



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

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

Abubakar, A.

Citation

Abubakar, A. (2021, May 18). *Bureaucratic politics in neopatrimonial settings: types of appointment and their implications in Ghana*. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/3176462>

Version: Publisher's Version

License: [Licence agreement concerning inclusion of doctoral thesis in the Institutional Repository of the University of Leiden](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/3176462>

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

Cover Page



Universiteit Leiden



The handle <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/3176462> holds various files of this Leiden University dissertation.

Author: Abubakar, A.

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

Issue Date: 2021-05-18

CHAPTER ONE

BACKGROUND AND INTRODUCTION

1.1 Introduction

What is more complex is how the civil servant is expected to accommodate the changes created by regular movements in political leadership...There is no doubt a natural conflict of interest, created particularly in our local setting where divergent opinion is seen as anti-government. Compliance with the policies of a particular government or politician also creates a delicate situation for most civil servants, particularly the senior ones as such work ethic is misconstrued as allegiance to a particular political grouping. Ironically the civil servant is expected to show unfettered allegiance to all governments. The existing bureaucracy within the civil service structure is also perceived as deliberate delay tactics and frowned upon by politicians. (Speech delivered by former President J.J Rawlings at the Quadrennial National Delegates Congress of the Civil and Local Government Staff Association in Cape Coast, Wednesday, January 12, 2011).

Reference is made to a sunny but regular day of July 27, 2019, making good on my routine, I logged onto *myjoyonline.com*, a leading online news portal in Ghana, to apprise myself with the latest news bulletin only to notice an intriguing banner headline: *“Management, political interference leading to revenue loss – Ghana Revenue Authority (GRA) Workers Cry”*. The main contents of this news item revealed that middle and lower bureaucrats of the main revenue collecting body of Ghana, the GRA, as part of their labour union activities, held a staff durbar where the media were invited to shine a light on what they perceived as the irregular appointment of personnel whose competence is in doubt due to their poor performance. These bureaucrats bemoaned the irregular processes used in appointing those (political) bureaucrats; this created enmity among staff, especially since these appointees, in turn, appoint their cohorts as clearing agents who mostly exploit loopholes in the *exemptions regime* to clear goods at Ghana’s ports.

According to the staff, this situation breeds conflict of interests since those who secure their appointments on a silver platter “think that they should help or work for their godfathers or

superiors at the detriment of the state”. In this bulletin, the secretary of the national union of GRA Workers, Mr. Ken Tweneboa-Kodua revealed that they were poised in sending notices to the political class to put a stop to the practice of ordering (political) bureaucrats to discharge and release impounded contraband goods, failing of which “we will name and shame those who engage in excess political interference in our work.” The cry of the GRA worker’s union was only one of many similar predicaments in the complex politico-administrative context within which Ghanaian bureaucrats operate – an environment which pits them against reconciling various levels of interests, i.e. national interest, political interest and/or personal interest.

Earlier, the country rose to a different broadcast of a game-changing publication widely reported in the Ghanaian media on June 24, 2019, regarding a Supreme Court (SC) ruling. The ruling emanated from a case initiated by a private citizen, Mr Theophilus Donkor and his counsel, Mr Godwin Edudzi Tamakloe on January 4, 2017, regarding the dismissal/reassignment of all public Chief Executive Officers (C.E.O.), Director-Generals (DG) and some Chief Directors (CD) by the ruling government after they won elections in 2016, in accordance with the Presidential Transition Act (PTA) of 2012 (Act 845 amended in 2016). The bulletin specified that the ruling of the SC repealed section 14 of the PTA which requires “Chief Executives or Director-Generals (however described) of public boards or corporations to cease to hold office upon the assumption of office by a person elected as president of the Republic of Ghana, the same is hereby declared to be unconstitutional and void for being in contravention of articles 190 and 191 of the Constitution.”

The ruling held that the practice whereby top bureaucratic principals such as CEOs are asked “to step aside during a change of government was unconstitutional” and that “per Article 190 Clause 1(b) of the 1992 Constitution, public corporations were part of the public services of Ghana and, therefore, such persons were bureaucrats whose appointments were protected by the constitution.” It also held that the appointment of such bureaucrats was governed by article 195 of the constitution and their “removal must, therefore, be done per the terms and conditions of their

contract of engagement, or it must be justified, as stipulated in Article 191 (b) of the constitution.” These two instances within an epoch of two months (June and July, 2019) changed the dynamics of discussions within the Ghanaian public service arena regarding the conduct of bureaucrats in Ghana and, equally, generated interesting debates and discourses concerning the relationship between political principals and bureaucrats.

As the saying goes, “a problem identified is half-solved”, the above-cited examples illustrate part of the compelling context and dynamics which inform the choice of this study in Ghana. That is, to investigate the politics of bureaucratic appointments in Ghana by focusing on the type of civil servants’ appointments (patronage, merit, hybrid) and its consequences on civil servants’ attitudes and behaviour in the bureaucracy. Some scholars argue that as the executing agents, civil servants are expected to faithfully and zealously pursue the interests and agenda of their principals as long as they remain at post (Levitan, 1942; Gupta, 2001; Bryner, 2003; Dunn, 2004; Hill, 2005). As succinctly stated by Levitan (1942: 14), a civil servant has a “basic requirement of loyalty to a superior and... in a democracy, an additional obligation of loyalty... to the majority decision.”

However, this argument is contested by other scholars since the nature of the relationship between political principals (agenda-setters) and civil servants (agenda-implementers) has been a subject of considerable debate in bureaucratic studies (Poocharoen, 2012). The Wilsonian thesis on the subject-matter is seminal for this debate. Its long-held contention was that administration as a discipline is distinct from politics: “the field of administration is a field of business. It is removed from the hurry and strife of politics...; administrative questions are not political questions” (Wilson, 1887: 18). Weber (1968) also argued for a dichotomy between politics and the bureaucracy, albeit in a reverse direction of Wilson. This is because Weber argued that politicians are incapable of curtailng bureaucratic power, for which reason he insisted that it was essential that bureaucracy and politics are dichotomised (Weber, 1919; 1968).

However, an equally distinct but influential class of scholars argued that it is not practicable to separate the bureaucracy from politics or vice versa and that their connection could best be portrayed as complementary rather than dichotomous. Scholars such as Waldo (1948), Appleby (1949), Frederickson (1976), Svara, (1998; 1999; 2001) and Overeem (2005), through various arguments, maintained that it is impossible to expressly separate politics from bureaucracy. According to Waldo, any separation between politics and the bureaucracy is simplistic and that "...it had become common to refer to the politics administration dichotomy as an outworn if not ludicrous creed" (Waldo, 1987: 93). Frederickson (1976) even argued that since civil servants utilised their value judgments regarding public interests, politics and bureaucracy cannot be separated. Indeed, Gladieux (1952: 174) posited that while he "deplores, as do all thoughtful observers, the introduction of political influence in employment matters, I think it too much to expect in a dynamic democracy it will ever be possible to remove politics completely from public appointments. We can only seek to minimise this factor."

