Bureaucratic politics in neopatrimonial settings: types of appointment and their implications in Ghana

Abubakar, A.

CHAPTER TWO

DISSECTING APPOINTMENT TRADITIONS IN GHANA FROM THE PRE-COLONIAL ERA TO GHANA'S FOURTH REPUBLICAN GOVERNANCE.

2.1 Introduction

Nti (1978:3) tellingly argues that "one cannot explain change or continuity except in terms of history". Based on this assertion, Ghana's checkered bureaucratic appointments history is recounted by this study through the varying political regimes with its conflicting approaches to the politics of appointments in the bureaucracy. As indicated in Chapter One, the country had undergone four republics and four military interventions over the past six decades. These republics involved competitive elections albeit occasionally interspersed with military interventions. This kind of political history has contributed to shaping the predominant bureaucratic appointment practices deployed by the elite in the country's bureaucratic history.

Recruitment or appointment into Ghana's bureaucracy has had a long history, reinforcing the intensely political, competitive and polarised environment within which bureaucrats operate and the myth of the politics-administration dichotomy in Ghana (Ayee, 2013). A discussion of the account of the politics of appointment history of Ghana would, therefore, be adequately addressed by categorising its historical antecedents into a periodic account of the Ghanaian political history; thus, the pre-independence period up to 1957, post-independence period of 1957 – 1966, 1966 – 1992 and 1992 till date. This historical categorisation is significant because Ghana's post-independence history has a checkered character defined by long periods of military interventions and punctuated by brief interludes of civilian rule under the second (1969-72) and third (1979-81) republics. Within this period of history, the country's inability to sustain a government for 3 years without military intervention had profound ramifications for bureaucratic appointments. Therefore, it is impossible to have a meaningful historical account of the politics of appointment in Ghana without the context of the categorisation of the country's political history. This is because

it was only in the early 1990s after a decade of quasi-military rule by the Provisional National Defence Council (PNDC) that the country evolved into a stable state. This culminated in the promulgation of a new constitution in 1992 and the relaunch or inauguration of another attempt at multiparty democracy. This ushered Ghana into a new dawn of democratic governance under the fourth republic. The next section, therefore, begins with Ghana's bureaucratic history from pre-independence.

2.2 Patrimonialism and pre-independence dynamics of patronage relations in Ghana.

To begin with the period of pre-independence (before 1957), analysts of Ghanaian politics suggest that the politics of bureaucratic appointments derived its underpinning from deep historical and structural roots, resulting in the continent's failure to establish a formal economy large enough to displace the informal economy (North *et al.*, 2009; Khan, 2010). According to North *et al.* (2009) and Khan (2010), public organisations in Africa failed to displace personalised networks within bureaucratic structures where meritocracy and due process were supposed to be celebrated while programmatic forms of party politics also failed to replace traditional patrimonial relations (Levy, 2014). Berman (1998: 305) argued that modern African ethnicity is "a social construction of the colonial period through the reactions of pre-colonial societies to the social, economic, cultural and political forces of colonialism." African states were historically saddled in alliances with local "Big Men", creating ethnically-defined administrative units linked to patron-client relations. Berman (1998) maintained that the colonial legacy of "bureaucratic authoritarianism", "pervasive patron-client relations" coupled with "complex ethnic fragmentation" had persisted up to post-colonial societies. Since then, patron-client networks have remained a core state-society linkage accounting for the "personalistic", "materialistic" and "opportunistic" character of African politics (Vansina,1990). The relations of power in pre-colonial Africa were characteristically those of patrons and clients or principals and agents. This unquestionably wedged the merit-based approach that the colonial governments later attempted to establish for the purposes of

administration as a legacy to be bequeathed to the newly found independent states. In Berman's (1998: 310) view, "big men presided over intricate networks of agents involving reciprocal but unequal relations with small boys…".

The colonial state of the Gold Coast (now Ghana) was basically a reproduction of a systemic institution of political domination for control of areas and districts occupied mainly by peasants. This arrangement was linked to reflections of neo-traditionalist ideologies of patriarchal nature (Mozaffar, 1995). The observed model of political control in the colonial state was that of divide and rule, effectively curtailing revolt on a large scale (Mozaffar, 1995). According to Arriola (2009), this strategy was used as a means to discourage likely opponents from rallying by distributing patronage to clients and agents. Among the interrelationships in the colonial era, the most salient was European district administrators and local rulers, where these local rulers provided conduits between the colonial state and African societies with clear symptoms of patron-client and principal-agent relations popularly coined in political parlance as "indirect rule" (Vansina, 1990).

