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Abstract:

The purpose of this study is to test if the local government’s performance management practices are predicted by their employee’s public service motivation levels. Local governments’ performance management practices are effective when their employees are committed and motivated. Employees whose motivations are unique to public institutions will be committed to both their key performance indicators and the general strategic goals of local governments’ core mission, and the lack of it may be detrimental to the local level management practice. The study used a cross-sectional survey of 850 local government employees in the Greater Accra of Ghana. The method of analysis of the data was multiple regression techniques. The findings suggest that employees’ scores on attraction to policymaking, civic duty, and commitment to the public interest are strongly positively associated with performance management practices. The regression analysis demonstrated that public service motivation subscales combined to predict the variance in the dependent variable. Several studies of performance management research examine utilization and the rational decision-making process in federal governments; however, this study is one
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of the few to examine performance management practices of local governments and public service motivation theory by showing that employees' public service motivation levels can significantly predict the changes in performance management practices.
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### 1. Introduction

Performance management (PM) is a vital tool for organizations and their employees to achieve their goals, increase value to citizens, and deliver quality public services. Although PM has been an old organizational performance tool in the private sector, recent developments suggest a widespread adoption by local governments in the public management literature (Abane & Phinaitrup, 2017; Ammons & Roenigk, 2015). Similarly, research on PM over the years have concentrated on the measurement system (Ammons & Rivenbark, 2008; Hoontis & Kim, 2012), metric difficulty (Cavalluzzo & Ittner, 2004), goal clarity (Hoontis & Kim, 2012; Moynihan et al. 2012), and political support (Moynihan et al. 2012; Yang & Hsieh, 2007). While these studies are important for the effective implementation of PM policies, little information is available to explain how employees’ motivations can help implement PM.

Motivation has been one of the subjects of contention in public sector discourse and the disagreement bothers on whether or not all types of motivations are suitable for reinforcing desirable behaviour in public organizations? The public management literature notes that not all types of motivations can be used to increase performance among public employees (Houston, 2000; Perry & Wise, 1990; Perry & Hondeghem, 2008). Scholarly literature demonstrates that some motivational types are better in achieving results than others and one such motivational tool used in the public sector is public service motivation (PSM) (Andersen et al., 2014; Homberg & McCarthy, 2015; Perry, 1996).

Further, the evidence available suggests that PM can motivate employees to perform to their optimal best. This is so with the current ideas on performance-based funding or performance-based grant in the public sector. To the extent that PM can motivate employees, it is important to understand how this link can be tested using one of the employee motivational types specific to public sector organizations. According to Pandey (2015, p.1), PM research “promises to be a long one” and the topic has surged in the last two decades which will continue to increase in the
next decade. This is because, evidence of its effectiveness is mixed and many developing countries are beginning to use the elements of PM in the management of public policies and programs at the local level (Abane & Phinaitrup, 2017; Mmieh et al., 2011; Ohemeng, 2011; Public Services Commission, 2012).

Despite the extensive research on the subject, there is inconclusive evidence on whether or not motivation can influence its effectiveness in LGs. For example, few studies have explored the relationship between PSM and PM (Christensen et al., 2013; Lynggaard et al., 2018). While these studies have contributed to our understanding of the significance of PSM, and its link with the PM system, the findings provide little understanding of how PSM contributes to PM best practices of local government authorities especially relating to their strategic planning, performance monitoring & evaluation, review, and improvement. These four best practices are considered as the complete phase of an effective PM cycle in organizations (Armstrong & Baron, 2007). In this study, we examine the extent to which individual PSM levels are measured by five subscales: “attraction to policymaking”, “commitment to the public interest”, civic duty “compassion”, and “self-sacrifice” influence the effectiveness of LGs PM best practices. The results showed that employees’ PSM scores have a significant relationship with LGs PM best practices. However, the subscales have different effect sizes.

This study adds to the current body of research on PM and PSM (Christensen et al., 2013; Kroll & Vogel, 2013; Moynihan & Pandey, 2010). Though there is significant research on PM in LGs (Ammons & Roenigk, 2015; Baird, Kevin & Schoch, Herbert & Chen, 2012; Boyne, 2002; Moynihan & Pandey, 2010; Nurkholis et al. 2014), this has generally been studied at the executive agencies and the councils’ levels. Consequently, few studies directly study local government (LG) employees’ PSM levels and their impact on PM especially within the context of sub-Saharan Africa. Therefore, the study aims to test the effect of the 1996 PSM construct (Perry, 1996) on PM best practices of LGs in Ghana and to explain how PSM contributes to the effectiveness of LG PM policies. By testing Perry’s (1996) PSM construct on LGs PM best practices from a developing country’s perspective, it will help to shape the PSM theory and add knowledge from the Ghanaian experience since, South Africa is the only known country that was part of the 150 samples used to test the PSM’s 1996 construct (Perry & Hondeghem, 2008).
2. Literature Review

2.1 Performance management practices (PMPs)

PM is a multidimensional concept that focuses on how organizations combine operational bundles to achieve their key performance indicators (KPIs) by following a set of steps to implement their goals and measure their performance (Biron et al. 2011; Lee, 2005). Some scholars see PM as a strategic, as well as tactical process, which helps to improve employees' performance (Abane & Phinaitrup, 2017; Biron et al. 2011). Others view PM as a systematic approach to people management where both organizational and individual activities are geared towards goal attainment (Maley, 2014; Waal & Counet, 2009). Subsequently, PMPs may be viewed as a systematically structured bundle of activities for setting goals, measuring, evaluating, reviewing, and influencing employees’ performance, and at the same time, a tactical tool that top management use to achieve their goals (Biron et al. 2011).

