Governance of Ethiopia Public Universities in Southern Region: Professional & Administrative Accountability Perspective

Mulatu Dea,
Wolaita Sodo University
&
Befikadu Zeleke,
Addis Ababa University

Abstract: This inquiry aimed to examine the practices of governance with particular domains of professional and administrative accountability in South Nation Nationalities Region public universities. Mixed research design (Quantitative dominant Qualitative) was instrumental. Proportional Stratified random sampling, and purposive sampling techniques were used to select sample universities and respondents (n=370. One way ANOVA employed to examine the variations between and within groups by considering its assumptions. Besides, Binary regression was applied to test overall model evaluation and goodness-of-fit. Principal component analysis (PCA) utilized as a data reduction technique among the explanatory variables. Independent t-test also used to compare differences between separate groups and to determine a significant difference in scores between and within groups. The study reveals, the logistic regression model was statistically significant, at Wald test: $\chi^2 = 25.350$, $p < .001$. The model explained 36.0% (Nagelkerke R2) of the variation in accountability practices and correctly classified 68.30 % of cases. Hosmer-Lemeshow test points out the goodness of fit of the model with chi-square value of 8.036 and with a P>0.05, which provides significant at the 5 % level, the model suggesting, does not conform to the data set as alternative assumption (H1). We can conclude that system of accountability from both professional and administrative accountability perspective in the sampled public universities were on an infant stage and not promising. The study also forwarded policy options will aid to insure that the HE sector in the sampled region attains effective professional and administrative accountability, and responsiveness to the society and market demands.

Key Words: *Governance, Autonomy, Accountability, Professional Accountability, Administrative Accountability, Higher Education Institutions*

I. INTRODUCTION

As clearly stated by Pandey (2004) in the context of higher education, governance refers to the issues of autonomy and accountability in most countries including developing nations. Autonomy is the prerogative and the ability of an institution to act by its own choices in pursuit of its mission and goals. Autonomy extended to higher education institutions (HEIs) in order to increase the flexibility, which these institutions require to meet the needs of the society. According to Sifuna (1998), the term autonomy encompasses three areas: academic, institutional, and financial. Academic autonomy is the freedom for faculty members to operate freely which would lead to intellectual wealth. Institutional autonomy includes operational freedom and freedom of decision-making. The freedom of HEIs to raise and use funds according to their priorities and internal rules considered as financial autonomy.

Mulgan (2000) also consider autonomy or self-government as a key ingredient in university governance. They define autonomy as the freedom to make decisions on a broad complex of issues without interference from external, non-university agencies. Hence, according to the stipulations of the various African universities acts, these universities are supposed to be autonomous of government control. However, the provision of universities' autonomy and academic freedom is very much depending on the nature of the prevailing political system in the country (Ayalew, 2008; Taye 2008; Yimam, 2008; Sifuna, 1998).

Although many universities have enjoyed some degree of autonomy with regard to student admissions and academic staff recruitment as well as in the determination of their teaching and research agenda, government involvement in the running of universities has been a common feature of government-university relations (O'Connell, 2005). Similarly, government involvement in university affairs in Ethiopia has been widely observed in the areas of management (Demoze, 2013, Kenenisa, 2015, Ayalew, 2008).

Pandey (2004) argues that autonomous or, not all organizations, including HEIs are accountable to their stakeholders in particular and to the society in general. Autonomy of publicly funded institutions also implies societal accountability. Greater autonomy to these institutions means greater accountability to the society. Normally, accountability means measuring the efficiency and effectiveness of what an institution does.

As universities have become increasingly interdependent with external forces, institutions are accountable to external organizational relationships such as local and federal governments, equally in managing business and corporate relationships. Accountability will be wanting from HEIs if the society loses trust in them. If that is the case, the challenge is to regain the society's trust. Hence, HEIs strive to strike a balance between stakeholders' needs, societal demands and institutional autonomy (Pandey, 2004).

Governance in HEIs also involves the authority to make decision and decision-making structures within the institutions (Sifuna, 1998). It refers to the extent to which decisions made in participatory manner and extent of centralization and decentralization.

In today's world of competitions and knowledge-based economy, HEIs recognized as an important way of forming skilled and educated manpower through the provision of quality education. Consequently, HEIs expected to become responsive, innovative, quality conscious, active, creative, dynamic, demand-driven, efficient and effective (Brown, 2012).

All over the world, countries have been responding to the challenges of globalization and the information age through improving governance system of HEIs. In this regard, based on a 20-year strategic direction of the country, a goal of becoming a middle-income country before 2025, the government of Ethiopia has launched a higher education reform program throughout the country as of 2002 to enhance institutional capacity of the institutions (FDRE, 2009).

The higher education reform focuses on access creation, redefining mission, governance, finance and promoting quality (MoE, 2002). According to Bovens (2005), "similar to the situation in other African countries, FDRE, (2009), the Ethiopian higher education reform's objectives are to ensure equity, accountability, relevance and responsiveness. The governance reform involves issues of autonomy, decentralization, democratization and accountability.

However, local studies conducted to assess the implementation of governance reform with particular reference to systems of accountability are almost scanty. Hence, this study designed with the aim of examining the nature of accountability from governance perspective in public universities in Ethiopia since the time of reform.

II.   STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

In Ethiopia, as clearly stated by Teshome (2003), despite the addition of several public universities, higher education in Ethiopia not well developed in line with the work force needs of the country. Due to problems associated with the quality and relevance of programs of studies and research, equity and resource utilization and governance, the universities' contribution to the development of the country in work force development is not significant (Lerra, 2014)

Hence, following the 2007 civil service reform initiated and monitored by the government, HEIs in general and public universities particular have made to implement five major reforms. Of these, governance reform is one. To reinforce the implementation of the governance reform the revised higher education proclamation that granted greater autonomy to the institutions issued in 2009.

Although the public universities enjoy some relative measures of autonomy, government involvement in their governance has become a common feature. Currently, public universities in Ethiopia are not determining their own curriculum of studies for undergraduate programs, graduate assistants recruited and placed by MoE, and the institutions have no any say on student admission. Amanuel, 2016, Kenenisa, 2016, Solomon (2010) also attribute the absence of significant changes in public universities to the excessive intervention of the Federal Ministry of Education and lack of autonomy of the institutions.

