

Philosophical and Administrative Perspectives on Teachers' Accountability

By. Nur Kholis

ABSTRACT

The paper attempts to explore the scope of accountability of teachers philosophically and administratively. The idea itself is not intended to burden the teachers, but mainly to question whether there is a need to account for them. If it is right to take an account of teachers, the question is : accountability for what and to whom they must be accountable? It would be clear that teachers are accountable for student's behave and to various bodies although such accountability might have different accentuation. (Red)

Introduction

The concept of accountability is borrowed from the field of business management and was applied to education firstly by Leon Lessinger in 1969. The term accountability has since begun to feature commonly in speeches and writing on educational topics. Many proposals of accountability are concerned with the relationships between educational 'inputs' and educational 'outputs'. The purpose is to hold someone to account for the improvement of education and to prove that this is being done. However, unlike business, which has a clearly measurable profit-making goal, it is not easy to measure accountability in education, as it involves unquantified outputs.

Some teachers in Indonesia are not comfortable with the idea of accountability. They hold a belief that teachers need no form of accountability other than their own 'conscience'. Nevertheless, to reject the idea of accountability is not to imply

that teachers are responsible to no one. The reality tells us that many schools in Indonesia are run or funded by government which is accountable to the tax-payers for educational policies and expenditure. Also, due to human weakness, one cannot assume that all members of the teaching profession have sufficient integrity, energy, health, knowledge and judgement to be accountable to themselves. There are in fact some irresponsible teacher in schools. Thus, with public funding of schools and educator's moral responsibility, one cannot deny that teachers should be held accountable. The questions are : Accountability to whom? Accountability for what? If teachers are not thought to be performing satisfactorily, what kind of measure should be taken. This paper will discuss these topics although it is important to provide background about the concept of accountability and its scope in schools.

Defining accountability

In broad terms, accountability can be defined as an accounting of costs that are related to the product, which education is students. Some components should be addressed in determining accountability. These are the goals of schools, the school measurement of attainment of its objectives, and the school learning characteristic profile of each student. Galbraith (1978: 646) argued that accountability is getting and giving accurate information; working to make schools open and welcome places; and staying involved with schools activities and issues. According to this definition, accountability asks the schools to provide information about their activities to people. Schools should always be ready to facilitate open discussion with parents, and parents should meet and support the activities done in relation to schools. It is important in order for schools to be recognised by the community that they should provide the necessary information about their activities for which they will be held an account.

Sockett (1976) stated that "an agent that is accountable for its actions is not merely to say that it is able to give an account but that it is under an obligation to do so ... accountability obligations will be specified in contracts; they may also appear in written or unwritten undertakings without legal force ... one party may seek redress against another for failure to meet specified obligations. "To be accountable is to be held to account (Sockett, 1980). It defines a relationship of control. It implies rather formal ties between the parties, one of whom is answerable to the other for the quality of their actions and performance.

Accountability is aimed at maintaining and improving the quality of educational provision and providing information that is being done properly (Sockett, 1976:35). This means that accountability is directed to educational development and providing accurate information about what has been done. Whether the school has done the "good thing" can be recognised through the accountability program. Thus, accountability in this case may be seen as evaluation and assessment of the school for its development.

To sum up, accountability is a concept applied in an educational setting that requires schools to provide accurate information about what they have done to people involved in education.

Scope of Accountability

Applied in schools accountability can cover many areas. Hattie (1990: 101) has identified what should be involved in accountability. He argued that accountability should involve a determination of the goals and duties, a process to assess these goals, standards of the attainment of these goals, an attempt to measure the extent of achieving the goals or the duties, and acceptability by various interest groups of this evaluation. It can be stated that the coverage of accountability proposed by Hattie simply deals with the ideals of the school. In fact, there exist other groups or individuals to whom the schools will be accountable, for example, teachers, parents, governments and the community. In line with this idea Musgrave (1984:5) made a good point that accountability should be seen in terms of monitoring of the rights and duties of teachers. This kind of accountability is not merely concerned with what

is actually being done, but teachers as those having duties in transforming knowledge are accounted too.

