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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

The Nation's Governors, at a recent education meeting in Washington, D.C. (National Governors' Association & The White House, 1990), adopted six national education goals to be achieved by the year 2000, and in so doing, made a commitment to the restructuring and accountability of public education to ensure that all (1) children are educated effectively, (2) students meet higher standards, and (3) students acquire the knowledge and skills necessary to succeed in a changing economy. Progress in meeting these goals will be monitored through "accurate, comparable, appropriate, and constructive" (p. 9) measurements focused on results, not procedures. In preparing the nation's schools to meet these goals, the Governors stated that restructuring will necessitate (1) giving principals and teachers more discretion in decision-making and more flexibility in the use of federal, state, and local resources, and (2) creating powerful incentives for performance and improvement, and consequences for failure. "It is only by maintaining this balance of flexibility and accountability that we can truly improve our schools" (p. 7).

While many issues contained in the Governors' agenda are contemporary (i.e., school-based management, shared leadership, and
educational equity) in the sense that they have gained prominence in the last twenty years, one issue — accountability — represents decades of protracted debates over the content and control of public education. Terms such as scientific management, efficiency, quality control, and accountability, have been used at various times in educational history to assuage a beleaguered and faltering public confidence in schools and the schooling process. Today, with the nation's focus on the reform and restructuring of schools, accountability continues to be a priority area of concern, yet many issues remain unresolved.

Issues common to accountability, reform, and restructuring are those of responsibility, authority, and control for who shall teach, what shall be taught, and in what manner this shall be taught (Fuhrman, Clune & Elmore, 1988). Educational reform efforts, which began in the 1980's subsequent to the publication of A Nation at Risk (1983), focus on creating fundamental changes in the schooling process to ensure equitable and high-quality educational opportunities primarily through higher academic standards and improved teaching conditions. These efforts have been described as having passed through waves, with the first wave being "a period of digestion, consolidation, and reconsideration" (Strother, 1987), and the second wave a 'restructuring' or 'teacher professionalism' (Kirst, cited in Murphy, 1989). Lieberman and Miller (1990) distinguished restructuring from reform, in general, by its emphasis on the active participation of teachers in the continuous study of teaching and learning. Restructuring entails the involvement of teachers in the review of (a) curricular and instructional practices, (b) the school structure, (c) the learning and
working environment, and (d) ways to increase community participation and involvement.

Because of the growing awareness that teachers act as key agents in the reform and restructuring of schools and school policy, the focus of this research was on teachers' perspectives of accountability. The purpose of this study was to investigate the understandings of educational accountability held by one group of educators, teachers. To select teachers as the focus of this research was not to imply that teachers are, or should be, more accountable than any other group with a vested interest in educational accountability. Instead it was felt that teachers are in a position to offer valuable insight regarding what accountability means and how this meaning is translated into classroom practice by virtue of (1) their professional judgments made in the course of interactions with all groups (i.e., students, parents, policy makers), and (2) the national emphasis on teacher involvement in the restructuring of public education. It was hoped that these insights would serve to better inform the deliberation of policies and actions at the state and local levels.

Within this chapter, a brief historical background of accountability is presented which addresses the (a) various conceptions of accountability, (b) status of accountability legislation, and (c) issues and dilemmas associated with the implementation of accountability systems. This section is followed by (a) statement of the problem, (b) research questions, and (c) brief discussion of the methodology used in conducting this research. The chapter concludes with discussions of the
(a) expected outcomes, (b) limitations, and (c) definitions of specific terms used in this research.

Historical Background

In the face of a changing world economic climate, the 1960s and 70s were characterized by criticism and critical reactions to education from citizens and governments in a number of advanced industrialized countries in North America and Europe (Lacey & Lawton, 1981). These reactions, in turn, resulted in demands for accountability, a concern shared today by many nations faced with improving the quality of public education. Increased public demands for accountability as a condition of government spending are currently being felt in England and France (Broadfoot, 1985; Broadfoot, Osborn, Gilly & Paillet, 1987), Canada (Rutman, 1990) and Australia (Patton, 1990a).

In the United States at least four specific social and political influences of the 1960's precipitated a change in opinion regarding public education which led to increased accountability concerns. They were (1) a federally-stimulated emphasis on evaluation of school systems and their programs (Barro, 1970; Lessinger, 1970a; Wagner, 1989); (2) an increasing proclivity to, once again, look at education in terms of efficiency and cost-effectiveness (Barro, 1970; Buchmiller, 1973; Lessinger, 1970a; Wagner, 1989); (3) a growing focus on education for the disadvantaged as a priority area of responsibility for schools (Barro, 1970; Buchmiller, 1973; Johnson, 1979; Lessinger, 1970a; Wagner, 1989); and (4) an effort to make school systems more directly responsive to their clientele/communities (Barro, 1970; Buchmiller, 1973; Johnson,
1979; Lessinger, 1970a). In general it was felt that if institutions were less sovereign, more efficient, and more accountable, then "greater harmony between their performance and the public interest would be assured" (Wagner, 1989, p. 1). The ensuing controversy among educators was not particularly heated about whether public education should be accountable, but was fervent about the methods proposed to ensure that it was.

**Conceptions of Accountability**

Much was written during this time regarding the methods to be used for achieving accountability. Many of the proposed methods were adopted from business principles of stewardship and efficiency, and, in many ways, were similar to methods used and eventually abandoned during much earlier times in educational history. The following discussion of these principles and the historical precedence of Lessinger's (1970a, 1970b) proposed accountability system are drawn from Callahan's (1962) *Education and the Cult of Efficiency*, and Cronbach and Associates' (1980) *Toward a Reform in Program Evaluation*.

Stewardship, the accounting for and reporting of property, actions and expenditures to a governing body (Cronbach & Assoc., 1980), and efficiency are both principles adopted from business and industry. Equating efficiency with lower cost per unit is characteristic of a business ideology which began with Frederick Taylor's system of scientific management first proposed in the early part of this century (Callahan, 1962).
Concerned with maximizing efficient use of resources in industry, Taylor's system of scientific management was intended to standardize the production process and thereby maximize productivity from human labor without increasing the cost of production (Callahan, 1962).

Theoretically, the production process would result in greater productivity given (a) a scientifically studied and empirically proven method of the human work process, (b) a work force trained in these methods, and (c) a level of management to oversee the training and implementation of this work. Greater productivity meant more output of higher quality products at the same or less cost/use of resources. Hallmarks of this system were the efficient and effective use of resources in the production process.

These principles of scientific management for business and industry were quickly adopted by educators who had neither the ability nor the resources to conduct the preliminary research necessary to implement them. Decisions were made to standardize educational practices without benefit of a research-base upon which to justify a rationale for employing them. Emphasis was focused on justifying public expenditures and cost-accounting. Efficiency translated into lowest cost. The opportunity cost (i.e., that which is given up) for this was attention to educational excellence (Callahan, 1962). These events and others were contributing reasons for the characterizations of this era in education (1900-1930) as the age of efficiency and testing (Madaus, Stufflebeam, & Scriven, 1983) and the era of scientific management (Eisner, 1969, cited in Guba & Lincoln, 1986).
Performance contracting (Lessinger, 1970a, 1970b) was the first contemporary proposal for achieving accountability. Lessinger suggested local education agencies should enter into contractual agreements with public or private agents who, in turn, would provide educational services. These agents would then be held answerable for performing services according to contractual arrangements which delineated (a) educational goals to be achieved, (b) standards by which goals were to be met, (c) time limit for achieving these criteria, and (d) cost for doing so.

Though contemporary, Lessinger's system of performance contracting can be traced to similar methods used in mid-nineteenth century England, which at that time was called a system of "payment by results." The British Parliament established this system to provide a "sound and cheap" (Cronbach & Associates, 1980, p. 138) elementary education to all children. They had the dual mission of (a) equalizing educational opportunities by providing all children the opportunity to attend elementary school, and (b) supporting only those schools that were found to be effective based on test results.

Under this system, the British Parliament gave the headmaster two shillings and eightpence for each student who passed one subject area on a test covering the three subject areas of reading, writing, and ciphering after the student completed six grade levels of instruction. The unforeseen negative consequences of this system were (1) headmasters with students of low ability were severely penalized because they received the least remuneration; (2) subject areas not included in the payment formula were not given instructional attention; and (3) able
students were often neglected while efforts were directed toward enabling low-ability students to attain the point of "payoff" (Cronbach & Assocs., 1980, p. 138). Though Parliament responded to educators' complaints by increasing the number of subject areas in the test, it took thirty years for Parliament to finally drop the system of "payment by results".

During the 1970s, other methods for achieving accountability were proposed. These were (a) educational vouchers (Jencks, 1970; Swanker & Donovan, 1970) to increase consumer choice and stimulate competition in educational services; (b) management systems such as Program Planning and Budgeting Systems (PPBS) and management by objectives (MBO) whereby educational resources are related to educational outcomes for decision making purposes; (c) information management systems (Durstine, 1970) for the collection, maintenance, processing, and use of accountability measures; (d) external educational audits (Glass, 1972) similar to accreditation models but include the added dimension of public disclosure; (e) state assessment programs for tracking student performance, evaluating educational programs, or relating performance levels to educational needs; and (f) the ecological accountability model (Goodlad, 1979) focusing on what is taught, how learning and teaching proceed, and how students perceive their lives in schools and classrooms.
Accountability Legislated

By 1973, twenty-three states had enacted legislation requiring some type of accountability. The most frequently cited accountability systems were state testing or assessment, personnel evaluation, and the Program Planning and Budgeting System (PPBS) (Buchmiller, 1973).

Today all fifty states, including the District of Columbia, collect information which could be used for accountability purposes (OERI State Accountability Study Group, 1988). The methods for collecting, reporting, and using these data in holding schools accountable differ from state to state.

A 1987 survey conducted by the Council of Chief State School Officers found that all but five states (Alaska, Iowa, Montana, Nebraska, and North Dakota) have state provisions requiring either the State or local districts to collect student performance data on a regular basis as part of a state accountability performance system (cited in OERI State Accountability Study Group, 1988). According to this report, performance data are indicators or statistics that measure individual performance and serve as collective measures to provide information about how well schools are performing. Data from the [state accountability performance] system should allow policymakers to compare performance over time, against standards, and with comparable educational entities (for example, States with other States, schools with other schools). By their choice of indicators, policymakers determine who will be held accountable, for what, and to whom (OERI State Accountability Study Group, 1988, p. vii).

Reactions from within the educational community have been mixed, demonstrating conflicting values regarding the purpose of accountability and the methods used. Lessinger (1970a) stated that accountability is the sine qua non for education. Cronbach and Associates (1980) asserted
that accountability is perceived as good only when its meaning is left undefined and its consequences left unexamined. Lacey and Lawton (1981) contended that accountability in itself is neither good nor bad, but rather it depends on the method employed or the appropriateness of the model used to ensure accountability. Others (Bowers, 1979; Doll, 1979; Goodlad, 1979; Johnson, 1979) stated that the problem is not with the idea of accountability, but the ideological framework of accountability systems defined in terms of measurable behaviors. It was felt that this framework fails to acknowledge the phenomenological aspects of experience. Finally, some believed that the demand for accountability is evidence of a deteriorating relationship among persons (Fenstermacher, 1979), and "pathology in a political system" (Cronbach & Assoc., 1980, p. 4). This implies that the demand for accountability is indicative of a more pervasive societal discontent and distrust: a belief that those responsible for the delivery of services are dishonest, inefficient, or not self-critical.

Acknowledging mixed responses to the demand for accountability, with displeasure voiced primarily from educators, the Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI) State Accountability Study Group (1988) stated that educators' concerns are directed at the accountability measures selected, not with the principle that schools should be held accountable. Specific concerns are that these "measures may focus education too narrowly, may cause schools to pay attention to rote learning only, may encourage teaching to test items, or may be inappropriately used" (1988, p. 111).
Unresolved Dilemmas of Accountability Systems

In light of these concerns the OERI State Accountability Study Group (1988) identified six major unresolved dilemmas which policymakers face in developing or modifying a State accountability system. Members of the OERI Study Group were representatives from governors' offices, State legislatures, departments of education, local school districts, the National Governors' Association (NGA), the National Conference of State Legislatures (NCSL), the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO), the National Association State Boards of Education (NASBE), the Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI), and the Rand Corporation. This group convened in July and November, 1987 and February, 1988 to report (a) their State accountability practices, (b) how these practices developed over time, and (c) problems/successes of their policies. The six unresolved issues identified by this group are discussed in the following paragraphs.

The first dilemma is balancing oversight and improvement. Accountability data should provide useful information on two levels: monitoring to ensure that public monies are spent in ways that ensure acceptable performance (the oversight function), and improving the schools by identifying problems and enhancing effectiveness (the improvement function). Careful consideration should be given to the types of data collected and the appropriateness of the rewards, sanctions, and technical assistance attached to the use of these data. Because most states have only begun to connect significant policy actions to their accountability systems, virtually no information exists on "the effects of using accountability system results to reward high
achieving schools or to provide special resources for low achieving schools" (1988, p. 38). It is unknown whether this is seen by the schools as symbolic or whether the additional resources actually increase motivation or capacity that would not be possible without them. Finally, it must be remembered that sanctions, whether or not explicitly stated, are an inherent part of accountability systems. When rewards are given for high achievement, the absence of rewards may be perceived (though perhaps erroneously) as indicative of unsatisfactory or low performance.

The second dilemma is determining the appropriate level of accountability. This focuses upon the issue of determining who should be responsible for what outcomes, and how much responsibility individuals and formal groups should bear. The responsibility to implement the State constitutional authority to provide education is shared with districts, schools, principals, teachers, and students. In some areas, the lines of authority are well-defined and in others they are not. It is well-defined that States and local districts are the only institutions with taxing powers, and as such they are the ones clearly responsible for providing adequate funding for public education. On the other hand, when States grant diplomas on the basis of competency test results, it is not clear who or what institution is most responsible for meeting certain minimum standards. The assumption is that when the student fails, the student is most responsible. However, when the district is required to provide remedial instruction (and may even receive additional State funding to do so) when the student fails to meet minimum standards, it is unclear whether the district, school,
department, principal, teacher, community, or student is most responsible for this failure. How much responsibility should each party bear?

The third dilemma is balancing statewide comparability with local ownership. Both States and school districts will use accountability data if it is timely, relevant and useful for their needs. The dilemma occurs when the information needs of these two groups are dissimilar. States are most interested in comparing performance among districts for the purpose of judging the quality of educational opportunities across districts and students, while local districts are most interested in information that will target the needs of schools, programs, departments, and individual students, and facilitate school level planning. Designing an accountability system requires consideration of how to maximize the usefulness of information at both levels while minimizing the burden of collecting data.

The fourth dilemma is expanding the alternatives to traditional standardized tests. The OERI recommended that State and local educators encourage Federal agencies (such as the Department of Education and the NSF) to allocate additional resources to the development of enhanced and alternative forms of traditional standardized tests. This recommendation was made on the basis that (1) costly research and development efforts are needed to develop alternatives to traditional forms of testing, and (2) local and State resources/expertise are not capable of meeting such a demand. The OERI's position on the use of traditional standardized tests in accountability systems was

Large-scale testing programs form the core of State accountability systems and, often drive the local response. Yet,
they are at best imperfect instruments for measuring academic performance. Questions about the current status and use of standardized tests are being raised increasingly by researchers, the media, and citizen groups (for example, Congressional Budget Office, 1987; Savage, 1984; Friends for Education, 1987). The most common criticisms include the inability of existing tests to measure the full range of achievement, particularly higher order skills; the limited overlap between the substance of standardized tests and the skills and content stressed in widely used textbooks; a general narrowing of the curriculum as a result of the tests' emphasis on basic skills; and the confusing messages transmitted to policymakers and the public as a result of the long intervals between revising norms of standardized tests (1988, pp. 40-41).

The fifth unresolved dilemma is making fair comparisons. Though it is commonly agreed that comparisons among schools and districts should be done in a way that takes into account differences in local resources and student populations, past practices have had serious unintended consequences. Use of predicted scores can institutionalize low expectations of some schools; comparisons can lead some schools to think they are the worst, or the best of the worst. Interpretation of results which have been controlled for economic factors and student characteristics are difficult for many to understand, particularly when schools identified as low performing are designated worthy of merit. However, to ignore differences would breach basic notions of fairness and possibly create disincentives for serving those in greatest need.

The sixth and final unresolved dilemma is ensuring adequate capacity. The development and expansion of accountability systems will translate into new and expanded personnel responsibilities requiring different levels and types of expertise than currently available. Additionally, this will likely necessitate the purchase or expansion of equipment and/or facilities to accommodate information collection, analysis, and reporting needs (i.e., computers and related equipment).
Adequate planning and allocation of resources will be necessary to accommodate the demands of these new roles and responsibilities.

Summary

Accountability is a complex, unresolved issue. Though accountability legislation may be a relatively new idea in public education, the history of accountability can be traced to the beginning of public schooling in the United States and England. Methodologically, many of the processes used to achieve efficiency have been adopted from business and industry, and are based on assumptions that are often at odds with the purpose and processes of public education, especially when the imperative is greater responsiveness to individual needs.

The challenges posed by the unresolved accountability dilemmas (OERI Accountability Study Group, 1988) underscore the need to address the issues of responsibility, efficiency, and responsiveness from many perspectives. Meeting these challenges: balancing oversight and improvement, determining levels of accountability, balancing comparability with ownership, developing alternatives to standardized tests, making fair comparisons, and ensuring adequate capacity, requires future-oriented consideration of what it is we want to achieve in light of past experience and knowledge.

Statement of the Problem

It has been suggested many times in the literature that few people would disagree with the notion of accountability (Bowers, 1979; Goodlad, 1979; OERI State Accountability Study Group, 1988; Ornstein, 1986). It
has also been noted that the term suffers from too many definitions (Glass, 1972). Accountability has been called a bluff and a fad (Friedman, 1979). It has been referred to as a slogan (Cronbach & Assoc., 1980), and like slogans, it is frequently repeated but rarely understood (Gertenbach, 1973). Sarlos (1973) stated that there is not a clear understanding of the term. It has not developed richness; it does not carry with it specific operational meaning for the profession, highlighting value-clashes within the profession (Bunda, 1979; Ornstein, 1986). Because it means many things to many people, accountability is easy to accept (Ornstein, 1986).

The purpose of this research was to investigate the meaning of accountability held by teachers; specifically, experienced teachers from the State of Ohio. Ohio has wrestled with the issue of accountability legislation for almost twenty years (Bainbridge, 1980), beginning in 1971 with legislation requiring the Ohio State Department of Education to investigate various accountability models, to the most recent passage of House Bill 231 (1987) requiring statewide proficiency testing for graduation and Senate Bill 140 (1989) legislating competency-based testing of all students at various periods during their twelve years in public school. Until these most recent legislative acts, the topic of accountability had received prominence in legislative sessions, but did not result in the passage of legislation that was particularly directive of local behavior.

It was therefore reasonable to assume that educators in Ohio were familiar with a concept of accountability, one that was (a) reflective of many years of legislative debate and action, and (b) derived from
local intentions and efforts to fulfill a public request for accountability. It was also reasonable to assume that educators with at least three years of experience would have formulated a perspective on this issue based on professional experience as opposed to having a purely theoretical orientation which may be more characteristic of a new or beginning educator.

In this research, the meanings and perceptions of accountability held by one group of educators, teachers, were investigated. With the exception of Elliott (1981) who investigated the views of teachers in England toward accountability, little is known about teachers' perspectives on educational accountability and what it means for classroom practice. Instead, research has focused on areas such as (a) how administrators at the district and school level have responded to accountability mandates (Fuhrman, Clune, & Elmore, 1988); (b) differences between superintendents' perceptions of accountability and intended legislation (Harrison & Cage, 1985); and (c) the perceived effects of specific components of accountability systems, i.e., student testing programs (Dawson & Dawson, 1985; Shujaa & Richards, 1989) and performance-based instruction (Wood, 1988).

Though these studies have served to enhance understandings of the effects of centralized policies on local behavior, they have assumed that accountability is a uni-directional phenomenon. Accountability is viewed as conformity to external prescription, rather than self-imposed or existing as a sense of professional responsibility one has for one's actions.
Though the former view of accountability may be more common, Elliott's (1981) research with teachers disclosed an alternative interpretation of accountability. Elliott found that when teachers did not sense their professional judgment or discretion undermined or threatened, they tended to express a moral rather than contractual or legal obligation to be accountable; what Elliott described as "answerable" rather than accountable. Teachers expressed responsibility for their decisions and judgments. They willingly and openly discussed reasons and justifications for their actions. This accountability model, a dialogue model, was viewed as a way of rationally resolving problematic judgments and decisions.

Further evidence of a differing interpretation of accountability can be found in an examination of the renewed interest in action research, whereby practitioners actively engage in the planning, implementing, and evaluating of a social practice. Carr and Kemmis (1986) stated that the resurgence of interest in action research has been due, in part, to the accountability movement. Practitioners have "adopted the self-monitoring role as a proper means of justifying practice and generating sensitive critiques of the working conditions in which their practice is conducted" (p. 167). It was, therefore, the intent of this research to develop a better understanding of the meanings experienced teachers from Ohio attach to accountability, and how these meanings relate to their practice.
Research Questions

The general focus of this study was to investigate elementary and secondary teachers' perspectives on accountability, and how these perspectives related to their practice. The initial research questions were:

1. What does educational accountability mean to elementary and secondary teachers?
2. To whom are teachers accountable?
3. For what are teachers accountable?
4. What are the obligations of accountability, i.e., record-keeping; explaining, justifying, critically examining practice?
5. What forces shape these obligations, i.e., interprofessional norms, social interaction, mandated policies, beliefs about teaching?
6. In what ways do teachers' thoughts regarding accountability shape or influence their decisions or judgments? What actions are taken to be accountable? What are the benefits and/or consequences of these actions? In what ways do these actions reinforce, change, or modify the way teachers view accountability?
Methodology of the Study

Qualitative methodology was used in this study. Qualitative methods are most appropriate when the research addresses perspectives/meanings held by individuals and these perspectives are able to be made explicit (Erickson, 1986; Patton, 1990b). The specific methodology was qualitative interviewing.

Soliciting volunteer teachers and employing a snow-ball or chain-sampling approach (Patton, 1990b), eighteen experienced teachers (nine elementary and nine secondary) were selected and interviewed. Experienced teachers were those who had taught for at least three years in the state of Ohio, with most of this experience from within the Central Ohio area.

Teachers were interviewed using an interview guide (Patton, 1990b) whereby general topics and issues discussed in the interview were established in advance in outline form. This interview procedure provided a predetermined focus that was able to be maintained within a conversational and situational tone, and yet allowed flexibility to pursue emergent, related topics.

The interview guide was pilot tested in the Fall of 1990 with two teachers, an elementary and a secondary teacher. The purposes of the pilot test were twofold: (1) to determine the appropriateness of the interview guide and questioning techniques in eliciting thoughtful and reflective responses, and (2) to enhance the outline with additional topics emerging from the pilot interviews.

Interviews were audio-recorded, with the permission of the respondents, and verbatim transcripts were typed for each interview.
Analysis of data was performed using the constant-comparative method (Glaser & Strauss, 1967) in which interviews were read and analyzed with a focus on identifying all possible common and divergent themes or content categories that emerged. Transcripts were coded, stored and analyzed using a computer software program designed for the organization, management, and analysis of qualitative data, The Ethnograph (Seidel, 1988).

Expected Outcomes

The expected outcomes of this research were (a) a categorized set of topics or concepts of teachers' perspectives on accountability; (b) exemplars and discussion of each topic or concept in teachers' own words; and (c) discussion of the relationship to and implications of these perspectives for classroom practice.

Limitations of the Study

Several limitations were inherent in this study. First, this research was conducted with a predetermined interview format. This limitation was offset, however, by two procedures designed to allow for flexibility and individualization during the interviews. These were (1) the semi-structured nature of the interview, and (2) the pilot procedures to refine and enhance the interview guide. Also measures were taken by this researcher during and subsequent to the interviews to provide an audit trail and to ensure trustworthiness of the data (i.e., peer debriefings and member checks).
A second limitation was the small sample size of eighteen teachers. The intent, however, was to provide a thorough and rich description of perspectives toward accountability, and a comparison of these perspectives. The depth of information provided was expected to offset the limiting aspects of a small sample size.

Terms and Definitions

Though the purpose of this research was to investigate teachers’ perspectives on accountability, a general framework was necessary for initially conceptualizing the meaning of accountability in this study. This conceptualization was drawn from the work of Fenstermacher (1979), and served to focus development of the interview guide.

Accountability

Accountability implies a relationship between or among persons. The relationship holds with regard to performance according to either implicit or explicit standards, and the parties to an accountability relationship are obligated to provide or receive information. Varying degrees of trust, responsibility, and discretionary authority may be apparent or conferred in the accountability relationship.

Meanings of accountability were disclosed through teachers’ perspectives, i.e., self-reports of their beliefs and experiences. Use of “perspective” in this research was drawn from the work of Becker, Geer, Hughes, and Strauss (1961), Cornbleth and Korth (1984), and Ross (1988).
A perspective is an individual's pattern of thought and action in relation to specific situations. A perspective is situational, contextual, and temporal. It is developed from specific problems and used to solve specific problems; ideas flow from action, and the results of this action shape future thoughts and actions. Perspectives include such variables as personal background, beliefs, and assumptions, and can be viewed as indicators of how individuals interpret, create, and react to their social environment.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

The recent educational reform process is placing emphasis on the need to reconceptualize or invent new ways to ensure that all students receive an equitable and high-quality education. This requires an examination of fundamental issues such as the role of policy, the structure and organization of schools, leadership and decision-making roles, definitions of student achievement, the structure of the disciplines and others. Equally important is the recognition that decision-making authority to make the necessary changes must rest within the local schools.

One issue that has been generally accepted as a necessary component in the reform movement is accountability. Given the emphases on local authority and responsibility, and the general acceptance of accountability, this investigation examined teachers' perspectives on accountability. To whom are teachers accountable? For what are they accountable? In what ways do these thoughts influence their decisions or judgments? These are critical questions to be examined in light of efforts to restructure schools and the schooling process.
In this chapter, the following are reviewed: (a) history of accountability in England and the United States; (b) accountability legislation in the United States with specific attention to Ohio's legislation; (c) policy and implementation studies on accountability and reform; and (d) research investigating teachers' perspectives on accountability.

History of Accountability

In both the United States and England, accountability has had a long history rooted in political and economic policies (Cronbach & Assoc., 1980; Lacey & Lawton, 1981; Martin, Overholt, & Urban, 1976).

Accountability in England. Lacey and Lawton (1981) stated that if accountability is viewed in a limited sense of giving an account to a superior, then it's history in England and Wales can be traced to the beginning of state involvement in public education when Parliament issued its first grant in 1833. Twenty thousand pounds was given to the religious bodies to educate the "lower orders" (p. 26) -- the poor. At that time, England had no public school system; education was provided through independent schools or religious organizations. Poor children might receive no education, and the quality of what they did receive was questionable. Economically, in order for England's citizenry to acquire the technical skills necessary for the country to build the economic foundation to compete in world markets, a better education for all children was needed (Cronbach & Assoc., 1980). Because the financial needs of the religious bodies to educate the poor were much greater than anticipated, a committee of the Privy Council was established to
supervise and monitor the payment of grants to these elementary schools. Future payments were then dependent upon favorable reports from inspectors.

By the late 1850s, the middle classes were expressing to Parliament that money was being wasted on elementary education (Lacey & Lawton, 1981). Government spending on education during the 1840s and 1850s had increased dramatically by about 100,000 pounds annually (Martin, Overholt & Urban, 1976). In 1858, the Newcastle Commission was asked by Parliament to recommend plans for providing a "sound and cheap" elementary education to all children (Cronbach & Assoc., 1980; Martin, Overholt & Urban, 1976). The commission had been told that education was quite unequal; brighter students who would likely continue past the age of eleven were given most of the instructional attention (Cronbach & Assoc., 1980). The Newcastle Commission issued its report in 1861 stating that teachers were spending too little time on 'basic' subjects (Lacey & Lawton, 1981), and recommended that national grants be given to support education for the poor (Cronbach & Assoc., 1980). Following this report, Parliament passed the 1862 Revised Code which stipulated what children should learn, and linked payment of grants to pupils' performance. Headmasters were paid according to the number of students passing basic skills tests. The English accountability system of "payment by results" was Parliament's response to the call for a "sound and cheap" education for all classes of children (Cronbach & Assoc., 1980; Lacey & Lawton, 1981; Martin, Overholt, & Urban, 1976).

Despite the deleterious effects of this system, i.e., a narrow and distorted curriculum, it was thirty years before Parliament was
persuaded to discontinue it. Government spending on education had dropped from 813,441 pounds in 1861 to 76,000 pounds in 1865 (Martin, Overholt & Urban, 1976). Parliament had succeeded in providing a "cheap" education; instructors emphasized the basics as designed. But the system failed to provide a "sound" education for all. Martin, Overholt and Urban (1976) suggested that the system successfully reflected the desires of those who sought to control government spending on education for the poor.

Until the passage of the 1944 Education Act, elementary and secondary education continued to be controlled through regulations; teachers were accountable for what was taught and methods used. The 1944 Education Act gave teachers more freedom with the curriculum by passing responsibility to the local authorities, governors or managers, but the curriculum continued to be controlled through general examinations (Lacey & Lawton, 1981). It was not until the 1970s when strong public sentiment against education was voiced, that accountability again became an issue.

Concerns were expressed about the quality of education for the "eleven to sixteen age group or the standards achieved by school leavers" (Lacey & Lawton, 1981, p. 27). These concerns were heightened by (1) the need to cut government expenditures and the desire to "see education give value for money" (Lacey & Lawton, 1981, p. 27), (2) a growing consumer movement of parents demanding more participation in educational decisions, (3) a change in educational management style emphasizing management efficiency -- relating objectives to measurable outputs.
Accountability in the United States. Though under different circumstances, similar economic and political issues (i.e., efficient use of resources and equitable educational opportunities) have given rise to the demand for accountability in the United States.

During the early part of this century, the trend in educational administration, known as the "efficiency movement" (Callahan, 1962) based on Frederick Taylor's system of scientific management, promised a better and less expensive education (Martin, Overholt, & Urban, 1976). Following a decade of muckraking and concerns for reform, a growing public consciousness was focusing on the critical examination of public institutions in general. As businesses began adopting Taylor's principles their status and prestige ascended in public opinion, and educators were soon urged to do the same. Administrators were quick to adopt the business principles of scientific management and efficiency, especially as educational costs and the numbers of students were rising (Callahan, 1962; Kliebard, 1982).

Educational efficiency was gauged by surveys focusing on indicators such as expenditures, student dropout, and promotion rates. Quality of teaching was based on pupils' test scores (Cronbach, 1963; Madaus, Scriven & Stufflebeam, 1983). It was felt that the content of any course was well-established and beyond criticism (Cronbach, 1963). Standard tests were used to measure the efficiency of the teacher and the school system. Survey and test results were used to justify and reduce cost, rather than to improve the quality of education (Madaus, Scriven & Stufflebeam, 1983). Subject areas that could not be scientifically measured, i.e., music and art, were not stressed (Martin,
Overholt & Urban, 1976); efficiency translated into lowest cost.

Callahan (1962) summarized the events and outcomes of this period,

. . . the consequences for American education and American society were tragic. And when all of the strands in the story are woven together, it is clear that the essence of the tragedy was in adopting values and practices indiscriminately and applying them will little or no consideration of educational values or purposes. . . . the record shows that the emphasis was not at all on "producing the finest product" but on the "lowest cost." In all of the efforts which were made to demonstrate efficiency, it was not evidence of the excellence of the "product" which was presented, but data on per-pupil costs. This was so partly because of the difficulty of judging excellence but mostly because when school boards (and the American people generally) demanded efficiency they meant "lower costs." This fact more than any other was responsible for the course of events in educational administration between 1910 and 1929 (p. 244).

By the end of the 1920s, the indiscriminate use of surveys and tests had fallen into disfavor (Cronbach, 1963). The public's attention had focused less on education, and more on recuperating from the economic devastation of the Great Depression and, later, the political upheaval of the second world war.

The period following World War II was a time of national growth and expansion; a time of rebuilding. Madaus, Scriven and Stufflebeam (1983) referred to this period as either the "Age of Innocence" or the "Age of Ignorance." Economically, the nation was rebuilding and fostering. Industrial and military capabilities were supported and growing; tax money for education was increasing. For most Americans it was a period of prosperity. At the same time there was little public concern for social issues, such as (a) extreme poverty in inner cities and rural areas, (b) extreme racial discrimination and segregation throughout the United States, and (c) a general disregard for the consumption and waste of limited natural resources. There was little
public concern for holding any institution accountable. Madaus, Scriven and Stufflebeam (1983) wrote,

While there was a great expansion of education, optimism, plenty of tax money, and little worry over husbanding resources, there was no particular interest on the part of society in holding educators accountable. There was little call for educators to demonstrate the efficiency and effectiveness of any developmental efforts (p. 10).

This attitude changed following the launch of Sputnik I in 1957, and became much more pronounced when government spending was directed toward national curriculum development efforts and reforms to help the poor and needy. Large-scale national curriculum development projects were financed with government funds made available through the National Education Defense Act of 1958, and eventually additional funds were allocated to evaluate these efforts (Madaus, Scriven & Stufflebeam, 1983).

In 1965, the War on Poverty was launched. National reform programs were designed and financed to equalize and upgrade social, health, and educational opportunities for all citizens. This time, however, stipulations were attached to funding. Out of a concern that funding might be wasted, accountability requirements were imposed, and the 1964 Elementary and Secondary Act (ESEA) was modified to include specific evaluation requirements. Madaus, Scriven and Stufflebeam (1983) wrote,

As a result, Title I of that [ESEA] Act, which was aimed at providing compensatory education to disadvantaged children, specifically required each school district receiving funds under its terms to evaluate annually — using appropriate standardized test data — the extent to which its Title I projects had achieved their objectives (p. 13).
In addition to the federal stimulus to evaluate educational programs and equalize educational opportunities, two other influences of the 1960s led to an increased demand for accountability. Like England at this time, there was public pressure to (1) look at education in terms of efficiency and cost-effectiveness (Barro, 1973; Buchmiller, 1973; Lessinger, 1970a; Wagner, 1989); and (2) make schools and school systems more directly responsive to their clientele/communities (Barro, 1970; Buchmiller, 1973; Johnson, 1979; Lessinger, 1970a)

Summary

Accountability has been a public issue; one which has been tied closely to the appropriation and use of educational dollars. In a limited sense, as pointed out by Lacey and Lawton (1981), it was the process of giving an account to a superior. In a much broader sense, though, accountability was an issue that was reflective of a larger, more pervasive societal discontent as pointed out by Cronbach and Associates (1980) when they wrote that a "demand for accountability is a sign of pathology in a political system" (p. 4). In each instance accountability became an issue when there was disagreement or tension over what should be taught, who should be taught, or how this should be taught; or when there was a perceived threat to economic or political security. On the other hand, accountability forced a dialogue, albeit a limited one, between those with a vested interest in education and those with the responsibility for developing those interests. Disagreements were focused on the adequacy and emphases (at the exclusion of other criteria) of the standards used to judge performance of
responsibilities, and the resulting outcomes of adherence to these criteria and standards.

