

A Comparative Analysis of Public Service Accountability and Performance Management Systems in the United States and Nigeria: Institutional Designs, Outcomes, and Policy Lessons

Jumai Ahmadu^{1*}, Naomi Oboyi²

¹Federal Capital Territory Administration, FCTA

²Independent Researcher, Abuja, Nigeria

*Corresponding Author: Jumai Ahmadu, jumaiabuahmadu@yahoo.com

Abstract

This study comparatively examines how institutional design, accountability mechanisms, and performance management systems shape public service effectiveness in the United States and Nigeria. Using a comparative narrative review, the analysis synthesizes scholarly and policy-oriented literature on administrative structures, oversight arrangements, performance measurement, managerial capacity, digital governance, institutional constraints, policy transfer, and reform trajectories. The findings show that both countries possess formal accountability and performance frameworks, but their effectiveness differs substantially because of variations in administrative capacity, oversight density, technological infrastructure, data quality, managerial autonomy, workforce capability, and implementation discipline. The United States benefits from more institutionalized performance routines, stronger administrative data systems, and denser oversight arrangements, although intergovernmental fragmentation, professional resistance, and coordination complexity remain important constraints. Nigeria maintains significant formal governance structures, yet uneven infrastructure, implementation gaps, capacity limitations, inconsistent enforcement, and weaker institutional follow-through often reduce the translation of formal rules into measurable outcomes. The review further finds that cross-national policy learning is most effective when reforms are adapted to domestic institutional realities rather than copied mechanically. Emerging technologies, including automation, predictive analytics, and artificial intelligence, offer substantial opportunities for more responsive and evidence-based administration, but they also require robust human oversight, transparency, explainability, and data governance. The study concludes that sustainable reform depends on linking measurement with learning, accountability with corrective action, and digital innovation with institutional responsibility. It recommends stronger audit follow-through, interoperable administrative data, professional capacity development, citizen-responsive monitoring, context-sensitive policy adaptation, and explicit governance frameworks for automated decision systems. These priorities can strengthen service quality, public trust, institutional resilience, and the capacity of both systems to generate public value.

Keywords: Public accountability; Performance management; Institutional governance; Administrative reform; Digital governance; Public service delivery

DOI: 10.66592/dgadt110

1. Introduction

1.1 Public Sector Accountability and Performance

Public-sector accountability and performance management are mutually reinforcing dimensions of administrative capacity. Accountability establishes the institutional obligation of public officials and agencies to explain decisions, justify the use of authority and resources, and remain answerable to oversight bodies and citizens. Bovens conceptualises accountability as a structured relationship between an actor and a forum in which conduct must be explained, questioned and judged, with consequences potentially following. This formulation is particularly useful for comparing the United States and Nigeria because it moves analysis beyond formal reporting requirements toward the quality of answerability and enforceability embedded within administrative systems (Bovens, 2007).

Performance management complements this accountability function by translating public mandates into objectives, indicators, monitoring routines and evidence for managerial action. In the United States, performance measurement has become embedded in administrative practice because metrics can serve several purposes, including evaluation, control, budgeting, learning and organizational improvement. The central challenge is not merely producing indicators but selecting measures appropriate to the managerial purpose for which they are intended (Behn, 2003). Accordingly, a credible accountability regime requires performance information that illuminates whether resources, programmes and administrative effort are producing defensible public value rather than simply demonstrating procedural compliance.

Institutional capability strongly conditions whether such information becomes consequential. Evidence from U.S. federal performance-management reforms indicates that training can increase officials' use of performance information and strategic goals, illustrating that formal systems require complementary managerial capacity if they are to influence decisions (Kroll & Moynihan, 2015). Comparable research on South African municipalities identifies employee development, motivation, engagement, feedback and continuous management processes as important influences on the functioning of performance-management systems (Marie & Khumalo, 2024). These findings are relevant to Nigeria, where performance reforms likewise

operate within organizational environments shaped by uneven capacity, technological readiness and implementation discipline.

Accountability also increasingly depends on the governance of information systems. Nigerian evidence from regulated organizations shows how formal IT-governance frameworks can strengthen regulatory compliance by clarifying controls, responsibilities and monitoring processes (Fadero et al., 2018). Similar governance logic applies to public institutions: performance information is most valuable when responsibilities for its generation, verification and use are explicitly assigned. Governance models that connect compliance with operational quality further reinforce the importance of integrating oversight with everyday managerial processes rather than treating accountability as an episodic reporting exercise (Akin-Oluyomi& Akhigbe, 2022).

More recent governance approaches extend this integration by linking transparency and accountability with strategic execution, thereby framing performance not simply as output attainment but as alignment between institutional commitments, managerial actions and observable results (Akhigbe, Falemi& Akin-Oluyomi, 2025). This alignment matters because excessive emphasis on managerial targets can create tensions with political accountability. Evidence from local government demonstrates that managerial accountability can improve performance, particularly in weaker-performing organizations, but its effects depend partly on the surrounding political-accountability environment (Ji, 2022). For a United States–Nigeria comparison, public-sector performance must therefore be examined as an institutional process in which measurement, transparency, oversight, managerial capability and enforceable responsibility interact to determine whether formal administrative systems generate credible and publicly accountable outcomes.

1.2 United States and Nigerian Contexts

The United States and Nigeria present markedly different institutional environments for examining public service accountability and performance management, yet both systems confront the enduring administrative challenge of converting formal mandates into measurable public outcomes. In the United States, performance-oriented governance has developed within a comparatively institutionalised framework of federalism, statutory oversight, professionalised agencies and extensive administrative data. Research on performance-based monitoring in Texas public organisations shows that formal accountability interventions can influence short-term outcomes, although gains may dissipate when managerial support and institutional follow-through are weak, demonstrating that sophisticated monitoring alone cannot guarantee durable improvement (Rutherford, 2014).

The Nigerian context combines constitutionally defined federal structures with persistent variations in administrative capacity, infrastructure, implementation quality and service accessibility across jurisdictions. Evidence from federal public organisations indicates that performance-management practices can improve efficiency, job satisfaction, productivity and service quality, but weaknesses arise when appraisal findings are insufficiently connected to training and employee development (Ijewereme, 2023). Spatial evidence further demonstrates how inadequate road conditions can constrain physical access to health facilities in rural communities, illustrating that public-sector performance must ultimately be assessed against citizens' practical ability to obtain essential services (Alaka, Ajayi & Bolaji, 2020).

These differences also shape how accountability systems respond to infrastructure and development priorities. In the United States, sustainable infrastructure increasingly requires coordination among energy efficiency, transportation logistics, technological systems and policy interventions, reinforcing the importance of integrated public-sector planning and measurable implementation (Opara et al., 2024). Nigeria faces comparable coordination imperatives but within a setting where uneven institutional resources and territorial disparities can intensify implementation constraints.

African comparative experience reinforces the significance of institutional context. South African municipal research shows that performance-management systems are embedded in legal and administrative frameworks yet can be weakened by strained political-administrative relations, limited transparency, capacity deficits and inconsistent implementation (Ndevu, 2022). At a broader governance level, economic participation and sustainable development are also shaped by the interaction of institutional inclusion, inequality and opportunities for effective participation, highlighting the developmental consequences of governance design (Agwuna, Rhodes & Mowat, 2026).

