## Binghamton University The Open Repository @ Binghamton (The ORB)

Capstone Projects 2015-Present

**Public Administration** 

Fall 2016

# Monitoring: Ensuring Country Representatives Efficiency and Accountability

Benjamin Edwards Binghamton University--SUNY, bamankw1@binghamton.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://orb.binghamton.edu/mpa\_capstone Part of the <u>Public Affairs, Public Policy and Public Administration Commons</u>

**Recommended** Citation

Edwards, Benjamin, "Monitoring: Ensuring Country Representatives Efficiency and Accountability" (2016). *Capstone Projects* 2015-Present. 25. https://orb.binghamton.edu/mpa\_capstone/25

This Book is brought to you for free and open access by the Public Administration at The Open Repository @ Binghamton (The ORB). It has been accepted for inclusion in Capstone Projects 2015-Present by an authorized administrator of The Open Repository @ Binghamton (The ORB). For more information, please contact ORB@binghamton.edu.



### MONITORING: ENSURING COUNTRY REPRESENTATIVES' EFFICIENCY AND ACCOUNTABILITY

## **BINGHAMTON UNIVERSITY** STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

Benjamin Edwards, MPA Candidate, 2016. Faculty Advisor: Professor David Campbell.

#### Site Supervisor: Michael Kesseh

#### Summary

This study is a review of Exit Interviews (EIs) of World For World Organization (WFWO) appointed Country Representatives (CRs) who have served their various terms of office from 2008-2015 and WFWO executive management's internal Performance Score assigned to each CR during the same period. The review was done with the view to uncovering potential operational loophole and monitoring deficiency that may have contributed to the CRs inefficiency, mismanagement, and fraudulent activities that have triggered concerns among executive management, sponsors, and other stakeholders, Following, it applies gualitative comparative analysis to measure the impact the deficiency and loophole have on the CRs' efficiency (i.e., their Performance Score).

#### Introduction

World for World Organization (WFWO) is a nonprofit organization based in Italy with Consultative Status with ECOSOC (UN). It was founded in 2001 as an advocacy and resource mobilization group to increase awareness on global development issues as well as contribute to the UN Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). In an effort to contribute to the MDGs, WFWO set up Ambassador for Development Networks (ADNs), overseen by Country Representatives (CRs) to work with identified local partners to initiate economic development projects. Areas of work include human security, economic sustainability, food security, education, health, and children and women empowerment.

mage: Ghana ADN working in partnership with a local nonprofit organization on economic development project (2011)



#### Research Question: Will close monitoring of the CRs lead to ADNs operational efficiency (i.e, performance scores from 80-100 percent)?

A person's ethical reasoning and conduct is affected by organizational structures and norms (Rhode and Packel, 2009). Structures that lack monitoring can lead to managers behaving opportunistically (Fama, 1980). Under circumstances where bending the rules provides payoff, they may feel substantial pressure to put their moral convictions on hold (Rhode and Packel, 2009). Thus, monitoring (an observation of an agent's effort and outcome) is expected to prevent managers from making decisions that may have a negative impact on an organization regardless of incentive alignment (Fama, 1980).



#### Methodology

#### **Research Design**

I used three sources of information to learn about the impact monitoring has on the CRs performance: 1) a review of Exit Interviews: 2) a review of management internal Performance Scores; 3) correlation between the Exit Interview results and Performance Score to help argue about causality

#### Review of Exit Interviews (EIs)

26 Els from CRs who have served their various terms of office from 2008-2015, covering eight countries (Ghana, Nigeria, Togo, Benin, Indonesia, The Philippines, Thailand, Singapore) in two continents (Africa and Asia) were used for this study. The CRs were asked to indicate on a scale of 1 to 5, where one is the lowest and 5 is the highest, how often they (1) sought inputs from management; (2) received timely response from management; (3) met with management; and (4) communicated project operations reviews and reports information with management. The purpose of the review was to provide a framework for theoretically determining level or degree of monitoring. Monitoring routinizes contact between parties (Langfred, 2014) through "regular dialogue" (p. 63). Building on this theory, my method assumed sustained contact and regular dialogue corresponded to monitoring. Based on the indicated responses, I coded the scales 0-2 as low or infrequent contact between executive management and the CRs (therefore, low or inadequate monitoring) and 4-5 as high or frequent contact and regular dialogue between executive management and the CRs (therefore, close monitoring),

#### Review of Performance Scores

Management has graded performance of the CRs from 2008-2015. The Performance Score ranges from 30 percent-100 percent (where the range, 30 percent-70 percent assigned as low, and 80 percent-100 percent assigned as high) using their internal performance evaluation mechanism.