Accountability in schools applies for all bodies that have interrelations with them. Because schools are run by various levels of governments, therefore, it is accountable to these various levels (Musgrave, 1984:11). This is interesting because the school is run by federal, state or local government, so it should be accountable to this levels. If so, however, the schools will have more complex duties in that it is not only responsible to itself but also to other organisations. So, is it really necessary for the school to be responsible to the governments? It could be argued that if the school is responsible to government, the freedom of the school to manage its development could be limited and therefore it will be hard for the school to maximise its effort to bring the students to the highest academic achievement.

It is important that the schools should be responsible to their own program internally. McGough (1978:644) in line with this idea asserted that schools are accountable on how they discipline children (accountability to students), on making sure that teachers are truly teaching (accountability to teachers), and that minded and fair (accountability to parents). However, if the school is not accountable to the government, how could it maintain its survival since the school is funded by government. Does government have the right to make schools accountable to it? Because government funds the schools, it has the right to ask and know what the school has done, is doing and will be doing.

Thus a school is not only accountable to governments but also accountable

to students, teachers, parents and other bodies involved in it.

To Whom Should Teachers be Accountable

The occurrence of accountability is base on the notion that one carries a duty for the other. One can be asked about what is being done. Elliott (1978:5) argued that a person becomes accountable because he or she is capable of rendering an explanation that accounts for his or her conduct if compelled to do so by another who decides to attribute responsibility to him or her for the consequences of his or her action. This highlights that a person is accountable because of the result of his or her action.

Sockett (1976) has identified two models of teachers' accountability : the utilitarian and professional model. Under the utilitarian model of teacher accountability, the teacher is accountable to the public as tax-paying providers and voters. They demand results for the resources. The professional model of accountability proposes that the teacher ought to be accountable to a range of constituencies and within them different constituents. The public may be seen not merely as taxpaying beneficiaries (Sockett, 1976 : 47). The following people may be seen as teachers' constituencies (Sockett, 1980:14): individual pupils and parents; pupils and their parents as parts of the community; the teachers' employers; the providers of the resources, e.g. government; professional peers inside and outside the school; other relevant educational institutions, e.g. universities; the public, and industry. Sockett (1980:14) argued that because the character and quality of a teacher's work affect the work and responsibilities of each

of these people, then teachers are accountable.

Walker (1977:16) has listed individuals or groups to whom teachers may be accountable. They are the individual child; the teacher herself; the teaching profession; the teacher unions; the education department; state (or schools council), the church; the local community; and the public. Similarly, White (1977:126) identified seven groups or individuals that teachers are accountable to.

The first body is the employer. When a person accepts an appointment as a teacher, she becomes responsible to her employer for fulfilling the condition of the appointment as she applies to the employer.

The second body is the school principal. The principals are legally responsible for the general management of the school, professionally responsible for the educational objectives and morally responsible for the tone or climate within the school. To fulfil these requirements, they will delegate some of their responsibilities or allocate various duties to teachers. When accept some of the principal's responsibilities, they are held accountable to the principal.

The third group is staff colleagues. Teachers are also members of the school staff. To meet the school objectives of the maximum development of each student, it is essential for the staff members to co-operate fully, working as a team and creating a school climate that ensures the effectiveness of each teacher and his or her professional growth.

The fourth group is parents of their pupils. Parents are involved in education through taxation. They are compelled to send their children to school. They entrust teachers to care for their children.

They share with teachers a common responsibility for the welfare and educational development of children. In this sense, teachers are accountable to parents.

The fifth group is students. Teachers can be legally accountable to their students for an injury as a result of the teacher's negligence or excessively severe punishment. Teachers also have moral accountability for the quality of education experience by individual pupils, who are their real clients and on whose behalf and welfare teachers serve.

The sixth body is profession. For teachers to be accountable to their profession, a first requisite would be that the profession is able to exercise control over its members. For example, the General Teaching Council in Scotland has power over the registration of teachers, the determination of qualifications and the professional training before a person may be registered as a teacher. It can investigate complaints against teachers and take disciplinary action. Thus, teachers are held accountable to the professional body.

The final body is themselves. Teachers are accountable to the standard they set for themselves, which determine their competence, diligence, and effectiveness.

Model of Teachers Accountability

Barton (in Bottery, 1990:116) has analysed three modes of accountability; moral accountability; professional accountability; and contractual accountability.