In the literature, PMPs have four important bundles: strategic planning, performance monitoring & evaluation, performance review, and performance improvement (Ammons & Roenigk, 2015). Strategic planning involves a formal setting of objectives and goals which cascade the organizational goals to individual goals (Dewettinck & van Dijk, 2013). Performance monitoring and evaluation is a careful plan of action to supervise and assess employees KPIs for effective implementation (Amirkhanyan et al. 2014), while performance review is assessing the achievement or otherwise of the individual KPIs. While performance review can take the form of a quarterly, mid-year, or annual review or a combination of any of these in a given year. (Biron et al. 2011; Dahling & O’Malley, 2011; Favero et al., 2016; Gill & Carter, 2016; Nielsen, 2014).

Performance improvement constitutes the developmental approach to managing performance (Abane & Phinaitrup, 2017; Maley, 2014; Sanderson, 2001). It can further be viewed as a corrective measure of employee performance by modifying their skill-set to enhance future performance through training and capacity building. The main function of performance improvement is to ensure that employees enhance their previous scores on their KPIs, as well as acquire skills and knowledge that may be relevant to their job descriptions. Further, it is at this stage that employees can be incentivized through different motivational strategies with the view that such incentives will push them to improve their performance. Unfortunately, this component of PMBP has not received attention in public organizations (Andersen et al. 2014; Halachmi, 2002; Hawke, 2012; Koike,
Therefore, the objective of this paper is to investigate the relationship between PSM and its effect on PMPs and LGs can make use of their employees PSM to support performance at the local level.

2.2 Public service motivation (PSM)

PSM has been variously been linked to prosocial behaviour in organizations (Brief and Motowidlo 1986; Campbell et al. 2016; Francois, 2000; Grant, 2008a; Moynihan et al. 2012), altruistic (Campbell et al. 2016; Piliavin & Charng, 1990). In contrast, Perry & Hondeghem (2008) maintain that prosocial behaviour is mostly viewed as voluntary action towards others without expecting a return (Brief & Motowidlo, 1986), while altruism refers to deliberate individual action directed towards individuals or groups to promote their welfare (Kim, 2006). Perry and Hondeghem (2008), however, view both altruistic and PSM as complementary constructs. Subsequently, they refer to it as a ‘specific expression of prosocial, other-oriented motives, goals, and values’ (Perry & Hondeghem, 2008; Vandenabeele, 2007).

PSM, according to Vandenabeele (2007: 549), refers to beliefs and values that transcend the self and organizational interests in favour of social and political domains. Similarly, Brewer and Selden (1998: 417), view PSM as a ‘motivational force’, which induces meaningful performance from employees in public organizations. The common denominator in the PSM definition is that it is a type of motivation vested in public institutions, a compelling force with the ability to elicit a good and meaningful performance from public employees. This study defines PSM as a compelling motivational instrument found in public organizations to benefit from the ‘outside and inside’ of an organization regardless of the type of setting, thus, public or private. Following Perry & Wise (1990) and (Perry, 1996), this study conceives PSM to be measured by three motives: rational, norm-based, and affective motives (Perry, 1996).

The literature on PSM is vast. The subject continues to receive much attention and it seems this is not going to end soon. The reason behind the continuous focus on the idea is that motivated employees will increase their task performance. Although PSM research has increased over the past 20 years (Christensen et al. 2017; Ritz et al. 2016), there have been uncertainties and ambiguities in understanding the concept with other concepts like altruism and the ‘publicness’ of the construct (Bozeman & Su, 2015; Bullock et al. 2015).

Consequently, Perry and Hondeghem (2008), as well as Christensen et al. (2017) trace two tracks of research. The first track incorporates ‘other-
regarding’ orientations in disciplines outside public management, and they focus on employee motivation in organizations (Christensen et al. 2013; Gould-Williams et al. 2015; Wright & Christensen, 2010), the link between prosocial behaviour (Finkelstein et al. 2005; George & Bettenhausen, 1990; Grant, 2008b, 2012), and altruism (Penner et al. 2005; Perry & Hondeghem, 2008). The second track is interested in linking PSM to public management and administration research. Subsequently, studies in this area emphasize the testing and strengthening of the PSM construct and its measurement, institutional assumptions, and the relationship between PSM and performance (Christensen et al. 2017). Other themes that are prominent in this track also includes organizational context/setting (Cun, 2012; Steijn, 2008), and studies that purely focus on improving the practice of public management systems (Christensen et al. 2013; Kroll & Vogel, 2013; Moynihan et al. 2012; Moynihan & Pandey, 2010; Wright et al. 2012).

In line with improving public management systems, this study is contributing to the second track of research on PSM by testing five of the subscales of the PSM construct on PMBPs of LGs in a developing country context. This is important because the literature on PSM is predominantly Western (Ritz et al. 2016) with only eleven (11) studies from Africa and ten (10) from South Africa while 43.4% is concentrated in Europe, and 27.5% from the USA (Ritz et al. 2016). Hence, testing the PSM scale in Ghana, which is in the Sub-Saharan Africa (SSA) region, will help in strengthening the PSM theory and to further validate the construct.