Towards a settlement of the above debates, Ingraham & Ban (1986; 2007) translated these broad arguments into three main bureaucratic management models: neutral competence, responsive competence and managerial competence. Ingraham & Ban (1986) explained that the neutral competence model argued for the functional separation of politics from bureaucracy, by carving out policy-making as the exclusive preserve of elected officials and political appointees while career expertise and longevity of bureaucrats compensate for political instability and change. Concerning the responsive competence model, a premium is placed on professional responsiveness to political direction. In this sense, professional competence and longevity do not necessarily compensate for political influence but are rather deployed as a means to achieve political goals.

The third cluster of managerial competence emphasises neither neutrality nor political influence, but pure professional competence and expertise. This model is similar to neutral competence; the difference, however, is related to its reliance on private-sector techniques in

the delivery of public interests. Ingraham & Ban's (1986) classification failed to settle the debate, except that it untangled the nuances of the discourse from a managerial perspective. Considering these broad debates coupled with the understanding from Mosher & Kingsley (1936) that an efficient government is only possible through responsive bureaucratic personnel; and Riccucci's (2007) argument that nothing fundamentally shapes the realm of government than its bureaucratic personnel, it is conceivable why the question of how and who is appointed into the bureaucracy have long attracted significant interest among scholars and policy-makers (Wilson, 1887; Weber, 1919; Dahlström, Lapuente & Teorell, 2012).

Indeed, much of the extant literature suggests that how civil servants are appointed into the bureaucracy can have significant consequences on their attitudes and other range of development outcomes (World Bank, 1993; Kaufmann, Kraay & Mastruzzi, 2006; Iyer & Mani, 2008). Several scholars have maintained that democracy thrives on competent and responsive delivery of public services by bureaucrats (Freedman, 1978; Rourke, 1992). In pursuit of this goal, varied government interventions by way of reforms (e.g. New Public Management - NPM) have centred on how to effectively and efficiently deliver on public goods and services in neo-patrimonial settings. As stated by the immediate past president of Ghana regarding bureaucratic efficiency during a political principal's swearing-in ceremony:

It can't be business as usual. We must learn to think outside the box and see how things can be done more efficiently than they've been done in the past. You must not follow the usual ways of carrying out your duties with the pretext 'That is how we have always done it' but rather be challenged that you can do it better and more efficiently in the interest of the people of Ghana... The bureaucracy has taken an adverse effect on delivery and so you must be able to cut down on the unnecessary bureaucracy but still do it within the framework of the law and regulations (Swearing-in by John Mahama on Wednesday, 30 January 2013 at the Castle-Osu).

One of the means to achieve this responsive and efficient delivery of public goods has

much to do with the role of human resource management systems within bureaucracies since it is the repository through which recruitment, appointment, promotion and retention of the appropriately qualified and dedicated bureaucrats are processed (Kellough & Selden, 2003). Bureaucrats, when appointed, are entrusted with the responsibility of executing government agenda (Hays & Kearney, 2001). However, bureaucratic personnel management issues have always proven to be challenging regardless of political or administrative history (Kellough & Selden, 2003). McAllister & Rose (1983:534) have long reminded us that such challenges are associated with the democratic arena, where bureaucratic personnel operate along “...the articulation of competing demands and about the authoritative resolution of competing demands by government” or “...the intersection of competing values” (Kellough & Selden, 2003: 166).

Constant competing values to reconcile political values with administrative ones for efficient delivery of public services within the bureaucratic space primarily inform the extent to which administrative discretions, responsibilities and/or political oversight are exercised (Ingraham, 1987; Osborne & Gaebler, 1992; Kellough & Selden, 2003). Substantial attention has therefore been focused on the growing incidence of varied civil service appointment types deployed by elite principals aimed at accomplishing various interests within government systems (Rourke, 1992; Iyer & Mani, 2008). Focusing on bureaucrats whose routine job is to implement the principal’s interest and agenda, the study seeks to investigate what influences bureaucrats’ attitudes and behaviour and in particular, establish whether these attitudes and behaviour are a consequence of their appointment types or not.

Based on evidence from 35 developing countries, Rauch & Evans (2000) indicate that merit-based appointments are an important determinant of performance and control of corruption. Oliveros & Schuster’s (2018) study also advances the argument that merit-based appointments curb corruption and political services by bureaucrats, while enhancing work motivation. Reports by the World Bank (WB) also attribute the economic development success of the East Asian

“Tigers” to merit-based appointments (World Bank, 1993). According to Evans & Rauch (2000), meritocracy is essential in building a capable and professionalised civil service to stimulate development. As indicated by the World Bank (1997), merit-based civil service helps in bringing together reputable bureaucrats who are motivated by prestige for good work performance to propel development. To Rauch & Evans (2000), Lewis (2008) and Gerber & Gibson (2009), merit systems with professional bureaucrats efficiently produce public goods like contract enforcement, education, security and public infrastructure that benefit the vast majority of citizens, regardless of who controls the public office. Proponents of meritocracy (Aucoin, 1997; Kanyane, 2006) argue that embracing a culture of merit-based appointment and promotion is best practice since patronage breeds prejudices and deters accountability, transparency and the advancement of national interest.

Yet, other scholars and advocates link patronage-based appointments within bureaucracies to beneficial outcomes in the forms of economic performance and democratic development (Linz & Stepan, 1996; Kaufmann *et al.*, 2006; Lambsdorff, 2006; Iyer & Mani, 2008; Grindle, 2012; Kopecký *et al.* 2012; McDonnell, 2017; Toral, 2019). Kopecký & Scherlis (2008) argue that in the European political settings, patronage appointments are seen more as vital organisational and governmental resources than detrimental political benefaction between principals and loyalists. This is because patronage appointments may not be dispensed as a mechanism to just reward loyalty, but also to exercise control over an increasingly fragmented bureaucracy needing competent trustees to map out government policies into outcomes; thereby, serving as a tool for good governance (Krause, Lewis & Douglas, 2006; Corinna & Escartin, 2014).