1.3 Review Scope, Objectives, and Approach

This review examines the institutional architecture, accountability arrangements, and performance management systems that shape public service delivery in the United States and Nigeria. Its scope encompasses the formal structures through which public institutions establish performance expectations, monitor administrative conduct, evaluate organizational results, and hold officials answerable for the use of public authority and resources. Particular attention is given to the interaction between institutional design and implementation capacity, recognising that formally established accountability mechanisms do not necessarily produce equivalent outcomes across different political, administrative, and socioeconomic environments.

The principal objective is to compare how the two countries organize accountability and performance management within their respective public sectors, while identifying the institutional conditions that strengthen or constrain effectiveness. The review therefore considers the design of oversight arrangements, performance measurement practices, managerial responsibilities, transparency mechanisms, administrative coordination, and the use of performance information in decision-making. It also examines how differences in bureaucratic capacity, fiscal resources, technological infrastructure, professional norms, and implementation environments influence the practical operation of these systems.

Methodologically, the study adopts a comparative narrative review approach. Relevant scholarly literature, institutional analyses, and policy-oriented studies are synthesised thematically rather than treated as isolated national accounts. The comparison is structured around common analytical dimensions to permit systematic examination of similarities, differences, and transferable lessons. Emphasis is placed on institutional functionality rather than simple structural equivalence, thereby avoiding assumptions that practices effective in one national setting can be reproduced unchanged in another.

The review ultimately seeks to generate context-sensitive policy insights by distinguishing universal principles of accountability and performance management from mechanisms whose effectiveness depends heavily on domestic institutional conditions. This approach provides a coherent basis for assessing outcomes, diagnosing implementation weaknesses, and identifying realistic reform priorities for strengthening public sector effectiveness, transparency, responsiveness, and administrative accountability.

2. Foundations of Public Service Accountability

Public service accountability rests on the principle that authority exercised on behalf of society must remain explainable, reviewable, and subject to consequences. It therefore extends beyond administrative compliance to encompass the institutional relationships through which public officials justify decisions, disclose performance, and demonstrate responsible stewardship of public resources. At its conceptual core, accountability involves an obligation to render an account to an external forum capable of questioning and evaluating conduct, although the term has progressively expanded to include transparency, responsiveness and broader expectations of good governance (Mulgan, 2000).

Within public administration, accountability is multidimensional because officials simultaneously respond to hierarchical superiors, legal rules, professional standards and political constituencies. The classic distinction between bureaucratic, legal, professional and political

accountability demonstrates why public agencies cannot be evaluated solely through a single chain of command; different institutional expectations generate distinct forms of responsibility and may occasionally conflict (Romzek & Dubnick, 1987). A robust system must consequently balance control with professional discretion while ensuring that delegated authority remains connected to legitimate public purposes.

Accountability also performs democratic, constitutional, and learning functions. Democratic accountability links administrative action to representative authority, constitutional accountability constrains abuse of public power, and learning-oriented accountability enables institutions to identify deficiencies and improve future performance. These functions make accountability an institutional mechanism for both restraint and organizational development rather than merely a punitive exercise (Bovens, Schillemans & 't Hart, 2008). Contemporary evidence further suggests that accountability need not always depend on sanctions; nonpunitive arrangements may influence administrative behaviour through intrinsic and relational motivations when officials perceive scrutiny as meaningful and legitimate (Schillemans & Aleksovska, 2025).

The relationship between accountability and performance nevertheless requires careful distinction. Performance indicators can make governmental activity more visible, but measurement does not automatically establish substantive accountability. New Zealand's experience demonstrates that an excessive concentration on countable outputs may displace attention from outcomes, efficiency and policy effectiveness, thereby creating an appearance of control without adequately demonstrating public value (Lonti & Gregory, 2007). Consequently, accountability systems must connect measurable results to explanation, scrutiny and corrective action.

This foundation is particularly important in Nigeria, where accountability and public-sector performance have long been linked to institutional quality, transparency and the effective utilization of public resources. Weak enforcement, corruption and historical patterns of administrative non-accountability can undermine performance even where formal oversight arrangements exist, making effective governance dependent upon credible institutions capable of enforcing responsibility (Adejuwon, 2014). Organisational effectiveness also depends on the conduct and professional attributes of personnel who operationalise institutional rules, illustrating how administrative responsibility is ultimately enacted through individual behaviour within organizational structures (Onche, Adenekan & Sabboh, 2021).

African experience similarly underscores the normative importance of ethical leadership. Effective policy implementation within regional governance environments depends not only on formal frameworks but also on leadership capable of sustaining integrity, institutional

commitments and implementation discipline (Enaifoghe, Dlamini & Agwuna, 2020). South African experience further demonstrates that constitutional and legislative accountability provisions may coexist with practical weaknesses in oversight, financial stewardship and consequence management, reinforcing the distinction between formal institutional architecture and its effective enforcement (Munzhedzi, 2016).

Emerging administrative technologies add another dimension. Comparative evidence concerning generative artificial intelligence indicates that organizational readiness, managerial sophistication, governance arrangements and workforce capability substantially condition successful technological integration across the United States and lower-income settings (Ayinde, Ojukwu & Ohunyon, 2025). For public institutions, such developments reinforce a foundational proposition: accountability requires more than transparency technologies or performance dashboards. It depends upon clearly allocated responsibility, reliable information, ethical administrative conduct, institutional capacity, meaningful scrutiny and mechanisms capable of translating identified deficiencies into organizational learning and corrective action.

3. Institutional Designs and Governance Structures

Institutional design determines how authority is distributed, coordinated and constrained within public administration, thereby shaping the channels through which accountability and performance are produced. Governance structures encompass formal hierarchies, intergovernmental arrangements, oversight bodies, administrative networks and rules governing interaction among public organizations. Their effectiveness depends not simply on organisational charts but on whether responsibilities, decision rights and reporting relationships are clear enough to connect policy objectives with implementation. Whole-of-government scholarship demonstrates that structural fragmentation can generate coordination deficits when specialized agencies pursue narrow mandates without mechanisms for horizontal integration (Christensen & Lægreid, 2007).

The United States illustrates a polycentric governance environment in which federal, state and local institutions exercise overlapping authority across many policy fields. Polycentric systems can support experimentation, local responsiveness and institutional learning because multiple decision centres remain formally autonomous while interacting around shared problems (Thiel, 2023). Yet dispersed authority also increases coordination demands. Collaborative arrangements are most effective when institutional design specifies participation rules, balances power asymmetries and creates credible arenas for joint decision-making rather than assuming cooperation will emerge automatically (Ansell & Gash, 2008).

Network governance provides an important bridge between hierarchy and fragmentation. Participant-governed networks, lead-organization structures and network administrative organizations offer different balances between inclusiveness, efficiency and centralized coordination (Provan & Kenis, 2008). This logic also illuminates how operational decisions can be aligned with strategic mandates. Strategic-alignment models show that leadership, data-driven decision support and cross-functional integration can connect decentralized operational choices to overarching institutional goals, an insight applicable to complex public organizations (Akin-Oluyomi & Akhigbe, 2023).