Considering to whom teachers should be accountable, there is a difference between those to whom a teacher thinks he or she is or ought to be accountable and those to whom others might argue he or she ought to give an account.

The former depends on the feeling of the teacher that may be based on moral theories or professional ethics while the later involves coercive or utilitarian force that may be exercised by some person or organisation who are in power. Because education does not exist in a vacuum, but exists in a social and political context, teachers cannot be totally independent bodies who go their own way just as they want. Others want to know what they are doing. Therefore, teachers should also consider those who think they ought to be given an account.

As government is accountable to taxpayers who would desire to know that millions of dollars poured into education are spent wisely, the utilitarian model would propose that teachers are accountable only to taxpayers. However, since the teachers are professionals who provide important services to society, their roles must be examined from the viewpoint of the member of society (Bayles, 1989:5). So, it is an unreasonable and too narrow point that teachers should be accountable to taxpayer only. In this sense Sockett has been salutary that teachers should be accountable to diverse constituents. Sockett, White and Barton all agreed that students, parents, colleagues are the primary person on whom teacher's accountability lies.

Overseas experience such as in Indonesia gives further evidence that teachers are accountable morally to students and parents, professionally to themselves, colleagues and principals and contractually to employers, e.g. government.

Moral accountability is a call to teachers to prove that they have honoured a contract-the contract being the agreement that they nurture the intellectual and emotional capacities of children. This

means that they are competent to act as the agent of development of the child or the preparers of the next generations. The role of teachers is to promote student's learning. Students have to rely on and trust teachers who have the knowledge and skills that students lack. Teachers' performance will affect the mental growth of students in the process of learning. Their belief, way of thinking, behaviour may influence the character and moral convictions of students. In this sense, teachers should show "good behaviour" to their students if they are concerned with the benefits of students. Therefore, regarding their roles, teachers should consider their obligation and the power of influence. Teachers should be held morally accountable to their dependents-students.

Teachers are also accountable to the parents. Parents to a certain extent may be considered as "consumers" of schools. For example, schools offer a product which parents buy directly through the school fees. Regarding this idea there is a voucher system in the USA whereby each child is given an educational voucher which can be cashed at the schools of their choices in return for educational programs and experiences. Such a system is designed to be directly accountable to parental wishes in the sense that they could move their children from a less satisfactory school. However, the market analogy of parents as consumers cannot work too far because education for certain ages is compulsory.

Therefore, the accountability of teachers to parent has other connotations. By law, parents are required to send their children to schools, and teachers have the obligation to protect or take care of the safety of their pupils in school environ-

ments. This is the legal accountability of teacher to parents. Nevertheless, teachers are morally accountable to parents. Parents, who have the most intimate relations with the children, are one group in the society that can claim to have a prime and true interest in the welfare of the child. Because they have sent their children to educational experts, and teachers have the obligation to report to them. Through teacher's accountability to parents, teachers and parents can work closely to facilitate the benefits of students (White: 1977:132).

Professional accountability demands self-respect for oneself as a teacher, and places an obligation upon the individual to support other members of the team within the school, that is the principal and the colleagues. What happens to the child in the school is determined by the multitude of transactions among people who perform different roles and presumably have differing effects on learning. In other words, to promote student learning, school staff should be held accountable to each other. This means that teachers should also be accountable to the principal and colleagues (White, 1977: 130-131). However, if the professional body of teachers does not have power of sanction, such as in Indonesia, teachers cannot be accountable to the union or the professional body.

Walker (1977: 16-18) argued that accountability is a multi-faceted concept. The reality of accountability is the interlay among the various accountability dimensions. At one time, the needs of the students may be upmost, but at another time the demands of the employers, and at another one's own conscience. The question is what hierarchy of accountability might be favoured among

these groups if conflicts arise. It is argued that children are upmost to hold teachers' accountability.

Contractual accountability to employers is similarly moral. It is related to the notion that teachers having been paid to work, are giving a value for the money. The payment is on one side of the contract or bargain, but on the other is the performance of the services contracted for. When the teaching duty arises out of the contract, teachers should be held accountable to their employer.

