

IMPROVING PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT IN THE NIGERIAN GOVERNMENT CONTEXT: A PRAGMATIC DISCOURSE

AGBOOLA Theophilus Olumuyiwa

Department of Public Administration, Faculty of Administration, Obafemi Awolowo University,
Ile-Ife, Nigeria

ABSTRACT

The paper examined the performance management in Nigerian public service, over the past decades. Performance and accountability has been central in public service administration. Nigeria governments are under pressure to improve public service performance and at the same time contain expenditure growth. Meanwhile public accountability is most essential and a priority for effective performance management in the public service because both elected and appointed officials need to show the electorates that they are performing their responsibility in the best way and using the tax payers' resources provided to them effectively and efficiently. The paper examines key institutional drivers that may contribute to improving public service efficiency and focuses on performance information and its role and use in the performance budgeting process. The paper adopts qualitative method in gathering data from various sources. The findings revealed that the absence of accountability and transparency in public service administration in Nigeria led to the incursion of military into Nigerian public administration. The paper concluded that unless good governance, transparency and accountability are in place with efficiency been carefully observed, any effective public service performance cannot be realised. Nigeria government should focus on corruption in particular as the major bane of public accountability and effective performance.

Keywords: Good Governance, Performance Management, Public Accountability, New Public Management, Corruption.

Introduction

Most of the public sector reform programmes that have taken place in developing countries during the last four decades were introduced as part of the Structural Adjustment Programmes (SAPs) of the World Bank in the 1980s. However, most of the more recent reforms, under the influence of the New Public Management (NPM), have been driven by a combination of economic, social, political and technological factors, which have triggered the quest for

efficiency and for ways to cut the cost of delivering public services. Additional factors, particularly for Nigeria and African countries, include lending conditionalities and the increasing emphasis on good governance (DPMD, 2003).

Providing more public services with less public spending is ongoing challenge in Nigeria which is becoming increasingly vital in the context of ageing. In the current economic and financial crisis knowing the factors that generate success and the ways in which it can be measured has a critical importance. Performance indicators are designed to provide information on the quality of processes performed within an organization offering support to achieve the objectives on time and within a predetermined budget. But, to fulfill this role, it is necessary to understand their full and proper use. No business scenario can guarantee economic stability, and the ability to control organisational performance during an economic recession/financial crisis becomes more difficult. An organisation in difficulty must be able to identify those measures that enable it to respond effectively to new problems to adapt as quickly as possible to changes in the business environment (Gavrea, Ilies & Stegorean, 2011).

Adejuwon (2015) posited that efficiency and effectiveness became central points used in assessing and measuring the performance of public services. As a result, there have been increasing calls for the public services in Nigeria to provide quality public services that meet the needs of good service delivery to her people. Public service must be more accountable for its decisions and actions and to manage resources more prudently. This shows that accountability, efficiency and performance of public officials and institutions are the central concerns of modern governance in delivery of services to the citizens.

The Nigerian public service needs training, re-training and workshops that will increase performance management that holds the key to economic wealth and high standards of living in general, and that improved public service productivity is a vital factor in promoting and sustaining socio-economic growth and development. It is hoped that the senior workshop devoted to this issue, would raise awareness and promote a deeper appreciation of the issues pertaining to performance management and their implications for Nigerian socio-economic

development. The continued deterioration of the level of corruption among public officials in Nigeria shows that the adoption of new public management has contributed to good governance. Given these facts, the specific objectives were raised to

1. assess the extent of performance improvement consciousness in Nigerian public services;
2. identify ways and means of improving the performance management of public services;
and
3. determine the challenges and prospects of performance management improving in Nigerian public services;

These are the most vital objectives that the paper set out to examine for the policies and practices developed for performance management improvement in Nigerian public services.

Conceptual and Literature Review

The terms “Governance” and “Good Governance” are being increasingly used in development literature. Bad governance is being increasingly regarded as one of the root causes and international financial institutions are increasingly basing their aid and loans on the condition that reforms that underpin good governance are undertaken (UNESCAP, 2012).

Agboola (2017) opines that good governance is an indeterminate term used in the international development literature to describe how public institutions conduct public affairs and manage public resources. Governance is the process of decision-making and the process by which decisions are implemented (or not implemented). The term governance can also be applied to corporate, international, national, local governance or to the interaction between other sectors of society.