From a prudent perspective, a third model for bureaucratic appointment is advanced by some contemporary public administration researchers known as the hybrid/complementarity model (Peters & Pierre, 2004). This is a situation where merit selection criteria are combined (subtly or overt) together with political and personal considerations (Matheson *et al.*, 2007). Peters & Pierre (2004) posit that the contemporary incentive for political principals to make efforts to

control the bureaucracy emanates from the waning of orthodox political control mechanisms of bureaucrats occasioned by New Public Management (NPM) reforms through delegation and deregulation. Yet, these political principals are accountable and responsible to the electorate regardless of their lack of control under autonomous bureaucracies (Peters & Pierre, 2004). Therefore, scholars such as Osborne & Gaebler (1992), Ingraham *et al.* (1995) and Thompson & Riccucci (1998) underscored the need for a new paradigm which accommodate the situation where administrative and political fiats (which are different) can come together in a mutually supportive way in the pursuit of public interest. That is, a situation where “compliance coexists with independence; accommodation of political interest along with a commitment to shape and promote the public interest; deference to political principals along with adherence to the law; and appreciation of politics along with support for professional standards” (Svara, 2001: 179).

Evidently, current bureaucracies, seem to have a mix of patronage and professional civil servants even though the circumstances under which principals create these bureaucrats may vary (Huber & Ting, 2015). Putnam (1973; 1975) argued that hybrid civil servants are theoretically conceived to operate with pluralistic interests. They are aware of legitimate differing interests; therefore, are conscious of “political realities” and treat political influences on policy-making as legitimate. This explains why performing economies in the developed world including the U.S, U.K, China, Malaysia, Japan and South Korea may appear to have a mixture of patronage, merit and hybrid appointments in the civil service. For example, in the U. S, approximately 3,000 (0.25%) senior civil servants are patronage appointees capped at 10% of total executive appointments while the rest are expected to be merit-based (Orac & Rinne, 2000). Burns (2007) reports that despite political affiliates in China making up 5% of the country’s population, they occupy 80% of the bureaucracy while the rest are expected to be merit-based.

However, in SSA, the phenomenon of having various types of appointment is rooted in neopatrimonialism, colonial legacies and political history. For instance, Ghana’s (neo-patrimonial) history reveal that the country was bequeathed with a merit-based civil service by the British

colonial regime (Muwanga-Barlow, 1978; Amonoo, 1981; McSheffrey, 1983; Adamolekun, 2002). However, despite this merit-based legacy, there have been evidence and manifestations of other types of appointment such as patronage and hybrid (Kopecký, 2011; Sigman, 2015; Brierley, 2018). As argued by Ekeh (1975), this is because the experiences of colonialism in Africa have led to the emergence of two publics instead of one public (as in the case of Western countries) and that many of Africa's political woes are due to the relationship between these two publics namely "the primordial public" and "the civic public".

According to Ekeh (1975), the primordial public realm comprises aboriginal groupings, ties and sentiments which influence and determine an individual's public behaviour which may impinge on public interest. On the other hand, there is the civic public realm which is based on civil laws and structures like the constitution and the bureaucracy. It is historically associated with the colonial administration and has become identified with popular politics in post-colonial Africa (Ekeh, 1975). In Ekeh's (1975) postulation, the most outstanding characteristic of the African political situation is that the same actors simultaneously operate in both the primordial and civic publics and that the relationship between the two publics foments the unique situation that has come to characterise African bureaucratic institutions and politics.

Similarly, Clapham (1985: 49) argued that politics and patronage in Africa were due to neo-patrimonialism, and it was "the most salient type of authority" in the third world because it "corresponds to the normal forms of social organisation in pre-colonial societies." Bratton & van de Walle (1997: 62) asserted that "although neo-patrimonial practices can be found in all polities, it is the core feature of politics in Africa...Whereas personal relationships occur on the margins of all bureaucratic systems, they constitute the foundation and superstructure of political institutions in Africa". Bratton & van de Walle (1997) further buttressed this point by claiming that the pervasiveness of patronage in African bureaucracies was fuelled by features of political systems such as presidentialism and networks which are characteristics of neo-patrimonialist regimes. These arguments within the SSA context constitute the foundation for various types of bureaucratic

appointments.

Although there are many assumptions about the consequences of having varied appointment practices on the attitudes and behaviour of civil servants, direct scientific research is modest, especially in Ghana. This is because to the best of the researcher's knowledge, no studies have specifically looked at the nexus between appointment types and their consequences on bureaucrats' attitudes and behaviour in Ghana. Meanwhile, it is important to know the level of influence that a type of appointment may have on bureaucratic attitudes and behaviour because of its unswerving relevance to the performance of both the entire bureaucracy and, by extension, national development (Niskanen, 1971; Weber, 1997; Haque 2007). Hence, this study moves beyond extant literature to address this gap by obtaining novel data to assess the consequences that the types of appointment may have on bureaucrats' attitudes and behaviour.

1.2 Research Aim and Questions

This study seeks to contribute to the discourse on the extent to which types of civil service appointments shape the attitudes and behaviour of civil servants in neo-patrimonial settings, with a focus on the Ghanaian experience. An important caveat is that even though this research establishes the depths of Ghana's types of civil service appointments, it does not extensively focus on them since that has been amply established by extant research (Kopecký, 2011; Ayee, 2013; QOG, 2015; Brierley, 2017). Instead, it focuses on exploring the consequences that these established types of appointments may have on bureaucrats' attitudes and behaviour. Despite the widely held theoretical view in a corpus of public administration literature about the consequences of the types of civil servants' appointment on attitudes and behaviour, the empirical evidence is marginal in emerging democracies such as Ghana and, by extension, SSA.

Regarding the specific attitudes and behaviour of concern, the study focuses on the nature and level of bureaucrats' autonomy, loyalty, responsiveness and to whom. This is because, notwithstanding the design of Ghana's civil service to be apolitical with the goal of public interest,

the service is rife with politics, personal interests and considerable levels of polarisation (Fridy, 2007; Gyekye, 2008; Abdulai, 2009; Ayelazuno, 2009; Ayee, 2009, 2013; Whitfield, 2011; Gyimah-Boadi & Prempeh, 2012). It is, therefore, vital to understand why civil servants, despite their apolitical cloak, demonstrate varied attitudes and behaviour. This is especially when such attitudes and behaviour are in contravention with their professionalism and, in particular, to determine whether the route (type) of appointment influences such attitudes and behaviour. The justification or purpose of this study is, therefore, aimed at closing the gap between assertion and empirical research.

