Performance-Based Management in Nigerian Public Sector: Issues and Challenges

Theophilus Olumuyiwa AGBOOLA
Department of Public Administration
Faculty of Administration
Obafemi Awolowo University Ile-Ife, Nigeria.
E-mail: agboolatheo@gmail.com
Tel: +2348062228541; +2348028803174

Abstract

The paper examined the performance-based management in Nigerian public sector which structured around four central issues. These issues were related to the objectives, accountability, effectiveness and outcomes with the view to managing the organisational performance. Performance measurement has become increasingly prevalent performance-evaluation activities at all government levels, yet most administrators/managers still struggle with the fundamental question of what to do with performance measurement data when they have it. Management teams want to know how they incorporate performance measurement into their management and decision-making processes. In this regard, this paper proposed a methodology for moving from measuring performance to performance-based management. Rather than simply reporting performance results, performance-based management focused on linking performance measurement to strategic planning and using it as a lever for cultural change. By creating a learning environment in which performance measures were regularly reviewed and discussed, organisations can improve the pace of learning and decision-making process, improve performance and facilitate broader cultural change.

Keywords:-Performance-Based Management, Leadership, Accountability, Performance Measurement, Strategic Planning

Introduction

All high performance organisations, whether public or private are, and must be, interested in developing and deploying effective performance measurement and performance management systems, since it is only through such systems that they can remain high-performance organisations. The measurement of the performance of business (and other) organisations has long been of central interest to both administrators and new public management researchers (Otley, 2009).

The plethora of idioms and acronyms for performance management initiatives, planning, programming and budgeting, performance-based budgeting, pay-for-performance system, management by objectives, and more-impede a facile understanding of how and why we measure public sector performance. Yet as conceptions, designs, and methodologies for performance measurement continue to evolve, a

single central purpose of these initiatives has been unchanging to improve public management and programme outcomes (Ola, 2015). According to Esu, & Inyang (2009) opined that the tools of performance management and public expectation for their usefulness have been growing in sophistication. Early performance measurement efforts, including planning programming and budgeting in the 1960s, the Nixon administration's management by objectives and the Carter administration's zero-base performance in the 1970s showed performance management which include ability for processes (audits, site visits and other monitoring tasks). Appraisals of government performance were concerned primarily with assessing the relationship of inputs to cost and the value of cost-reduction activities in these systems, adopting techniques from the larger field of management science.

Hollings (2015: 25) characterizes these types of activities as "performance auditing," aimed at pointing out breakdowns in operational controls and the implementation of functional responsibilities and areas for cost reduction and operating improvements (Heinrich, 2017).

Hale (2014) states that the functions of management are generally accepted as plan, staff, organise and control along with lead, communicate, and motivate. The functions can be thought of as managerial duties and organisational processes. However you think of them, the functions, collectively, describe what has happen for an organisation to be competitive and to fulfill its mandate. She explained further that performance improvement is a result-driven perspective to work, the workplace, and the worker. Recognising the importance of organizing tasks and responsibilities, performance asks, what you do, why do you do it, and how you go about it, it is not a substitute for the functions of planning, organizing, controlling, leading, staffing, and so on.

Heinrich (2017) asked an important question that arises for public managers/administrators and researchers, that is, are outcomes-based performance management systems more effective than traditional approaches to

bureaucratic control (that is, accountability for inputs and processes)? In other words, do the quantitative evaluations of programme outcomes induce agencies to change programme priorities and primary work processes in ways that improve or positively influence programme results? This implies that the information obtained through performance measurement is used to inform programme managers/administrators at multiple levels of organisation.

It is useful and important to assess the influence of organistional structure, policy choices and constraints. Olowu (2004) analysis of Obasanjo's public service renewal programme of 1999-2007 act implementation suggest that requirements for specific performance goals, plans, and results have increased administrative constraints, elevated conflict among multiple levels of programme management, and ignored the political complexities that have complicated act's implementation.