The European administrators patronised both local rulers and the emerging indigenous elite with streams of income which more or less served as a reward for cooperation and compliance (Berman, 1998). The disbursement of such patronage inducements reflected the "benefits" of colonial rule in the eyes of recipients; thereby, cementing their loyalties and consolidating the state as the source of benefits of development albeit with a partisan veil (Mozaffar, 1995). Most importantly, it established patron/client and principal-agent relations not only as the primary access to the state's resources but also, as in pre-colonial society, the relationship between ordinary people and the elite (Vansina, 1990). The local rulers, through their acquired wealth, also dispensed patronage inducements to their acquaintances and supporters while through the abuse of power, extorted or punished perceived detractors under their control (Berman, 1998). As principal clients of the colonial state, local rulers were the most powerful patrons within their locality and became

the architects of patronage networks in statures of eminence in a vicious cycle of dependence in colonial societies like the Gold Coast (Berman, 1998). These networks within the context of local administration were mostly ethnically defined (Berman, 1998).

Progressively, however, in the 19th century, with the advent of educated indigenes, an elite class emerged and became both prestigious and powerful, effectively changing the traditional patron-client relations of peasants and local rulers to new power relations and networks between the educated elite and the commoners. Eventually, the erstwhile Gold Coast in 1850 under British colonial rule through the elite established its own legislative council with the primary aim of advising the colonial Governor in crafting laws and ordinances (Bennion, 1962). The issue that dominated the elite at that time in the Gold Coast was, thus, the need for more representation in the legislative council to enhance their elitist or prestigious status as opposed to independence (Bennion, 1962).

It was then clear that the British colonial government's approach of governance fit into the "elite model" which focuses on the influence exercised by powerful individuals or groups; that is, power was concentrated in the hands of a privileged few (Cochran *et al.*, 2009). In definitional terms, Lasswell (1952) defines elite as those with the greatest status, prestige and access or control of values within polities. The "elite", in this context, refers to individuals who hold privileged positions in society or organisations (Fukai & Fukui, 1992). The elite used by the colonial government was thus "set apart from the rest of society by their pre-eminence in political and governmental hierarchies". The existence of the elite group, thus, suggests the existence of a hierarchy and an uneven distribution of politically and socially valuable resources (Fukai & Fukui, 1992). From the above, it can be deduced that the elite will always be the "minority" with privileged access to influence and resources. Within the Gold Coast context, patronage relations were not a prerogative of a single actor but different contending and interested elites with "power brokers" on the side. The historical narrative of the colonial African states was, therefore,

construed as authoritarian administrative machinery of control via the elite as opposed to a democratisation process (Ranger, 1993).

According to Kimble (1963), nationalism began to gain momentum around the end of the 19th century and early in the 20th century. It was fuelled by the formation of an elitist Aborigines Rights Protection Society (ARPS) comprising of chiefs and lawyers and the National Congress of British West Africa (NCBWA). This political mobilisation with the spirit of nationalism was formed with elitist youths such as J.B Danquah who was at the forefront (Apter, 1963). These elites began to press home certain demands like statuses in the colonial administration. This included the bureaucracy because, by this time of the colonial period, the top hierarchy of the bureaucracy was the preserve of the British while the educated indigenous elite whose services were required mostly occupied the lower echelons (Ayee, 1991).

Regarding human resource personnel base of the colony, educational establishments were essentially designed and restricted as a training hub for indigenes for the limited purpose of performing administrative roles. This did not include how to run capitalist enterprises; thereby, limiting opportunities to train these indigenes to serve the needs of the wider ordinary citizenry (Ranger, 1993). However, the widely held perception was that engagement with the colonial state came with risks and favours; that is, favours to multiple resources at the disposal of the elite and the state as well as the risks of its capricious penalties (Berman, 1998). These associated risks required mitigation through the support of the elite, hence, fostering the reciprocal dependence of agents seeking patrons and vice versa. This led to a "big man-small boy" politics in the colonial regime (Ranger, 1993). While networks in the colonial societies were also shaped by ethnic identities like the "Fante Confederacy" in the Gold Coast, the "politics of the belly" also emerged within the social relations of the colonial state (Bayart, 1993).

For the bureaucracy, these strategies employed by the colonial regime to administer the colony was simultaneously orchestrated along with the establishment of a British bureaucratic

system founded along the Weberian models of merit in the colonial administration of the Gold Coast. The colonial bureaucracy was initially lean and primarily focused on civil and local government services with a specific fiat to securing "Pax Britannica" or "British Peace" after the global hegemonic power tilted towards the British empire (Morris, 2002; Ayee, 2019). The civic arrangement of the colony was, therefore, heavily influenced by the British system of administration for obvious reasons, albeit with occasional modifications as and when nationalism and struggle for independence became more intense.