Olaiya (2009) cited World Bank (1989) sees governance as the exercise of political, economic and administrative authority to manage a nation’s affairs. It is the complex mechanisms, processes, relationships and institutions through which citizens and groups articulate their interest, exercise their rights and obligations in the society from the family to the state and embraces all methods that are good and bad so that societies distribute power and manage public resources and problems. Good governance is therefore a subset of governance, wherein public resources and problems are managed effectively, efficiently and in response to critical needs of

society. Effective democratic forms of governance rely on public participation, accountability and transparency.

UNDP (1996) sees good governance as, among other things, participatory, transparent and accountable. It is also effective and equitable, and promotes the rule of law fairly. Good governance ensures that the voices of the poorest and the most vulnerable are heard in decision-making over the allocation of development resources, and that political, social and economic priorities are based on broad consensus among the three stakeholders the state, private sector and civil society. All three stakeholders are critical for sustaining human development that is, the state creates a conducive political and legal environments, the private sector generates jobs and income, and civil society facilitates political and social interaction.

Anifowose (1999) sees governance as the conscious management of regime structures with a view to enhancing the legitimacy of the public realm. He further explained that those who govern are given the resources and the popular consent necessary to execute their duties. By accepting leadership positions, the political elite incur certain obligations. The ruler, expect the elite to be responsive, to act as if serious consideration is given to the needs and desires of the electorates. For effective governance, the rulers must avoid alienating the populace from the institution of government, the conception of politics in zero-sum terms and an instrument for the promotion of general welfare and development.

Mackie (2008) agreed that the term performance management as commonly used today to describe a range of managerial activities designed to monitor, measure and adjust aspects of individual and organizational performance through management controls of various types. Performance management integrates the management of organizational performance with the management of individual performance. He further explained that performance management in the public sector is the managerial activity necessary to promote well-performing policy management and service delivery. A desire for improved performance in public sector organisations has resulted in a results-orientation and a cost consciousness in a range of OCED

countries (OCED, 1997:8).Performance management requires a performance information system that can be audited as its related to financial management and policy cycles.

Agboola (2017) agreed that performance management includes activities which ensure that goals are consistently being met in an effective and efficient manner. Performance management can focus on the performance of an organisation, department, employees' or even the processes to build a product or service as well as many other areas. It also known as a process by which organisations align their resources, systems and employees to strategic objectives and priorities.The role of human resource in the present scenario has undergone a critical change and its focus is on evolving such functional strategies which enable successful implementation of the major corporate strategies so human resource and corporate strategies function in alignment. He explained further that human resource works towards facilitating and improving the performance of the employees by building a niche work environment and providing maximum opportunities to the employees for participating in organisational planning and decision making process. Recently, the major activities of human resource are driven towards development of high performance leaders and fostering employee motivation. So it can be interpreted that the role of human resource has evolved from merely an appraiser to a facilitator and an enabler.

Armstrong (2006) posited that performance management is both a strategic and an integrated approach to delivering successful results in organisations by improving the performance and developing the capabilities of teams and individuals. The process of performance management starts with the joining of a new incumbent in a system and ends when an employee quits the organisation. Performance management can also be regarded as a systematic process by which the overall performance of an organization can be improved by improving the performance of individuals within a team framework. It is a means for promoting superior performance by communicating expectations, defining roles within a required competence framework and establishing achievable benchmarks.

He explained further that performance management is a much broader and a complicated function of human resource, as it encompasses activities such as joint goal setting, continuous

progress review and frequent communication, feedback and coaching for improved performance, implementation of employee development programs and rewarding achievements.

Adejuwon (2015) sees public accountability as a means of government and its employees are accountable and their activities are open to the citizens. In ethics and governance, accountability is answerability, blameworthiness liability and the expectation of accounts-giving. As an aspect of governance, it has nub to discussions to berate in the public sector, non-profit and private corporate and individual contexts. In leadership roles, accountability is the acknowledgement and assumption of responsibility for actions, products, decisions and policies including the administrative, governance and implementation which the scope of the role or employment position and encompassing the obligation to report, explain and be answerable for resulting consequences

Curristine, Lonti & Jouranrd, (2007) defines efficiency as a cost per unit of output. They further explained that measurement of efficiency requires quantitative information on costs (or physical inputs) and outputs of public service provision. Ideally, this requires an accrual accounting system that registers costs rather than cash flows, likewise, the measurement of outputs should ideally capture both quantitative and qualitative aspects of the services provided. The latter is especially difficult in the public service since a large bulk of the services provided were typically intangible, e.g. policy advice.