Ajayi (2012) identifies some of the impediments to administrative reform through outcomes-based performance management, he cited the absence of strong leadership or coalitions supporting a result orientation, measures that constrain flexibility and are not well linked to goals or consequences, mutual distrust between agencies and legislators about gaining of measures, and employees concerns that their responsibility is not commensurate with their authority.

He further explained that performance-based management, government needs to start with what they want to achieve and then consider how to measure their programmes towards the goal. The concluding section of this paper considers the implications of the study findings on the current performance-based management systems and the design of future systems in government (Ajayi, 2012).

Conceptual Clarification
The concepts of Performance-Based Management, Performance Measurement, Accountability, Leadership and Strategic Planning were reviewed to suit the paper.

Some people may get confused by the meaning of the term performance-based management programme. A performance-based management programme refers to a formalised framework within an organisation for the implementation, conduct and maintenance of a performance-based management approach to business (service) operations.

Artley, Elison & Kennedy (2011) defines performance-based management as a systematic approach to performance improvement through an ongoing process of establishing strategic performance objectives, measuring performance, collecting, analysing, reviewing, and reporting performance improvement. They explained further that the first step to establishing a performance-based management programme is to define the organisational mission and strategic performance objectives. This step also known as the strategic planning phase of performance-based management and it is covered in this conceptual framework. Strategic planning is a continuous and systematic process where the guiding members of an organisation make decisions about its future, develop the necessary procedures and operations to achieve that future and determine how success is been measured. One of the benefits of strategic planning is that it can be an opportunity to unify the management, employees, stakeholders and customers through a common understanding of where the organisation is going, how everyone involved can work to that common purpose and how progress and levels of success will be measured.

Performance measurement is the "heart and soul" of the performance-based management process. Flowing from the organisational mission and strategic planning process, it provides the data that will be collected, analysed, reported, and ultimately, used to make sound business decisions. It directs the business function by justifying budgetary expenditures, documenting progress towards established objectives, identifying area of both strength and weakness, providing an on-going assessment of the current "organsational climate," and driving business improvement. In a nutshell,

performance measurement supports organisational existence (Artley, 2009).

Artley, Elison & Kennedy (2011) defines performance measurement as the ongoing monitoring and reporting of programme accomplishments particularly progress towards pre-established goals. It is typically conducted by programme or agency management. Performance measures may address the type or level of programme activities conducted (process), the direct products and services delivered by a programme (outputs), and/or the result of those products and services (outcomes). A "programme" may be any activity project, function, or policy that has an identifiable purpose or set of objectives.

He explained further that performance measurement systems succeed when the organisation's strategy and performance measures are in alignment and when senior administrators/managers convey the organisation's mission, vision, values and strategic direction to employees and external stakeholders. The performance measures give life to the mission, vision, and strategy by providing a focus that lets each employee know how they contribute to the success of the organisation and its stakeholders' measurable expectations. Integration makes it possible for performance measures to be effective agents for change. If the measures quantify results of an activity, one only need compare the measured data with the desired goals to know if actions are needed. In other words, the measures should carry the message.

Armstrong (2012) defines performance management as a systematic process for improving organisational performance by developing the performance of individuals and teams. It is a means of getting better results by understanding and managing performance within an agreed framework of planned goals, standard and competency requirements. Processes exist for establishing shared understanding about what is to be achieved, and for managing and developing people in a way that increases the probability that it will be achieved in the short and longer term. It focuses

people on doing the right things by clarifying their goals. It is owned and driven by line management.

Altmayer (2006) opines that performance-based management is markedly different than performance reporting. Performance reporting focuses on communicating results, while performance-based management uses resources and information to achieve and demonstrate measurable programmes toward agency and programme goal. Performance reporting may have its uses and value for an organisation, but it is not likely to drive cultural and organiational change in and of itself. Much to the disappointment of many administrators/managers, the investment in performance reporting may yield value in communicating results, but it will not, by itself, trigger any improvement in results. She explained further that a clear statement of government bureaucracies or programme's mission and goals should be viewed as a prerequisite for performance measurement and building a performance-based organisation. Performance management does not equal to strategic planning, also it does not having a clear statement of the mission and goals while government organisation makes meaningful performance measurement challenging at best and measurements must be specific of the government organisation.