On the other hand, as Pandy (2004) argues, publicly funded HEIs are accountable in their actions and outcomes to the external environment, the public at large. However, there is no strong system of accountability in public universities in the country, except some attempts of self-and external evaluations and supervisions conducted in the institutions. Centralized decision-making structure also characterizes the institutions (Ashebir, 2016; Lerra, 2014 Befekadu, 2013).

More importantly, our personal experience as a lecturer and researcher in public universities of Ethiopia and the opportunity we have had to supervise some of the public universities help us to identify the gap between what is stated in higher education proclamation, national constitution and reform documents and what actually happening in the institutions. This initiated us to develop keen interest to carryout scientific inquiries in university governance with framework of professional and administrative accountability.

On the other hand, most of the studies conducted worldwide on university governance primarily concerned about funding. The present study, however, focuses on the role of governance in developing sense of accountability of the academic leaders of HEIs in Southern region public universities. Therefore, from the above

perspectives it is high time critically examine the nature of university governance in Ethiopia. Thus, this study guided by the following research question.

1. To what extent do public universities in Southern Nation and Nationalities People Region guided by system of accountability (professional as well as administrative accountability?

III. OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The main objective of the present study is to examine the state of university accountability (professional and administrative) as viewed by academic leaders, academic staff, and university administrators. More specifically, the study intends to address the following specific objective:

a. To examine the extent to which public universities in SNNPR guided by system of accountability from professional as well as administrative perspectives.

IV. SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

This study is significant in several respects. First, the study will examine the nature of governance in light of accountability dimensions in public HEIs in the sampled region. As a result, findings will serve as a useful reference document to planners, administrators and practitioners dealing with higher education system of accountability and its improvement. Secondly, results of the study will help to create awareness among university officials, government and its agency (MoE) about the state of university governance in line with accountability practices and related problems. Thirdly, the study will contribute to making possible more informed and effective accountability system in public universities.

V. SCOPE OF THE STUDY

Currently there are seven public universities in Southern Ethiopia owned and regulated by Federal Ministry of Education. Of these, the study is delimited to three (42 %) public universities namely Arba Minch University, Wolaita Sodo University, Wachamo University. More importantly, the study will emphasize on two dimensions of accountability: professional and administrative accountability.

Literature Review: Theoretical Perspective of Accountability

Accountability is one of those golden concepts that no one against. It increasingly used in political discourse and policy documents because it conveys an image of transparency and trustworthiness. However, its evocative powers make it also a very elusive concept (Bovens, 2003). In contemporary political discourse, 'accountability' holds strong promises of fair and equitable governance; it is the authorities themselves who being held accountable by their citizens, a hallmark of modern democratic governance (Dubnick, 2002).

Accountability has become an icon for good governance both in the public and in the private sector (Dubnick, 2002). Dubnick pinpoints that for anyone reflecting on accountability, it is impossible to disregard these strong evocative overtones. As an icon, the concept has become less useful for analytical purposes, and currently resembles a garbage can filled with good intentions, loosely defined concepts, and vague images of good governance (Harlow, 2002, Fisher, 2004; Van Gerven, 2005).

Accountability refers to concrete practices of account giving, social relation, 'the obligation to explain and justify conduct'. This implies a relationship between an actor, and a forum or the account-holder (Pollitt 2003:89). Particularly in scholarly and political discourse 'accountability' often is used interchangeably with 'good governance' or virtuous behaviour; a concept 'without specified termination of boundaries' (Sartori 1970: 1042). It present when public services have a high quality, at a low cost and are performed in a courteous manner (O'Connell, 2005:86); 'responsiveness', and 'the appropriate exercise of a navigational competence: that is, the proper use of authority to range freely, across a multi-relationship terrain in search of the most advantageous path to success' (Considine 2002: 22).

Accountability is an authoritative tool of governance to increase efficiency, effectiveness and employee productivity inside an institution (Bourke, 1998), quickly responding to changing environments, creating and reinforcing a positive work culture (Altizer, 1993), encouraging employees to use their talents to solving societal problems, maintaining pride and morale among employees (Quinn and Spreitzer, 1997), making workforces act more responsibly (Spreitzer, 1995).

Accountability is the one of the domain used to examine the governance practices of HEIs. It increasingly used in political discourse and policy documents because it conveys an image of transparency and trustworthiness. The contribution of governance to development depends as much on the quality of accountability. Sasha et al., (2006) believe accountability as the 'driver' of governance and can understood as consisting of three layers: being held to account (compliance); giving an account (transparency); taking account (responsiveness to stakeholders).

Accountability is a mechanism aim to ensure that executive action and resource uses corresponds to the policies and plans approved by decision-makers (Donnelly, et al., 2000). Dubnick, (2002) pinpoints

accountability as an instrument to enhance the effectiveness and efficiency of public governance, and has become an icon for good governance. In fashionable political and scholarly discourse 'accountability' often aids as a conceptual umbrella that covers various other distinct concepts, such as transparency, equity, efficiency, responsiveness, responsibility and integrity (Behn, 2001).

Accountability has paramount importance as various scholars: qualify a state of affairs or the performance of an actor; helps to act in a transparent, fair, and equitable way (Bovens 1998). It can help to ensure that the legitimacy of the public administration remains intact or increased (Elchardus & Smits, 2002); given the opportunity to explain and justify their intentions, and in which citizens and interest groups can pose questions and offer their opinion, can promote acceptance of government authority and the citizens' confidence in the state institutions administration (Aucoin & Heintzman, 2000:49). Furthermore, used to patch up a rambling argument, to evoke an image of trustworthiness, fidelity, and justice, or to hold critics at bay (Pollitt, 2003: 89). Moreover, it serves as an conceptual umbrella that covers various other distinct concepts: transparency, equity, democracy, efficiency, responsiveness, responsibility, and integrity (Mulgan 2000b: 555; Behn 2001:6; Dubnick 2002), makes powerful institutions responsive to their particular publics (Mulgan, 2003).