In this study, we aim to (in)validate the theoretical and conventional view in extant literature that within the Weberian bureaucracy, merit-based appointments influence bureaucrats' autonomy (Weber, 1919; 1948; 1968; Johnson & Libecap, 1994; Rauch & Evans, 2000; Dahlström *et al.*, 2012; Cooper, 2018). Secondly, the study aims to ascertain the theoretical postulation that under bureaucratic politicisation, bureaucrats' loyalty is significantly influenced by patronage-based appointments (Johnson & Libecap, 1994; Goetz, 1997; Du Gay, 2000; Kopecký *et al.* 2012; Veit & Scholz, 2016). Finally, the study aims to determine the extent to which hybrid-based appointments induced by NPM reforms shape bureaucrats' level of responsiveness (Appleby, 1949; Friedrichson, 1976; Waldo, 1987; Svava, 1999, 2000; Peters & Pierre, 2004; Page, 2007).

Based on the omnibus hypothesis that the type of a civil servant's appointment will influence his/her attitudes and behaviour within the bureaucracy, the overarching research question this study seeks to answer is "To what extent does type of appointment (merit, patronage, hybrid) influence the attitudes and behaviour (autonomy, loyalty, responsiveness) of civil servants in Ghana?" This broad question is supported by the following specific questions; 1. How does merit-based appointments increase bureaucrats' autonomy? 2. To what degree does patronage-based appointments increase bureaucrats' loyalty? 3. To what extent does hybrid-based appointments increase bureaucrats' responsiveness? 4. Are there any attitudinal and behavioural distinctions

between merit, patronage and hybrid appointees? Finally, does the civil servants' network, if they are members, play any role concerning the various interests pursued in the bureaucracy?

These questions have been addressed in this study through the analysis of the novel data gathered. In addition to the empirical data, the study has also drawn on theories such as Public Service Motivation (PSM), Principal-Agent (PAT), Public-Choice (PCT) and NPM theories to aid in unravelling and offering interpersonal theoretical explanations and nuances regarding bureaucrats' attitudes and behaviour. It also explores the specific ways in which types of appointment (politics of appointment) may shape the autonomy, loyalty and responsiveness of bureaucrats. While all these theories can be applied to analyse the attitudes and behaviour of civil servants, they differ in their points of interest.

From the public service motivation perspective, the emphasis on bureaucrats' attitudes and behaviour is placed on the desire to serve the public interest (Perry & Wise, 1990). It explains and predicts why merit bureaucrats through their attitudes and behaviour desire to serve the overall public interest. Its adherents argue that the theory generally consists of intentions, attitudes, behaviour "that motivate individuals to service the public interest" (Bright, 2008: 151). This study, therefore, draws on the theory's explanation that merit bureaucrats are predominantly motivated by their desire to prioritise the public interest as a basis for their attitudes and behaviour in the course of performing their duties; hence, functioning with a mind-set of neutral competence.

From the principal-agent perspective, the focus of interest is that of the principal (superior), where one entity (the principal) appoints another (the bureaucratic agent) to act in his or her interest (Jensen & Meckling, 1976; Moe, 1984). Moe (1984) argues that inherent in the principal-agent relationship within the civil service is the issue of delegation by a principal to an agent (subordinate). Within the context of this study, patronage appointed bureaucrats are conveniently characterised as agents of the principals who facilitate their appointment. The study, therefore, draws on the concepts' provisions to explain and predict that patronage and hybrid bureaucrats may behave the way they do by loyally or responsively prioritising their principals' interests due

to the fiduciary obligations imposed by PAT arrangements. Furthermore, it also provides us with the basis as to why patronage bureaucrats will prioritise their principals' interests even if it amounts to an affront on the conventions and dictates of the bureaucracy.

In contrast to the Principal-Agent perspective is the Public-Choice perspective which focuses on the self-centred attitudes and behaviour of bureaucrats (Moe, 1984; Starr, 1989; Felkins, 2013). This study borrows from the theoretical arguments of Public-Choice advocates to contend that bureaucrats "...feel, even if subconsciously, that one of their major functions is that of supporting [them]selves" (Tullock, 1965: 126). Since the theory essentially preaches loyalty to self, the study hypothesises that regardless of how bureaucrats are appointed, some bureaucrats may be motivated by such subjective interests as job security, income, influence, self-esteem and reputation (Niskanen, 1973). The final theory employed in this study, as noted earlier, is NPM. As we know, NPM is a reform agenda that seeks to tap into management models of best practice to improve bureaucratic efficiency. Given its focus on efficiency and productivity, this study draws on NPM's amalgamation of political and professional considerations to theoretically explain the motivation of hybrid bureaucrats relative to their attitudes and behaviour in the bureaucracy. All these theories espoused above represent research traditions that have historically appeared to hold contrasting viewpoints on the face-value. However, recent scholarship tends to demonstrate that they are not necessarily alternative approaches, they can operate in mutually reinforcing ways to comprehensively explain the dominant motivations for civil servants' attitudes and behaviour.

1.3 Case Selection: Why Ghana?

Some scholars argue that the nature of democratic regimes, i.e. the relationship between the executive, legislature and judiciary, is foundational to bureaucratic appointment politics, with specific distinctions between parliamentary, presidentialist and semi-presidentialist systems. Research on constitutional democracies around the world suggests varying levels of differences

within these tripartite regimes relative to key institutional attributes (McCormic, Hague & Harrop, 2019). Moe & Caldwell (1994: 172) emphasised the transcendental nature of the choices between any of these regimes by stating that “when nations choose a presidential or parliamentary form, they are choosing a whole system, whose various properties arise endogenously... out of the political dynamics that their adopted form sets in motion...”. Despite the differences between these types of regimes, other scholars argue that democratic political systems are perhaps less significant since particularistic attitudes and behaviour has historically been observed in all types of polities within the context of bureaucratic appointment politics (Kopecký, 2011) and that semi-presidential constitutions are similar to parliamentary and presidential ones (Cheibub *et al.*, 2013). Even though notable cases of particularistic exchanges cut across political systems and democratic regimes, political systems are still essential to the theoretical examination of bureaucratic politics in Ghana because of the powers they bestow on the executive and principals to appointed bureaucrats.

To examine Ghana as a case, considering Eckstein (1975), George & Bennet (2005), and Gerring’s (2007) classification of case studies, the country can be considered as a typical or representative case. This is because, its political and bureaucratic dynamics mirror those of emerging democracies within the context of neo-patrimonial regimes in SSA which constitutionally stipulate a merit-based Weberian bureaucracy on the one hand and the other, sanction-wide powers of bureaucratic appointments to the executive (Asante & Gyimah-Boadi, 2004; Ayee, 2013). The Ghanaian case, therefore, exemplifies a broader pattern of constitutional paradoxes in neo-patrimonial regimes where its findings can have good external validity and potential generality to (in)validate the hypotheses. The argument is fully elaborated below.