The evidence on PSM suggests mixed findings. For example, previous research such as (Christensen et al., 2013; Cun, 2012; Kim & Kang, 2016; Kim, 2006; Lee & Choi, 2013; Steijn, 2008; Vandenabeele, 2014), found that there were significant differences in the effect size of the PSM scale on Korean public sector employees. These mixed findings are also evident in the 150 countries that the PSM scale was administered in the study conducted by (Christensen et al., 2013; Perry et al., 2010; Perry & Hondeghem, 2008). As a result, the evidence reveals that contextual factors and the national culture of a country can influence the effect of employee PSM.

### 2.3 Empirical research on the PSM construct

The PSM construct is anchored on six main psychological motives (Perry, 1996; Vandenabeele, 2007) of public service employees: 1) the desire to take part in public policymaking by employees 2) commitment to the public interest that is the perceived public value of work which seeks to benefit others; 3) civic duty, relates to the non-elected nature of public
office holders; 4) social justice, demands that employees become equity sensitive in decision making especially towards minorities outside the organization; 5) compassion which requires public service post holders to be responsive to the needs of the groups who do not will political influence and 6) self-sacrifice demands that employees substitute personal gain or material reward for intangible rewards in the form of selfless service to the nation (Perry, 1996).

The evidence suggests that PSM has an influence on employee task performance and affects the perception of the value of their work to the larger society (Moynihan et al. 2012; Wright et al. 2012). The literature indicates that PSM is positively related to employee performance (Christensen et al. 2013; Moynihan & Pandey, 2010; Ritz, 2009), culture (Cun, 2012; Gould-Williams et al. 2015; Kim et al. 2012; Wright, Christensen & Pandey, 2013), and commitment and job satisfaction (Cun, 2012; Homberg & McCarthy, 2015; Vandenabeele, 2009). These findings suggest that employees with higher levels of PSM perform better than those with lower levels of PSM. Also, other studies find that higher levels of PSM are exclusively associated with only public employees (Bullock et al. 2015; Houston, 2000; Steijn, 2008; Vandenabeele, 2008). This evidence suggests that employees in public organizations tend to have higher scores on the PSM scale than employees in the private sector (Houston, 2000).

While there is substantial information on how PSM relate to organizational and individual performance (Andersen et al. 2014; Christensen et al. 2013; Schott et al. 2015; Vandenabeele, 2009), there is little empirical evidence that explains how PSM impacts the tools and the processes that lead to organizational performance (Christensen et al. 2013; Kroll & Vogel, 2013; Moynihan & Pandey, 2010). Also, most of these studies only focus on the developed world with a paucity of research on developing countries, where contextual factors are extremely different from that of the developed world.

2.4 PSM and performance management practices (PMPs)

PSM research is multidisciplinary, and it cuts across all organizational forms that seek to manage employee and organizational performance (Gabris & Simo, 1995; Houston, 2000; Moynihan & Pandey, 2007; Perry, 1996; Steijn, 2008). Current trends in the literature on organizational systems suggest that PSM influences the management practices of organizations (Ritz et al. 2016). The main assumption of PSM is that individual employees are predisposed to motives that focus on public service values and employees are driven to work extra hard because they
perceived that their work will have a social impact on the larger society (Bullock et al. 2015; Moynihan et al. 2012). One fundamental gap in PSM research is whether or not the concept has a relationship with the internal business practices of organizations. While there have been few studies to this effect, the findings have been inconclusive and contextual (Moynihan et al. 2012). For instance, some Scholars have found links between PSM and public managers' use of PM in a sample of executive agencies of the US and the German local governments respectively (Moynihan & Pandey, 2010; Moynihan et al. 2012; Kroll & Vogel, 2013).

Moynihan and Pandey’s (2010) study indicates that PSM is an individual driver of managers’ use of performance data for decision-making in organizations. The study used a multi-method survey of 1538 senior managers in the US local government system and found that PSM is positively associated with performance information use which is one of the best practices of PM. The findings support the notion that PSM is significantly related to behaviours that contribute to high individual and organizational performance (Belle, 2013; Christensen et al. 2013; Kroll & Vogel, 2013).

In another study, Moynihan et al. (2012) find that the perceived social impact of employees’ work to the public is related to their use of performance information, especially with purposeful and political uses of the PM cycle. The implication is that if public managers have high PSM levels, they tend to use performance data for decision-making such as promotion, program funding, etc. The study further observed that a unit increase on the perceived social impact of work corresponds with a unit increase of 0.42 on the type of performance data uses: purposeful and political (Moynihan et al. 2012: 470). Similarly, several studies have found evidence to support the PSM-performance link. Other studies have also found that public sector employees with higher levels of PSM correlated with employee performance, meaningful work, person-job fit, and the desire to serve the public cause (Houston, 2000; Perry, 1996; Steijn, 2008).

The evidence supporting PSM and PMPs is inconclusive. For example, studies that attempt to link PSM with PMPs find that employees’ perception of the social impact of their work may lead to their extra-role behaviour to use performance information for decision-making (Moynihan & Pandey, 2010). These studies merely look at only information use which is part of the performance review process thereby offering little understanding of how PSM affects PMPs which are a set of bundles implemented by top management to enhance individual and organizational performance.
2.5 The context of public service motivation in local government in Ghana

This study examines four (4) PM dimensions: strategic planning (SP), performance monitoring & evaluation (PME), performance review (PEREVIEW), and performance improvement (PERIMP) of metropolitan and municipal assemblies, and the links between these dimensions and employees’ PSM levels in LGs. Perry and Hondegehem (2008) argue that testing the effect of PSM across different cultures is important in contributing to the reliability and theory building of the PSM construct globally and at the same time it will help public organizations to explore its benefits to increase performance outcomes and productivity.