Keith & David, (2006) showed more significant and independent role of accountability in encouraging leaders to engage in empowerment than has so far to being acknowledged. Thus, empowerment is unlikely to operate without some form of accompanying accountability. Although how committed to pursuing institutional goals, academic leaders involved in empowerment initiatives will unvaryingly remain accountable for their actions. Indeed, scholars suggest that accountability may increase through empowerment. Despite these differing views, the ways in which managers' experience of empowerment may affected by the presence of changes in accountability practices have received little detailed attention from previous studies of empowerment (Hales, 2000). In addition, Keith & David, (2006) noted the significant association between empowerment and accountability. As the authors, academic leaders who experience a greater sense of empowerment, experience greater accountability pressures, it also indicates that they are positive about the motivational effects and self-determination aspects of greater accountability.

Public higher education institutions and officials operating in a constitutional democracy find themselves confronting at least five different domains of accountability: professional, administrative, legal, social and political accountability (Romzek, 1996). This study focused only professional and administrative accountability.

Romzek, (1996) and Dubnick, (2002) stated professional accountability as the accountability construct that characterized by the existence of a set of norms and practices of a technical or professional nature that govern the behavior and performance of members of certain profession. As Bovens, (2005), it focuses on conformity to standard and codes of conduct for professional behaviors, through their professional institutions. These norms and practices as long as their respective profession is integrated in the organic structure of public administration, become also part of the set of rules, regulations and principles that govern the operation of public administration in those areas where the profession is exercised (Dubnick, 2002). As Sasha et al., (2006), members of the profession, that are subjected to this normative set, but they move with full autonomy when performing professional activates, acting only according to their own criteria and professional knowledge under professional accountability.

Many public managers are, apart from being general managers, professionals in a more technical sense. They have trained as various professionals or police officers required in institutions (Abbot, 1988). This may imply accountability relationships with professional associations and disciplinary tribunals. Professional bodies lay down codes with standards for acceptable practice that are binding for all members. These standards monitored and enforced by professional supervisory. This type of accountability relation will be particularly relevant for public managers who work in professional public organizations. Most forms of professional accountability also (Bovens, 2005) are diagonal accountability systems of some kind. A strict hierarchy and a principle-agent relationship are absent, yet the external obligation to account is there (Freidson, 2001).

Administrative accountability is full subjection of public officials and administrative units to a wide set of constitutional, legal and administrative rules and procedures that govern tightly their performance (OCED, 1997). Furthermore, OCED, (1998; 1999) stated as full subjection of public officials and administrative units to instructions and commands issued by official bodies and superior in the hierarchical ladder. It exercised by superiors through their hierarchical relationships in their respective university and needs leadership competencies and skills to implement the public institutions (Cavill, 2004). It is evaluation based on the fulfilment by public officials and administrative units of the provision and procedures set by formal rules and regulations and on the correct use of public resources (OCED, 1999). Administrative accountability relations are usually an intermediary form, with account being rendered to another public organisation that has been charged by top officials to supervise or monitor the agent's conduct (Schillemans & Bovens, 2004).

VI. RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

Design of the Study: The present study was employed a mixed design in that it used a concurrent strategy of data collection and interpretation (Creswell et al, 2011). The study was predominantly quantitative inquiry that complemented with qualitative data. The qualitative data collected to reinforce the quantitative data.

Research Method: The study is a cross sectional survey type method in that it presented current practices in public university governance in South Nation Nationalities Regional State. Because, cross-sectional survey is effective in providing a snapshot of the current behavior, attitude and belief in among the university staff and owns an advantage of providing data relatively quickly and the information collected from the selected individual at a single period in time (Creswell, 2012; Gay et al., 2009).

Sources of Data: Multiple sources of evidence used to triangulate the data, thereby increasing the credibility of the results of the study. Consequently, relevant information generated from both principal and secondary roots. Primary data solicited from academic leaders (Presidents, Vice presidents, Directors, College deans and department heads), academic staff, and students' council. National organizations, higher education proclamations, higher education reform documents, guidelines and our personal experiences utilized as secondary sources.

Sample Size: For the purpose of this study, the sample size was determined using the standard tables for sampling, using the confidence level of 95% and 5% confidence interval. To minimize the error, a 10% of the total population added to each sample. Based on the standard, the sample size for a population of all the three universities is 3180 (42.8%). Of these 352 samples were selected which accounts, academic leaders, 21.6 %, which accounts for deans 10 (2.8%), department heads 40 (11.4%), directors 19 (5.4%), presidents 3 (0.9%), vice presidents 6 (1.9%) and a sum of 276 (78.4%) were lecturers according to Sidhu (1973).

Sampling Techniques: A multi-stage sampling technique was instrumental under the current study. The proportional stratified random sampling technique was used to select universities to keep the representation from each strata (1st, 2ne, 3rd generations). The selection of academic leaders (Deans, Department Heads) and lecturers made via random sampling while from their respective college /school/ faculty. Purposive sampling method used to select top management (presidents, Directors) from administration wing and the students' council.

Instruments: Relevant data generated from the study participants through self-developed survey questionnaires, interviews and focused-group discussion. Data collected from academic leaders and academic staff by means of survey questionnaires. Two sets of questionnaires comprising both open ended and closed-ended questions items were prepared. While interviewing administered to senior staff, deans, directors, department heads, and FGD conducted by students' council.

Table 1. Coefficients of Internal Consistency Using Cronbach's Alpha Methodology.

No	Items	Reliability Coefficient
1	Professional Accountability	0.8363
2	Administrative Accountability	0.8027

Data Analysis: In the data processing phase, data editing, coding and cleaning were made to determine the consistency and validity of information gathered by different instruments. In analyzing data, both quantitative and qualitative methods employed. Descriptive data analysis tool, mainly mean, standard deviation, frequency and percentage employed in analyzing quantitative data.

Various inferential data analysis was instrumental. One way ANOVA utilized to see the variations between and within groups by considering its assumptions. Moreover, the outcome variable classification was based on the threshold or mean value of accountability (professional, administrative) domains which were measured based a five-point Lickert scale (1=Strongly Disagree to 5=Strongly Agree), accordingly, the outcome variable above the mean value is considered to be effective, represented by 1 while the outcome variable below the average value is taken as ineffective, represented by zero (i.e., a dummy variable, 1=effective and 0=ineffective). Therefore, the appropriate econometric model for the binary outcome variable is a Binary Logistic Regression model and adapted to determine the relationship between a dependent variable and a set of independent variables (Level of education, specialization, academic rank, and position held). Besides, Binary regression was employed to test overall model evaluation and goodness-of-fit of the data. Principal component analysis used as a data reduction technique among the explanatory variables. Moreover, it used to measure sample adequacy and good fitness of the model. Independent t-test also used. The independent t-test is, probably, the single most widely used tests in this study to compare differences between separate groups and to determine if there is a significant difference in scores between the groups. The quantitative analysis carried out by employing statistical analysis software SPSS Version 20.0 and Stata version 13.0 interchangeably. Qualitative data analysis method were applied to the data generated from transcriptions of interviews, FGD and document analysis.

