



International Journal of Economic Research

ISSN : 0972-9380

available at <http://www.serialsjournal.com>

© Serials Publications Pvt. Ltd.

Volume 14 • Number 13 • 2017

The Factors Impact the Accountability in Vietnamese Public Sector Accounting–Empirical Study at Administrative Units

Pham Quang Huy¹

¹*School of Accounting, University of Economics Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam, E-mail: pquanghuy@ueh.edu.vn*

Abstract: The public sector accounting system in many countries is being implemented a series of reforms to aim of providing the financial and non-financial information in public sector with a transparent manner in the direction of adopting International Public Sector Accounting Standards. When conducting so, most countries believe and expect that their public accounting system will gain clarity in information and enhance accountability. Especially, the Vietnamese Government is being set out many solutions to transform public sector accounting into international integration. Moreover, the Ministry of Finance of Vietnam has implemented a number of action programs to implement the government's decisions. This research paper focused on the characteristic of accountability in Vietnamese public accounting in Vietnam by identifying the factors that influence the enhancement of this feature in the Vietnamese public sector. The article indicated that there are seven factors that influence accountability in empirical surveys with 281 office who have worked in administrative and non-business units in Vietnam. The paper also proposed three policy implications for Vietnam to consider in the coming time.

1. INTRODUCTION

In the current global development of science, responsibility in different areas is a topic that is being focused and an issue that is being researched by researchers and policymakers in the recent years. There are many different types of responsibilities, such as responsibility for construction, responsibility for product quality, responsibility for education, etc. However, in the field of economics, the responsibility in finance and accounting is always paid more attention as accounting is considered the language of business. It can be affirmed, together with the fast and strong development in production and business activities in companies, the public sector is also considered an integral part with full functions assigned by the state. The important thing is that public sector units are those that use the state budget to carry out their assigned tasks in order to achieve the results set out in the plan. Hence, Ssonko (2010) implies that public sector responsibility is an important issue that needs to be emphasized because the budget is primarily contributed from the taxes of the national citizen. In order to affirm liability and to explain the responsibilities related to this financial

information, the management of the units should rely on the data provided by the accounting department in order to assess the operation situation of the organization as well as fasten the powers and obligations in each data provided by public accounting (Jaeger, 2005 and 2010).

At present, there are more and more evidences in the world about the benefits of research for enhancing accountability for public accounting information of countries, regions or organizations (Ebrahim, 2003). Responsibility will be enhanced when accounting information becomes transparent. This helps to benefit the national economy by increasing organizations' access to capital markets and lowering repayment costs. Beechy (2007) said that when the policies guiding of public finance, accounting and investment are clear and transparent, showing clearly the responsibilities of the parties and those responsible for the accountancy, instability and operating budget will be lower, resulting in the more effectiveness in strategic decisions, estimates and project implementation considerations.

However, looking back over the content of public accounting in the past time, budget-related activities and strategic decisions of the state, the government and public agencies have somewhat blurred the role of people in society. In addition, there is a big gap in the decentralization, assignment, etc. so we sometimes think that they were defined strictly but indeed they were very loose, so when a problem happened, there is no specific object taking responsibility (Anheier, 2005). There are no countries where the state has made too many projects like in Vietnam and if so, how can the system have the capacity to manage. Besides, the delegation of authority in the divisions is not linked to a clear and specific assignment of responsibilities. With these constraints, in the near future, accountability for macroeconomic and microeconomic information needs to be systematic and accelerated.

Besides with the disclosure of information, people also need to know who is responsible for these data. In addition, it is necessary to improve the forecasting ability as well as enhance the publication of economic forecast data of key agencies in Vietnam. Things related to this accountability have been emphasized in many specific actions by state agencies. Specifically, during the 13th National Assembly session, the Minister of Planning and Investment highlighted the fourth issue in the reform of the economy is

“reform of state issues in the market economy. That are the regulations of state' responsibilities, state system, public servants, recruitment, regimes, state relations with society, principles of transparency and accountability, etc.”

And especially in the financial sector, the Finance Minister emphasized:

“The spirit of the Finance sector in 2014 is transparent and tending to accountability.”