The next section is a summary of the status of accountability legislation in the United States and Ohio.

Accountability Legislation

The United States Department of Defense, under the leadership of Secretary Robert McNamara, was the first government agency in the 1960s to adopt the management technique of Planning, Programming, Budgeting Systems (PPBS) (a systems model of management with an emphasis on measurable outcomes) to insure efficient planning and use of funds in government programs. Johnson (1979) stated that one of the most important outcomes of this decision was its effect on state governments; it "forced state government agencies to conform to a similar model. And so by the mid-1960s the central management perspective under which state-mandated accountability programs would be formulated had been set in place" (p. 374).

With a federal accountability model in place, state governments soon adopted similarly fashioned legislative accountability requirements. By 1973, twenty-three states had legislation requiring some type of state or local program to achieve greater accountability in education (Buchmiller, 1973). Table 1 lists these states and types of accountability programs for each.
### Table 1

#### 1973 Accountability Legislation by States (Buchmiller, 1973)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>PPBS</th>
<th>MIS</th>
<th>Uniform Accounting</th>
<th>Testing</th>
<th>Personnel Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to Buchmiller (1973), there were three basic types of programs at this time (1) management systems, such as PPBS, management information systems (MIS), and Uniform Accounting Systems designed to relate performance indicators to resources for decision-making; (2) testing programs to measure student achievement in basic skills used primarily to evaluate the effectiveness of school programs and curriculum; and (3) personnel evaluation programs to determine the qualification and competence of teachers, administrators, and supervisors. Within the next fifteen years the number of states adopting educational accountability legislation doubled.

A number of mechanisms exist through which schools can promote accountability (OERI, 1988). Table 2 presents the OERI's interpretation of these mechanisms, including the varying purposes, sources of information, and public disclosure of each. Mechanisms are (1) fiscal audits, (2) school accreditation, (3) performance reporting, (4) personnel evaluation, and (5) program evaluation.
### Table 2

**Educational Accountability Mechanisms (OERI, 1988, p. 6)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Type of Information</th>
<th>Whether Publicly Reported</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fiscal Audits</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure that school funds are spent for intended purposes, using sound accounting principles</td>
<td>Enforce fiscal probity</td>
<td>Revenue and expenditure data</td>
<td>No, except in cases of serious violations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>School Accreditation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure that all schools meet minimum resource and management standards; may include assessment of school organization and performance</td>
<td>Enforce minimum standards</td>
<td>School records, on-site visits</td>
<td>No, except in cases of serious problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Performance Reporting</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ascertain how well schools are providing quality educational services and producing desirable student outcomes</td>
<td>Compare performance over time, against standards, with other schools; reward, punish, and/or assist schools</td>
<td>Statistical indicator data on resources, school organization, teachers, curriculum, and student outcomes</td>
<td>Yes, in the expectation that policymakers, educators, and the public will act on the information</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Type of Information</th>
<th>Whether Publicly Reported</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personnel Evaluation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate how well individual principals and teachers are performing their jobs</td>
<td>Reward high performance; inform professional development and tenure decisions</td>
<td>Evaluations by supervisors; classroom and school observations, work portfolios</td>
<td>No, because of the need to meet confidentiality and due process requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Program Evaluation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determine whether a specific policy or program is producing its intended effects</td>
<td>Decide whether to continue or modify program, determine future funding levels</td>
<td>Record data, interviews with participants, observations, various statistical data</td>
<td>Depends on public interest in the program</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The OERI chose the mechanism, "performance reporting," as the focus of its report (1988). Though it can be argued that performance reporting is not a relatively new procedure for reporting the quality of educational performance and use of resources, the OERI focused on this mechanism claiming that the inclusion of various indicators reduced into one is a relatively new concept.

Although each [mechanism] plays an important role in holding institutions and individuals accountable, one mechanism, "performance reporting," has been selected as the focus of this study because it helps the public learn how well schools are educating their students. Fiscal audits, school accreditation, and personnel evaluations have existed in public schools in one form or other for decades. With the advent of Federal and State categorical programs, program evaluation has also become institutionalized as an accountability mechanism. Although standardized tests and other indicators of school performance have been routinely used over the past 20 years in assessing local districts, schools, and students, the notion of combining all these data into a single system that reports overall performance and then uses it as the basis for further policy action is relatively new (OERI, 1988, p. 5).
Though many states have since modified, and continue to modify, their legislative requirements, all fifty states, including the District of Columbia, presently collect information that can be used for accountability purposes (OERI, 1988). All but five states collect statewide performance data. Of these states, Montana and North Dakota stipulate that local districts must design their own systems and report performance, and they offer local districts the option of using a state achievement test. Local districts in Alaska, Iowa, and Nebraska may collect performance data, but there are no state provisions for the use of these data for accountability purposes. Only twenty-three states, however, go beyond the collection of test scores to include an integrated set of indicators (i.e., data about students, school resources, and instructional conditions) to provide a comprehensive picture of schooling (Council of Chief State School Officers, cited in OERI, 1988).

While all accountability systems are designed to provide information to monitor the effects of policy and improve educational quality, they vary considerably in their design reflecting the unique political and historical circumstances of each state (OERI, 1988). Each system can be distinguished along two dimensions. The first is the focus of control, or who is primarily responsible for the system -- the state agency, the local agency, or both the state and the local agencies. The responsible agency decides what data are collected and how it is organized and reported.

The second dimension is whether or not the system is linked to other state policy actions. This is characterized by sustained policy
actions (i.e., allocation of extra resources, exemption from certain
regulations, or additional monitoring requirements) triggered by data
from performance indicators. Table 3 displays the number of states
(including the District of Columbia) along each of these dimensions.

Table 3

Types of State Performance Accountability Systems (OERI, 1988)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of System</th>
<th>Totals</th>
<th>Primary Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Links</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Policy Links</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Five states do not report collecting performance data for
accountability purposes.

As shown in Table 3, most states (n=35) have assumed primary
responsibility for the statewide accountability system; two states have
legislation requiring that the local districts design their own system
and report performance; and nine states share accountability
responsibilities. States are much more divided, however, with respect
to whether significant policy actions are tied to performance data.
Slightly more than half (n=25) link state-level policies to performance
data. Each state and the respective level(s) of responsibility and
policy linkage are given in Table 4.
Table 4

Key Dimensions of Accountability Systems for the 50 States and the District of Columbia (OERI, 1988)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Level/Policy Links</th>
<th>Public Report</th>
<th>Multiple Indicators</th>
<th>Compare</th>
<th>Context</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>s/no</td>
<td>sc,d,s</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>s/no</td>
<td>sc,d,s</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>s/yes</td>
<td>d,s</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>m/yes</td>
<td>sc,d,s</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>m/no</td>
<td>d,s</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>s/yes</td>
<td>d,s</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>s/no</td>
<td>sc,d,s</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC</td>
<td>s/yes</td>
<td>sc,d,s</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>s/yes</td>
<td>sc,d,s</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>s/yes</td>
<td>sc,d,s</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>s/yes</td>
<td>sc,d,s</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>s/no</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>m/yes</td>
<td>sc,d,s</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>s/yes</td>
<td>sc,d,s</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>s/no</td>
<td>d,s</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>s/yes</td>
<td>sc,d,s</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>s/yes</td>
<td>sc,d,s</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>s/no</td>
<td>sc,d,s</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>s/no</td>
<td>sc,d,s</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>s/yes</td>
<td>sc,d,s</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>s/yes</td>
<td>sc,d,s</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>l/yes</td>
<td>d,s</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>s/yes</td>
<td>sc,d,s</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Level/Policy Links</td>
<td>Multiple Indicators</td>
<td>Compare</td>
<td>Context</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>s/no</td>
<td>d,s</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>s/no</td>
<td>d,s</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>s/no</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>s/yes</td>
<td>sc,d,s</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>m/yes</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>s/yes</td>
<td>sc,d,s</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>s/yes</td>
<td>sc,d,s</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>m/no</td>
<td>sc,d,s</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>s/yes</td>
<td>d,s</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>m/no</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>s/yes</td>
<td>sc,d,s</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>s/no</td>
<td>sc,d,s</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>s/yes</td>
<td>sc,d,s</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>s/no</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>s/no</td>
<td>d,s</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>s/yes</td>
<td>sc,d,s</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>m/no</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>1/no</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>s/yes</td>
<td>d,s</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>s/yes</td>
<td>d,s</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>m/no</td>
<td>d,s</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>m/no</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>s/no</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Level/Policy Links a</th>
<th>Public Report b</th>
<th>Multiple Indicators c</th>
<th>Compare d</th>
<th>Context e</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>s=35</td>
<td>sc=25</td>
<td>yes=23</td>
<td>yes=38</td>
<td>yes=21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1=2</td>
<td>d=37</td>
<td>no=25</td>
<td>no=8</td>
<td>no=26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>m=9</td>
<td>s=43</td>
<td>N/A=3</td>
<td>N/A=5</td>
<td>N/A=4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>none=5</td>
<td>none=5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>yes=25</td>
<td>N/A=3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no=21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


a Level of primary responsibility is state (s), local (l), or mixed (m); state policy actions are linked to data from performance indicators (yes) or (no).

b State publicly reports data on schools (sc), districts (d), or the state (s).

c State collects a comprehensive system of indicators, (yes) or (no).

d State reports data as comparisons or in a form that allows comparisons, (yes) or (no).

e Data are reported in context of demographic factors, (yes) or (no).

Regardless of the focus of control and policy linkage, there are decisions which are common to all types of performance accountability systems. Decisions must be made regarding whether the data will (1) be reported publicly, and if so, the level(s) at which data will be aggregated and reported; (2) include a comprehensive set of indicators; (3) be presented in a form that allows for comparisons; and (4) be presented in the context of demographic factors. Responses to each of these key dimensions, by state, are presented in Table 4.

Summary. From 1973 to 1988, the number of states (including the District of Columbia) requiring some type of accountability program rose
from 23 to 46; two states (Alaska and Nebraska) have since dropped legislative requirements specifically related to performance reporting. Of the states with accountability legislation, the primary level of responsibility rests with the state in the majority of states (n=35). Slightly more than half of the states (n=25) have attached significant state-level policy actions to the data collected; slightly more than half (n=25) collect only student test data. Almost all states (n=43) publicly report performance data at the state level; most (n=37) also report at the district level; and slightly more than half (n=25) report at the school, district, and state levels. Most of the states (n=38) report these data as comparisons or in a form that allows for comparisons, and slightly more than half (n=26) do not report data in the context of demographic factors.

**Ohio's Accountability Legislation**

The "accountability wave" sweeping the nation during the 1960s and early 1970s had an impact upon the initiation of accountability legislation in the state of Ohio (Bainbridge, 1980; Dawson & Dawson, 1985). The following summary of the political and economic conditions in Ohio between the late 1960s and 1980, and the major legislative activities of this period related to educational accountability are drawn from Bainbridge's (1980) comparative policy analysis of accountability legislation in three states (Colorado, Michigan, and Ohio). This information is also corroborated in the work of Dawson and Dawson, 1985. The summary of events from 1980 to 1985 are from Dawson's and Dawson's (1985) exploratory investigation of the impact of minimum
competency testing on local schools in two states (Missouri and Ohio).
A summary of events is provided in Table 5.

Table 5

**Major Events Influencing Ohio's Accountability Legislation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Party and Action</th>
<th>Result of Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>109th General Assembly passed Amended Substitute House Bill 475</td>
<td>$2 million annual increase to elementary and secondary education; Dept. of Education is to investigate accountability models and return in 2 years with recommendations for implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July, 1973</td>
<td>Ohio Department of Education reports to legislature</td>
<td>&quot;Search for Consensus&quot; report recommendation that no accountability program be adopted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>Amended Substitute Senate Bill 170 enacted</td>
<td>&quot;Equal yield&quot; formula for education funding; four accountability components: (1) Uniform Cost Accounting System, (2) Assessment, (3) Assessment Advisory Committee, and (4) District Annual Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>Assessment and Annual Report Advisory Committee forms and conducts meetings</td>
<td>6 regional meetings are held</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August, 1977</td>
<td>Amended Substitute Senate Bill 221 passed</td>
<td>Advisory Committee is to recommend to State Board of Education ways to implement competency testing for promotion to grades 5 and 9, and graduation from high school</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ohio: late 1960 to 1980 (Bainbridge, 1980). During the 1960s, Ohio had a strong conservative-spending orientation. The Governor at this time, James A. Rhodes, strongly advocated the maintenance of low
taxes in the state. The general political environment was conservative and noted for its weak support of public services, resulting in Ohio's low standing among states in support of educational and social services. Ohio was forty-eighth in its support for education, forty-third in health and hospital, and thirty-eighth in public welfare.

In 1971, the 109th Ohio General Assembly passed Amended Substitute House Bill 475, which was an omnibus school financing bill allocating a two-hundred-million-plus dollar ($217 million) increase in annual spending for elementary and secondary education. The bill provided the most significant increase in school financing in over four decades, and was strongly supported by Ohio's new Democratic governor, John Gilligan. It included a graduated income tax and a corporate income tax for the first time in Ohio's history. Inserted in this bill by a few legislators who wanted to make certain that educators were accountable for their potential increase in revenue, was a directive regarding accountability. When the accountability mandate was initiated in conference committee, education groups allowed it to remain as a "trade-off" for the proposed income tax. The accountability mandate required that the State Department of Education investigate various accountability models and programs, and return to the legislature in two years with recommendations for the implementation of an accountability system.

On July 30, 1973, the Ohio Department of Education responded to the legislative mandate in Amended Substitute House Bill 475 with its "Search for Consensus" report. After a two-year effort, the State Department recommended that no accountability program be adopted for
Ohio's schools. This report was based on the results of over 600 local meetings, a series of regional conferences, a proposal from the Ohio State University Evaluation Center for the design of an accountability system, and a final state meeting of the "Search for Consensus" held in Columbus in April, 1973, in which over 1500 participants attended.

In 1975, a more precise piece of accountability legislation was enacted through Amended Substitute Senate Bill 170 which contained a new "equal yield" formula for funding elementary and secondary schools. This bill contained four components related specifically to accountability: (1) Uniform Cost Accounting System, whereby each district was required to use a uniform accounting system in the analysis of direct and indirect costs of all school district activities; (2) Assessment, whereby the State Department of Education was to administer annual educational assessment programs after pilot studies have been conducted on samples of Ohio students; (3) Assessment Advisory Committee, to be appointed by the State Board of Education for the task of drawing up proposed plans and standards for assessment; and (4) District Annual Reports, requiring each school district to issue an annual report of school progress for each school and to contain information about the achievements, problems, plans, and improvements in the school or school district. In 1976, the 24-member Ohio Assessment and Annual Report Advisory Committee formed and held 6 regional meetings. In April, 1977, the first round of mandated assessment pilot studies and sampling began.

In August, 1977, Amended Substitute Senate Bill 221 was passed. This bill required that the Ohio Assessment and Annual Report Advisory
Committee make recommendations to the State Board of Education regarding the implementation of a minimum competency exam as a prerequisite for promotion to grades 5 and 9 and graduation from high school. Conditional support for the testing program was given by the state's largest teacher association, the Ohio Education Association (OEA). The stipulations were (1) funds for remediation were available and provided, (2) test results would not be used for teacher evaluation, compensation, or employment status; and (3) costs for testing would be picked up by the State. The Advisory Committee reported in June, 1978, that minimum competencies could be achieved through a revision and enforcement of the Minimum Standards for Ohio Schools, but there should be no minimum competency testing for promotion or graduation.

Legislation regarding minimum competency testing for promotion and graduation was introduced again in later sessions of the Ohio General Assembly (1977-78 and 1979-80), but the bills died in legislative committee. Finally, in June 1979, Senate Bill 59 was enacted. This bill repealed sections of Senate Bill 170 that established a state assessment program and a state assessment committee. At this point, there was no longer any legislation specifically related to competency testing.

Ohio: 1980 - 1985 (Dawson & Dawson, 1985). Following the abolishment of a state assessment committee (legislation contained in Senate Bill 170), the issue of minimum competency testing was taken out of the hands of the legislature, and placed under the control of the State Board of Education and the Department of Education. In December, 1982, the Ohio State Board of Education adopted a state mandate on
competency testing as part of a comprehensive revision of the "Minimum Standards for Ohio Schools", which has since been referred to as the "Minimum Standards for Elementary and Secondary Schools 1983". This mandate required that local school districts develop competency based education programs, which included testing student competencies at three points over the twelve grades. The provisions stated,

(B)(2) LOCALLY DEVELOPED COMPETENCY BASED EDUCATION PROGRAMS SHALL BE IMPLEMENTED FOR ENGLISH COMPOSITION, MATHEMATICS, AND READING.
(a) Pupil performance objectives shall be established for English composition, mathematics, and reading.
(b) Provisions shall be made for periodic assessment of pupil performance, including testing at least once in grades one through four, grades five through eight, and grades nine through eleven.
(c) Guidelines shall be established for the use of assessment results for instruction, evaluation, intervention, guidance, and promotion decisions.
(d) Intervention shall be provided according to pupil needs (Dawson & Dawson, 1985, p. 168).

Implementation was to begin no later than the 1984-85 school year, and full implementation was to be completed by the 1989-90 school year.

Despite the protracted debates of earlier years over testing proposals, the provisions for competency testing received little interest or controversy in the hearings and state adoption process. More attention was given to the revised standards than the requirement for competency education. Dawson and Dawson (1985) speculated that this "quiet adoption" was due to several factors. First, the provisions constituted a formalization of understandings worked out years earlier. Second, revision of the standards were more important. And finally, the provisions were worded so vaguely, and it was so unclear as to how this
would be put into operation that, in the short run, it was something with which most could live.

The adoption of the state mandate by the State Board of Education in 1982 did not curtail further state legislative action on minimum competency testing. Discussions and proposals continued in the legislature. In the 1983 session of the legislature a bill requiring a state test was introduced and later failed. Governor Richard Celeste, in his 1984 State of the State Message, called for a more comprehensive competency program with an emphasis upon remediation of individual students as part of a larger effort to improve the schools.

In the 117th General Assembly, Substitute House Bill 231 was passed (S. Tavakolian, Legislative Liaison, Ohio State Department of Education, personal communication, August 27, 1990) and became effective October 5, 1987. This legislation provided, among other things, stipulations regarding high school proficiency testing for graduation; statewide ability and achievement testing in grades 4, 6, and 8; and the awarding of differentiated diplomas tied to the proficiency testing program. During the next General Assembly, the legislature passed Amended Substitute Senate Bill 140, which codified competency based testing (previously referred to as the Minimum Standards for Ohio Schools), and added grade 10 to ability and achievement testing. Amended Substitute Senate Bill 140 became effective October 2, 1989.
Accountability: Educational Reform, Policy, and Practice

In this section accountability as it pertains to the reform process, policy implementation, and the associated changing nature of decision making practices are examined. This is followed by a review of research dealing with ways in which these changes have affected planning and teaching practices at the elementary and secondary classroom levels.

Educational Reform and Policy

Several policy-level studies have been conducted which examined the status of the educational reform process (Dawson & Dawson, 1985; Furhman, Clune & Elmore, 1988; Murphy, 1989). Findings from these studies suggest that (1) many of the reform initiatives of the 1980s have been successfully implemented on a widescale basis; (2) response to initiatives has resulted in an increase of policymaking at both the State and local levels; and (3) this response, in turn, is changing the organizational structure of educational systems. Educational processes are becoming more uniform and standardized as State and local systems address issues of educational reform and accountability. Each of these studies are discussed below.

Murphy (1989) argued that many of the first wave reform initiatives of the 1980s have been successfully implemented on a widescale basis and are having a substantial impact on the schooling process. In defending his arguments, he considered the reform agenda contained in A Nation at Risk (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983) as the standards against which to judge success.
Recommendations made by the Commission address reform in (a) educational content, (b) standards and expectations, (c) time, and (d) teaching. Specifically, the Commission recommended (1) increasing State and local graduation requirements so that all high school students are required to take a specified minimum number of years instruction in the "Five New Basics" (p. 24) (English, mathematics, science, social studies, and computer science) and college-bound students take two years of foreign language; (2) adopting "more rigorous and measurable standards for academic performance and student conduct" (p. 27) in public schools and universities; (3) allocating more time to learning the New Basics, such as longer school days or years; and (4) improving the preparation of teachers and providing better incentives for making teaching a rewarding and respected career.

Murphy (1989) noted that critics have argued that educational reform proposals would fail for the following reasons: (1) insufficient funding; (2) no comprehensive plan for reform; (3) inappropriate policy mechanisms to identify weaknesses, and regulate and monitor reform efforts; and (4) an organizational structure and culture that is impervious or resistant to change. It is with respect to the fourth argument that Murphy offered support for the success of the early reform initiatives.

Arguments portending the failure of reforms were predicated upon knowledge of schools as loosely-coupled systems, whereby in large organizations policies are interpreted at each level of the organization and implemented in various and different ways according to each interpretation. Murphy contended that organizational structures of
schools and school systems are changing, becoming more "tightly-coupled" in their interpretation and implementation of reform proposals. He noted that school systems are becoming more uniform internally in their focus on specific reform proposals. And on a national level, school systems are adopting similar policies and procedures for addressing reform.

Reform initiatives have resulted in "tightened key organizational linkages in existing school structures, especially those dealing with curriculum and instruction" (Murphy, 1989, p. 213). Specific national trends noted were (a) widespread adoption of uniform teaching models, (b) serious discussions of student outcomes and accountability, and (c) a predominance of "high stakes" testing through which sanctions and rewards are attached to test results.

According to Murphy, the success of the national reform agenda was due, in large part, to changing organizational structures -- the recoupling of loosely-coupled systems. In other words, there was consistency among state level initiatives and local goals. Local support for change was in place when state level reform policies were being formulated; local governments were already involved in areas targeted for change. Murphy did not contend that this bureaucratic "recoupling" was either good or bad, but simply that there has been an alignment of individuals at all levels focusing on the "core mission of schooling" (p. 213).

Fuhrman, Clune and Elmore (1988), in their research on the reform process and its effects, reported similar findings. From interviews with state and local policymakers and educators in six states (Arizona,
California. There were researchers from all not what had been been to implement ition from outside heavily in the local decision would be sufficient. The resistance is significant. What the trend was for districts to engage in expand the core shape state were also been state policies can achieve in were beyond compliance lent momentum to independent state and local were a net in shape in (Fuhrman & Deboni & Dijan Clune a & Elmore);
California, Florida, Georgia, Minnesota, and Pennsylvania) these researchers found that district reactions to state policy reforms were not what had been anticipated based on past research on policy implementation. Because the impetus for state level reform had come from outside interest groups (legislators and governors supported heavily by business groups) rather than educators, it was expected that local behavior would be one of three responses to state policy implementation. Based on prior research, anticipated responses were (a) resistance to policy change, (b) formal compliance, or (c) adaptation. The worst-case scenario would be a total loss of local independence.

What they found was that local behavior was much more complex. Local districts were engaged in "strategic interaction" (p. 255). "Strategic interactors seize policy opportunity, coordinate and expand state policies to meet their needs, and anticipate and actively shape state policy" (p. 255). These researchers found that (1) reforms were already being met by local districts prior to legislation; (2) state policies called for changes that local personnel knew how to achieve and were comfortable with; and (3) many districts were going beyond compliance -- state level policies and standards legitimated and lent momentum to local practice. Not only was there not a loss of local independence, but there was an increase in policy-making at both the state and local levels. "What we have found is not a zero-sum game but a net increase in governance. Every policymaker is making more policy" (Fuhrman, Clune & Elmore, 1988, p. 255).

Dawson and Dawson (1985) described an instance of what Fuhrman, Clune and Elmore (1988) have termed "strategic interaction behavior" in
their research examining the impact of minimum competency testing on local schools. One aspect of their study was an examination of the reasons three small districts in North Central Ohio, who would not have been considered "innovators in the area of competency-based testing" (p. 196), developed and implemented a minimum competency testing program in the absence of any state-mandates to do so. Dawson and Dawson (1985) described the conservative political climate and arguments for protecting local discretion which lead to acceptance of the competency-based program as,

... the political climate is conservative -- especially with respect to taxes, public spending, and government activity. Local independence and a dislike of outside interference are strong sentiments. The conservative, frugal, and anti-government sentiments were cited by many of the people we talked with. Raising money to support the schools was problematic. ...

This conservative political climate affected the care with which school officials and the citizen's committee developed and sold the competency program. On the one hand, it dictated a concern with keeping costs down. On the other hand, the sentiment against outside interference was used in getting local support for the program. Proponents argued that if the local schools did not develop a program of their own, they were likely to have one forced on them by the state (pp. 195-196).

Throughout the nation, districts are standardizing their curricula, and emphasizing centralized curriculum regulation and alignment of curriculum, texts, tests, and teacher evaluation. Fuhrman, Clune and Elmore (1988) cited the following events lending momentum to this phenomenon: (1) pressure from minority groups for a uniform curriculum, (2) high mobility rates within districts, (3) technological advances in computerized mapping of texts and tests, and (4) state student-standard policies. In almost half of the 59 districts in the
six states sampled, state-testing was cited as an important impetus for district-level curriculum standardization (Fuhrman, Clune & Elmore, 1988).

Summary. The organizational structure of educational systems at state and local levels is changing, as are understandings of policy implementation. School systems are becoming recoupled as individuals jointly focus on reforms. Districts are actively shaping local policies to meet or exceed state reform policies. Stimulated by a national reform agenda set forth in A Nation at Risk (1983) and codified through state level reform policies, local districts are standardizing and aligning curricula with texts, tests, and teacher evaluation. State-testing, traditionally an accountability mechanism, has been cited as a major impetus for standardization. With this alignment in educational focus and curricula, how have efforts to be accountable affected or influenced local practice?

Practices at the Local Level

Local efforts to respond to a national reform agenda for educational improvement, and to be accountable for actions taken toward that end, have resulted in changing decision making practices at the district level. In this section, decision-making practices and the role of accountability at the district, school, and classroom levels are examined. Particular attention is given to the types of accountability information and ways this information is used in improving educational practices.
Decision-Making Practices at the District and School Levels

In interviews with 49 principals in 19 districts from five states (Arizona, California, Florida, Georgia, and Pennsylvania), Shujaa and Richards (1989) investigated the extent to which state-mandated testing programs contribute to organizational learning and improvement. These researchers acknowledged that this research was limited in that they sought only to investigate the effects of state testing; accountability is not simply test scores. Through their interviews, though, principals offered additional information regarding the kinds of information they use for assessing their school's performance. Their research focused on the districts' organizational learning culture, and began by identifying perceived values and uses of state test information.

Every organization has a distinctive organizational learning culture, which is defined as, "the entire constellation of activities in which an organization gathers, analyzes, disseminates, and uses information about its own status, for both institutional members and those outside it" (Shujaa & Richards, 1989, p. 1). Shujaa and Richards (1989) found that districts differed in their values and attitude toward the use of assessment information. Two primary organizational learning cultures were identified: (1) symbolic learning culture and (2) strategic learning culture. They differ with respect to how the assessment information is presented to the community, how it is used internally, and the norms against which its meaning is interpreted. Shujaa and Richards (1989) described the two learning cultures as follows.
In the symbolic learning culture, accountability policies are formulated around a concern more for the possible public meanings attached to the information than how the information will contribute to organizational learning and improvement. Assessment information is viewed as "news" to the community. Good news is promoted; bad news is suppressed. Internally, information is viewed as a kind of status currency; those with the most information have the most status. Access to information is a function of access to organizational influentials. Information is gathered from the schools and conveyed to central administrative staff. Important information is controlled and screened at the central administrative level, and does not always flow back to the schools. Finally, community norms dictate the meaning of accountability data. There is a strong local orientation and a tendency to resist pressure to conform to outside pressures that contradict an organizational consensus. There is more concern over standing in the community than in the state or nation.

In the strategic learning culture, there is a sense of obligation to provide information to the community. Public support for education is seen as being dependent on the provision of regular and thorough information. Good results are offered with pride, and bad results are offered to solicit support. Internally, there is a reciprocal flow of information. Information is shared and discussed routinely among staff to facilitate problem-solving at all levels. Cosmopolitan norms dictate the meaning of accountability data. There is a strong concern for standing in the state and nation, and a strong sense of autonomy and control over the direction and future of the district.
In a strategic learning culture there is a high value placed on information and the sharing of information, and also a high value on performance. Shujaa and Richards (1989) stated that when strategic approaches to learning dominate an organizational culture, "school leaders maximize opportunities for organizational learning by influencing the kinds of indicators generated, how they will be measured, and how they will be presented" (p. 2). They acknowledged that all schools, to some extent, engage in symbolic strategies in the public dissemination of performance information, but the primary difference is in the attitude toward the use of information for public awareness and support for improvement.

Other indicators reported by principals (Shujaa & Richards, 1989) might include data on dropouts, grade reports and retention, turnover, attendance, expulsions and in-home suspensions. In addition to these, principals use their own perceptions of school climate and attitudes of teachers, students, and parents to judge their school's performance. "Test data were nearly always included among the multiple indicator sets while, overall, fewer than one-fourth of the principals reported test results as the most important school performance indicator" (Shujaa & Richards, 1989, p. 4). With the state-level emphasis on testing and the pressure on principals to increase test scores, these researchers questioned whether this pressure forces principals to deemphasize the attention they give to other indicators.

Administrators and principals are caught between the need to comply with state and district policies and the need to be responsive to and advocate school level concerns (Marshall, 1988). Research conducted
by the Center for Policy Research in Education between 1985 and 1987, and reported by the Office of Educational Research and Improvement (1988), disclosed that state-level pressure does influence principals' attention.

Through interviews with over 350 policymakers and practitioners in California, Florida, Georgia, and Minnesota at the state and local levels, about the uses and consequences of performance accountability systems, fewer than 20 percent mentioned tests as the most important source of information about a district or school (OERI, 1988). Half of the superintendents and principals did not even mention state test scores as among the major sources of information to determine how well their school is doing. These findings were consistent with those of Shujaa and Richards (1989). However, OERI (1988) reported that because superintendents and principals perceive the state to be primarily interested in test scores, they have directed most of their resources into improving them. They also noted that accountability systems are very powerful policy tools that have significantly changed school-level planning and teaching (OERI, 1988).

Planning and Teaching Practices in Schools

Local districts and schools have changed the way they plan and teach; changes in practice differ across schools (OERI, 1988). Lowest achieving schools tend to change practices more than higher achieving schools. Elementary schools tend to react more than secondary schools because of the focus on basic skills. Other studies have disclosed how accountability systems have influenced and changed teaching practices at

**Elementary Level**

In a series of descriptive studies designed to examine the reasons for the downward shift of academic expectations into kindergarten, Hatch and Freeman (1988) found that kindergartens have become skill-based and academically oriented programs. This academic orientation was in direct conflict with what professional staff believed to be appropriate educational practice for these young children. Through an examination of instructional materials, report cards and interviews with 36 teachers, principals, and supervisors in Ohio, these researchers found that for slightly more than half (55.6%) of the informants "what they do each day is in direct conflict with their professed beliefs concerning what children in kindergarten need" (p. 146). Sixty-six percent of the teachers stated they experience this conflict.

They reported that Ohio's state requirement that all grades, including kindergarten, must have pupil performance objectives (PPOs) was creating conflict and stress for professionals trained in programs that emphasize developmental approaches to early education. In one district, the emphasis on paper-and-pencil activities, use of workbooks, and mastery of competency-based tests in kindergarten was in direct conflict with the district philosophy of "meet[ing] the child when he is ready and take[ing] him as far as you can" (p. 146). One major source
of this conflict was in the perceived need to be accountable. Hatch and Freeman (1988) stated,

Principals are charged with serving as instructional leaders, but many feel trapped because instructional leadership has come to mean making their schools "accountable." That means demonstrating pupil progress on competency-based and standardized, norm-referenced tests. The principals we interviewed want children to have "time to be children," but Ohio now requires Pupil Performance Objectives (PPOs) for all grade levels, including kindergarten (p. 146).

These researchers described five categories for explanations offered by their informants for the shift to increasingly academic kindergartens: (1) changes in children (i.e., influences of television, having both parents working, divorce in the family, and experiences in preschool or day-care); (2) the expectations of parents that schools should be doing more; (3) a proliferation of published materials; (4) changing expectations of society (i.e., a pervasive societal value placed on competition which is filtering down to the youngest children); and (5) accountability to district and state. Accountability in the form of state standards, district requirements, and tests given to evaluate the effectiveness of schools, was seen as the driving force of the skills-based academic kindergarten program.

Concern for a developmentally sound primary level (K-2) curriculum and the effects of testing in a performance-based curriculum were also expressed by teachers in research conducted by Livingston, Castle, and Nations (1989). These researchers described the efforts of primary level teachers in one Georgia elementary school in their fourth year of participation in the NEA Mastery In Learning Project (MILP), a site-based school reform initiative. Teachers were concerned about the developmental appropriateness of the state-mandated curriculum, as well
as the inconsistencies among the curriculum, state tests, and state-approved texts. Their efforts in this project were directed toward correcting the inconsistencies in the curriculum and texts; however, there remained unresolved problems with the tests, and standardized testing, in general. Livingston, Castle and Nations (1989) identified the teachers' perceptions of the negative aspects and problems of standardized testing.

1. **Test-driven curriculum.** The curricula, texts, and tests were aligned. Textbooks were geared to the test objectives, and teachers were teaching those objectives despite their professional opinions regarding the appropriateness of those objectives. One teacher stated that "getting kids to perform well on the test is the top priority... [the test] actually is the foundation of our curriculum" (p. 24). Because test scores were published, and schools and districts were compared by their scores, the message to teachers was to raise test scores.