Because many schools are government schools the employers are government. In this sense, teachers are accountable to government. Nevertheless, since there is a tendency towards the implementation of a centralised curriculum, for example in Australia, teachers in non-government schools should also be held accountable to governments. In Indonesia, however, although the curriculum is centralised, government does not fund private schools, so teachers in non-government schools are not accountable to the government.

Accountability for What

To students, teachers are accountable for the achievement of and adhering to the principles. The utilitarian model of teacher's accountability suggests that teachers are accountable for the achievement of pre-specified performance by students, performances that embody the desired objectives defined in the contract. According to this model, children's performance are assessed through tests and thus the result of test becomes a valid way of evaluating teachers' skills.

Sockett (1976) argued that measuring by test scores could not improve educational quality because it could only

measure teachers' skills in improving test score. but it may neglect some factors such as children's emotional and physical state, their background experiences, their attitude to the test, etc. Therefore, according to Sockett, teachers should not only be accountable for the achievement of specified results. Another reason is that a person can only be accountable for what is within his or her control. There are limits in teacher's control over learning outcomes. Firstly, there are empirical or quasiempirical constraints. Teachers cannot control a wide range of factors that affect children learning. More significantly, they cannot set upper limits on what children learn and things they want children to learn.

Secondly, there is a possibility of logical and conceptual limits on teachers' control of the result the pupils achieve through learning. Thirdly, there is an educationally inappropriate belief that the children's achievements in learning are the teachers' task. Therefore, it is more appropriate that teachers are accountable for the quality of the conditions and opportunities the teachers establish rather than for the results of learning. In this case Sockett (1976) suggested that teachers are responsible for adhering to certain principles governing their practise such as "a concern for the truth and rationality, objectivity and open mindedness." These principles are derived from the ends that educators have. If teachers value these ends, these ends will guide their thought and conduct inside and outside the classroom. Teachers can make use of those features of the substantiated values as a part of what and how they teach, part of the ends and the means (Sockett, 1976).

White (1976) criticised Sockett's model. He argued that it is reasonable to

continuously ask teachers to get success in results, at least to some extent, although it is improper to ask them to guarantee that their pupils will learn certain content within a certain time. Moreover, related to adhering to the principles of practice, various principles of efficiency and affectiveness should be included. Teachers should use various methods in their instruction as efficiently as possible. This all means that what White has suggested is that teachers are accountable for both results and the adherence to principles (White, 1976).

Some argue that teachers are only accountable for the achievement. However, in a pluralistic and multi-ethnic society, such as Australia, that encompasses attitudes, beliefs, values and a range of behavioural norms, there is very little agreement in the aims of education and the legitimate roles to be played by schools to achieve these aims. Thus, schools may have a cluster of aims to be achieved within specific spans of time, such as a semester, a year, or in later years. This may involve long-term or short-term goals. How can a determination about teachers' ability be made only by measuring students' performance from a short-term test, while it is difficult to measure the attainment of many goals? Because there is a difficulty in doing measurement, the greatest danger related to the notion of accountability is that the measurement is related to the measurable short-term goals.

This is what is mostly done. Accountability greatly considers that the role of teachers is instructing or teaching pupils. However, the teachers' role is more than teaching but also in educating pupils. Thus there must be an inclusive sense of accountability. Peters (in

D'Cruz, 1977) argues that teaching unites process, such as instructing and training, and overall intention of getting pupils not only to acquire knowledge, skills and modes of conduct, but to acquire them in a manner which involves an evaluation of the rationale underlying them. Accountability, then, also involves non-operationally defined, yet educationally worthwhile activities, such as appreciating, reflective thinking and judging. This means that teachers' accountability includes two senses, observable and non observable. However, educational measurement techniques have not reached the degree of sophistication that can include the two senses of accountability, and thus cannot inspire teachers with a confidence that decisions on measurements will always be made on accurate information.

Nevertheless, it does not mean that teachers are not accountable for the outcomes. Although teachers cannot properly be asked to guarantee that their students will learn a certain content in a certain period, it is reasonable to hold teachers responsible for part of the result. If teachers are assigned to teach the English language, but their students cannot say ABC, their employer and parents can ask if the cause was the lack of teaching skills. For this reason, it is not appropriate to separate the result and adherence to principles as accountability of teachers as Sockett has argued. Therefore, teachers are accountable for both result and adherence to principles of practice (White, 1976:59).