Digital governance adds another layer to institutional architecture. Access-control systems demonstrate how information rights can be differentiated and protected across organizational networks, reinforcing the importance of clearly specified authorization structures where sensitive administrative data move between actors (Shittu & Nabil, 2023). Integrated risk-governance models likewise show the value of connecting human-resource strategy, operational analytics and risk intelligence rather than allowing functional silos to weaken organizational responsiveness (Falemi, Akhigbe & Akin-Oluyomi, 2024).

Nigeria's institutional context combines constitutional federalism with consequential relationships among federal, state and local authorities. Scholarship on Nigerian public administration identifies tensions between formal administrative structures and practical governance, including politicisation, procedural weaknesses and difficulties translating institutional mandates into effective performance (Chioke, 2024). Institutional design also carries representational objectives: Nigeria's Federal Character Principle embeds diversity and social equity within federal public-service recruitment, illustrating how bureaucratic architecture serves both administrative and legitimacy functions (Ikpebe, Akinrinmade & Asempah, 2025).

Comparative African experience shows that restructuring alone does not guarantee stronger performance. South Africa's post-apartheid machinery of government has undergone continuing reconfiguration, with variation in internal organizational arrangements reflecting mandate, strategic scope and path-dependent development (Naidoo, 2024). Evidence from Ghana demonstrates that hierarchy can suppress employee voice and bottom-up innovation when supervisors resist ideas from subordinate officials, showing how informal authority relationships can modify the effects of formal organizational design (Williams & Yecaló-Tecle, 2020).

Table 1. Illustrative comparison of institutional design dimensions

Dimension	United States	Nigeria	Accountability implication
Authority distribution	Multi-level, polycentric federalism	Federal, state and local tiers	Clarifies responsibility for outcomes
Coordination	Interagency and network mechanisms	Vertical and intergovernmental coordination	Reduces mandate fragmentation
Oversight	Legislative, audit and administrative channels	Constitutional and administrative controls	Strengthens review pathways
Performance linkage	Agency goals linked to managerial systems	Variable integration across institutions	Determines whether structure produces results
Digital governance	Mature data-intensive systems	Uneven but expanding digital capacity	Shapes transparency and monitoring

4. Performance Management Systems and Practices

Performance management in the public sector is best understood as an integrated system through which governments convert policy mandates into measurable objectives, monitor implementation, assess results, and use evidence to improve decisions. Its effectiveness depends less on the mere existence of indicators than on the quality of the routines linking plans, targets, managerial behaviour, feedback, and resource allocation. Meta-analytic evidence shows that performance management produces only modest average gains unless systems incorporate strong managerial practices, indicating that measurement must be embedded within purposeful management rather than treated as an administrative reporting exercise (Gerrish, 2016).

In the United States, performance management has developed through formal federal routines that seek to connect agency goals with recurrent review and managerial use of data. Evidence from implementation of the GPRA Modernization Act indicates that cross-agency priority goals, focused agency priorities, and data-driven reviews are associated with greater use of performance information in managerial decision-making (Moynihan & Kroll, 2016). Earlier evaluation of GPRA and the Program Assessment Rating Tool similarly demonstrated that participation in formal performance routines is most useful when leadership commitment, organizational learning, and the ability to link measures with action are present (Moynihan & Lavertu, 2012). Strategic management therefore becomes important because performance

systems are strongest when monitoring informs strategy continuously rather than operating as a retrospective compliance process (Poister, 2010).

Nigeria's experience illustrates the importance of institutional context. Public-sector performance management has repeatedly been promoted as a mechanism for clarifying objectives, aligning individual responsibilities with organizational priorities, reviewing progress, and improving service delivery; however, implementation difficulties, weak appraisal cultures, and inconsistent links between assessment and development have limited its impact (Eneanya, 2018). This gap between formal design and practical use is particularly significant for a comparative analysis because it shifts attention from whether a performance system exists to whether public organizations possess the managerial capacity and institutional discipline required to make it consequential.

Data-driven systems can strengthen that capacity when performance indicators are designed to support operational learning. A multi-site performance framework demonstrates how standardized indicators, real-time information, predictive analysis, and continuous-improvement mechanisms can help managers identify variation and coordinate geographically dispersed operations (Akin-Oluyomi & Akhigbe, 2023). Workforce-oriented models similarly show that productivity depends on integrating human factors such as skill variation, workload, fatigue, and task allocation into performance design rather than relying exclusively on output measures (Akanbi, Ganiu & Sunday, 2022). The connection between workforce stability and productivity is further strengthened when retention analytics, engagement information, and operational metrics are incorporated into unified decision-support systems (Falemi, Akhigbe & Akin-Oluyomi, 2023).

Leadership constitutes another critical performance-management practice. Frameworks that translate leadership effectiveness into measurable operational outcomes emphasize the value of performance dashboards, behavioural indicators, feedback cycles, and explicit links between managerial decisions and organizational results (Falemi, Akhigbe & Akin-Oluyomi, 2025). Such alignment is especially relevant in public institutions, where managers must reconcile efficiency targets with legal obligations, political priorities, workforce development, and citizen expectations.

Comparative African evidence reinforces the difficulty of institutionalizing performance management. In Ghana, administrative leaders have played an entrepreneurial role in embedding performance-management reforms, demonstrating that formal systems require champions capable of sustaining routines, legitimacy, and organizational acceptance over time (Ohemeng & Kamga, 2020). South African research likewise shows that effective public-sector performance management depends on the interaction between employment relationships, engagement,

feedback, and perceptions of the system's credibility rather than on appraisal instruments alone (Maake, Schultz & Harmse, 2023).

5. Accountability Mechanisms and Administrative Outcomes

Accountability mechanisms acquire administrative significance when they move beyond formal reporting to alter how public institutions allocate resources, respond to evidence, correct deficiencies, and deliver services. Such mechanisms include legislative scrutiny, financial and performance audit, transparency requirements, administrative review, citizen monitoring, digital reporting, and evidence-based evaluation. Their effectiveness therefore depends on whether information about public action reaches actors with sufficient authority, incentives, and institutional capacity to demand explanation and secure corrective action. Comparative evidence across 189 countries demonstrates that supreme audit institutions differ substantially in structure and capacity, while their contribution to accountability is conditioned by wider state capability and governance environments rather than institutional form alone (Romão et al., 2026).

Audit represents one of the most institutionalised pathways connecting scrutiny to administrative improvement. Evidence from Norway indicates that performance audits can induce ministries and agencies to modify practices, although responses are shaped by institutional, political, and instrumental conditions surrounding the audited organisation (Reichborn-Kjennerud & Johnsen, 2018). The broader public value of audit consequently lies not merely in identifying irregularities but in producing credible findings that legislatures, administrators, and citizens can use to improve efficiency, effectiveness, and stewardship of public resources (Cordery & Hay, 2019). In South African local government, oversight and accountability similarly function as important safeguards for constitutional governance and effective service delivery, particularly where institutional monitoring must translate formal responsibilities into observable administrative conduct (Janda & Masango, 2024).