Methodology

The paper adopts a qualitative research design to nub insight into the nature and character of Nigerian public service. It also uses descriptive analysis and observation methods to berate corruption and performance in Nigeria. This paper which is theoretical in nature basically draws its nub from secondary data including academic journals, textbooks, internet sources and other publications. However, data collected for the paper were analysed using content analyses.

Performance Management in Nigeria Government Bureaucracy

Performance management is broad concept that involves understanding and acting on the performance issues at each levels of organization, from individuals, teams and departments to the organisation itself. These issues include leadership, decision making, motivation, encouraging innovation and risk taking among others. Performance management in Nigerian public service is the managerial activity necessary to promote well-performing policy management and service delivery (Mackie, 2008).

Performance Management is one of the various NPM-inspired measures to address some of the accountability problems mentioned in the previous section. In pursuit of the goal of performance improvement, performance management advocates for the “empowerment” of managers, i.e. vesting the public manager with the power and authority she/he needs to serve the citizen, and strengthen the links between government and its diverse clientele in civil society (CAPAM, 1996). Underlying the empowerment premise is the assumption that the power or authority that is “delegated” to the average manager would not only be shared with the subordinates, but would also be exercised for the public good (Hope, 2001). This is assumed to increase efficiency, based on the notion that public sector managers are hampered by rules and regulations, and have few incentives to take risks and to be innovative and service-oriented.

Mackie (2008) explained that performance management in the public sector is the managerial activity necessary to promote well-performing policy management and service delivery. A desire for improved performance in public sector organisations has resulted in a results-orientation and a cost consciousness in a range of OCED countries (OCED, 1997:8). Performance management requires a performance information system that can be audited and is related to financial management and policy cycles. Organisational performance management in a government context concerns monitoring the success of public policy, programmes or projects in achieving their objectives and in securing the expected benefits.

Organisational performance management in a government context is therefore the activities of government or its agencies in planning, implementing, reviewing, evaluating and reporting, the effectiveness of its policies, programmes and projects.

He further explained that the key purpose of organizational performance management is to introduce systematic controls in the management process to guide and regulate the activities of an organization or any of its parts, by means of management judgement, decision and action for the purposes of attain agreed objectives. In an organization, control consists of verifying whether occurs in conformity with the plan adopted, instructions issued and the principles established that is, control can be either strategic or operational.

Esu &Inyang (2009) agreed that performance management is broader than performance appraisal. Performance appraisal according to Fajana (2002) “focuses on the extent to which an individual is carrying out assigned duties, as well as joint actions that can be taken by both the supervisor and the subordinate to manage observed variances between set standards and actual performance” while performance management deals with a strategic and integrated approach to delivering sustained success to organisations by improving the performance of the people who work in them and by developing the capability of teams and individual contributors. He explained further that performance management deals with the processes and activities of the organisation that enhance the design, development, implementation of performance technologies. It embraces all formal and informal methods adopted by an organization and its managers to increase commitment and individual and corporate effectiveness. Performance appraisal is reactive while performance management is proactive.

Oyediran (2008) sees performance appraisal as to provides the management with information about existing and potential manpower strength and weakness as a basis for manpower and corporate planning, about performance and potential for development of the individual employees and used as a basis for salary reviews, merit awards, promotion, transfer, retention, dismissal, et and means of auditing the adequacy of other personnel procedures., while performance is a positive process, and good systems that create a culture in which success is

applauded. Poor performance existed as a result of inadequate leadership, bad management or defective systems of work.

Performance management is also expected to increase accountability because clear and explicit managerial targets, combined with managerial autonomy and incentives to perform, make it easier to establish the basis for managerial accountability and to achieve outputs (Hills and Gillespie, 1996; Lane, 1995). Further, according to Therkildsen (2001), this in turn increases political accountability by making it easier for administrators/managers to match targets with political priorities. Politicians can, in turn, hold managers accountable for their performance, and also performance targets can make service provision more transparent to customers. According to this line of reasoning, increased transparency and explicit performance targets are further steps toward better democratic control and accountability of the bureaucracy. It is a means of getting results from individuals, teams and the organisations at large, and allows for the development of indicators against which performance can be later measured and performance management systems is currently in place in Nigeria.

