did you have?

What do you believe to be the most important factors when implementing these measures?

When choosing these measures, do you take into consideration that they might affect the quality of the verdicts?

The chief judge in the examined courts goes through all changes from the court of appeal. Is it not possible to assemble a team of competent judges that go through these changes in order to evaluate the quality of verdicts?

What are the consequences of a dysfunctional system?

Is there not a risk that all measures are communicated to everyone in the courts?

How would you describe the differences between old and new strategic guidance?