Transparency forms another mechanism, but disclosure alone should not be equated with accountability. Public information becomes consequential only when audiences can interpret it, identify responsibility, and activate institutional or political responses. Transparency arrangements must therefore be assessed according to their legal, organisational, political, and cultural settings rather than assumed automatically to generate better governance (Pozen, 2020). Digital participation can strengthen this accountability chain. Evidence from U.S. local service requests indicates that collective citizen input submitted through digital reporting platforms can affect administrative prioritisation and the speed of governmental responses, demonstrating how citizen-generated information may influence frontline service delivery (Schiff, 2025).

Citizen monitoring can produce particularly tangible outcomes where communities possess usable information and credible avenues for engagement. A randomized intervention in Uganda found that strengthened community monitoring of primary healthcare providers increased provider effort, service utilisation, and measurable health outcomes, demonstrating that accountability can affect administrative behaviour when citizens are able to observe and challenge service performance (Björkman & Svensson, 2009).

Nigeria's administrative context similarly illustrates the value of converting public data into actionable accountability evidence. Multi-criteria assessment of rural-road rehabilitation shows how surface condition, population, and market-access indicators can be integrated to establish transparent priorities, reducing reliance on less systematic allocation decisions (Alaka et al., 2023). Administrative records can likewise reveal spatial patterns in road traffic crashes, allowing public authorities to identify high-risk corridors and direct enforcement or safety interventions toward demonstrated needs (Alaka, Tiamiyu & Bolaji, 2021).

The capacity to combine administrative and external data further strengthens institutional responsiveness. Integrating field surveys with open geospatial information offers decision-makers a practical basis for infrastructure planning in data-scarce environments, thereby improving the evidentiary foundation upon which agencies can justify priorities and evaluate interventions (Tiamiyu et al., 2023). Emergency-service analysis in Kwara State similarly demonstrates how network-based assessment can reveal geographic gaps in response coverage and convert otherwise abstract service obligations into identifiable spatial deficiencies requiring administrative attention (Tiamiyu, Alaka & Ajayi, 2021).

Table 2. Illustrative accountability mechanisms and administrative outcomes

Accountability mechanism	Operational pathway	Expected administrative outcome	Comparative relevance
Performance audit	Independent examination and recommendations	Corrective action and improved management	Stronger institutional oversight
Legislative scrutiny	Review of agency decisions and expenditure	Answerability and consequence management	Clarifies responsibility
Transparency systems	Disclosure of decisions and performance data	Greater visibility and contestability	Supports external scrutiny
Citizen monitoring	Feedback and community observation	Responsive frontline services	Strengthens social accountability

Digital reporting	Real-time citizen-government information	Faster issue identification and response	Enables data-driven responsiveness
Geospatial monitoring	Spatial assessment of service conditions	Better targeting and resource allocation	Valuable in data-scarce settings
Performance evidence	Indicators linked to administrative decisions	Learning and corrective intervention	Connects accountability with outcomes

6. Comparative Challenges and Institutional Constraints

Comparative assessment of public-service accountability and performance management must recognise that institutional systems operate within markedly different political, administrative, technological and socioeconomic environments. Consequently, similar reforms may generate substantially different outcomes in the United States and Nigeria because implementation is mediated by administrative capacity, organisational culture, infrastructure, managerial autonomy and workforce readiness. Institutional constraints are therefore not peripheral obstacles to reform; they determine whether formal accountability structures translate into sustained behavioural and performance change.

A central difficulty is the gap between adopting recognised institutional forms and developing the capabilities required to make them functional. Public-sector reforms can produce “capability traps” when governments replicate internationally accepted structures, procedures and management instruments without cultivating the problem-solving capacity required for effective implementation. Reform success consequently depends on locally identified problems, experimentation, continuous feedback and institutional learning rather than the mechanical transplantation of presumed best practices (Andrews, Pritchett & Woolcock, 2013). This distinction is particularly relevant when comparing Nigeria with the United States, where differences in administrative resources and institutional maturity affect the feasibility of ostensibly similar performance reforms.

Even in highly developed administrative systems, managerial reforms encounter organisational resistance. Evidence from the United Kingdom shows that professional values, established institutional arrangements and occupational interests can constrain management restructuring despite substantial governmental commitment and resources. Formal change therefore does not necessarily alter deeply embedded practices or professional authority relationships (Ackroyd, Kirkpatrick & Walker, 2007). European comparative evidence similarly demonstrates that managerial autonomy varies considerably across administrative systems, indicating that reform

instruments operate differently depending on inherited state traditions, organisational arrangements and the intensity of previous managerial reforms (Bezes, 2018).

Technological modernisation introduces another institutional constraint. Digital performance systems require employees who possess appropriate skills, confidence and adaptive capacity. Technology-adoption frameworks demonstrate that readiness depends upon training, employee participation, supportive leadership, psychological acceptance and continuous feedback; technology introduced without these complementary capabilities can encounter resistance or fail to yield expected productivity improvements (Akhigbe, Falemi & Akin-Oluyomi, 2024). For Nigeria, these workforce issues intersect with material infrastructure limitations that are less pronounced across many U.S. public institutions.

Evidence from Nigerian transport systems illustrates how digital and physical infrastructure can jointly restrict service accessibility. Beyond state capitals, insufficient mobile-network coverage and poor road conditions affect different populations and can combine to restrict digitally mediated transport, demonstrating that technological innovation cannot compensate automatically for underlying infrastructure deficits (Alaka, Ajayi & Bolaji, 2022). Such constraints complicate performance comparisons because administrative outcomes may reflect environmental limitations as much as managerial efficiency.

Institutional resilience becomes particularly visible during crises. During Nigeria's COVID-19 movement restrictions, changes in essential travel and transport substitution varied across major cities according to the intensity of restrictions and available mobility alternatives, illustrating how emergency policies interact with local socioeconomic and infrastructure conditions (Ajayi, Alaka & Tiamiyu, 2020). South Africa's pandemic response likewise exposed tensions between decisive governmental intervention and its economic consequences, particularly for informal businesses and vulnerable workers excluded from portions of formal support arrangements (Ikwegbue et al., 2021).

7. Cross-National Policy Lessons and Adaptation

Cross-national learning in public administration is most valuable when it distinguishes transferable principles from institutional arrangements that depend upon specific political, administrative and socioeconomic conditions. For the United States and Nigeria, this distinction is essential because performance management and accountability mechanisms operate within different traditions of federalism, bureaucratic professionalisation, fiscal capacity and technological development. Policy transfer should therefore be understood as the selective use of knowledge from another jurisdiction rather than the wholesale replication of administrative

structures. International experience demonstrates that transfer can fail when policymakers possess incomplete knowledge of the originating system, transfer only selected components, or import arrangements incompatible with domestic institutions (Dolowitz & Marsh, 2000).