The first real structural attempt by the colonial regime towards a merit-based bureaucracy in the Gold Coast was witnessed when self-rule became imminent. Only then was a PSC established in 1951 to advise the colonial regime on issues relating to appointments in the bureaucracy, including the management of competitive entrance examinations into the civil service, transfers and the disciplinary control of public officers (Ayee, 2019). Thus, the structural foundation of Ghana's professionalised and merit-based tradition was laid with the establishment of the PSC in 1951. As argued by Muwanga-Barlow (1978) and Adamolekun (2002), the bureaucratic system which was bequeathed to Ghana at independence was modelled per the Weberian concept. By independence, competitive elections between indigenous political foes began to reinvigorate deeper patronage relations within the public space, including the bureaucracy, since it became a basis for political support and access to the higher levels of influence (Young, 1986). Consequently, the solid unity demonstrated by the nationalist elite against colonialism in the pre-colonial era began to witness damaging cracks as these elites exploited the ethno-regionally based politics which began to emerge in the decolonisation era and became extremely antagonistic (Asante & Gyimah-Boadi, 2004).

In 1951, legislative assembly elections were held based on political parties and universal adult suffrage. Two political parties led by Dr J. B. Danquah and Dr Kwame Nkrumah of the United Gold Coast Convention (UGCC) and the Convention People's Party (CPP) respectively

contested the elections seeking to govern the country after the exit of colonial rulers. Eventually, Gold Coast became independent on the 6th of March 1957 with a new name *Ghana* under the leadership of Dr Kwame Nkrumah. Nkrumah's success was underpinned by the grassroots and the mass party character of the CPP as opposed to the UGCC of Dr J. B. Danquah which was perceived as elitist. Indeed, the era of the end of World War II marked the beginning of an age of political mobilisation that effectively ceased to be the exclusive preserve of the elite.

However, after independence, due to the nature of reciprocal relations in the pre-colonial era, during colonial rule and the politics preceding independence, attitudes and behaviour were seemingly influenced in the post-colonial bureaucracy as it became a financial reservoir for those who managed it and for the political principals who lead it (Bayart, 1993). The result was a clear extension of principal-agent networks to the very centre of the state apparatus, with their ramifying linkages reaching from the cabinet to the village, to produce what Bayart graphically describes as the rhizome state (Bayart, 1993). Currently, principal-agent or patron-client networks have travelled beyond the state to co-opt other social groups such as religious groupings (churches), trade unions, professional associations and other organisations which are trans-political communities that represent personal and secular interests in modern society (Ngunyi, 1995). Real-life governmental issues such as economic decline, reforms and the snail pace of how resources trickle down to the masses exacerbated reliance on patron/client relations in Ghana. The next section will endeavour to examine Ghana's bureaucratic appointment politics and history from independence to the end of the first republic in 1966.

Table 1:

Ideological Types of Bureaucratic Appointments in Ghana.

Type of Appointment	Conceptual Features	Period
Predominantly Merit	*Inspired by Weberian Model*	*1951 - 1957*
Predominantly Patronage	*Inspired by Neopatrimonialism*	*1957 - 1992*
Predominantly Hybrid	*Inspired by NPM reforms*	*1993– till date*

2.3 The politics of bureaucratic Appointments Birthed by Nkrumah's *Africanisation Agenda*.

From independence under the first republic i.e. 1957 – 1966, as indicated earlier, the bureaucratic system that was bequeathed to Ghana from the British colonial regime at independence was modelled along with a Weberian bureaucracy (Muwanga-Barlow, 1978; Adamolekun, 2002). The bureaucracy was structured per a British merit-based model which was characterised by apolitical features such as professionalism, neutrality, impartiality and anonymity in the execution of the Ghanaian public interest (Amonoo, 1981; McSheffrey, 1983). Despite these features during the colonial rule, one predominant distinctive feature of the country's bureaucracy was that British expatriates dominated the top tiers of the bureaucracy while the indigenes were at the lower echelons. To this end, Dr Kwame Nkrumah, the new president in post-independent Ghana, undertook aggressive "Africanisation" of Ghana's bureaucrats aimed at reversing the trend of expatriate dominance. In the process, he effectively dismantled the merit-based system of appointments established by the colonial authorities.