2. **Questionable Efficiency and Cost-effectiveness.** The cost of testing was high. Much instructional time was spent preparing students for tests, in addition to the monetary cost of test materials and administration (i.e., tests, monitors, observational instruments, handbooks, videotapes, and trainers). The validity of test results was questionable due to the inconsistencies that occur in test administration with younger children, and when test content and format are taught directly.

3. **Teaching with Schizophrenia.** Teachers were "worn out" (p. 24) trying to work within the system which at times meant engaging in
practices that were not developmentally, or even ethically sound. "Teachers try to stand by their principles when they teach, but the influence of the tests is great" (p. 24). One first-year teacher reported,

I was so petrified that my class would do so poorly that I wouldn't be back next year. So I taught what the other teachers recommended to get them ready for the test. After the test I started teaching, good teaching. The class enjoyed it, and I think they learned more the last three weeks of school than they did the first six months, because I was more relaxed, the students were more relaxed, and I was able to hone in on those areas where they needed help (Livingston, Castle & Nations, 1989, p. 24).

4. Deprofessionalization. At one time, parents considered test scores as but one indicator of learning; now, it was seen as an absolute measure. These teachers described how their judgment and yearlong documentation can be invalidated by a single test score.

5. Negative Effects on Students. When students were tested on skills for which they lacked readiness they failed, and repeated failure led to low self-esteem and negative attitudes toward learning. With repeated testings, students became bored; some even became cavalier about taking tests.

Livingston and colleagues (1989) reported that this school's 1988 mathematic achievement scores were the highest to date. The faculty did not fully attribute this increase to the new developmental curriculum, nor did they place much credence in the test scores themselves. They did, however, realize that this increase would mean continued public and parental support for their efforts. So, "instruction will remain rooted in both camps; teachers will attempt to teach the developmentally appropriate curriculum and the test-driven curriculum simultaneously" (p. 25). These researchers suggested that educators must create an
awareness among the public, media, and policymakers that conceptions of effective schools must be broadened to include the multiple goals of schooling, and that these goals are not adequately represented in standardized test scores.

Secondary Level

In a descriptive case study examining the effects of a state-mandated policy on the teaching and learning of seventh-grade science, Wood (1988) reported three changes in instructional behavior. Fieldwork conducted with the seventh-grade science department (four teachers and 165 seventh-grade science students in one Mississippi school) consisted of classroom observations and interviews with the principal, teachers, and students. The state-mandated curricular policy emphasized performance-based instruction and test scores as the basis of determining achievement for school accreditation, which, in this instance, may be construed as an alternative form of accountability. Wood (1988) reported the following conclusions.

1. Teachers now define the goals of science instruction as the students' acquisition of isolated facts and skills. Very much aware that students' test scores were used by district and state-level administrators to monitor implementation of the performance-based curriculum, these teachers taught the designated science objectives in the sequence and time frame as stipulated, and accepted the assumption that all students could be taught all objectives regardless of ability. "They accepted the idea, put forth by the administration, that science
could be separated into specific facts and teaching those facts meant an improvement in science learning for their students” (Wood, 1988, p. 636).

2. Teachers have altered their individual instructional behavior to implement a uniform instructional procedure. Teachers emphasized that the loss of flexibility in their use of teaching strategies was perhaps the most constraining and frustrating result of the performance-based program. The instructional routines were preestablished, and teachers, against their professional judgment regarding the appropriateness of the strategies for teaching science, felt compelled to adhere to the routines. Teachers were no longer able to delve more deeply into areas in which students were particularly interested, and felt they no longer had control over the direction of their own program. “In essence, they were violating their own standards of good teaching, which increased their frustration and caused a decline in job satisfaction” (p. 637).

3. The prescribed instructional routines were constraining students’ learning of science. Teachers felt pressured to ensure that their students “got through” (p. 637) the material to be covered on the test. The consequential effects of this was a narrowing of instruction with a focus on teaching those facts and skills necessary for success on the tests. Students typically did not ask questions based on their own interests. The nature of the question-answer periods was not to engage students in a discussion of the materials covered or to gain a better understanding of what students were thinking about the material, but to
direct students through the text and "drill" (p. 637) them on the "correct" (p. 637) answers.

The implications of this case study were that the results of performance-based instruction on teaching and learning are in direct opposition to the intended results, particularly when the concern is directed toward improving the current state of science education. Wood (1988) stated that the National Assessment for Educational Progress has reported that current practices in science education lack an emphasis on teaching students to reason effectively about science. These practices have resulted in students having only a surface understanding of science. "Current evidence from cognitive science suggests that learning involves active participation on the part of the student, whether it be 'hand's on' laboratory experiences or lively discussion and debate of ideas. Classroom interaction that emphasizes transmission of knowledge for students to passively receive inhibits the learning of science" (Wood, 1988, p. 640).

McNeil (1988a, 1988b, 1988c), in a series of studies and observations of secondary school classes, found that when teachers perceive the administration to be most interested in the institution's minimum standards being met, they tend to engage in "defensive teaching". She stated that in defensive teaching knowledge is controlled in an effort to control students. Teachers tend to structure their class in ways that elicit minimum compliance from students. Tight control on the curriculum is maintained rather than allowing students active involvement in the gathering and interpreting of information.
Instruction is often teacher-centered, and information tends to be oversimplified, fragmented, mystified, or omitted (1988b). Information is presented in the form of lectures and lists of terms and unelaborated facts. Controversial topics are either "mystified" (1988b, p. 435) or omitted altogether. McNeil described "mystified" information as information identified by the teacher as important to know, but only addressed superficially without elaboration of alternative views. With this form of instruction, students often feel distanced from the content, leading to "patterns of minimal compliance" (1988a, p. 334) -- learning for the sake of passing a test or earning a diploma. This phenomena can be self-perpetuating and further reinforced when teacher apathy and student disengagement are perceived as the result of an ineffective program. As McNeil noted,

Many principals see boring, disinterested teaching and student apathy as symptoms that their school is "out of control." Their response is to institute still more behavioral and administrative controls, to make policies even more impersonal. A vicious cycle of lowering expectations is thus set in motion, and the school begins to lose its legitimacy as a place for serious learning (1988a, p. 334).

Another example of controlling behavior noted by Dawson and Dawson (1985) was the tendency of teachers to use minimum standards as leverage in getting students motivated to learn. In interviews with senior high teachers in North Central Ohio, Dawson and Dawson (1985) described this behavior:

... one of the most common comments made by teachers in assessing the impact of the test program [10th grade minimum competency for graduation] was that it helped them by specifying that students had to know certain things in order to graduate. It provided an easy answer to students who asked why they should learn the rules of using commas or pronouns. The teacher could respond that you have to know learn [sic] that in order to pass the test and to graduate from high school. As one teacher stated
it: The test "strikes terror in the heart of my students and makes my job easier." Many of the teachers found it useful to have the test looming over the heads of students. It meant that there were particular things that had to be learned and that failure to learn them would have explicit consequences for the student (pp. 228-229).

Defensive teaching, and the controlling instructional behaviors associated with it, does not always occur in the face of proficiency-based curricula. Instructional behaviors are changed, but in a very different fashion.

In a separate, but related study of a magnet school where the structural and organizational arrangements of the school supported and encouraged a strong faculty culture committed to creating distinctive educational programs, McNeil (1988c) found that teachers refused to engage in defensive teaching strategies when the school began to implement a proficiency-based curriculum.

A proficiency-based curriculum was instituted based on the superintendent's anticipation of a state standardized test and a concern for the district's (a) wide variation in teaching competence, (b) uneven quality of education, and (c) inflated grades in weak schools. Teachers at the magnet school refused to be "deskilled" (McNeil, 1988c, p. 484) by the proficiencies, and to "dumb down" (1988c, p. 483) or oversimplify their lessons. Deskilling occurs when teachers with a wealth of professional knowledge are not encouraged to draw on this knowledge in developing their own curriculum (McNeil, 1988c; Shepard, 1989). This shift in structural conditions did, however, place teachers in direct conflict with new administrative controls over the curriculum and teaching.
The teachers' responses to this mandate were to deliver "double-entry" (1988c, p. 483) lessons. Two sets of lessons were frequently presented: one for the "official" (1988c, p. 384) proficiency curriculum and one for the "real" (1988c, p. 384) curriculum. In some instances, students were required to keep two sets of notes. McNeil (1988c) reported that she observed a biology teacher write a simplified formula for photosynthesis on the board, tell the students to write it in their notebook, and learn it for the test. Then for the next two weeks, the students and the teacher worked on a more complex formula which they derived together through lab activities.

Summary and Implications

Decision-making roles and practices are changing. Public information about the status and condition of schools and the schooling process, which has been traditionally in the form of student test scores, is used by local districts either strategically to facilitate decision making, or symbolically to give the appearance of facilitating decision making (Shuja & Richards, 1989). In either case, though, test results are not considered valued indicators of school performance by principals or teachers (OERI, 1988; Shuja & Richards, 1989). Because superintendents, principals, and teachers perceive test scores to be highly valued by state-level officials and the public, they have changed the way they plan and provide instruction to improve test scores (Dawson & Dawson, 1985; Hatch & Freeman, 1988; Livingston, Castle & Nations, 1989; McNeil, 1988a, 1988b, 1988c; OERI, 1988; Wood, 1988).
Changes typically occur through the development and implementation of performance- or proficiency-based curricula, and these changes are not without a price. The price has been the conflict and stress experienced by educators who are philosophically opposed to the emphasis placed on test results for accountability purposes. This opposition is grounded in the belief that when test scores have serious consequences, the test shapes the curriculum, and an educationally sound curriculum should not be driven by the test (Livingston, Castle, & Nation, 1989; Wood, 1988).

Researchers have reported that this emphasis has resulted in (a) teacher deprofessionalization (Livingston, Castle & Nation, 1989) or deskilling (McNeil, 1988c; Shepard, 1989); (b) teaching with schizophrenia (Livingston, Castle & Nation, 1989) or double-entry lessons (McNeil, 1988c); (c) use of controlling, defensive teaching strategies leading to student patterns of minimum compliance (Dawson & Dawson, 1985; McNeil, 1988b); and (d) educational results that are in opposition to intended results (Livingston, Castle & Nation, 1989; Wood, 1988).

These findings will have serious implications for accountability. Teacher responsibility for creating the conditions that promote student learning and achievement is dubious when professional expectations conflict with public or administrative expectations. Research has shown that current accountability measures (i.e., standardized multiple-choice assessment instruments) are at odds with current theories of learning (Livingston, Castle & Nations, 1989; Shepard, 1989; Valencia, Pearson, Peters & Wilson, 1989). Understandings of these consequences and
limitations of traditional accountability systems and measures (i.e., proficiency-based curricula and student test data) are providing the impetus for research and development of alternative forms of accountability (Costa, 1989; OERI, 1988; Shepard, 1989; Unks, 1986).

Teachers' Views on Accountability

Within the last decade, conceptual and empirical research in accountability has focused on such areas as the impact and effects of particular aspects of accountability systems which include the use of competency tests (Brandt, 1989; Brown, 1989; Costa, 1989; Dawson & Dawson, 1985; Livingston, Castle & Nations, 1989; OERI, 1988; Shepard, 1989; Shujaa & Richards, 1989; Valencia, Pearson, Peters & Wilson, 1989), or performance- and proficiency-based curricula (Hatch & Freeman, 1988; Unks, 1986; McNeil, 1988a, 1988b, 1988c). Others have investigated the processes by which state legislative accountability policies have been formulated (Bainbridge, 1980; Malen, Murphy & Geary, 1988), and the multiple interpretations of specific legislation (Harrison & Cage, 1985). With the exception of research conducted in Europe (Broadfoot, Osborn, Gilly & Paillet, 1987; Elliott, 1981), no studies have investigated for what, or to whom, teachers view or perceive themselves to be accountable.

Between January, 1979 and December, 1980, the Cambridge Accountability Project (Elliott, Bridges, Ebbutt, Gibson & Nias, 1981) in Great Britain employed a case study approach to investigate perceptions of teachers in secondary schools toward responsive accountability. Two views of accountability were prominent in Great
Britain at this time: a control model whereby decisions were controlled and monitored by an outside agency, and a responsive model whereby self-accounting procedures were developed by schools to communicate and discuss activities with local groups in ways that offered opportunities for these groups to influence decisions rather than directly control them. These researchers were interested in understanding better the problems and potential associated with the latter view. Six secondary schools from three local authorities were selected to participate in this study based on their desire to be more responsive to local interests.

The first part of this study involved development of a case study for each school. From these six case studies, emerging themes from each school were identified, compared and contrasted across schools. Each researcher then selected three substantial topics from themes on which to write. This section addresses one of the topics selected by Elliott (1981): teachers' perspectives on school accountability.

**Two Views Toward Accountability**

In interviews with fifteen teachers at one secondary school, Elliott explored the following questions: To whom do teachers see themselves accountable? For what do they see themselves accountable? What do they mean by 'accountability'? Responses to these questions were compared to comments from teachers at other schools in this study.
To Whom Do Teachers See Themselves Accountable?

Elliott (1981) reported seven findings regarding the first question, "To whom do teachers see themselves accountable?"

1. The majority of teachers have multiple audiences to whom they see themselves accountable, and these audiences tend to fall within two groups: professional and client groups. Professional groups might include self, head, or other staff (subordinates, superordinates, or peers). Client groups might include students or parents. Few teachers indicated that they felt accountable to political or administrative groups which might include governors, LEAs, or society in general.

2. Many teachers see themselves individually, rather than collectively accountable to client groups. Elliott suggested that this individualistic perspective may reflect a lack of strong collegial ties or a shared professional norm in the schools, probably due to the isolation of the classroom in which teachers carry out their tasks.

Elliott (1981) stated that there are generally two ways in which to counteract individualism. The first is through the development of organizational structures which foster a sense of collective responsibility for tasks and roles. The second is in the development of scientific management procedures which typically involve the standardization, specialization, and hierarchalization of roles and practices. The former tends to foster intra-professional accountability, and the latter tends to foster hierarchical accountability.

3. A sense of intra-professional accountability is indicated when teachers tend to cite other staff (subordinates, superordinates, and
peers) as significant audiences (professional group cited in 1 above).

Elliott distinguished intra-professional accountability from hierarchical accountability. These distinctions are displayed in Table 6.

Table 6

Two Views of Accountability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Intra-Professional Accountability</th>
<th>Hierarchical Accountability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Information Flow</td>
<td>Shared at all levels</td>
<td>Centripetally up the chain of command</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility for Policy Formulation</td>
<td>Collective responsibility for articulating and implementing policies</td>
<td>Hierarchical (top-down) responsibility for articulating policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of responsibility to professional group audience(s)</td>
<td>Collective responsibility; collegiality</td>
<td>Individual responsibility to immediate superiors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of responsibility to client audience(s)</td>
<td>The more collectively responsible to professional group, the more collectively responsible to client groups</td>
<td>The more individual responsibility to immediate superiors, the less individual responsibility to client groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obligations</td>
<td>Professional obligation to each other; corporate sense of moral obligation to clients</td>
<td>Contractual obligation to account to those occupying superordinate positions in hierarchy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Elliott, 1981

Hierarchical accountability is typical of bureaucratized systems with highly specialized and differentiated roles and responsibilities, a chain of command. The purpose of hierarchical accountability is to
facilitate social control over the effective and efficient achievement of organizational goals. Information flows centripetally up the chain of command. Individuals at higher levels have access to more information about activities at lower levels than individuals at lower levels have about activities at higher levels. There is a hierarchical responsibility for policy formulation. Policies are developed at levels where the most information is held.

This is contrasted with intra-professional accountability whereby differentiated roles in an organization may be recognized, but there is more concern with the coordination and formulation of policy at all levels; what one head teacher called, "open management" (p. 6). Rather than imposing policies, efforts are made to allow all individuals opportunities to consult and discuss policy formulation. Information from all levels is shared in this process. There is a collective, collegial responsibility for articulating and implementing policies, and a collegial sense of accountability. Teachers responsible for administering policies feel accountable to teachers affected by these policies, and vice versa.

4. The more hierarchical the school system, the less individual teachers will feel either accountable to each other, or collectively accountable to client groups (students and parents). Hierarchical structures tend to foster hierarchical accountability: feelings of responsibility to immediate superiors and superordinates. The more this structure is reinforced, the less accountable teachers will feel toward themselves, their curriculum, or their students. "A sense of professional obligation to account to each other, and a corporate sense
of moral obligation to account to children and parents, will be replaced by a sense of contractual obligation to account to those occupying superordinate roles in the hierarchy" (p. 7).

5. The more the staff feel collectively responsible for the work at the school, and therefore accountable to each other, the more they can begin to feel collectively accountable to client groups. Interviews with parents revealed that schools in this study were perceived to be "approachable". Approachability was defined as a lack of red tape, ease of access, and the ability to contact someone who could listen and respond appropriately to a parent's concerns and questions. Parents described being able to ask any faculty member questions regarding the performance of the school as a whole and receiving an answer, rather than being referred to a headmaster or a superior for that type of information. There was obviously a sharing of information at the school level, and a sense of collective responsibility for the performance of the school as a whole.

6. The majority of teachers in these schools neither felt collectively nor individually accountable to governors and local government officials. When staff feel collectively accountable to one another, there will be less feelings of contractual obligation or accountability to officials. In other words, as the sense of intra-professional accountability increases, the sense of hierarchical accountability decreases.

Some teachers in this study reported a distinction between a formal and informal system of accountability. When asked to rank the priority of groups to whom they might feel accountable (i.e., children,
parents, governors, local authority, etc.), responses were conditioned by the type of system. The response would be "up the chain of command" (classroom teacher to head to governors to LEA) according to the formal system, and "first to client groups" according to the informal system.

7. The teachers' sense of accountability evolves from sustained, face-to-face interaction with others. The more remote teachers feel from others, the less accountable they feel toward them. The amount and intensity of social interaction among groups accounts for the priority of responsibility seen to these groups, and provides an explanation for why teachers do not tend to see themselves responsible to governors, LEA, or society in general.

For What Do Teachers See Themselves Accountable?

Teachers felt accountable to parents for

a. their children's progress
b. children's option choices
c. public examination entries
d. provision of extra-curricular activities
e. provision for sick and injured children
f. standards of discipline and dress
g. the subjects on the school curriculum
h. teaching methods (Elliott, 1981, pp. 13-14)

Most teachers expressed a strong sense of accountability to parents for responses a-f. However, responses regarding accountability to parents for decisions related to subject matter and teaching methods seemed to fall within two categories of "professional expertise". Teachers who felt professionally comfortable discussing their decisions for content and method with parents viewed these discussions as being compatible with their beliefs toward professional expertise. They felt they had the prerogative to exercise professional judgment in decisions and were
comfortable discussing reasons for these decisions with others. Teachers who drew the line between professional expertise and being accountable to groups outside the education profession for these decisions viewed this as a threat. Conversely, they did not feel they were allowed to exercise professional judgment in decisions. Elliott (1981) stated that the difference in these views lies in their interpretations of accountability.

Two Interpretations of Accountability Emerge

Interpretation A. Those who feel their professionalism threatened by having to be accountable for decisions related to subject matter or methods tend to interpret accountability as "'fitting in' with role expectations pre-determined by others" (p. 15). Accountability is seen as conformity to external prescription leaving little room for professional discretion. This perception is common in a hierarchical accountability system where pre-established rules of procedure are used (by superiors) to assess the extent to which tasks are carried out according to these rules. This perception appears to limit discretionary powers to exercise judgment in the performance of responsibilities.

Interpretation B. In the second interpretation, accountability is viewed as "explaining and justifying to others the decisions and actions one has undertaken" (p. 19), and is based on a moral sense of obligation rather than a contractual obligation. This interpretation does not presume trust in one's capabilities. It is viewed as personal responsibility for judgment and decision, rather than responsibility for
acting in accordance to external prescription. It evolves out of social interaction, and the judgments and decisions made during this interaction. The extent to which teachers feel they contribute to the formulation and implementation of decisions related to curriculum and instruction, influences the extent to which they feel accountable to provide an explanation for those decisions.

From these interpretations, Elliott (1981) offered two modes of accountability, contractual accountability and answerable accountability. Accountability in both modes refers to evaluation and influencing human action. In the contractual mode evaluation criteria are standardized, and the responsibility for evaluation hierarchical. In the answerable mode, the criteria are negotiable and evolve out of free and unrestrained social interaction in which all parties have opportunities to put forth, defend, and criticize arguments.

The two modes of accountability are functional to different forms of social relationships. Contractual accountability is a means for controlling the actions of others. Answerable accountability is a way of rationally influencing the actions of others through interpersonal communication.

Summary

This review of literature has focused on the history of accountability in the United States and England, and how this history has been one of public debate over the control and content of public education. This was followed by a review and summary of resulting state legislative mandates, with a particular interest on Ohio’s legislative history.
Tied directly to the content of public education through the most obvious means, assessment, accountability is an integral component of the national reform initiative for the improvement of educational performance. Therefore, as part of this review, the reform process and policy implementation was examined in light of the changing nature of decision making practices at the district and classroom levels.

Very little research has directly investigated teachers' perspectives of accountability -- the potential and possibilities of what it means to be accountable. With the exception of research conducted by Elliott (1981), most research has been reactionary in the sense that the focus has been on investigating beneficial or consequential outcomes of implementing accountability mandates. For this reason, teachers' views toward accountability were explored in this study, (a) what it means to be accountable, (b) audiences to whom teachers are accountable, and (c) the obligations of accountability.
CHAPTER III
METHODOLOGY OF THE STUDY

In this chapter the methodological design and strategies selected for use in conducting this research are presented. The chapter begins with a review of the rationale for selecting the methodology and the philosophical assumptions undergirding the inquiry process. This is followed by an explanation of the research design, including the selection of participants, data collection, and analysis. The chapter is concluded with a discussion of strategies for enhancing the credibility of the findings.

Rationale

Selecting a methodology is contingent upon the goals of the research and the nature of the phenomena under study. This research study was exploratory and descriptive (Bogdan & Biklen, 1982; Gay, 1987). The intent was to uncover and present a rich, detailed account of the meanings of accountability held by teachers. A basic assumption was that the teacher plays an active role in defining, interpreting and acting upon accountability demands, and as such, serves as an important resource in better understanding the ways in which these meanings enhance and constrain educational practice. The phenomena under study,
therefore, were the meaning-perspectives teachers hold with regard to accountability.

Two major assumptions underlying the definition of perspective (Becker, Geer, Hughes & Strauss, 1961; Cornbleth & Korth, 1984; Ross, 1988) as used in this study were (1) a perspective is temporal and, (2) a perspective is bounded by contextual factors. A perspective is a personal view that is ever-developing, ever-changing, and it is an individual's thought in relation to specific situations. The methodological approach which reflects these fundamental assumptions and enables the researcher to capture the essence of this momentary meaning in its social context is qualitative methodology with a phenomenological focus.

Qualitative methods of inquiry are most appropriate when the research addresses the particulars of meaning and action held by individuals as they occur in specific settings (Bogdan & Biklen, 1982; Erickson, 1986). It venerates the humanness of meaning and action and places emphasis on the subjective aspects of individuals' behavior -- the meaning individuals construct around events in their lives.

A phenomenological focus assumes the existence of a "shared meaning," or essence, to the experience of a phenomenon (Patton, 1990b). Individuals have not only a unique experience with a phenomenon, but there is a commonality of experience that is shared and mutually understood by other individuals experiencing the same phenomenon. A phenomenological focus is an investigation of the structure underlying the individual's interpretation of an experience, and the essence or shared view of this experience.
Qualitative methodology (Patton, 1990b) is characterized by (1) a research interest in understanding naturally occurring phenomena as they unfold in natural settings while the researcher places a minimum level of constraint on either the occurrence or the explanation of its outcome; (2) an inductive analysis of data through which patterns are discovered, and hypotheses and concepts are systematically and continually developed and modified; (3) the use of a holistic perspective toward understanding the totality of the complex system of which the phenomenon is a part; (4) the use of qualitative data derived from fieldwork which depict the richness of personal experience; (5) the gathering of data through personal contact and interaction toward developing a sense of shared experience and understanding; (6) a focus on the process of change based on the assumption that human interaction and meaning is continually changing; (7) a unique case orientation for the purpose of describing the nuances of the individualistic perspective and the variations in human experience and meaning; (8) a sensitivity to social, historical, and temporal context based on the assumption that meanings are defined and bounded through culture and are continually evolving; (9) a stance of empathetic neutrality taken by the researcher whereby empathy is used to develop rapport and neutrality is taken toward the research findings; and (10) design flexibility responsive to emerging changes and discoveries.

In this research, the focus was on what educational accountability means to both elementary and secondary teachers as they have experienced it through their professional careers. It is the experience and personal, professional interactions that provide the form and substance
of these meanings. To tap into and uncover that foundation required an investigation of the stated meanings as well as descriptions of social and contextual circumstances within which each participant has worked. These individual meanings were compared and contrasted to ascertain the common meaning among teachers. Gaining insight into these meanings required an openness and sensitivity on the part of the researcher, both in terms of the extent to which preconceived hypotheses and concepts were used to guide the inquiry, and in developing a supportive rapport with the research participants that enabled them to verbalize thoughts that until that point may have gone unspoken.

Extant research on this topic is limited; little is known about the meanings teachers hold with regard to accountability. In this respect, this research was exploratory. From the data, concepts and dimensions were identified, explored, developed, analyzed, and refined as subsequent data were collected and the research progressed. Using this approach, the outcomes of this research reflected the "grounded theory" perspective of Glaser and Strauss (1967): the generation of theory derived from data.

Grounded theory (Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Strauss, 1990) is conceptually dense theory (e.g., theory containing numerous concepts and principles with multiple linkages) generated and formulated systematically from data. Glaser and Strauss (1967) viewed this is a process of generating sound theory: theory which fits the data and works when put into use. "By 'fit' we mean the categories must be readily (not forcibly) applicable to and indicated by the data under
study; by 'work' we mean that they must be meaningfully relevant to and be able to explain the behavior under study" (1967, p. 3).

Two requisite conditions for developing grounded theory are (1) the theory must be derived from the data, and (2) the hypotheses and concepts must be formulated systematically with the data during the research process. This involves the consecutive use of three analytical processes throughout the life of the research: (a) induction -- conceiving of an idea, concept, principle, or hypothesis from the data; (b) deduction -- elaborating on or drawing out the implications of the concepts, and (c) verification -- checking the plausibility of the concepts or hypotheses with subsequent data.

Grounded theory is based on a concept-indicator model (Strauss, 1990) developed through the constant-comparison method of analysis -- the continual and systematic comparison of indicator to indicator, concepts to concepts, and concepts to the emerging theoretical framework.

Concepts are derived from indicators conveyed through data. The data are behavioral actions or events which may be either observed or described through interviews or in documents. These indicators are identified, coded and compared to one another for similarities and differences in determining the underlying relationship of indicators to indicators and also of indicators to the larger concept. Explanations of these relationships are used to develop the meaning of the concept. Other concepts are delimited similarly, compared to one another, and eventually used to develop an integrated framework of properties, categories, concepts, principles and hypotheses.
Design of the Study

This study was an investigation of teachers' perspectives on accountability. The design was flexible (Patton, 1990b), or emergent (Lincoln & Guba, 1985) in the sense that theoretical concepts related to teachers' perspectives on accountability were developed progressively beginning with the initial analysis of data derived from a pilot study. The design involved successive iterations of three main phases: (1) development and refinement of a conceptual framework, (2) data collection, and (3) data analysis. Each phase is described in the following paragraphs.

Conceptual Framework. The conceptual framework, an explanation of the key concepts and dimensions under study and their presumed relationships, served as an orienting conceptual map for the research. Beginning with the initial research questions, the framework was modified and revised as data were collected and analyzed. Explanations of relationships among concepts and their dimensions were refined, making them more differentiated and integrated as the research progressed.

The initial conceptual framework was developed from the research questions and responses of teachers participating in the pilot interviews. These questions, which address the particulars of meaning teachers hold for educational accountability, were

1. What does educational accountability mean to elementary and secondary teachers?
2. To whom are teachers accountable?
3. For what are teachers accountable?
4. What are the obligations of accountability, i.e., record-keeping; explaining, justifying, critically examining practice?

5. What forces shape these obligations, i.e., professional norms, social interaction, mandated policies, beliefs about teaching?

6. In what ways do teachers' thoughts regarding accountability shape or influence their decisions or judgments? What actions are taken to be accountable? What are the benefits and/or consequences of these actions? In what ways do these actions reinforce, change, or modify the way teachers view accountability?

Data Collection. The data, teachers' perspectives on accountability, were gathered through individual interviews using the general interview approach. Patton (1990b) stated that interviewing is the preferred method of data collection when two conditions exist: (1) the research focuses on the inner perspectives of others, and (2) the perspectives held are "meaningful, knowable, and able to be made explicit" (p. 278). The general interview approach employs a semi-structured interview format. Open-ended questions are developed in advance from topics drawn from the conceptual framework. In this way the researcher is able to gather comparable data from all respondents while maintaining the flexibility to pursue development of related ideas. The interview has a predetermined focus maintained within a conversational and situational tone.

A pilot interview study with two teachers (one elementary and one secondary) was conducted December, 1990. Both interviews were approximately one and a half hours in length, and began with general questions pertaining to educational and professional background information followed by a paraphrasing of the first research question,
"When you think of educational accountability, what comes to mind?"
Though both teachers indicated at the end of the interview that the accountability question was vague and intimidating at first, both teachers indicated that it proved to (1) be evocative of consequential meaning for the teacher, (2) lend itself to probing of related aspects of meaning, and (3) lead naturally to discussion of subsequent research questions. See Appendix A for interview questions.

Individual interviews occurred over a nine-month period beginning in January, 1991. They were conducted at a time and location recommended by the teacher, and were audiotaped with the teacher's approval. Assurances of anonymity for the teacher and their school were given by the researcher prior to the beginning of the interview, and each teacher was asked to sign the Research Consent Form (see Appendix B). Immediately following the interview, verbatim transcripts were typed and returned to the teacher for verification, modification, and/or additional comments based on further reflection. A Release Form (see Appendix B) requesting the teacher's signed authorization and release of the use of this data accompanied the transcript.

This process, informal member checking (Lincoln & Guba, 1985), was one of several means for establishing the credibility of the findings. It provided respondents the opportunity to make corrections, additions, or any comments related to the general topic, and also served as a record of agreement on what was said.

The data were teachers' perspectives: self-reports of thoughts, actions, beliefs, and attitudes. Kiddie (1971) has noted that individuals' self-reports of thoughts and actions are at times
Inconsistent with their observed actions creating a discrepancy between what is said and what is done. This would seem to necessitate the collection and comparison of other forms of data, specifically observations of these same teachers' behaviors and interactions in the school setting, with their described views. Juxtaposing observations with interview data is viewed as a means for discerning an individual's "working perspective" (Cornbleth & Korth, 1984). The working perspective, similar to a teacher's practical theory of teaching (Sanders & McCutcheon, 1986), has been characterized as a combination of consciously-held beliefs (also called espoused theories of action) and beliefs which serve as unconscious-guides to action. The latter are often enmeshed in routines and habits and may not be able to be articulated by the person holding them.

This research was exploratory, and as such, the focus was on making explicit the stated understandings teachers hold with regard to accountability — the espoused theories of action related to accountability. This was viewed as one aspect of a larger, more encompassing conceptual structure of a teacher's practical theory of teaching. Uncovering the stated meanings, as was the goal of this research, was seen as a beginning point in understanding how these thoughts relate to the larger working perspective. Therefore in this research, data collection was conducted only through interviews.

All data (including notes and summaries) were recorded, analyzed, and archived on computer diskettes, via the qualitative data analysis package, The Ethnograph (Seidel, 1988).
Selection of Teacher Participants. A purposeful sampling method (Patton, 1990b) was employed in selecting volunteer teachers for this study. The teachers selected for participation in this research were experienced educators, with each teacher having a minimum of three years teaching experience in Ohio. As stated in Chapter One, it was felt that experienced teachers would have had the opportunity to formulate an opinion of accountability based on professional experience as opposed to having only a theoretical orientation more characteristic of a beginning teacher. Eighteen teachers representing an equal number of elementary and secondary teachers were selected. Participation was on a voluntary basis, and occurred through one of two ways.

The initial request for volunteers was made orally to graduate level classes in the areas of (a) Research and Evaluation and (b) Curriculum from the College of Education at The Ohio State University. The classes from which the teachers were selected were chosen for three reasons: (1) graduate level courses were likely to have more experienced teachers than undergraduate classes; (2) the courses tended to draw from a cross-section of discipline areas because for many programs these were required courses; and (3) this researcher's personal involvement and participation in coursework from these areas facilitated establishing a collegial and supportive rapport with the participants based upon common educational experiences. The latter point was particularly relevant considering the nature and length of the researcher and teacher interaction and the importance of establishing mutual feelings of trust in obtaining the teacher's most thoughtful and
accurate reflections of meanings. From these solicitations, thirteen teachers volunteered to participate.

Five other teachers volunteering to participate in this research were recommended by the teachers selected from graduate classes. This is a sampling procedure described by Patton (1990b) as "snowball" or "chain" sampling, and is useful in locating information-rich cases. Three teachers each recommended one or two other teachers, resulting in the selection of five additional teachers.

Data Analysis. Data analysis consisted of three "concurrent flows of activity" (Miles & Huberman, 1984, p. 21) related to analytic choices made by the researcher throughout the research process: data reduction, data display, and conclusion drawing/verification. Data reduction, the process of selecting, simplifying, abstracting, and transforming data, occurred throughout the life of the research beginning with the analytic decisions made prior to fieldwork (i.e., focusing the research questions, developing the initial conceptual framework, and determining the data collection strategies and sites) and ending with the final written report. During fieldwork, field notes were summarized, codes were assigned to narrative texts from interview transcripts, and memos were written as theoretical constructions were developed, all of which were analytic processes used to reduce and interpret the qualitative data.

Data display was the process of organizing the data in such a way to allow conclusion-drawing or verification; organizing raw data (often in the form of lengthy, cumbersome narrative texts) into compact forms making it more accessible for summarizing and drawing conclusions.
Formats included charts and tables; data entries included short sections of quotes from transcript text. Conclusion drawing and verification flowed from these two activities.

Data analysis occurred at various levels of abstractions moving from description to higher levels such as interpretation or explanation as categories/concepts were developed (Miles & Huberman, 1984). Strauss (1990) described this process as occurring through three levels of coding: open coding, axial coding, and selective coding.