Indonesia has an examination oriented system of education. Two public examinations (the School Certificate of Education and the Advance Level Examination) are crucial to every student. Getting a good result would insure access to uni-

versities and a better career path. For the sake of students' prospects and expectations, their parents and their schools, teachers are accountable for result to some extent, otherwise students or parents will blame them. The question is to what extent should teachers be held accountable for educational results. Because it is too complicated a consensus on which part of result should be made between teachers and constituents.

It is universally true that schools have a basic responsibility for facilitating the growth and development of students both mentally and physically. Thus, teachers are accountable to students for cognitive learning gain, attitudinal change, vocational preparation, good citizenship, peer socialisation, etc. (Edwards, 1991). These objectives, of course, could not be achieved in a short time. Therefore, teachers are accountable for standards of pupils' attainment only to a certain extent. The progress of each child should be recognised as reflecting the quality of the instruction which teachers can create within the classroom. Nevertheless, teachers are obliged to try their best to teach with the principles of care, thorough preparation, fairness, practicality, sincerity, and patience.

Teachers are accountable to parents' for the welfare and educational development of their children. Teachers should be held accountable for knowing as much as they can about the performance and behaviour of their children and giving information to parents; for communicating with parents to show the teaching objectives, to get information on students' behaviour and performance at home; for great supervision and care; for the achievement of their children in public examination and for the improvement

of their children in various aspects.

Teachers are accountable to their employers for fulfilling the conditions of an appointment that is written down in the contract or agreement. If the employer is Islamic or has another religious association, they may be required to make commitment to religious services. If teachers do not accept the terms of the contract, they should not sign it. Once the contract is made, teachers then will hold obligations.

To the government, teachers are accountable for fulfilling the requirement for registration, for example, giving correct and true information about their qualifications. Teachers are also accountable for efficient and wise utilisation of public resources that are available in schools. If there is a government funded program or a centralised curriculum, teachers are then accountable for the completion of these programs. Since there is compulsory education, teachers are legally accountable for the teaching of all kinds of students with different abilities. Thus, here patience and fairness are demanded. Teachers are legally accountable for the injury suffered by their students as a result of their negligence or excessive punishment.

Students are affected by different teachers in schools; thus there should be a joint accountability of professional staff. The professional staff is to be held collectively accountable for knowing as much as they can about the intellectual and personal-social development of the children and about the conditions and educational services that may be facilitating or impeding the pupils' development. The professional staff of the school are to be held collectively accountable for using this knowledge to maximise the

development of their pupils towards defined and a greed-upon performance objectives (Dyer, 1973:37). On the basis of this notion, teachers are accountable to each other for the welfare of students.

However, principals play a leading role in schools. Their accountability to teachers is not the same as that of teacher to them. For educational objectives, that is to promote students' learning, the principals will hold teachers accountable for educational programs over which they have the power of decision, and for the quality of education provided that it is within their control. In schools teachers are accountable for other duties other than the welfare of students. To a principal who acts as an administrator, teachers are held accountable for fulfilling their obligations within the terms of appointment such as regular and punctual attendance, diligence, and following instructions. The degree to which teachers are accountable for these areas should be based upon the principle that these should be under teachers' control, in the interest of students and the common goal of the school.

Teachers are accountable to their colleagues for creating an optimum school climate that would promote the effectiveness of each teacher and his or her professional growth. For example, it is important for teachers to consult with their colleagues before involving a student in a task that may interfere with the colleagues' classes. White (1977:129) contends that teachers should act on the principle that they are knowledgeable in a particular matter; constructive in giving opinion; willing to consider different opinions of their colleagues; and willing to accept the decisions made by the majority of their colleagues.

To themselves, teachers are accountable for their moral commitment and professional standards. They are obliged to always assess their effectiveness in teaching. They should try their best to fulfil the job. They should be concerned with the welfare of students. They should respect their colleagues, the parents of students, their schools and their profession. Most of all, they should behave as the community expects a teacher to behave.