Leadership is about standing up and saying, "I am in charge!" but it does require leaders to behave in certain ways because it is their behaviours that reinforce or cue people in how to act. Leadership is what assures efforts that are focused on the right goals, objectives deliverables, and activities. It can and must occur at all levels so people are continually reminded of what is important, where the orgaanisation is headed, and what is required of them. Leadership can empower people if they understand where the organisation is headed and they have confidence in their leaders. There are two sets of behaviours, in particular, that are especially important to provided direction.
  (i) Focus on results happen, leaders overtly state what the goal is, what the rules are for carrying out the work, what

is and is not open for discussion or deliberate, what is expected of everyone and what will be as evidence of progress and success.
  (ii) Considering of focusing is about leaders consistently sending the same messages about what the goal is and what is important. Mixed messages like "Avoid excess inventory but never run out of product" confuse people and distract them the goal (Hale, 2004).

Cole (2004) sees leadership at work- As a dynamic process whereby one individual in a group is not only responsible for the group's results, but seeks the collaboration and commitment of all the group members in achieving group goals in a particular context and against the background of a particular national culture. He suggested that leadership is a dynamic process which implies that there is no "one best way" of leading that is leadership is essentially about striking the right balance between the needs of people, task and goals in a given situation.

Kuye (2001) sees the concept of leadership as a means of direction. It is the process of persuading people to strive for goals and showing how to achieve them. Leadership is the art of influencing others to direct their will, abilities and efforts toward the achievement of leader goals. In the organisational context, leadership is the ability of management to induce subordinates to work towards group goals with confidence and keenness. Leadership lies in influencing individual group effort toward the optimum achievement of organisational objectives.

Katz and Kahn (2008) see leadership, at least as applied to formally orgaanised enterprises, as the influential increment over and above mechanical compliance with the routine directives of the organization. In other words, there is much to add to the non-personal things an individual must do to carry out a job. These include supplementing the organisational design with information necessary for persons to perform their roles, clarifying roles in view of the

changing environment, and recognising the fact that every role is a part of an organised enterprise and interpreting them to those working in it and by making adjustments for human beings and their various behavior patterns (Kuye, 2011).

Oladoyin (2009) opines that accountability is a multidimensional concept and often a key enabler of success. In all the available literature on the subject of accountability, no common definition or view of accountability can be found. This lack of commonality is due partly to the fact that the concept of accountability that is, especially in the government setting it is just coming to the forefront. There are five view of accountability below:

- Accountability is an obligation to answer for the execution of one's assigned responsibilities. In simpler terms, accountability is reporting. People account or report, to other people. Therefore, it is useful to consider accountability in context of the relationships between the people or organisations involved.
- Accountability means being able to provide an explanation or justification, and accept responsibility, for events or transactions and for one's own actions in relation to these events or transactions.
- Accountability may be defined as a clearly identified employee obligation for the (authorised) conduct of a specified programme task where performance is evaluated through the application of established criteria.
- Accountability is the obligation to answer for the discharge of responsibilities that affect others in important ways.
- Accountability is a relationship based on the obligation to demonstrate and take responsibility or performance in light of agreed expectations.

He explained further that accountability refers to the obligation of a person, group, or organisation assumes for the execution of authority and or the fulfillment of responsibility. This obligation includes:

- Answering that providing an explanation or justification that is, for the execution of that authority and /or fulfillment of that responsibility.
- Reporting on the results of that execution and/or fulfillment, and
- Assuming liability for those results.

Adejuwon (2015) says that accountability doesn't "just happen" A person or group dose all of sudden say. "I'm accountable" or "We are accountable," then through an accountability framework. The environment integrates accountability into the individual, team, and organisational performance systems. The framework ensures the execution and fulfillment of the accountability obligations. An accountability environment refers to the condition in which accountability can flourish. Specifically, an accountability environment is the condition in which individuals, teams, and organisations fee that;

- Motivate to execute their authority and/or fulfill their responsibility;
- Stimulated to perform their work and achieve the desired results;
- Inspired to share (report) their results, and
- Willing to accept the liability for hose results.