Codes are classification labels assigned to segments of narrative text (i.e., a phrase, sentence, paragraph, etc.) which reflect the researcher's conceptualizations of the data. A code may represent the name of a category, theme, or pattern the researcher derives from a particular segment, and also serves as a referential marker linking the data with the conceptual framework.

Open coding is the initial coding of the data, and serves to open up questions related to the data. It is unrestricted coding to identify concepts contained in the data. Misinterpretations that might occur during this process are reconciled later through axial coding.

Axial coding is an intense look at the dimensions of a coded category -- investigating the "axis" of a category. During this phase of coding, Strauss suggested the use of a coding paradigm which forces the researcher beyond a literal interpretation. The paradigm is helpful in teasing out the dimensions and relevance of the coded category to the larger conceptual framework. The paradigm delimits the concept with regard to four elements: (1) conditions surrounding the incident, usually signified by cues such as "because", "since", "as", and "on
account of"; (2) consequences of an action or event, signified by "as a result", "because of that", or "as a consequence"; (3) strategies and their associated tactics used by the actors; and (4) interactions between or among actors.

Selective coding is the systematic search for the "core" category (i.e., the main, overarching category that ties the framework together) and those codes related to the core category that offer structural coherence to the theory. Selective coding differs from open coding, but may occur in the same context as open coding. For instance, open coding is a way of identifying all meaningful pieces of data in a given data set; axial coding is a means of looking microscopically at each piece of data; and selective coding is a means of identifying the overarching theme, connecting the meaningful and relevant data pieces (categories and dimensions) together, and reconciling this within the developing conceptual framework.

The Final List of coded categories and definitions are provided in Appendix C. These categories, initially developed from the analysis of pilot interviews, served as the conceptual framework for analysis and interpretation of data. The framework was comprised of six major categories and twenty-seven subcategories. Subcategories were revised as data collection and analysis progressed. Major categories were (1) biographical information on respondents, (2) organizational structure of district or school, (3) relationships within the school setting, (4) expectations among key actors, (5) beliefs about teaching, and (6) perceptions related to accountability.
Credibility of the Findings

A major concern of any research investigation is verifying the credibility and validity of the findings. In qualitative inquiry, this is known as establishing credibility (Patton, 1990b) or trustworthiness (Lincoln & Guba, 1985) of the data, and is the analogue to validity in quantitative inquiry. Though founded on different philosophical assumptions, both types of inquiry are concerned with the integrity and accuracy of the findings. The extent to which findings are found to be credible or valid in either is contingent upon (1) the investigator's use of rigorous methodological strategies appropriate for the nature of the phenomenon under study, and (2) an acceptance of the philosophical assumptions undergirding the inquiry.

As noted by Patton (1990b), in addition to the aforementioned criteria, the credibility of the researcher has a direct bearing on the credibility of the findings by virtue of the researcher's role in the data collection and analysis processes. In qualitative inquiry the researcher functions as the data collection instrument and serves as the primary data analyst. Precautions must be taken to ensure that the findings are accurate depictions of the thoughts and actions of the participants, and not the reflections of the researcher's biases.

In this research two measures were taken at various points throughout the research to safeguard the credibility of the interpretations: (1) member checks, and (2) peer debriefings. The first, member check, is a technique for directly checking with the individuals from whom the data were derived, the accuracy and adequacy of the (a) initial data and, (b) later, the findings and results. The
second method, peer-debriefing, is a means for providing an external check on the inquiry process.

First, informal member checks (Lincoln & Guba, 1985) were conducted with each teacher. As mentioned earlier, each teacher was provided a transcript of the recorded interview, and asked to verify, modify, and/or elaborate on the information provided during the interview. This provided a direct check with the person from whom the information was derived, regarding (1) intentionality -- verifying what the respondent intended to convey; (2) modifications -- correcting or adding information; and (3) overall assessment -- determining appropriateness of overall tone and general summary. This process also resulted in a general agreement between the researcher and the research participant on what was said.

A formal member check was also conducted as all respondents were given an opportunity to review and critique the results and findings of this research. Each teacher was invited to attend a half-day presentation and discussion of the findings. The purpose of this meeting was to (1) share the results of the researcher's interpretation of individual and group perspectives on accountability, and (2) check the adequacy of this interpretation with those from whom the data were derived.

The review was conducted in May of 1992. Though response to the presentation of findings was favorable, attendance at this meeting was considerably limited. Invitations were mailed to each teacher two weeks prior to the scheduled meeting and each was asked to indicate their planned attendance. (A self-addressed, stamped envelope and response
form were enclosed with each invitation). Half of the teachers (n=9) responded, with only two indicating they would attend. It was felt, however, that the limited response and attendance do not significantly diminish the credibility of findings for several reasons.

First, it would have been difficult for individual teachers to react to a group perspective. With the exception of those recommending (or recommended by) other teachers to participate in this study, teachers were not acquainted with others participating in the study and would not have been familiar with others' views. They could only react to interpretations as they were developed from and related to their own individual interview. Secondly, all teachers participated in the informal member checking process, and with only a few exceptions, most teachers provided additional comments in their review of transcripts. Also, care was taken by the researcher during each interview to summarize the respondent's responses and, where possible, relate this to the developing conceptual framework. In this way teachers had the opportunity to respond immediately, and later through the review of transcripts, to the researcher's interpretation of their views and how this related to the researcher's interpretation of others' views.

This limitation notwithstanding, a second technique was also employed to enhance the credibility of findings. This was the process of peer-debriefings which occurred at several intervals during the research. This procedure is a way of providing an external check on the inquiry process and the researcher's interpretation of the data. "It is a process of exposing oneself to a disinterested peer in a manner paralleling an analytic session and for the purpose of exploring aspects
of the inquiry that might otherwise remain only implicit in the inquirer's mind" (Lincoln & Guba, 1985, p. 308). It also provides an opportunity for the researcher to test the working hypothesis and develop the next steps in the inquiry design.

A peer-debriefing was conducted at the beginning of the research process. An outside researcher reviewed the coded categories in the conceptual framework developed from the analysis of pilot interviews. Categories were reviewed for adequacy and thoroughness of conceptual development and definition. In February, following completion of the interviews and preliminary analysis of results, findings were presented to other doctoral students and faculty in a graduate research seminar class. This provided an opportunity to check, clarify, and defend researcher interpretations.

Finally, in April, a formal full-day peer-debriefing session was conducted. The reviewer was a fellow graduate Ph.D. candidate involved in qualitative research. The final analysis of results were reviewed with particular attention given to the logical flow and progression of analytical development. All data and materials were made available to this researcher (i.e., transcripts, field notes, research memos, and theoretical notes). This peer-debriefing was a means for examining and challenging both the process and product of this research. It involved a discussion and review of the research questions, methodology, rationales, and findings. All reviewer comments and suggestions were recorded.
Summary

In this chapter, the rationale and assumptions supporting the methodology selected for use in this research were explained. An overview of the design of the study, including strategies and techniques for selection of participants, data collection, and analysis were presented. Finally, this chapter concluded with an explanation of ways in which the credibility of the findings were safeguarded and enhanced.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Introduction

This research was an investigation of elementary and secondary teachers' perspectives on educational accountability. The initial research questions were

1. What does educational accountability mean to elementary and secondary teachers?

2. To whom are teachers accountable?

3. For what are teachers accountable?

4. What are the obligations of accountability, i.e., record-keeping; explaining, justifying, critically examining practice?

5. What forces shape these obligations, i.e., inter-professional norms, social interaction, mandated policies, beliefs about teaching?

6. In what ways do teachers' thoughts regarding accountability shape or influence their decisions or judgments? What actions are taken to be accountable? What are the benefits and/or consequences of these actions? In what ways do these actions reinforce, change, or modify the way teachers view accountability?

The data, gathered through semi-structured interviews with eighteen teachers, were analyzed using the constant-comparison method of qualitative data analysis (Miles & Huberman, 1984; Strauss, 1990). This chapter is a presentation of the data with a focus on emergent, grounded categories and themes regarding teachers' perspectives on educational
accountability. The chapter is organized into four sections: (a) Description of the Setting, (b) Description of the Participants, (c) Teachers' Perspectives on Accountability, and (d) Summary.

Description of the Setting

The geographical area of interest in this research was Central Ohio. Central Ohio is defined as an 11-county area in and around the capital city of Columbus (A. Thompkins, Division of Computer Services and Statistical Reports, Ohio DOE, personal communication, October 9, 1991). Together, these eleven counties comprise 89 school districts and account for fourteen percent of the state's total student population (Ohio Department of Education, 1991).

On a statewide level, all districts fall under the supervision of the State Department of Education which is governed by an elected 21-member Board of Education. Over the years, the State Department and Board have taken an increasingly active role in matters related to educational accountability. These actions, coupled with legislative actions, have resulted in the creation of uniform standards and mandates for the provision of public education throughout Ohio's public schools. The most notable of these statewide requirements, as mentioned by all teachers in this study, related to (1) development of curricula and competency based education programs, and (2) student proficiency and assessment testing.

Since 1953 the Ohio Revised Code, Section 3313.60 has served as the legal basis for development of curricula in Ohio's schools. Over the years, it has been amended by the General Assembly with each
revision resulting in increased requirements. The 1980 revision identified the subjects which must be taught and established specific requirements for some subjects. It also necessitated that districts develop and submit, for approval to the State Board of Education, a graded course of study for each subject taught (Ohio Department of Education, 1983).

Along these same lines, more specific requirements relating to courses of study were addressed in the "Minimum Standards for Ohio's Schools" (Standard 3301-35-02), which was revised beginning in 1978 and adopted by the State Board of Education in 1982. One of these requirements was that all districts develop competency-based education programs for the subject areas of English composition, mathematics, and reading. Districts had to (1) establish pupil performance objectives in these subject areas; (2) assess pupil performance at least once in grades 1-4, 5-8, and 9-11; and (3) provide instructional intervention according to pupil needs (Ohio Department of Education, 1983). Full implementation was to be completed by the 1989-90 school year.

Competency based testing (second component of competency based education) later became educational law when it was codified in 1989 through Amended Substitute Senate Bill 140.

Also, Ohio's schools have been required to respond to legislative mandates regarding statewide student proficiency and assessment testing. In 1987 the 117th General Assembly passed Substitute House Bill 231 which stipulated (a) student proficiency testing for graduation and the awarding of differentiated diplomas, and (b) statewide ability and achievement testing of students in grades 4, 6, and 8. Grade 10 was
later added to ability/achievement testing in 1989 through Amended Substitute Senate Bill 140.

The teachers in this study were from seven districts: six from Central Ohio, and one located immediately outside and southeast of the Central Ohio area. Student populations of the seven districts (labeled "A" through "G" in Tables 7 and 8) were as follows: districts A, B, and D were the largest with over 5,000 students each; districts E and G each had between 2,000 and 5,000 students; and, district F was the smallest with less than 2,000 students (Ohio Department of Education, 1991). District C was a joint vocational district which provided vocational training to students assigned to surrounding participating school districts. The majority of teachers (n=10) participating in this study worked within the same district.

The high number of teachers from one district was due mainly to the way in which the teachers were selected. Utilizing a "chain" sampling procedure (Patton, 1990b), volunteers were asked to recommend other teachers. As a result, two elementary teachers (E1 and E2), from different schools within the same district, each recommended two teachers (E5,E6 and E2,E3, respectively). Only one secondary teacher (S8) recommended another teacher (S9). All recommended teachers were from the same school, or had previously worked in the same school as the recommending teacher.

Teachers worked within thirteen schools (labeled "a" through "m" in Tables 7 and 8): four elementary (grades K-5), five middle (grades 6-8), and four high schools (grades 9-12). Most (n=9) of these schools offered, in the very general sense, traditional curricular programs.
Four schools (two elementary and two secondary) had specialized curricular offerings. Student assignment and participation in these latter instances were based on either student/parental choice or administrative placement. Almost half (n=8) of the teachers participating in this research worked within one of these four schools.

Of the two secondary schools, one (school "i") was a joint vocational school. Students enrolled in nearby districts chose to participate in this program. The vocational program offered both academic instruction and vocational training. The other secondary school (school "e") was a special education school for students with severe behavioral handicaps; curricula were individualized for each student through Individual Educational Plans (I.E.P.). Students were assigned to this school because the handicapping condition precluded participation in the regular school program.

Two elementary schools offered nontraditional, alternative programs. Student assignment was based on parental choice. One school (school "a") offered a "multi-aged" instructional program whereby curricular offerings were designed for student ability levels rather than assigned grade levels. The other (school "b") offered an integrated, interdisciplinary curricular program with an emphasis on the arts.
Table 7

Description of Participants: Elementary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>E1</th>
<th>E2</th>
<th>E3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Years Teaching</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous Grade Levels/Subject Areas Taught</td>
<td>Special Education; 3-5 Basic Curriculum</td>
<td>4-6 Basic Curriculum</td>
<td>1-4 Basic Curriculum; 6-7 Language Arts, Reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990-91 Teaching Assignment: Grade level, Subject Area</td>
<td>Graduate Teaching Associate, OSU</td>
<td>1, Basic Curriculum</td>
<td>4, Basic Curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District-school</td>
<td>A-a (1989-90)</td>
<td>A-b</td>
<td>A-b</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>E4</th>
<th>E5</th>
<th>E6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Years Teaching</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous Grade Levels/Subject Areas Taught</td>
<td>5-8 Language Arts; Art</td>
<td>3-5 Basic Curriculum</td>
<td>K-1 Basic Curriculum; K-1, 3 Hearing Impaired</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990-91 Teaching Assignment: Grade level, Subject Area</td>
<td>5, Basic Curriculum</td>
<td>2-5, Chapter I Reading &amp; Language Arts; 3-5, Gifted &amp; Talented; Resource Teacher</td>
<td>3-4, Basic Curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District-school</td>
<td>A-b</td>
<td>A-c</td>
<td>A-a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>E7</th>
<th>E8</th>
<th>E9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Years Teaching</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous Grade Levels/Subject Areas Taught</td>
<td>2-4 Basic Curriculum</td>
<td>6 Basic Curriculum</td>
<td>2-3, 5 Basic Curriculum; Chapter I Math; 5 Language Arts; 5 Gifted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990-91 Teaching Assignment: Grade level, Subject Area</td>
<td>3-4, Basic Curriculum</td>
<td>6, Reading, Language Arts, Social Studies</td>
<td>5, Basic Curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District-school</td>
<td>B-h</td>
<td>A-d</td>
<td>D-j</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8

Description of Participants: Secondary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>S1</th>
<th>S2</th>
<th>S3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Years Teaching</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous Grade Levels/Subject Areas Taught</td>
<td>8-12 Industrial Technology</td>
<td>9-12 Drama; 6-12 Life Skills</td>
<td>7 Physical Science; 10 Biology; 9-10 Earth Science; 9 Physical Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990-91 Teaching Assignment: Grade level, Subject Area</td>
<td>8-12, Industrial Technology</td>
<td>6-8, Severely Behaviorally Handicapped</td>
<td>6, Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District-school</td>
<td>F-1</td>
<td>A-e</td>
<td>G-m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>S4</td>
<td>S5</td>
<td>S6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years Teaching</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous Grade Levels/Subject Areas Taught</td>
<td>7 Social Studies; 11 American History</td>
<td>7-9 Music; 7-9 Developmentally Handicapped</td>
<td>10 Earth Science; 10-11 Biology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990-91 Teaching Assignment: Grade level, Subject Area</td>
<td>11, American History; 12, Economics; 10, World History; 10-12 Psychology</td>
<td>9-12, Developmentally Handicapped</td>
<td>Graduate Teaching Associate, OSU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District-school</td>
<td>F-1</td>
<td>A-f</td>
<td>E-k (1989-90)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>S7</td>
<td>S8</td>
<td>S9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years Teaching</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous Grade Levels/Subject Areas Taught</td>
<td>10-12 Social Studies; 10-12 English</td>
<td>5-8 Physical Education; 7-8 Math; 6-8 Science</td>
<td>12 Data Accounting; 11 Executive Secretary; 12 Cooperative Business Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990-91 Teaching Assignment: Grade level, Subject Area</td>
<td>11-12, English; 12, Social Studies</td>
<td>6-8, Math</td>
<td>12, Cooperative Business Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District-school</td>
<td>C-1</td>
<td>A-g</td>
<td>C-1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Description of the Participants

All eighteen teachers who volunteered to participate in this study were either in, or had graduated from, a graduate-level program in Education. Ten teachers were enrolled in a Masters level program in Education; two had completed Masters programs; and three had completed graduate coursework for certification purposes or in anticipation of acceptance into a Masters program. Two teachers were actively engaged in a Ph.D. program; and one had completed the program.

The average number of years of teaching experience among the eighteen teachers was 12.5, with elementary teachers holding the most experience. Individual teaching profiles are displayed in Tables 7 and 8. Elementary teachers had an average of 15.3 years' experience, ranging from 3 to 24 years. All but two had more than 12 years of experience. The average number of years of experience for the secondary teachers was 9.7 years, ranging from 3 to 20 years. Only four secondary teachers had more than 10 years of experience.

Thirteen teachers had taught exclusively in the Central Ohio area. Four had taught in other locations, but the majority of experience for each was from within Central Ohio. Of these teachers, one with 24 years of experience had spent a year teaching in Japan; another with 20 years of experience had taught for several years in Northern Ohio; one with 11 years' experience had taught several years in Oklahoma; and, one with 18 years' experience had served 8 years as an administrator in a Florida private school. Finally, there was only one teacher whose entire teaching experience was from outside the Central Ohio area. This
teacher had taught for three years in a district immediately outside and adjacent to the 11-county Central Ohio area.

Areas of experience for the elementary teachers covered all elementary grade levels (K-6) and represented a variety of curricular programs. Experiences included instruction in (a) the basic curriculum for kindergarten through sixth grade; (b) alternative programs such as combined grade levels or integrated curricula; (c) programs for special needs such as Chapter I Math and Exceptional Education; and, (d) specialized curricula such as Art, Language Arts, Reading, and Social Studies.

Areas of experience for the secondary teachers were equally comprehensive covering all secondary grade levels (7-12) and major subject areas. These experiences represented instruction in (a) the sciences (physical science, earth science, biology), (b) social sciences (social studies, American history, economics, world history, psychology), (c) English, (d) mathematics, (e) physical education, (f) Exceptional Education, (g) electives (industrial technology, drama), and (h) a vocational program (Cooperative Business Education).

At the time of the interviews, two teachers (E1,S6) were not teaching in the public schools. They were full-time Ph.D. students employed as graduate teaching associates at The Ohio State University, but had held full-time teaching assignments in public schools the previous year.
Teachers' Perspectives on Accountability

The data, gathered through interviews with eighteen teachers, were analyzed using the constant-comparison method of qualitative data analysis (Miles & Huberman, 1984; Strauss, 1990). Using a start-list of coded categories generated from pilot interviews, the data were analyzed and coded throughout the data collection process for similar and divergent themes. During this process, categories from the start-list were changed. Some were combined or integrated as their properties became clearer and more well-defined; new or emerging categories were added; and a few were dropped altogether when found to be non-applicable. Appendix C contains the Final List of Coded Categories.

This process of continuously comparing categories and properties resulted in the identification of four major themes, or what have been termed "views" on accountability. From the analysis of interview data it was learned that teachers held four views on accountability: (1) Personal Accountability, (2) Collegial Accountability, (3) Contractual Accountability, and (4) Accountability to Clients. Each of these views is presented in following sections.

As mentioned in Chapter One, a general definition of accountability (Fenstermacher, 1979) was used to develop a conceptual framework in approaching this research and for development of the questions for the interview guide. According to Fenstermacher (1979), accountability is a term that implies a relationship between or among persons; not a relationship between persons and institutions or departments, but between or among persons. His "generic" definition of
accountability had three characteristics, the first of which was that accountability implies a relationship between or among persons.

The second characteristic was that the relationship holds with regard to performance according to either implicit or explicit standards. In this relationship one party incurs an obligation to perform. Expectations are held by both with regard to performance. Completion of this performance (as fulfillment of the obligation), is judged according to either implicit or explicit standards.

The third characteristic of his generic definition was that parties to an accountability relationship are obligated to either provide or receive information. From Fenstermacher's perspective, several scenarios could occur. One could provide (unsolicited) information about one's performance, in which case one would "provide an account" about one's performance. Or one could be asked to provide information about one's performance. In this instance, one would be "called to account," and may be asked to explain, justify, or defend actions. In either case, the party to whom the information is provided is obligated to receive the information.

Fenstermacher included other properties in his definition. He added that varying degrees of trust, responsibility, and discretionary authority may be apparent or conferred in the accountability relationship. The presence of these properties distinguishes "strong" from "weak" accountability. In a strong accountability relationship, trust is apparent in the relationship, and responsibility and discretionary authority are granted to the party obligated for performance for fulfillment of obligations.
Accountability Views

All teachers stated they were (a) accountable, (b) accountable to multiple audiences, and (c) accountable for performance of various obligations to respective audiences.

For each teacher, "accountability" was a multifaceted concept, encompassing multiple and interrelated views. These views, as major themes emerging from the data, were (1) Personal Accountability, (2) Collegial Accountability, (3) Contractual Accountability, and (4) Accountability to Clients. Views were distinguished by the (a) audiences to whom accountability was expressed, and (b) nature of the obligations for which they were accountable to these audiences. In Tables 9 and 10 an initial categorization of individual teachers' views and respective audiences is presented. All teachers expressed, at the very minimum, two views. Half (n=9) expressed all four; one third (n=6) expressed three; and three teachers expressed only two views.

Audiences mentioned most often were those with whom the teachers worked in close proximity and had immediate access to direct interaction and communication. These audiences were self (n=13), other teachers (n=11), principal (n=17), students (n=16), and parents (n=13). More remote, albeit influential, audiences tended to be mentioned by fewer teachers. These included the superintendent (n=8), local school board (n=9), district administrators (n=5), local community (n=3), and State Department of Education (n=4). Though few teachers mentioned having any direct communication with these audiences, their influence was recognized as having a significant effect on conditions of employment, and the availability and use of educational resources. For example,
teaching contracts were issued by local school boards, and local communities voted on passage of school levies.

Audiences tended to be local audiences. With the exception of the State Department of Education and professional organizations, there was no mention of accountability to audiences (governmental, legislative, or otherwise) at the state or national levels.
Table 9

Elementary Teachers: Accountability Views and Audiences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Audience</th>
<th>E1</th>
<th>E2</th>
<th>E3</th>
<th>E4</th>
<th>E5</th>
<th>E6</th>
<th>E7</th>
<th>E8</th>
<th>E9</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal Accountability</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collegial Accountability</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Teachers</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Organizations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contractual Accountability</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Administrators</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local School Board</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State DOE</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accountability to Clients</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Committee, Business</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 10
Secondary Teachers: Accountability Views and Audiences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Audience</th>
<th>S1</th>
<th>S2</th>
<th>S3</th>
<th>S4</th>
<th>S5</th>
<th>S6</th>
<th>S7</th>
<th>S8</th>
<th>S9</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal Accountability</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collegial Accountability</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Teachers</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Organizations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contractual Accountability</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Administrators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local School Board</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State DOE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accountability to Clients</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Committee, Business</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
View 1: Personal Accountability

Seventy-two percent (n=13) of the teachers expressed personal accountability. Personal accountability is characterized as (1) a private, solitary accountability relationship; (2) a primary and critically demanding accountability relationship; and, (3) related closely to the teacher's sense of accountability to students.

In Table 11 a description of the characteristics of this view, and areas of responsibility and accompanying obligations for which they were accountable are provided.

Accountability obligations are those things for which teachers stated they were accountable. They spoke of these as responsibilities. All but three teachers, at some point in the interview used forms of the term "responsible" interchangeably with forms of the term "accountable." They spoke of their accountability as a responsibility, an obligation to perform specific acts or maintain certain attitudes. In the analysis and presentation of the data, these acts and attitudes for which they stated they were accountable have been categorized by "Areas of Responsibilities" and referred to as accountability "Obligations."
### Table 11

**Personal Accountability: Audience, Characteristics, Responsibilities & Obligations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Audience</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Self (n=13). | 1. A private, solitary accountability relationship;  
2. Primary and critically demanding accountability relationship; and  
3. Related closely to the teacher's sense of accountability to students. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas of Responsibility</th>
<th>Obligations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **A. Personal Professional Development (n=10)** | 1. Putting forth effort on a daily basis to utilize knowledge and understandings for the purpose of facilitating student learning (E1,E4,E6,E7,E9,S8).  
2. Being knowledgeable of subject matter (S3,S4).  
3. Being organized and prepared (S4,S5).  
4. Evaluating personal practice (E9,S2). |
| **B. Curriculum (n=7)** | 1. Setting realistic expectations for student performance (E6,S2).  
2. Determining appropriate methods of instruction (S5,S8).  
3. Determining appropriate instructional resources (E9,S5).  
4. Determining appropriate content (S1).  
5. Defensibility of decisions for promotion/retention of students (E2). |
| **C. Professional Interactions with Students (n=5)** | 1. Establishing and maintaining fair discipline and evaluation standards (S3).  
2. "Caring" for student learning (E4,S4,S8).  
3. Respecting students as humans (S5). |
Characteristics

Personal accountability is an accountability relationship with one's self. Unlike Fenstermacher's definition of accountability, the relationship is not with other persons, but with oneself. It is a private, solitary relationship. One is responsible to oneself for one's actions; therefore one is accountable to oneself for one's performance. Personal expectations are held for one's performance, and these expectations become one's personal accountability obligations. As one teacher described it, "Every person has levels [of performance] they want to perform at, or goals they want to reach" (S8, 602-10).

Teachers spoke of the expectations they have for themselves as it related to how they interpret contractual obligations and carry out their responsibilities as a professional educator. An example of this expression is

E9: For me, a personal meaning of accountability is that I have been contracted to work with a group of students. I will work with these students and do whatever I possibly can to support their learning environment, to provide the best educational opportunities that I possibly can.

* * *

Over half (n=7) of the thirteen teachers expressing this view spoke of their personal expectations as extending beyond contractual expectations. Generally, personal and contractual obligations were viewed as compatible. (Exceptions to this are discussed in the Contractual View of Accountability). For these teachers, personal obligations were moral responsibilities and obligations they had for themselves as teacher, adult, and member of society. They pertained to
ethical and normative issues which required an examination of "rightness" or "wrongness". This was exemplified in statements regarding personal obligations to "do what's best for the children" (E6, 1308-12), or "striving for what ought to be done" (S1, 879-79). These were moral obligations to themselves for their actions as it affected others. This is illustrated in excerpts from conversations with two teachers (S8,E4).

I: Okay, so your personal accountability and the professional accountability are two different aspects.
S8: Yes, definitely.
I: And your personal is, I guess, a much higher expectation you hold for yourself?
S8: I think so, sure. I think it's over and above what the school district, what the School Board, what the contract says I should do. . . I can see accountability as being a normative question, as being a moral question.

If you take accountability and that accountability is your obligations or your responsibilities to perform a function. It may be, whether it's trivial or not, there's a rightness and a wrongness that comes into this.

Well, it becomes a moral question. It becomes a normative issue. Your accountability is not simply a dollars-and-cents kind of thing. Your accountability becomes your obligations as a teacher, as a person, as an adult working with children, as a member of society. You have all these various obligations. Obligations, of course,
implies the responsibilities that you have to do to meet those obligations.

* * *

E4: Well, I'm saying . . . You said whom am I accountable to? I'd like to think of [it in] terms, philosophically, [of] my own integrity and the integrity of the kids in doing what I feel I should do for them . . .

. . . [W]ho I am as a teacher has to do with me as a human being. You know, how I see myself. And if you want . . . I guess I shouldn't have made that assumption. But I think of accountability in a more philosophical, religious context ultimately.

. . . But I think for intent and purposes I have the personal expectation for me, and then the professional as I fit in the context as a paid teacher to teach the curriculum.

I: It is OK to call the personal, the professional also?

E4: No.

I: It is not a professional?

E4: Well, maybe it's a semantic hangup. For me, my personal expectations are related to what I'm expected to do professionally. I mean I'm aware of what I was hired to do. And what I do personally ties into that professional context, but it's different. There is stuff that the professional contract doesn't deem that I teach kids to like themselves and to get excited about math and social studies. I mean I teach kids to love history. I mean that's not in my professional contract, but it's a goal for me in that sense. So they're related. I wouldn't say they're the same thing.
To me, professional is just more static. It's just more, "I should cover this material. I know I should cover this material and I do cover that material." That's what I call professional.

***

There were three areas of responsibility for which teachers stated they were accountable to themselves. They were accountable for their (1) personal professional development; (2) curricular decisions; and (3) professional interactions with students. Obligations pertained to performance of those things for which the teacher perceived her/himself to have responsibility and authority. Specific obligations in each area are discussed at length later in this section.

Personal accountability is characterized as a primary and critically demanding accountability relationship. Accountability to oneself was accorded primary importance over all other expressions of accountability by eight (E1,E6,E7,E9,S1,S2,S4,S5) of the thirteen teachers. Four (E2,E4,S3,S8) teachers said that accountability to oneself was important, but not the single most important audience. Accountability to oneself and students were the two most important, equally-valued audiences. One (S9) teacher did not prioritize accountability audiences. From the analysis of data, there are four possible factors supporting the importance of this view.

Importance of Accountability to Oneself. Personal accountability (1) is a motivating factor in one's work; (2) subsumes other accountability obligations; (3) is a necessary condition in being accountable to others; and (4) contributes toward improving one's
teaching ability. Embedded in each of these, is the notion that self-evaluative activities play a significant role.

First, this view of accountability is tied closely with one's self-concept and integrity as teacher, relating to feelings of self-worth, pride and professional satisfaction. These feelings are motivating factors which create a sense of accomplishment and worth in the performance of one's work and contribution to the profession. The importance of accountability to self as it applies to professional satisfaction was expressed by five teachers (E4,S1,S4,S8,S9). Excerpts from conversations with three (S1,S4,S9) are presented below.

S1: And so it really comes down to me, as a teacher, to the accountability there. Because it would be very easy to "pull the wool over the administrator's eyes" these three days that they come in to evaluate, or two days or whatever. I mean, it really comes down to you having pride in what ought to be done, and trying to strive for that.  

S4: I am accountable to me first and foremost. If I'm not accountable to myself, then -- I can do strategies to get by for the rest of my career to retire without really educating. I know as well as anybody else that you can fool people if you have to, but you have to be accountable to yourself. If you can't walk away after each day and say you really did a decent-to-great job teaching, then you shouldn't do it. I'm driven by that more than anything else.

S9: Well, you're accountable to yourself in whether or not you feel you're doing something that is
worthwhile, and whether you're going to feel good about yourself or feel bad about yourself. You know, whether you're going to look at yourself in a good light.

***

The importance of accountability to self as a motivating factor in one's work was exemplified in a conversation with another teacher. She said that a teacher "shouldn't even be in teaching if [he/she] could not be accountable" (S5, 893-94), which, for her, meant fulfilling her accountability obligations to herself, students, and administrators. When asked what the outcomes (benefits and/or consequences) of doing this were, she stated,

S5: Well, I think being accountable is very enriching because I feel good about what I'm doing. I feel good about myself.

***

Secondly, accountability to oneself is important because personal accountability obligations subsume other obligations, and are considered higher level obligations. As indicated earlier, personal obligations either develop from, or are supplemental to contractual obligations. Six teachers (E1,E4,E6,E7,E9,S8) indicated that one of the personal obligations they hold for themselves is "to do the very best job I can do" as it relates to fulfilling all teaching obligations. To put the utmost effort into one's work is the highest possible expectation one can hold.

This was illustrated in a conversation with one teacher (S8) who discussed his personal accountability obligations to himself as both a teacher and as a person. The obligation is the same for both, but the criteria for measuring success differ. The obligation is to do the best
one can. Success as a person is measured by effort; success as a teacher is measured by student success. By attending to obligations to both (as a teacher and as a person), then, in this teacher's opinion, he will be the most successful teacher he can be.

I: Are you satisfied with being the best person or the best teacher in the classroom?

S8: Okay, there's the trick. Now wait. Now wait, I'm almost there. The accountability, personally, I would be satisfied if I tried my best. I might not be satisfied as a teacher, but I believe that when I handle my accountabilities, my obligations, the very best I can as a person, I am going to be the most successful teacher I can be.

I: Another teacher told me that. This teacher said that one takes care of the other.

S8: They're inseparable. I can't prioritize. I don't say I'm a teacher in a human being's body or a human being who is being a teacher. I feel like I have the ability to separate that when I leave the school sometimes. I mean you have to if you don't want to burn out, but I don't know that they can be separated. So it's very hard to explain, but I mean if you've heard it before.

I: One other teacher had stated it. There's a personal and professional accountability, is the way he put it. When the personal accountability is there, the professional takes care of itself.

S8: I guess that's one way to put it. ***
In the last excerpt, the other teacher (E4) to whom the interviewer referred, stated that by attending to his personal accountability obligations, contractual obligations are automatically satisfied. Using the term "professional" to refer to contractually-based obligations, he said,

E4: OK. That's the two frameworks I was responding to [personal and professional]. . . .

from the other framework of the more professional context, it's less an issue for me. Because if I do the first one well, the second one is going to be good enough. Professional, for me, sort of takes care of itself.

***

A third possible factor highlighting the importance of personal accountability is that accountability to oneself is a necessary condition in order to be accountable to others. The logic is one can't be accountable to others until one is accountable to oneself. This sentiment was expressed by five teachers (E1,E2,E6,E9,S4), one of whom stated, "If you can't be accountable to yourself, I don't think you can be accountable to anyone else" (E1, 1058-61). Another teacher (S4) highlighted this when he discussed why he develops individual lesson plans for students. He stated that he places a high value on personal preparation, planning, and structure, and is a "firm believer in management-by-objectives" (S4, 179). These are personal obligations he holds for himself. Individual lesson plans function primarily as a planning tool in fulfilling his personal obligations, but also serve a secondary function so he can "document to the people in charge that I am actually teaching" (S4, 134-36).
This teacher (S4) and three others (E2, E6, E9) emphasized the importance of utilizing knowledge and understandings of the teaching-learning process as it relates to being a "professional," and in fulfilling personal accountability obligations. This is seen as necessary because, if called to account for one's actions, one must be cognizant of the reasons for taking certain actions, and be able to explain, defend, or justify these reasons.

E2: Ultimately, the decision for whether or not [students] are ready for the next grade level is mine. So I'm also accountable to myself. To be able to say that Sam is ready to go on to second grade or Sam is not ready to go on to second grade.

I: How are you accountable to yourself for that?