Ghana’s 1992 constitution stipulates concentration of political power in the president; this confirms Bratton & van de Walle’s (1997: 63) claim that “the concentration of political power in the hands of one individual” is a key factor underpinning Africa’s neo-patrimonial regimes. Even though Ghana’s civil service appointment practice traces its roots to both pre and post-colonial

regimes, which mirror the broader pattern in SSA, the concentration of appointing authority to the executive (elites) in particular, does foster undue influence, especially in appointment decisions through diverse strategies in the civil service. Fox *et al.* (2011: 26) argue that this executive dominance has “created a parallel system of political patronage in which members of the winning party are rewarded for their allegiance”. That is, bureaucratic appointment politics in Ghana is associated with the concentration of power in the executive, where political principals may reward party activists, repay political debts, perpetuate personal loyalties and preserve political ideologies and affiliations via state jobs (Flinders & Mathews, 2015).

Indeed, regarding the executive powers, the study notes that Ghana’s 1992 constitution, under article 195 (1), stipulates wide presidential and executive discretionary powers in the appointment of all bureaucrats (defined by Article 190 of the constitution), presenting fertile grounds for the executive to influence bureaucratic personnel appointment. When the president often exercises such powers, the professionalism of the bureaucracy is potentially diluted with political agents or clienteles of democratic politics. Additionally, those who are the “most senior public sector bureaucrats” are also typically appointed by a presidential fiat bestowed by the constitution, most often based on parochial political criteria rather than pure merit (Hirvi & Whitfield, 2015; Ayee, 2019). For example, the country report on human rights practices produced by the United States Department of State - Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights, and Labour (2018: 13) stated that “The June ouster of the electoral commission chairperson [and her deputies] and the president’s subsequent stacking of the Electoral Commission with persons considered to be biased in favour of the ruling party raised questions about whether the body might be used to stifle voter registration among the opposition’s base.”

The irony is that the same constitution also stipulates an independent and professionalised Public Services Commission (PSC) mandated to ensure that appointment into the public services of Ghana is guided by the principles of merit and transparency under Article 195. It further provides an emphasis on a merit-based professional civil service devoid of politics and

discrimination while promoting public interest under Article 196 (Chapter 14 of 1992 Constitution). The country would later exacerbate this constitutional paradox in 2012 by enacting, through an act of parliament, a Presidential (Transition) Act 2012 (Act 845) touted as a legal blueprint to govern the transition of political power in the country. Inherent in the act (845) was the provision for the dismissal of all CEOs, Director-Generals, Managing Directors (MD), etc. of state-owned institutions upon the assumption of office by a newly elected President of the Republic of Ghana. The provisions in Act 845 only compounded the constitutional atrocities unleashed by the legal regime to the plight of bureaucrats in Ghana.

The political elite religiously clung to the Act (845) and the already precarious constitutional ambiguities to influence bureaucrats in a highly charged competitive political climate and an increasingly polarised atmosphere. This made a mockery of article 191 (b) of the Ghanaian constitution, which states that “a member of the public service shall not be dismissed or removed from office or reduced in rank or otherwise punished without a just cause.”

So severe was the application of the provisions contained in Act 845 by the political elite that on January 4, 2017, a private citizen, Mr Theophilus Donkor and his counsel, Mr Godwin Edudzi Tamakloe initiated an SC judicial review of the constitutional interpretation of Article 195 of the constitution. In its ruling of June 2019, the SC of Ghana held that the replacement of such bureaucrats (CEOs, DGs and heads of public corporations, statutory boards and authorities, as well as the governing boards of such institutions) was unconstitutional. They added that “per Article 190 Clause 1(b) of the 1992 Constitution, public corporations were part of the public services of Ghana and, therefore, such persons were bureaucrats whose appointments were protected by the constitution.” It, therefore, effectively repealed Section 14 of the Presidential Transition Act 2012 (Act 845 as amended in 2016) as unconstitutional and void for being in contravention of Articles 190 and 191 of the Constitution.

This was the first landmark ruling in favour of curtailing presidential powers of appointment and/or dismissal within the context of bureaucratic appointments as similar cases

brought before the court in the past were dismissed. Reminiscent in recent history are previous separate suits brought by the Ghana Bar Association and a broadcast journalist to the SC in 2016 on the appointment of justices of the SC and the chairman and members of the Electoral Commission. The SC threw out the suits contesting how the President appointed the justices of the SC and the chairperson of the Electoral Commission (EC). The seven-member panel, in a unanimous decision, held that even though the President was mandated to seek advice, he was not bound by the advice of bodies such as the judicial council and the council of state in making appointment decisions.

Yet, this partial extrication of the legal web through the June 2019 SC ruling did not cure all the ills of the constitutional paradox of Ghana's political system which bestows on the President (with political motives) a wide range of appointing powers. It is instructive to note that in neo-patrimonial democracies where systems are relatively weak, although there may be structural checks and balances to the president's appointing powers such as a judicial review or parliamentary veto in approving or rejecting such appointments, there are inadequate or compelling motivations to check presidential abuse of appointments from such bodies when due processes are not complied with.

From a relational perspective, the legal relationship between political principals and bureaucrats is also defined by the 1992 constitution and other legal documents (The Republic of Ghana, 1992; 1993; 1994). In one breath, it prohibits bureaucrats from engaging in partisan politics since Article 94 (3b) of the 1992 constitution lists civil servants and chiefs as ineligible to engage in partisan politics. The preclusion of bureaucrats in political partisanship is also implicit in Article 191 of the constitution, which insulates them from "victimisation, discrimination, dismissal, removal, reduction in rank and punishment without just cause." Therefore, their engagement in partisan politics undermines their protection. Under Chapter 24 of the Constitution, bureaucrats ought to avoid compromising themselves by being entangled in the conflict of interest situations in the performance of their bureaucratic functions. A bureaucrat's involvement in partisanship

creates potential conflicts of interest situations.

However, even though it is enshrined in civil service law as well as the Civil Service code of conduct (1993), in particular Section 69 (1) of the Civil Service Law, PNDC Law 327, 1993 that “a civil servant may form or join any association”, section 69 (2) prohibits bureaucrats from associations where membership conflicts with the performance of their duties as civil servants. Besides, the constitution also stipulates in Article 21 that all citizens have the right to form or join political parties and participate in political activities in a free and democratic society while article 55 gives every citizen of voting age the right to join a political party. However, exercising these rights by joining political parties and being patronised may create avenues for conflict in the bureaucracy.