VII.   DEFINITION OF TERMS

Key terms that repeatedly used in the present study operationally defined as follows:
Academic Community: refers to all those persons studying, teaching, and doing research as permanent or visiting members of an institution (Nkurikiyumukiza, 2010) *Academic Leaders*: refers to all persons designated in different level of leadership positions of the university. *Academic staff*: refers to all persons engaged only in the teaching – learning process of the university. *Governance*: In the context of higher education institutions, it refers to the internal structure, organization and management of autonomous institutions. *Public University*: means a higher learning institution whose budget allocated by the Federal or state government as the case may be (FDRE, 2009).

VIII.   RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Demographic Characteristics of the Respondents on different variables

Equally it has been distinctly put forward in the methodology section of the report, the researcher has distributed 370 questionnaires and successfully collected 352 questionnaires for lecturer, department heads, deans, directors, vice presidents and presidents of the three sampled public universities to receive decent data regarding its governance practices. Below are the demographic characteristics of the respondents in terms of sex, academic qualification, academic rank, and academic position and service years. Furthermore, the researcher has opted to place tables in number, frequency and percentages to show the effects.

The system of governance highly appreciates the participation of women in every aspect of the organizations. But the data make clear that females' participation in all three positions (Lecturer, middle level management and top level management) was insignificant as compared to their male counterparts. In governance context, it reveals that, all sampled public universities of south national, nationalities region were experiencing patriarchal domination. Despite the fact that there are age gaps in line with the establishment of three sampled universities, this data reveals that a minimum qualification gap existed between three sampled public universities which were contributed their own specific traits to build up effective governance patterns of their respective universities. Moreover, in line with their composition, it is quite better than before, and the number of professionals with high caliber increased from time to time as of 0:30:70 government initiatives GTP II. Also providing valuable information for public university governance studies, variation in academic titles gives a hint that the bulk of academic staff, 297 (84.4%) was easily qualified, means that above second degree. The situation might have a significant effect to understand the university's governance practices. The study also tried to see the academic position of the respondents. Because having different respondents from different academic echelons of the sampled public universities helps to investigate the governance practices and its potency in different stages of academic positions of the universities. The work experience of respondents also other variable treated well in this study. The availability of respondents with different years of service or stay in the universities could mean that their data is reliable and explanatory to the written report pertaining to the prevailing patterns of governance in the framework of leadership and accountability.

Analysis based on the basic question

1. To what extent does public, universities in the sampled region are guided by system of accountability (professional as well as administrative)?

Accountability Domains Analysis

Accountability is an ethical concept and it concerns proper behavior, deals with the responsibilities of individuals and organizations for their actions towards other people and agencies. Hence, below this section two dimensions of accountability (professional and administrative) properly examined.

Professional Accountability Analysis

Table 2 below shows the analysis of first dimension of accountability (Professional accountability). Professional accountability entails five domains. Among, the first domain is "Commitment to quality, excellence, integrity of its teaching and learning, research and community services" (P2Q1). The table depicts, the highest mean and SD scores of (3.80, .881), (3.74, .629) has been held in the first variable from MLM and TLM category as rated as "*Agree*" respectively. The lecturer relatively scored higher mean (2.73, 1.017) in this variable category as rated as "*Disagree*". The sum of 2.95, 1.061 means and SD values with 349 (n-2) degree of freedom has immersed from the analysis. The respective F value (0.051) at $P<0.01$ could also show that the existing significant difference in the practices of the first variable among different work groups probably due to reasons other than chance.

The second variable under the same table was "Securing high quality education for as many individual as possible subject to the constraints of resources available" (P2Q2). The result portrays, the highest mean and

SD scores of (3.60, .1.105), (3.38, .898) has been gained in the second domain from MLM and TLM category as rated as "*Agree*". The other mean and SD score (2.94, 1.036) has been received from lecturers category as rated as "*Disagree*". The corresponding F value (4.634) at P<0.01 could show that the significant difference in the second variable between the three groups of respondents not merely by chance because of some other reason.

The third domain item under same table is **"Provision of opportunity for lifelong learning"** (P2Q3)**.** The result illustrates that the highest mean and SD scores 3.64, .898; and 3.27, 1.023 were gained from MLM and TLM rated as "*Agree*" respectively. The mean SD score of 2.87, 1.015 observed from lecturer rated as "*Sometime*s". The respective F value (0.065) at P<0.01 revealed the existing significance difference among three respondents were not by chance. Ensuring availability of library collections and access without restriction to information resources (P2Q4), having mechanisms to which academic leaders hold themselves accountable to their various stakeholders (P2Q5) were the last two variables under professional accountability. Accordingly, the mean and SD scores of 3.52, .679 and 3.39, .852 obtained from MLM and 3.69, .950 and 3.38, .836 gained from TLM were rated as "*sometimes*". Contrarily, the mean and SD scores of 2.96, .848 and 2.49, .953 obtained from lecturer rated as "*Disagree*". The respondents did not favorably rate both the domains. The corresponding F value of (. 240) at P<0.01 and (. 116) at p<0.01 could depict the significance difference among the groups.