The optimal accountability environment is one of proactive accountability where in the individual, team, and organisation is focused on achieving great results rather than figuring out ways to explain away poor results. For the most part, the accountability environment is established from the top down that is organizational leadership institute and promotes the environment and cascades it throughout the various levels of management down to the individual worker. Thus, "troubles" with the accountability environment at the individual worker level usually can be traced to a "polluted" environment within the management level. However, there are times when the individual worker shuns accountability regardless of management support and

commitment that is he/she has no personal accountability (Nkwede, 2013).

Aluko (2015) defines strategic planning as a continuous and systematic process where the guiding members of an oganisation make decisions about its future develop the necessary procedures and operations to achieve that future and determine how success is to be measured. One of the benefits of strategic planning is that, it can be an opportunity to unify the management, employees, stakeholders and customers through a common understanding of where the oganisation is going, how everyone involved can work to that common purpose, and how progress and levels of success will be measured.

James (2015) defines strategic planning as a process for helping an organisation to envision what it hope to accomplish in the future by identifying and understanding obstacles and opportunities that affect the organisation's ability to achieve that vision. Stategic plans set the foundation for effective performance measurement systems. Traditional performance measurement systems that focus on the wrong set of performance measures can actually undermine an organisation's strategic mission by perpetuating short-sighted business practices. For this reason, it is appropriate to discuss the critical elements of strategic plans and review the compatibility of strategic plans to an integrated performance measurement system.

Artley, Elison & Kennedy (2011) defines strategic planning as a process for helping organisations to think about the objectives they should establish to fulfill their mission and in what directions they should move to achieve those objectives. It is the foundation for all planning, budgeting, execution, control and evaluation activities by an organisation.

Establishing and Maintaining a Performance-Based Management

A performance-based management system enables individuals and organisation to achieve strategic ambitions through processes that are both systemic and systematic (Esu &Inyang, 2009). Performance measurement is the comparison of actual levels of performance to pre-established target levels of performance and to be effective, performance measurement must be linked to the organizational strategic plan. Performance-based management essentially uses performance measurement information to manage and improve performance and to demonstrate what has been accomplished.

The first step to establishing a performance-based management programme is to define the organizational mission and strategic performance objectives. For successful government organisations the voice of the people drives operations and charts the course for the future. Government enterprises both state and federal have begun focusing on customers (people) as one of the key drivers in planning for the future. When the voice of electorate becomes an integral part of organisational strategies, the organization becomes what is termed a customer-driven organisation (Artley, 2009). Performance-based management has many benefits including;

- It provides a structured approach to focusing on strategic performance objectives. In other words, performance-based management focuses on the achievement of results not on the number of activities.
- It provides a mechanism for accurately reporting performance to upper management and stakeholders. Performance-based management the takes guess work out of. Because all work is planned and done in accordance with the strategic performance objectives, the end result is an accurate picture of individual, programme, and organizational performance.
- It provides an excellent framework for accountability. Performance-based management ensures accountability for results. In the performance-based management framework, all actions, decision, expenditures, and results can be easily explained, justify and recorded.
- It provides a mechanism for linking performance and budget expenditures. Performance-based management provides a framework for showing what

goad will be accomplished and what resources will be necessary to accomplish those goals and it shows what was actually accomplished and what resources actually were used to achieve those results. Thus, performance-based management takes the uncertainty out of budget allocations and provides an effective accounting for money spent.

- It shares responsibility for performance improvement that is, performance-based management process, performance improvement becomes a joint responsibility between the organization and its stakeholders/customers or between the individual and the management. This "jointness" assures input from both sides and increases involvement in the process, ownership of results, and accountability for performance (Artley, Elison, & Kennedy, 2011).