Making Collaboration across Public Service Work in Nigeria

The federal government's new performance management regulations create flexibility for agencies/parastatals and allow them to decentralize appraisal and awards to the right organizational context. An exigency to establish individual accountability for meeting a retention standard now can be balanced with an opportunity to establish performance goals that tandem to generate commitment and focus energy among hard-working employees, who are in the majority (Hausser, Dirks & Mc Donald, 2013).

Oyediran (2008) provides guidelines for administrator/manager for pragmatic performance management in the public service. The crux of the matter is in knowing what to measure and how to measure public service effectiveness in Nigeria. Being a manager/administrator you need to play a critical role in getting results for the community, good organisational performance management is fundamentally about good management. It's already part of what the

administrator/manager do. Change the lens through which you see organisational performance management, and the return on investment is yours.

The prospects are administrator/manager will be better placed to plan, improve and deliver for the future through using performance information to make informed investment and resourcing decisions. Administrator/manager will be better able to communicate the big issues that are critical to your team's work also the administrator/manager and the agency can recognise your team and how your contributions matter to the organisation and the community.

Esu & Inyang (2009) agree that organisational performance management is worth the effort, administrator/manager should return on investment which he/she is in knowing the business better. By being proactive, you can get the benefits of organisational performance management and maximise the use of your performance information with effective systems that is benefits won't accrue automatically. They explained further that some upfront planning and preparation are needed for a solid return on the investment that is manager/administrator should embark on leadership roles as to ensure your team understands the links between its work and the objectives of the agency. People who understand the big picture can contribute more effectively, also uses consistent processes and datasets to report information to the various internal and external audiences, which is targeted to their specific needs. The performance management also says a lot by saying very little that is using exception reporting wherever possible. Graphs and other visual mediums can also communicate performance 'at a glance' and talk to the executive manager and the team to identify current and future performance information needs to reflect the organisation's vision and direction. This will help to ensure the organisation having information they need to support decisions and track performance progress over time also sharing information about key achievements and challenges across the agency and the sector, with other managers and stakeholders and this builds trust, promotes learning and innovation and encourages reciprocation.

Nkwede (2013) agrees that leadership can harness the prospects of organisational performance management, leaders must be proactive to get the benefits by talking about performance of

employees' on the floor, in the halls, on the frontline, it is critical in leading and influencing performance by making conversation that can make a big difference also to be proactive and harness the knowledge and insights of the team and external stakeholders.

Performance management of organization can open the door and ask about key issues and challenges in delivering services and achieving outcomes, and how these might be addressed. It draws on local knowledge and experience to understand the issue. Consultation and workshop ideas are powerful sources of innovation and encourage ownership of, and commitment to, the solution.

He further explained that it create opportunities for improved performance and use ideas for improvement need to be auctioned also apply the leadership skills to make it happen then plan, manage and report business improvements. It also maintain the business that is, enthusiasm can waiver over time as challenges emerge or everyday workload gets in the way that one can lead by example and keep new initiatives and improvements front of mind and a regular point of discussion and monitor the progress also it closed the loop that is let your team know how business performance conversations have helped your organization and make significant decisions of where the members of staff are energised when they know their ideas are valued and utilised. Talking about organisational performance at the frontline, it harnessed the innovation of the team and stakeholders. Having regular, robust and honest conversations about business performance is the best way to get better results.

Agboola (2016) observes the prospect of performance management in organisation to have regular conversations with the team and stakeholders about your business or programme's performance. This provides a designated safe-space to reflect and identify strategies for improvement, when problems arise they talk about it, that is, talking about performance is an important first step in dealing with the issue also conversation can produce shared understanding, openly discuss how to address the problems at hand, then negotiate, decide on and implement corrective actions.

He further explained that new public management set off a new wave of performance management efforts in Nigeria government. Recent performance literature has shown the shortcomings of performance management and recommendations on how to improve it with the direct manager in a timely manner. This also helps to build an understanding of complex issues and ensures that there are no 'nasty surprises' in the boardroom. Preparation helps organisational performance management at work. Regularly information and conversation enables improved performance that confronts the hard issues, if there is no substitute for conversation that is collaboration is challenging. However, when agencies work together with the community as well as with industry and with other levels of government, it brings benefits and outcomes which are otherwise not possible. Collaboration worth with the effort but it takes ongoing conversation, cooperation and commitment also collaboration requires management to plan, deliver, manage and report on performance.

