

**On Public Organizations in Ghana:  
What Differentiates Good Performers from Poor Performers?**

Francis Owusu, PhD  
Department of Community and Regional Planning  
Iowa State University  
Ames, IA 50011-3095  
Phone: (515) 294-7769; Fax: (515) 294-2348  
E-mail: [fowusu@iastate.edu](mailto:fowusu@iastate.edu)

**Acknowledgements**

The research for this paper was sponsored jointly by the World Bank-Netherlands Governance Knowledge Sharing Program. The author would like to thank Elizabeth Asiedu and the participants at the “International Conference on Shared Growth in Africa” organized by ISSER, Cornell University, World Bank, DFID and USAID in Accra, Ghana on July 21 – 22, 2005, for their helpful comments.

## **Abstract**

Public sector reform programs implemented across Africa, including the World Bank's "first" and "second" generation reforms, are based on the assumption that all public organizations are inefficient. This problematic assumption has had significant implications for policy in Africa. By failing to recognize that not all public organizations perform poorly, we ignore any potential lessons that could have been learnt from the experiences of organizations that have managed to perform effectively under the same social, political, economic and institutional environment. This paper uses Ghana as a case study to examine whether there are *significant* differences in the characteristics of poor and good performing public organizations. We found that good and poor performing organizations in Ghana were significantly different in two respects: remuneration and hiring criteria.

## 1. Introduction

The importance of a well-functioning public sector in Africa's development process is indisputable. The challenge however is finding ways to create effective public sector organizations capable of facilitating national development. Indeed, many African countries, with the support of the World Bank and other pro-reform international institutions have since the 1980s experimented with various public sector reform strategies. These policies include the World Bank's "first- and the second-generation" public sector reform programs. The first generation reforms were introduced in the 1980s and focused on reducing the explosive public-sector wage bill. They, however, led to the erosion of public-sector wages vis-à-vis the private sector, and many skilled workers left public employment. The second generation reforms were introduced in the 1990s to improve the quality of the public sector, but these too have so far produced disappointing results in many African countries.<sup>1</sup>

The first and second generation policies have two important flaws. First, the underlying assumption of the policies is that *all public organizations are ineffective*. Clearly, this assumption is flawed because within each country there are public organizations that perform relatively well, given the constraints that they face (Grindle, 1997; Owusu 2005). Second, policies were applied across the board — i.e., a one-size-fits-all solutions — and therefore did not take into consideration the country-specific conditions under which organizations operate. Note that by failing to consider any possible differences in the performance of organizations within countries or even acknowledge the possibility of the existence of good and poor performers within countries; the policies ignored any potentially valuable lessons that could have been learned from the well-performing public organizations in the same social, political and economic environment. Moreover, because the policies are not based on experiences of organizations in the country, they are often seen by management as outside impositions (Tsikata, 2003) and the performance standards as utopian expectations that could never be achieved in their specific organizations given the constraints they face. As a result, public-sector reform policies generally have been implemented by officials with a lukewarm attitude. Indeed, policies based on the experiences of

---

<sup>1</sup> See Lienert and Modi (1997) and Nunberg (1999) for explanations for why the policies were unsuccessful.

organizations within a country are more likely to be seen as realistic and have a greater chance of adoption than those derived from organizations in different countries.

Surprisingly, studies on the differential performance of public organizations within the same countries are scant (Grindle, 1997; Owusu 2005). Rather, research in this area has generally focused on explaining the poor performance of public organizations. This paper contributes to the search for an effective public-sector reform strategy by using Ghana as a case study to examine whether there are *significant* differences in the characteristics of poor and good performing public organizations. The topic is timely for Ghana and Africa as a whole because of the renewed sense of urgency for creating an effective public sector at both the continental level and at the national level in many countries, including Ghana. For instance, the 4<sup>th</sup> Pan-African Conference of Ministers of Public Service, held within the framework of the New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD)<sup>2</sup> in March 2003 in Cape Town, agreed to a Pan-African Governance and Public Administration (G&PA) capacity development program to strengthen the public institutions and systems of African states (NEPAD, 2005). Public sector reform has also become a high priority for the government of Ghana. For example, in May 2005, the Kuffour Administration created a new department, the Ministry of Public Sector Reform (MPSR), to implement public sector reforms in the country. In sum, there is an active on-going search in Africa and in Ghana for ways of creating *effective* and *efficient* public sector reform strategy. Thus, our paper will provide some guidance to policymakers as they grapple with restructuring the public sector.