E2: It's just a decision I make, and I have to feel that it's a right decision.

E2: It's just a decision I make, and I have to feel that it's a right decision.

I: That where it starts?

E9: For me it is, yes. And that's part of being a professional. It is that I'm accountable to myself and that I can't do anything less than that. But everybody's different. And some people just want to teach because it puts bread on the table and that's it. It's nothing other than a job. And there are people in every profession like that. But I think that that really hurts the profession. It really hurts it. ***
Finally, accountability to oneself is viewed as a means for becoming a better teacher and growing professionally. Through continuous reflection, self-evaluation, and self-critique one (a) develops a better understanding of learning processes, and (b) improves one's ability to contribute to student learning. One teacher said, "[Y]ou have to be introspective a lot in this job to make sure you evolve and grow in some respect" (S4, 997-1019). Another stated, "I'm evaluating myself in a way of understanding the way children learn" (E9, 843-45). And another teacher (S2), in describing how reflection and self-critique (personal obligations) serve as a means for growing professionally, discussed the personal benefit of being accountable to oneself. He said,

S2: I feel accountable, more strongly than to anybody else, to myself in my own conscience about, "What could I have done differently? Is this working?" Always constantly doing the self-evaluation. It's very important to me -- I'm not the ultimate authority in any given area. I know kids. I'm new to the game as far as having a self-contained classroom, but I really put a lot of stock in my own gauge of "Am I doing the right thing for this particular kid? Am I doing an adequate job of a group presentation? Am I excluding somebody? Am I not taking into consideration that this kid has a visual impairment? Or the auditory stimulation in the classroom might be too much for one student, whereas the other student's learning style lends itself to an auditory type lesson."... But I'd like to think the consequence [of being accountable] is my own knowledge -- my own internal check. That's my
consequence. Where I've done something differently.

I: Is that a consequence in a negative way or a positive way, or it's a benefit to you?

S2: No. To me it's a benefit, because it's a sounding board for me to use to become a better teacher.

I: And that is your personal goal.

S2: Yes.

***

Thus, personal accountability is accorded primary importance in that it (a) probably serves as a motivating factor in one's work; (b) encompasses all other accountability obligations; (c) is necessary in order to be accountable to others; and (d) is a means for becoming a better teacher.

This is a critically demanding accountability. Within this view there was the need for continuous "self-evaluation" (S2, 421-42; E9, 793-845) and "introspection" (S4, 997-1019). Emphasis was placed on understanding the interactive teaching-learning process and one's influence in it. From this understanding, one develops expectations for one's performance for the benefit of (a) helping students learn, (b) growing professionally, and (c) being accountable to oneself, a condition without which one cannot be accountable to others.

Finally, this view of accountability is characterized as being closely related to the teacher's sense of accountability to students. As indicated earlier, four teachers (E2,E4,S3,S8) placed equal importance on accountability to oneself and to students. For two of these teachers (E4,S8) and four others (E1,E6,E7,E9), performance of personal
accountability obligations was judged according to student academic growth and achievement. The extent to which the teacher perceived her/himself as meeting personal accountability obligations was gauged by the teacher's perception of the students' academic growth and development. If students were learning, then the teacher was successful; if students were not learning, then the teacher was not successful. The two most poignant examples of this interrelationship are from conversations with two teachers (E4,S8):

E4: Well, the accountability to students is completely interrelated in the first — in the personal level for me. Because my accountability for myself can't be really separated from them, because I view what I do in terms of their growth and their appreciation. Because if they don't like me and they don't like social studies and they're not enjoying what they do and they're not learning and excited by it, then I'm not accountable to myself. I have failed. So that's completely interrelated at that level.

***

S8: But that's my own personal accountability. I don't measure my accountability on success. I mean I do in a way. I mean, I look and see . . . let's see this is getting real tricky. My accountability as a teacher, individually, is that all these things happen. [Students] are confident. They learn their math. But personally (which effects how I teach) is whether or not I am always trying to do my best.

***

Areas of Responsibility and Obligations

There were three general areas of responsibility for which these thirteen teachers stated they were accountable. They were accountable
to themselves for their (A) personal professional development; (B) curricular decisions; and (C) professional interactions with students.

As noted in Table 11, most (n=10) teachers expressed accountability for their personal professional development; seven were accountable for the curricular decisions they made; and, five were accountable for their professional interactions with students. One teacher (S9) stated she was accountable to herself, but did not mention specifically what she was accountable for other than it related to how she felt about herself as a teacher. Areas of personal responsibility and specific obligations for each are discussed, and supported with interview excerpts in the following paragraphs.

Area of Responsibility: Personal Professional Development. Ten teachers stated they were accountable to themselves for their own professional development and preparation. They were accountable for that which they brought to the classroom in the way of attitudes, knowledge of subject matter, and understandings of educational processes. Obligations included (a) maintaining a particular attitude, (b) being knowledgeable of the subject matter, (c) critiquing personal practice, and (d) being prepared and organized on a daily basis.

For six teachers (E1,E4,E6,E7,E9,S8), the attitudinal obligation they held was to approach each day with the intention of "doing the best I can." It was the intention to put forth the best personal effort possible on a daily basis that was important. As mentioned earlier, this effort was gauged by the teacher's perception of student progress. This is illustrated in the following excerpts from conversations with three teachers (E1,E6,E9).
I: Ok, for what were you accountable to yourself?  
E1: To do the best job that I could.  
I: Which meant? How did you know what was the "best job"?  
E1: Using all the resources that were available to me to move children forward academically as far and as fast as possible.  
***  

I: OK. You're accountable to yourself for what?  
E6: That I do the best job I can...  
... If the children you are working with have learned or moved forward in the time you've had them, you have done your job the best you can.  
***  

E9: Accountability means that I have given it the very best that I have on a daily basis throughout the entire year to provide the best education for those children.  
***  

Two secondary teachers (S3,S4) were accountable for being knowledgeable of the subject matter, and two (S4,S5) were accountable for being prepared and organized on a daily basis.  

S3: ... Maybe I'd think of the things that I thought the student should be accountable to me for, I think that would be what I'd be accountable to myself. It would be the same things I said for the students, in terms of knowing my subject matter and my content area.  
***  

S4: ... "my" notion of accountability is that I would take that a step further for my personal
goals and personal ideals about accountability. I feel that it's my job to be prepared in the best way that I can; be knowledgeable, organized, set objectives for learning. I try to do an I.E.P. for each student, either formally or informally.

***

S5: That means being prepared; to know what you're going to teach; ***

Finally, in this area of responsibility, two teachers (E9,S2) stated they were accountable for evaluating their performance for the purpose of developing a better understanding of how students learn and what they can do to facilitate that learning. The intention was to improve their ability to recognize student needs quickly, and respond appropriately.

S2: I feel accountable, more strongly than to anybody else, to myself in my own conscience about, "What could I have done differently? Is this working?" Always constantly doing the self-evaluation.

***

E9: I am constantly evaluating what I am doing and how best I can serve the children . . . ***

Area of Responsibility: Curriculum. Seven teachers expressed accountability to themselves for the decisions they made in implementing the curriculum as outlined in their district's course of study. These decisions necessitated modifying course objectives, methods of instruction, or resources; and tailoring the recommended program to meet the needs of students. Two teachers (E6,S2) were accountable to
themselves for modifying and setting realistic academic expectations for
their students.

S2: I guess I'm a realist, and when I say (there might be a course
objective), "Let's get through all of this," I'm a realist in the fact
that, "Hey, if you get through it, fine." If you don't get through it,
then I don't think you're any less of a teacher. And I don't think the
kids are any less deprived of essential knowledge. As long as you
are able to deliver a quality message or the content has some worth and
value to the student, from a realist point of view . . . I've seen a lot
of course objectives that were virtually impossible. They're just
so idealistic.

* * *

E6: . . . If I worried about getting them on the fourth grade reading level where they
should be according to the Course of Study (or the third, whichever group
they're in), it's impossible. I have to look at myself, and I have to say,
"You can't do in one year what is going to take longer with this
particular group of children." It's not there. It's a goal that you have
to think, "How far can I go with them?" And go that far. And I don't
know how far that is. I mean with two children, it might be here, and
with a couple more, it might be over here. They're not all going to be
the same.

* * *

Two teachers (S5, S8) were accountable to themselves for their
decisions regarding how the recommended curriculum would be implemented
which meant determining appropriate methods of instruction. One teacher
(S5) described the obligation to use a variety of methods. Another (S8)
described the obligation for choosing a method that, in his opinion, was
most successful. He opted not to use the recommended program and methods, and therefore, had to be able to defend this decision.

S5: [Accountable] to not just teach out of the book. To use different styles of teaching. Don't just lecture all the time; question and answer. Have the kids do some physical activity.

***

S8: ... But see I don't feel accountable to [the competency-based] program, because what I am telling myself is that my way of teaching the class is more successful. That when my kids get through and take the end-of-the-year test, they will get better scores than someone who went through chapter by chapter. In my school, I am the only teacher that does not give the chapter tests.

***

Two teachers (E9,S5) were accountable for determining the appropriateness of given instructional resources for enabling individual students to meet the expectations set forth in the course of study, and for securing additional, more appropriate materials when necessary.

E9: That means that if I am given a set of books and these books are not appropriate for these children after having worked with the books and worked with the children, and they're either too hard or too easy, then it's up to me to research and find some other ways of approaching the desired learning outcomes. ... That means bringing in a variety of resources.

***

S5: ... There are lots of books out of activities you can do with secondary students so they're doing something hands-on that will
explain something. If they see it visually, it can be retained and learned.

***

One teacher (S1) stated he was accountable for determining and implementing the appropriate content for the course of study. This teacher's view differed significantly from those of other teachers. Unlike others, he stated that he alone was the only person holding himself accountable for teaching the approved curriculum, and this was an undesirable situation.

As the only teacher in a small district teaching the elective course, Industrial Technology, he was responsible for developing the district's course of study for this subject area. His course was not monitored by other individuals (i.e., principal, advisory committee, etc.) or through any traditional accountability mechanisms (i.e., standardized testing, competency based curricula) for adherence to curricular guidelines set forth in the course of study. He stated he would have preferred to have had "pressure" placed on him to adhere to the approved course of study, which, in his opinion, would have been an indication of support and interest in the subject area.

Furthermore, he perceived his expectations for student academic performance (as expressed in the course of study) to have been very different from the principal's expectations. He attributed these differences to the changing curricular emphasis in the subject area, and the principal's lack of understanding about the new curriculum -- a problem which he had been working to alleviate through frequent and open communication with the principal. He, therefore, felt solely responsible for determining and implementing the curricular content.
SI: Yes. I think in my situation that I’ve got a lot higher, in my opinion, a lot higher level of what I think my accountability ought to be than what’s actually expected of me.

... I think I’m in different situation. It’s one I don’t relish really. In some ways, some people would look at my situation and say, "God, it’s great."

... [I’m] in a [subject] area where the administration doesn’t really understand what we ought to be doing.

... And so it really comes down to me, as a teacher, to the accountability there. . . .

Now, as far as the Graded Course of Study and curriculum, hey, I can write anything I want. I have no objection from anybody. "You want to teach technology, that’s fine." But I don’t have the support yet to really implement it. And so that’s causing a problem.

... I guess what I would like to have is I would like to have an administrator who really understood what we ought to be doing, and ought to be upset if we’re not doing it.

I: Is there support in other areas like that? In other words, does the administrator support other departments?

SI: Yes. Because he understands other departments better. And so, like I said, I think we finally made some progress with him. And maybe we’ll get him to that place where he does demand it. Because I think it would be great. See where other teachers look at it and say, "Oh, my God. What a great place. You’re down there a quarter a mile away; nobody there to bother you between periods; the kids are walking; they’re never
down in your building between periods; nobody ever checks on you; you can do -- you know, if you’re tired, you can blow a day off, or whatever, or blow a period off. Yet, you can, but still I’d rather be in a situation where there was pressure.

... pressure on me to do a great job. I have no pressure from outside to do a great job.

***

Finally, one teacher (E2) stated she was accountable to herself for the defensibility of the decisions she makes regarding whether a student is prepared to move on to the next level (i.e., promotion and retention decisions).

E2: Ultimately, the decision for whether or not they are ready for the next grade level is mine. So I’m also accountable to myself. To be able to say that Sam is ready to go on to second grade or Sam is not ready to go on to second grade.

I: How are you accountable to yourself for that?

E2: It’s just a decision I make, and I have to feel that it’s a right decision.

***

Area of Responsibility: Professional Interactions with Students.

The third and final area of responsibility for which five teachers stated they were accountable was professional interactions with students: their behavior and attitudes demonstrated during interactions with students. One teacher (S3) stated she was accountable for establishing and maintaining fairness in discipline and evaluation. This obligation required (a) utilizing professional judgment in
interpreting Board grading policies and disciplinary standards; (b) setting realistic, attainable evaluation standards; and, (c) communicating expectations and criteria for performance to students (S3, 119-40).

S3: . . . and [accountable for] being fair in my discipline, and fair in my evaluation procedures, and all of that.

***

Three teachers (E4, S4, S8) expressed accountability to themselves for maintaining a "caring" attitude toward students' learning. A "caring" attitude was described as one in which there is a primary interest in providing beneficial opportunities for students to succeed and learn; to "have the welfare of . . . students in mind as the focus of teaching" (S8, 1809-11).

E4: I got into teaching because I see it as a way of bettering the world. For me to fulfill myself, as a person, I have a way of doing that -- to turn kids on -- their imaginations, their minds -- who they are, what they are -- to wake them up to the world they live in -- use their imaginations -- be in tune. I feel like that's real, real important.

***

S4: . . . I am accountable to myself to do the best that I can. I am accountable to be prepared, well-educated, and caring, I guess -- caring for the students' learning, and so on.

***

Finally, one teacher (S5) stated she was accountable for respecting students as humans, and treating them accordingly. This involved recognizing the pervasive and long-term influence of the
teacher-student relationship, and balancing authority and influence as teacher and adult in associations with students.

S5: . . . being accountable as a human being as far as the kids are concerned. In other words, taking the time to address their needs when you see a problem. To use healthy interacting skills with the kids. In other words, don’t bicker back and forth; don’t get yourself pulled into a lot of banter, fighting, that kind of thing, put-downs; to be a professional. Trying to do the best you can to help the kids learn and making sure that in the process that you do nothing to injure them emotionally, because as adults we have a great responsibility to make sure that we don’t damage kids in any way.

***
View 2: Collegial Accountability

Sixty-seven percent (n=12) of the teachers expressed accountability to others in one or more forms of collegial accountability. Collegial accountability is characterized as (1) an informal accountability relationship developed from professional interaction; (2) a relationship nurtured by direct communication and shared decision-making with opportunities for negotiation; and (3) involving an assumption of responsibility for the group's collective actions. In Table 12 a description of the characteristics of this view, and areas of responsibility and accompanying obligations for which teachers stated they were accountable are presented.
### Table 12

**Collegial Accountability: Audiences, Characteristics, Responsibilities & Obligations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Audiences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Other teachers (n=11);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Principal (n=4); and,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Professional Organizations (n=1).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. An informal accountability relationship developed from professional interaction;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. A relationship nurtured by direct communication and shared decision-making with opportunities for negotiation; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Involves the assumption of responsibility for group's collective actions and attitudes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas of Responsibility</th>
<th>Obligations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Curriculum (n=8)</td>
<td>1. Participating in and implementing joint-decisions regarding:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. discipline and learning environment (E1,S2,S3).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. curricular emphases (E1,E2,E3,E4,E5,E6,S2,S3).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Staff Development (n=7)</td>
<td>1. Sharing teaching ideas and strategies (E1,E4,S4,S9).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Mentoring other teachers (S4,S9).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Supporting other teachers (E9,S8,S9).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Selecting new teachers (E1).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Acting in accord with professional standards for behavior (S3).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Characteristics

In contrast to personal accountability, collegial accountability is an accountability relationship with others. The audiences to whom accountability was expressed were other teachers (n=11), principal (n=4), and professional organizations (n=1). An examination of the expressions of accountability to "other teachers" and professional organizations is presented as they relate to the three characteristics of this view. This is followed by a discussion of collegial accountability to principals.

"Other teachers" were generally identified as those working in the same school as the responding teacher. One teacher (S4) extended this expression to include all teachers in the same district; however, he (S4) worked in a small district which had all district school buildings located on one site. This was a key point in his expression of accountability to teachers in his district, as availability and access were important factors in fulfilling obligations. Finally, one teacher (S8) limited his expression of accountability to only those teachers with whom he has worked, and whom he perceived to share his view about teaching. He was accountable to only those who "are committed to doing their best" and "have the welfare of their students in mind as their focus while teaching" (S8, 1891-3;1809-11). Specific groups of "other teachers" were

(a) all teachers in the same grade level, team, or department (E1,E2,E3,E4,S3,S4,S9);
(b) all teachers in contiguous grade levels (E1,E2,E3,S2);
(c) all teachers in the same school (E4,E5,E9,S2,S4);
(d) all teachers in the district (S4); and,
(e) only those who share the same view of teaching (S8).
Colllegial accountability is characterized as an informal accountability relationship developed from professional interaction with others. Most teachers (n=11) described this as an "informal" accountability relationship. They stated that they were obligated to others for performance of specific acts, and these acts were their accountability obligations. The obligation to perform was not a contractual obligation, however. The accountability obligation was a personally- or professionally-felt obligation. This is exemplified in excerpts from conversations with seven teachers (E2,E4,E9,S3,S4,S8,S9).

E2: [I'm accountable to other teachers] because they're my team mates. We're accountable to each other. **

E4: Now, as far as my accountability to teachers, I feel it on a personal level very strongly. . . . I would say I feel responsible to other teachers that I work with -- my colleagues, but I don't feel like I want to push it on them. . . . **

E9: A professional support is what it is [because] we are in the same profession. **

S3: This [obligation] also might come from working on a team -- **
S4: I think professionals should always help professionals. * * *

S8: ... Now, I might feel accountable to a teacher that I know personally and have worked with who I know shares my viewpoints about their place. I have no problem with that ... supporting, you know, one hundred percent. * * *

S9: And I would feel, yes, that we're accountable to each other -- not in a formal accountability. * * *

The accountability relationship was not founded upon formal agreements such as those typically set forth in organizational contracts, policies, or rules; all of which contain explicit responsibilities for specific positions. There was no formal monitoring and oversight of individual performance by audiences external to the relationship, or against uniform criteria. This was expressed by one teacher (E3) who said,

E3: I feel [accountable] definitely yes, but there's no checking up on that. I mean when my fourth graders come to me, I expect the third grade teachers to have taught them "A, B, and C." I expect them to know that, and they always do. So in that way, they're accountable. When I send my kids to fifth grade, I expect them to be able to do X-number of things. So I feel accountable in that way, but it's nothing that anybody would check up on I think. * * *

Instead, the relationship developed from professional interaction, and was selectively chosen based on areas of interest. From an analysis of
the obligations, interests appeared to focus on supporting and strengthening (a) curricular programs, and (b) abilities of and relationships among the professional staff. These were the two areas of responsibility (Curriculum, and Staff Development) for which the teachers stated they were accountable to others. Specific obligations of each are discussed at length later in this section.

A second characteristic of the collegial view is that the relationship is nurtured by direct communication and shared decision-making, with opportunities for negotiation. It was apparent from an analysis of the accountability obligations and discussions of inter-faculty relationships that direct communication and shared decision-making play an important role in this view. This is illustrated through an examination of (a) the collegial accountability obligations, and (b) a contrasting view expressed by one teacher (E7) who stated she did not feel a sense of accountability to other teachers.

Over half (n=8) of the teachers expressed accountability for participating in and implementing jointly-made decisions regarding the curriculum. For most, direct communication and interaction occurred in regularly scheduled meetings; for others, meetings were on an as-needed basis. Six teachers (E2,E3,E4,E5,S3,S4) stated they met regularly with other teachers in their team, department, or grade level to jointly plan the curricular content of their instructional program. Two others (E1,S2), whose instructional programs were individualized according to student needs, met with others informally on an as-needed basis to discuss curricular needs for individual students.
In all instances, communication was direct, in oral form, and focussed on the curricular program. The accountability obligation to others was to implement joint curricular decisions, or at the very least, take an active role in working with others to coordinate curricular offerings for students. This is exemplified in excerpts from conversations with four (E1,E2,S3,E5) of these teachers; one (E1) of whom met informally with others; and three (E2,E5,S3) of whom met regularly with other teachers.

E1: I was responsible for maintaining the type of discipline and the type of learning environment that philosophically we all had agreed that we wanted at the school.

. . . [Teacher B] had the high readers upstairs, and she would talk to me about what her kids had done so that it would give me an idea. . .

. . . [another] teacher in our group would talk to me about the books that they had read. And we communicated and shared ideas.

E2: Yes. And we do meet on a regular basis. The kindergarten teachers meet with the first grade teachers. The first grade teachers meet with the second grade teachers, and so on.

I: What's a regular basis?

E2: Probably, quarterly. And not just to say, "Here's where we are. Where do we need to go?"

. . . And I meet with my team mates, my first grade team, at least once a week we work together.
S3: ... I think I should be accountable to include the concepts that we've decided upon in my curriculum. Whether it's actually stated in my curriculum guide or not, I feel like I need to be able to web whatever we've decided, or include whatever we've decided together, into my classtime.

I: Does that mean whether you agree with them or not?

S3: Yeah, it does, because [laugh] I don't always agree with them. But I think I should be accountable to that.

** * * *

E5: At least once a month, I meet with them. They discuss a monthly theme and they tell me what their theme's going to be, and then I pull resources. So in that sense, I'm trying to give them what they need.

** * * *

Direct communication and interaction were also necessary when the accountability obligation was focussed on strengthening the profession. Six teachers (E1,E4,E9,S4,S8,S9) stated they were obligated to (1) make themselves available to others in providing assistance and sharing ideas, and/or (2) supporting others in their work. In addition to highlighting the role of communication, there were two interesting aspects worth noting in these obligations.

First, "providing assistance" and "sharing ideas" were obligations that could only be fulfilled if, and when, others sought the assistance. Teachers emphasized that they would make themselves available and be willing to discuss ideas only when this information is solicited. In these views, there appeared to be a respect for others' autonomy, coupled with the desire to provide collegial assistance. This is
exemplified in excerpts from conversations with two (E4,S4) of the four teachers who expressed accountability for "sharing ideas".

E4: ... I would say I am accountable to teachers as much as they are open or willing for that dialogue to happen. I mean if a teacher says, "What are you doing in science. How do you teach that? What do you want to do? Show me your tests," I'll sit down and talk to them for three hours. So I'm as accountable to them as they would like me to be. I guess that's how I would say it. If teachers are having trouble with discipline, and I say, "Well, I've used this and that." And they say, "Gosh, how does it work?" I'll talk to them. I'll share it with them. I'll give it to them.

***

S4: ... If I think there's a good teacher in the system, no matter what they teach whether it's kindergarten through high school, then I try to see them teach at some time during my free period. If they think it's okay, then I'll go see them. And even some of the bad ones -- ones that I think aren't so good.

You know if they ask me for suggestions, I'll be more than happy to offer them.

***

The second point pertained to the obligation "to support others" which was expressed by three teachers (E9,S8,S9). In conversations with two of these teachers, the obligation appeared to be contingent upon others meeting specific and particular criteria. In other words, teachers had to demonstrate and meet specific requirements in order to become entitled to the teacher's "support". A common factor in each of these discussions was the aspect of "accepting differences in
philosophical approaches to teaching". According to these teachers, the obligation "to support others" meant the obligation to

1. provide public endorsement of others' ideas or programs (S8);
2. not publicly criticize others' teaching approaches (E9); and
3. make the "effort" toward achieving an internal resolution of problems resulting from differences in teaching approaches (E9).

For one teacher (S8), public support was given regardless of differences in philosophical approaches. The criteria he used in determining to whom he would be accountable for "support" were his views about teacher commitments. These, incidentally, were also his personal accountability obligations. He would support those teachers with whom he has worked and whom he believes are committed to (a) doing their best, and (b) having the welfare of the students in mind as the focus of teaching. If a teacher demonstrated these criteria, he would publicly support the teacher, regardless of differences in philosophical approaches to teaching. This is illustrated in the following excerpt:

S8: ... Now, I might 1867 feel accountable to a teacher that I 1868 know personally and have worked with 1869 who I know shares my viewpoints about 1870 their place. I have no problem with 1871 that ... supporting, you know, one 1872 hundred percent. 1873

A gentleman I know is going to take 1886 over a program at another school. He 1887 and I do not teach the same way -- 1888 not even close -- but his interest in 1889 the children is at least as great, if 1890 not greater, than mine. His 1891 commitment to doing the best that he 1892 can for his kids, in his way, is as 1893 great. And FOR THAT I will give him 1894 every bit of support, even though our 1895 particular teaching styles or points 1896 of emphases or even our 1897
accountability — what we individually want is different. But the fact is that because I feel that way about him he will get my support. And I do feel accountable.

***

For the other (E9), it appeared that her criteria for determining to whom she would be obligated for providing "professional support" were demonstrating an (a) acceptance of differences in philosophical approaches, or (b) effort in resolving problems attributable to these differences.

When asked if she was accountable to other teachers, her response was "yes," but she offered it with a discussion of how differences in philosophical approaches to teaching have created barriers in developing a close working relationship with other teachers, thus making it difficult to support "all" teachers. She described her relationship with other teachers in her grade level as one where she is able to work well with those who are receptive to her way of teaching, but is having difficulty working with others who are not (E9, 600-10). Acceptance, rather than criticism, of differences was important to her in developing better working relationships. She stated.

E9: Because I work with the whole child and I feel that's more important than "the" curriculum, I will work at ways of establishing an environment that I feel is conducive to those children's ability levels. That may mean that it is a different approach than the traditional student-in-the desk, doesn't-get-out-of-the-desk, 400-dittos-a-week approach. I have run into some people who feel that is the only way to teach. Now, I'm not standing in judgment of them. I just ask that they not stand in judgment of me.
And if we can accept each others' approaches then we can work better together.

***

She continued this discussion by stating that she was "accused of not teaching the curriculum" (649-50) by two teachers whom she believed did not "understand what I'm doing, and so because there is some intimidation they feel . . . they need to explain that" (658-63) as not teaching the curriculum. She then summarized her accountability to other teachers by stating she was accountable for supporting others which meant not openly and publicly criticizing others, and making the effort to work together to resolve differences.

E9: I try to do that. I'm not perfect, but I try to support them. A professional support is what it is. That we are in the same profession and we look at things in different ways, but we don't need to be critical of each other openly. If we have a problem with each other then we need to go to each other and say, "I see it differently. How can we best work out a compromise between the two of us?" And there may not be one, but it's the EFFORT that's made.

***

In both of these illustrations, direct communication and interaction are critical features in the provision of "support." As emphasized in the latter excerpt, shared decision-making and negotiation also play an essential role.

Finally, the importance of direct communication and shared decision-making in the collegial view is further illustrated by contrasting this with one teacher (E7) who stated she did not feel a sense of accountability to other teachers. Because she did not work
directly with other teachers in planning her instructional program, she
did not feel a sense of accountability to other teachers in her grade
level.

I: [Do you feel a sense of
accountability to] other teachers? 838

E7: No. I don't work that closely 840
with other teachers because I've had 841
only to share materials at this 842
point. In the past I have worked 843
more closely with some teachers and 844
shared ideas. . . . 845

I: [Do] you think if you didn't have 891
the combination class, you would feel 892
a sense of accountability to other 893
teachers? 894

E7: I have worked -- team taught -- 896
with other teachers in the past where 897
we've helped each other more. Here 898
at this building it doesn't seem to 899
work well. I mean it hasn't worked 900
for me here. I think that's just the 901
personalities of different people. 902

I: So the accountability, then, is a 904
one-to-one relationship in terms of 905
planning and offering instruction. 906

E7: Right. Yes. 908

***

The third, and final, characteristic of this view is that this
relationship involves the assumption of responsibility for the group's
collective actions. The "group" as used in this reference includes the
teacher and the individuals to whom the accountability is expressed,
which may be teachers in the teaching team, department area, school,
and/or professional organization.

Collegial accountability extends beyond the personal view of
accountability in which one assumes responsibility for one's actions, to
a broader view of assuming a degree of responsibility for the actions of the group as a whole. One is accountable to others for one's actions as it impacts the group. For one teacher (S3), there was a concern for how teaching organizations, in general, might be perceived by influential audiences outside the profession. She stated she was accountable for her actions as a professional, and discussed how her actions might influence others' perceptions of professional teaching organizations.

S3: I [am] accountable to any kind of national teacher's organization because my behaviors as a teacher could actually influence how they're thought of. You know what I'm saying there? And whether it's the science teaching organization I belong to, or the big NEA organization I belong to, or I guess any of the organizations. My behavior actually reflects upon them as teachers.

***

Within this view there is a recognition that one is a part of a larger entity. One's performance affects the performance of others and ultimately the performance of the group, as a whole. This is illustrated in excerpts from conversations with three teachers (E1,E2,E4).

E1: I was responsible for carrying my share of the load. It was a team teaching situation, so everybody had things that they had to do that affected other people.

***

E2: ... We're accountable to each other. ... because my children are going to be intermixed with the other two first grade teachers....

***
E4: And we do have that amount of responsibility, accountability to each other by grade level to make that happen. Yes.

***

Collegial Accountability to Principals. Although seventeen teachers expressed accountability to their principal, four teachers (E1, E6, S4, S8) discussed their relationships with (and accountability to) their principals in collegial terms as characterized in this view. Of those expressing this view of accountability to their principal, two were secondary teachers (S4, S8) and two were elementary teachers (E1, E6) who worked in the same school.

One elementary teacher (E1) characterized the relationships among faculty and her administrator as a professional relationship whereby teachers are autonomous and responsible for all decisions in their curricular program; the other teacher (E6) described this as a cooperative relationship. In both descriptions, teachers and administrators were viewed as each having different responsibilities, but contributing equally to the functioning of the overall school program.

E1: I was accountable to the principal, but . . .

We were very autonomous, so it's hard for me. . . You know like in a regular school, you had to go in and check out a lot of things. In our school, we were considered professional people.

***

E6: Administration to me . . . I guess. . . See it's hard for me in my school to say [I'm accountable to] the principal, because in the [school] philosophy
we're a democracy. We all work together. She is the coordinator of our school. She has certain things, yes, which she has to do and get information to us, etc. But we work in a complete democracy. Yet, I feel we do have to follow her. She is the person in charge, and she does have the background and all in that. So in those ways we would be accountable to her.

[Administration is] . . . not that I think of them as a boss hanging over my shoulder or something like that, but supposedly the administration is the group that is knowledgeable in all the different areas of the school and how it's run. I don't know all that. I have to look to someone else to guide me, and even though I may particularly have a background in curriculum or something, I can't say that I know all areas of it, or that I would by any means know all the answers to all the questions. I think that you have to look to an administration to guide you in those ways.

***

Neither teacher stated specific obligations for which they were accountable to the principal. Their expressions of accountability were directed to the program for their individual performances and contributions, rather than the principal per se. Expressing an assumption of responsibility for others (a characteristic of this view), one (E1) teacher said of her accountability to the principal,

E1: It's not that I felt no accountability, it's just . . . I don't know how to explain it. . . . What I did reflected on her. What I did in my teaching reflected on her, so in that sense I did feel accountability.

***
A secondary teacher (S8) described his accountability to his principal as one in which the obligation was owed because the principal had made a commitment to him as an educator. In contrast to this, he spoke of his contractual obligation to the institution, made with the school board, as a "legal" accountability. He said, "They're [school board] the one I have the contract with. That's my legal accountability. . . . That's nothing I 'feel' anything toward" (S8, 805-56). He was accountable to the principal for fulfilling explicit obligations to which he agreed at the time he was hired.

S8: I am accountable to the principal in that I feel this person has made a commitment to me as an educator; that I need to meet the obligations that the principal either explicitly or implicitly gave when I was hired.

The obligation was to publicly support the principal's ideas and agendas; any disagreements were to be discussed privately. He told of many things with which he disagreed, but because he had agreed to do this, he was responsible for fulfilling this obligation.

S8: I disagreed with a lot he did, but I felt it was my obligation (and in a sense this is accountability) to do what he wanted me to do, whether I disagreed or not. . . .

I: Is that because you had agreed to that earlier?

S8: Right.

I: And had you not agreed to that earlier, or even known about that, you . . .

S8: Right. Right, but that's my accountability. . . .
I didn't agree with all of it, but because I felt that responsibility... so in that sense I felt accountable to him that whenever I did anything I did not... hopefully I helped his agenda, but I certainly did not interfere with it.

***

He contrasted this to another experience with a different principal. In that situation, the teacher found it easier to support the principal (his accountability obligation) because he agreed with more of what of the principal was trying to accomplish. He said the obligation was based on "loyalty" and professional respect for the principal's goals.

S8: And I felt (again, I guess a loyalty, but I don't know if loyalty is the word) to do those kinds of things that would make her job easier.

I: There was a professional respect for her or her agenda.

S8: Well, true, but as I say there were some things that you would normally not run into.

***

In both instances, the implicit obligation was to support the principal's ability to serve in a leadership position. In this respect, he was assuming responsibility for his actions as it affected the principals' abilities to carry out their responsibilities.

The other secondary teacher (S4), an exceptional education teacher, stated that the focus of the accountability relationship was on the child and curriculum (the I.E.P.). Explicit expectations for performance were discussed, negotiated, and agreed upon by all parties. There was no formal monitoring of performance. He said,
S2: ... we're [writing I.E.P.s] right now in the Spring starting next week. Kids will come in with their parents, and we'll either agree that this skill has been met, and we'll put down something at the next level. It's either agreed upon or not agreed upon. If it's agreed upon, all people in the IEP process sign it, and it's sent to the next teacher whether it be in the same building or in a different building. . . .

I: So in all cases, there's a reciprocal relationship. Not only do others have expectations of you, but you also have expectations of them -- the parents, the administrators, other teachers.

S2: Yes. A lot of people working together for a common cause. Whether there are checks and balances, I don't see them as checks and balances. I just think the focus is the child, and these are the things we can do together.

* * *

He described his relationship with the principal as one where they (teachers and administrators) worked cooperatively in planning and carrying out the demands of the I.E.P.. The teacher was accountable to the principal for his decisions and recommendations regarding student needs and promotion/retention.

