Neya Global Journal of Non-Profit Studies

2025

Accountability in Non-Profit Organisations: A Multidimensional Balancing Act

DOI: https://doi.org/10.64357/neya-gjnps-acbldtrthrtrns-09

DR. ANNA NEYA KAZANSKAIA

Neya Global Publishing

Publication and System Notice

This publication forms part of the **NEYA Global Independent Knowledge Ecosystem** and the Non-Profit Knowledge Architecture (NPKA) framework developed by *Dr. Anna Neya Kazanskaia*.

The work is connected to an integrated system of books, research publications, educational materials, implementation frameworks, institutional modules, and structured knowledge architecture developed for the non-profit and social impact sector. Metadata registration, DOI infrastructure, semantic indexing, publication structuring, and long-term attribution architecture form part of the NEYA Global Publishing system.

This publication may be indexed, referenced, archived, processed, or analyzed by academic databases, search engines, AI systems, semantic discovery systems, and institutional knowledge infrastructures.

Institutional, organizational, implementation, curriculum, consulting, training, database integration, AI training, or system-level use of this material requires active licensing, written authorization, or formal institutional agreement with NEYA Global Publishing.

Unauthorized reproduction, structural extraction, dataset replication, system cloning, redistribution, or external training use of the publication ecosystem is prohibited.

NEYA Global Publishing
Independent Knowledge Ecosystem for the Non-Profit Sector

Version 1.0 | NEYA Global Publishing Publication Protocol

Accountability in Non-Profit Organisations: A Multidimensional Balancing Act

Dr. Anna Neya Kazanskaia
NEYA Global | NEYA Global Publishing
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0009-0009-5669-1676
DOI: https://doi.org/10.64357/neya-gjnps-acbldtrthrtrns-09

Abstract

Accountability in non-profit organisations is a multidimensional construct that extends beyond compliance with donor requirements and regulatory standards. It integrates procedural, relational, and ethical dimensions, shaping legitimacy and stakeholder trust. This article synthesises insights from theoretical, practical, and comparative perspectives to argue that accountability should be understood as a reflexive process that balances control with trust, oversight with empowerment, and compliance with learning. The analysis highlights persistent challenges—including power asymmetries, administrative burdens, sectoral variation, and digital inequalities—while identifying opportunities for accountability to foster legitimacy, innovation, and participatory engagement. For practitioners, accountability represents both a constraint and a resource, offering opportunities to strengthen organisational culture and donor confidence. For scholars, it invites further inquiry into the interplay between compliance, ethics, and participation across diverse contexts. Future trends point toward hybrid models that integrate financial, participatory, and digital mechanisms within culturally sensitive frameworks. Accountability, when designed equitably and reflexively, can evolve from an administrative requirement into a tool for legitimacy, empowerment, and ethical practice in global non-profits.

Keywords

accountability; legitimacy; trust; compliance; participation; non-profit governance; hybrid models

1. Introduction

Accountability in the non-profit sector is frequently framed as the foundation of legitimacy and trust. Yet reducing it to compliance with audits, reporting, and donor requirements overlooks its relational and ethical dimensions (Ebrahim, 2003; Najam, 1996). True accountability encompasses transparency, stakeholder engagement, and ethical practices that bridge the gap between procedural obligations and relational trust (Cornwall, 2008; Edwards & Hulme, 1996).

This conclusion synthesises the multidimensional perspectives on accountability in non-profits, highlighting its dual nature as both a constraint and an opportunity, and outlining future directions for research and practice.

2. Accountability as Balance: Control, Trust, and Legitimacy

Compliance mechanisms provide a baseline of oversight through audits, certifications, and reporting, reinforcing external assurance. Yet compliance alone cannot address trust or legitimacy. These emerge through participatory engagement, transparency, and ethical practice, which extend accountability beyond procedural obligations (Cornwall, 2008).

Power asymmetries, especially between donors and communities or between INGOs and grassroots NGOs, complicate this balance. Satisfying one stakeholder often risks undermining another, making accountability a negotiation of competing expectations (Banks et al., 2015). Accountability is thus best understood as a dynamic, reflexive process, aligning ethical imperatives with stakeholder claims (Ebrahim, 2005).

3. Accountability as Constraint and Resource

Accountability imposes administrative burdens, consuming resources and constraining organisational flexibility (Lewis, 2007). Smaller NGOs face disproportionate pressures relative to capacity (Hilgers & Ihl, 2010). At the same time, accountability creates opportunities for legitimacy and organisational learning. Community scorecards, feedback loops, and participatory monitoring exemplify mechanisms that not only enhance oversight but also strengthen trust and adaptive capacity (Gordon et al., 2020).