The analysis in the paper are based on data collected in Ghana, between June and August 2003, that documented the characteristics of selected public sector organizations (see Section 3 for details). Using this data, we examined whether there were significant differences between the attributes of good and poor performing organizations. We found that the two types of organizations were different in two respects: remuneration and hiring criteria. Specifically, we found that good performing institutions paid

---

<sup>2</sup> NEPAD is a development framework put together by African leaders to eradicate poverty and promote growth in the region (see Owusu, 2003)

higher salaries. Furthermore, employees of bad performing institutions are more likely to be hired based on their personal connections than qualifications.

The remaining sections of the paper are organized as follows. Section 2 discusses public sector reforms in Ghana. Section 3 describes the data collection process, the classification method, the variables and the empirical results and Section 4 concludes.

## **2. Public Sector Reforms in Ghana — A Brief Review**

Similar to many African countries that experienced economic crisis in the 1970s and 1980s, the public sector in Ghana was in complete disarray by the mid-1980s. A combination of devaluation and inflation led to a significant decline in real salaries between 1960 and the late 1980s. For example, the minimum wage that has been falling since the 1960s, reached its lowest level in 1983, and although real wages improved between 1986 and 1989, even at its peak in 1989, it was only 42% of the level in 1960 (Owusu, 2001). Public sector employees were not exempted from this precipitous decline in wages. Between 1976 and 1984, public-sector real wages in Ghana declined by 73 percent for unskilled labor and 93 percent for skilled labor. Moreover salaries were not only inadequate, but payment was also erratic. To make matters worse, most offices, especially those outside the capital city, Accra, were dilapidated and lacked the basic necessities of a functioning office such as paper, pencils, telephones, light bulbs, etc. Employees became demoralized; effectiveness and productivity concerns were relegated to the background as work effort declined, absenteeism and moonlighting increased, and corruption, political hiring, and rent-seeking became widespread (Owusu, 2005). These conditions made it extremely difficult to recruit and retain technical and professional staff. Gradually the bloated public sector became increasingly incapable of performing basic tasks, let alone to facilitate national development efforts. The ineffectiveness of the public sector became a serious hindrance when the government embarked on

economic reforms in 1983.<sup>3</sup> As a result, the government was compelled to initiate public sector reforms to support the implementation of the economic policies.

A brief background of the World Bank's public sector reform policies recommended for African countries is necessary for understanding the Ghana government policies because of the striking similarity between them. World Bank public sector reform policies can be classified into two: the "quantitative" first-generation, and the "qualitative" second-generation reform programs.<sup>4</sup> The first-generation reforms were implemented between the 1980s and early 1990s, and were part of the structural adjustment policies implemented by the Bank in several African countries. The aim of the first-generation reforms was to trim the size of the government and the policies implemented included retrenchment, cost-recovery and privatization (Lienert and Modi, 1997). Although these policies helped reduce government wage bills in some cases, overall, they failed to improve the performance of the public sector. One reason for the ineffectiveness of the policies was the narrow focus of the reforms (Numberg, 1999). The second generation reforms began in the 1990s. This time, the policies focused on improving the *quality* of public-sector employment and to make it more attractive (World Bank, 2001). Specifically, remuneration and promotion policies were used to reward performance; measures were put in place to improve management and accountability; and employees were provided with incentives, skills and motivation. The second generation reform policies also did not produce the desired results.

Versions of the Bank's policies have been implemented by the Ghanaian government. The country's first comprehensive public sector reform program was the Civil Service Reform Program (CSRP - 1987-1994). Coinciding with the era of the "quantitative" first-generation reforms, the CSRP aimed to reduce overstaffing and trim redundant civil servants as a part of the effort to reduce government expenditure and help achieve macroeconomic stability. The program successfully reduced the number of

---

<sup>3</sup> Since April 1983, Ghana has rigorously embarked upon World Bank and IMF-supported economic reforms. The program has evolved from the initial objective of reversing economic decline and stagnation to institutional reforms and poverty reduction.