That is, the Africanisation of the bureaucracy was aimed at substituting all colonials with loyal indigenes, particularly in the spheres of policy advice and formulation. This was complemented with significant increases in the salaries of indigene clerks and other bureaucratic

personnel (Appiah, 1979; Sigman, 2015). This exercise of substituting expatriates mostly at the top echelons of the bureaucracy with loyal indigenes ostensibly to eradicate remnants of colonialism through the Africanisation of the service became a defining moment in the Ghanaian bureaucratic history (Omaboe, 1966). According to Bennell (1982: 148), "in many respects, the Africanisation of the civil service became the most important political issue during the 1950s because the replacement of British bureaucrats by Africans was considered to be the fundamental precondition for the attainment of true independence".

As a result, political principals under Nkrumah's era sought to control both policymaking and bureaucratic management. This meddling of political principals also in turn ultimately created tensions, antagonistic relationships and mistrust between new political bureaucrats and career bureaucrats because career bureaucrats had, hitherto, carried themselves around with a feeling of superiority since their status was bestowed by law (Omaboe, 1966; Amonoo, 1981). This was partly due to the unconscious acceptance of the dichotomy by the career bureaucrats who claimed fiduciary powers for policy implementation (Adarkwa & Ohemeng, 2015). The relationship between politicians and bureaucrats was, therefore, defined in this context (Amonoo, 1981; Gyimah-Boadi & Rothchild, 1990). Politicians sought to become policymakers as well as implementers ahead of career bureaucrats, posing a master-servant relationship (Omaboe, 1966; Amonoo, 1981; Appiah, 2006; Ayee, 2013).

From independence, the ideological underpinnings of government projects and the speed with which the erstwhile Nkrumah government desired to execute those projects contributed to the patronage politics within the bureaucracy (Amonoo, 1981; Appiah, 2006). This is because the bureaucracy had been perceived by the incumbent political principals as an "uncooperative" bunch of technocrats deserving replacement with loyalists (Amonoo, 1981; Gyimah-Boadi & Rothchild, 1990; Appiah, 2006). Gyimah-Boadi & Rothchild (1990: 233) noted that Nkrumah resolved that "he would see to it that there were no 'civil masters' but 'civil servants' carrying out the policy

decided by the cabinet". Because Nkrumah suspected bureaucrats and questioned their loyalty, he did all he could between the period of 1957 - 1966 to gain control over the bureaucracy through patronage (Amonoo, 1981; Ayee, 2001). He is reported to have stated his intention to eradicate disloyal bureaucrats even if by so doing he suffers some temporary dislocation as according to him, "disloyal civil servants are no better than saboteurs" (Nkrumah, 1961: 173). His inclination to establish and centralise control of bureaucratic institutions during his presidency compounded the HRM difficulties (Ayee, 1991).

By 1965, Nkrumah had concentrated power at the centre as a bureaucratic management strategy. To illustrate this point, he established the State Enterprises Secretariat whose hierarchy was filled with the political party faithful (Ayee, 2019). He further established a Civil Service Commission to coexist with the PSC (Clerk, 1972) but later curtailed the PSCs jurisdiction by excluding "all organisations other than the civil service and its powers as regards the appointments of heads and deputies of departments" (Nti, 1975: 170). He eventually dissolved the PSC and merged it with the Establishment Secretariat under complete political control (Muwanga-Barlow, 1978). Even worse, he co-opted bureaucrats into the Kwame Nkrumah Ideological Institute (Aryee, 1991). The regime also cloaked itself with the ability to dismiss bureaucrats in situations of perceived disloyalty to the state or "the African project" (Ayee, 2001). Accordingly, the bureaucracy became a device used in attaining parochial political interests through appointed loyalists to the detriment of merit-based personnel or overall bureaucratic efficiency (Akinnusi, 1991). Some scholars of Ghanaian bureaucratic history painted a very bleak picture of those events to the point that Ayee (1991: 291) delivered a damning verdict on Nkrumah's management of the bureaucracy as "…one [was] tempted to say that Ghana had become almost a classic example of an administrative system on the verge of collapse" via poor bureaucratic personnel practices.