Agboola (2017) posits that effective communication is critical to improve performance management in public sector which includes to:

- Understand the issue at hand then to scope out the key drivers and influences.
- Engage the most appropriate people to get the job done and make sure that the manager has all the key stakeholders to identify and represent.
- Find a common language and purpose to work together and to understand the needs and priorities of other agencies. Identify shared interests and negotiate common ground for action.
- Use a road map to identify the steps which stakeholder use potential risks and external influences to the programme from low level activities right up to high level outcomes. Complete this early in the process so stakeholders have a shared understanding of what the program aims to achieve, how you will get there and how you will measure success. Agree on the contributions of each agency and who is accountable for what.
- Talk about assumptions, values and drivers for change. What are the things that are important to the core service or project, the respective agencies, the community and manager? Develop a shared understanding about your expectations so you can work together and achieve success as a team.

Develop agreed protocols for working through disagreements and talk about what kind of issues can be worked through at the officer level and at what point issues need to be escalated to executive managers then making collaboration across government work.

Conversations about where organisation are going and how to get there are critical then share information at the officer-to-officer level. Be open to diverse opinions and local expertise. Don't be afraid of challenging one another's thinking –that's where ideas, innovation and breakthroughs can occur.

- If things go wrong, keep talking and don't be afraid of the bad news then avoid blaming others and work together to find an agreed way forward. Not every situation will produce a perfect win-win, sometimes you need to agree on a compromise. Remember the big picture. The issues at hand are often bigger than your agency and ultimately you're all on the same team and it's your leadership and commitment to results that can make the difference. Stand up and be counted and be a leader and collaborate for success. Getting business results requires sustained effort and commitment (The State of Queensland, 2009).

New Public Management as a Framework for Improving Performance Management in Nigerian Public Service

New Public Management (NPM) reforms worldwide have introduced a variety of performance measurement and management practices. Performance management has gradually become an integral part of modern governance arrangement. In recent years, evaluative research has uncovered some paradoxes in the current practice (Dooren & Thijs, 2010).

The introduction of NPM over three decades represents one of the most vital events for the study and practice of public administration and NPM is only pragmatic way to traditional public administration in term of corruption, efficiency and effectiveness. The new paradigm of public administration, new public management points to the failures and inadequacies of public sector performance over time and the challenges niggling lying squarely in the nature and processes of public sector activities and traditional public administration (Adejuwon, 2015).

Lynn (1998) agreed that the adoption of new public management is due to the anti-bureaucratic rhetorics of NPM since the 1980s. This has been the crisis of public confidence in governance in major capitalist nations, which led political parties and leaders to use public bureaucracy as a scapegoat. They blamed public servants for worsening socio-economic problems in order to make themselves look good in the eyes of public. By pointing fingers at the public sector as a trouble-maker and drawing public attention to NPM as an alternative, the ruling parties tried to justify unpopular policies like retrenchment, welfare cuts, and user fees. In an attempt to avoid responsibility and regain public confidence, they also held the public service responsible for government failure, focusing on economic and fiscal crises rather than good governance. It has been pointed out that in most capitalist nations it is mainly the crisis of the Keynesian welfare state that led to the expansion of the private sector and the redefined (market – driven) role of the state in the form of NPM.

During the last three decades, different definitions of NPM have been suggested. In the early 1980s, Garson and Overman (1983:275) defined it as “an interdisciplinary study of the generic aspects of administration that is a blend of the planning, organizing and controlling functions of management of human, financing physical, information and political resources”. Later on in mid 1990s, Borins (1995:12) defines NPM as “a normative conceptualisation of public administration consisting of several inter-related components providing high quality services that citizens value, increasing the autonomy of public managers, rewarding organization and individuals on the basis of whether they meet demanding performance targets, making available the human and technological resources that managers need to perform well; and appreciative of the virtues of competition, and maintaining an open minded attitude about which public purposes should be performed by the private sector, rather than a public sector”. Despite divergent and contradictory views, opinions and definitions about meaning and implications of this doctrine, there is however no doubt that it has become extremely influential in public administration theory and practice since the 1980s.

Agboola & Lamidi (2017) agrees that the exigency of new public management is tandem with berates that is against the precepts of democracy. Also it was argued by some critics that NPM

may reduce workers and political accountability, if the managers allow to manage and accountable than the politician. He further explained that modern management ideas have resulted in a more corporate style of management in government agencies and a trend toward de-bureaucratisation through privatization, reductions of rules and norms.