The test of the PSM construct in Ghana is less known. Hence, its evidence among local-level public managers is equally unknown. However, few studies have found evidence to support that PSM exists in the civil service in Ghana, however, there is no relationship between PSM levels and civil service employees’ performance or output (Brenya, Adu-Gamfi, Kyei, Tariah, Nmerukini, Boateng & Angmor, 2017). The study further found that employees profess to have a sense of social justice, compassion, commitment to the public interest, self-sacrifice, and civic duty, however, they were unwilling to commit to the course of the public service because of poor conditions of services.

However, there are several studies on public sector motivation in the Ghanaian experience. Recent studies suggest that motivation in public sector organizations has largely been ineffective and this accounts for the low productivity levels in the public service (Annan-Prah, & Ohemeng, 2015). This is because the government has been unable to develop a strong motivational system for LG workers (Ayee, 2001; Antwi, 2009). The result of this failure has led to several industrial actions, thereby affecting productivity at the local level (Akudugu, 2013; Dodoo, 1997). The low morale among LG employees may be due to the poor compensation and reward systems found in the public service. The consequential effect is that many public programs have failed at the implementation stage, thereby constraining local-level development (Ahenkan, Tenakwah & Bawole, 2018; Ohemeng, 2009).

Many of the problems associated with PM practices in Ghana is the lack of technical competencies and the understanding of the PM system (Bawole et al., 2013; Biron et al., 2011). However, the mechanical aspects of the PM systems are too technical, and the information is often too detailed and not user-friendly (Biron et al., 2011).
Also, research reveals that financial or external rewards have often failed to meet the demands of workers (Jacobsen et al., 2014; Koike, 2013), and relying heavily on extrinsic rewards systems may not be enough to bring about changes in employee and organizational performance (Jacobsen et al., 2014). Consequently, PSM is the framework that predicts a higher level of employees’ motivation and performance outcomes in the rapidly changing environment of public organizations in managing for results at the local level (Moynihan & Pandey, 2005). If local government employees with higher levels of PSM adapt to these kinds of rational, norm-based and affective motives in their task performance, greater attention will be given to individual and organisational KPIs.

For this study, examining how individual PSM levels are measured by the five sub-scales: ‘attraction to policymaking’, ‘commitment to the public interest, ‘civic duty, ‘compassion’, and ‘self-sacrifice’ may influence PMBPs: SP, PME, PEREVIEW, and PERIMP. The study recognizes that PSM is both rational, normative, and affective based (Perry, 1996) and it investigates the combined connection between these three motives and the four dimensions of metropolitan and municipal assemblies’ PMPs. From the above discussions, the study proposes the following hypotheses:

- **H₁**: Employees with higher levels of PSM levels will positively influence their LGs PMPs.
- **H₂**: The combined PSM construct will be significantly be associated with total PMP.

### 3. Methodology

#### 3.1 Sample and study setting

A total of 850 LG Employees in the Greater Accra Region (GAR)⁠¹ were part of this study. Out of the 850 questionnaires that were administered, only 725 responses were received representing an 85.29% response rate. However, after screening and cleaning the data for missing values, only 441 responses were useable. Participation in the survey was voluntary and respondents’ confidentiality was protected. Respondents for the survey were current employees of Local Government Service (LGS) who were either full time or part-time employees located in the GAR. The sample consisted of 178 females (40.4 per cent) and 263 (59.6 per cent).

---

⁠¹ Greater Accra Region is the National Capital of Ghana located in the coastal zone.
3.2 Data collection procedure

This study is a cross-sectional survey in which the data was collected at one time. The survey questionnaire was self-administered between July and August 2017. Participants were contacted for this study through the Office of the Head of Local Government Service (OHLGS)\(^2\) and an introductory letter was sent to the 11 metropolitans, municipal assemblies (MMAs) in the National Capital of Ghana. The respondents were personally contacted in their respective offices. The respondents consisted of senior local government officers who have served between 1-20 years and above. Eight hundred and fifty (850) survey questionnaires were randomly distributed to officers with the salary Grade Level 15 - Level 21\(^3\) in the 11 MMAs using the Established Warrant Levels\(^4\) in the Controller and Accountant General’s Integrated Personnel Payroll unit of the OHLGS to ensure that each element in the sample had an equal chance of being included in the study. A list of the 850 officers and their workplaces were written and further contacted directly to respond to the survey. All data were collected with the guidelines of the Local Government Service ethics and protocol\(^5\).

The study recognizes that PSM comprises rational, normative, and affective motives, using Perry’s (1996) classification to test the connection between these three motives and the four bundles of metropolitan and municipal assemblies’ (MMAs) PMB practices. The study measured individual PSM levels using the five sub-scales for the three motives above: ‘attraction to policymaking’, ‘commitment to the public interest’, ‘civic duty’, ‘compassion’, and ‘self-sacrifice’ while PMBPs bundles included SP, PME, PEREVIEW, and PERIMP.