By the time of the overthrow of Nkrumah in 1966, the relationship between bureaucrats and political principals was one of an uneasy tension (Amonoo, 1981). Gyimah-Boadi & Rothchild

(1990) reported that the regime was not keen to entrust the corporate and developmental responsibility to the old-line career-oriented (merit) bureaucrats since it regarded them as routine-minded, conservative and non-committed. Hence, it sought to limit merit-based professionals and bureaucrats to conservative or traditional routine functions while using patronage appointments to run much of the bureaucracy (Adarkwa & Ohemeng, 2015). This uneasy or toxic relationship between the Nkrumah regime and the bureaucracy contributed to the momentum which eventually saw the demise or military overthrow of the Nkrumah regime in 1966. Indeed, the period following the Nkrumah regime also marked another noteworthy epoch in Ghana's bureaucratic history. Therefore, the next section will focus on the conflated but significant brief and long periods of civilian and military rules from 1966 to 1992 and its impact on Ghana's bureaucratic appointment politics.

2.4 From NLC to PNDC – The flip-flops of personnel strategy for the bureaucracy.

The occurrences between the demise of the Nkrumah regime to the end of the PNDC era (1966 - 1992) can best be described as a roller-coaster relationship between bureaucrats and political principals. The government changed often, mainly through military takeovers, except when there were civilian administrations in 1969 - 1972 and 1979 – 1981 respectively. Corruption in the bureaucracy was perceived to be widespread, severely damaging its reputation, and this translated an already precarious situation into an abyss, especially under the succeeding military regimes (Adarkwa & Ohemeng, 2015).

The National Liberation Council – NLC (the military regime which overthrew Nkrumah) in 1966 was made up of top military and senior officers who assumed policy-making roles while other ranking military officers were appointed to run the bureaucracy and remain answerable to these top military commanders (Asante, 2005). However, it is argued that bureaucrats still retained some significant status during this period in terms of their relationship with their military principals. Of the relationship between political principals (military and civilian) and bureaucrats

before the PNDC days, Gyimah-Boadi & Rothchild (1990) noted that the succeeding ruling military and civilian regimes worked in collaboration with bureaucrats who maintained their influence from this association as professionals or experts. The NLC in some respects sought to depoliticise the service. It tried to establish a hearty relationship with the bureaucrats byreplacing political appointees with career bureaucrats (Gyimah-Boadi & Rothchild, 1990) while economic policymaking also involved the technocrats and bureaucrats alongside the business community of the NLC's National Economic Council. According to Kosack (2012), the NLC government simulated the British since under that regime, bureaucrats were at the centre whilst the NLC ruled at the periphery via coalitions with chiefs and through centrally appointed bureaucrats.

The 1969 election which ushered in the second republic was fiercely contested between K. A. Busia's United Party (UP) and K. A Gbedemah's National Alliance of Liberals (NAL) with profound characteristics. In the end, Busia's UP was victorious, and the politics of the bureaucracy which ensued are of significance to this study. The Busia regime (1969-1972) did not significantly vary from the NLC style of governance, i.e. technocrats dominating the government's economic team. However, these technocrats were from outside the bureaucracy, i.e. international development agencies such as the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund - IMF (Libby, 1976). The policy-making arena was therefore reserved for political principals and technocrats from International development agencies, "resulting in the external co-optation of the policymaking process in Ghana" (Ohemeng, 2019: 221).

Moreover, the ethnic backgrounds of the two leading parties and the voting pattern did not help matters that unfolded after the 1969 election (Asante & Gyimah Boadi, 2004). Significantly, the disqualification of K. A. Gbedemah, an Ewe as the leader of the opposition NAL effectively reinforced the perception of marginalisation of Ewes within this era, especially under Busia's administration. This marginalisation was exacerbated by the deposing of senior military officers of Ewe origin in the Ghana armed forces (Asante & Gyimah Boadi, 2004). This was followed by

the discharge of 568 bureaucrats by the Busia regime apparently under the 1969 Constitutional transition provisions to address the widely held view that Ewes were more represented within senior bureaucrats of the civil service (Asante & Gyimah-Boadi, 2004). This redundancy and retrenchment exercise was perceived by Ewes as a deliberate targeting and exclusionary measure and only deepened the Ashanti-Ewe rivalries. Darkwa *et al.* (2006) maintained that this retrenchment exercise referred to in Ghanaian history as "Apollo 568" highly politicised the bureaucracy and further polarised the country. Critics of the policy contended that it was a clear case of political patronage as it was seen as "getting rid" of bureaucrats deemed to be foes of the incumbent political principals (Owusu, 1972; Amamoo, 2000).