Accountability of teachers in an educational setting is a complex matter. Different constituents set different standards or requirements for teachers' performances. Their performances cannot simply be assessed by measurable results. Then what are the grounds for evaluating teachers? Who should determine the requirements? In this sense the requirements are better organised internally by educators who have the knowledge about the complexities of the educational process. Although, each constituent has his or her own standard, negotiation should be carried out between educators, parents, students and government to reach a consensus-an agreement that should be based upon the purpose of education.

Accountability is a set monitoring mechanisms. Teachers are monitored by students, parents, principal, colleagues, employers, government and themselves to discover whether their duties have been fulfilled. However, if teachers' performances are found unsatisfactory by diverse constituencies, what should be done.

What Measures Should be Taken

Lessinger (in Sockett, 1978:39) argued that the concept of accountability involves "penalties and rewards." Sockett

(1978:35) states that "one party may ask another to take responsibility for failure to meet specified obligations." If teachers are said to be unsatisfactory, is sanction or penalty an immediate measure?

When teachers are considered unsatisfactory most people will think of imposing sanctions such as termination of service or cancellation of registration. Such measures will stigmatise the teachers and deprive them of their means of living. Therefore, this should be done with proper care and fairness because it will affect others' lives. Furthermore, the purpose of evaluation given by one party is not simply a judgement of incompetence but should be considered as feedback on areas that need improvement. Teachers should be given the opportunity to improve their weaknesses. Thus, sanction is not the immediate measure.

If people are to be judge according to the quality of their performance, it is reasonable to claim that they have the right to know the standards according to which they are judged. The standards should be known in advance. Teachers have to hold accountability to different persons for different purposes, and there are no universally accepted teaching methods. Thus it is not fair if teachers having not been given notice of different constituents' expectations, are penalised. They must be given a chance to comply with them. It is very important to find out which constituent is not satisfied with the performance of teachers. Is there any different perspective of educational goal? Is the judgement made on a standard that teachers do not know in advance? If the answer is yes, the teacher and the constituents should discuss and reach a compromise. Teachers may have to learn what they should be accountable for. Mean-

while the school administrators should provide checklists of accountability to teachers.

If the problem is not related to the aims of education, a further action taken is to verify complaints from different constituents. Complaints mostly come from parents and students, as they are the prime "clients" of educational service. Parents, have not been in a position to attend the teachers' lectures and they are not experts. They rely much on the information from children whose judgement on teachers' ability. Valid evidence should be produced. Moreover, complaints should come from different constituents at different levels and in different position in the school system. Classroom observation should be conducted by school administrator to check the reliability of the complaints.

If teachers' performance is proved to be unsatisfactory, school administrators should examine the cause. Usually, the most commonly perceived cause is the teachers' lack of ability or skill in performing instructional duties. Another cause may be that teachers lack effort or motivation. The school administrators should firstly specify the nature of the deficiencies (such as a weak intellectual ability, inadequate knowledge of the subject or poor classroom management). Secondly they should discuss with them effectively and take corrective action to improve the performance of the teachers.

The principals should gather an extensive file of concrete data (e.g. complaints from parents and students) and discuss with teachers directly. They should try to specify the origin of the problem and give teachers the opportunity to explain. If the problem is only related to teacher's ability and skills, assis-

tance should be given. Firstly, behavioural directives that are based on the requirements they should be accountable for should be listed. This will clarify which improvement is needed. The principal should spell out the tasks to be accomplished, and classroom behaviours which should be used in accomplishing the goal. The principal and colleagues can conduct classroom observation on the ground that they are offering supportive help. Beside those actions, teachers should be given other opportunities such as observing classrooms of outstanding teachers who are teaching the same grade or the same content. If there are in-service training courses or workshop available, the poor performer is encouraged or required to participate in them. However, teaching is an extremely complex activity, and incompetent teachers often manifest numerous shortcomings in performing this complicated task. Under such condition, it is unrealistic to expect major change overnight. For improvement, teachers may need to learn new sets of skills and to integrate them into a long established behaviour. Improvement is likely to occur in small increments rather than in giant steps. Thus, the poor performers should be given an extended period of remedy.

If teacher have a philosophy that is different from that of school, principal, and their colleagues, and thus they are unwilling to accept any advice, it is better to transfer these teachers to other schools or another non-teaching position.