<sup>4</sup> There are indications of the emergence of a "service delivery" third-generation reforms (see World Bank, 2003). Although this analysis focuses on the first- and second- generation reforms, the recommendations are expected to have wider applications.

civil servants in central government from about 140,000 in 1987 to 90,000 in 1994 (Leita, 1999). Despite this success, the overall effect of the program in terms of efficiency gains was mixed, partly because of its narrow focus and the lack of government commitment.

In 1994, the government changed the focus of public sector reforms with the creation of the National Institutional Renewal Program (NIRP) and the launching of the Civil Service Performance Improvement Program (CSPIP). Like the “qualitative” second generation reforms of the time, these programs had broader objectives that included enhancing efficiency and facilitating the development of a proactive and motivated public sector. In October 1997, the government implemented the Public Sector Re-Invention and Modernization Strategy (PUSERMOS) to help transform state institutions, their accountability and performance framework and their relationship with the private sector and civil society. Although the NIRP’s Overview Reform Committee was chaired by the then vice president, Mr. J.E.A. Mills, overall, little progress was made due to lack of political will on the part of government to go through with the promised reforms. A recent evaluation of the reforms concluded that: “... on the whole, the [Public Sector Reform Program] PSRP has failed to effectively manage many of the more fundamental issues and problems facing the public service, such as low salary, corruption and poor delivery of public services” (PricewaterhouseCoopers, 2003:10).

As at August 2005, the government of Ghana was still in the process of developing a new public sector reform strategy. In addition to developing a new working document for the reform,<sup>5</sup> the government had also created a new ministry in May 2005 called the Ministry of Public Sector Reform (MPSR) to provide institutional home for all public sector reforms. The MPSR has held a number of working sessions to establish the key focus of its reforms efforts.<sup>6</sup> Although the MPSR is yet to articulate the new vision for public-sector reforms, and past experiences suggests that we should expect policies that

---

<sup>5</sup> The Office of the Senior Minister put together a working document for public sector reforms titled: “Towards a New Public Service for Ghana” in June 2004.

<sup>6</sup> See “Public Sector Reform” presentation at Ministerial Retreat, Ministry of Public Sector Reforms, 4 – 6 August, 2005.

might resemble the World Bank's "service delivery" third-generation reforms now in vogue. Thus, this article is timely and its policy recommendations will contribute significantly to this on-going search.

### **3. Description of the Data, Variables and Results**

#### **3.1 The Data**

The paper is part of a larger project designed to document the experiences of good and poor performing public organizations in Ghana (Owusu, 2004). The data was collected between June and August 2003. Assessing the performance of public organizations is a difficult for several reasons. Unlike private organizations where profits are often used as a measure of performance, there is no single performance indicator that can compare the different types of organizations that make up the public sector (Rainey and Steinbauer, 1999). Moreover, as Manning, Mukherjee, and Gokcekus (2000:9) argue, public-sector organizations often provide goods of both "low contestability and measurability," and therefore it is impossible to find good performance measures. Measuring the performance of public organizations in Ghana was particularly difficult due to the lack of access to data that would ordinarily be publicly available in other countries.

To overcome these challenges, the reputational method was used for selecting the organizations to study and for measuring their performance.<sup>7</sup> First, a list of 47 public organizations was compiled. Second, we also compiled a list of 23 "knowledgeables"— persons who live in Ghana and are well-informed about the functioning of public organizations. The knowledgeables included officials in government agencies, bilateral and multilateral agencies, nongovernmental organizations, academic institutions, research organizations and the private sector. Third, the knowlegeables were asked to rank the 47 organizations on a scale of 1 to 5 (1 for poor performer; 5 for best performer) based on their

---

<sup>7</sup> This method has been used extensively in sociological studies of formal and informal power structures within communities. It involves asking knowledgeable citizens to list the most influential people in the community and it is expected that the names of the powerful people would reappear on several lists (see Henslin, 1999).

capacity to perform the major tasks for achieving their main functions.<sup>8</sup> Fourth, data from the survey of knowledgeable were tabulated and the mean score for each organization determined. The 13 top-ranked organizations were labeled as good performers and the 13 bottom-ranked organizations were labeled as poor performers, and the 26 organizations were selected for the next phase of the study. Of these 26 organizations, a total of 19 (9 good performers and 10 poor performers) participated in the study (see Table 1).