Recognizing the significance of the state budget is the revenues and expenditures to ensure the performance of the functions and tasks of the State, the current limitations and the importance of the nature of responsibilities of the related parties, in the field of science, Vietnam has undertaken researches to promote and further enhance accountability's nature in various sectors of the economy. However, in the field of public accounting, there are still few works done. In addition, in the Vietnamese public sector, administrative units account for a large amount of the public sector. In addition, these units manage many important fields assigned by the Vietnamese government. Therefore, the main objective of the article is to identify the factors that affect the accountability of public accounting with the research objects are the administrative units in Vietnam.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

In terms of history and semantics, many scientists around the world recognize that the term ‘accountability’ is closely related to accounting and in relation to books. Dubnick (2007) had traced back to the origins of contemporary concepts related to the term and had found the signs associated with the reign of William the First, in the decades after 1066 when Norman conquered England. In 1085, King William asked all property owners in his field to make a notebook to report what they owned. Ownership of these assets was evaluated and statistic by the royal representations, and then incorporated into a common book of the dynasty, called the Domesday Book. This is a book that lists what is in the country and which is in all the areas that the king is ruling. According to Dubnick, this would in fact admit that the king was the head and all owners of the property would be capable and willing to follow a moral duty to be called to proof in their books about the actions that they themselves taken.

With the development process described above, in the world recently, the term ‘accountability’ has become familiar and almost appears in many types of organizations, in many organizations with all levels from central to local (Karkoszka, 2013). However, what does this word really mean and what is the content? In Jabbra’s view (1988), accountability is understood to be a prerequisite and grounding in preventing abuse of power as well as ensuring that different objects use the power that they have to implement in order to achieve the national established objectives. Going into detail, if considered in the view of experts, Edward and Hulme (1996) mentioned accountability is a means by which organizations or individuals report on their power as well as the responsibility for those actions. In addition, according to the study by Fox and Brown (1998), similarly, they consider it a process by which executors are responsible for what they have done. In the special printing of IDS Bulletin, Cornwall, Lucas and Pasteur (2000) have broadened their approach, assuming that accountability is both taking responsibility and assigning responsibility to one individual somehow. Thus, it has both outward aspect, that is, an obligation to meet the norm or in other words, the general requirements of society (Chisolm, 1995) and inward aspect, that is describing the individual actions and tasks of the organization (according to Fry, 1995).

Although acknowledging the accountability element is an important content, this is, however, a matter of broad meaning and often used in the most general and comprehensive way (Hulme and Sanderatne, 2008), or in other words, the role of accountability is also addressed in a holistic meaning. In terms of the types of general performance dimensions within an organization, including the private and public sectors, accountability is expressed through the following roles:

- First, through the process of operation, accountability will relate to different objects such as the government, elected representatives, appointed officials, etc. in carrying out the solving process and these works will reflect the role of providing information about the work they have done and the corresponding responsibilities through accountability (McDermott, 2010). The information provided may be detailed or generalized in accordance with the specific national legislation, implementation plan, objectives or criteria set out in the course of operation and the forecast financial statements in public sector.
- Second, according to Meyer at Australian Monash University (1995), the second role of accountability, especially in the public sector, is to raise the responsibility of the government and ministries to public goods and service products that achieve the stated objectives and can publicly

test them. It is primarily associated with the content of individual or group commitments during a session and expressed in writing with the suggestions. Thus, accountability element in the public sector is more meaningful and broader than when applied to private sector business (Ole Ingstrup and Crookall, 1998). Accordingly, in the private sector each employee in a business is solely responsible for their leader, but in the public sector the scope will be broader, which can be the boss, the organism in charge, the Government or any public agency.

- Third, the next role of this nature is also a fundamental element of accountability, which is to provide a reasonable and satisfactory explanation for the implement of personal power, right and resources used. This will be one of the basic for reviewing and evaluating the task completion of each object at the end of each operation phase.
- Fourth, accountability also seeks to improve the role of the performer's self-responsibility. This also helps to reduce errors, improve morale in the communication process and media as well as the operation of the work according to the functions and duties assigned to it. At the same time, they also have to answer questions if any when the result is publicly declared to verify the reliability, truthfulness of financial or non-financial data.