The dependent variable, ‘PMBP’ was measured by four bundles: ‘strategic planning’, ‘performance monitoring & evaluation’, ‘performance review’, and ‘performance improvement’. First, SP was measured using nine (9) items that were developed to capture the processes and activities of the PM process using previous studies (Ammons & Roenigk, 2015).

\(^2\) The Office of the Head of Local Government Service can be located along the Gamel Abdul Nasser Road adjacent Efua Sutherland Children’s Park in Accra.

\(^3\) Levels 15-21 are senior entry grades for professional and non-professional classes in the Local Government Service in Ghana. These levels are considered as middle and managerial levels in practice.

\(^4\) The established warrant level is the pay roll grades and structure used in the public service to pay employees with different qualifications and experience.

\(^5\) The local Government Service ethics and protocol can be found on www.lgs.gov.gh under Service Protocol Menu.
Respondents were asked to indicate whether their organizations engaged in the SP process before designing their performance indicators. A sample item on the ‘SP scale’ is “my assembly conducts strategic planning”. Items for the ‘PME scale’ had four (4) items and included “My assembly has a routine monitoring plan”. The ‘PEREVIEW scale’ had three (3) items, which included ‘during performance reviews, my supervisor focuses on the results I should obtain’. The ‘PERIMP scale’ was measured by eight (8) items and a sample item is “my assembly has a routine performance improvement programs for staff”.

All the four scales were measured using a 7-point Likert scale (1-strongly disagree to 7 strongly agree). To measure the ‘PMBP’, the four bundles were combined for this purpose making a total of twenty-four (24) items. The Cronbach alpha reliability result for PMBP for the 24 items was 0.94 which suggested high reliability for all the items (see Table 1).

The PSM construct was measured using Perry's (1996) three based motives: rational, norm-based, and affective. These three motives were further divided into sub-indicators namely: ‘attraction to policymaking (ATTRACT)’, ‘commitment to the public interest (COMM)” (rational motives), ‘civic duty’ (CID) (norm-based motive), and ‘compassion’ (COMP) & ‘self-sacrifice’ (SS) (affective motives). For the ‘ATTRACT scale’, all the five (5) items from the original scale were used and a sample item included PSM11 ‘politics is a good word’. The ‘COMM scale’ was measured using four (4) items and it included PSM30 ‘meaningful public service is very important to me’. Also, the ‘CID scale’ was measured by 5 items and a sample item included PSM21 ‘I am willing to go great lengths to fulfil my obligations to my country’, whereas ‘COMP’ was measured using all the eight (8) items from the original scale and a sample item include PSM2 ‘I am often moved by the plight of the under privileged’, and the ‘SS scale’ was measured with five (5) items and it included PSM1 ‘making a difference in society means more to me than personal achievements’. For total PSM, a combined 27 items from the five scales were used to observe the total effect of PSM on the dependent variable.

All the five scales were measured on a 7-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1(strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). Except for the ‘attraction to policymaking’ scale which had a Cronbach alpha of 0.68, the rest had a reliability test above 0.7. The Cronbach alpha for the PSM scale in this sample was 0.94 which is robust compared with previous studies (Moynihan & Pandey, 2010). Table 1 depicts the individual reliability test for all the scales in this study.
Table 1. Results of Individual Scales Reliability Test

| Variable      | Cronbach Alpha (α) | No. of Items | N  |
|---------------|--------------------|--------------|----|
| PMBP subscales|                    |              |    |
| SP            | 0.90               | 9            | 425|
| PME           | 0.82               | 4            | 437|
| PEREVIEW      | 0.83               | 3            | 438|
| PERIMP        | 0.93               | 8            | 429|
| PMPs          | 0.94               | 24           | 407|
| PSM Sub-scales|                    |              |    |
| ATTRACT       | 0.68               | 5            | 427|
| COMM          | 0.89               | 4            | 440|
| CID           | 0.85               | 5            | 440|
| COMP          | 0.89               | 8            | 428|
| SS            | 0.88               | 5            | 435|
| PSM           | 0.94               | 27           | 411|

4. Results and discussions

The results of the descriptive statistics include means, standard deviations, and bivariate correlations for all the variables provided in Table 2.

4.1 Bivariate correlations

The first hypothesized relationship was between the four bundles of PMBPs of LGs: SP, PME, PEREVIEW, and PERIMP, and their employees PSM levels. As predicted, there were significant correlations between SP and employees PSM levels, \( r = 0.51 \) \((p<0.01)\), PME, \( r = 0.43 \) \((p<0.01)\), PEREVIEW, \( r = 0.21 \) \((p<0.01)\), and PERIMP, \( r = 0.32 \) \((p<0.01)\). That is, employees with high scores of PSM were significantly more likely to report that their organizations engaged in SP, PME, PEREVIEW, and PERIMP. Except for SP which correlated 0.3, the other three had moderate correlations.

While these results seem to support the bivariate relationships between these variables, further analyzed through collinearity diagnoses using SPSS and the results revealed that the degree of collinearity evident in the data was not detrimental to the findings (Hair et al. 1998; Pallant, 2011). The largest variance inflation factor (VIF) was not greater than ten and the tolerance statistics were greater than 0.2, suggesting that no strong linear relationship exists between the variables and, accordingly, no major violations of the assumptions of the inferential statistics used.
For the multicollinearity test in this study, the variables were not affected, because most of the variables correlated lower than 0.70 (Tabachink & Fidell, 2014). Also, the PSM scales correlated high with total PSM which further validates Perry’s (1996) construct reliability since all the five indicators measure the same thing thus, employees PSM levels. Nonetheless, except for CID & COMP; and COMP & SS, which had correlations above 0.7 (0.77, and ‘0.79 respectively), they were no major multicollinearity present in the data. Additionally, the results showed that the correlations between the four bundles of PMBPs suggest no significant collinearity. Hence, hypothesis 1 is supported.