Establishing an Integrated Performance Measurement System

Adejuwon (2015) agrees that performance measurement systems succeed when the government organisation's strategy and performance measures are in alignment and when senior administrators/managers convey the organisation's mission, vision, values and strategic direction to employees and stakeholders. The performance measures give life to the mission, vision, and strategy by providing a focus that lets each employee know how they contribute to the success of the government organization its stakeholder measurable expectations.

Artley & Stroh (2013) sees performance measures as a composed of number and unit of measure. The number gives us a magnitude (how much) and the unit gives number a meaning (what). Performance measures are always tied to a goal or objective (the target). Most performance measures can be grouped into one of the following six general categories. However, certain government or private organisations may develop their own categories

as appropriate depending on the organisation's mission:

- Effectiveness: A process characteristic indicating the degree to which the process output (work product) conforms to requirements.
- Efficiency: A process characteristic indicating the degree to which the process produces the required output at minimum resources cost.
- Quality: The degree to which a product or service meet customer requirements and expectation.
- Timeliness: Measures whether a unit of work was done correctly and on time. Criteria must be established to define what constitute s timeliness for a given unit of work. The criterion is usually based on customer requirements.
- Productivity: The value added by the process divided by the value of the labour and capital consumed.
- Safety: Measures the over health of the organisation and the working environment of its employees.

Esu & Inyang (2009) agrees that performance measurement yields many benefits for government and private organisations, one of the benefit is that, it provides a structured approach for focusing on a programme's strategic plan, goals, and performance. Another benefit is that measurement provides a mechanism for reporting on performance to upper management that is, promotion. Performance measurement improves the management and delivery of services. Some of civil society organisation recently conducted an opinion poll in Lagos, Nigeria, what they thought about the federal government's top priority should be? Almost 95% of the respondent emphasis put on better management. In a word of diminishing resources, improving management of programmes and services is critical.

Oladoyin (2012) defines accountability as a relationship based on the obligation to demonstrate and take responsibility for performance in light of agreed expectations. Often, the word responsibility is used in conjunction with the word accountability.

Responsibility is the obligation to perform while accountability is the liability one assumes for ensuring that an obligation to perform. In other word, responsibility is the obligation to act while accountability is the obligation to answer for responsibilities.

Accountability for performance could not be established without the use of accountability tools. This fact was the main thrust of the establishment of getting federal agencies to report their performance results through the use of several interlinked accountability tools. Since accountability requires reporting, the focus of accountability tools is on reporting of performance that is, both intentions and results. Accountability tools include:

- Strategic Plans
- Performance Agreements
- Performance Plans
- Accountability Reports
- Performance-Based Contracts
- Self-Assessments
- Performance Reviews
- Management Controls
- Equity Statement
- Accountability Meetings.

Beschen, Day, Jordan & Rohm,. (2001) sees data collection as a purpose to provide a basic for analysis, in other words, to turn data into information that is used by, and useful to decision-makers. However, before data can be collected, a data collection plan needs to be developed. A data collection plan is essential to ensuring that data supports the overall objectives of the performance measurement programme and provides details to support decision-making by the users of the information. The integrity of the performance measurement programme is dependent upon the quality of the collected data. Jordan, Prevette, Woodward. (2001) opines that analysis is one of the most important steps in performance-based management, yet it is often the one that is neglected even highly educated individuals are often unfamiliar with numerical analysis. The purpose of data analysis and review is to convert raw data into performance information and knowledge. The data that have been collected are processed and synthesized so that government organisations can make

informed assumptions and generalisations about what happened, why this might vary from what was expected, and what corrective action might be required. The purpose of data analysis is insight.

Model for generating useful information include:
1) Question Review.
2) Data Collection and Organisation.
3) Data Analysis.
4) Data Presentation.

Gee, Jones, Kreitz, Neveil, O'Connor & Ness. (2001) opines that there are always many activities being performed within an organization. Performance measurement methods can be developed and used to assist in determining progress for any or all of these activities because the resultant performance information can be extensive, it is necessary to develop a strategy for dealing with and presenting these large amounts of data in an effective manner. They explained further that performance measurement information has many uses, primarily, these data provide management and individual performers with a view of current and past levels of performance. It can also provide an indication of future performance. These levels of performance provide the necessary clarity as to where an organization (or individual performer) stands relative to its goals and aspirations. Therefore, it is incumbent or management to establish an appropriate method for presenting key information in a way that promotes and encourages the behaviours necessary to attain the organisation's objectives and vision.