The Factors Inhibiting Performance Management in Nigerian Public Services

Improving public services means changing the ways that public services deliver services to citizens. That is, first defining responsibilities of government ministries, departments or agencies, then ensuring that ministers and staff have enough funds, people, equipment and other resources to carry out these responsibilities. Clearly, public service reform can include almost anything that could affect the effectiveness that is, doing the right things and efficiency means doing things in the right way of public service delivery.

Olowu (1991) states that the factors that inhibit performance improvement in Nigerian public services, there are a great diversity of factors at play which are closely interrelated and making it difficult to give primacy to one set of factors over another, this inhibiting factors include; leadership, political, economic, stakeholder interest, organisational, conflicting purposes, He explained further that institutional and administrative instabilities are among the political factors hindering performance management in the Nigerian public services, it makes it impossible to secure continuity in government and build on experience. Among other political factors contributing to performance management include; lack of consensus on national issues, lack of committed and dedicated leadership, inexistence of political will to embark upon worthwhile programmes and the absence of check and balance and institutions for free press freedom in Nigeria.

Dooren and Thijs (2010) cited Curristine (2005) posited that strong leadership been politically, is the key in explaining the success of performance management. Someone has to put his or her shoulders under performance management effort and develop a measurement strategy. Good leadership may be a response to these paradoxes because he carries weight and it takes the

unaccountable into account, quickly identifies core bits of information, motivates professionals and holds people to account in a fair way.

They explained further that integration, coordination, formalisation consistency coherence, routine-building, and alignment are some of the most nub for those who want to fix performance management without questioning to blueprint. Good performance information should strengthen the evidence base for solving the political problems of who get what, when and how and issues of who get what, when and how are at play at all levels, in government-wide policy making in policy sectors and networks, in organizational management, and micro-management. Performance indicators can elevate the quality of political discussions at all of these levels. It is not suggested that the political institutions that is, the executive, parliaments, judiciary, political parties, etc. have to interfere with all performance of recognizing the political nature of performance management.

The problems with performance management in the public service continue to be well documented by the evaluation community, at times with zealous glee. The issues of pay and conditions of service were identified as major determinants of performance management. The pay is not only ridiculously low in Nigerian public service, but it is out of step with the cost of living. Inadequacies in public services compensation are observed in respect to two elements that is, wage levels and wage structure. Olowu (1991) observed that wages and salaries have been declining in relation to cost of living, so much so, that in Nigeria current wages are just pittance. The monthly wage is enough only for a week's supplies of goods and services. This decline in the economies of Nigeria has been follow by inflation and economic recession that has eroded the purchasing power of the currencies.

He explained further that limited use of information management technology to enhance system productivity where attempts have been made to introduce them, they are characterised by faulty choice of technologies and challenges confronting in coordinating their use, especially large scale data centre, lack of information resources, trained information specialists and system personnel, and lack of communication facilities. Also, poor maintenance culture, problems of

working tools and equipment, absence of indigenously-driven technology development and absence of training in technology acquisition and negotiation. Even though socio-cultural factors vary from one state to another, that is, the socio-cultural values tend to adversely affect performance management in Nigeria public services.

Findings

Measuring performance is useful only when it translates into action. Performance management tools by themselves do not create sustained high performance, it is important to create an environment conducive for effective and efficient performance with a system of rewards and punishment, besides building capacity at all levels of government to get results. The finding showed that new public management reforms have introduced performance management in the modern governance, while public accountability and performance management in the public service both have been the nub in public sector management and the absence of accountability and transparency in public service administration in Nigeria was due to the incursion of military into Nigerian public administration.

The finding also showed that information management technology enhanced system productivity where attempts have been made to introduce them, they are characterised by faulty choice of technologies and challenges confronting in coordinating their use, especially large scale data centre, lack of information resources, trained information specialists and system personnel, and lack of communication facilities. Also, poor maintenance culture, problems of working tools and equipment, absence of indigenously-driven technology development and absence of training in technology acquisition and negotiation. Even though socio-cultural factors vary from one state to another, that is, the socio-cultural values tend to adversely affect performance management in Nigeria public services.

The finding showed that performance management is both a strategic and an integrated approach to delivering successful results in organisations by improving the performance and developing the capabilities of teams and individuals. Performance management can also be regarded as a systematic process by which the overall performance of an organization can be improved by

improving the performance of individuals within a team framework and it is a means for promoting superior performance by communicating expectations, defining roles within a required competence framework and establishing achievable benchmarks.