The second hypothesized relationship in the model was between the total PSM and PMBP of LGs. However, as Table 2 indicates, there were significant variations in each of the effects of the five scales of PSM on PMBP of LGs and their employees' PSM levels. There were significant

| Variable | Mean  | SD  | 1   | 2   | 3   | 4   | 5   | 6   | 7   | 8   | 9   | 10  | 11  |
|----------|-------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| SP       | 47.23 | 7.62|     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| PME      | 18.10 | 3.47| 1   |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| PERVIE   | 11.70 | 3.27| 0.69**| 1   |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| PERIMP   | 37.59 | 9.76| 0.54**| 0.64**| 1   |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| PSM      | 112.35| 116.3| 0.71**| 0.51**| 0.43**| 0.21**| 0.32**| 1   |     |     |     |     |     |
| ATTRACT  | 22.33 | 4.08| 0.32**| 0.14**| 0.14**| 0.67**| 1   |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| COMM     | 19.37 | 3.33| 0.49**| 0.36**| 0.11**| 0.26**| 0.78**| 0.59**| 1   |     |     |     |     |
| CID      | 24.57 | 4.43| 0.47**| 0.39**| 0.18**| 0.294**| 0.88**| 0.44**| 0.64**| 1   |     |     |     |
| COMP     | 41.24 | 7.37| 0.41**| 0.35**| 0.23**| 0.305**| 0.89**| 0.37**| 0.54**| 0.77**| 1   |     |     |
| SS       | 24.21 | 4.84| 0.41**| 0.36**| 0.17**| 0.29**| 0.81**| 0.404**| 0.59**| 0.71**| 0.79**| 1   |     |
| Total PMBP | 86.42 | 13.81| 0.89**| 0.86**| 0.69**| 0.71**| 0.51**| 0.32**| 0.43**| 0.45**| 0.42**| 0.41**| 1   |

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed); *. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed), N=381 (Listwise), SP= Strategic planning; PME= Performance monitoring & evaluation; PERVIEW=Performance Review; PERIMP= Performance improvement; PSM= Public Service Motivation; ATTRACT=Attraction to policymaking; COMM= commitment to the public interest, CID=Civic duty, COMP= compassion, SS= self sacrifice, PMBP= performance management best practice
relationships between employees’ scores on ATTRACT and total PM best practices of LGs, $r=0.32$ ($p<0.01$), COMM, $r=0.43$ ($p<0.01$), CID, $r=0.45$ ($p<0.01$), COMP, $r=0.42$ ($p<0.01$), and SS, $r=0.41$ ($p<0.01$). This implies that employees’ rating themselves higher on the five subscales of PSM were more likely to report that their organization's performance management practices were effective, providing significant support for hypothesis 2.

4.2 Regression analyses

Based on the significant bivariate relationships indicated in Table 2 above, multiple regression analysis was performed to examine the combined effect of the univariate effect of the five scales of the PSM construct as independent variables on the outcome variable (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2014), PMP as the first model, and to test the combined effect of the total PSM on the four individual bundles of the PMP scales as the second model. Multiple regression analysis also accounts for the inter-correlations found between the five PSM scales in Table 2 above (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2014).

The results showed that the hypothesized relationships in the first model, indicate that employees' scores on ATTRACT, COMM, CID, COMP, and SS should all predict ‘PMP’. In the first model, all five PSM scales were entered into the regression equation as independent variables. Combined PMBP was included in the model as a dependent variable. In Table 3, the combined relationship between the five indicators of PSM on PMP was statistically significant $F (5,375) =25.607$, $p<0.0005$, and contributed 25.5 per cent of the variation in the PMP. The Beta weight for the following variables was not statistically significant: ATTRACT ($r=0.07$, $ns$), COMP ($r=0.12$, $ns$), and SS ($r=0.05$, $ns$), suggesting that only COMM ($r=0.19$, $p<0.005$) and CID ($r=0.18$, $p<0.05$) contributed to the variation in combined PMP (see Table 3).
The study further examined the combined effect of the PSM construct as a single independent variable on the four bundles of PMBP: SP, PME, PEREVIEW, and PERIMP as separate dependent variables. The hypothesized relationships, ATTRACT, COMM, CID, COMP, and SS were entered in the first model as independent variables, and SP was included as the dependent variable. The results from Table 4 shows that the combined relationship between ATTRACT, COMM, CID, COMP, and SS on SP was statistically significant \( F(5, 390)=31.354, p<0.001 \) and accounted for 28.7 per cent of the variance in SP. The Beta coefficients for ATTRACT \( r=0.05, \text{ns} \), COMP \( r=0.05, \text{ns} \) and SS \( r=0.04, \text{ns} \) were not statistically significant, indicating that only COMM \( r=0.28, p<0.001 \), and CID \( r=0.20, p<0.001 \), contributed most to explain the total variance in SP. Additionally, to observe the effect of the five scales of the PSM construct on PME, the regression results in the second model showed that the five scales were statistically significant \( F(5, 402)=16.549, p<0.001 \) and could only explain 17.1 per cent of the variance in the dependent variable (PME). The standardized beta coefficients for the two of the scales: ATTRACT \( r=0.16 \), and CID \( r=0.16 \) were statistically significant, while COMM \( r=0.04, \text{ns} \), COMP \( r=0.07, \text{ns} \), and SS \( r=0.09, \text{ns} \) were not significant.