The net effect of these paradoxes has led to the evidence of increased partisan political participation by bureaucrats since the return to democratic governance in 1993 (Ayee, 2013). Furthermore, the ambiguity and technical decision of Ghana’s SC in 2000 further blurred the lines of a dichotomy between politics and administration, exposing it as a myth. According to Ayee (2013), in the election year of 2000, the NDC had approved Kofi Opoku-Manu, the Chief Director (CD) of Ministry of Finance (MOF), and Joseph Oteng-Adjei, a Director at Ministry of Mines and Energy, as parliamentary candidates for Asante-Akyem North and Bosomtwe constituencies, respectively. This positioned them in active politics. The NPP contested the decision of the NDC at the SC in a case known as *New Patriotic Party v. the National Democratic Congress and Others* (Civil Motion No. 36/2000) on June 8, 2000. It sought a declaration that the action was inconsistent with and in contravention of the constitution, particularly Article 94(3b). On November 21, 2000, the SC, by a majority decision, held that the NDC’s nomination of Opoku-Manu and Oteng-Adjei did not constitute an act but only an intention. The decision, therefore, failed to clarify whether bureaucrats could participate in partisan politics or not (Ayee, 2013).

These legal provisions under the constitution of Ghana and other acts of parliament as well as the SC rulings are the footings of the complex relationship that has mired and defined the

dynamics between political principals and the bureaucrats. The overall net effect of the paradoxical legal framework and instruments has led to profound politics regarding bureaucrats' appointment which, according to Ayee (2009), has created a situation where bureaucrats either openly engage in politics or take political appointments, blurring their supposed dichotomy. Many observers such as Wereku (2008), Ayee (2013, 2019) and IDEG (2019) believe that the failure of Ghana to have a relatively strong merit-based professional civil service devoid of patronage and politics as emphasised by a part of the constitution is due to this legal paradox. This presents us with intriguing questions regarding Ghana's political and bureaucratic culture because, despite the limitations of the civil service, it is still the primal vehicle for governance without which the organs of government would cease to function.

Like many other SSA countries, Ghana as a neo-patrimonial regime is expected to be receptive to patronage appointments especially under a wide range of executive powers of appointments. But this condition, when juxtaposed with the country's constitutionally established apolitical (Weberian) bureaucracy, is a recipe for tension and crises. These competing provisions or contradictions provide a fertile battleground for exploring the consequences of types of appointments on bureaucrats' attitude and behaviour. Following from the above constitutional puzzle, it is therefore noteworthy to select and investigate Ghana as a case. As a neo-patrimonial democratic country in the sub-region, the findings of this research will inform and provide insights for other neo-patrimonial countries with similar constitutional crises while reconciling findings with existing theories within the context of emerging democratic governance in Africa. Since Ghana is also considered as a shining example of democratic governance in SSA and has been repeatedly touted as "an example to the rest of Africa on successful democratic practice" (World Bank, 2009; Sigman, 2015), her experiences have the potential of presenting us with useful insights concerning the theoretical expectations of democracy's value in promoting civil service professionalism and national development. For example, Peters (1995), in his examination of bureaucracy, argued that the separation of powers and authority within the branches of government in democracies produce

administrative systems which make the exercise of control a major issue; thereby, breeding fertile grounds for tensions within the bureaucracy.

Also, according to Golden's (2003) constituency service model, politicians create opportunities to serve constituents and meet their electoral goals by deliberately creating a bureaucracy that is inefficient through dispensing appointments in the civil service to their agents. Ghana is also typical of the countries in the sub-region where sustained national growth and poverty reduction at the national level have been modest while the increased politicisation of the civil service has been accompanied by low bureaucratic efficiency. This reflects the case of the entire SSA. As Carino (1992) pointed out, bureaucracy is a tool for principals as they pursue social, economic and political objectives either for their benefit or on behalf of and frequently in collusion with particularistic interests rooted outside the bureaucracy. It is, therefore, strange that so far, analyses of attitudes and behaviour of bureaucrats as a result of how they are appointed has eluded scholarly scrutiny from researchers and policy-makers within neo-patrimonial settings.

1.4 Ghana's geographic, political and bureaucratic profile.

Ghana is geographically located in West Africa, bordering the Gulf of Guinea, Cote d'Ivoire and Togo with a land area of 238,391 km² (92,100 sq. mi). The country has a population of 24,658,823 (2010 population and housing census) and a projection of 30,284,301 in 2019 (Ghana Statistical Service - GSS, 2019). Politically, Ghana as a colony secured its first impression of parliament (Legislative Council) in 1850 with members selected by the British colonial administration to primarily comprise the governor and at least two other persons appointed by the colonial administration (Ward, 1948; Bennion, 1962). This legislative council's primary responsibility was to enact ordinances and laws necessary for the peace and governance of the colony. It could also be seen more as an advisory body since it lacked supervisory powers over the colonial government (Ward, 1948; Bennion, 1962). Various

agitations against the colonial authorities led to varied concessions from the colonial regime until it culminated in gaining independence in March 1957 (Bourret, 1960). After independence, the country witnessed four different republics i.e. first republican constitution of 1960, the second republican constitution of 1969, the third republican constitution of 1979 and the fourth Republican constitution of 1992. The occasional military interventions in Ghanaian politics curtailed the life of the first three republics until constitutional governance was finally restored under the fourth republic with the promulgation of the 1992 Constitution.

Ghana has historically practised alternative political systems at specific interludes of its democratic dispensation. According to McCormic *et al.*'s (2019) classification of electoral and governmental systems, Ghana's political systems between the periods of 1957-1960 and 1969-1972 is classified as parliamentary. Based on the same classifications by McCormic *et al.* (2019), the country also practised presidential systems between the periods of 1960-1964 and 1979-1981 while it practised a one-party system in 1964-1966. The current hybrid or semi-presidential system began in 1993 with a unitary form of government. Examining Farrell's (1997) distinctions between electoral systems, it can be determined that Ghana's president is elected through a *majoritarian* (50% plus 1) electoral system and is subject to *the two-ballot systems procedure* where when no candidate wins a majority on the first ballot, the top two leading candidates go for a second run (*runoff systems*). However, for the parliamentary elections, a *single-member plurality* or the '*winner-takes-all*' or *first-past-the-post* system is adopted, where the winner is the candidate receiving the highest votes, i.e. whether this is a plurality (more votes than any other candidate) or a majority (more than 50%) (Farrell, 1997; Farrell & Carter, 2009 and McCormick *et al.*, 2019). A parliament runs for a four-year term.

Currently, about 24 political parties are registered with the Electoral Commission (EC) of Ghana, the body that oversees the conduct of elections in Ghana (Electoral Commission, 2019). Since the fourth republic, two major political parties, the National Democratic Congress (NDC) and the New Patriotic Party (NPP) have occupied about 96% of the seats in Parliament,

with the remaining 4% being shared among three other parties and independent MPs (Electoral Commission, 2019).