Effective adaptation consequently requires attention to the multiple actors and institutional levels through which policy knowledge travels. Cross-national reforms are shaped by international organisations, political executives, bureaucracies, professional networks and implementing agencies, meaning that transferred ideas are continually interpreted as they move between levels of governance. Policy learning is therefore a negotiated process in which structural conditions and administrative agency jointly determine whether external models become workable domestic practices (Evans & Davies, 1999).

This perspective is particularly relevant to Nigeria. Recent evidence from Nigerian tax administration demonstrates that reform does not simply replace existing administrative arrangements; bureaucratic, managerial and community-based institutional logics can accumulate through layering, producing hybrid governance structures. Reform design must consequently account for historical institutional practices rather than assuming that imported managerial approaches will displace established norms automatically (Bassey, 2026). Ghanaian public-sector reform experience similarly demonstrates that technically credible reform programmes remain vulnerable to political dynamics, fragmented ownership and implementation difficulties, reinforcing the importance of domestic commitment and institutional legitimacy when adapting international reform principles (Ohemeng&Aye, 2016).

A practical policy lesson concerns capability development. Accountability frameworks, performance dashboards and digital monitoring technologies cannot function sustainably without personnel able to interpret information, exercise professional judgement and translate performance evidence into corrective action. Capability-building models emphasise strategic competency identification, continuous learning, workforce analytics and technology-enabled development, suggesting that institutional reform should invest simultaneously in systems and the people expected to operate them (Falemi, Akhigbe & Akin-Oluyomi, 2020).

Data capability provides a second transferable principle. Analytics frameworks demonstrate how predictive information, real-time monitoring and structured decision support can improve forecasting and identify operational bottlenecks before they become entrenched performance failures (Akin-Oluyomi& Akhigbe, 2023). For Nigerian public institutions, adaptation would require proportionate systems designed around available administrative data, technical capacity and service-delivery priorities rather than direct reproduction of highly sophisticated U.S. platforms.

Workforce flexibility constitutes another important lesson. Institutional performance can deteriorate when staffing levels, competencies and deployment patterns fail to respond to changing demands. Integrating workforce forecasting, agile allocation and continuous monitoring provides a means of linking human-resource capacity with evolving operational requirements (Falemi, Akhigbe & Akin-Oluyomi, 2023).

8. Reform Priorities and Future Directions

Future reform of accountability and performance management in the United States and Nigeria should move beyond periodic appraisal and retrospective reporting toward integrated systems capable of generating timely, intelligible and actionable performance intelligence. Reform priorities should therefore combine institutional strengthening, digital transformation, workforce capability, data governance and meaningful oversight. The objective should not be technological modernisation for its own sake, but the creation of administrative systems in which information enables decision-makers, oversight institutions and citizens to identify performance deficiencies and trace responsibility for remedial action.

Digital transformation presents an important opportunity for Nigeria. Evidence from federal ministries, departments and agencies indicates that digitalisation can strengthen transparency and accountability by improving information accessibility, transaction visibility and institutional monitoring. Its effectiveness, however, depends upon coherent implementation, reliable infrastructure and the capacity to embed digital tools within existing accountability structures rather than operating them as isolated technological interventions (Obidike&Onuora, 2025). South African experience similarly demonstrates that public-sector digital transformation is constrained by digital literacy deficits, inadequate infrastructure, unreliable power supply and limited executive participation in information-technology governance, highlighting the institutional prerequisites for sustainable reform (Shibambu, 2024).

Automation should consequently be accompanied by governance safeguards and workforce development. Smart monitoring architectures illustrate how real-time data acquisition, predictive analytics and automated control can improve visibility over operational processes while supporting faster identification of deviations. Such systems nevertheless create cybersecurity, interoperability and technical-capacity requirements that must be addressed through phased implementation and appropriate governance arrangements (Omoegun et al., 2024). These principles can inform future public-sector performance infrastructures, particularly where agencies manage complex physical assets or geographically distributed services.

More advanced monitoring technologies demonstrate the direction in which performance management may evolve. Digital-twin architectures can combine physical assets, data acquisition, simulation and analytical functions to facilitate continuous monitoring and earlier detection of operational failures, illustrating how public infrastructure agencies could shift from reactive management toward predictive oversight (Shittu et al., 2023). AI-enhanced digital twins further demonstrate the potential of explainable analytics, real-time optimisation and predictive maintenance to improve reliability while maintaining interpretability for users responsible for operational decisions (Shittu & Shittu, 2024).

Machine-learning applications provide similar possibilities for public monitoring. Environmental systems can use sensor-generated historical data to establish normal behavioural ranges, detect anomalies and generate interpretable indicators for timely intervention, demonstrating how future government monitoring could increasingly move from fixed thresholds toward adaptive evidence-based surveillance (Adamolekun et al., 2026). Such innovation should nevertheless preserve administrative accountability rather than transfer responsibility to automated systems.

This concern is increasingly salient in the United States, where state governments are developing rules for accountable AI use. Evidence from 32 states indicates that public-sector AI governance increasingly requires explicit standards concerning responsibility, transparency, oversight and consequences, although gaps remain between academic recommendations and government practice (Chen, Gasco-Hernandez & Gil-Garcia, 2026). Future reforms in both countries should therefore require human oversight, auditable decision trails, explainability, data-quality controls and mechanisms for contesting automated decisions.

Conclusion

This study examined the institutional foundations, accountability mechanisms, performance management systems, comparative constraints, policy-transfer dynamics, and reform priorities shaping public administration in the United States and Nigeria. The analysis met its objectives by demonstrating that accountability and performance are not products of formal rules alone, but of the interaction between institutional design, managerial capability, oversight quality, information systems, workforce competence, and implementation discipline. Across both contexts, effective governance depends on whether public institutions can translate mandates into measurable objectives, generate reliable performance information, assign responsibility, and convert scrutiny into corrective action.

The comparative evidence revealed important differences. The United States benefits from denser oversight arrangements, institutionalized performance routines, stronger digital

infrastructure, and administrative data capacity, although fragmentation, professional resistance, and intergovernmental complexity remain constraints. Nigeria possesses substantial formal accountability and performance structures, yet outcomes are more uneven because infrastructural disparities, capacity limitations, implementation gaps, inconsistent data quality, and weak follow-through can reduce institutional effectiveness. The review further established that reforms cannot be transferred mechanically across jurisdictions. Adaptation must reflect domestic administrative traditions, fiscal realities, workforce capabilities, and technological readiness.

The study also showed that future performance systems will increasingly depend on digital platforms, predictive analytics, automation, and artificial intelligence. However, technological sophistication will strengthen accountability only where human oversight, data governance, transparency, explainability, and institutional responsibility remain explicit.

Accordingly, reform should prioritize stronger audit follow-through, interoperable administrative data, professional capacity development, clearer responsibility chains, citizen-responsive monitoring, and evidence-based resource allocation. Nigeria should emphasize implementation capability, digital infrastructure, and enforcement consistency, while the United States should deepen algorithmic accountability, cross-agency coordination, and governance of automated systems. Both countries should pursue adaptive, context-sensitive reforms that connect performance measurement with learning, service quality, equity, and public value. Sustainable improvement ultimately requires institutions that are not merely capable of reporting performance, but are demonstrably able to learn, respond, and remain answerable for results.