[Insert Table 1 here]

A total of 223 employees from the 19 institutions were interviewed— 130 of the respondents were from well-performing organizations and 93 were from poor performing institutions. Table 2 presents the background characteristics of the respondents.

[Insert Table 2 here]

### **3.2 Description of the Variables**

The factors that affect performance of the public sector can be broadly classified into two: internal and external factors. Internal factors refer to factors that are under the control of individual organizations, such as hiring procedures and performance evaluation. External factors refer to influences beyond the control of each individual organization, such as political interference. Following this literature, we group the responses into external factors and internal factors. Appendix A shows the specific measures utilized for each factor. Respondents were asked to respond to items on a Likert-type scale and some yes/no questions. Where the items of a measure had different scales, the responses were

---

<sup>8</sup> The knowledgeable were asked the following question: “Please rank the following ministries, departments and agencies in Ghana on a scale of 1 to 5 (1 for poor performer; 5 for best performer). Please draw on your knowledge of their activities as well as your official contacts with them to evaluate their capacity to perform major tasks for achieving their main functions. Please select N/A if you do not feel competent in ranking a particular organization.”

standardized. Similarly, where questions were asked in a negative, the responses were transformed into positive. The descriptive data for the measures are presented in Table 3.<sup>9</sup>

[Insert Table 3 here]

### External Factors

1. *The Incentive System*: This includes the wages and salaries received by employees for services rendered, as well as discretionary payments other than direct wages or salaries that workers get from their jobs. We consider remuneration as an external factor because in Ghana, salaries of public organizations are determined by the government. Kiltgaard (1997) and Grindle (1997) argue that there is a positive relationship between remuneration and public sector performance. If this is true, then salaries should be higher in good performing organizations.
2. *Specificity of Tasks*: Refers to the consistency of instructions and policies that come from the government to the individual organizations. Consistent instructions and policies promote good performance (Israel, 1987). This suggests that the specificity of tasks is more consistent for good performing organizations than poorly performing ones.
3. *Political Interference*: Refers to the political context in which organizations operate; including the extent to which organizations are politically autonomous and operate free from constant and particular direction from politicians (Wolf, 1993). Excessive political interference in the activities of public organizations in Africa has been blamed for the poor performance of the public sector (Sandbrook, 1993).

---

<sup>9</sup> See Owusu, (2004) for a detailed discussion of the methods and the analysis of the factors.

4. *Client Demand and Oversight*: This is a measure of the effectiveness of civil society in demanding high performance from public agencies. The extent to which citizens are seen as customers of public organizations and the extent to which organizations are accountable to citizens have been shown to influence employee attitudes toward work (Grindle, 1997; Deininger and Mpuga, 2004).

#### Internal Factors

1. *Organizational Mission*: This refers to the general social contribution and purpose of the agency and its related general goals (Rainey and Steinbauer, 1999). Useful missions are established interactively by the external stakeholders and members of the organization and broadly shared and internalized by employees (Grindle, 1997).
2. *Recruitment Criteria*: Organizations that hire employees based on their qualifications are more likely to be productive than those that hire based on personal connections. With this in mind, we examine whether there are significant differences in the importance of personal connections in the hiring of employees in good and bad performing organizations.
3. *Performance Expectation and Evaluations*: Performance expectation refers to the degree to which employees are given clear signals about how diligently they should work and about the quality of work expected of them (Grindle, 1997), and performance evaluation refers to the degree to which employees know and understand, on a continuous basis, how effectively they are performing (Hackman and Oldman, 1975). Organizations that have clear and consistent policies about performance expectations and evaluation procedures would be expected to perform better.
4. *Employee Sanctioning*: Involves reprimanding employees who perform below expectations and disregard the organization's rules and regulations. A sanctioning system that is based on

transparent, fair and unbiased criteria could discourage such practices. Thus, good performing organizations will have better sanctioning system than poor performing organizations.

5. *Autonomy*: Is the degree to which employees are offered the freedom, independence and discretion to make decisions pertaining to the substantive and procedural aspects of their jobs, such as scheduling and determining the procedure to be used in executing the task (Hackman and Oldham, 1975). The impact of autonomy can be seen at different levels of an organization. For instance, autonomy from civil service rules and regulations may allow management to use creative ways to deal with the day-to-day problems of the organization. Similarly, employees would be less motivated if they had to refer every little decision to management. While complete lack of autonomy can stifle performance, too much autonomy also can have a negative effect by creating “extreme isolation from communication and exchange with external stakeholders” (Rainey and Steinbauer, 1999:16). The key to effective performance therefore is “responsive autonomy.”