Table 2. Mean and Interdependent t- test for Professional Accountability between Lecturer, MLM, and TLM

Variables	Position	Mean	SD	DF	F	Sig.
Commitment to quality, excellence, integrity of its teaching and learning, research and community services (P2Q1)	Lecturer	2.73	1.017	275	0.051	0.000***
	MLM	3.80	.881	49		
	TLM	3.65	.629	25		
	Total	2.95	1.061	349		
Securing high quality education for as many individual as possible subject to the constraints of resources available (P2Q2)	Lecturer	2.94	1.036	275	4.634	0.000***
	MLM	3.60	1.107	49		
	TLM	3.38	.898	25		
	Total	3.07	1.063	349		
Provision of opportunity for lifelong learning (P2Q3)	Lecturer	2.87	1.015	275	0.065	0.000***
	MLM	3.64	.898	49		
	TLM	3.27	1.023	25		
	Total	3.01	.863	349		
Ensuring availability of library collections and access without restriction to information resources (P2Q4)	Lecturer	2.96	.848	275	.240	0.000***
	MLM	3.52	.679	49		
	TLM	3.69	.950	25		
	Total	3.10	1.08	349		
Having mechanisms to which academic leaders hold themselves accountable to their various stakeholders (P2Q5)	Lecturer	2.49	.953	275	0.116	0.000***
	MLM	3.39	.852	49		
	TLM	3.38	.836	25		
	Total	2.68	1.047	349		
*Note: [** if p<0.05, and *** if p<0.001]*						

Source: Field Survey (2016)

To sum, because of increasing complexity of the tasks of HE administration, public universities are more and more becoming expert organizations specialized in executing certain specific tasks. Holding and supervising this kind of expert activity requires 'professional accountability', which is largely founded on 'deference to expertise within the organization'. We can deduce that all fields of professional accountability were not sympathetically rated by the majority of respondents, particular the domains such as commitment to quality, excellence and integrity; access to information and resources without restriction, and ensuring quality education to the citizen.

Regression Analysis

Regression analysis also conducted to check the influence of one variable to others. Among, the first dimension is professional accountability. Accordingly, the F value of the first regression model is *111.68* (p<0.01). Four variables were employed to judge the practice of professional accountability as the ratio of percentage 55.85 (R2) at p<0.001).

The coefficient of determination indicated that 55.85 % of the variation in the professional accountability of the sample of 352 can be *explained* by securing high quality education for as many individual as possible subject to the constraints of resources available (Y1), having mechanisms to which academic leaders

hold themselves accountable to their various stakeholders (Y2) and whereas 44.15 % remains *unexplained*. From this, we can understand that, the model used statistically significantly foresee the dependent variable.

Table 3. Statistical test for individual variable of Professional Accountability

P2Q1	Coef. (β)	St. Err	t	P>|t|	[95 % Conf. Interval]
P2Q2(Y1)	.637693	.0456543	13.97	0.000***	.5478978-.7274875
P2Q3(Y2)	.017673	.049559	0.36	0.722	-.079802-/1151479
P2Q4(Y3)	.0799088	.0501173	1.59	0.112	-.0186641-.1784817
P1Q5(Y4)	.1292316	.0434636	2.97	0.003**	.0437455-.2147176
CONST	.3464415	.1464415	2.37	0.018**	.05878664-.6340967
Note: No. of Observations . =352; F (4,346)=111.68; Prob>F=0.000; R-Squared=0.5635; Adj R-Squared=0.5585; Root MSE=7059					

Source: Field Survey (2016)

ANOVA for Professional Accountability

A one-way between groups analysis of variance conducted to explore the significant difference between and within the groups' responses of professional accountability scores under table 9. Respondents split into three groups according to their positions held (Lecturer, MLM, and TLM). As we can see from the table, there was a statistically significant difference at the $p < .001$ levels in P2Q1, P2Q2, P2Q3, P2Q4, P2Q5 scores for three groups $F (6, 345) = 11.40, 4.746, 4.661, 5.122, 9.113$ at $p < .001$. Notwithstanding the success of statistical significance, the actual difference in mean scores between groups was moderate. The effect size, calculated using eta squared, was .395, .229, .270, .260, .343 respectively. Post-hoc comparisons using the Tukey HSD test indicated that the mean score for between group (M = 10.895) was significantly different from within the group (M =.956). There was no statistically significant difference in mean scores between middle and top level managers.

Table 4. Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) for the Variable of Professional Accountability

Variable		SS	DF	MS	F	Eta	Sig.
P2Q1	*Between Group*	65.372	6	10.895	11.40	.395	0.000***
	Within Group	329.707	345	.956			
	Total	395.080	351				
P2Q2	*Between Group*	27.979	6	4.663	4.746	.229	0.000***
	Within Group	338.996	345	.983			
	Total	366.974	351				
P2Q3	*Between Group*	26.485	6	4.414	4.661	.270	0.000***
	Within Group	326.739	345	.947			
	Total	353.224	351				
P2Q4	*Between Group*	25.905	6	4.317	5.122	.260	0.000***
	Within Group	290.811	345	.843			
	Total	316.716	351				
P2Q5	*Between Group*	52.652	6	8.779	9.113	.343	0.000***
	Within Group	331.245	345	.963			
	Total	383.897	351				
Note: SS - Sum of Squares, MS - Mean Square , Eta value=.01-small effect, .06-medium effect, .14 and above –larger							

Source: Field Survey (2016)

Administrative Accountability Analysis

The second accountability dimension is administrative accountability. As the table depicts, the highest mean and SD scores (3.84, 1.054) and (3.69, .788) which is graded as "*Agree*" has been obtained in item "Provision of effective musical accompaniment in the University (P3Q1)" from MLM and TLM category respectively. The lecturer group relatively scored higher mean and SD of (2.73, .976) to the response rate of "*Sometimes*". Totally 2.91, 1.029 means and SD values with 348 (n-3) degree of freedom have been riveted from the analysis. The respective F values 19.15 at P<0.01 could also show that the significant difference in the mean of the three participant groups. Unlike to the first item, different pool of values could found in the second item "Fair treatment of all academic communities in the university (P3Q2)" on the same table. The highest mean and SD scores (3.40, .990) and (3.38, .852) which is rated as "*Sometimes*" and "*Agree*" in this class was gained at MLM and TLM respectively. Contrary the other list mean and SD values i.e. 2.80, .984 achieved at Lecturer category which is valued as "*Disagree*". To this effect, a total mean and SD of 2.93, 1.003 have been scored with.121 F value and P<0.01significance level. This variable not positively rated by the majority of study participants.