This Asante-Ewe ethnic rivalry in the NLC and Busia-Progress Party regimes with bureaucratic appointment politics undertone was to later affect the next military government under Colonel Acheampong's National Redemption Council (NRC) (1972-75) and Supreme Military Council I – SMC I (1975-78). In an attempt to ensure the ethnic and regional balance of the ruling Council, the Acheampong regime tried to foster de-politicisation and promote a merit-based professional civil service to avoid the mistakes of the Busia regime (Rothchild, 1978). In this regard, the NRC/SMC promulgated the "Redemption Charter" which sought to establish "party-less" politics in Ghana and a Union Government (Unigov) system characterised by military cum civilian power-sharing arrangements. These two strategies were thought to be a compromising position by the NRC/SMC between Nkrumah's authoritarian rule and Busia's multi-party civilian rule which was presented as an alternative under the auspices of the military regime (Chazan, 1983). However, Acheampong's Unigov concept which aimed at promoting national unity, the professionalisation of the civil service and decreasing patronage politics and tensions through no-party politics was very disappointing (Asante & Gyimah-Boadi, 2004). The referendum in 1977 was supposed to validate the concept but turned out to be politically divisive and cemented the plot which culminated in a palace coup in 1979, ushering in SMC 2 under General F. W. K Akuffo's leadership (Chazan, 1983).

The multi-party election that was staged in 1979 virtually brought to the fore, once again, Ghana's ethnic constituency cleavages, with Ewes voting massively against the Popular Front Party (PFP) because of a perception that its candidate, Victor Owusu (an Ashanti) was ethnocentric (Asante & Gyimah-Boadi, 2004). The People's National Party (PNP), as well, gained popularity in the northern regions because its candidate, Dr Hilla Limann was considered a "native son" and that contributed to his success in the general polls. With this third force from the PNP driving its political muscle from the North, the Asante-Ewe rivalry had been temporarily curtailed in the third republic under the Limann-PNP administration. His regime was however short-lived with the military revolution of the Provisional National Defence Council (PNDC) led by Flt. Lt. J.J. Rawlings.

The politics of bureaucratic appointments witnessed under the PNDC era recorded contentious relationships and tensions between political principals and bureaucrats which later culminated or coincided with the NPM reforms sweeping across the globe with support from the Bretton woods institutions. Before the PNDC, the bureaucracy had suffered from the economic plights that afflicted the country in the 1970s. The salaries of bureaucrats were weakened by rising inflation, and some civil servants exited the country for greener pastures (Herbst, 1993; Ayee, 2001; Werlin, 2003). Also, the bureaucracy's capacity to perform its routine roles was extremely constrained (Nti, 1980). Thus, "by 1981, the evidence pointed to a service which was beset with a myriad of capacity problems" (Appiah, 2006: 12). The next military government (PNDC) partly held the bureaucracy to account for the socio-economic and political woes the country was bedevilled with and characterised it as an "agent of imperialism and neo-colonialism" deserving redundancy as opposed to reform (Ayee, 1993: 28).

Generally, the bureaucracy was blamed for corruption, red-tapism, inadequate productivity, inefficiency and vestiges of neo-colonialism with undemocratic leadership (Appiah, 2006). The military regime, therefore, established revolutionary organs such as the People's

Defence Committees (PDC) and Workers Defence Committees (WDC) in various locations, including the bureaucracy. The WDCs were created to help in formulating and implementing government policies; however, their spirit and letter smacked of patronage in both character and policy execution (Ohemeng, 2019). Within this period, a significant number of bureaucrats were retrenched while others were prosecuted for corruption in public tribunals set up by the revolution (Hutchful, 1997; Adarkwa & Appiah, 2006; Ohemeng, 2015).

In the almost-eleven-year governance (1981 to 1992) of the military PNDC, a myriad of reforms and political changes affected bureaucrats and their relationship with political principals. This was especially when the regime signed up to the structural adjustment through economic recovery programmes occasioned by the Britton Woods institutions (IMF and WB). The Britton Woods institutions insisted on the adoption of the NPM approach. This practically returned the country to external co-optation of the policymaking process with international development agencies (Libby, 1976) while excluding bureaucrats from the discussions and implementation of programmes' core aspects (Hutchful, 1997). The NPM model sought to improve the management of resources in the bureaucracy with the insistence on merit rather than the length of service as the basis for promotion, the introduction of a performance appraisal system based on target setting and revision of the Civil Service Law. The signing of performance agreements and contracts with the respective ministries had remained an essential part of the appointment of top bureaucrats under the NPM reform. These tools were employed not only for efficiency but also to redirect bureaucrats to achieve the goals of their respective sectors (Ayee, 2000). The ensuing discussion will, therefore, focus on the NPM oriented civil service reform in Ghana since the beginning of democratic governance under the fourth republic and its role in the growth of a hybrid model regarding bureaucratic appointment strategies.

