



## **SHOULD COMPENSATION IN THE PUBLIC SECTOR BE BASED ON PERFORMANCE?**

**Carl D. Scott Sr.**

Compensating based on performance in the public sector fosters excellence, openness, and alignment with public service objectives. Conventional remuneration schemes prioritize tenure and equity but frequently neglect to promote individual productivity, creativity, and accountability. A well-structured performance-based pay (P4P) system incentivizes significant contributions, fosters professional development, and optimizes public investment returns. Gerrish (2016) shownby meta-analysis that performance management systems correlate with enhanced organizational performance in the public sector, indicating that well-structured incentives can improve public service delivery.

For a P4P system to be functional, several attributes are needed. Initially, explicit, quantifiable, and job-related performance indicators are essential to guarantee fairness and impartiality. These metrics must encompass both quantitative outcomes, such as service efficiency, and qualitative factors, such as stakeholder satisfaction and collaboration. Hvidman and Andersen (2014) discovered that public companies enhance their performance most effectively when performance metrics are congruent with mission-oriented objectives rather than strictly defined outputs. When performance objectives align with fundamental principles and strategic priorities, public servants are more inclined to exhibit intrinsic motivation and dedication to the organization's success.

Secondly, the alignment of performance metrics with an agency's strategic objectives is essential. Brewer and Selden (2000) assert that public employees are motivated by a distinct type of public service motivation, which thrives when their work is perceived as promoting civic or community interests. Connecting performance incentives to these overarching goals increases employee engagement and validates the societal value of their work. This congruence fosters individual accountability and institutional integrity.

Third, transparency and equity in evaluation processes are essential for fostering employee trust and ensuring program credibility. Newcomer and Caudle (2011) assert that insufficient transparency in performance evaluations might demoralize employees and erode corporate morale. Kellough and Lu (1993) contend that the perceived equity of performance evaluations directly affects employee satisfaction and the enduring viability of merit-based remuneration schemes. A transparent P4P framework must encompass explicitly articulated expectations, objective criteria, and consistent bidirectional communication.

Fourth, continuous feedback and coaching are essential elements of an effective P4P system. Instead, than depending just on annual assessments, managers want to offer ongoing support to facilitate staff development and alignment with evolving priorities. This correspondence reinforces expectations and fosters a culture of growth inside the company (Battaglio, 2021). Consistent and constructive feedback fosters a sense of recognition, support, and motivation in employees, encouraging them to achieve or beyond their objectives.

The efficacy of a P4P program is significantly contingent upon the proficiency and integrity of management. Supervisors must be educated to undertake equitable assessments and to acknowledge both individual achievements and collective efforts, as well as contextual difficulties. Wright (2001) emphasizes that evaluator bias and insufficient training are significant factors contributing to the failure of P4P systems in the public sector. Proficient leadership guarantees that assessments are uniform, fair, and congruent with both technical performance and public service principles.

Of all these attributes, transparency and managerial competence are likely the most essential. In the absence of transparent processes, even meticulously crafted P4P models may be regarded as capricious or prejudiced, thereby diminishing employee morale. Managerial competency guarantees that assessments are performed equitably and with sound professional judgment, hence reducing the likelihood of favoritism or discrimination. Collectively, these components maintain procedural justice and enhance organizational trust, both of which are vital for the success of any performance-oriented system.

Furthermore, performance-based compensation is consistent with biblical tenets of stewardship, fairness, and accountability. Scripture endorses the significance of labor and the ethical obligation to compensate it justly. Genesis 1:27 asserts that humans are fashioned in the likeness of God, bestowing intrinsic value upon their labor. Colossians 3:23 urges individuals to labor “as working for the Lord,” promoting excellence and intentionality. Luke 10:7 asserts, “The worker deserves his wages,” while Matthew 25:21, within the Parable of the Talents, underscores the principle of recompensing diligent and fruitful service. These principles establish a moral and contractual basis for remunerating public personnel according to their contributions.

In conclusion, remuneration in the public sector ought to be contingent upon performance, since it fosters quality, accountability, and public value. Nevertheless, these systems must be meticulously designed to prevent injustice and unforeseen repercussions. The essential attributes of an efficient P4P system encompass clearly defined and mission-aligned metrics, transparency, continuous feedback, and proficient management. Among these, openness and ethical leadership are crucial for sustaining confidence and legitimacy. Rooted on effective administrative practices and biblical ethics, P4P systems can improve public sector performance while upholding the dignity of labor and the tenets of justice and stewardship.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Battaglio, R. P. Jr. (2021). Performance appraisal. In *Public human resource management: Strategies and practices in the 21st century*. (“*Public Human Resource Management: Strategies and Practices in the 21st ...*”) SAGE Publications. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781483395784.n7>
- [2] Brewer, G. A., & Selden, S. C. (2000). Why elephants gallop: Assessing and predicting organizational performance in federal agencies. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 10(4), 685–711. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordjournals.jpart.a024287>
- [3] Gerrish, E. (2016). The impact of performance management on performance in public organizations: A meta-analysis. (“*The Impact of Performance Management on Performance in Public...*”) *Public Administration Review*, 76(1), 48–66. <https://doi.org/10.1111/puar.12433>
- [4] Hvidman, U., & Andersen, S. C. (2014). Impact of performance management in public and private organizations. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 24(1), 35–58. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/mut019>
- [5] Kellough, J. E., & Lu, H. (1993). The paradox of merit pay in the public sector: Persistence of a problematic procedure. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 13(2), 45–64. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0734371X9301300205>
- [6] Newcomer, K., & Caudle, S. (2011). Public performance management systems: Embedding practices for improved success. *Public Performance & Management Review*, 35(1), 108–132. <https://doi.org/10.2753/PMR1530-9576350105>
- [7] Wright, B. E. (2001). “Public-sector work motivation: A review of the current literature and a revised conceptual model.” (“*The Dimensions of Public Service Motivation and Sector Work Preferences*”) *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 11(4), 559–586. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordjournals.jpart.a003515>
- [8] The Holy Bible, New International Version. (1978). *Biblica*. (Genesis 1:27; Colossians 3:23; Luke 10:7; Matthew 25:21)