Correlation Between Els Result and management Performance Scores First, I applied qualitative comparative analysis (QCA) to determine which logical conclusions the Els results and Performance Scores support. I followed to apply correlation analysis to help me define potential relationship between Els results and Performance Scores, and to test the hypothesized relationship: if close monitoring (4-5) of the CRs results in efficient management of the ADNs (Performance Score of 80 percent-100 percent).

#### Data Analysis

- · I examined relationship between level of monitoring (high is 4-5; low is 0-2) and individual CR's Performance Score (high is 80 percent-100 percent; low 30percent-70percent).
- · I compiled all responses (EIs) to the same questions together and examined as a set to control for potential impact individual CR's skills and/ or level of commitment might have on Performance Score, then, I examined relationship between level of monitoring and the CRs Performance Scores again.
- · I examined the CRs Performance Scores and level of monitoring by year. This is because span of control, (i.e., the number of staff that report to a manager) can influence level of monitoring. There were fewer CRs from 2010-2012 than 2013-2015



#### Findings

#### General

Fourteen of the twenty-six participants (53.8 percent) who received close monitoring (i.e., indicated 4-5) showed efficiency (i.e., Performing Score from 80 percent-100 percent). The remaining eight participants (46.2 percent) who received inadequate monitoring (i.e., indicated 0-2) showed inefficiency (i.e., Performing Score from 30 percent-55 percent). A correlation between level of monitoring and performance score shows a perfectly linear relationship with a correlation coefficients of +1.00. The results are represented on the graph in figure 1.0 below.



Figure 1.0. Correlation between Performance Score and Monitoring

#### Performance Score and Level of Monitoring by Year

Management's internal Performance Score report shed light on variations in performance by year. There seems to be a majority higher Performance Score from the year 2008-2011 than from 2012-2015. Likely, from 2013-2015, management is handling more and over-stretched. This impacted level of monitoring, and subsequently, the CRs' Performance Score. Table 1.0 shows the management's internal Performance Score assigned to the CRs (vertical coded green=performance score in percentage; horizontal coded ash=year; horizontal with no color=the number of CRs falling in score range).

Table 1.0. WFWO's Management Internal CRs Performance Scores.								
PR	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
(%)								
30-70	3	2	2	3	12	11	13	14
80-100	23	24	24	23	14	15	13	12

#### Conclusion and Recommendation

In this study, I focused on the effect monitoring has on Performance of the CRs, hence, efficiency of the ADNs operations. I sought to measure how level of monitoring of individual CRs influence their performance, and how span of control can influence level of monitoring, and in turn, affect performance. I have provided enough evidence that, first, close monitoring of the CRs significantly enhanced their performance and resulted in efficient management of the ADNs. This is supported by high Performance Scores. Second, span of control significantly influenced the CRs performance. There were majority higher Performance Scores when there were fewer CRs, and significant majority poor Performance Scores as the CRs increased in number.

Using the results of this study as a measuring stick, it is theoretically reasonable to recommend that WFWO puts in place effective monitoring system to enhance the ADNs operational efficiency. This is also applicable to nonprofit organizations with the similar operational structure

References

Fama, F. (1980). Agency problems and the theory of the firm. Journal of Political Economy, 88: 288-307.

Langfred, C. W. (2004). Too much of a good thing? Negative effects of high trust and individual autonomy in self-managing teams. The Academy of Management Journal, Vol. 47, No. 3, 385-399.

Rhode, D. L., & Packel, A. K. (2009). Ethics and nonprofit. Stanford Social Innovation Review, 1-9

World for World Organization (www.worldforworld.org)