The finding showed that integration, coordination, formalization consistency coherency, routine-building, and alignment are some of the most nub for those who want to fix performance management without questioning to blueprint and good performance information also strengthen the evidence base for solving the political problems of who get what, when and how and issues of who get what, when and how are at play at all levels, in government-wide policy making in policy sectors and networks, in organisational management, and micro-management.

The finding also showed that performance appraisal provides the management with information about existing and potential manpower strength and weakness as a basis for manpower and corporate planning, about performance and potential for development of the individual employees and used as a basis for salary reviews, merit awards, promotion, transfer, retention, dismissal, etc. and means of auditing the adequacy of other personnel procedures., while performance management is a positive process, and good systems that create a culture in which success is applauded. It also showed that performance management increases accountability because it has clear and explicit managerial targets, combined with managerial autonomy and incentives to perform, makes it easier to establish the basis for managerial accountability and to achieve outputs.

The finding showed that limited use of information management technology can enhance system productivity where attempts have been made to introduce them, they are characterised by faulty choice of technologies and challenges confronting in coordinating their uses, especially large scale data centre, lack of information resources, trained information specialists and system personnel, and lack of communication facilities. Also, poor maintenance culture, problems of working tools and equipment, absence of indigenously-driven technology development and absence of training in technology acquisition and negotiation. Even though socio-cultural factors

vary from one state to another, that is, the socio-cultural values tend to adversely affect performance management in Nigeria public services.

Conclusion

This paper briefly examined potential key institutional drivers that may contribute to improving public sector efficiency. New public management set off a new value for performance management efforts in Nigerian public service. Recent literature on performance had shown the failures of performance management and provided recommendations on how to improve on it. With the new performance management regulations giving greater flexibilities to agencies in designing their programmes, agencies now can design better tools for improving individual, group, and organisational performance. In this paper we have discussed the issues of public accountability and performance management and factors inhibiting performance management improvement of achieving accountable governance that can sustain effective performance in public service delivery.

Recommendations:

Having reviewed the various challenges relating to performance management, the author made the following recommendations aimed at improving and enhancing performance of Nigerian public services.

- As alluded to previously Nigeria do not have effective systems of data collection, processing and producing information with respect to their budgetary or national accounts, employment levels, manpower, demographic trends, resources base, material procurement etc. This, itself has contributed to wastage and severe loss of performance management. Nigerian government to create and /or strengthen her management information.
- Having noted that reforms of wage structures and grading systems are useful in that they help to streamline, simplify and tidy personnel management in the public service, thus saving costs. The author urged that measures be taken to complement such efforts with positions classification and determine strategies for coping with political pressure.

- Nigeria government should focus on corruption in particular as the major bane of public accountability and effective performance.
- In order to make performance management ambiguity-proof, it may be useful to have more agile measurement system, to manage performance close to the action, and to better appreciate the political nature of performance management.
- Government and corporate organisations should also assist with training in the management of human resources.

REFERENCES

- Adejuwon, D.K. (2015). Enhancing Public Accountability and Performance in Nigeria: Periscoping the Impediments and Exploring Imperative Measures, *Africans Public service Delivery and Performance Review*, Research Article, Pp. 102-125.
- Agboola, T.O. (2016). Service Compact and Service Delivery in Nigeria: An Empirical Study, *International Journal of Politics and Good Governance*, Vol. 7, No. 7, pp.1-26, 3 Quarter III.
- Agboola, T.O. & Lamidi, K.O. (2017). New Public Management Reforms in Nigerian Democratic Governance: Issues and Challenges. *Journal of Research in National Development (JORIND)*, Vol. 15, No. 1. Pp. 62-74.
- Agboola, T.O. (2018). Performance-Based Management in the Nigerian Public Sector: Issues and Challenges. *Ife Journal of Social Sciences*, Vol. 6, No. 1, Pp. 72-84.
- Anifowose, F. (1999). Politics, Leadership and Governance, *The Nigerian Journal of Politics*, Vol. 4, Nos. 1 & 2, Pp. 1-15.
- Armstrong, M. (2012) *The Handbook of Human Resource Management Practice*, (10th eds) London: Kogan Page. Pp.495.
- Borins, S. (1995). The New Public Management is here to Stay, *Canadian Public Administration*, Vol. 38, No. 1, Pp. 122-132.