2.5 Ghana's 4th Republican Democracy & Bureaucratic Appointments under NPM Reform.

Ghana returned to constitutional rule in January 1993 when the fourth Republic was born.

Since 1992, the country has held seven successful multi-party elections. The peaceful transfer of power from the government of the NDC to the NPP following national elections in December 2000, the transfer of power again from the NPP to NDC in 2008 and vice versa in 2016 demonstrate how far Ghana has travelled along the path of democratic consolidation. These periods (2000, 2008 and 2016) have witnessed three alternating governments between the NDC and NPP so far between an interval of eight years in turn. Indeed, with these significant developments, Ghana passed Samuel Huntington's (1991) "two turnover test" of democratic consolidation whilst the country's democratisation is touted as one of the political success stories in Africa (Gyimah-Boadi 2008; Whitfield & Jones 2008). The ensuing discussion will, therefore, proceed to look at structural reforms and the politics surrounding the bureaucracy in Ghana since its return to constitutional democracy.

Within the context of bureaucratic reform politics, various stakeholders underscored that the fundamental barrier to the government's efficient performance was the persistent corruption, over-centralisation with undemocratic leadership occasioned by patronage (Appiah, 2006). Thus, "by 1981, the evidence pointed to a service which was beset with a myriad of capacity problems" (Appiah, 2006: 12). Under democratic governance, the government rolled out major reforms designed to invigorate efficiency in policy implementation while also redefining the mutual relationship between the bureaucrats and political principals. The proponents of reform believed that when government function is advanced from a business viewpoint, bureaucrats can flexibly and innovatively run the business of the bureaucracy for greater productivity (Kettl, 2012). The fundamental hypothesis of this viewpoint is embodied in the NPM propositions where the emphasis is placed on elements such as bureaucratic autonomy, decentralisation, deregulation and positive interpersonal attitudes and behaviour in bureaucratic management (Osborne & Gaebler, 1992). Under NPM, bureaucracies with political support, autonomy and clarity of goals are presumed to be responsive and effective (Wilson, 1989). Cohen (1998) argued that bureaucrats need freehand and political cooperation to manage with autonomy since this will afford them the

space to apply their skills, knowledge and abilities in the pursuit of public interest (Bowman & West, 2007). In favour of NPM ideals, Cohen (1998) further argued that the necessary political environment to trigger the efficiency of bureaucrats is increased autonomy, commitment and flexibility in the implementation of public policies and programmes.

In Ghana, however, scepticism about implications of the NPM reforms under its personnel deregulation system and the decreasing influence of the political principal over bureaucrats as a result of curtailed direct political appointments led to the amplification of a hybrid set of home-grown reforms. On the face value, propositions of NPM reforms weakened the political principal's traditional control mechanisms through patronage appointments as a result of personnel deregulation; this effectively reduced the traditional grip of political principals on bureaucrats (Peters & Pierre, 2004). Because politicians were still held accountable and responsible irrespective of the loss of control they suffered, it necessitated politicians to look for other ways of guaranteeing responsiveness by tempering with the traditional merit-based appointment processes. This resulted in the subtle and overt injection of political sensitivity criteria in appointing bureaucrats to elicit political responsiveness. While sceptics maintain that such reforms have opened the door for the political principals to slither in patronage appointments, Ingraham (1987) and Heclo (1988) argued that such appointments serve as a conduit through which the political principals exercise oversight responsibility for the bureaucracy. Ingraham (1987) maintained that since political appointments originate from the constitutional realities of the democratic process, such appointees who occupy key portfolios can exploit the nebulous nature of some aspects of the law to fulfil policy objectives of the political principal.

It is noteworthy to concede that past bureaucratic reforms under Busia (1969 - 1972) and Acheampong (1972 – 1978) experimented variations of hybrid appointments albeit at comparatively less pronounced or formal levels before the advent of homegrown NPM reforms which formalised the phenomenon. The new Ghanaian civil service law of 1993 thus provided the

legislative framework for the modified homegrown NPM reform programme as it fundamentally streamlined the structure of the bureaucracy. The law included the creation of the Head of Civil Service portfolio analogous to a ministerial rank which was distinct from the post of the secretary to the cabinet. It also included the re-designation of the position of Principal Secretaries (PS) as Chief Directors (CD) in charge of sector ministries and the OHCS. These CDs were appointed based on both merit and partisanship (Ohemeng, 2019).