### **3.3 Results**

The results are presented in Table 4. Among the external factors, the only measure that showed significant differences between good and poor performers is the incentive system: remuneration is higher in good performing organizations than poor performing ones. For the other external measures, namely, client demand and oversight, specificity of task and political interference, we found no significant differences between the two types of organizations. With regards to the internal factors, only one measure, recruitment criteria, was significantly different among the two groups: employees in poor performing institutions were more often hired based on personal (family and/or political) connections. None of the other internal factors considered was significant in distinguishing between the types of organizations.

[Insert Table 4 here]

#### **4. Policy Recommendations and Conclusions**

This study has empirically analyzed the differences between good and poor performing public organizations in Ghana. The data shows that good performing organizations are different in two respects: remuneration and hiring criteria. Specifically, we show that good performing organizations pay higher salaries. Furthermore, poor performing organizations are more likely to hire employees based on their personal connections. We argue that to the extent that the characteristics of an organization determine the organization's performance, our results suggest that the differential performance of the two types of institutions may be partly attributed to differences in salaries and hiring criteria. In Ghana, salaries in the public sector are determined by the government. Thus, our analysis suggest that in order to improve performance in poor performing organizations, both the government and management must play important roles: the government needs to boost salaries in poor performing organizations and the management of these organizations should employ open and competitive recruitment procedures.

We end by noting some caveats. The limited size of the sample of organizations and employees who participated in the study and problems associated with the use of the reputational method for classifying organizations into good and poor performers must be taken into consideration when applying the results. This study must be seen as a first step in documenting the experiences of good and poor performing organizations in Ghana and other African countries. The work may be expanded to include more public organizations in Ghana, increase the number of respondents, and extended to cover other African countries.

Table 1. Public Organizations included in the Study

<b>Good Performers</b>	<b>Poor Performers</b>
1. Ghana Investment Promotion Council	1. Audit Service
2. Internal Revenue Service	2. Department of Community Development
3. Ministry of Finance	3. Department of Parks and Gardens
4. Ministry of Food and Agriculture	4. Department of Social Welfare
5. Ministry of Health	5. Ghana National Fire Service
6. Ministry of Interior	6. Information Service Department
7. Ministry of Local Gov't & Rural Dev't	7. Ministry of Environment and Science
8. Ministry of Roads and Transport	8. Ministry of Tourism
9. National Electoral Commission	9. Ministry of Works and Housing
	10. Ministry of Youth, Sports & Education

*Note: The Ministries of Defense, Foreign Affairs, Trade and Industries, Lands and Forestry, and Manpower Development and Employment as well as the Police and the Prison Services did not participate in the study.*

Table 2. Demographic, Educational and Employment Characteristics of Respondents

Characteristic	Categories	Good Performers	Poor Performers	Total
No. of Respondents		130	93	223
Gender (%)	Male	57.0	62.0	58.4
	Female	43.0	38.0	41.6
Age (%)	Under 29	13.8	13.5	13.7
	30 – 39	33.3	32.6	33.0
	40 – 49	35.8	28.1	32.5
	Over 50	17.1	25.8	20.8
Marital Status (%)	Married	72.4	75.3	73.6
	Not Married*	27.6	24.7	26.4
Highest Educational Attainment (%)	Senior Secondary School	14.0	14.0	14.0
	Technical/Polytechnic	20.9	16.1	18.9
	University/Post-University	45.0	49.5	46.8
	Other/not stated	20.2	20.4	20.3
Studied outside Ghana? (%)	Yes	25.8	20.7	23.7
	No	74.2	79.3	76.3
No. of years in current position (%)	Less than 3 yrs	34.2	48.3	40.2
	3 - 10 yrs	40.0	32.6	36.8
	Over 10 yrs	25.8	19.1	23.0

\* Includes singles, divorcees, and those who have separated.