In other words, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Denmark (2013) emphasized that accountability in public accounting can be considered as the responsibility of the government and its members to meet the interpretation of objectives with the results achieved or commitments decided in advance. Considering from a historical perspective and the concepts presented by many organizations, it is possible to see accountability embedded in the relationship between the society and the operating mechanism to carry out the explanation and evaluation of acting performance or results achieved. According to Pollitt (2003), the key feature of this accountability is that it implies talking about the relationship between the implementer and the organization that assigned the task. This relationship is often expressed by providing information not only about the results of the activity, but also on the feasibility of specific cases, solutions, questions and answers given by the team to the objects that perform the response, and even evaluates the performance of those objects. In addition, Bovens (2007) also outlines the fundamental characteristics of accountability in a narrower and more passive context, which is the tie between the task doer and the task assigner, in which the task doer has an obligation to explain and make clear what they have done, and the task assigner can ask questions to make the basis for the assessment. Thus, in general, the nature of accountability has some basic features:

- First, the task doer is responsible for stating or explaining to the organization what actions he or she will take or took to accomplish that task by providing a series of data about result of the task performance, results achieved or procedures used. In case of failure or not as good as expected, show the proof.
- Secondly, the assigning party has right to ask questions and give concerns related to the above statements to determine the suitability, reliability of the information provided or the legitimacy of the conduct. With this feature, the term accountability is quite close to the term answerability.
- Third, the task assigner may identify the behavior of the party performing the work, which may help to detect inappropriate points in the books that make unrealistic policies and inappropriate behavior by individuals or organizations, then carry out to impose the solving method for influencing behaviors.

According to Goetz and Jenkins (2005), accountability is expressed in two basic areas, the answerability and the enforceability. These two content exist in 4 different categories of this nature. Specifically, these four categories are detailed as follows:

Traditional Accountability

The content of this category usually focuses on compliance for financial transactions and the response to rationality, consistency with the legal corridor, and governance policies. Any country will require its members to function in a hierarchical manner and must clearly define the relationship between the parties as well as the responsibilities of the positions.

Accountability for Governance or Politics

The content of this category often relates to the effectiveness and economy of the use of funds, assets, human resources and other resources. Senior positions within a unit, which may be department head or board of directors or chief, must clearly define activities, job descriptions and specific obligations. Afterwards, these contents should be widely publicized in order to create fairness, clarity and no other dispute.

Program Accountability

The content of this category often focuses on the results of the leadership strategies, plans, or programs. To implement this category, each country will use its own tools such as performance audits, periodic or regular reviews, cost-benefit analysis, or targeted management models to build the basic of accountability.

Process Accountability

The content of this category often focuses on the emphasis on the procedures and methods of activities. Through this form, both the supplier and the recipient must clearly state the standards that the product or service should guarantee.

3. ANALYTICAL FRAMEWORK AND RESEARCH METHOD

3.1 General Introduction

Based on the content of the framework mentioned above, it can be seen that people in Vietnam as well as other user groups find it difficult to access information about published public accounting related to the situation of State budget revenues and expenditures, which are carried out, aggregated and statistics by the budget accounting department. Since then people cannot determine who or which part is responsible for the data. However, it is important to understand that the benefits of accountability for a unit or country are enormous. The biggest meaning is to build trust for the people and sponsors, domestic and foreign donors, since then help organizations to implement bilateral and multilateral commitments and create funding sources for activities according to the function of each unit. At the same time, if the responsibilities of the parties are clearly defined and publicized, it will be the best evidence of improving the reliability of data, numbers and reports published by public agencies related to projects or orders or production processes. This is the first criterion for organizations, especially the countries in the world or foreign organizations to

understand the market, the economic and social of public units in Vietnam. With this important significance, the author has conducted research on accountability by finding the answer to the research question: What are the factors that affect the nature of accountability in Vietnam? The results of the response will help the Vietnamese authorities to further enhance their accountability in public accounting.

3.2 Scope and Subject of the Study

On the subject of the survey: the topic focused on understanding the accountability of public accounting so the survey mainly focused on those who work in public administrative units in the provinces or cities of Vietnam. In addition, this nature effects to users in other sectors of the economy so beside the public employees in the public sector, the survey is also carried out with the workers either in the private sector or in the companies.