Ghana's 1992 republican constitution provides both the legal and structural frameworks regarding how various institutions (state or otherwise) and individuals ought to function and co-exist. The constitution requires that a majority of the ministers of state in Ghana be appointed from parliament (article 71 of the 1992 Constitution). The principle of separation of powers is nonetheless a central feature of the 1992 constitution which is intended to foster the separation of powers and provide checks and balances. However, this principle seems undermined by the constitutional provision of the majority of ministers being sitting members of parliament (MP), that is the fusion of the executive and legislature. The independence of the judiciary is also restricted because there is no upper limit to the number of justices of the SC that can be appointed by the president.

Currently, Ghana's parliament is unicameral and is composed of 275 seats. The MPs are elected on a four-year term basis; however, there is no limit on the number of terms a representative can serve. The parliament is led by a speaker who is not an MP but must possess the qualifications to stand for elections as an MP (Constitution, 1992). An MP who is elected as the speaker must resign his seat as a member as happened in 2013 when Emmanuel Doe-Adjaho had to resign as an MP after he was elected the speaker of the 6th parliament. The speaker also chairs a five-member parliamentary service board.

Ghana has had significant experiences with political life, being interspersed with civilian and military rules. However, since the return to constitutional rule in January 1993, there has been political stability as demonstrated by eight successive national-level elections which were held in 1992, 1996, 2000, 2004, 2008, 2012, 2016 and 2020. There have also been seven successful full-term parliaments with the eighth parliament due to expire in January 2025. The NPP and the NDC have had an alternation of power both at the presidential and the

parliamentary levels in 2001, 2009 and 2016, thus qualifying Ghana as a consolidated democracy per Samuel Huntington's (1991) "two-turnover test". Since 1993, the winner of the general elections (political party) wins both the presidential election and a parliamentary majority. The first two elections were won by Jerry John Rawlings-led NDC while the next two were won by the John Agyekum Kuffuor-led NPP. The subsequent two were won by the NDC's Prof. Atta Mills and John Mahama in 2008 and 2012 respectively whilst the 2016 and recent 2020 election were won by NPP's Nana Addo Dankwa Akufo-Addo. The 2020 parliamentary election results indicate that the NPP and an independent MP currently constitute a majority with 138 seats (50.1%) and the NDC in minority with 137 seats (49.9%).

Concerning Ghana's ethnic profile, an estimated number of ninety-two separate ethnic groups exist. These groups are often classified into larger groups, namely Akan (49.1%), Mole-Dagomba (16.5%), Ewe (12.7%), Ga-Adangbe (8.0%), Guan and Gurma (8.3%) and a host of other minor ethnic groups amounting to 5.4% of the population (GSS, 2010; Langer, 2009: 535). This complex mix of ethnicity is vital to the dynamics of the politics of bureaucratic appointments in Ghana and its implications for attitudes and behaviour because it "has allowed political and cultural entrepreneurs to exploit divisions and sub-classifications to suit their purposes" (Asante & Gyimah-Boadi, 2004:15). Boone (1994) and Arriola (2009) argued that one of the features of politics in SSA is the integration of ethnic and regional elites as a means to discourage likely opponents from rallying and to distribute patronage to the clients and agents they represent. According to Abdulai (2012), the phenomenon of ethnicity and regionalism in Ghana is almost synonymous as the country's regional boundary structures are largely fashioned along ethnic lines.

Administratively, Ghana is divided into 16 regions with 254 Metropolitan, Municipal and District Assemblies (MMDAs). Each region has a regional coordinating council headed by a regional minister who is appointed by the president to supervise decentralised structures such

as the metropolitan, municipal and district assemblies under his jurisdiction. At the local level, the MMDAs are the highest political authority(ies). Membership of these assemblies is obtained via two routes, i.e. 70% of elected members to represent their electoral areas and 30% government nomination in consultation with the traditional authorities in each district. The MPs for constituencies which fall under the various MMDAs are ex-officio members of these assemblies without voting rights. These MMDAs are led by Chief Executives who are nominated by the president and approved by the assemblies and can pass by-laws to regulate various activities under their purview.

Concerning the bureaucratic population of Ghana, some definitions are useful. According to the 1992 Constitution, the public services of Ghana include the civil service; judicial service; audit service; education service; prisons service; parliamentary service; health service; statistical service; national fire service; customs, exercise and preventive service; internal revenue service; police service; immigration service; legal service; public corporations other than those set up for commercial ventures; public corporations established by this constitution and such other public services as parliament may prescribe (Republic of Ghana, 1992). Thus, essentially, Ghana's bureaucracy derives its mandate from the 1992 Constitution of the fourth republic. Its functions are detailed in the legislation but mainly it is the machinery or vehicle through which government policies are formulated and implemented (PNDCL. 327).

The term bureaucracy in this study, however, mostly refers to the higher and lower tiers of the civil services of Ghana listed under Chapter 14 of the 1992 constitution. The population of this research, therefore, primarily refers to civil servants currently comprising of 36 sector ministries (OHCS, 2019). Accordingly, the term 'bureaucrats' mainly include personnel of these civil service outfits who should ordinarily be appointed, posted/transferred and promoted under the law through the Office of the Head of the Civil Service (OHCS). These civil servants or bureaucrats would thus for example encompass Chief Directors, management, junior staff

and special political appointees within the service who may have been appointed by the executive through the PSC or OHCS. Since the main objective of this study is to contribute to the discourses related to the politics of types of appointments, the influences between political heads and bureaucrats regarding appointments and their expected attitudes and behaviour is central. Indeed, Svava (2001:176) argued that “relationship between [bureaucrats], on one hand, and political leaders and the public on other hand...and the proper role of [bureaucrats] in the political process have been the subject of considerable debate”. The restriction of this study to the civil services is, therefore, suitable as it is the intersection between professionalism and politics. It is also an arena for entanglement between professional and political bureaucrats on the one hand and political heads and politicians (with vested interests) on the other.

Furthermore, the public sector as an institution is the second-largest employer, accounting for 7.6% of Ghana’s employment-population (GSS, 2016). The private sector accounts for 74.4% of the economically active persons out of which the private informal sector accounts for 52.5% while the private formal sector accounts for 22.9% (GSS, 2016). The majority of workers enter the informal economy which is the largest employer, absorbing about 88% of the labour force (Labour Market Profile, 2016). However, focusing on the civil service, only 1.3% of the 7.6 % share of the public sector is engaged in the Civil Service (GSS, 2016). This reveals that Ghana’s public service employment rate is below the average rates for developing countries (8% - 30%).