Heinrich (2017) sees requirements for outcomes-based performance management in the public sector as an increasing performance-evaluation activities at all government levels. Research on public-sector performance management however, points to problems in the design and management of these systems and questions their effectiveness as policy tools for increasing governmental accountability. He explained further that research on performance management suggests that federal agencies should choose performance measures that

(i)   are closely aligned with their stated goals;

(ii) appropriate actual performance as closely as possible;

(iii) are relatively simple and inexpensive to administer;

(iv) make it difficult for administrators/managers to increase their measured performance in ways other than increasing their actual performance.

Kravchuk & Schack (2006) disagreed that how difficult it is to develop and implement a performance-management system with these qualities. When multiple or conflicting goals motivate employees, when organizational goals and performance measures diverge, or when bureaucratic effort across government levels is not readily observed, problems in performance management systems are likely to arise (Heinrich, 2017).

Murphy & Cleveland (2015) urges that, in addition to specifying accurate measures of performance, administrators/managers should give more attention to contextual factors that influence or interfere with performance measurement and may undercut objectives to improve accountability and organisational performance. The contextual factors that identified in this paper is private sector organisations include organisatonal complexity and coordination; organisational climate or culture and values; competition among functional units or within sectors; and general economic and political conditions. The importance of these factors may be magnified in public organisations by frequent changing political and administrative priorities, professional and partisan conflict within bureaucracies, and the between formal and informal authorities in programme implementation. To be effective, performance measures should be strongly correlated with programme goals in order to provide the right marginal incentives to programme administrators/managers and staff.

The State of Productivity in Nigerian Public Services

Economic Commission for Africa (1991) opines that the need for the state of productivity in Nigerian public service stemmed from the recognition that increased productivity holds the key to economic wealth and high standards of living in general, and that improved public service productions an important factor in promoting and sustaining socio-economic growth and development. Productivity and efficiency in Nigerian public service is at low ebb, as a result, productivity improvement in Nigerian public services has become a major concern. The economic crisis, the global recession seem to have had a direct impact on the resources available for Nigeria, in a situation of a declining resource base, the effective and productive use of whatever little resources exist become of paramount concern and importance.

Agboola (2015) agrees that there is no doubt that the Nigerian public service has been afflicted over the years with series of problems, among which are poor performance, corruption, absenteeism and the ghost workers syndrome. Considering these malaise that have characterized the public service as well as the need to reposition it to make it people-oriented and compatible with the reality of global standard, President Olusegun Obasanjo approved the establishment of Bureau for Public Service Reforms (BPSR). The bureau was mandated to streamline and standardise the public service at the federal level, including setting minimum standards to be met by each ministry or agencies. The task was "to build a public service that is performance and result oriented, professional and technologically sensitive, and committed to a continuous improvement in the conduct of government business and the enhancement of national productivity".

Ajayi (2012) agrees that the demand for improved productivity/services delivery and performance of the Nigerian public services has also emanated from the public, which is asking for better services in spite of the economic crisis in the country. The political representatives of the people and the public servants themselves

are complaining that they are unable to deliver the services required of them in the face of material and financial constraints being faced. The concentration of public servants at headquarters, instead of the field administration where their services are required more, was also identified as another challenges hampering the effectiveness of the Nigerian public services. Ajayi explains further that government should reposition and re-professionalise the public service for greater efficiency, effectiveness in service delivery, accountability, transparency, and overall national productivity.