About the scope of the survey

The positions or jobs of the surveyed people are different within a unit, such as the cashier, the administrative department, the accounting department, the warehouse, the trainer, the general finance department, the sales department, the production management department etc. and most of the objects are in the accounting department of the units. Regarding the survey area, due to the limitation of time, the spatial scope of the project was mainly concentrated in three provinces: Ho Chi Minh City, Binh Phuoc and Kien Giang. Therefore, it can be concluded that the sample selection with convenient method.

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

In each province or city of the survey, due to the difficulty in approaching the subjects involved in the content of the research topic that are in the public sector, each region, the author has sent an average of 100 questionnaires. So with the scope of implementation as above, the total sending amount is with the formula $n = 300$ copies. After the survey, the author has collected 281 votes with sufficient and suitable data, from which to enter data and have the results. First, the descriptive statistics are presented as follows:

4.1 Accountability in the overall questionnaire is presented in the descriptive statistics, through the four basic indicators of qualitative issues including Minimum, Maximum, Mean and standard deviation (Std Deviation) values. The results of the questions in each section are presented in descriptive statistics as follows:

Based on the statistical results described above, it can be seen that the minimum and maximum values are respectively 1 and 5. This can be understood that the questions presented in the questionnaire have respondent responds and has good reliability. In addition, the value Mean is the statistical average value of the random variable, also called the expected value and is the value of the random variable that we expect it to occur the most. Based on the results of the above eight sections, it can be seen that the average of respondents was greater than or equal to 3.13, which is considered quite high. This shows that most respondents agreed with the statements in the questionnaire. Next, the Std. Deviation value is called standard deviation. In standard deviation statistics, the stability of the statistics revolves around the mean. The lower the standard deviation value, the greater the stability of the data and the smaller the oscillation around the average. The higher the standard deviation value. the smaller the stability of the data, the

Table 1
Descriptive Statistics

<i>Deviation</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Minimum</i>	<i>Maximum</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Std.</i>
T1-The law on this nature has not yet finished	281	1	5	3.19	1.034
T2-The published information is uncheckable	281	1	5	3.27	1.048
T3-The unit information is sufficient publicized	281	1	5	3.27	1.074
T4- The unit provides the information as required	281	1	5	3.38	.982
T5-Understanding the problems of the unit through the organization information	281	1	5	3.31	.989
T6-Transparency to go with the state process	281	1	5	3.37	1.062
Valid N (listwise)	281				
A1-Still not have the official adjusted document	281	1	5	3.20	.905
A2-The nature is presented through reports	281	1	5	3.42	.820
A3-Accountability by answer the questions	281	1	5	3.39	.998
A4-Has not yet defined the object that take responsibility	281	1	5	3.34	1.054
A5-The general object that is responsible is the government	281	1	5	3.42	.942
A6-The job and the performer have not yet defined clearly	281	1	5	3.35	.970
A7-Attached to the obligation and job of specific object	281	1	5	3.47	.964
Valid N (listwise)	281				
B1-Document is origin of all information	281	1	5	3.68	.962
B2-Knowledge to use the means to create the information	281	1	5	3.47	.824
B3-The department information created in accordance with the arising time	281	1	5	3.31	.874
B4-Estanblishment attached to the responsibilities of individual and department	281	1	5	3.48	.899
B5-Input of public accounting archives the nature	281	1	5	3.28	.903
Valid N (listwise)	281				
D1-Information should be communicated among the departments	281	1	5	3.45	.921
D2-The departments receive the information on time	281	1	5	3.46	.894
D3-The departments is publicized actively	281	1	5	3.15	1.047
D4-Be supported to receive information sufficiently	281	1	5	3.42	.979
D5-The declaration of information is integrated carried out	281	1	5	3.37	1.007
D6-Taking note of information archived the responsible nature	281	1	5	3.34	.884
D7-Budget report has had accountability	281	1	5	3.34	1.097
Valid N (listwise)	281				
C1-Information receiving from the parties is clear and easy to understand	281	1	5	3.35	.905
C2-The secret of different information	281	1	5	3.33	.910
C3-Instructing the way of information risk control	281	1	5	3.43	.920
C4-Secure devices in information control	281	1	5	3.50	.867
C5-The origin of information is completely checkable	281	1	5	3.47	.937