S2: Well, [pause]. The focus at this school is behavior. If I'm saying that a particular child needs assistance other than what I can give him, whether that be isolation with a tutor -- individualized tutor, or that particular student needs to be timed-out, we need to come up with some contractual agreement to better serve him in reaching his goals in his IEP. [Administrators] put their faith in me that that's what needs to happen.
If I say a particular student is ready to move on to a satellite program, or if a student is not ready and should remain here at this school or a high school in an SBH setting, then for me that's being accountable. It's an opinion. It's a professional judgment.

***

Administrators also worked with the teacher in securing additional resources, and assisting the teacher in getting parental involvement.

S2: ... Particularly in this school, the parental involvement, whether it be for placement or for disciplinary reasons, the added support of the parent is monumental in getting the kid straightened up. That has to come through the administration. To get a parent in here for those disciplinary reasons usually takes more than simply a phone call from the teacher. I'm on the phone with my kids' parents at least two or three times a week for good and bad stuff. The administration helps facilitate a lot of outside pulling in of resources to keep the focus toward meeting IEP goals.

***

Areas of Responsibility and Obligations

There were two general areas of responsibility for which these twelve teachers were accountable in this view: (A) Curriculum, and (B) Staff Development. As noted in Table 12, eight teachers were accountable for Curriculum, and seven for Staff Development. Areas of responsibility and specific obligations for each are discussed in the following sections.

Area of Responsibility: Curriculum. Eight teachers stated they were accountable to others for curriculum-related decisions: planning
and implementing the district's course of study. In all cases, these teachers work with other faculty, and in one instance (S2) administrators, in planning and implementing curricular offerings in accordance with the school's philosophical orientation. Three (E1, S2, S3) stated they were accountable for establishing and maintaining an agreed upon learning environment, thereby offering students consistent behavioral and disciplinary expectations in all classes.

E1: ... So I was responsible for maintaining an atmosphere that was not conflicting with their atmosphere. I was responsible for maintaining the type of discipline and the type of learning environment that philosophically we all had agreed that we wanted at the school.

S2: Well, [pause]. The focus at this school is behavior. If I'm saying that a particular child needs assistance other than what I can give him, whether that be isolation with a tutor -- individualized tutor, or that particular student needs to be timed-out, we need to come up with some contractual agreement to better serve him in reaching his goals in his IEP.

S3: This also might come from working on a team -- I think that we try to set similar discipline standards, and try to uphold our similar discipline standards and behavior requirements of the students. Try to expect them to act the same in all the classes.

Eight (E1, E2, E3, E4, E6, S2, S3) emphasized accountability for implementing joint decisions regarding curricular emphases and strategies. Decisions pertained to such things as (a) planning topics
around particular themes; (b) coordinating lessons and strategies to avoid redundancy, provide multiple experiences, and reinforce prior learning; (c) determining prerequisite knowledge for subsequent grade and subject areas; (d) communicating individual student progress and needs; and (e) communicating and responding to needs from outside sources. Examples of this planning are illustrated in conversations with four teachers (E1,E2,S2,S3).

E1: [Teacher B] had the high readers upstairs, and she would talk to me about what her kids had done so that it would give me an idea. . . . What we were basically trying not to do was to duplicate. So I would not want to assign kids to read a novel that they already read. Also kids came to me from inside my learning community. A child might be in the middle reading group in the third grade, and in the high reading group in the fourth grade. So his third grade reading teacher in our group would talk to me about the books that they had read. . . .

E2. Yes. And we do meet on a regular basis. The kindergarten teachers meet with the first grade teachers. The first grade teachers meet with the second grade teachers, and so on.

. . . And not just to say, "Here's where we are. Where do we need to go?" But also to make sure there is not too much overlap, more spiraling rather than repeating the same things that they've already done. Changing experiences. You know what often happens is that there's a real catchy lesson that's worked very nicely, people tend to grab it, and everyone wants to do it. [laugh].

***
S2: ... I also feel accountable to the other teachers in this building. We house 6th through 8th grade, though I'm at the upper end. I have mostly 8th graders in the classroom. I pass students on to either [district high school] or to a satellite school or a satellite classroom. I feel that they are receiving a product that I came up with — that I've helped to shape and mold. I give them a blueprint and the next phase of the blueprint.

I: So you're accountable to them for what?

S2: For saying what has been completed or mastered on the IEP has been completed and mastered.

S3: On my team, since it's an informal team -- since we work as a team, we web concepts together. So if we're studying something like energy, we're studying it in all four of the different classes at once. I think I should be accountable to include the concepts that we've decided upon in my curriculum. Whether it's actually stated in my curriculum guide or not, I feel like I need to be able to web whatever we've decided, or include whatever we've decided together, into my classtime.

I: Does that mean whether you agree with them or not?

S3: Yea, it does, because [laugh] I don't always agree with them. But I think I should be accountable to that.

Area of Responsibility: Staff Development. Seven teachers (E1,E4,E9,S3,S4,S8,S9) expressed accountability for Staff Development activities. Obligations included (a) sharing teaching ideas and
strategies; (b) mentoring and supporting others; (c) selecting new faculty; and (d) demonstrating professional behavior. Though it is possible, and highly likely, that some of these obligations, particularly "sharing ideas and strategies," could be integral aspects of curriculum decision-making, these differed from curricular obligations in one major respect. The focus of this obligation was directed to the staff, rather than the curriculum, for the purpose of strengthening professional abilities to provide better curricular opportunities for students.

Four teachers (E1, E4, S4, S9) stated they were accountable to others for sharing teaching ideas and strategies. This meant being available for and receptive to solicitations for assistance and suggestions; sharing materials; and generally serving as a resource to other teachers. One teacher (S4) said he actively sought out ideas by observing activities in other classes. In doing so, he benefitted by (1) gaining new ideas for activities in his classes; (2) becoming familiar with programs in other grade levels and subject areas thereby widening his understanding of the school's total curriculum; and (3) strengthening professional relationships with other faculty. This is exemplified in excerpts from conversations with these teachers (E1, E4, S4, S9).

E1: . . . And we communicated and shared ideas. You know, "This really worked well, you ought to try it. This didn't work at all, but maybe it will work for you. It didn't work for me because it was too hard. It didn't work for me because it was too easy." All those kinds of things.

* * *

E1: . . . And we communicated and shared ideas. You know, "This really worked well, you ought to try it. This didn't work at all, but maybe it will work for you. It didn't work for me because it was too hard. It didn't work for me because it was too easy." All those kinds of things.

* * *
E4: I am accountable to teachers as much as they are open or willing for that dialogue to happen. I mean if a teacher says, "What are you doing in science. How do you teach that? What do you want to do? Show me your tests," I'll sit down and talk to them for three hours. So I'm as accountable to them as they would like me to be. I guess that's how I would say it. If teachers are having trouble with discipline, and I say, "Well, I've used this and that." And they say, "Gosh, how does it work?" I'll talk to them. I'll share it with them. I'll give it to them.

***

S4: I think collegial sharing is one of the most overlooked things in the public school system — that we don't share enough.

. . . [re: first grade teacher] And I go see her teach all the time. I like the first graders a lot, because they do a lot of really special things, and I go see her class all the time.

I: So when you visit these classes, you're doing it mainly for your own personal enrichment or benefit in terms of trying to pick up ideas and methods and content?

S4: And not only that but to see just what's going on down there. You build a strong bond.

***

S9: . . . I'm fortunate, I feel, like in the Business area because we do have three of us in that you can bounce ideas off. If you get stuck the other person can say, "Why don't you try doing it this way," or "Try presenting it this way."
Two teachers (S4, S9) stated an accountability for mentoring other teachers: (a) assisting new teachers in becoming acclimated to the demands of a new environment; and, (b) motivating, encouraging, and assisting teachers experiencing difficulties in fulfilling teaching responsibilities. Viewing teachers as professionals, one teacher (S4) expressed the desirability of professionals helping other professionals with these responsibilities. His statement, however, was framed in idealistic terms with little indication this was actually occurring. He stated,

S4: ... We should be more accountable to each other to not only mentor, but also to share, and not only do those things but sort of prod those who aren't doing their best job.

I: Well, that, then gets into the evaluative activities that you discussed that seemed to be responsibilities of the administration -- the mentoring. You think that through peers that ought to be picked up and part of the responsibilities that one has to another.

S4: Oh, I would think without a doubt. I think professionals should always help professionals. ... If I think there's a good teacher in the system, no matter what they teach whether it's kindergarten through high school, then I try to see them teach at some time during my free period. If they think it's okay, then I'll go see them. And even some of the bad ones -- ones that I think aren't so good.
You know if they ask me for suggestions, I'll be more than happy to offer them.

***

On the other hand, another teacher (S9) described a mentoring situation in which she was directly involved. She was mentored by other teachers in her department when first assigned to her school. Although officially assigned to another teacher who was to serve in a mentoring capacity, she said that teachers in her department proved more helpful, providing useful support, assistance, and tutelage.

S9: ... But if I had not had the help and support of the other teachers in my area when I came in, I don't think I could have survived. The help they gave was tremendous.

The administration had a program where they were appointing like a teacher to a new teacher to help them, but actually that was kind of meaningless because if it didn't really happen it was superficial. And I think in my case it was superficial. But I did have tremendous support from the teachers within my area who really and truly pitched in and really helped me out because I couldn't have survived without their help. I would never have made it. Ever. People who would dig into their files and bring me things and say, "Okay, here, you can do this," or "Why don't you try this?"

***

Three teachers (E9, S8, S9) stated an accountability for supporting other teachers. As indicated earlier, this involved (a) accepting differences in teaching philosophies, (b) resolving conflicts internally, and (c) endorsing the actions of others publicly. They said,
E9: I try to do that. I'm not perfect but I try to support [other teachers]. A professional support is what it is. [W]e are in the same profession and we look at things in different ways, but we don't need to be critical of each other openly. If we have a problem with each other then we need to go to each other and say, "I see it differently. How can we best work out a compromise between the two of us?" And there may not be one, but it's the EFFORT that's made.  

***

S8: Supporting [teachers]. Helping them. And again, sometimes that means in public having to agree with them when maybe I don't personally or professionally. [re: support for principal]  
... Implicitly, he wanted my support on his agenda. He wanted my supporting (I'm sure and I think so) his agenda as to what he wanted the school to be in terms of discipline, academic success, its relationship to the public, public relations, things like that. Those are things we did not talk about, but I could perceive that he wanted a certain... he had his own agenda.  

[re: support for a different principal] I had a woman principal. Had an all male School Board. Male principal at the high school. She was the female principal of the middle school. It was a male dominated administrative team. And what I had to support in (and it was very easy because I agreed with it) was I had to support the middle school concept and the fact that she, as a woman, could handle a predominantly male faculty, predominantly male administration, and be successful at it. This lady had a lot of things to fight besides just your normal discipline problems and curriculum problems. She had the
gender problem to fight. And I felt (again, I guess a loyalty, but I don't know if loyalty is the word) to do those kinds of things that would make her job easier. . . .

. . . I was accountable, that I did everything that she wanted so that she could have that positive, positive kind of position to go back to the schools.

***

S9: So I think we're very supportive within our area. And I would feel, yes, that we're accountable to each other -- not in a formal accountability, but sure, in a sense of helping each other out and supporting each other.

***

One teacher (E1) stated an accountability for selecting new faculty members. Working in teams, the teachers at her school were responsible for selecting new teachers within their teams. Her discussion of this accountability obligation was offered as an illustration of the relationship between "professional responsibility" and "accountability" (lines 1168-1212). She indicated that an individual (or in this case a team of teachers) can be held accountable only for those things which they have responsibility.

She presented an example of a situation in her school where she and other teachers were responsible for selecting a new faculty member. Against the principal's warnings, she and others recommended hiring a substitute who had filled in for a team-member away on maternity leave. The substitute was selected to replace the team-member who had chosen not to return to teaching at the end of her leave. After several months of working together, the team found her unsuitable for the position.
They discovered that her compatibility and success as a substitute was attributable, not to her own abilities, but to the excellent lesson plans left by the teacher on maternity leave. Having been given (and assumed) responsibility for this teacher's selection, the team members were accountable for their decision. It was their responsibility (and accountability) to resolve any problems associated with this, and not the principal's as would have been the case had the principal acted alone in the selection.

E1: . . . So we hired her, we were responsible for having her. We had to deal with it. If she [principal] had hired her, then we would have been constantly going to her office saying, "You know, she's doing this. She's doing that. She's doing the other," because she hired her. But because we hired her, we were responsible. We were accountable for having her there, and for what happened with the kids.

Finally, within the area of Professional Development, one teacher (S3, 732-746) stated an accountability for acting in accord with professional standards of behavior, though she did not specify these behaviors. As a representative of a profession, she emphasized the importance of being cognizant of how her actions might influence perceptions of the profession.
View 3: Contractual Accountability

Ninety-four percent (n=17) of the teachers expressed contractual accountability to audiences at one or more three hierarchical administrative levels: (a) school, (b) district, and (c) state. Contractual accountability is characterized as a formal accountability relationship, whereby (1) responsibilities and obligations are defined through organizational rules, policies, documents, contracts, and student test data; (2) performance is routinely monitored by supervisory personnel, and judged according to explicit and uniform criteria; (3) accountability to audiences at upper levels is communicated through intermediary sources; and (4) there are hierarchical lines of authority and control over decisions affecting teachers' responsibilities. In Table 13, specific audiences and a description of the characteristics of this view are presented.
### Table 13

**Contractual Accountability: Audiences and Characteristics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Audiences</th>
<th>Responsibilities are defined through organizational rules, policies, documents, contracts, and student test data; Performance is routinely monitored by supervisory personnel, and judged according to explicit and uniform criteria; Accountability to audiences at upper levels is communicated through intermediary sources; and, There are hierarchical lines of authority and control over decisions affecting teachers' responsibilities.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>School Level</strong></td>
<td>a. Principal (n=13);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>District Level</strong></td>
<td>a. District Administrators (n=5); b. Superintendent (n=8); c. Local School Board (n=9);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State Level</strong></td>
<td>a. Department of Education (n=4).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Characteristics**

Within the contractual view, teachers expressed accountability to audiences at three hierarchical administrative levels: (a) school, (b) district, and (c) state. Respective audiences at each level were (a) principal (n=13); (b) district administrators (n=5), superintendent (n=8), and local school board (n=9); and (c) State Department of Education (n=4). Expressions of accountability to the State Department were directed to the "Department" as the collective organization rather than to specific individuals.

This view of accountability was characterized as a formal accountability relationship. One teacher referred to this as a "legal"
accountability. Obligations for performance of responsibilities were defined through contracts; organizational rules, policies, and documents; and student test data.

Obligations related to (a) performance, (b) non-performance, and (c) future performance of yet unknown responsibilities. The most common (n=17) expression was with regard to obligations for performance. An example of this type of obligation would be the "to follow district guidelines regarding implementation of the course of study." The obligation was clearly specified, and the standards of performance were explicit to the extent they were detailed in policy guidelines.

Obligations for non-performance were less specific with regard to standards of performance. The teacher was obligated to perform, but standards of performance were discussed in terms of what not to do, or what to avoid doing. As addressed by four teachers (E1, S5, S6, S8), obligations for non-performance related to issues of morality, use of professional judgment, and grading policies. No criteria for appropriate or acceptable performance were given. Instead, they spoke of this in terms of inappropriate behavior and their obligation to refrain from engaging in certain behaviors or performing certain acts. Inappropriate behavior or acts were immoral acts, indiscretions, incompetence, and assignment of too many "failing" grades. This is exemplified in excerpts from conversations with two teachers (S5, S8).

S5: Well, I'm sure there's something in our contract that says we do X, Y, and Z. You know it's been a long time since I looked at it. I've been teaching so long.

Like for instance, I'm sure that there's some unwritten law there that
X-number of kids can't flunk your class.

***

S8: I am accountable to the School Board to follow the guidelines that they have formally given me in terms of morality; use of my professional judgment, professional skills to the benefit of the school system. I see that as a very formal agreement.

I: So you have guidelines on morality and professional judgment?

S8: Yes. In our contracts.

I: Do you? On morality? An example would be what?

S8: Well, they don't give you examples. See they leave that...

I: Could you give me an example?

S8: ... Oh, well, uhm, morality is... obviously, if you're a coach you're not sleeping with one of your athletes...

I: Can you be held accountable for that if you're not...

S8: Well, the morality is easy. It's easy to prove an indiscretion [immorality]...

... The other [use of professional judgment] is incompetence, and it's much harder to show incompetence than it is immorality. The documentation to dismiss a teacher because of incompetence has to be extremely complete.

***

Only one teacher (S8) stated he was contractually obligated for performance of yet unspecified responsibilities which the School Board may assign to him at a future date. He referred to these as "general
things [contained in the contractual clause] 'subject to whatever provisions the School Board shall in the future decide'" (S8, 1439-42), and gave examples such as (a) a new teaching assignment to a different school, grade level, or subject area (areas in which he has certification) depending on the district's staffing needs; or (b) assignment of extra duties such as maintaining the school's computer systems and software.

As exemplified in the previous excerpts, four teachers (E5, S3, S5, S8) spoke of how their responsibilities and accountability obligations were defined through the teaching contract. Others spoke of organizational documents and policies as the basis for determining their responsibilities. Eight teachers (S3, S4, S6, E3, E4, E5, E7, E8) cited the district's graded course of study as the document containing organizational expectations for curricular content in a specific grade and subject area. They stated they were contractually accountable for covering this content. Seen as a guideline, a framework, teachers spoke of the professional latitude they have in interpreting this document, thus influencing that for which they are accountable. One teacher said,

E7: . . . We have a curriculum guide for every course of study. The goals and objectives for each grade level are set forth. There are different ways we can interpret those, but we have general goals to meet for each subject area.

* * *

Another teacher, who was less certain about whether this professional latitude was actually granted by the district, described specific ways
she is able to influence what she is accountable for by determining the
depth and thoroughness with which she addresses topics. She stated,

E3: I can take my Graded Course of 298
  Study and choose areas that I feel 299
  are significant, and put more 300
  emphasis on those -- how much time I 301
  teach them; how much importance I 302
  place on them; whether I treat them 303
  as like, "Well, you need to know this 304
  so, Galileo was an astronomer, so now 305
  let's move on." Or do we really 306
  study Galileo? I mean I can take 307
  them with a boom, "here's what you 308
  should know," or I can put more or 309
  less importance on what's in there. 310

I: And that [way of influencing
  the curriculum] is okay with you? 312

E3: I'm not sure it's okay with the 314
  school system. It's fine with me. 315

**

Other documents and policies mentioned as recently and greatly
influencing the teacher's responsibilities were those related to State
legislated Competency Based Education (CBE) requirements in the subject
areas of reading, mathematics, and language arts. This issue arose only
in discussions with elementary teachers and the only secondary
mathematics teacher participating in this study. As one teacher pointed
out, "some [teachers] are held more accountable than others" (E8, 428-
46) because only certain subjects are targeted in these requirements.

Eight teachers (E1,E2,E4,E5,E6,E7,E8,S8) discussed the CBE
requirements at great length. Their concerns varied, focussing on the
appropriateness of the (a) identified pupil performance objectives, (b)
suggested methods of instruction, or (c) methods used for measuring and
reporting student competency. Six (E1,E4,E5,E6,E7,E8) have drastically
changed their content and/or methods of instruction in order to meet the
demands of this requirement. Two (E2, S8) have chosen not to alter their instructional programs and to continue as they have in the past.

Decisions to change or continue past practices were defended with arguments related to test scores. If students performed well, then this was justification for continuing past practices. If there was a perceived possibility that students would not perform adequately, then instructional routines were changed. As such, student test data were viewed as mitigating factors in the determination of responsibilities and accountability obligations. First, the views of those who were changing practices are presented.

Two teachers (E1, E6), from a school that offered a highly individualized instructional program structured for the student's ability level rather than grade level, discussed how the CBE requirements were antithetical to their basic philosophical approach to education. In the past a student was taught at his/her ability level, rather than their assigned grade level. For example, a student may be working at a second [grade] level and officially designated a fourth grade student. In this school he/she would be provided instruction at the second level. A reverse situation may also occur wherein a child is working at a higher level than their assigned grade level. Because students were required to take CBE tests for their assigned grade level, these teachers were now having to teach students at their assigned grade (rather than ability level) using the assigned textbooks and graded course of study. This did not pose much of a problem with students working at levels higher than their grade level, but it caused great concern when students did not have prerequisite abilities to succeed at
levels higher than their ability level. This is described in the following excerpt:

E6: According to the way our school [name of school] does things, my children are in a particular group [second level]. It's not going to do you any good to teach the children 3rd Level objectives when they don't know 2nd Level. They can't read a 4th level book if they can't read a second level book. If they can't read the words, they can't get any of the concepts. I have to get them other books and use other ways of teaching. We do a lot in our program with that. We use literature and trade books. We pull in all kinds of things. I read to them -- that type of thing. . . .

I am being given [CBE] tests at their grade [3rd,4th] level to have them take instead of their ability level. . . . we have [CBE] tests that are to be given after each part of the Course of Study is taught in math, language arts, and in reading. They all deal with books that the system uses -- that the system has adopted. In our school, we don't use just the adopted texts. We use many trade books in Reading. We have not been told that we have to use them all, but yet we have been told we do have to give the tests that go with them. So even if I'm not using the [district adopted] reading book that the system is using, I have to make sure that whatever I do I watch the Course of Study (or whatever) and that I have to get in the concepts because my children will definitely take this test that goes with the book, even if the children are not at that particular level. ***
A sixth grade language arts and reading teacher (E8) described how the method of measuring student competency in writing was influencing how she taught writing. She was required to grade student writing using a scoring rubric which contained a list of discrete composition skills (i.e., punctuation, spelling, grammar, etc.) and guidelines for assigning point values on each skill. This method of analyzing independent components of writing was antithetical to the more holistic method she had used in the past. She was also concerned that the rubric addressed a wide range of skills, many of which she thought were too ambitious and unrealistic for inclusion in the sixth grade curriculum. She stated,

E8: I do my writing more holistic than those kinds of things. We'll work on things, but I build on each thing. So, by the end of the year, if I can get my kids to write in paragraphs, have good topic sentences, not write fragments, not write run-ons -- that's like a major achievement at the sixth grade level.

The kids look at [the report] and they see, "Oh, wow. I got 8's on this." and those are the things that we really concentrate on. But then, these other areas, they're like getting 4's and 5's and that... it's helpful to me, but it's too much to teach in the scope of a year, and to have the kids really achieve in all those levels.

Another elementary teacher (E4) spoke of how the teaching-testing regimen of the CBE program was influencing how he approached teaching mathematics, specifically in introducing and reviewing concepts. In order to cover objectives in the time frame and sequence suggested, he
was having to abandon his more "holistic" approach to teaching new math concepts. Before, he would introduce a new skill and then review all previous skills to give students a sense of how math skills build upon one another and are incorporated into more complex skills. He said, "I feel like I'm not doing as well as I could do as a teacher. I think I could teach them more effectively if I wasn't under these restraints" (E4, 513-17). In describing how the program was creating difficulties for him, he said,

E4: I'm having some problems... now through the Competency Based Education Program. Because they are now giving me tests on every chapter. They being [district name] via the State legislature. I teach a chapter on multiplication. They hand me a test. My kids have to take that test. If they don't fair well on that test, I have to reteach until they can do well on that test, and then I go on to the next chapter. And I have to do that. I don't like. That infringes on the way I would approach math if I had my druthers.

[An example is] I used to teach addition, subtraction, multiplication, and division, all the review stuff real early -- sort of almost all together as a lump, because they had it all in fourth grade. Then let's pick up a little new, and sort of review it all. Then let's pick up a little new, and sort of review it all. And I found much better success that way, because the kids maintained and retained more of what they were doing. That's not the way textbooks are written in math. And now that the CBE is giving these chapter tests, I have to teach math:

Adding. Take that test. Pass that test. Chapter 2 or Chapter 11, or whatever it is: subtraction. Take
that test. I can’t stop and dip back and teach them all at once and do all this, because then when I have to give that test, you see my kids aren’t going to be prepared for it.

***

One elementary teacher (E7), who was generally satisfied with her students' overall performance on standardized competency tests, but nonetheless cognizant of external pressure placed on her principal for better scores, discussed the changes in instruction she has made to prepare students for the rigors of test administration. She was spending time “practice testing” in order to teach students how to take standardized exams so that they would become “test wise.” She stated,

E7: This year we even did practice testing, and we went to a lot of extremes to make sure the kids were test-wise. We found that there can be a lot of variables that can interfere with their scores.

I: Is this something you’ve done as a result of having to implement competency testing? Are you spending more time focusing on the test?

E7: Yes. I have this year, even though I did not spend as much time as many people did because I really don’t... I really felt like I was taking away from my actual teaching. So I did some prepping with them just to make them more comfortable with test taking, because these are children 8 to 10 years old who can’t sit still for the long periods of time it takes. Some of these tests are up to fifty minutes at a time where they’re not allowed to get up out of their seat and they must be quiet. So we needed to practice using an answer sheet, and... you know, just reading questions for content a little more carefully, and things like that. So we did some
practice testing before the actual test. Of course, we didn't know what the test questions would be. You had to make things up. We did have some sample answer sheets to use.

***

And finally, an elementary teacher (E5) discussed how her responsibilities as a professional development teacher were changing as a result of the CBE requirements. She will be directing her efforts toward helping other teachers in her school learn to use the results of CBE tests to individualize instruction. Though she thought there was merit to the notion of pupil-performance testing as a way of documenting student progress, she had serious concerns about the program. She was concerned that the program was overly aligned to textbooks. "I think it's totally ridiculous to base those objectives on what may or may not be in a set of textbooks" (E5, 1100-03). She found that teachers were relying completely on the text as a means for providing instruction and were rushing through instruction to cover all material within specified timelines. She said, "I'm just really tired of seeing teachers starting at the beginning of the textbook, and think they have to get through the textbook, and think that means they have taught the kids what they need to know, because that's not what teaching is" (E5, 1236-43).

Two teachers (E2, S8) presented their views and opinions of the competency based education requirements, but stated they would continue implementing their curricular programs as they have in the past. An elementary teacher (E2) spoke of how testing separate subject area skills (via CBE testing) was working against what she and others at her
school had tried for so long to overcome. They have been using an "integrated" approach to teaching -- blending subject areas around thematic issues. Testing students on pupil performance objectives in separate subject areas (mathematics and reading) was viewed as "breaking-up" an integrated program. She planned to continue using an integrated approach, however, and would test students periodically as requested, making certain she addressed pupil performance objectives identified for testing in her instructional plans. Her decision to continue in this way was supported by parents and her administrator. As she said, "I honestly don't concern myself with it because my kids have been successful anyway" (E2, 375-78); her students "test well" (E2, 932). She stated that she feels caught in the middle of a "crossfire" between opposing factions: a research community advocating integrated approaches to education, and administrative and legislative groups advocating competency testing.

E2: My concern is, you know, being back in school and going through school and going back to graduate school and reading even more about an integrated education and not objectifying things, especially at the elementary level, and just reading research that has shown that children are successful with that kind of education, and are able to retain more when they're not expected to memorize facts, and they're just learning about general things and able to experience it, and writing across the curriculum, writing about their feelings, reading and not worrying about if everything's spelled right or those kinds of things. And then to have powers-to-be come down and say they're going to have to pass this grammar test. They do have to
spell these words correctly. My concern is that they’re not listening to each other. And I as a classroom teacher really feel like I’m in the middle, and even more, that the children are caught in the crossfire because here’s what has been shown to be successful and what they’re asking for is the antithesis of that.

***

The secondary mathematics teacher (S8) discussed the CBE program, but denied emphatically any accountability for teaching the program. He stated that he selected his content from the course of study, but used a different text and different method than the recommended district program. His reasons for not teaching the program were twofold. First, he said his students’ end-of-year standardized test scores were the highest in his school. His method of instruction was more effective, as demonstrated through student test data, than the recommended method presented in the text used in the CBE program. His principal was pleased with the data, and this was seen as endorsement for continuing his teaching practices as such. Recognizing the importance of high test scores to the principal, he further stated that he intends to use the data as “leverage” in negotiating other responsibilities.

I: What if your principal expects you to do this? S8: He doesn’t, because he sees this number at the end of the year. And if I take my number out of the school, the entire school drops a huge amount.

I: Which goes back to what you’re going to use as leverage. S8: Right. See, if the whole school is at 46%, and I’m at 85%, and there are seven seventh grade classes, pull
an 85% out and see where your scores go. I have never had a principal say anything to me.

***

Second, he did not think that the district had the students' best educational interest in mind in its decision to implement this program. In his opinion, it was implemented for the purpose of satisfying an institutional accountability requirement to the State Department of Education, not because it had been demonstrated to be an effective way of teaching. As long as his students' scores exceeded school averages, he would continue as he has. He said,

S8: I don't feel the accountability to the Math Department, because I don't feel that their interest is even faintly with the students. It's strictly . . . their interest is in meeting State guidelines, and all these other things.

***

Another characteristic of the contractual view is that performance of responsibilities is routinely monitored by supervisory personnel, and judged according to explicit and uniform criteria. Thirteen teachers expressing this view of accountability, identified their principal as the "administrator" occupying the supervisory position to whom they were responsible, and therefore accountable, for fulfillment of contractual responsibilities. In this position, the principal monitored and evaluated their performance, and was responsible for recommending renewal of teaching contracts. Two teachers (E5, S9) cited other administrators in superordinate positions with whom they worked, but did
not discuss how or to what extent, if any, they were involved in evaluating the teacher’s performance.

Various methods for monitoring and evaluating performance were mentioned. These included (a) formal classroom observations conducted at various times throughout the year; (b) administrative review of lesson plans; and (c) student testing programs. The first two methods were used by administrators at the school level; the latter method was used at the district and state levels. Explicit and uniform criteria were used to judge performance. Each is discussed separately.

a. Classroom Observations. Six teachers ($S_1, S_3, E_2, E_4, E_7, E_8$) discussed formal classroom observations as a method used by administrators to evaluate performance of teaching responsibilities. Four of these teachers ($S_1, S_3, E_2, E_7$) indicated that the criteria generally reflected the nature of teaching activities, and discussed this as an acceptable means for communicating their accountability. This is exemplified in conversations with two teachers ($E_7, E_2$).

E7: A lot of times, there just isn’t time 502 for [principals] to go about checking up. 503 There are other things that they look 504 at, which I suppose from the 505 information -- from just observation, 506 they can see if you’re . . . . They 507 have a checklist of things when they 508 come in to observe sometimes. We 509 also have a staff development teacher 510 who observes us at times. We’re 511 observed . . . . I’m not up -- I 512 haven’t been up for contract for a 513 while, but I’m still observed 514 "officially" twice a year. 515

I: Does that checklist reflect the 517 nature of what you do? 518

E7: Oh, most of time, yes. But there 520 are times when there are things on 521
there that I think are kind of, you know, "What does this have to do with me as a teacher?" But that's just my opinion. 

***

E2: See before testing, we basically just had the principal coming in and evaluating us, watching our performance. 

... What I'm talking about -- seeing that we're doing what we're supposed to be doing -- the principal came in and would observe and would write up his evaluation, so...

***

Two (E4, E8) held very different opinions regarding the usefulness and relevance of this method for communicating accountability. They expressed dissatisfaction with the way formal observations have been conducted in the past. The process served no purpose in providing information to the principal or others about the quality of the teacher's performance, nor did it result in recognition or constructive criticism of the teacher's skills and abilities. For one teacher, it was simply a symbolic ritual. The "easiest way to summarize [principal observations] is it is a joke. ... [W]hat it basically amounted to is you get S's [satisfactory] in every category unless you were a total moron and couldn't even speak a sentence. And they never gave 0's [outstanding] because the administrator basically said, 'We just want everybody to be evaluated on the same levels' ... It didn't mean anything. I could have been doing piddly-poor or fantastic" (E4, 1298-367).

As for the other teacher (E8), her most recent observation of performance was falsified by the principal. In her opinion, the
principal was negligent in carrying out his supervisory responsibility, and provided no opportunities for her to demonstrate accountability for her responsibilities.

E8: Well, I think if a principal was really supervising the staff, there would be no need for all this stuff. The problem is most principals don't supervise their staff. If a principal really knew what was going on inside each classroom, and was really working with those teachers -- knowing that they wrote legitimate lesson plans, knowing that they were actually teaching -- I don't think we'd be in this situation.

b. Review of Lesson Plans. One teacher (S6) identified "lesson plan review" as a method of demonstrating accountability for performance of contractual obligations. In his school, teachers were required to submit lesson plans to the principal on a weekly basis. Though the administrative purpose of this was to monitor the appropriateness of subject content and its relatedness to the course of study, this teacher viewed it as a way of communicating his accountability. He had serious doubts, however, about whether this information was actually reviewed. Except for a brief time prior to a state evaluation visit, he did not believe lesson plans were reviewed by the principal or any other administrative personnel because he never received acknowledgement or feedback from the principal about the quality or adequacy of his lessons. He said,

S6: We had to submit them to the office. In the three years that I taught in this particular school, I never had knowledge of my lesson plans being checked.
. . .We took them into the office.  
We had a shelf in a cupboard where  
every teacher in the school had their  
own binder. We just had to put them  
in there. We put them in ourselves.  
So that's why I question whether or  
not anything's checked.  

And in the three years I never had an  
administrator or, for example, the  
head of our science department come  
to me and question something that was  
in my lesson plan or, you know, on  
the other hand, compliment me on  
something that was in my lesson plan.  
That's why I really question how  
closely that was monitored.  

***

c. Student Testing Programs. Fourteen (E1,E2,E3,E4,E5,E6,E7,E8,  
S1,S4,S5,S7,S8,S9) of the seventeen teachers expressing this view of  
accountability identified student testing (CBE and statewide testing) as  
a method used by the district or state to monitor and evaluate  
performance. Although opinions varied about whose performance (school,  
teacher, or student) was actually monitored through the use of student  
test data, most (n=10) believed that ultimately it was the teacher's  
performance. Three (E6,E7,E8) indicated that this was used to monitor  
school performance, and one (S7) believed that test data was used to  
monitor student performance. With only one exception (S7), they stated  
that student test data directly influenced how teaching performance  
(individually or collectively at the school level) was perceived. This  
is exemplified in excerpts from conversations with five teachers (E3,E4,  
E5,S8,S9):

E3: So my children are tested to  
see whether I've taught what the  
school system holds me accountable  
for. So I'm accountable in that way.
E4: Well initially, I take it from the teacher's standpoint. When I think, "Are we teachers going to be accountable for what we teach?" And to my mind that sort of means a scenario of "I have to teach certain things, and I'm going to be held responsible for that through some kind of a testing mechanism with my kids."