If teachers fail to demonstrate sufficient improvement, a letter warning should be given to them and they should be informed of the possibility of dismissal should be induced. Dismissal is the hardest sanction that can be imposed on teach-

ers, and it may be equivalent to the death penalty. So, this must be done carefully. As there are no clear-cut standards or yardsticks for determining whether teachers have failed to meet a particular criterion, numerous examples of teachers' shortcomings must be accumulated to demonstrate that a pattern of failure ex-

whom everyone knows cannot teach. Moreover, teachers have a great effect on students' character and moral convictions. How can we expose pupils to incompetent teachers? Considering the wellbeing of students, we cannot tolerate teachers who fail year after year, with pupils after pupils.

Conclusion

Accountability is a court of judgment that distributes praise and blame and sometimes sanctions or dismissal. However, without an agreement on what teachers should be accountable for, any judgment about teachers' performance would be arbitrary, unfair and biased. Nevertheless, to assure the quality of education, accountability is undoubtedly necessary and desirable. Due to the limitations of knowledge about learning, there is still a need for the improvement of the implementation of accountability procedures.

References

"Two Perspectives on Accountability." *Social Education*. November-December 1978.

Bayles, M.D. (1989). *Professional Ethics*. Wadsworth: Belmont Calif

Becher, T. and Maclure, S. (Eds.). (1978). *Accountability in Education*. Berks: NFER Publishing Company.

Bottery, M. (1990). Evaluation and ac-

ists.

Some may argue that this is inhumane. However, schools have an obligation to protect students from incompetent teachers. Each day lost in the classroom is the lost of a precious commodity that can never be reclaimed. It is also not fair to put students into a room with a teacher

countability : Problems and prospects. *The Morality of the School : The Theory and Practise of Values in Education*. London: Cassel.

Bridges, E.M. (1986). *The Incompetent Teacher*. Philadelphia : Falmer Press.

D'Cruz, J.V. (1977). Towards and inclusive notion of accountability. *Accountability in Education : School Leadership in Action*. London : Falmer Press.

Elliot, J. (1978). Classroom accountability and the self-monitoring teacher. In W. Harlen (Ed.), *Evaluation and the Teacher's Role*. London : Macmillan Education.

Galbraith, R.E. (Ed). (1978). Two perspectives on accountability : An educator's perspective. *Social Education*, November-December.

Hattie, J. (1990). The quality of education and accountability. In J.D. Chapman (Ed.), *School-Based Decision Making and Management*. London : The Falmer Press.

Hewitson, M. (n.d). Social accountability and the school system. In R.K. Browne and L.E. Foster (Eds.), *Sociology of Education*.

McGough, K. (Ed.). (1978). Two perspectives on accountability : A parent' perspective. *Social Education*, November-December.

Musgrave, P.W. (1984) Accountability in Australian schools : Past, present, and

- future. *The Journal of Educational Administration*, 12(1).
- Ornsten, A.C. (Ed.). (1973). *Accountability for Teachers and School Administrators*. California : Fearon Publishers.
- Peach, J.W. (1977). Accountability in Education : A North American viewpoint. In P.R. Chippendale (Ed.), *Accountability in Education*. Brisbane : The University of Queensland Press.
- Sockett, H. (1980). Accountability : The contemporary issues. In H. Sockett (Ed.), *Accountability in the English Education System*. Norfolk : Hodder and Stoughton.
- Sockett, H. (1976). Teacher accountability, *Proceedings of the Philosophy of Education Society of Great Britain*.
- Walker, S. and Barton, L. (1987). *Changing Policies, Changing Teachers : New Directions for Schooling?* London : open University Press.
- Walker, W.G. (1977). What on earth is accountability? In Chippendale and Wilkes (Eds.), *Accountability in Education*. Brisbane : The University of Queensland Press.
- White, J.P. (1976). Teacher accountability and school autonomy. *Proceedings of the Philosophy of Education Society of Great Britain*.
- White, W.A. (1977). Accountability and the teacher's accountability in education. In Chippendale and Wilkes (Eds.), *Accountability in Education*. Brisbane : The University of Queensland Press.
- *) The writer is a lecturer at the faculty of Education of the Institute for Islamic Studies (IAIN) Malang.