Contd. table 1

<i>Deviation</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Minimum</i>	<i>Maximum</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Std.</i>
C6-Enhancing in checking the information of all departments	281	1	5	3.63	.861
C7-Budget law raises up this nature	281	1	5	3.48	.845
C9-Public accounting has stressed the nature	281	1	5	3.52	.837
Valid N (listwise)	281				
M1-Be able to keep secret the information created	281	1	5	3.64	.899
M2-Be shared the right to use the information	281	1	5	3.61	.812
M3-Know the list of information that need to keep secret	281	1	5	3.60	.881
M4-Be supported in exploiting and using the information	281	1	5	3.59	.792
M5-The information is exploited on time with right authority	281	1	5	3.48	.887
Valid N (listwise)	281				
E1-This nature has relationship with each other	281	1	5	3.61	.904
E2-This nature has relationship with many other fields	281	1	5	3.60	.885
E3-Attached to the public accounting information	281	1	5	3.85	.865
E4-Need to have solution to enhance this nature	281	1	5	3.68	.864
E5-Any organization need to have this nature	281	1	5	3.64	.896
E6-Related to limit the organization corruption	281	1	5	3.71	.940
E7-Help to save the legal right of the people	281	1	5	3.76	.890
E8-This nature is important	281	1	5	3.89	.876
Valid N (listwise)	281				
S1-Need to promulgate the legislation system	281	1	5	3.69	.899
S2-Need to have the specification in function, mission and power	281	1	5	3.90	.822
S3-Need to have procedure of information declaration	281	1	5	3.86	.855
S4-Enhance the role of inspection agency	281	1	5	3.90	.903
S5-The role of state accountancy is important	281	1	5	3.81	.888
S6-Complete the public accounting system	281	1	5	3.87	.827
S7-Complete the structure of state administrative apparatus	281	1	5	3.86	.908
S8-Need to apply with the international guide	281	1	5	3.77	.861
S9-Enhance the professional training	281	1	5	3.94	.872
S10-Enhance the role of participating in monitoring	281	1	5	3.98	.894
Valid N (listwise)	281				

greater the variation around the average. Thus, based on the results obtained, most standard deviations are nearly equal to 1, so the level of stability of the data in the questionnaire collected is assessed to be high.

4.2 Identification Exploratory Factor

In order to determine the factors affecting vigilance and accountability in public sector accounting, after the scale has been verified to be reliable, the author uses the EFA tool to conduct analyze the factors that affect this nature. Exploratory factor analysis is a statistical analysis method used to reduce a set of many

interdependent observation variables into a smaller set of variables (called factors) to make them more meaningful but still contains most of the information content of the initial set. Factor analysis was performed with the Principle Component extraction, Varimax rotation for 56 independent variables. Sample size of 281 analysis is appropriate. When analyzing the factor, the author is interested in the following criteria:

- (i) KMO (Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin) coefficient ≥ 0.5 and the significance level of the Bartlett test ≤ 0.05 ;
- (ii) Factor Loading coefficient > 0.5 (due to sample size > 100).

If the observation variable has a factor load coefficient ≤ 0.5 , it will be rejected to ensure that the input data is meaningful for the factor analysis. After processing the data by software, the results show that the content was made and extracted partly as follows:

Table 2 shows the descriptive statistics and Table 3 shows the correlation matrix between several variables. We find that the correlation coefficient among variables in this matrix is relatively high. Next, the Table 4 shows the KMO coefficients:

Table 2
Descriptive Statistics

	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Std. Deviation</i>	<i>Analysis N</i>
B4-Creation process is associated with the responsibility of each individual, department	3.48	.899	281
B5-Input of public accounting achieves these two natures	3.28	.903	281
D3-Departments proactively disclose the information they carried out	3.15	1.047	281
D5-The disclosure of information is done in a complete and synchronized manner	3.37	1.007	281
D6-The process of recording and synthesizing information achieves these two natures	3.34	.884	281
D7-The budget statement is transparent and completely accountable	3.34	1.097	281
C1-Information received from the parties with clear content, easy to understand	3.35	.905	281
C5-The origin of information is completely checkable	3.47	.937	281
C7- Budget Law affects the enhancement of these two natures	3.48	.845	281
C9- In the public accounting content there is emphasis on this nature	3.52	.837	281
E1-Two properties are closely related	3.61	.904	281
E4-Need to have solutions to enhance these two natures	3.68	.864	281
E5-Any type or organization needs both of the natures	3.64	.896	281
E6-Are two factors related to the restriction of corruption in the organization	3.71	.940	281
E7-These two factors help protect the rights and interests of citizens	3.76	.890	281
E8-In short, realize that these two natures are important	3.89	.876	281

This table shows the result of the Barlett test. Based on this result, we see that the KMO in this case is 0.901 greater than 0.5 and the Sig value 0.000 is smaller than the 5% significance level, it is possible to reject HO and choose H1, in other words, the variables are not correlated so factor analysis is a suitable method for analyzing correlation matrix in the Table 5.