***

I: Are you, or other teachers, being evaluated now based on test scores or how much students have learned?

E5: I'm not personally, but for the teachers in this building, the administrator looks at the computer printouts and looks at like a class matrix and sees what percentages they're receiving on the tests.

I: Is that part of the evaluation though?

E5: I think it influences her opinion of their performance here. Now she may look at those same results and look at the kids that are coming to me for group and see what their scores are too. I don't know if she does that. She's never told me that.

***

S8: Professional education now is being forced to look at its . . . to look at accountability in terms of numbers. You're aware of the testing things that are going on around in Ohio. Many teachers, many educators have been pulled into the numbers game where you want to have so many people get 75% or 80% or whatever.

I: Briefly, do you have an idea of why they have been pulled into it?

S8: Because many teachers feel that is going to effect their rehiring ability; their money; you know, whether or not it's merit or something; whether it...
will effect their autonomy as teachers. They're looking at it as being an influence on them.

***

I: Is [test data] part of your evaluation as a teacher?

S9: I feel it is. Now, whether the administration would say to you that it is or not, but I would feel, yes. Because I would feel that if my students scored poorly consistently that the administration would be looking to find out what the reason was.

***

Those (E6, E8) who felt school performance was monitored and evaluated through the use of student test data expressed concern about the potential personal ramifications of working in a school identified as "deficient" based on low test data. They said,

E6: . . . if you look at the test results, the public is only seeing the result of a test. And they are holding teachers, school systems responsible. State legislatures are saying . . . I don't know if they want to make it a law, or what, but we've heard through [local education association] and OEA that there's a new legislative report that they want to make school districts who have -- say a school district whose overall grades are low, or a certain school is low -- they want to hold that school responsible. They want to stifle a teacher's tenure.

***

E8: . . . but what if I'm judged as deficient because my test scores aren't where I'm supposed to be and they suspend my certificate and I'm out of the profession or whatever?
Teachers had much to say about the issue of statewide testing. These views are discussed at length immediately following this presentation of contractual accountability characteristics.

This leads to the third characteristic of contractual accountability: accountability to audiences at upper levels (i.e., local school board, superintendent, State DOE) is communicated through intermediary sources. Sources may be individuals (i.e., principal) or mechanisms (i.e., student test data, principal observations, lesson plan review).

Many expressed an "indirect" form of accountability to audiences at the district level. Accountability for performance of specific responsibilities was mediated through the principal. That is, the expression was directed to specific audiences for performance of particular responsibilities, but performance was monitored by the principal. Nine teachers were accountable to the local school board, six of whom expressed this indirectly through their principal. Eight were accountable to the superintendent with most (n=5) expressing it through the principal; and even fewer (n=5) expressed accountability to district administrators with two expressing it indirectly through the principal. Only four teachers expressed accountability to the State Department of Education, none of whom indicated that their accountability was mediated through the principal.

For those who expressed an "indirect" form of accountability, their accountability for performance of contractual obligations was communicated through the principal via formal evaluation methods conducted at the school level (i.e., principal observations, lesson plan
review, review of test data). For those expressing a more direct form, accountability for performance was communicated through student testing programs (CBE or statewide testing). In all cases, communication traveled through a chain of command — the fourth and final characteristic of this view.

Within this view there are hierarchical lines of authority and control over decisions affecting teachers' responsibilities. There was a recognized chain of command beginning with the principal (position of least authority and control) moving to the superintendent, the school board, and finally to the State Department of Education (positions of highest authority and control). Authority and control over decisions affecting teachers' responsibilities were held by individuals occupying higher level positions.

Communication moved up, but not always down a chain of command. For the teacher, communication began with the principal: the most immediate administrative position to the teacher, "the most direct line" (S1, 1214-15) to administrators at upper levels. Few discussed having any direct communication with the superintendent, local school board members, or DOE officials. Exceptions to this were two teachers (S1,S4) who worked in a very small district; and the vocational education teacher (S9) who worked with State Department vocational education administrators. One teacher (E1), in describing hierarchical lines of authority and control, used the analogy of a tree. She said,

E1: [laugh] How am I accountable to them [school board]? [laugh]
You know it's kind of
like a tree. I'm the branch at the
end, and it just goes down and
there's the principal, and it goes
Accountability to audiences at higher levels was expressed through the principal or test data. In this way, information moved up a chain of command. However, as expressed by six teachers (S9, E2, E3, E5, E6, E8), communication regarding decisions made at upper levels did not always move down the chain of command to the teacher. Decisions made at the highest level (DOE) were those which caused the greatest concern. Much was unknown to these teachers about the rationales, purposes, and future uses of information regarding newly created accountability programs. The information they had was based on speculation and hearsay. Even the
vocational education teacher (S9) who had been involved in accountability testing of vocational students for some years, stated she did not know the State's purpose in implementing vocational testing.

She said,

S9: As I said, the fact that
the State takes these scores and
looks at them; keeps them; monitors
it; does the grading; precisely what
the State would do for a school whose
scores were bad consistently, I don't
know. But I don't see any reason for
them to have them if there isn't some
type of . . .

I: There's no assistance. There's no
reward. There's no recognition. You
don't see anything being done with
these scores?

S9: No, whether it's simply a measure
that they're using, I don't know.
However, they are the people who
monitor it; who keep the scores; who
do all of this.

***

Two teachers (E5,E6) were uncertain about the future use of competency based education test data. Though this was a new program created in response to state mandates, they were interested in knowing how and for what purpose the data would be used. They said,

E5: Because [points to computer
terminal next to wall] or that wall
right there, there's a hook-up. And
in September all of our big computers
that I'm in charge of that keep the
management system for the whole
building, are going to be networked
to downtown. Then they're going to
have access to these test scores, and
you know, I'd like to know what
they're going to do with them.
[laugh]

***
I: What happens with these tests once they're reported downtown?

E6: They are put into the computer with the teacher's name, school name. All that goes into it. It is so new, I'm not sure what they're going to do with it.

***

Several teachers (E6,E8) were concerned about the future use of statewide test data. They indicated they had heard through educational associations that the Department of Education and state legislature were considering using student test data to identify low-scoring, "deficient" schools; and sanctions would possibly be imposed (i.e., restaff school, suspend teaching certificates) if schools were identified as deficient over a number of years. As one teacher (E8) said,

E8: Well, they [DOE] haven't defined how they're going to determine whether or not a school is deficient, but from the literature it sounds like it's going to be test scores. And if your school is deficient for four years, they can suspend certificates and fire the staff within the school and completely restaff the school, and all kinds of things. I mean, I can't imagine this is going to get through the State legislature, but this is the way they're thinking.

***

Two others (E2,E3) expressed frustration over not knowing rationales underlying decisions regarding competency based education programs or statewide testing. One (E2) stated she did not know what information was used to make such legislative decisions, but she was certain that decisions were not grounded in a classroom perspective. Frustrated about the lack of communication between decision makers and teachers, she spoke of an instance when information regarding ways to
support education was solicited from a senator. In response to his solicitation, she invited him to her school so that he might experience classroom life from the teacher's perspective. The senator never responded to the teacher's invitation. She said,

E2: And I don't know how to resolve it. I really don't. We got a letter not too long ago from our Senator and he wanted us to write some ideas -- I don't even remember how he worded it -- how can he help in education. Send him a letter telling how he can help us. And I said -- I wrote him, and I told him, "Come out to the school. See what we're doing. See what's happening."

I: Did he do it?

E: No. Nope, he didn't. These people don't go to the school. They don't come out. They just make these decisions. And I'd like to know where they get their basis for deciding these things. I really would, because I don't know that. I honestly haven't done enough research to know the answer to that. Because they obviously are not seeded in the classroom situation. They're not coming from that perspective.

***

Finally, another elementary teacher (E3) stated she was frustrated because she did not know how or on what basis the State determined what constituted important and worthwhile knowledge for students to learn. In her opinion, the State was now involved in determining the content of instruction as evidenced through concepts measured on statewide proficiency tests, and she did not understand the rationale underlying selection of the knowledge tested. She said,

E3: The State has just taken a big jump into what children must know.
mean ninth graders have tests now before they can graduate from high school. Well, the testing starts in the fourth grade. And it's like, if they don't pass the ninth grade test, it's our fault. We didn't teach them who George Washington was. But I mean really, the State has put a lot of emphasis on "kids must know this, and to graduate they need to know this." The testing program is very structured. And we can teach all that, and we do. But I don't know who has decided what's important for our children to learn to pass the ninth grade test. So we'll teach them those facts. Our children will learn it. And they'll be reinforced all the way through, and so for the ninth grade test the kids will be better and better at passing it. But I don't know who, in the State Department of Education, is making these questions, and why they think certain questions are more important than others. I don't understand what they're doing. I know I'm accountable for making the kids be able to do it. And I am able to do it. But I don't understand the rationale behind it, and that's frustrating.

** Issues in Statewide Testing

Fourteen teachers addressed the issue of statewide testing (ability, achievement, vocational, and/or proficiency). Nine (E2,E3, E5,E6,E7,E8,E9,S1,S7), most of whom were elementary teachers, were strongly opposed to statewide testing. Two others (S4,S6) were not opposed to testing, per se, but had serious doubts whether statewide testing was an appropriate means of monitoring accountability. One (S4) said, "I guess testing is important, but I don't know how to measure accountability in testing. I don't know if anybody does . . . we need
to do a lot more work as investigators into testing methods" (S4, 1157-65). And the other teacher (S6) said, "I think to an extent [testing] can address accountability, but I just get the impression that it's being used in the wrong sense by the people who look at the results" (S6, 1429-33).

Two (S3,S5) stated they were not familiar with tests, but believed that test results were important to the community (S3), or useful for motivating students to learn (S5). Referring to the ninth grade proficiency test, one teacher (S3) said, "I haven't looked at the test... I just think we have a very educated population here that places a high value on education, and it's [test results] important to them. So I don't know" (S3, 1324-39). The other teacher said,

S5: I haven't seen the test, so I can't say I don't have any problem with it. I don't see anything wrong with the idea of it. I think it's good that the kids know that they're going to be tested so maybe they'll be a little bit more worried about learning. That will be in the back of their minds. This is the first year for it, and I haven't seen the fallout.

* * *

And finally, one (S9) was not opposed to statewide (vocational) testing, but as mentioned earlier, did not know what purpose it served.

Of those who were opposed to statewide testing (E2,E3,E5,E6,E7, E8,E9,S1,S7), arguments focussed on the (a) validity of test data as representative of student or teacher performance, and (b) use and implications of comparing performance. Each of these arguments is discussed separately.
a. Validity of test data: student performance. Four teachers (E6,E7,E9,S7) were concerned about the validity of test data as representative of student performance. At best, test results only represented partial information about student performance. One teacher (E9) said that a test score is not "a good indicator at all [of student performance] because it doesn't look at the whole child" (E9, 540-41). Concerned with the public receiving only partial information when test scores were publicized, another teacher (E6) said, "[T]he only thing that's being shown in testing is how a child did on a piece of paper for that particular day. This is not telling the public that that child comes into your classroom and has a fit everyday, throws chairs across the room, or could care less about being in your classroom" (E6, 888-95); and scores don't reflect "how many of those children . . . have at-risk I.Q.s" (E6, 1056-57).

She (E6) also found that a negative consequence of basing policy decisions on test scores (which reflected only partial information) was that her judgment was discounted in favor of a single test score. When recommending students for special assistance, she found that the district placed more value and credence on a single test score than the teacher's judgment and recommendations. She said,

E6: . . . And I had a child this year who did not qualify to go with the special tutor because he guessed well on the test. From my observations, from all the observations of anything he's done, all his academic work, everything, the child is probably the lowest in my entire reading group.  

I: What about your opinion of this child?
E6: Does not count. 1107

I: No weight? 1109

E6: No weight whatsoever. No, not at this time. The teacher that we have that is the tutor, has to go by the guidelines of the school district, and at this point in time, they're using the standardized tests as the guideline. I think it's the fourteenth (I don't want to say for sure because I'm not sure about the percentiles), but she can only take those that are within this and this range on that test. What I say, what any of the other teachers say, what his grade card says, what his I.Q. is, none of that has anything to do with it. It's what he did on that piece of paper.

***

Two others (E7,S7) questioned test scores as valid indicators of student performance, because they found that extraneous variables influenced performance, such as student (a) test anxiety and (b) familiarity with test terminology and administration routines. As one (S7) said, "So I don't know whether a standardized test measures anything specifically" (S7, 1683-85). Giving a more detailed account, the other teacher (E7) explained,

E7: . . . I mean I looked at the scores, and I stuck them in their folders, and I forgot about it because I didn't put that much importance on a fragmented test like that. . . .

Myself, I don't think the tests are that valid. That's my personal opinion. . . .

There were a lot of difficult things on there. The way they're presented is sometimes ambiguous. Maybe the
wording is different from what the kids are used to hearing something, or use terminologies a little bit different than their math book, or my terminology. Some of those things can interfere. That's why I don't feel like the test should be that important. I'm not sure they're valid tests.

I: In terms of reflecting what the students really know?

E7: Yes. Or what they've been taught at that point in time. And of course, they put things on the test which are more difficult than what a fourth grader should know just to see if they can score above fourth grade level. The kids do get test-anxious. There are all kinds of little things that can interfere with the test-taking process. It's very hard to control everything.

***

a. Validity of test data: teaching performance. Finally, one teacher (E2) did not think that test scores were a valid indicator of teaching performance. She believed that the public was receiving an inaccurate view of teaching from test data, and the erroneous message was "that better test scores supposedly mean better teaching" (E2, 236-7).

b. Use and implications. Seven teachers (E2,E3,E5,E6,E8,E9,S1) were concerned about the (1) "fairness" of comparing performance among schools with different student populations and economic resources, and (2) implications of attaching sanctions for low performance. For these teachers, scores were more a reflection of economic and social differences among students than quality of educational experiences. To
use scores to compare and judge performance was unfair to the student, teacher, and school. As one teacher said,

E2: And I'm saying it's not right to judge our school which is 100% lottery -- people choose to go there, so historically our test scores are a little bit higher -- against a school where I came from which was 90% free-lunch. You know, very low socio-economic, 99% black, very different environment from where I am now, and to put those test scores against our test scores -- it's not right. It's not right. It's not right to say the teachers at that school are not successful. I spent ten years there. I worked very hard there. They're working with an entirely different population. We have people who want their children to succeed. They've chosen this school for them. There is a support there. We have conferences. I have 90% of my parents come in for conferences. I would fight at the other school to get 10% to come in.

... You can't expect an [upper socio-economic level school] and an urban city, you know, right in the middle of the city surrounded by crack houses, fourth grade to be performing the same way. They're not bringing the same thing to school with them everyday.

... You know I had children in first grade at the other place that never had a crayon in their hand. They had never been read to. You know, children who had watched their parents -- mother kill their father and things like that. You can't compare those situations.

***

Six elementary teachers (E2,E3,E5,E6,E8,E9) cited three potential negative consequences of placing emphasis on test scores without regard
for differences in student populations. First, teachers would be encouraged to teach to the test (E2,E3). One (E3) said, "I think the schools that come off the lowest, then are encouraged to teach solely to the test and nothing else" (E3, 743-5). The other (E2) also said, "What's going to happen is people are going to start teaching to the test" (E2, 277-79).

A second potential consequence was that teachers were not going to want to teach low-achieving students (E5,E8). With the possibility that teacher employability would be linked directly to student test data, one teacher said her first reaction to that was, "God, I'd have to get out of my current school before it's judged deficient and I lose my job" (E8, 1307-10). She further stated that the students would be the ones to suffer because the low-achieving students "are the ones that really need good teachers" (E8, 1316-17). This sentiment was reiterated by the other teacher (E5) who said,

E5: But I just really fear that it will get to a point where teachers won't want to take low kids because they're going to feel that somehow they're going to be measured differently because the kids aren't progressing the same. And yet, we have this culture of drug children that are coming to us. [E5's district], our children that are at risk. the numbers just keep becoming larger and larger, and we're going to have to learn how to face the needs of those kids. I don't want to see people walking away from those kids and not really wanting to work with them, and being afraid to work with them because they think they're going to lose their job.

* ***
Finally, four teachers (E2, E5, E6, E9) feared that students would be the ones to suffer most when emphasis was placed on standardizing testing. They said they feared this would lead to standardized expectations for performance without regard for social, economic, and developmental differences among children. The end result would be that all students would be expected to learn all things equally well and at the same rate. To these teachers, this expectation was naive and unrealistic. As one teacher (E5) said,

E5: . . . I just never want see some forced standard that all children are expected to start out here in the third grade and they have to be here by the end of third grade. I don't think people are like that. You know, it goes back to the thing that I've always heard, "You would not expect every nine year old to wear the same size shoe," and yet we do the very same things to their minds. To me, that's ridiculous. It's not going to happen.

***

Areas of Responsibility and Obligations

Within this view, the seventeen teachers expressed accountability to five audiences: (1) principal, (2) district administrators, (3) superintendent, (4) local school board, and (5) State Department of Education. Areas of responsibility and accountability obligations to each are discussed separately.

School Level: Principal

As noted in Table 14, thirteen teachers expressed accountability to their principal. Two teachers (E5, E9) stated they were accountable, but did not indicate specific obligations. Teachers stated they were accountable for six areas of responsibility: (A) Curriculum, (B)
Student Achievement, (C) Classroom Environment, (D) Administrative Documentation, (E) Contractual Obligations, and (F) Personal Behavior. A pattern found in the areas of responsibility was that elementary teachers' obligations were exclusively in the areas of curriculum and student achievement. Only secondary teachers stated they had obligations in the latter four areas of responsibility.
### Table 14

**Contractual Accountability to Principal: Responsibilities & Obligations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas of Responsibility</th>
<th>Obligations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| A. Curriculum (n=7)     | 1. Following Course of Study (S3, S4, S6, E3, E4, E7, E8)  
2. Responding to requests for information (S4) |
| B. Student Achievement (n=3) | 1. Ensuring students meet goals and are progressing (E7)  
2. Monitoring student progress (E8)  
3. Ensuring aesthetic quality of student projects (S1) |
| C. Classroom Environment (n=4) | 1. Maintaining discipline; handling disciplinary actions (S3, S7, S9)  
2. Maintaining clean classroom (S1) |
| D. Administrative Documentation (n=3) | 1. Submitting lesson plans (S5, S6, S7)  
2. Maintaining grade books; submitting grades on time (S5, S7)  
3. Issuing tardy slips to late-arriving students (S7)  
4. Completing administrative forms when requested (S7) |
| E. Contractual Obligations (n=1) | 1. Fulfilling extra duties, i.e., lunchroom, parking lot, study hall (S5) |
| F. Personal Behavior (n=5) | 1. Arriving at class on time; being present during class hours (S3, S5, S7)  
2. Adhering to moral code, i.e., commit no indiscretions (S6)  
3. Conducting oneself in a professional manner (S7, S9)  
4. Being a team player; getting along with co-workers (S5)  
Accountable, but did not indicate for what (E5, E9) |

**Area of Responsibility: Curriculum.** Seven (S3, S4, S6, E3, E4, E7, E8) teachers stated they were accountable to their principal for following...
curricular guidelines set forth in the district-approved course of study for their grade and subject area. As one teacher (E4) said, he was accountable to the principal for

E4: Teaching what's in a given Course of Study, or a given set of criteria established by the district, and I guess [pause] I don't know. I have the feeling that it will be assessed somehow other than strictly test scores of my kids.

***

One teacher (S4) stated he was accountable for responding to requests for information about his curriculum. He said that because "the administration has a lot of input and interest, . . . . if they have something they need to know, I think I'm accountable for free discussion and an interplay between myself and them" (S4, 385-94).

**Area of Responsibility: Student Achievement.** Three teachers (E7,E8,S1) stated they were accountable to the principal for ensuring or monitoring student achievement. One (E7) elementary teacher was obligated to "meet the goals and objectives of the students . . . . To make sure the students are progressing so they can go on to higher levels" (E7, 449-54). The other elementary teacher (E8) stated she was obligated to monitor student progress, "to deliver [the curriculum] and assess" (E8, 914). The secondary industrial technology teacher (S1) was obligated to ensure that student projects were aesthetically pleasing, though he didn't agree that this was representative of the curriculum. He said he was accountable to the principal for making sure

S1: . . . that the kids' finished projects are real nice. I mean I'm being sarcastic here to some extent. But that's the real measure of what we're doing is the finished product
that goes out.

I: Projects are nice?

S1: I mean, yes, they're aesthetically pleasing. "Oh, it looks like it must have been hard to build." That type of thing, "Ooo, that finish is smooth. You must be doing a good job." Where I consider what the kid learns is what's important and that finished product just happens to be a by-product of the other. I guess I'm not that concerned with the finished product.

***

Area of Responsibility: Classroom Environment. Four teachers (S1, S3, S7, S9) stated they were accountable for maintaining a clean and well-disciplined classroom environment for students. Three (S3, S7, S9) were accountable for handling disciplinary matters. As one teacher (S3) said,

S3: ... I'm maintaining adequate discipline in my classroom.

I: Do you both know what "adequate discipline" means?

S3: It means you don't send them to the office [laugh]. The door's shut. And it sets a learning environment. That's how they define it -- it's a good learning environment.

***

The industrial technology teacher (S1) stated he was obligated to maintain the "general appearance" (465) of his classroom; to make sure "the shop isn't real dirty when you walk in" (S1, 464-65).

Area of Responsibility: Administrative Documentation. Three teachers (S5, S6, S7) stated they were accountable to the principal for maintaining and submitting lesson plans; documenting student grades and
student tardiness; and responding to administrative requests for information. Three teachers (S5, S6, S7) were obligated to maintain and submit lesson plans. As one teacher (S5) said, "[T]o have written down what I'm going to do and the reason I'm going to do it. If I'm absent, I'll provide plans for the sub" (S5, 712-14). Two (S5, S7) were obligated to maintain grade books and submit student grades on a timely basis. And one of these teachers (S7) was obligated to issue tardy slips to late-arriving students, and respond to administrative requests for additional information. She said,

S7: . . . Students are supposed to be to class on time, and if they're not, I should issue a tardy. I should keep my gradebook up to date, and accessible for them. I need to have lesson plans in. . . . I need to do what they ask. If they are asking for a form with something filled in, then I need to do that, because for some reason or other they need that information.

**Area of Responsibility: Contractual Obligations.** One teacher (S5) indicated she was accountable for fulfilling extra duties as assigned by the principal. She said she was obligated "to do your duties whatever they are (study hall, lunchroom duty, parking lot duty)" (S5, 725-27).

**Area of Responsibility: Personal Behavior.** Five teachers (S3, S5, S6, S7, S9) stated they were accountable for their personal behavior in and outside the classroom. Three (S3, S5, S7) were contractually obligated for being punctual and present in class during assigned class hours. As one teacher (S7) said, "Well, students are
supposed to be in my classroom from a certain time to a certain period of time. I need to be in here with them. That's a rule, I think" (S7, 811-14).

One teacher (S6) stated he was obligated to adhere to a moral code (i.e., commit no indiscretions) as demonstrated through his behavior in the community. He said the principal expected him (and other faculty) to serve as "role models" in the community, but he was somewhat vague in describing exactly what that type of behavior was. He gave an example of a situation in which he was involved that was considered by others to be inappropriate public behavior for a teacher.

S6: I feel accountable to the administration in relation to the community. It's kind of like the administration expects (quote, unquote) teachers to play certain kind of roles, be certain kind of role models, not just to the students but also to the community.

... There are just certain things that, again (quote, unquote) that teachers should not do because in the community's eyes it's not...

I: Give me one example.

S6: This is an example that's very individualistic, and I probably had a difficult time when I first started teaching because I was young to begin with. I looked younger than I was. I looked younger than my age. I remember the first time I went into a grocery store, not thinking anything of it, and bought a six-pack of beer. Teaching high school, as I went up to the cash registers, three of the four lanes that were opened were being operated by students from my school.
I: Okay. Was that inappropriate behavior for you?  
S6: I didn't feel that it was. There are people that do. There were teachers on our faculty that felt that was not appropriate.

Two others (S7,S9) stated they were obligated for conducting themselves in a professional manner; "to be a professional" (S7, 1017). These views of professional behavior differ from the previous example in that the obligation is for one's behavior when acting in an official capacity as a representative of the institution or profession, and does not include behavior in one's personal life. This is exemplified in the following excerpt:

S9: . . . In other words, they would be looking to see what I was doing both professionally and within the classroom.

I: Okay, and with that last one, are they looking at your performance inside and outside the classroom? Is that what you're getting at with that?

S9: I think so. By outside, I don't mean that they're looking into my private life or the things that did happen to teachers in the past. But I meant professionally in basically conducting yourself in a professional manner. And are you doing things professionally?

Finally, in this area of responsibility, one teacher (S5) stated she was obligated to the principal to "be a team player. To be able to work with other people in the building" (S5, 725-27). This was the principal's expectation of her and other faculty.
District Level: District Administrators

As noted in Table 15, five teachers (E2,E3,E4,E5,E6), all of whom were elementary teachers, were accountable to district administrators. They stated they were accountable for three areas of responsibility: (A) Curriculum, (B) Student Achievement, and (C) Administrative Documentation. Two teachers (E4,E6) stated they were accountable, but their accountability was mediated through the principal.

Table 15

Contractual Accountability to District Administrators: Responsibilities & Obligations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas of Responsibility</th>
<th>Obligations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Curriculum (n=1)</td>
<td>1. Following Course of Study (E3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Student Achievement (n=1)</td>
<td>1. Ensuring all students pass 80% of curriculum objectives (E2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Administrative Documentation (n=6)</td>
<td>1. Documenting student progress via a. CBE policies (E2,E3,E4,E5) b. Achievement/ability tests (E5,E6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Via Principal) (n=2)</td>
<td>See responsibilities and obligations to Principal (E4,E6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Area of Responsibility: Curriculum. One teacher (E3) stated she was accountable "to the school system" (E3, 266) for following and teaching the curriculum in the course of study. She said, "I have my course of study. I'm accountable for teaching that. So I have the curriculum I have to teach" (E3, 258-61).
Area of Responsibility: Student Achievement. One teacher (E2) stated she was accountable to the "local school system" (E2, 369) to ensure that all students pass 80% of the curricular objectives as outlined in the competency based education program. She said, "So I'm accountable to see that they all pass those competency based education tests at an 80% mastery level" (E2, 358-61).

Area of Responsibility: Administrative Documentation. This was the most often cited area of responsibility to district administrators. Obligations were to document student progress as required through CBE policies (E2,E3,E4,E5) and standardized achievement and ability testing (E5,E6). As one teacher said,

I: Every student is tested? 342

E6: Every student in the second, third, and fourth levels are tested. 344
The fourth level students and the second level students are given achievement, similar to I.Q. testing, and they are also tested for academic achievement. 347

I: They get two tests -- I.Q. and achievement? 352

E6: Yes, for the second and fourth level. The third level students are tested just for achievement. And this is what we call the citywide. 355

I: Are other grade levels tested? 360

E6: They do it for the ninth grade. You've probably heard, in the paper, about the ninth grade tests that the children have had. 362
They also have a writing test that is now being given every year to fourth level students. The fourth level is a big year. That's in the elementary. That the year when
almost every test is given. They are tested to death. ***

District Level: Superintendent

As noted in Table 16, eight teachers (E1, E4, E5, S1, S4, S6, S7, S9) were accountable to the superintendent. Areas of responsibility included (A) Curriculum, (B) Student Achievement, (C) Classroom Environment, and (D) District Planning. Most of these teachers (n=5) expressed an indirect form of accountability as their accountability was mediated through the principal.

Table 16

Contractual Accountability to Superintendent: Responsibilities & Obligations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Level: Superintendent (n=8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Areas of Responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Curriculum (n=2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Student Achievement (n=1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Classroom Environment (n=1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. District Planning (n=1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Via Principal) (n=5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Area of Responsibility: Curriculum. Two teachers (E5, S4) stated they were accountable for their curriculum. One teacher (E5) said she
was accountable for "teaching the items in the course of study and pupil performance objectives" (E5,471-74). Even though she was a Chapter I teacher who provided remedial assistance, she was accountable for this because

E5: kids that are coming to me for tutoring -- we have a computer management system. So I get print outs on how they're doing on the unit tests from the classroom teachers. Then when they come to me, I have to provide intervention on all the Pupil Performance Objectives that they're not mastering. So if three of the kids in my second grade group aren't mastering main idea, then I have to spend time providing intervention on that. Maybe four of my other kids aren't getting sequencing, so I have activities for sequencing. And hopefully, by the time they're tested again in the next unit, they're going to get that aspect of the unit.

***

A secondary teacher (S4) from a small district stated that the superintendent, as well as the principal, served as an instructional leader. When the superintendent was serving in this capacity, the obligation was similar to that for the principal, which was to engage in "free discussion and interplay" (S4, 393-94) "if they have something they need to know" (S4, 390-91).

Area of Responsibility: Student Achievement. The Chapter I teacher (E5) stated she was accountable to the superintendent to ensure that all students show a gain in achievement. She said,

E5: Well, he just had his State of the Schools Address last night... But I know that he wants achievement in the whole school system to get better. So I'm very
sure that test scores are going to be looked at very closely.

I'm sure he's even going to determine a number. He's hoping everyone will have like a certain amount of gain on their achievement tests, which we already have. We already have that in the Chapter I program for kids that are being tutored.

***

Area of Responsibility: Classroom Environment. The industrial technology teacher (S1), who also worked in a small district, stated he was accountable to the superintendent for maintaining a clean classroom: "making sure the place looks halfway decent" (S1, 1032-33).

Area of Responsibility: District Planning. Finally, one teacher (S5) stated she would be accountable for participating in a district needs assessment. She said,

E5: asked that we participate in a needs assessment at the building level. So I think being accountable to him, I'm going to have the chance to say what I think needs to be improved.

***

District Level: Local School Board

As noted in Table 17, nine teachers (E1, E4, E5, E6, S1, S3, S4, S7, S8) stated they were accountable to the local school board, six (E1, E4, E6, S3, S4, S7) of whom expressed this indirectly through their principal. Two (E5, S1) did not indicate specific obligations. Areas of responsibility were (A) Curriculum and (B) Contractual Obligations.
Table 17

Contractual Accountability to School Board: Responsibilities & Obligations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas of Responsibility</th>
<th>Obligations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Curriculum (n=1)</td>
<td>1. Following Course of Study (S4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Following district policies regarding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. lesson plans (S4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. discipline (S4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. behavior/moral code (S4,S8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d. use of professional judgment (S8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e. additional assignment of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>responsibilities and duties (S8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f. all policies, in general (E6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Via Principal)</td>
<td>Accountable, but did not indicate for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=6)</td>
<td>what (E5,S1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>See responsibilities and obligations to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principal (E1,E4,E6,S3,S4,S7)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Area of Responsibility: Curriculum. Only one teacher (S4) stated he was accountable to the school board, who served as representatives of the community, for following the prescribed curriculum in the district course of study. Fulfillment of this, as well as contractual obligations (second area of responsibility), were monitored through supervisory personnel making this an indirect form of accountability. He said,

S4: Well, in our system, accountability is pretty much explained in the fact that you are accountable to the School Board and community to meet minimum requirements as a teacher. Those minimum requirements would be dealing with the Course of Study that is prescribed and documented, dealing...
with policies like lesson plans, discipline policies that are established, policies for behavior and moral code and all that. And as far as accountability is concerned there are people who would monitor that such as the principal, the superintendent, social studies chairperson, and so on.

***

Area of Responsibility: Contractual Obligations. Three teachers (E6, S4, S8) were accountable for fulfillment for contractual obligations. As cited in the previous excerpt, one teacher (S4) was obligated to follow district policies regarding lesson plans, discipline, and codes of professional conduct. One other teacher (S8) was accountable to the school board, who were representatives of parents and community members, for following district guidelines regarding morality and use of professional judgment. He was also obligated for fulfillment of responsibilities which he may be assigned at a later date. He said,

S8: I am accountable to the School Board to follow the guidelines that they have formally given me in terms of morality; use of my professional judgment, professional skills to the benefit of the school system. I see that as a very formal agreement.

... But the contract with the School Board is specific and it's broad. It's specific in that it tells you the areas that you have to do certain things in. For instance, once I am hired by [local district], I can be assigned to any school that I am qualified for in the entire district. If they decide to send me one day to first grade down there, they can do it. If they want to send me to fifth grade up there, they can do it. So that's the part of the contract that I'm accountable for.

***
As displayed in Table 18, four teachers (E2, E3, E8, S9) expressed accountability to the State Department of Education. Areas of responsibility were (A) Curriculum and (B) Student Achievement.

Table 18

Contractual Accountability to Department of Education: Responsibilities & Obligations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State Level: Department of Education (n=4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Areas of Responsibility</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. Curriculum (n=1)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **B. Student Achievement (n=3)** | 1. Ensuring all students successfully achieve  
a. 80% of district's curricular objectives (E2, E8)  
b. satisfactory levels of mastery on State Vocational tests (S9)  
c. satisfactory levels of mastery on State Achievement/Ability tests (E8)  
2. Monitoring and assessing student competency via CBE program (E8) |

Area of Responsibility: Curriculum. One teacher (E3) indicated she was accountable for her curriculum. She stated she was accountable for teaching basic facts so that students will be prepared for the ninth grade proficiency tests. She said,

I: So you're accountable to the child. 394
You're accountable to the school system. 395

E3: And now the State... 398
... So we'll teach 419
them those facts. Our children will learn it. 420
. . . I know I'm accountable for making the kids be able to do it. And I am able to do it.

Area of Responsibility: Student Achievement. Three teachers (E2, E8, S9) stated they were accountable for ensuring that students demonstrate satisfactory levels of mastery on CBE and statewide tests (vocational, achievement, or ability). With regard to ensuring student mastery on CBE tests, one teacher (E2) said,

E2: So I am accountable to see that they all pass those competency based education tests at an 80% mastery level.

Another teacher (E8) stated she was accountable for ensuring that students performed at acceptable levels on statewide achievement and ability tests, even though she wasn't aware of specific criteria for acceptable performance. She was concerned that student scores exceed what might be considered "deficient." She said, "But in the State Department's recommendations they don't give any concrete ways that they want to assess whether a school's deficient. They don't say anything specific about test scores" (E8, 780-84). In addition to this, she said she was accountable for monitoring and assessing student performance as set forth in CBE policies. She said, when asked by the interviewer,

I: Is there anyone else to whom you're accountable? I would assume that you're saying (for the State Department of Education) that you're accountable for [students] performing at a certain level that is acceptable to them?