Table 3: Descriptive Statistics of the Variables

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Standard deviation
<b>External Factors</b>				
1. Specificity of the Organization's Tasks	0	4	2.522523	.9109375
2. Political Interference	0	3.99	2.289013	.9915062
3. Client Demand and Oversight	1	3	2.268131	.5145984
4. Incentive System	.67	4.33	2.368837	.8478682
<b>Internal Factors</b>				
1. Organization Mission	.5	5	3.407317	1.015177
2. Recruitment Practices	0	5	.9189189	1.170993
3. Performance Expectations and Evaluation	1	2	1.714909	.2104854
4. Employee Sanctions	1.25	6	5.064189	.9791903
5. Autonomy in Personnel and Budgetary Issues	0	3.75	1.995785	.9228194

Table 4. Test of Difference Between Means

Factor	Good Performers	Poor Performers	T-Values	P-Values
<b>External Factors</b>				
1. Specificity of the Organization's Tasks	2.496	2.559	-0.508	0.612
2. Political Interference	2.284	2.296	-0.085	0.932
3. Client Demand and Oversight	2.264	2.273	-0.125	0.900
4. Incentive System	2.480	2.214	2.288	0.023*
<b>Internal Factors</b>				
1. Organization Mission	3.458	3.339	0.826	0.410
2. Recruitment Practices	.779	1.113	-2.112	0.036*
3. Performance Expectations and Evaluation	1.712	1.718	-0.140	0.889
4. Employee Sanctions	4.964	5.011	-0.477	0.634
5. Autonomy in Personnel & Budgetary Issues	1.962	2.043	-0.651	0.516

\* = Significant at 5% percent

Appendix A:

Definition and Measurement of Variables

<b>External Factors</b>
<i>Specificity of the Organization's Tasks</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Do you think the instructions and policies from different parts of the government complement each other or present conflict? (very consistent = 1; very inconsistent = 4).</li> <li>▪ How often do you disagree with the policies that your organization is asked to implement? (often = 1; not at all = 4)</li> </ul>
<i>Political Interference</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How frequently does your organization receive political pressure to perform tasks in a way that it would not have otherwise done? (often = 1; not at all = 4)</li> <li>• Overall, would you say that employees with connections to influential people in the community/government or your organization have more advantages at work (promotion, bonuses, benefits, etc) than employees without such connections? (much better = 1; same = 3)</li> <li>• In your experience, do you feel employees with high political connections or from wealthy or prominent families are treated differently from other employees? (definitely = 1; same = 3)</li> </ul>
<i>Client Demand and Oversight</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Do you think that clients of your organization have the right to complain to the next higher office if they are dissatisfied with services offered by your organization? (no/yes)</li> <li>• Do you think your organization should disclose its every expenditure to the public? (no/yes)</li> <li>• Do you think it is the press's role to ensure that your organization is accountable to the public? (no/yes)</li> </ul>
<i>Incentive System</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Salary level in your organization is similar or greater than other civil service organizations. (completely disagree = 1; completely agree = 5)</li> <li>• The benefit package offered by your organization is similar or better than other civil service organizations. (completely disagree = 1; completely agree = 5)</li> <li>• Is your salary sufficient to pay your living expenses? (no/yes)</li> </ul>
<b>Internal Factors</b>
<i>Organizational Mission</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ In my organization, everyone believes that battling against poverty is one of their functions as a public servant. (completely disagree=1; completely agree=5)</li> <li>▪ In my organization, everyone believes that the citizens are our clients. (completely disagree = 1; completely agree = 5)</li> </ul>
<i>Recruitment Criteria</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Within an organization, different people are hired for different reasons. This survey is interested in learning about general hiring trends. In your organization, would you say that employees were hired more often for? (none = 0; almost all = 5) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Family connections</li> <li>▪ Political connections</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