Despite significant turbulence, the world’s share of public service remains high, at approximately 30% with a breakdown of about 22% in developed market economies, 40% in transitional countries and between 6% and 30% in developing countries (Hammouya, 1999; OECD, 2017). In Ghana, a little over one in every five workers (22.5%) is an employee, and the main sectors of employment are private, public and not-for-profit organisations (GSS, 2016). The employment-to-population ratio is 75.4%, with the majority of the currently

employed persons (68.7%) engaged in vulnerable employment (GSS, 2016). According to the GSS (2016), the working population of the country is dominated by people with no formal education as well as those with basic (primary and middle school) education. Ghana's 2016 labour market profile estimates the country's unemployment at 6.4% as up to 300,000 prospective job seekers are introduced to the job market pool every year. Of this, only about 2% find jobs in the formal sector (Labour Market Profile, 2016). Yet, Amoako (2008) found that the Ghanaian economy, in terms of employment outcomes, had created nearly three million jobs between 1991 and 2006 for the 24 - 64 age group (Amoako, 2008).

Regarding Ghana's appointment legal regime, appointments into Ghana's public and civil services are legally sanctioned on the principle of merit and non-discrimination, pursuant to chapter 14 of the fourth Republican Constitution (Constitution of Ghana, 1992). The country's merit appointments procedure is also governed and regulated by the PSC framework which derives its mandate from both article 196 of the 1992 constitution and the PSC Act 482 of 1994 (PSC, 2015). This merit appointment regime is directly applicable to all public services covered under chapter 14, Article 190 of the 1992 republican constitution. Among other requirements, the regime stipulates equal treatment to all bureaucrats by applying the same standards and principles for staffing, human resource development and personnel capacity building tailored for service delivery needs (PSC, 2015).

Regarding security of tenure for bureaucrats, article 191 (a) and (b) of the 1992 Constitution stipulates that bureaucrats are protected and secured from arbitrary depositions and abuses as they shall not be victimized or discriminated against. It enjoins principals from capriciously discharging bureaucrats from office or reducing them in rank or any form of punishment without just cause. Indeed, article 199 (1) provides that bureaucrats tenure is secured until they come up for mandatory retirement from the bureaucracy at age sixty (60) or voluntary retirement at a minimum age of forty-five (45). However, notwithstanding the above

provision, a retired bureaucrat after age 60 may be re-engaged due to the exigencies of his/her role for a cumulative period not exceeding five years. Under the law, bureaucrats are entitled to pensions payable from both their contributions and consolidated funds from government which are exempt or not subject to tax.

Bureaucrats regardless of their political or social backgrounds are prescribed to be apolitical since they are required to serve all governments. For example, Article 26 (1) of the political parties' Act prohibits bureaucrats from party politics. The aim is to embrace the principles of merit, non-discrimination, transparency and fairness. Therefore, bureaucratic institutions ought to be structured to ensure that the right quality and quantity of persons are at post within the Ghanaian bureaucracy (PSC, 2015). Correspondingly, Article 195 (1) of the Constitution adjudicates the power to appoint persons to hold or act in an office in the bureaucracy in the President who acts following the advice of the governing boards or councils of the services concerned and in consultation with the PSC.

However, evidence suggests that party affiliation, ethnicity and other networks are influential factors in bureaucratic appointments despite the country's strong sense of nationhood (Asante & Gyimah-Boadi, 2004). Asante & Gyimah-Boadi (2004) note that although meritocratic principles such as experience and technical capacity ought to be the most important factors necessary for the appointment of people into the bureaucracy, there is evidence to suggest that premium is put on patronage factors as well. The literature further demonstrates that the fine line between the political and apolitical has tilted in the direction of the political and that bureaucrats who should be insulated from politics are manipulated by political elites (Ayee, 2013). Accordingly, bureaucrats and political principals in Ghana have come to believe that a non-politicised bureaucracy is a myth since it is part of the move towards securing greater responsiveness, accountability and effectiveness in service delivery (Ayee, 2013).

Additionally, the bureaucracy has also suffered a battered image with a high perception of

inefficiency in the eyes of the public, government and other stakeholders. The frequently pronounced criticisms against the civil service include excessive bottle-necks or red-tapism; indiscipline; inadequate human capacity and ineffective leadership; weak management practices (Ayee, 2001). It is also accused of a lack of appropriate vision or a clear sense of direction; leakage of government official information to unauthorised sources; low morale and general inefficiency and effectiveness to government policies and programmes (Ayee, 2001). Owing to this perception, Ghana has made various attempts to reform the service in line with the NPM ideals to make it more efficient and effective in carrying out its role (Ninsin, 1998; Ayee, 1999; 2000;). Following from the above account of the profile of the Ghanaian state, the next section will briefly look at the thesis structure.

1.5 Thesis structure

This thesis is composed of eight (8) chapters. Chapter One, which is the introduction, encompasses the background to the study, statement of the problem, research objectives, research questions, significance of the study, delimitations and organisation of the thesis. The review of the historical literature concerning Ghana's appointment traditions constitutes Chapter Two. Chapter Three centres on an overview of extant studies on bureaucratic appointments in Ghana which contributes to establishing the gaps in addressing the question of bureaucratic attitudes and behaviour relative to the types of appointment. The chapter also introduces the study's theoretical hypotheses to be tested in the empirical Chapters. That is, the Chapter fully examines the theoretical framework of this study to aid in addressing the research hypotheses. Chapter Four covers the research methodology and descriptive statistics. Specifically, it focuses on the research design, methods and procedures. It further presents and interprets the descriptive statistics of the study as a preliminary presentation of research findings.

The fifth Chapter which is the first of the empirical chapters concentrates on exploring the consequences of merit-based appointments on bureaucrats' autonomy. It establishes the

conventional direction of the hypothesis but also goes ahead to reveal that though merit factors such as qualifications are vital preconditions for appointment, they are predominantly insufficient to secure an appointment in the bureaucracy. Furthermore, it finds that though merit is significantly associated with autonomy, it does not necessarily guarantee a bureaucrats' autonomy. Chapter six continues with a focus on the influence of patronage-based appointments on bureaucrats' loyalty. It finds that bureaucratic appointments based on patronage factors such as personal connections or political considerations are significantly linked to bureaucrats' loyalty within the bureaucracy. It further makes the case that contrary to widely held perceptions that patronage is counterproductive, the idea of loyalty to the principal can enhance accountability to political principals who are ultimately responsible for the provision of public goods and services to the citizenry. Chapter Seven, the last of the empirical chapters, comprises the nexus between hybrid-induced bureaucratic appointments and responsiveness to the political principal. It specifically examines the extent to which hybrid bureaucrats are responsive to principals or government in the discharge of their duties. Chapter Eight, which is the final chapter, encompasses the conclusions and recommendations of the thesis.