- Commonwealth Association for Public Administration and Management(CAPAM), (2006), *Current Good Practices and New Developments in the PublicService Management: The Commonwealth Portfolio*, London: Commonwealth Secretariat.
- Currstine, T., Lonti, Z.& Journard, I. (2007) Improving Public Sector Efficiency: Challenges and Opportunities, *OCED Journal on Budgeting*, Vol. 7, No. 2, Pp. 1-41.
- Development Policy Management Division (DPMD), (2003) *Public Sector Management Reforms in Africa: Lesson Learned*, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia: Economic Commission for Africa. Pp. 14-16.
- Dooren, W. & Thijs, N. (2010). Paradoxes of Improving Performance Management (Systems) in Public Administration. *EIPASOPE*, Pp. 13-18.
- Esu, B. B. & Inyang, B. J. (2009) A Case for Performance Management in the Public Service in Nigeria, *International Journal of Business and Management*, Vol. 4, No. 2, pp. 98-105.
- Fajana, F. O. (2012) *Human Resource Management: An Introduction*, Lagos: Labofin and Company. Pp. 4-6.
- Garson, G.D.& Overman, E.S. (2013).*Public Management: Research in the United States*, New York: Praeger. Pp. 55-57.
- Gavrea, C., Ilies, L. & Stegorean, R. (2011). Determinants of Organisational Performance: The Case of Romania,*Management and Marketing Challenges for Knowledge Society*, Vol. 6, Nos. 6, pp.285-300.
- Hienrich, C. J. (2002). Outcomes-Based Performance Management in the Public Sector: Implications for Government Accountability and Effectiveness, *Public Administration Review*, Vol. 62, No. 6: 712-716.
- Hill, M. and Gillespie, K. (2016).Social Control of Civil Service Systems, inBekke, Perry and Toonen (eds), *Civil Service Systems in a Comparative Perspective*,Bloominton: Indiana University Press. Pp. 121-145.
- Hope, K.R. (2001).The New Public Management: Context and Practice inAfrica, *International Public Management Journal*, Vol. 4, No.2, pp. 76-90.
- Lane, J. (2015).*The Public Sector: Concepts, Models and Approaches*, London: Sage Publications.
- Hausser, D., Dirks, T. & McDonald, G. (2013). *Performance Management: New Opportunities to Integrate and Invigorate*. A Paper presented to Federal Government of United States of America. Pp. 1-7.

- Lynn, L.E. (1998). The New Public Management: How to Transform a Theme into a Legacy, *Public Administration Review*. Vol. 58: (3), Pp.231-237.
- Mackie, B. (2016). Organisational Performance Management in a Government Context: A Literature Review, Edinburgh: Scottish Government Social Research. Pp. 1-5.
- Nkwede, J. O. (2013) Public Sector Restructuring and Governance in Nigeria: Perspectives, Processes and Challenges, *Journal of Business & Management*, Vol. 3, No. 3, pp. 32-41.
- Olaiya, T.A. (2009) A Comparative Study of Tax Administration and Burden of Governance in Nigeria and Ghana, Ph.D. Thesis presented to the *Department of Public Administration*, O.A.U., Ile-Ife. May 21.
- Olowu, D. (1991). Factors Inhibiting Productivity Improvement in African Public Services in SAPAM, *Improving Productivity in African Public Services*. United Nations Economic Commission for Africa Public Administration, Human Resources and Social Development Division. Pp. 11-14.
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) (2007), *In Search of Results Performance Management Practices*, Paris: OECD. Pp.3.
- Otley, D. (2009) Performance Management: A Framework for Management Control Systems Research, *Management Accounting Research*, Vol. 10, No. 1, pp. 363-382.
- Oyediran, P. (2008) *Human Resource Management: A Diagnostic Approach*, Abuja: Chartered Graphic Press.
- Sheng, Y.K., (2012) *What is Good Governance?* Paper presented by United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific. PP. 1-15.
- Therkildsen, O. (2011) Efficiency, Accountability and Implementation, Public Sector Reform in East and Southern Africa: *Democracy, Governance and Human Rights Programme Paper, Number 3*, Geneva: UNRISD.
- The State of Queensland (Public Service Commission), (2015) *A Guide for Managers Organisational Performance Management: Working it work for You*, Queensland: Public Service Commission
- UNDP, (2016) *Report on Workshop on Governance for Sustainable Human Development*, MDGD, New York.