Key interview informants from senior lecturers remarked:

In my university, there is no fair and merit based competition for the academic positions. It highly relied on the proximity of the top officials rather experience and qualification. It is very discouraging. (T4). They allow their friends to be part of the universities, micro and mega projects without any requirements. They isolate the one who fit the project positions because of closeness, family-hood, and ethnic issues. One college research officer participated in more than five research and community services. On the other hand, some of the staff excluded from the research and community services. (T3).

Table 5. Mean and Interdependent t- test for Administrative Dimension between Lecturer, MLM, TLM

Variables	Position	Mean	SD	DF	F	Sig
Provision of effective support in the University (P3Q1)	Lecturer	2.73	.970	275	19.15	0.000***
	MLM	3.84	1.054	49		
	TLM	3.69	.788	25		
	Total	2.91	1.029	348		
Fair treatment of all academic community in the university (P3Q2)	Lecturer	2.80	.984	275	.121	0.000***
	MLM	3.40	.990	49		
	TLM	3.38	.852	25		
	Total	2.93	1.003	348		
Efficient, honest and an open accounting system and use of resources in the university (P3Q3).	Lecturer	2.71	.963	275	2.379	0.000***
	MLM	3.42	1.090	49		
	TLM	3.38	.759	25		
	Total	2.86	1.008	348		
Having well designed systems for organizing , managing, and distributing information to appropriate audience (P3Q4)	Lecturer	2.49	1.000	275	1.034	0.000***
	MLM	3.39	.953	49		
	TLM	3.38	.852	25		
	Total	2. 69	1.047	348		
Note: [** if p<0.05, and *** if p<0.001]						

Source: Field Survey (2016)

Efficient, fair and an open accounting system and utilization of resources in the university (P3Q3) considered as the third administrative accountability variable under this analysis. Accordingly, lecturers and MLM mainly opted for the tertiary category, P3Q3 to characterize the administrative accountability dimension with the mean and SD values 2.71, .963 and 3.42, 1.09 as "*Sometimes*" while the, TLM gave relatively higher score for this variable type with; 3.38, .759 values rated as "*Agree*". Such enormous values made the entire figure of mean and SD of 2.86, 1.000 to 2.379 F value and at P<0.01 level of significance.

The last variable type, "Having well designed systems for organizing, managing, and distributing information to the appropriate audience (P3Q4)" ranked differently in the current sampled public universities. Particularly, Lecturers' response had a mean and SD values of 2.42, and 1.000, which is much lower than the previous figures scored and rated as "*Disagree*". Management level holders (MLM, TLM) have also rated the variable as "*Sometimes*" and "*Agree*" at higher mean and SD values (3.38, .953) and (3.39, .853). When we call for a look on the total figure, 2.69, 1.047 mean and SD values under 348 degrees of freedom with 1.034 F value and P<0.01 at a statistically significant level were obtained in this last variable type.

Regression Analysis for Administrative Accountability Variables

Table 6: Statistical test for individual variable of Administrative Accountability

P3Q1	Coef. (β)	St. Err	t	P>ItI	[95 % Conf. Interval]
P3Q2 (Z1)	.3226299	.0551655	5.85	0.000***	.2141303-.4311296
P3Q3 (Z2)	.2610898	.0560051	4.66	0.000***	.1509387-.3712409
P3Q4 (Z3)	.2951759	.0489542	6.03	0.000***	.1988925-. 3914594
CONST	.4025192	.1332185	3.02	0.003**	.1405044-.6645339
Note: No. of Observations = 352; F(3,348) = 129.018; Prob>F = 0.000; R - Squared=0.5265; Adj R-Squared = 0.5225; Root MSE = 7094					

Source: Field Survey (2016

The second regression analysis to four administrative accountability variables was conducted (Z1, Z2, and Z3). Therefore, the F value of the second regression model is 129.018 at (p<0.01). Four variables express the dimension of Administrative accountability as the ratio of percentage 52.25 (R^2) at p<0.01. The coefficient of determination indicated that 52.25 % of the variation in the administrative accountability for the sample of 352 can be explained by (Fair treatment of all academic community in the university (P3Q2:Z1)**;** (Efficient, honest and an open accounting system and use of resources in the university (P3Q3:Z2); (Having well designed systems for organizing, managing, and distributing information to appropriate audience (P3Q4:Z3) and whereas

47.75 % remains inexplicable/unexplained. This signposts that, overall, the model used can statistically significantly forecast the dependent variable.

ANOVA for Administrative Accountability Variable

Table 72: Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) for the Variable of Administrative Accountability

Variable		SS	DF	MS	F	Eta V	Sig.
P3Q1	Between Group	41.268	2	20.634	21.913	.082	0.000***
	Within Group	328.638	349	.942			
	Total	369.906	351				
P3Q2	Between Group	21.031	2	10.515	11.047	.089	0.000***
	Within Group	332.194	349	.952			
	Total	353.224	351				
P3Q3	Between Group	29.336	2	14.668	15.622	.047	0.000***
	Within Group	327.562	349	.939			
	Total	356.898	351				
P3Q4	Between Group	23.466	2	11.733	13.739	.088	0.000***
	Within Group	298.032	349	.854			
	Total	321.497	351				
Note: SS-Sum of Squares, MS- Mean Square, Eta value=.01-small effect, .06-medium effect, .14 and above –larger							

Source: Field Survey (2016)

Principal Component Analysis for Individual Variables

Principal component analysis requires that the Kaiser-Meyer - Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy be greater than 0.50 for each individual variable as well as the set of variables. On iteration 1, the MSA for all of the individual variables included in the analysis was above 0.5, supporting their retention in the analysis.

Table 8. KMO and Bartlett's Test for Appropriateness of Factor Analysis and for MSA

Kaiser-Meyer - Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy (MSA):		*0.876*
Bartlett's Test of Sphercity	*Approx. Chi-Square*	*1433.32*
	Df	*21*
	Sig.	
*0.000****		

As we can see from the table above regarding the sampling adequacy for a set of variables, the overall MSA for a set of variables included in the analysis was 0.876, which exceeds the minimum requirements of 0.50 for the overall measure of sampling adequacy. Principal component analysis requires that the probability associated with Bartlett's Test of Sphercity be less than the level of significance. Thus, the probability associated Bartlett's test <0.001, which satisfies this requirement.