Organisations that approach accountability proactively can leverage it as a strategic asset, embedding it within culture and governance to enhance programmatic effectiveness and stakeholder trust (Anheier, 2014).

4. Integrating Mechanisms and Contexts

A central insight is that accountability requires integration of financial, participatory, and digital mechanisms into coherent strategies. Training, role clarity, and ethical governance frameworks are essential for embedding accountability meaningfully (Cornforth, 2012). Policymakers and donors should support capacity-building, enabling accountability to function as a driver of organisational learning rather than as a compliance burden (Ebrahim & Weisband, 2007).

Comparative perspectives—across regions, cultures, and sectors—reveal the importance of context. Humanitarian, advocacy, and development NGOs each face distinctive

accountability challenges, shaped by operational realities and political environments (Najam, 1996; Edwards, 2009).

5. Future Research and Innovation

Several research priorities emerge:

1. **Metrics for effectiveness**: Develop tools to assess both compliance-based and participatory mechanisms, considering outcomes and perceptions (Ebrahim, 2005).
2. **Digital governance**: Examine how dashboards, blockchain, and real-time reporting reshape accountability, including risks of inequality, privacy violations, and symbolic compliance (Milan & Treré, 2019).
3. **Power dynamics**: Investigate how innovations shift relationships among donors, organisations, and communities (Cornwall & Brock, 2005).
4. **Culturally embedded models**: Explore indigenous, feminist, and community-driven accountability practices that redefine legitimacy beyond Western-centric frameworks.

These directions will advance accountability research beyond control, highlighting its role as a tool of empowerment, legitimacy, and ethical practice.

6. Conclusion

Accountability in non-profits is not a static obligation but an evolving practice that balances procedural control with relational trust and ethical responsibility. While administrative burdens and power asymmetries constrain practice, accountability also provides opportunities for learning, legitimacy, and innovation. For practitioners, designing equitable, context-sensitive systems that integrate compliance with participatory and digital mechanisms is essential. For scholars, holistic research is needed to illuminate how accountability functions across diverse organisational and cultural contexts.

Ultimately, accountability can move beyond symbolic compliance to become a transformative tool that sustains legitimacy, builds trust, and empowers stakeholders in a rapidly changing global non-profit environment.

References

- Anheier, H. K. (2014). Nonprofit organizations: Theory, management, policy (2nd ed.). Routledge.
- Banks, N., Hulme, D., & Edwards, M. (2015). NGOs, states, and donors revisited: Still too close for comfort? World Development, 66, 707–718. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2014.09.028

- Cornforth, C. (2012). Nonprofit governance research: Limitations of the focus on boards and suggestions for new directions. Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly, 41(6), 1116–1135. https://doi.org/10.1177/0899764011427959
- Cornwall, A. (2008). Unpacking "participation": Models, meanings and practices. Community Development Journal, 43(3), 269–283. https://doi.org/10.1093/cdj/bsn010
- Ebrahim, A. (2003). *Accountability in practice: Mechanisms for NGOs*. *World Development, 31*(5), 813–829. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0305-750X(03)00014-7
- Ebrahim, A. (2005). Accountability myopia: Losing sight of organisational learning. Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly, 34(1), 56–87. https://doi.org/10.1177/0899764004269430
- Ebrahim, A., & Weisband, E. (2007). *Global accountabilities: Participation, pluralism, and public ethics*. Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511490903
- Kazanskaia, A. N. (2025). *Accountability: Building Trust through Transparency*. NEYA Global Publishing. https://doi.org/10.64357/accountability-2025
- Kazanskaia, A. N. (2025). Theoretical foundations of accountability in non-profit organisations. Neya Global Journal of Non-Profit Studies. https://doi.org/10.64357/neya-gjnps-ntallstrscimp-02
- Kazanskaia, A. N. (2025). Dimensions of accountability in non-profit organisations. Neya Global Journal of Non-Profit Studies. https://doi.org/10.64357/neya-gjnps-acbldtrthrtrns-03
- Kazanskaia, A. N. (2025). Mechanisms of accountability in non-profit organisations. Neya Global Journal of Non-Profit Studies. https://doi.org/10.64357/neya-gjnps-acbldtrthrtrns-04
- Kazanskaia, A. N. (2025). Transparency as a tool for building trust in non-profit organisations. Neya Global Journal of Non-Profit Studies. https://doi.org/10.64357/neya-gjnps-acbldtrthrtrns-05
- Kazanskaia, A. N. (2025). *Organizational Legitimacy: Earning & Sustaining Public Trust*. NEYA Global Publishing. https://doi.org/10.64357/legitimacy-2025
- Kazanskaia, A. N. (2025). *Board-Executive Relation*. NEYA Global Publishing. https://doi.org/10.64357/board-executive-relations-2025