Also, the third model showed that the Beta weights for three indicators of PSM: COMM \( r=-0.08, \text{ns} \), CID \( r=0.05, \text{ns} \), and SS \( r=-0.04 \) were not significant, whereas, ATTRACT \( r=0.11, p<0.01 \) and COMP \( r=0.23, p<0.01 \) were statistically significant at 10%. The total variance explained in the dependent variable, ‘PERIMP’ was only 6.5 per cent. The fourth regression model shows that the hypothesized relationships for all the five scales were not statistically significant. That is employees who rated themselves higher on the five scales of the PSM construct were
more likely to report that their LGs were not engaged in performance improvement practices. Although this finding confirms previous studies on LG PM practices (Moynihan et al., 2012), the finding must be interpreted with caution, because other contextual factors may account for this. The five scales contributed about 11.8 per cent of the variance in PERIMP as the dependent variable, however, the overall model was significant $F (5, 394) = 10.578, p<0.001$.

Furthermore, the hypothesized relationship, total PSM levels of employees should predict employees’ LGs PMBPs was supported in this study. Table 4 shows that the effect of total PSM on combined PMPs was statistically significant $F (1, 379) = 124.427, p<0.001$, and contributed 24.7 per cent of the variance. The standardized Beta weight for total PSM was statistically significant ($r=0.49$, $p<0.001$), thus explaining the changes in combined PMPs.

Table 4. Regression Results of the Relationship between PSM Sub-measures and PMBP Sub-measures

| Model | Variable | B     | SE B | $\beta$ | $R^2$ | Adj.$R^2$ | F      | N  | Dependent Variable |
|-------|----------|-------|------|---------|-------|-----------|--------|----|-------------------|
| 1     | ATTRACT  | 0.10  | 0.09 | 0.05    |       |           |        | 395| SP                |
|       | COMM     | 0.63  | 0.14 | 0.28*** | 0.287 | 0.278     | 31.354*** |    |                   |
|       | CID      | 0.35  | 0.13 | 0.20*** | 0.171 | 0.160     | 16.549*** | 407| PME               |
|       | COMP     | 0.06  | 0.08 | 0.05    |       |           |        | 408| PEREVIEW          |
|       | SS       | 0.07  | 0.12 | 0.04    |       |           |        |    |                   |
| 2     | ATTRACT  | 0.14  | 0.05 | 0.16*** |       |           |        |    |                   |
|       | COMM     | 0.04  | 0.07 | 0.04    |       |           |        |    |                   |
|       | CID      | 0.12  | 0.06 | 0.16*** | 0.065 | 0.054     | 5.643**  |    | PEREVIEW          |
|       | COMP     | 0.03  | 0.04 | 0.07    |       |           |        | 408|                   |
|       | SS       | 0.06  | 0.05 | 0.09    |       |           |        |    |                   |
| 3     | ATTRACT  | 0.08  | 0.05 | 0.11**  |       |           |        | 408| PEREVIEW          |
|       | COMM     | -0.08 | 0.07 | -0.08   |       |           |        |    |                   |
|       | CID      | 0.04  | 0.06 | 0.05    | 0.065 | 0.054     | 5.643**  |    |                   |
|       | COMP     | 0.11  | 0.04 | 0.23**  |       |           |        |    |                   |
|       | SS       | -0.03 | 0.06 | -0.04   |       |           |        |    |                   |
| 4     | ATTRACT  | -0.10 | 0.14 | -0.04   |       |           |        | 399| PERIIMP           |
|       | COMM     | 0.32  | 0.20 | 0.11    |       |           |        |    |                   |
|       | CID      | 0.21  | 0.18 | 0.09    | 0.118 | 0.107     | 10.578*** |    |                   |
|       | COMP     | 0.17  | 0.12 | 0.13    |       |           |        |    |                   |
|       | SS       | 0.20  | 0.16 | 0.08    |       |           |        |    |                   |
| 5     | Total PSM| 0.41  | 0.37 | 0.49    | 0.247 | 0.245     | 124.427*** | 380| PMBP              |

Notes: ***=p<0.001  
**=p<0.05
The hypotheses were developed to show that LGs PM best practices are partly influenced by their employees' PSM levels measured by three main motives that compel them to join LGs. The first motive that compels and explains why employees choose to work with public institutions is based on rationality. With this motive, employees are attracted to the policymaking processes of LGs and view their presence there as a contribution to protecting the public interest. The second motive involves normative assumptions of institutions. The norm-based motive is premised on the assumption that organizations exist to perform a communal duty to society and therefore, by fulfilling this motive, employees help their LGs to achieve their core mandate and mission. And the third motive is that LGs employees’ behaviours are influenced by affective feelings where employees see their service to the larger social system as being above their interest. LG employees believe that this ‘call to service’ and the perceived impact of their work transcend beyond their immediate environment. The focus of affective motives measured by compassion and self-sacrifice is for employees to see the social benefits of their work to minorities and the less-privileged at the local level. In this paper, PSM was examined at five levels to give a clearer picture of the unique contributions of each of the scales on PMBPs, and how employees PSM levels can influence these bundles.