Binary Logistic Regression Result

As important to Park (2013), a logistics model for overall evaluation and goodness-of-fit should admitted in the logistic regression results. As recommended by Park (2013) relating to the results of logistic regression, this written report also attempts to represent the outcomes in table 9 and10.

Overall Model Evaluation of Accountability Variables

Table 9.Present the inferential information for overall model evaluation, which includes likelihood ratio & Wald tests.

Test	*Categories*	X^2	*df*	*P-Value*
Overall Model Evaluation	*Likelihood ratio test*	*465.74*	*1*	*.000****
	Wald Test	*25.350*	*1*	*.000****

As shown above, statistics for the likelihood ratio and Wald test were 465.74 and 25.350 respectively. These tests yield similar conclusions from the given data ($P < 0.01$).

Goodness of fit Statistics:

Hosmer-Lemeshow test indicates the extent to which the model offers a better fit than a null model with no predictors, or, in a different interpretation, how well the model fits the data, as in log-linear modeling. If the chi - square for goodness of fit is not significant, then the model has sufficient faith. The outcome presented below.

Table 10. Hosmer - Lemeshow Test

Test	Chi square	df	P-Value
Goodness of –fit test	8.036	4	.090
Assumption: Ho= the modal is fit to the data set at P<0.05; H$_1$ = The model is not fit the data set at P>0.05 (alternative hypothesis)			

Hosmer-Lemeshow test points out the goodness of fit of the model with chi-square value of 8.036 and with a probability value of >0.05, which provides significant at the 5 % point. The overall model is statistically significant, suggesting it does not conform to the data based on the second alternative assumption (H1) designed to hold the first assumption (H0). To summarize, a logistic regression carried out to determine the effects of Independent variables (academic leadership positions, employment experience, academic rank, educational qualification) on the likelihood that participants have effective accountability practices. The logistic regression model was statistically significant, at Wald test: $\chi^2 = 25.350$, $p < .001$. The model explained 36.0 % (Nagelkerke R^2) of the variance in effective accountability practices and correctly classified 68.3 % of cases. It also depicts only the association between academic leadership position and work experience with effective accountability practices at P<0.001 level of significance.

IX.   CONCLUSION

As we experience, accountability arrangements are of outstanding interest and implication for the office holders, their masters, and the broader public because they dispense with professional autonomy and external control and generally organized- professional, administrative, legal, social and political. However, this study limited only to professional and administrative accountabilities. Despite the fact that there was a great deal of initiatives of government to maintain accountability in the public universities, the higher officials of the sampled universities is neither accountable nor transparent to their university communities in both dimensions of accountability.

For instance, under professional accountability, focus on conformity to standards and codes of conduct for professional behaviors, through their professional institutions is unheard of. The academic leader's commitment to character, excellence and integrity of its three strategic pillars (teaching-learning, research, community services) of higher education institutions, guaranteeing high quality training, hold themselves accountable to their various players is not bright. Even though the university administration encourages research, the research tradition and the organizational culture of vibrant intellectual discourse and scholarly dynamism that characterize academic life in sampled universities not conceived and need to see.

Administrative accountability is the most common kind and exercised by superiors through their hierarchical relationships in their respective university. It needs leadership competencies and skills to implement in the public institutions. Nonetheless the academic leaders have considerable amount of accountability in their respective universities, *none* of the items (effective support in the university; fair treatment of academic community; efficient, honest and open accounting system and use of resources; well-designed system for organizing, managing and distributing information to appropriate audience)   of administrative accountability variables are rated favorably by the majority of lecturer respondents and even by middle level managers. We can conclude that incompetence and in capabilities characterizes the academic leaders in sampled public universities in southern region.

X.   POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

- ✎ *Strengthening academic leaders of the HEIs*: The current study reveals that, one of the major challenges of the current academic leaders in sampled public universities in the region is continuing to look for direction from the government other than having the confidence to give strategic directions themselves. It has paramount importance of building up leadership and autonomy of academic leaders to increase institutional autonomy and accountability and to maintain effective governance in public HEIs.
- ✎ *Strengthening Accountability in HEIs:* Having the right balance between self-reliance and accountability in HEIs is very critical to maintain effective governance practices. In order to operationalize this right, extricates steered systems from those that heavily regulated in the HEIs.

REFERENCES

[1]   Abbott, A. (1988). *The System of professions: An essay on the division of expert labour,* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

[2]   Abraha B. (2011). Public institutions reform in Ethiopia: The case of higher education governance management and leadership reform.

[3]   Altizer, C. (1993). Four steps to empowerment," *Network for empowering productivity, quality, and customer satisfaction*, v.4, no.1, pp.21-23

[4]   Amanuel W. (2015). Organizational change implementation in public universities in Ethiopia. PhD dissertation, Addis Ababa University, Ethiopia

[5]   Ashebir Bezabhi (2016). Power distance and its impact on academic staff performance in Ethiopian Higher Education Institutions. PhD dissertation, Addis Ababa University, Ethiopia

[6]   Aucoin, P. & R. Heintzman, (2000). The dialectics of accountability for performance in public management reform. *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, 66: 45-55.

[7]   Ayalew S. (2008). Academic Freedom in Ethiopia: Perspectives of Teaching Personnel; a case of Bahir Dar University. *Forum for Social Studies*, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.

[8]   Befikadu Z. (2013). The Link between Leadership, Institutional Culture and Change in the Public Universities of Ethiopia. PhD dissertation, Addis Ababa University, Ethiopia

[9]   Behailu A. (2011). The path of governance transformation in Ethiopia Higher Education: Institutional Perspective (MA Thesis) Oslo University.

[10]   Behn, R. D., (2001). *Rethinking Democratic Accountability*: Mulgan, *op. cit.* notes 7 *supra*, at 555, pp. 3–6. Brookings Institution Press. *Ibid*

[11]   Bourke, J.F. (1998). Employee empowerment. *Dallas Business Journal*, v.21, no.46, pp. 24-32.

[12]   Bovens, M., P.'t Hart, S. Dekker & G. Verheuvel (2003). The Politics of Blame Avoidance: Defensive Tactics in a Dutch Crime-fighting Fiasco'. In: H.K. Anheier (ed.), *When things go wrong: Organizational failures and breakdowns,* Thousand Oaks: Sage: 123-147.