References

1. Ackroyd, S., Kirkpatrick, I. and Walker, R.M. (2007) 'Public management reform in the UK and its consequences for professional organization: A comparative analysis', *Public Administration*, 85(1), pp. 9–26. DOI: 10.1111/j.1467-9299.2007.00631.x.
2. Adamolekun, A., Ganiu, O., Adamolekun, T., Logah, F.X. and Okhuegbe, O. (2026) 'Machine learning-enabled characterization of normal water quality behavior and anomaly detection in groundwater and surface water monitoring systems', *Journal of Geography, Environment and Earth Science International*, 30(6), pp. 61–69. DOI: 10.9734/jgeesi/2026/v30i61062.
3. Adejuwon, D.K. (2014) 'Enhancing public accountability and performance in Nigeria: Periscoping the impediments and exploring imperative measures', *Africa's Public Service Delivery & Performance Review*, 2(2), pp. 102–125. DOI: 10.4102/apspdpr.v2i2.54.
4. Agwuna, L., Rhodes, B. and Mowat, S. (2026) 'Economic participation and sustainable development in South Africa: Interlinking trade, poverty, inequality, and the

- environment’, in Enaifoghe, A. (ed.) *Digital Governance, Democracy, and Inclusion in Developing Countries*, pp. 229–254. IGI Global Scientific Publishing. DOI: 10.4018/979-8-2600-1618-3.ch009.
5. Ajayi, O., Alaka, O.B. and Tiamiyu, R. (2020) ‘Essential trip making and mode substitution during COVID-19 movement restrictions in Nigerian cities’, *IRE Journals*, 4(4), pp. 442–465. DOI: 10.64388/IREV4I4-1722673.
 6. Akanbi, O., Ganiu, O.S. and Sunday, E.A. (2022) ‘A workforce-centric line-balancing model for throughput maximization in multi-shift operations’, *Shodhshauryam: International Scientific Refereed Research Journal*, 5(3), pp. 439–464. DOI: 10.32628/SHISRRJ225491.
 7. Akhigbe, R., Falemi, A. and Akin-Oluyomi, O.T. (2024) ‘An advanced framework for technology adoption that supports employee readiness in modern organizations’, *International Journal of Advanced Multidisciplinary Research and Studies*, 4(1), pp. 1637–1659. DOI: 10.62225/2583049X.2024.4.1.5344.
 8. Akhigbe, R., Falemi, A. and Akin-Oluyomi, O.T. (2025) ‘An advanced governance model for improving transparency, accountability and strategic execution in complex enterprises’, *Article*, December.
 9. Akin-Oluyomi, O.T. and Akhigbe, R. (2022) ‘A supply chain governance model for enhancing compliance and operational quality across retail networks’.
 10. Akin-Oluyomi, O.T. and Akhigbe, R. (2023) ‘A conceptual supply chain leadership model for aligning logistics decisions with enterprise strategy’, *International Journal of Advanced Multidisciplinary Research and Studies*, 3(1), pp. 1725–1744. DOI: 10.62225/2583049X.2023.3.1.5340.
 11. Akin-Oluyomi, O.T. and Akhigbe, R. (2023) ‘A proposed supply chain analytics framework for improving forecasting accuracy and reducing bottlenecks’, *International Journal of Advanced Multidisciplinary Research and Studies*, 3(1), pp. 1686–1703. DOI: 10.62225/2583049X.2023.3.1.5338.
 12. Akin-Oluyomi, O.T. and Akhigbe, R. (2023) ‘An advanced framework for improving multi-site operational efficiency using data-driven performance indicators’, *International Journal of Advanced Multidisciplinary Research and Studies*, 3(1), pp. 1763–1781. DOI: 10.62225/2583049X.2023.3.1.5343.
 13. Alaka, O.B., Ajayi, O. and Bolaji, O. (2020) ‘Geospatial assessment of access to health facilities over unpaved rural road networks’, *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Growth Evaluation*, 1(5), pp. 1199–1214. DOI: 10.54660/IJMRGE.2020.1.5.1199-1214.
 14. Alaka, O.B., Ajayi, O. and Bolaji, O. (2022) ‘Mobile network coverage and road surface condition as joint constraints on digitally booked transport beyond state capitals’,

- International Journal of Engineering and Modern Technology, 8(5), pp. 142–168. DOI: 10.56201/ijemt.v8.no5.2022.pg142.168.
15. Alaka, O.B., Tiamiyu, R. and Bolaji, O. (2021) ‘Spatial clustering of road traffic crash locations on intercity corridors using national road safety records’, International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Growth Evaluation, 2(6), pp. 1086–1101. DOI: 10.54660/IJMRGE.2021.2.6.1086-1101.
 16. Alaka, O.B., Tiamiyu, R., Ajayi, O. and Bolaji, O. (2023) ‘Multi-criteria prioritization of rural road rehabilitation using surface condition, population, and market-access indicators’, International Journal of Advanced Multidisciplinary Research and Studies, 3(6), pp. 3047–3058.
 17. Andrews, M., Pritchett, L. and Woolcock, M. (2013) ‘Escaping capability traps through problem-driven iterative adaptation (PDIA)’, World Development, 51, pp. 234–244. DOI: 10.1016/j.worlddev.2013.05.011.
 18. Ansell, C. and Gash, A. (2008) ‘Collaborative governance in theory and practice’, Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory, 18(4), pp. 543–571. DOI: 10.1093/jopart/mum032.
 19. Ayinde, M., Ojukwu, P.U. and Ohunyon, G. (2025) ‘Organizational readiness for generative AI integration in healthcare operations: Comparative management capabilities between the U.S. and low- and middle-income countries’, International Journal of Advanced Multidisciplinary Research and Studies, 5(6), pp. 2207–2222. DOI: 10.62225/2583049X.2025.5.6.6007.
 20. Bassey, E. (2026) ‘Rethinking public administration reform: Institutional layering of bureaucratic, managerial and community logics over time in Nigeria’s tax administration’, Public Administration and Development. DOI: 10.1002/pad.70058.
 21. Behn, R.D. (2003) ‘Why measure performance? Different purposes require different measures’, Public Administration Review, 63(5), pp. 586–606. DOI: 10.1111/1540-6210.00322.
 22. Bezes, P. (2018) ‘Autonomy and managerial reforms in Europe: Let or make public managers manage?’, Public Administration, 96(1), pp. 3–22. DOI: 10.1111/padm.12361.
 23. Björkman, M. and Svensson, J. (2009) ‘Power to the people: Evidence from a randomized field experiment on community-based monitoring in Uganda’, The Quarterly Journal of Economics, 124(2), pp. 735–769. DOI: 10.1162/qjec.2009.124.2.735.
 24. Bovens, M. (2007) ‘Analysing and assessing accountability: A conceptual framework’, European Law Journal, 13(4), pp. 447–468. DOI: 10.1111/j.1468-0386.2007.00378.x.
 25. Bovens, M., Schillemans, T. and ’t Hart, P. (2008) ‘Does public accountability work? An assessment tool’, Public Administration, 86(1), pp. 225–242. DOI: 10.1111/j.1467-9299.2008.00716.x.