<i>Performance expectations and evaluation</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ How well does the written job description reflect your current functions? (very poorly = 1; very well = 3)</li> <li>▪ Are you informed of changes in the professional standard requirements related to your job? (no/yes)</li> <li>▪ How frequently are you given written evaluation of your performance? (never = 1; two or more times per year = 5)</li> <li>▪ Do you think the evaluation was objective? (no/yes)</li> <li>▪ Do you know when the next evaluation is going to be held? (no/yes)</li> </ul>
<i>Employee sanctions</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ In the past three years have staff in your organization been disciplined for any of the following reasons? (almost all = 1; none = 6) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Poor work performance</li> <li>▪ Insubordination</li> <li>▪ Absence from work without leave</li> <li>▪ Lack of discipline</li> <li>▪ Embezzlement</li> <li>▪ Accepting bribes</li> <li>▪ Doing another job to the detriment of substantive job (moonlighting)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<i>Autonomy in Personnel and Budgetary Issues</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Overall, how much freedom do you have in the performance of your duties? (no freedom = 1; much freedom = 4)</li> <li>▪ Are you allowed to make any decisions relating to the performance of your duties? (all decisions by superiors = 1; seldom refers decisions to superior = 4)</li> <li>▪ How much of your organization's internal budget allocation was actually decided by the organization? (none = 1; much = 3)</li> <li>▪ How much discretion does your organization have in deciding where to cut its budget? (no discretion = 1; very much discretion = 4)</li> </ul>

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Deininger, K. and P. Mpuga (2004), "Does Greater Accountability Improve the Quality of Public Service Delivery? Evidence from Uganda" *World Development* Vol. 33, No. 1
- Grindle, M.S. (1997), "Divergent Cultures? When Public Organizations Perform Well in Developing Countries." *World Development*, Vol. 25, No. 4
- Hackman, J. R., and G.R. Oldham (1975), "Development of the Job Diagnostic Survey." *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 60, No. 2.
- Henslin, J. (1999), *Sociology: A Down-To-Earth Approach*, (4th Ed) Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Israel, A. (1987), *Institutional Development: Incentives and Performance*. Baltimore, MD: John Hopkins University.
- Kiltgaard, R. (1997), "Cleaning Up and Invigorating the Civil Service." *Public Administration and Development*, Vol. 17.
- Leita, S. P. (1999), "Ghana: Selected Issues." IMF Country Report No. 99/3.
- Lienert I. and J. Modi (1997), "A Decade of Civil Service Reform in Sub-Saharan Africa." IMF Working Paper WP/97/179.
- Manning N., R. Mukherjee, and O. Gokcekus (2000), "Public Officials and their Institutional Environment: An Analytical Model for Assessing the Impact of Institutional Change on Public Sector Performance." World Bank Working Paper No. 2427.
- NEPAD (2005), "Strengthening Africa's Public Services" *NEPAD Dialogue*, 1 September, Issue 105/106 available at <http://www.nepad.org/2005/files/newsletterarchive.php>
- Nunberg, B. (1999), "Rethinking Civil Service Reform." *PREM Notes* No. 31, October, World Bank.
- Owusu, F. (2001), "Urban impoverishment and multiple modes of livelihood in Ghana" *The Canadian Geographer* Vol. 55, No. 3
- Owusu, F. (2003), "Pragmatism and the Gradual Shift from Dependency to Neoliberalism: The World Bank, African Leaders and Development Policy in Africa" *World Development* Vol.31, No.10.

- Owusu, F. (2004), "Organizational Culture and the Performance of Public Organizations in Ghana: Learning from 'Good Performers', report submitted to PREM Public Sector Department, Governance Knowledge Sharing Program, The World Bank
- Owusu, F. (2005), Livelihood Strategies and Performance of Ghana's Health and Education Sectors: Exploring the Connections." *Public Administration and Development* Vol.25, No.2.
- PricewaterhouseCoopers (2003), Public Sector Reform: Towards a Future Strategic Framework." Draft Report presented to the Government of Ghana.
- Rainey, H. G., and P. Steinbauer (1999), "Galloping Elephants: Developing Elements of a Theory of Effective Government Organizations." *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, Vol. 9, No. 1.
- Sandbrook, R. (1993), *The Politics of Africa's Economic Recovery*. Cambridge University Press.
- Tsikata, Y.M. (2003), "Owning Economic Reforms: A Comparative Study of Ghana and Tanzania" in Kayizzi-Mugerwa (ed). *Reforming Africa's Institutions: Ownership, Incentives, and Capabilities*. Helsinki, Finland: The United Nations University.
- Wolf, P.J. (1993), "A Case Study of Bureaucratic Effectiveness in U.S. Cabinet Agencies: Preliminary Results." *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, Vol. 3.
- World Bank (2001), *World Development Report 2002: Building Institutions for Markets*. Washington, DC: The World Bank.
- World Bank (2003), *World Development Report 2004: Making Services Work for Poor People*. Washington, DC: The World Bank.