

## EDITORIAL

### **Public Accountability and its diverse context: a tale from different disciplinary parameters.**

One of the greatest hurdles of sound administrative and governance contexts in Africa remains that of accountability. Accountability in itself is huge and can be seen from different angles and no issue of a journal like this one can pride of a capacity to cover all forms of accountability. There is political accountability, financial accountability, administrative accountability, managerial accountability, and professional accountability. Accountability can also be business accountability, bureaucratic accountability, social accountability, representational accountability, audit accountability, fiscal accountability, legal accountability and many other forms. There remains a serious deficit of all these forms in the African continent. In all forms of accountability there are four outstanding pillars: -

- i. Responsibility: a duty that binds to the course of action
- ii. Answerability: being called to account
- iii. Trustworthiness: a trait of being worthy of trust and confidence
- iv. Liability: being legally bound to a debt or obligation

Tanzania has had good examples of accountability in various forms. In this issue, a substantial portion is devoted to this country not for any other reasons but for enabling readers appreciate how accountability can be a theme that is so huge that authors from one country or organisation still can tackle it from diverse contexts. To help us understand the concept of accountability and mainly from a financial angle, Ramadan Marijani starts of this issue with an article themed '**Transparency and public money accountability in Tanzania: a bench learning approach of selected civil society organizations (CSOs)**'. The author begins by warning his audience of how Transparency and Public Money Accountability (TPMA) are ubiquitous themes in current discourse. He then delves into role of CSOs in ensuring transparency and public money accountability in Tanzania. He feeds us with findings which were obtained through a methodological approach that entails archival data gathered from CSOs' official documents, policy documents, plans and strategic documents, published reports and articles as well as Web search and personal contacts that provided him primary data through Key Informant Interviews (KIIs). Overall, the findings from his study suggest that CSOs have the potential to enhance TPMA through a robust analysis and demonstration of expertise in research, monitoring and evaluation, advocacy and stakeholders' engagement. However, despite the few success stories registered, the current trends in CSOs working environment in Tanzania indicate a dark and difficult future.

Article two is by Grace Kapama and Wilfred Lameck, again from the Tanzanian jurisdiction on what the authors call '**The discrepancy of labour institutions and the three metrics for labour dispute settlement in Tanzania**'. This is another form of accountability which is both managerial and institutional accountability. The authors use the analytical framework proposed by dispute Budd (2004) and Budd & Colvin (2005) which is illustrative of the fact that competing rights of different stakeholders of employment relationship can be harmonized through balancing the three dimensions: efficiency, equity and voice in the dispute resolution system. Their findings indicate that implementation of industrial disputes resolution mechanisms as established by the Labor Institutional Act and assurance of peace, harmony and access to justice is still questionable.

In what we classify as Public Sector accountability, Frank Jones Mateng'e, walks us through the **Legacy of New Public Management in Tanzania with a sharp eye on the Human Resource Management aspect**. The study used a qualitative approach to examine NPM attributes in the management of people in the public sector in Tanzania. He justifies his choice of Tanzania on two grounds. First, Tanzania has been reforming its public service in the last three decades within the framework of NPM prescriptions. Secondly, as a public servant for over 20 years, the author has sufficient experience in and is widely knowledgeable about the selected case. The author sadly identifies those developments in HRM practices that point to reversals from NPM and examines their implications for the management of public sector employees. On a happy note, he reports that The NPM movement has left a legacy in Tanzania and this legacy continues to shape the management of employment relations in the public sector. The NPM legacy manifests in terms of modernization and rationalization of the public service through an increased use of ICT for managing HR matters, the use of OPRAS, though not in its envisaged outcome, among others.

In the fourth article, we turn to political accountability in different African countries where Benon C Basheka, Daniel M. Walyemera and Dominique E Uwizeyimana, combine experiences on a theme **'Judicial Proceduralism: The Application and Exploitation of The Substantiality Rule in Presidential Election Petitions in Africa'**. The authors observe that within the African continent, the upsurge of democratization has led to a number of elections. These elections have tended to be contested by the losing candidates and the role of courts in the nomenclature of the governance apparatus of countries has been subjected to scrutiny. The article educates readers on how Presidential candidates who have faith in judicial supremacy have tended to turn to the courts for redress when they lose presidential elections. The courts on their part rely on some technicalities and the substantiality test to determine the elections is one such technicalities which the authors in a comparative manner give us a comparative picture from many African countries.

Finally, this issue deals with managerial and administrative accountability on the **'Effect of student's involvement in fees policy implementation on learner's stability in public universities in Uganda: the case of Makerere University'** by Doreen Tazwaire and Chrisostom Oketch. Their study adopted a case study design and had a sample of 368 consisting of students, their leaders and selected university administrators. The results indicated that there was a gap on the part of student leaders to consult extensively from their constituents because they lack advocacy and lobbying skills, management rarely put into consideration student's views while making decisions, and that protests are seen by students as a mobilization structure for airing out their voices on fees policy changes. The study concludes that the level of student involvement in fees policy implementation depends on the nature of student leadership and willingness of management to incorporate their views in decision making.

Accountability is broad and takes many facets. The debates on accountability in each of the papers presented are exciting. We invite readers to reflect on how accountability thrives in their own contexts as they read through the five articles in this issue.

*Professor Benon Basheka*

**Editor in Chief**