H1 examined the relationship between employees’ scores on the individual scales of the PSM construct and the combined PMPs of their LGs, and the results showed that they were correlated. Although this relationship has been empirically demonstrated in many studies (Andersen et al., 2014; Christensen et al., 2017; Homberg & McCarthy, 2015; Moynihan & Pandey, 2007) about employees viewing their work as contributions to the larger society and its impact on minorities, the results demonstrate that the mixed findings identified in previous studies of the PSM construct might have been due to factors specific to the context or the setting (Kim et al., 2012; Perry & Hondeghem, 2008; Vandenabeele, 2008).

In the Ghanaian LG system, we found that ‘ATTRACT’, ‘COMM’, ‘CID’, ‘COMP’, and ‘SS’ are all correlated with the four scales of PMPs. Further analysis using regression revealed that ‘compassion’ and ‘self-sacrifice did not contribute any unique variance to the prediction of combined PMP in our LG sample. This finding provides further evidence to support Cun (2012), Perry & Hondeghem (2008), and Kim et al. (2012) findings that employees PSM levels are influenced by organizational setting, socialization process, and culture and hence, this finding may require further testing in different organizational settings in the Ghanaian experience to conclude.
H2 indicated that there is a positive and significant effect of total employees PSM levels and combined PMP of LGs. Overall; the results support the findings of Moynihan et al. (2012), Kroll & Vogel (2013) who found that public managers PSM levels were significantly associated with performance information use of federal governments. Performance information use is a key component of a PM system and hence, the combined effect of the PSM construct was significant contributing about 24.7 per cent to explain the variance in PMP of LGs in this sample. This study may suggest that the PSM scores of employees are important in determining the effectiveness of LGs PM best practices. For example, LGs may vary the PM process by relying on employees with higher levels of PSM to encourage and lead the change process, especially in new performance regimes in developing countries contexts. However, the absence of the significant contributions of ‘compassion’ and ‘self-sacrifice’ as separate variables on PMP in this sample may require further analysis. The two scales constitute the highest scores on the PSM construct (Perry, 1996). However, this sample showed no significant effect of the two on PMP. The implication is that PSM is suitable for predicting relationships when it is used as a single construct (Perry et al. 2010). Nonetheless, this finding may require further research with different samples and in a different organizational setting to conclude (Cun, 2012; Kim et al. 2012).

The implications of this research for practitioners in LGs’ indicate that management practices should be both rational and normative to elicit positive employee behaviour in public organizations. Subsequently, increasing LG activities that encourage and release employees’ rational and norm-based motives through ATTRACT, COMM, and CID is associated with positive outcomes of their PMBPs which is important for overall organizational performance (Vandenabeele, 2009). LGs should seek to reinforce their employees’ COMP and SS behaviour that will lead to effective outcomes on management practices such as strategic planning, PME, PEREREVIEW, and PERIMP. Further, LGs should develop frameworks that allow every employee the opportunity to take part in the strategic formulation of organizational goals and to allow them to participate in the policymaking and implementation process at the local level.

4. Conclusion

This study was limited to the use of a cross-sectional design with data collected only from one LG administrative region involving 11 MMAs in the national capital. To compensate for this shortfall, the sample size was randomly distributed among the 11 MMAs to avoid common response
bias. The use of a single geographical region of LG employees has the potential limitation of common source bias. Since this is an exploratory study, there is a need to expand the cases to other regions to see whether the same results will be attained. However, in particular, LG in the GAR appears to have different incentives than those in other regions or even poor LGs and this forestalls any deficiency.

Our study contributes and adds to the literature on the relationship between PSM and PMPs by finding that higher PSM levels are significantly associated with the increases in LG PMPs. The findings also confirmed that PSM is more related to the rational motives of employees than affective motives in most cultures (Christensen et al. 2017; Cun, 2012; Kim et al. 2012). While previous studies have provided evidence to support that PSM is positively related to performance information use (Moynihhan et al. 2012), our research is one of its kind to test the PSM variable on the four bundles of PMBP. Hence, this finding requires further studies in similar and different settings to test the relationship between PSM and the PMP bundles of LGs. Of particular interest will be to test the relationship between national culture and employee PSMs levels on PMP of LGs.

This study suggested that PSM plays an important role in the study of PMBP. While the results may hold brief for the Ghanaian experience, they may have different implications for different contexts. Further studies should be conducted on the PSM construct on the four bundles of PMP as a single independent variable to support theory building as the individual treatment of the construct has yielded no significant impact on the dependent variable. While we believe that future research should be undertaken on the PSM as a single construct (Perry and Hondeghem 2008; Christensen et al. 2017), the cultural component of PSM should be addressed to strengthen theory building by including a cultural dimension of both PMPs and the PSM construct, since some cultures may support higher organizational management practices than others.
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Abbreviations

ATTRACT- attraction to policymaking
CID- Civic duty
COMM- Commitment to the public interest
COMP- Compassion
GAR- Greater Accra Region
LG- local government
LGs- local governments
MMAs- metropolitan and municipal assemblies
LGS- Local Government Service
PM- performance management
PMPs- performance management practices
PME- performance monitoring and evaluation
PERIMP- performance improvement
PEREVIEW- performance review
PSM- Public service motivation
SS- self-sacrifice
SP- strategic planning
VIF- Variance Inflation Factor