Table 3
Correlation Matrix

<i>Correlation</i>										
<i>Correlation</i>	<i>B5</i>	<i>D7</i>	<i>C9</i>	<i>M4</i>	<i>E1</i>	<i>E2</i>	<i>E3</i>	<i>E4</i>	<i>E5</i>	<i>E6</i>
<i>B5</i>	1.000	0.298	0.346	0.408	0.334	0.210	0.254	0.241	0.240	0.309
<i>D7</i>	0.298	1.000	0.270	0.298	0.190	0.176	0.117	0.136	0.045	0.071
<i>C9</i>	0.346	0.270	1.000	0.375	0.406	0.355	0.158	0.235	0.216	0.269
<i>M4</i>	0.408	0.298	0.375	1.000	0.308	0.329	0.234	0.313	0.285	0.283
<i>E1</i>	0.334	0.190	0.406	0.308	1.000	0.614	0.387	0.592	0.478	0.486
<i>E2</i>	0.210	0.176	0.355	0.329	0.614	1.000	0.300	0.554	0.533	0.393
<i>E3</i>	0.254	0.117	0.158	0.234	0.387	0.300	1.000	0.362	0.289	0.373
<i>E4</i>	0.241	0.136	0.235	0.313	0.592	0.554	0.362	1.000	0.635	0.578
<i>E5</i>	0.240	0.045	0.216	0.285	0.478	0.533	0.289	0.635	1.000	0.608
<i>E6</i>	0.309	0.071	0.269	0.283	0.486	0.393	0.373	0.578	0.608	1.000

Table 4
KMO and Bartlett's Test

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		.902
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	4681.157
	<i>Df</i>	528
	Sig.	.000

Based on the result of Table 5 on the Component Matrix (ie, the table showing the factors that not yet rotated), it can be seen that this feature will be governed by seven different factors. From there, the result of the next table on the Rotated Component Matrix will show clearly how to explain the factors more easily. The numbers in this table are called Factor Loading or factor weighting. These coefficients are well suited to determine the factor because they are equal to or greater than 0.5 (Hair, 1998). Indeed, based on the result of the table above, we have identified a total of seven factors that are strongly correlated. From there, based on the similarities (expressed the general feature) of the variables in the factor and the researches in advance, the researchers will name these factors.

- Factor 1 is called the relationship between the natures and includes variables from E1 to E8.
- Factor 2 is called information quality control and includes variables from C1 to C5.
- Factor 3 is called conveyance and disclosure the information and includes variables from D3 to D7.
- Factor 4 is called security and exploitation of information and includes variables from M1 to M4.
- Factor 5 is called information creation and includes variables B1, B3, B4, B5.

Table 5
Rotated Component Matrix (a)

	<i>Component</i>						
	<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>5</i>	<i>6</i>	<i>7</i>
E6	.812						
E7	.789						
E8	.753						
E5	.733						
E4	.727						
E1	.598						
E2	.583						
E3	.519						
C4		.756					
C3		.727					
C2		.683					
C5		.682					
C1		.652					
D6			.806				
D5			.806				
D7			.749				
D4			.684				
D3			.539				
M3				.753			
M4				.669			
M2				.630			
M1				.538			
B3					.679		
B1					.589		
B5					.545		
B4					.533		
B2						.694	
C8							.528

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis. *Rotation Method:* Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.
a Rotation converged in 19 iterations.

- Factor 6 is called employee qualifications through the use of information and includes only variable B2.
- Factor 7 is called public accounting and includes only variables C8.

In summary, with the results of the survey, Vietnam has not yet achieved transparency and openness on the responsibilities of its subjects; at the same time, this nature is influenced by 7 factors. From here, the solutions and recommendations in the next section will be based on the factors that will really bring the efficiency to the public sector in Vietnam in the coming period.

5. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATION

A system of providing economic data at all levels of government which is transparent and rules-based can help minimize changes to the budget and general shocks of the economy, especially help to reduce the corruption. It can be said that Vietnam's public sector is currently facing difficulties, backlogs and wastes in the state budget. According to the International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions (IFLA), transparency and accountability are important basics and the first foundation in preventing corruption on State budgets or a reduction the limitations in the public finances of a country. These two natures will provide a unified context for obtaining the best possible governance, in line with the economic situation of a country, enhancing the credibility of the governance system, compliance with regulatory and financial regulations and monitoring functions will improve. To apply and enhance these two natures in public accounting, Vietnam needs to base on three perspectives to identify specific solutions as follows:

- (a) In line with the legal environment and the operating environment of public sector units in Vietnam, as well as the international economic integration.

Socio economy of our country is currently in a difficult situation for the administration of state budget resources and information of the budget due to both subjective and objective, and internal weaknesses and imbalances of the economy. However, looking at the medium and long-term economic prospects and reconciling with national policy objectives, it is possible to see the economy moving in the right direction. Indeed, the global financial crisis and economic recession that began in 2008 in the United States has had a severe impact on the global economy, and the current socio-economic situation in Vietnam has complex developments, which require the right identification. Public agencies operate in a manner of expenditure control and cost-saving while achieving the stated strategic objectives. In addition, public agencies in Vietnam often have to attract foreign investments, sponsors or donations from abroad. For those organizations to sponsor the nation, transparent financial and accounting information is an effective tool for those decisions. With these changes, the government of Vietnam will issue regulations for timely response, especially the implementation of national programs related to the use of funds in activities, so that it can develop and curb inflation; at the same time, it should be acknowledged that lack of information is one of the reasons that the public sector is less transparent and less sustainable in the budget. Thus, the proposed solutions for increasing the transparency, publicity and accountability of public accounting should be in line with Vietnam's economic, political and social characteristics, while considering it in terms of harmonious relations with the context of integration and will be influenced by the world economy.

- (b) Strengthening the capacity, awareness, understanding and social responsibility of public agencies in ensuring transparency and accountability.

Most of the regulations on transparency are documented, not implemented in practice. The cause may be due to the understanding of the management and the collective of public servants in the public sector. Because of the different objectives, the accounting system's information has not been

fully disclosed and there is no clear responsibility. This will both affect the public sector itself and affect the whole system of public sector units in Vietnam. Moreover, in order for state budget to be used effectively, it is necessary to raise the awareness of civil servants and public employees, and to define the social responsibility of public organizations, because if the social responsibility is properly implemented in the public sector, it is considered to be the key to a strong corporate development and to build credibility and trust in the hearts of the people and related parties, and thus it will be a source of budget growth through the accounting work of the unit because the social responsibility activities will bring competitive advantages for units and the whole country, creating positive feedback from other units and countries have relations with Vietnam, which are two beneficiaries that directly contribute to the revenues and expenditures of the state budget of the unit.

- (c) Gradually improve the accounting system in the public sector towards access and integration with international public accounting standards.

International Public Sector Accounting Standard is a set of standards issued by the International Public Sector Accounting Commission. The main purpose of the standards is to apply the accrual basis in the accounting work of public sector units. Up to the present, more than 100 countries and organizations have adopted the 33 standards, and 32 of which are based on accrual basis and 1 based on the basis of money. The application of international public accounting standards will bring many benefits such as improving the comprehensiveness of budget information and business operations, the disclosure and transparency of financial statements; improving the quality and comparability of organizations operating in the public sector as well as consistency in the preparation and reporting of financial information, and the reduction of corruption. Therefore, in Viet Nam, in order to create transparency of budget information and accountability, solutions proposed need to be step by step perfected and directed in accordance with the guidelines of the international public accounting standards into the public accounting information system.