26. Chen, T., Gasco-Hernandez, M. and Gil-Garcia, J.R. (2026) 'Understanding accountability in AI use within the public sector: Insights from state governments in the United States', *Public Administration*, advance online publication, pp. 1–19. DOI: 10.1111/padm.70051.
27. Chioke, S.C. (2024) 'Can lamb and lion tango? Investigating Nigeria's practice of public administration and peculiar challenges from structural functional theory', *PanAfrican Journal of Governance and Development*, 5(1), pp. 78–105. DOI: 10.46404/panjogov.v5i1.5362.
28. Christensen, T. and Lægreid, P. (2007) 'The whole-of-government approach to public sector reform', *Public Administration Review*, 67(6), pp. 1059–1066. DOI: 10.1111/j.1540-6210.2007.00797.x.
29. Cordery, C.J. and Hay, D. (2019) 'Supreme audit institutions and public value: Demonstrating relevance', *Financial Accountability & Management*, 35(2), pp. 128–142. DOI: 10.1111/faam.12185.
30. Dolowitz, D.P. and Marsh, D. (2000) 'Learning from abroad: The role of policy transfer in contemporary policy-making', *Governance*, 13(1), pp. 5–23. DOI: 10.1111/0952-1895.00121.
31. Enaifoghe, A., Dlamini, N.P. and Agwuna, L.U. (2020) 'African economic integration development in technological transformation: Assessing the importance of ethical leadership for policy implementation in SADC', *Journal of Economics and Behavioral Studies*, 12(6), pp. 11–20. DOI: 10.22610/jebbs.v12i6(J).3102.
32. Eneanya, A.N. (2018) 'Performance management system and public service delivery in Nigeria: Impacts, problems, challenges and prospects', *Africa's Public Service Delivery & Performance Review*, 6(1), a201. DOI: 10.4102/apsdpr.v6i1.201.
33. Evans, M. and Davies, J. (1999) 'Understanding policy transfer: A multi-level, multi-disciplinary perspective', *Public Administration*, 77(2), pp. 361–385. DOI: 10.1111/1467-9299.00158.
34. Fadero, S., Oyesiji, S.O., Nwakamma, S. and Jooda, D. (2018) 'IT governance frameworks (COBIT/ITIL) and their impact on regulatory compliance in Nigerian insurance firms', *IRE Journals*, 2(5), pp. 478–496. DOI: 10.64388/IREV2I5-1722619.
35. Falemi, A., Akhigbe, R. and Akin-Oluyomi, O.T. (2020) 'A conceptual supply chain talent development model for capability building across distributed operations', *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Growth Evaluation*, 1(5), pp. 439–456. DOI: 10.54660/IJMRGE.2020.1.5.439-456.
36. Falemi, A., Akhigbe, R. and Akin-Oluyomi, O.T. (2023) 'A proposed framework for integrating employee retention systems with operational productivity metrics', *International Journal of Advanced Multidisciplinary Research and Studies*, 3(1), pp. 1704–1724. DOI: 10.62225/2583049X.2023.3.1.5339.

37. Falemi, A., Akhigbe, R. and Akin-Oluyomi, O.T. (2023) 'A supply chain workforce optimization framework for addressing staffing volatility during rapid expansion cycles', *International Journal of Advanced Multidisciplinary Research and Studies*, 3(1), pp. 1745–1762. DOI: 10.62225/2583049X.2023.3.1.5342.
38. Falemi, A., Akhigbe, R. and Akin-Oluyomi, O.T. (2024) 'A conceptual enterprise risk management model that integrates HR strategy with operational analytics', *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Growth Evaluation*, 5(6), pp. 1730–1753. DOI: 10.54660/IJMRGE.2024.5.6.1730-1753.
39. Falemi, A., Akhigbe, R. and Akin-Oluyomi, O.T. (2025) 'A proposed operational growth framework linking leadership effectiveness with measurable business outcomes', *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Growth Evaluation*, 6(6), pp. 1081–1102. DOI: 10.54660/IJMRGE.2025.6.6.1081-1102.
40. Gerrish, E. (2016) 'The impact of performance management on performance in public organizations: A meta-analysis', *Public Administration Review*, 76(1), pp. 48–66. DOI: 10.1111/puar.12433.
41. Ijewereme, O.B. (2023) 'The influence of performance management on staff performance: A case of two bureaucracies in Federal Public Service of Nigeria', *Journal of Public Policy and Administration*, 7(2), pp. 98–108. DOI: 10.11648/j.jpaa.20230702.18.
42. Ikpebe, E., Akinrinmade, B. and Asempah, E. (2025) 'Social equity and representative bureaucracy: The case of Nigeria's Federal Character Principle', *Public Administration*, 103(4), pp. 992–1003. DOI: 10.1111/padm.13072.
43. Ikwegbue, P.C., Enaifoghe, A.O., Maduku, H. and Agwuna, L.U. (2021) 'The challenges of COVID-19 pandemic and South Africa's response', *African Renaissance*, 18(1), pp. 271–292. DOI: 10.31920/2516-5305/2021/18n1a13.
44. Janda, S.N. and Masango, R.S. (2024) 'Oversight function and accountability as cornerstones for good governance in the South African local government', *Journal of Public Administration*, 59(1). DOI: 10.53973/jopa.2024.59.1.a8.
45. Ji, S. (2022) 'Role of managerial and political accountability in improving performance of local governments', *Public Performance & Management Review*, 45(3), pp. 499–531. DOI: 10.1080/15309576.2022.2062608.
46. Kroll, A. and Moynihan, D.P. (2015) 'Does training matter? Evidence from performance management reforms', *Public Administration Review*, 75(3), pp. 411–420. DOI: 10.1111/puar.12331.
47. Lonti, Z. and Gregory, R. (2007) 'Accountability or countability? Performance measurement in the New Zealand public service, 1992–2002', *Australian Journal of Public Administration*, 66(4), pp. 468–484. DOI: 10.1111/j.1467-8500.2007.00557.x.