Olowu (2004) observes that public service is perceived as unwieldy in terms of structure and personnel size and is almost unmanageable in Nigeria. Retrenchment is productive if it helps to reduce duplication, redundancy and over employment. If thoroughly and effectively carried out, departmental restructuring could help to identify redundant ministries, departments and personnel. It could thus help to reduce costs. De-bureaucratisation helps to simplify procedures and work methods through work-study techniques. It could also help to reduce paperwork and unnecessary secrecy in government work, and thus increase public service transparency. Cost recovery is especially useful for raising additional resources for services such as education, health, water supply, roads and even revenue collection. He explained further that it has been found to be a very useful strategy to strengthen local governments through empowering local communities to establish and run their major social services with support from the federal government. Where, however, the central/federal administration refuses to make the distinction between field administration and local governments and tightly controls the activities of local assemblies especially in respect of revenue mobilization and expenditure priorities, the results have been disastrous in all cases.

Obasanjo's Public Service Renewal Programme and Service Delivery (1999 – 2007)
Virtually Nigeria government created many parastatals immediately after independence and the civil war in order to realise a number of economic, political and strategic objectives. However, the experience of Nigeria was that these parastatals sustained heavy losses and became drains on the economy. As a result government had evolved, either on their own or in collaboration with international financial institutions, strategies of privatization and Commercialisation, and divestiture (Agboola, 2015).

Oyedele (2015) sees administrative reforms under Obasanjo's administration as an effort widely described as about the most comprehensive and far-reaching in the history of the Nigerian public service reforms. The reform was necessitated by the need to address the crisis in public management which led to service deterioration in the quality of governance in the country brought about by several years of military rule
.
Nkwede (2013) agrees that public sector restructure seek to achieve a better balance between the fiscal burden of public employment and the need to provide incentives that attract competent staff. It is therefore aimed at improving the confidence of the public and of business, that the public service is both honest and efficient. Against this backdrop, the restructure is predicated on the need to address the following critical issues; inefficiency in the delivery of social services, insensitivity to general welfare, reduction of public fund/expenditure, improvement on policy responsiveness and implementation, indifference to the norms guiding the conduct of public officials, rampart corruption and to improve service delivery and build public and private confidence.

Olaopa (2008) states that early in the life of Obasanjo administration, he initiated a reorientation programme involving retreats for political office holders, senior administrators and members of parastatals and agencies in the public service. The climax of these whole efforts was the "Kuru Declaration" of 2001 which represented a statement of commitment and the core elements of a vision for greater Nigeria. It was, also, a service charter of commitment to

serve the public better with utmost sense of social responsibility. The public service reform activities in the "Action Plan", in a very broad sense, are designed to focus on the core functions of government, namely, policymaking, service delivery, value orientation and accountability.

Conclusion and Recommendations

There is global convergence in relation to organisational performance-based management in a government context. There are consistent features in all contemporary performance-based management systems including the emphasis on outcomes and the central role for strategic planning, objectives, accountability, effectiveness, outcomes, performance measurement and the use of easy to understand concurrent and post-control tools and techniques. Performance-based management is comprehensive approach for planning and sustaining improvement in the performance of employees and teams so as to meet standard. The adoption of performance-based management will make public servants to be efficient and effective that is it will turnaround the Nigerian public servants and enables it to achieve their desire objectives and goals.

The following recommendations are made to enhance public sector performance-based management growth and success

- Government should put in place policies aim to helping the public servants to be efficient and effective as an instrument of public service delivery and development.
- Government should build synergy and consensus on restructure agenda between the political elites, drivers of restructuring and the bureaucracy regarding the scope, strategy and implementation modalities of the restructuring public sector process.
- Economic and social development plans should incorporate administrative strategies for implementing them.
- Public servants regulation should endeavour to commit public servants to a programme of performance improvement. These criteria should also be given an important weight in considering them for upward mobility.

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. (2015). Service Compact and Service Delivery in Southwestern Nigeria. Ph.D. Thesis Presented to the *Department of Public Administration,* O.A.U.,Ile-Ife. 234pp

Ajayi, G. O. (2012). E-Government, Reforming the Public Administration to Accelerate Development, *Paper Presented at the National Information Technology,* Abuja.