Due to the criterion of merit and politics, the CD position was open to others from outside the bureaucracy as opposed to prevailing conventions in the bureaucracy (Ayee 1991; Barnes, 2014). Previously, only career bureaucrats were appointed as PS and beyond (Head of Civil Service). However, under the New Civil Service Law of 1993 which established the two positions (the head of civil service as well as the CD), both positions had effectively become quasi-professional and political, paving the way for persons from outside the bureaucracy to be appointed. The strategic nature of the position of CD within the bureaucracy was apparent since it was the interface between the political principals and bureaucratic employees (from top to rank and file). This reveals how vital it was that a CD is considered as responsive to the political principal and the current government. It also explained why hybrid considerations were applied.

For instance, in 1994, the norm of appointing career bureaucrats to head the civil service was flouted by the NDC (I) regime as the government appointed Dr Robert Dodoo (a *Ga* who was an executive of the Prices and Incomes Board, a subvented organisation) as the Head of the Civil Service (OHCS). This appointment initially sparked controversies in the media and protest within the service because he was not a career civil servant. Since then, the position of the head of the civil service has been a subject of both political and professional considerations. Not surprisingly, upon assumption of office in 2001, the NPP (I) regime asked Dr Dodoo to "proceed on leave" and to hand over to K. Obeng Adofo (an Akan and the CD of the OHCS) as the acting head of the OHCS until 2003 when the regime appointed Dr Alex Glover- Quartey (a *Ga*), as the substantive

head of the service (The Civil Service Journal Vol. 1 No.1, 2003).

Consequently, the homegrown NPM induced bureaucratic personnel reforms paved the way for principals to appoint their loyalists into portfolios formerly reserved for purely merit-based appointees. While critics argue that such appointments encourage abuses that probably exacerbate tension in the system and have a potential to reduce bureaucratic efficiency, many others argue that a hybrid system is essential to facilitate a government's effectiveness (Moe, 1985; Heclo, 1988; Cohen, 1998). Lorentzen (1985) argued that a thriving administration is fuelled by change and continuity in that while change is propelled by frequent turnover of political bureaucrats, the career bureaucrats sustain continuity. He further argued that external scrutiny is a necessary weapon to curb sabotage or complacency in the bureaucracy (Lorentzen, 1985).

To conclude on NPM and the hybrid model, there are still obvious concerns of political control over bureaucrats by politicians even under the NPM reforms; however, the challenge should not concern issues of legitimate oversight responsibility for the bureaucrats by principals through their loyalists, but rather how that legitimate right of the political principal has been exercised to commensurate with the ideals of bureaucratic accountability without abuses and excesses (Lorentzen, 1985; Aberbach & Rockman, 1988; Cohen, 1998). That is, the challenge is how to reconcile such reform initiatives to foster the political accountability of bureaucrats to principals rather than to worsen it. It, therefore, remains to be seen whether the hybrid model that the Ghanaian reform under NPM has amplified will manifest the envisaged outcomes of efficiency, and if so, how it impacts the attitudes and behaviour of bureaucrats and bureaucratic political responsiveness. It is in the context of this intriguing speculations that this study is conducted.

2.6 Chapter Summary

Chapter two has essentially recounted Ghana's bureaucratic appointments history through the lens of politics and regime change. From the review, it is evident that the country has experimented and transitioned between varied bureaucratic personnel strategies aimed at

efficiency and responsiveness. Certainly, the pre-colonial era was patrimonially driven between patrons and clients classically dominated by 'big-men small-boy' politics. Subsequently, the colonial period was however initially seen as elitist as few privileged educated elites gained access or space within the colonial administration and bureaucracy. However, with the establishment of the PSC in 1951, it essentially gave birth to the British modelled merit-Weberian bureaucracy in Ghana which failed to see the light of day after the exit of the colonialists. This is because the Nkrumah regime which led the country after independence prioritised regime loyalty through patronage over professionalism, thus effectively dismantling an efficiently established merit-based bureaucratic machinery which was viewed as an appendage of neo-colonialism.

Subsequently, successive civilian and military regimes attempted to customise their own bureaucratic personnel strategies aimed the efficiency. While these efforts may have been well-intentioned, the desired results were sub-optimal leading to the prescription of NPM by the Bretton woods institutions in Ghana. This led to a set of home-grown bureaucratic reform interventions and legal amendments that could best be termed as a 'hybrid' of merit and patronage strategies under the current fourth republican dispensation in Ghana. Based on this history and guided by the existing studies on Ghana and theoretical literature, the next Chapter conducts a theoretical review of these main types of bureaucratic appointments currently existing in Ghana. In this next Chapter, the review will relate the theoretical underpinnings of these types of bureaucratic appointments to the expected attitudes and behaviour at the theoretical level.