48. Maake, G., Schultz, C. and Harmse, C. (2023) 'A performance management system, employment relationships and work engagement framework for the public sector in South Africa', *Southern African Business Review*, 27. DOI: 10.25159/1998-8125/13795.
49. Marie, R. and Khumalo, N. (2024) 'Factors that influence the performance management system in the Municipality of KwaZulu-Natal', *Cogent Business & Management*, 11(1), article 2350789. DOI: 10.1080/23311975.2024.2350789.
50. Moynihan, D.P. and Kroll, A. (2016) 'Performance management routines that work? An early assessment of the GPRA Modernization Act', *Public Administration Review*, 76(2), pp. 314–323. DOI: 10.1111/puar.12434.
51. Moynihan, D.P. and Lavertu, S. (2012) 'Does involvement in performance management routines encourage performance information use? Evaluating GPRA and PART', *Public Administration Review*, 72(4), pp. 592–602. DOI: 10.1111/j.1540-6210.2011.02539.x.
52. Mulgan, R. (2000) "'Accountability": An ever-expanding concept?', *Public Administration*, 78(3), pp. 555–573. DOI: 10.1111/1467-9299.00218.
53. Munzhedzi, P.H. (2016) 'Fostering public accountability in South Africa: A reflection on challenges and successes', *The Journal for Transdisciplinary Research in Southern Africa*, 12(1), a339. DOI: 10.4102/td.v12i1.339.
54. Naidoo, V. (2024) 'Tracking structural change inside South Africa's machinery of government: An empirical analysis', *Administratio Publica*, 32(3), pp. 1–25. DOI: 10.61967/adminpub.2024.32.3.2.
55. Ndevu, Z. (2022) 'Rethinking performance management: Realities in South African municipalities', in *Public Sector Performance Management*. IntechOpen. DOI: 10.5772/intechopen.107960.
56. Obidike, J.C. and Onuora, J.K.J. (2025) 'Effect of digital transformation on public sector accountability and transparency in Nigeria', *Journal of Accounting and Financial Management*, 11(1), pp. 40–51. DOI: 10.56201/jafm.v11.no1.2025.pg40.51.
57. Ohemeng, F.L.K. and Ayee, J.R.A. (2016) 'The "new approach" to public sector reforms in Ghana: A case of politics as usual or a genuine attempt at reform?', *Development Policy Review*, 34(2), pp. 277–300. DOI: 10.1111/dpr.12150.
58. Ohemeng, F.L.K. and Kanga, O. (2020) 'Administrative leaders as institutional entrepreneurs in developing countries: A study of the development and institutionalization of performance management in Ghana's public service', *Public Administration and Development*, 40(1), pp. 87–100. DOI: 10.1002/pad.1867.
59. Omoegun, G.O., Sunday, E.A., Essien, M.A. and Oluokun, O.A. (2024) 'Implementing smart automation solutions in medium-scale industries using SCADA systems', *International Journal of Scientific Research in Computer Science, Engineering and Information Technology*, 10(5), pp. 1207–1231. DOI: 10.32628/CSEIT241061242.

60. Onche, V.O., Adenekan, E.T. and Sabboh, G.M. (2021) 'Influence of personal and professional attributes of secretaries on organisational success of universities in Oyo State, Nigeria', *International Journal of Science Academic Research*, 2(4), pp. 1355–1359.
61. Opara, I.S., Elumilade, R.A., Liadi, K.O., Shittu, H. and Olaoluwa, I. (2024) 'A theoretical review of synergizing energy efficiency with transportation logistics optimization: Towards a sustainable U.S. infrastructure', *International Journal of Advanced Multidisciplinary Research and Studies*, 4(6), pp. 2968–2975. DOI: 10.62225/2583049X.2024.4.6.5738.
62. Poister, T.H. (2010) 'The future of strategic planning in the public sector: Linking strategic management and performance', *Public Administration Review*, 70(s1), pp. s246–s254. DOI: 10.1111/j.1540-6210.2010.02284.x.
63. Pozen, D.E. (2020) 'Seeing transparency more clearly', *Public Administration Review*, 80(2), pp. 326–331. DOI: 10.1111/puar.13137.
64. Provan, K.G. and Kenis, P. (2008) 'Modes of network governance: Structure, management, and effectiveness', *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 18(2), pp. 229–252. DOI: 10.1093/jopart/mum015.
65. Reichborn-Kjennerud, K. and Johnsen, Å. (2018) 'Performance audits and supreme audit institutions' impact on public administration: The case of the Office of the Auditor General in Norway', *Administration & Society*, 50(10), pp. 1422–1446. DOI: 10.1177/0095399715623315.
66. Romão, A.L., Fernandes, G.A.A.L., Borrego, P., Firmino, S.I. and Caldeira, D.M. (2026) 'Mapping supreme audit institutions, accountability, and good governance: A global comparative analysis', *Journal of Comparative Policy Analysis: Research and Practice*, 28(3), pp. 340–361. DOI: 10.1080/13876988.2026.2638858.
67. Romzek, B.S. and Dubnick, M.J. (1987) 'Accountability in the public sector: Lessons from the Challenger tragedy', *Public Administration Review*, 47(3), pp. 227–238. DOI: 10.2307/975901.
68. Rutherford, A. (2014) 'Organizational turnaround and educational performance: The impact of performance-based monitoring analysis systems', *American Review of Public Administration*, 44(4), pp. 440–458. DOI: 10.1177/0275074012470022.
69. Schiff, K.J. (2025) 'Does collective citizen input impact government service provision? Evidence from SeeClickFix requests', *Public Administration Review*, 85(1), pp. 32–45. DOI: 10.1111/puar.13747.
70. Schillemans, T. and Aleksovska, M. (2025) 'Making nonpunitive accountability matter: Exploring behavioral effects of nonpunitive accountability in a conjoint experiment', *Public Administration*, 103, pp. 1006–1025. DOI: 10.1111/padm.13024.

71. Shibambu, A. (2024) 'Transformation of digital government services in the public sector in South Africa', *Africa's Public Service Delivery & Performance Review*, 12(1), a753. DOI: 10.4102/apdpr.v12i1.753.
72. Shittu, H. and Nabil, M. (2023) 'Smart supply chain management with attribute-based encryption access control', 2023 IEEE 13th Annual Computing and Communication Workshop and Conference (CCWC). DOI: 10.1109/CCWC57344.2023.10099268.
73. Shittu, H.A. and Shittu, M.A. (2024) 'AI-powered digital twins for predictive maintenance and operational optimization of renewable energy systems', *International Journal of Science, Architecture, Technology and Environment*, 1(7), pp. 151–163. DOI: 10.63680/ijstate0324085.011.
74. Shittu, M.A., Shittu, H.A., Adeleke, O.J. and Adedokun, O.J. (2023) 'Digital twin modeling for real-time monitoring and fault detection in smart substations', *International Journal of Industrial Engineering Research and Development*, 14(2), pp. 25–44. DOI: 10.34218/IJIERD_14_02_003.
75. Thiel, A. (2023) 'Polycentric governing and polycentric governance', in Gadinger, F. and Scholte, J.A. (eds.) *Polycentrism: How Governing Works Today*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 98–120. DOI: 10.1093/oso/9780192866837.003.0005.
76. Tiamiyu, R., Alaka, O.B. and Ajayi, O. (2021) 'Emergency response coverage gaps on intercity highways in Kwara State: A network service-area analysis', *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Growth Evaluation*, 2(6), pp. 1102–1118. DOI: 10.54660/IJMRGE.2021.2.6.1102-1118.
77. Tiamiyu, R., Alaka, O.B., Bolaji, O. and Ajayi, O. (2023) 'Combining field survey and open geospatial data for transport infrastructure decision support in data-scarce regions', *International Journal of Advanced Multidisciplinary Research and Studies*, 3(6), pp. 3071–3084.
78. Williams, M.J. and Yecaló-Tecle, L. (2020) 'Innovation, voice, and hierarchy in the public sector: Evidence from Ghana's civil service', *Governance*, 33(4), pp. 789–807. DOI: 10.1111/gove.12472.