Aluko, M.A.O. (2015). Corporate Strategy, Strategic Management and Re-branding of Obafemi Awolowo University, Ile-Ife. *Ife Journal of the Humanities and Social Studies* 2(2), 161-173.

Armstrong, M. (2012). *The Handbook of Human Resource Management Practice,* (10[th]eds) London: Kogan Page. Pp.495.

Artley, W. (2009). *Establishing an Integrated Performance Measurement System,* California: University of California. Pp.3-5

Artley, W., Elison D. J. & Kennedy, B., (2011). *Establishing and Maintaining a Performance-Based Management Programme,* California: University of California. Pp.15

Artley, W. & Stroh, S. (2013). *Establishing an Integrated Performance Measurement System,* California: University of California. Pp. 8

Beschen, D. Day, Jordan & Rohm. (2001). *Collecting Data to Assess Performance,* California: University of California. Pp.10

Cole. G. (2004). *Management Theory and Practice,* (6th eds), London: Thomson Learning. Pp.53

Economic Commission of African, (1991). *Improving Productivity in African Public Services,* Tunisia: SAPAM. Pp. 6-10.

Esu, B. E. & Inyang, B. I. (2009). A Case Performance Management in the Public Sector in Nigeria*, International Journal of Business and Management,* 4(4), 98-105.

Gee, D. Jones, K. Kreitz, D. Nevell, S. O'Connor, B. & Ness, B. V. (2001). *Using Performance Information to Drive Improvement,* California: University of California. Pp.17

Hale, J. (2004). *Performance-Based Management: What Every Manager should do to get Results,* San Francisco, C A: John WiIey and Sons, Inc. pp. 11.

Hienrich, C. J. (2017). Outcomes-Based Performance Management in the Public Sector: Implications for Government Accountability and Effectiveness, *Public Administration Review,* 62, (6),712-716.

Jordan, G. Prevette, S. & Woodward, S. (2001) *Analysing, Reviewing, and Reporting Performance Data,* California: University of California. Pp. 15.

Katz, D. & Kahn, R. L. (2008). *The Social Psychology of Organisation, (5th eds),* New York: Willey & Sons Inc. pp.342-347

Kuye, O. L. (2011). *Management Theory and Philosophy: An Expository Approach,* Lagos: Harry-Dons Ventures. Pp.69

Kravchuk, R. S. & Schack, R. W. (2006). Designing Effective Performance-Measurement Systems under the Government Performance and Results Act of 1993, *Public Administration Review,* 56 (4), 348-358.

Monday, J.U. & Aladeraji, O.K. (2015). Strategic Management and Corporate Performance: A Resource-based Approach. *Ife Journal of the Humanities and Social Studies* 2, (2), 137-150.

Murphy, J. C. & Cleveland, J. N. (2015). *Performance Appraisal: An Organisational Perspectives,* Boston: Allyo and Bacon.

Nkwede, J. O. (2013) Public Sector Restructuring and Governance in Nigeria: Perspectives, Processes and Challenges, *Journal of Business & Management,* 2(3),32-44.

Oladoyin, A. M. (2006). Transparency, Accountability and Ethical Violation in Financial Institution in Nigeria. *Journal of Leadership, Management and Administration,* 4(1),44-60.

Olaopa, T. (2008). *Theory and Practice of Public Administration and Civil Service Reforms in Nigeria,* Ibadan: Spectrum Books Limited. Pp.156-176

Olowu, D. (1991). African Public Service Reforms and Productivity Improvement: A Review of Some Anglophone Country Experience. In *United Nations Economic Commission for Africa: Public Administration, Human Resources and Social Development Division,* SAPAM), Tunisia. Pp. 16-17.

Olowu, D. (2004). New Public Management: An African Reform Paradigm. *Africa Development,* 27 (3 & 4), 1-6.

Otley, D. (2009). Performance Management: A Framework for Management Control Systems Research, *Management Accounting Research,* 10(1), 363-382.

Oyedele, S. O. (2015). The Nigerian Public Service and Service Delivery Under Civil Rule, *Journal of Public Administration, Finance and Law,* 7, 33-43.