In summary, the process of global economic integration has promoted data transparency and responsibility to economic and accounting information in Vietnam recently. From the perspective of public administration reform, the implementation of transparency and accountability will further enhance the communication between people and government agencies. People and businesses will be easy to access to the information, decisions and solutions of the regulatory authorities and thus the implementation of these solutions and decisions will be more convenient. Consequently, enhancing transparency and accountability is considered as crucial factor in public sector accounting because of the following important significances:

- Disciplined supervision in terms of finance, accounting in the budget.
- Limit and help reduce the corruption in the budget.
- Promote access to public sector information for strategic assessment.
- Improve efficiency and effectiveness in using the budget.
- Attach the responsibility to the position of each specific object in the public sector.
- Enhance international economic integration in terms of scope and quality.
- Evaluate the results of activities accurately to make the basis for decision-making.

REFERENCE

- Anheier, H. K (2005), *Nonprofit Organisations: theory, management, policy*, Routledge, New York.
- Beechy, T. H (2007), *Does Full Accrual Accounting Enhance Accountability?*, *The Innovation Journal: The Public Sector Innovation Journal*, vol. 12, no. 3, pp. 1-18.
- Bovens, M (2007), *Analysing and Assessing Accountability: A Conceptual Framework*, *European Law Journal*, vol. 13, no. 4, pp. 447-468.
- Chisolm, L. B. (1995), *Accountability of nonprofit organizations and those who control them: the legal framework. Nonprofit Management and Leadership*, vol. 6, no. 2, pp. 141–156.
- Cornwall, A., Lucas, H., and Pasteur, K. (2000), *Introduction: accountability through participation: developing workable partnership models in the health sector*, *IDS Bulletin*, vol. 31, no. 1, pp. 1–13.
- Dubnick, M. J (2005), *Accountability and the Promise of Performance: In Search of the Mechanisms*, *Public Performance and Management Review*, vol. 28, no. 3, pp. 376-417.
- Dubnick, M. J (2007), *Situating Accountability: Seeking Salvation for the Core Concept of Modern Governance*, Unpublished Paper.
- Dubnick, M. J. and Romzek, B. S (1993), *Accountability and the Centrality of Expectations in American Public Administration*, *Research in Public Administration*, vol. 2, pp. 37-78.
- Ebrahim, A (2003), *Accountability In Practice: Mechanisms for NGOs*, Elsevier Science Ltd., *World Development*, vol. 31, no. 5, pp. 813–829.
- Fox, J. A., and Brown, L. D. (Eds.). (1998), *The struggle for accountability: The World Bank, NGOs, and grassroots movements*, Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Fry, R. E. (1995), *Accountability in organizational life: problem or opportunity for nonprofits? Nonprofit Management and Leadership*, vol. 6, no. 2, pp. 181–195.
- Goetz, A. M. and R. Jenkins (2005), *Re-inventing Accountability: Making Democracy Work for Human Development*, *International Political Economy Series*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Hulme D. and Sanderatne N. (2008), *The toothless and the muzzled: Public Accountability, Public Expenditure Management and governance in Sri Lanka*, University of Manchester.
- Jaeger, P. T. (2005), *Deliberative democracy and the conceptual foundations of electronic government*, *Government Information Quarterly*, 22, 702-719.
- Jaeger, P. T., and Bertot, J. C. (2010), *Transparency and technological change: Ensuring equal and sustained public access to government information*, *Government Information Quarterly*, 27, 371-376.
- Karkoszka, A (2013), *Transparency and accountability in the management of defence*, Director, Strategic Defence Review, Ministry of National Defence, Poland.
- McDermott, P. (2010), *Building open government*, *Government Information Quarterly*, 27, 401-413.
- Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Denmark (2013), *Effective and Accountable Public Sector Management*, Danish support for Good Governance, Documents of Strategic Priorities.
- Ole Ingstrup and Crookall P. (1998), *The three pillars of public management: Secrets of sustained success*, McGill – Queen's University Press, London.
- Pollitt, C (2003), *The Essential Public Manager*, Open University Press, McGraw-Hill, London.
- Ssonko, D. K. W (2010), *Ethics, accountability, transparency, integrity and professionalism in the public service: The case of Uganda*, Capacity Building Workshop for Public Sector Human Resource Managers in Africa, Cotonou, Republic of Benin– 12 to 16 April 2010.
- WhiteHouse.gov (2011), *Idea Factory, Department of Homeland Security*, retrieved from <http://www.whitehouse.gov/open/innovations/IdeaFactory> on 26 January 2014.