[13]   Bovens, M.A. (2005). Public Accountability, in: E. Ferlie, L. Lynne & C. Pollitt (eds.), *the Oxford Handbook of Public Management,* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

[14]   Bovens, M. (1998). *The Quest for Responsibility: Accountability and Citizenship in Complex Organisations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

[15]   Brown, R. (2012). *The corporatization of university governance.* London: University of West London.

[16]   Cavill, S. & M. Sohail (2004). Strengthening accountability for urban services: *Environment and Urbanization*: 16 (1).

[17]   Considine, M. (2002). The End of the Line. Accountable Governance in the Age of Networks, Partnerships, and joined-Up Services', *Governance*, 15, 1: 21-40.

[18]   Creswell, J. W., Klassen, A. C., Plano Clark, V. L., & Smith, K. C. (2011). *Best practices for mixed methods research in the health sciences.* Bethesda, MD: Office of Behavioral and Social Sciences Research, National Institutes of Health. Retrieved from http://obssr.od.nih.gov/mixed_methods_research

[19]   Creswell, J.W. (2012). Educational research planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research. 4th Edition. University of Nebraska, Lincoln.

[20]   Demewoz A. (2013). University governance: Autonomy and accountability in Ethiopian Public Institutions. Dissertation, Addis Ababa University

[21]   Donnelly R., Paula, K. Ouedraogo & Xiao Y. (2000). *Local level institutions and poverty eradication: Rural decentralization in Burkina Faso.* Environment and Social Development Unit, Africa Region. Washington, DC: World Bank.

[22]   Dubnick, M. J. (2002). *Seeking salvation for accountability*, paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, pp. 7–9, Boston.

[23]   Elchardus, M. & W. Smits, (2002). *Anatomie en oorzaak van het wantrouwen*, Brussel: VUB press.

[24]   FDRE (2009). Higher education proclamation, No. 650/2009 Federal Negarit Gazeta: No. 64.

[25]   Fisher, E. (2004). The European Union in the Age of Accountability. *Oxford Journal of Legal Studies*, 24, 1: 495-515.

[26]   Freidson, E. (2001). *Professionalism: The Third Logic*, Cambridge: Polity Press.

[27]   Gay, L.R., Mills, G.E., Airasian, P. (2009). *Educational research competencies for analysis and applications* 9th Ed. Upper saddle river, New Jersey Columbus, Ohio.

[28]   Hales, C. (2000). Management and empowerment programmes'. *Work, Employment and Society*, 14, 3, 501–19.

[29]   Harlow, C., 2002, *Accountability in the European Union,* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

[30]   Keith, G. &, Marginson, D. (2006). Empowerment and Accountability: Evidence from the UK Privatized Water Industry *Journal of Management Studies* 43:3 May 2006 0022-2380·DOI: 10.1111/j.1467-6486.2006.00600.x · https://www.researchgate.net/publication/4913907

[31]   Kenenisa D. (2015). Reforms in Ethiopian Higher Education Systems in a Global Context: Continuities, Changes and Challenges. PhD dissertation, Addis Ababa University, Ethiopia.

[32]   Lerra, M. (2014) Staff perception towards leadership in transforming Wolaita Sodo University: Qualitative inquiry. *Open Access Library Journal*, 1:. http://dx.doi.org/10.4236/oalib.1100907.

[33]   Mulgan, R., (2003). *Holding power to account. Accountability in modern democracies*, Basingstoke: Palgrave.

[34] Mulgan, Richard, (2000b). Accountability": An ever expanding concept?', *Public Administration*, 78: 555.

[35] Nkurikiyumukiza, P. (2010). Educational leadership and the management of change in higher education. Implementation of Module based Teaching at National University of Rwanda.

[36] O'Connell, L. (005). Program Accountability as an Emergent Property: The Role of Stakeholders in a Program's Field', *Public Administration Review*, 65, 1: 85-93.

[37] OECD-PUMA (1997). *Managing across-levels of government*. Paris, OECD.

[38] OECD-PUMA (1998). Performance management and service quality network. Paris, OECD.

[39] OECD-PUMA (1999). Synthesis of reform experience in Nine OECD Countries: Government roles and functions, and public Management. Report for the symposium 'Government of the future: getting from Here to There. Paris OECD.

[40] Pandey, I.M. (2004). Governance of higher education institutions, VIKALPA, V.29, No.2.

[41] Park, H. (2013). An introduction to logistic regression: from basic concepts to interpretation with particular attention to nursing domain. *Journal of Korean Academy of Nursing, 43*(2), 154–164. Retrieved from http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23703593

[42] Pollitt, C. (2003). *The Essential Public Manager*, London: Open University Press/McGraw-Hill.

[43] Quinn, R.E., Spreitzer, G.M. (1997), "The road to empowerment: Seven questions every leader should consider", *Institutional Dynamics,* Vol. 26 No. 2, pp. 37–49.

[44] Saint, W. (2004), "Higher education in Ethiopia: The vision and its challenges", Journal of Higher Education in Africa, Vol. 2, No. 3.

[45] Sartori, G. (1970). 'Concept Mis-formation in comparative politics', *American Political Science Review*, LXIV, 4:1033-1053.

[46] Sasha R., Simon Z. & Maria S. (2006). Partnership governance and accountability: *Reinventing development pathways.* The PGA Frameworks., 137 Shepherdess Walk, London N1 7RQ.

[47] Schillemans, Th. & M. Bovens, (2004). Horizontale verantwoording bij zelfstandige bestuursorganen. In: S. van Thiel (red.), *Governance van uitvoeringsorganisaties: Nieuwe vraagstukken van sturing in het publieke domein*, Apeldoorn: Kadaster.

[48] Sifuna, D.N. (1998). The governance of Kenyan Public Universities. Research in post compulsory education, Vol. 3, No. 2.

[49] Spreitzer, G.M. (1995), "Psychological empowerment in the workplace: Dimensions, measurement, and validation", *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 38 No. 5, pp. 1442–1465. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/2568665

[50] Taye A. (2008). Academic Freedom in Ethiopia: Perspectives of Teaching personnel; Conceptualization and Determinants. *Forum for Social Studies*, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.

[51] Teshome Y. (2003). Transformation is higher education: Experiences with reform and expansion in Ethiopian higher education system. MoE, Ethiopia