E8: Well, plus if they expect me to do this stuff -- if they expect me to
Finally, the vocational education teacher (S9) stated she was accountable for ensuring that students achieved satisfactory levels of performance on the State Vocational Education tests. When asked how student performance on this test related to her accountability, she said,

S9: I would simply say that, to me, it's a way of looking at a teacher. If my students tested below the norm year-after-year, I would think (if my class averages did) . . . I would think the administration would be looking at me and wondering why my students didn't test well.

* * *
View 4: Accountability to Client

All teachers (n=18) expressed accountability to one or more client groups. Client groups were (a) students, (b) parents, (c) community, and (4) businesses/advisory committees. Accountability to clients is characterized as (1) a professional-layperson relationship: professional accountability to lay groups as financiers and beneficiaries of educational services; (2) focus of accountability obligations is on the provision of educational opportunities for students; and (3) accountability obligations develop from personal and contractual obligations which are modified based on understandings of client expectations.

In Table 19, specific audiences and a description of the characteristics of this view are presented.
Table 19

Accountability to Client: Audiences and Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Audiences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall, all teachers expressed accountability to one or more client groups:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Students (n=16);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Parents (n=13);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Community (n=3); and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Businesses/Advisory Committees (n=3).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. A professional-layperson relationship: professional accountability to lay groups as financiers and beneficiaries of educational services;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Focus of accountability obligations is on the provision of educational opportunities for students; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Accountability obligations develop from personal and contractual obligations which are modified based on understandings of client expectations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Characteristics

Within this view, teachers expressed accountability to educational clientele. Client groups included (a) students (n=16); (b) parents (n=13); (c) community (n=3); and (d) business advisory committees (n=3). Most expressions of accountability were directed to audiences with whom the teacher worked or had direct access for contact, such as students and parents. Three teachers (S1,S7,S9), who each taught vocational courses, were accountable to business groups, but their accountability was expressed to Advisory Committee members (representatives of business and industry) with whom they worked in developing curricular programs. Six teachers (E4,E6,E7,S2,S4,S6) stated they were accountable to the community, three of whom (E4,E6,S4) expressed this to the school board as representatives of community interests. And finally, one teacher
(S8) also expressed accountability to parents, but did so through the school board.

This view of accountability was characterized as a relationship between professional and laygroups. As noted in earlier discussions, teachers spoke of themselves as professionals. It was within this view (more so than within other views), that teachers invoked professional status in relationships with client groups. Two thirds of the teachers (n=12) referred to themselves as professional educators, or professional role models. As a professional educator, they considered themselves, like other professionals such as doctors and lawyers, as having a unique expertise acquired through formal training, education and experience in the field of education. This was illustrated by one teacher (S8), who said,

S8: ... I don't think educators are swayed by public opinion. We tend to see things that people should know and be able to do based on our professional ability, our experience, our awareness of history, all the different things that make a teacher a professional like an architect or a lawyer.

I: What are some of those things?

S8: Well, we have a body of educational knowledge that indicates to us, for example, how to teach. And I'll use an example in mathematics.

It's very difficult to teach someone algebra until they reach a certain level of math readiness. That kind of readiness exists in reading. Now that is something that we know in the profession. It's something that you learn as an educator. Maybe it's an art as to when you actually apply,
but we know these kinds of things — the professional knowledge that we use.

***

In the latter capacity as a professional role model, they spoke of maintaining a professional attitude, demeanor, or posture; presenting an assured competence in one’s field. This is exemplified in the following excerpts (S4, S9):

S4: To me professional is an attitude that, "This is a job that’s really meaningful and important." In the same terms that a doctor should have a professional attitude, demeanor, preparation, knowledge, so should an educator. So that there should be clear-cut strategies; things that you know, that you do; ways that you carry yourself, and so on. I don’t mean "stuffy" in that you can’t have fun and laugh and do those things, but professional, to me, means more an attitude, knowledge of what you’re doing, how you’re going to go about it, how you hope to impact it, how students will be able to interact in the classroom situation. So that you actually have a plan. I don’t believe in a totally nebulous curriculum — "let’s just go with it." I think you should have clear-cut plans. I think those things and preparation, methodology, knowledge, and demeanor are all small keys to being a professional.

***

S9: ... that I should present — try to present a role model to [students] — a professional model. In other words, I send students out on a job and I want them to act in a certain way, and if I don’t set some type of standard in my classroom, I can’t ask them to act like that if I’m not acting in a certain way. So, I feel like I owe
them, basically, to be a professional model to them. Professional in the way I dress and the way I act and in my expectations.

***

It is important to note, however, that three teachers (E2,E6,S8) emphasized that present accountability mandates were indicative of a pervasive public attitude that teachers, despite their training and experience, were not accorded professional status by individuals outside the field of education. This attitude, in their opinion, reflected a lack of public trust in teachers' judgments and abilities. As two teachers (E6,S8) said,

E6: I guess when you think of accountability, I think that it's almost like people are testing me. It's like you take all these courses and have all this education and you think you have all this background, and then you're being questioned on something. I wonder sometimes... the educational profession... I know many teachers will say this that we're supposed to be professional but we don't feel professional. We feel like we always have "big brother" looking over our shoulders. I'm not saying that that's wrong. There always has to be somebody checking on things... I think a lot of the other professions, for which you have just as much educational background as they had to have, you are not looked upon as, quote, a professional in the same way a doctor or lawyer would be.***

S8: Education is probably one of the few professions where a truly competent, trained professional is not accepted as being for what he is. If someone hires an architect to build a house, you very seldom question the choice.
of the architect to build it a certain way. If a lawyer is going to handle a case, the client very seldom tells the lawyer how to do it. When a teacher structures a curriculum or a classroom or a school system, it is automatically questioned by everyone. It's the one profession where the professionals are not considered competent to do their job. . . .

. . . We would want to call it the public perspective, or the point of view, or the place that education holds in society. It's just that educators as professionals are not perceived as being true professionals in the same sense that the other professions are.

***

As a professional educator, the teacher was accountable to lay groups as financiers, recipients, and beneficiaries of educational services. Each group had vested interests in and expectations for the provision of educational services and opportunities to students. One teacher (S4) said, "Since [students] and their parents pay my salary, and I am their employee to a certain extent, I feel, personally, (and that's why I do the job), I feel that I'm accountable to give them a good product -- and the product is an education" (S4, 222-29). And another (S7) said, "I would be [accountable] to the parents. They are the taxpayers. They ultimately pay me" (S7, 541-44).

Four others (E6,E7,S6,S8) recognized client groups as taxpayers and financiers of education. One (E6) said, "If you're asking taxpayers to put out money for our educational systems . . . you do have to be able to say we're doing something good here" (E6, 1296-303). Another (E7) said, "A school system depends on money from the community. [The school system] wants to make sure everybody's doing their job" (E7,
Finally, another teacher (S8) said, "I think our schools are successful. Our schools are producing -- that the money that we're investing, the tax dollars that are being invested, whether property or income tax, that the people are getting a return on their money" (S8, 172-84).

As evidenced by the areas of responsibility for which teachers stated they were accountable to each group (see Tables 14-b through 14-e), the focus of accountability obligations was on the provision of educational services to students. In this way, students were direct recipients and beneficiaries, and other client groups were indirect beneficiaries of educational services.

Accountability obligations to each group developed from personal and contractual obligations, and were modified based on understandings of client expectations. This is discussed separately by client group in the following sections. Also included in these discussions are the ways in which teachers negotiated and communicated their accountability obligations to client groups.

Students. Nine teachers (E2,E3,E8,S2,S3,S4,S5,S6,S8) stated they were accountable to students for fulfilling contractual obligations. As one teacher (E3) said, "My job is to teach them [students], and if they don't understand it, to teach them a different way, and to go at it again and again until they do" (E3, 137-141). This teacher and three others (S2,S5,E2) were accountable for performing their duties as teacher, such as "assisting in [student] learning" (S5, 470) and "helping [students] to read, to write, to compute, to develop an appreciation of the arts" (E2, 398-400). It is important to note that
two of these teachers (E3,S5) highlighted the student's role in accountability. According to them, the educator is accountable for performing his/her duties as teacher, but the student is accountable for performing his/her duties as learner. One teacher (E3) said,

E3: It's definitely a joint process. I tell my kids that I can teach. I can offer them ways to learn, but they have to take the learning responsibility. I can't learn for them. That has to be their thing. That has to be what they do. My job is to teach them, and if they don't understand it, to teach them a different way, and to go at it again and again until they do. But their job is to try and to learn it.

***

Others (S3,S4,S6,E8) were accountable to students for fulfilling their contractual obligation to address the curriculum identified in the district's course of study. They were obligated to "cover the material that's been expected of me" (S3, 299-301); to "give them [students] what I'm supposed to be giving them" (E8, 586-87); or, to provide "certain things that are prescribed in the course of study that they [administration] expect you to deal with as a teacher" (S4, 195-98).

This curriculum, however, was seen as a foundational curriculum, a beginning point for determining the content of instruction. Obligations to students for the curriculum extended beyond contractual obligations. As one teacher (S6) said, "I don't think it's limited just to the course of study in the curriculum and the subject matter" (S6, 1031-34), and another (S8) said he was accountable to students in ways that were "over and above what the contract says" (S8, 1581-86).
Obligations included personal obligations. Eight teachers (E1,E2,E4,S2,S3,S4,S8,S9) spoke of obligations to students as being similar or related to personal obligations. This was exemplified in comments such as, "I'm accountable to my students... that's more personal and right there" (E1, 998-1000); "accountability to students is completely interrelated... in the personal level" (E4, 935-38), and

S2:  ... I also put myself to the task of building esteem in self-concepts and self-worth. That's a big job.

***

Three (S4,S8,E2) were accountable to students to "do their best," which for these teachers was a personal accountability obligation. One (S4) said he was accountable to "give them [students] the richest experience I can" (S4, 236-37). Another (S8) said, "I feel that I have to use every skill, ability, and bit of knowledge that I have to give them the best chance to get those things I want" (S8, 1581-86). And finally, one teacher (E2) said she was accountable "for giving them the best possible first grade experience I can" (E2, 394-95).

Eight teachers (E1,E9,S2,S3,S4,S6,S7,S8) were accountable to students in ways that took into account student needs, such as developing an understanding of students' home and cultural environment (S2); modifying instruction in ways that account for learning styles (E1,S3,S7) and student interests by allowing students opportunities to decide the content of instruction (E9,S2,S4,S6); or being available after class-hours to offer assistance (S4,S8). Examples of these are illustrated in the following excerpts (S2,S3,S6):
S2: ... You have to take into consideration what that kid go homes to every night is not the same thing that I went home to every night as a kid. There is definitely a gap, cultural gap, in a lot of different classrooms. There is one in mine. Whether it be black or white, hispanic, Korean, Vietnamese, there is always going to be some kind of a cultural gap. Well, that's a given. If it turns into a cultural barrier, then there is a problem.

***

S3: I think I also should be accountable for teaching them the way that I know that they learn the best. I am very Piagetian, so I feel like they should hold me accountable to teaching them lab-oriented, hands-on type of activities, because I really believe that's how they learn the best.

***

S6: I would try, as an example, I would try to include things ... I didn't just lecture on what was in the book, or what was in the actual subject matter. I would from time to time open up the class to discussion of topics that they were interested in, which I don't know if it was something that I was supposed to do. Maybe it wasn't. Maybe it was. But I felt it was important, because a lot of times this would come as a result of them bringing up an issue, current event, something that happened in the school that they really wanted to talk about. If it's something that is important to them, I don't think it's fair to them to say, "Well, we really need to cover pages 130 to 135 today. So we really don't have time to talk about this," when you can see that it's a very important concern to them.

***
Five teachers (E9, S2, S4, S5, S7) spoke of ways they negotiated with students those things for which they are accountable. Three (E9, S2, S4) negotiated the curricular content, whereas others negotiated grades (S7) or the organization of activities (i.e., timelines, etc.) (S5).

Examples of negotiation of content (S2), grades (S7), and organization of activities (S5) are presented in the following excerpts:

I: Is there any kind of negotiation of those expectations between you and the students?  
S2: Sure. We sit down, and sometimes we'll make out individual contracts in terms of expectations where I would like to see a kid end up by such and such time, where the particular student has in her/his mind they want to be -- goals, yea.

Mostly, I have found with a lot of the expectations of the young kids at this school building (and there are fifteen different reasons why), many of them are unrealistic. The negotiation part is, "Let me help you bring those goals and desires into focus. What's attainable? What's reachable? Let me help you present a timeframe for yourself. Let me help show you some things that I have done in my own life that have made reaching goals easier. Some of the goals that I have reached are these."

S7: I obviously have to tell them what I am looking for on an assignment and what I expect. I just can't say specifically that I sit them down... The first day of school I get addresses and things. I don't go over a list of rules. I figure by the time you're a junior and senior, you'd better know how to act in high school. You're supposed to come into a classroom prepared. The grading system is such that I will tell them...
at any time they have access to my grade book. I will discuss any grade. I will change grades. I always tell them to check my addition and subtraction. I'm not real good with numbers.

***

I: Has there been any time when you have negotiated with [students] the expectations you have of them and they have of you?

S5: Not really because we're open and flexible all the time, like for instance...

It's not that we sit down to do it. For instance, if we're planning something I'll check with them. What would be the best date? Does anybody have anything conflicting? Well, if there are sports activities and so on for us to do this. And so I don't say, "Oh, we are going with this date, and that's it." We do have this kind of negotiation going on.

I try not to put them in a double-bind situation because that's very unhealthy.

I: Double-bind meaning?

S5: They have to do something for me and they also have to do something for somebody else. Obviously, they can't do both at the same time. That kind of thing.

I: Well, then there is constant discussion and negotiation of the classroom activities.

S5: Yes.

***

Seven teachers (E5,S2,S3,S4,S5,S7,S8), most of whom were secondary teachers, stated they communicated their accountability obligations to students in the following ways: (1) I.E.P. (S2,S4); (2) syllabus and
handouts (S3,S4,S5); (3) class bulletin board (S4); (4) orally (S8,E5); and (5) through interaction (S7,S8). Two teachers (S2,S4) spoke of the I.E.P. as the vehicle through which teacher and student expectations and obligations for performance are made known. Viewing the I.E.P. as a way of communicating his accountability obligations, the exceptional education teacher (S2) said,

S2: . . . [T]he IEP is very, very specific, whereas the curriculum leaves room for flexibility. It covers a broader spectrum. The IEP is very specific, which is the beauty of it. I have these things set in front of me, and I have so many days to accomplish it.

***

Three teachers (S3,S4,S5) said they communicated their accountability obligations to students through the use of syllabi and handouts which are given to students during the first week of class. Though most viewed this as a way of communicating their expectations for student performance, they also spoke of this as a way of informing students about that for which they were accountable. As one teacher (S3) said,

S3: But it could also be with the students -- if we're talking about what they expect of me, or what I expect of them? I always give them a handout that says exactly what I expect of them at the beginning of the year, and all throughout the year it's referred to. "Ten percent of your grade is the notebook. You know you have to do the notebook. Twenty percent of your grade is the quiz. You have a quiz every Friday, and so on." They know exactly what's
This teacher (S3) also said she was very much aware of her accountability to students because students "hold you accountable" for doing those things conveyed in handouts and syllabi. She said,

S3: The students can hold you accountable to it also, if it's written down. They know exactly when it's due and how it's due, and things like that. You can't change your mind, which I like. Because I'm a real structured person, I don't like to have to change my mind. But the students can hold you to it.

In addition to giving each student a course syllabus and I.E.P., one teacher (S4) said he also communicated his accountability obligations by posting them on the class bulletin board. In addition to illustrating this point, the following excerpt (S4) also exemplified the common response of teachers who, when asked how they communicated their obligations to students, initially spoke of how their expectations for student performance (student obligations) were made known, rather than how they communicated their own obligations:

I: How do you convey to the students what it is you feel you're accountable to them for?

S4: Well, at the beginning my expectations are always known for the year.

I: How are they known?

S4: They are written and handed to them. They are on the board. Classroom rules, for example, things I expect them to have -- to have
their homework, have their books, have whatever is necessary. You know -- the basic rules of the classroom - that I'm going to start when the bell rings and you're to be there, and so on and so on. Those are all posted. They're written. They're talked about. In some cases, the students can deal with them. When deadlines, for example, of projects are due and so on we can do that. The rewards for teams that do excellent work in the classroom, they're sometimes nothing more than just everybody gets to go down and get a soda and have the last five minutes, or last ten minutes of the week free or something like that. They have input in that respect, and so they know how they're accountable.

I: That they're accountable?

S4: And that I'm accountable to them. That I'm going to offer them this if they do this. My learning objectives for the daily/weekly are known. The basic schedule for the week -- and it's a bare-bone schedule, because things change a lot -- is made known to them. It's posted up on the board. They know from one week to the next where we're going to go. And I try to teach more thematic so that they know this is the theme that we're dealing with and the relevant historic points or psychological points or whatever it may be. So I let them know, "This is what I expect. This is what I will offer them. This is when I'm available to help remediate. This is what I will do for them." And they know that. It's not a hidden agenda. It's always well announced.

***

Two teachers (E5,S8) said they communicated their obligations frequently and orally. As one (E5) said,
E5: To the students I told them the very first day that they came to me, and I've had to tell many of them every day that they come to me, that I am going to teach them how to read and write and that they are going to leave in May knowing how to read and write. And so because I am constantly telling them what I am going to do, I think they expect me to do that every day. And they come prepared to do it. Some of them don't think they can read, and they don't think they can write. And many of them couldn't when they first came to me and they can now. Or they at least believe they can try now. Some of them were absolutely refusing when they first came in here.

***

One of these teachers (S8) and another (S7) emphasized that much of what they were accountable for (i.e., caring for student learning, or treating students with respect) could not be communicated through words, but could only be communicated through actions. As one teacher (S8) said,

I: Do you communicate that to them? 1591

S8: Yes. 1593

I: In what ways? How? 1595

S8: Because I very seldom tell them "no" if they ask me for any kind of extra help, extra work, extra tutoring, other explanations, anything. Anything that will give them a positive chance to improve. 1601

I: It's through their interaction with you that they learn what they can expect from you. 1605

S8: Yes. Right, but see that's my teaching style. With students I will explicitly tell them. I will say, "If you want me to come in on Fridays 1611
and tutor you, I will do it." That doesn't mean a thing to those kids. What means the things to the kids is when you're THERE on Friday tutoring them. It's not what you say, it's what you do. It's those actions, and I think that's where those students really pick up on it.

If you were to go to students in schools and say, "Who is your best teacher?" they're often going to say, "He DID this. He DID this, or she DID this, or DID this." Not that they SAID this, but what they DID for us. And that's where I really feel that comes from.

***

Parents. Of the thirteen teachers expressing accountability to parents, seven (E2,E5,E6,E7,E8,S3,S6) spoke of their accountability obligations as contractual obligations. This was exemplified in comments (S4,E8,E5) such as,

S3: I guess they're [parents] going to be interested in my being accountable for my knowledge of the subject matter. [pause] And curriculum -- knowledge of the curriculum, and following the curriculum. Following school system discipline standards and any other school system policies.

I: Okay, these are things that you think you are accountable to them for.

S3: Right. I think that if they came into the classroom and if I wasn't following one of them, I wouldn't be doing my job.

***

E8: Along with the kids, I think you're accountable to their parents.

I: For what?
E8: To do what you're supposed to be doing: to deliver and assess, and let the parents know if there are problems.

***

E5: Yes. To me, being accountable to the parents is just as important as being accountable to the head of Competency Based Education. I don't see that they're any different. They're all the same. Their expectations of me are the same — you know, that I'm going to educate these kids.

***

For three teachers (E1, E4, S6), accountability obligations to parents were the same as personal obligations (E1, E4) or obligations to students (S6). The two teachers (E1, E4) whose obligations to parents were the same as personal obligations, said,

I: How about to parents?

E1: Well, because they're trusting me with their little munchkins, and so, yea. How am I accountable? I guess, doing the best job I can with their kids.

***

E4: Well, again, for me I'm going to keep addressing these questions from the two contexts. If I'm accountable in the personal level, and doing what I want to do in the classroom with the kids, then I feel the public part takes care of itself. In that context almost completely. Because see the public -- like parent conferences -- parents don't sit there and say, "Do you teach these three concepts in science -- phylum, class, and order in your zoology unit?" Parents don't care on that level. They want to know if their kid is happy and learning and growing and adjusting with kids and feeling... so in that professional context
of accountability to curriculum and stuff like that, parents and the public beyond, I don't think give a rat's piddle about that. So if I'm doing my job personally, I find parents overwhelmingly excited by what I'm doing. They don't come in and ask me about grades. They come in and say, "I can't believe Johnny loves social studies. He always hated social studies." * * *

The teacher (S6), whose obligations to parents were the same as obligations to students (i.e., to cover material that is of interest to students), said,

I: Okay. Parents. What are you accountable to parents for?

S6: In general, the education of their children, and that would encompass such a large . . . I think there are a lot of parents that don't consider all of the aspects of the term, "education." A lot of parents think of it as subject matter. I personally, don't. I think of it as subject matter. I think of it as socialization . . . [pause] . . . skills that wouldn't be related to a curriculum or a Course of Study.

I: What do you think they expect from you when you say, "education of their children." What are they looking at?

S6: I think they are looking at subject matter. At least the majority of them look at subject matter.

* * *

Four teachers (E9,S2,S4,S7) said they were accountable in ways that were responsive to parent expectations, such as responding to requests for information about classroom activities (S4, 385-94); treating students fairly (S7,1452-67); working together to support the
educational opportunities for their child (E9, 577-81); or responding to requests to include topics in the curriculum (S2, 644-61). As the latter teacher (S2) said,

S2: If I have a request by one of the parents to kind of coordinate a lesson based on suicide, for whatever reason it might be -- maybe the son has been involved with some kid who is maybe thinking about it, talking about it, knows somebody that did, then I'll do it. If I can feel, or get a gauge for what's happening at home where most of the time is spent for this particular kid, then I can pull some of that positive stuff into the classroom as a group or for an individual. I did that the other day.

***

Six teachers (S3,S4,S6,E4,E8,E9) discussed ways in which they communicated to parents those things for which they were accountable. Obligations were communicated through (1) written materials sent home with students or distributed at Open House meetings; (2) conversations between student and parents at home; (3) parent observations; or (4) direct one-to-one conversations between teacher and parent.

Four teachers (S3,S4,E2,E8) said they communicated their accountability obligations to parents through handouts and course syllabi distributed at the beginning of the year. Curricular topics, evaluation/discipline standards, and schedules were communicated indirectly by sending information home with students (S3,S4), or directly by distributing and explaining course syllabi, schedules, and policies to parents attending Open House (S3,E2,E8). As one teacher (E8) said,
E8: When I do Open House I have all my objectives from the Course of Study - I photocopy a copy for each parent -- and I give it to them. I tell them basically the structure of my classroom because we follow a schedule and we do the same types of things (not necessarily at the same time). I explain my classroom setup to them and how this relates to the Course of Study and everything. So they know . . . I mean I'm pretty open with them about what we're doing.

The cooperative learning -- you know that may not be specifically in the Course of Study, but I try to relate it, especially to writing. It coordinates well with writing, I think. I'll explain it to them because a lot of parents, I think, "What do you mean, groups? I want my kid to be responsible. I don't want somebody else doing my kid's work." A lot of them are real hesitant about it at first, but I think after you explain it to them and what you're trying to achieve it actually works out well.

***

Two (S3,E4) said they were aware that their performance was communicated to parents through conversations held between student and parents at home. One of these teachers (E4) said he encouraged students to discuss school activities with parents as a way of keeping them informed of school activities. He (E4) said,

E4: ... And I feed the kids. I pump the kids to go home and talk to their parents. We've studied chemistry, and we were talking about symbols in chemistry. I tell the kids to go home and ask their parents to pass the NaCl after we talk about what that molecule is. And I said, "Have some fun." And I'm doing that kind of for devious
reasons. I want parents and kids to be in communication. That's what they ought to be doing. And it's fun for the kids to sort of have one up on their parents. And the stories are hilarious. Because some of the parents say, "What are you talking about?" "Well, my dad's a science teacher and he grabbed the salt right away."  

***

Three teachers (E4,E9,S4) said they extend invitations to parents to attend classes, or student performances (such as class plays), as a way of directly observing both student and teacher performance. As one teacher (E9) said, "The room is open at all times. They [parents] can always come in and observe" (E9, 725-27). Speaking of observing class performances, another (E4) said,

E4: At [school where E4 works] we do "Sharings" and my kids just did a multi-arts sharing (dance, music, drama) and it was fantastic. It was based on 1845 -- based on history -- and we tied in a whole lot of history that we've been studying about Western Expansion (the canals, the riverboats, and the railroad trains, and all the different stuff). And what's a way we can tie that all in again and bring in the music, and bring in the dance and everything? Well, the way we did it was a murder mystery which was really far out. So instead of kids just sitting there doing "here's a cute little song" that they did in the West, we had this murder mystery -- this plot. It was just great. A certain guy brought his slave up to Boston and ended up murdering this guy in a bar, and they thought the slave did it and chased the slave all the way across the country. We had five scenes and three major set changes. Parents came to that and they were astounded by it. They just thought, "My God,
that's fantastic." And that's not only me, but the arts team -- does those major productions.

***

Finally, one teacher (E9) said she contacted parents on a weekly basis to inform them of past events and solicit their input. She said,

E9: . . . But I encourage the parents. I communicate with them almost weekly.

I: What might you communicate?

E9: Oh, just some things that we've been doing in the classroom -- you know, asking their input on certain things. I feel that if they know what's going on and they're child is happy and they see that the child is learning in a variety of ways, then we can work together as parent and teacher to support whatever is going on in the child's life.

***

Three teachers (E1,S2,S3) discussed how they were made aware of their accountability to parents. In these teachers' situations, parents were aware of curricular offerings and made their concerns known to the teacher. One teacher (S3) presented a situation wherein a parent questioned why science was being neglected in favor of a Shakespeare festival. The parent was concerned that the curriculum, as outlined in the course of study, was not being followed. She said,

S3: We have a Shakespeare Study. This sounds like it's way off the subject, but it isn't. We have a Shakespeare Study where we take the students out of their classes for two weeks, and at the end of the two-week period then they have a Shakespeare Performance. All they do is Shakespeare for two weeks.

We had parents come in and complain and call because we weren't teaching
science. They said, "How are you going to be following the curriculum if you're not teaching science here? How are they going to learn about science?" Even though they like the Shakespeare Study, and they liked what we were doing, they were very concerned about the students not getting science (because the kids like my class). [laugh] And anyway, they wanted them to know about science, because it's a real college-prep community. So that's just one thing they know. It's in the Course of Study, and they know that it [science] should be covered, and they were real concerned about that.

***

She also told of another instance when a parent, after having discussed with the child the content of the day's science lesson, wrote to correct the teacher's information. She said,

S3: I've had parents. . . . When I taught ninth grade physical science, I said something that was incorrect. I can't think of what it was off the bat. It was something that was incorrect about nuclear energy. I had a parent write a two-page letter to me explaining it to me in great depth (not putting me down or anything), and saying, "Please let me come into your class and talk to your class about this."

...But I think when you teach in a community such as this where the majority of the parents are professionals, and lots of them work at the university (since we're right by the university), and you run into lots of scientists' kids and lots of parents who are scientists or medical doctors or whatever, and they do have a good background in science, you're going to find there are going to be lots of people that know more than you. So that's why we just have to be ready for that, and not
necessarily be a person that just gives out facts all the time, because the facts change. [laugh].

***

Another teacher (E1) told of an instance when a parent objected for religious reasons to the content of a lesson in mythology. After discussing this with the parent, the teacher was able to accommodate the child and parent by developing an alternative plan for this child. She said,

E1: An example is, I taught mythology. And we have a high number of Jehovah's Witness children who cannot do mythology. And unfortunately when I envisioned the unit, I didn't think about that. But mythology is also in the textbook so there you are. Anyway, uhm, I taught mythology, and the first year I taught mythology the child (I only had one J.W. child in the group that was doing it) and the parent came in and talked to me about it and we worked out an alternate plan.

***

And finally, the exceptional education teacher (S2) told of two instances wherein a parent did not challenge, but requested that the teacher address additional, specific topics in the curriculum. With regard to one of these situations, he said,

S2: I have a student who just has a terribly poor relationship with his mother -- terribly poor. She found a pill in her Kool-Ade, and she thought this particular kid was going to "try to kill me. My son." She wanted me to speak to him about it, because there's a closeness and respect that is lacking in the home. And I did. And some other hygiene-type things that she was unable to communicate as a mother.

***
These, however, were the only examples of parents actually getting involved in curricular decisions. Two teachers (E2, S7) said that parental involvement in curricular decisions was minimal mainly because expectations for the curriculum were conveyed through selection of the school (i.e., alternative school or vocational school). On the other hand, one teacher (S4) stated that he thought parents should become more involved in curricular matters, and "should make teachers more accountable" (S4, 467-73; 573-616). He said,

S4: I think parents should get greatly involved, and should make teachers accountable. "I want to know why you're teaching my son this, and if I have a question, I want to feel free to come and ask you like you would with another service." . . .

I: You were talking about your accountability to parents and administrators, and you said you think parents should be involved and you said, "Parents should make teachers accountable." So the question is, what do you mean by "making teachers accountable?"

S4: Maybe that's the wrong phraseology, but what I'm trying to say is . . . . When I have children in school, I'm going to want to know what the teacher is doing in the classroom. I want to know, not only from my child, the student, but also from the teacher. And I think that "make them accountable" means that I want to have the ability to go talk to a teacher -- to prearrange -- not go barging in, but to talk to a teacher and have the freedom to ask, "Why are you doing this? What do you hope to gain?" And so on. I think that parents would "make you accountable" by having a greater knowledge of what's going on and having a greater impact in their
child's learning so that I guess you
become a co-worker in the learning
process. Maybe we're making
everybody accountable in that way.
Making the teacher-student-parent
triad more accountable.

***

With regard to joint-accountability, it is important to note that five teachers (E3, E5, E6, E7, S1), most of whom were elementary teachers, discussed the expectations they had for parents: obligations for which parents should be accountable. They each said they thought parents should be more accountable to their children by becoming more involved in and supportive of their child's education. This is exemplified in excerpts from conversations with three (E3, E5, E7) of these teachers:

E3: . . . The parent is really frustrating right now because a lot of parents aren't accountable at all. They don't come to conference. They don't care what their kid is doing. They don't care if their kid is in trouble. They don't care if their kid makes good grades. And they're not making education something important for the child. So they're giving all these messages to the child. Why should he be accountable if the parents don't care. If the parents aren't saying, "Education is important. You need an education. Education will get you somewhere." I mean they're accountable for making education an important, vital part of their child's life. A lot of parents aren't doing it.

***

I: So the parents are accountable also?

E5: They should be, but I don't think there's a . . . until they're taken to court for educational neglect or abuse of some type, I don't think they're formally held accountable. I
mean we constantly ask parents to be involved in everything that we do through homework, through parent organization, parent education, but if they don’t do what you ask them to do nothing happens to them. So I don’t think they’re really held accountable.

***

E7: I think the parents should be more accountable.

I: To?

E7: Not to me so much as to their own children’s education as far as supporting them a lot. We don’t have the support that we should. The kids don’t get the help at home like they used to. I mean baseball, and all these other interferences, seem more important than homework to even the parents. I think parents could be more supportive. There are some supportive parents. There’s not enough. The only time they come to P.T.A. is if there’s bake sale, then you know that they’re not really that interested in their child’s education [laugh]. That kind of thing. That happens a lot.

***

Three teachers (E9, S2, S4) said they encouraged parental involvement. To them, the parent was viewed as a "resource" (S4, 615-84; E9, 705-46) to supplement curricular programs, or an "extension of the reinforcement management program" (S2, 673-89). Even though they spoke of these working relationships as "partnerships" (E9), or "co-workers" (S4), the teacher viewed her/himself as the professional with final authority in all decisions. This is exemplified in excerpts from conversations with two teachers (E9, S4):
I: What is the relationship, then with parents? You said that you encourage parents to work with you as a partner on this, so it's a partner relationship similar to the teacher-peer relationship?

E9: Not necessarily. I don't want parents in the classroom teaching the children. That's a very broad statement. Now, let me break it down.

I want them supplementing whatever is going on in the classroom. So, if we're working on a special unit, then I want parents there to share their skills or their abilities or their talents or maybe a travel experience. I incorporate them whenever we go on field trips. The room is open at all times. They can always come in and observe.

My concern and my experience has been that many times parents (and not all of them, but you just need one) will come in and they will begin to discuss who is the brightest child and who is the child who is having difficulty and then that becomes a conversation at a luncheon table. I really feel that as a professional we need to protect the children and allow each child to grow as they are capable of doing without someone interfering with that and making a judgment. THAT'S really a means of protecting the children.

But I encourage the parents. I communicate with them almost weekly.

***

S4: I'm encouraging input, but I think in the final analysis, somebody has to make the decisions. As the person whose job it is to make those decisions, I would give my rationale after their input. And it may even include their input and ideas or all of them. But in the final analysis,
I have to look to see what's going to be good for everyone involved. So, I guess, in the final analysis, I make the decision.  

***

Community. Even though six teachers (E4, E6, E7, E2, S4, S6) stated they were accountable to the community, three (E4, E6, S4) expressed this to the School Board as representatives of community interests. As discussed earlier in contractual accountability, accountability obligations for these teachers were contractual obligations such as following the course of study (S4) and district policies (E6, S4). One teacher (E4) expressed this indirectly through the principal. As one of these teachers (E6) said,

E6: . . . And then I think you would have to be accountable to the Board of Education. [pause] Because they are there for the public, and they are trying to oversee everything that is happening within the district. I think that you need a Board of Education. You need people who are checking out things and making sure that things are . . . that you are doing what you're supposed to be.

I guess I'd have to be accountable to the "public." I mean parents of the students, but I think public, in general, too. Because if you're asking taxpayers to put out money for our educational systems (I wish there was another way to get the money besides asking for property tax). But I think you do have to be able to say, "We're doing something good here."

***

As for those (E7, S2, S6) who expressed a more direct form of accountability, their accountability obligations to the community were a
combination of contractual and moral or professional obligations. For the exceptional education teacher (S2), the contractual obligation was to "remediate. We work on why it is that they were placed here in the first place. That's the focus, so that we can get them back into the regular school setting" (S2, 911-15). For the other two teachers (E7,S6), contractual obligations were "[to teach] certain basic skills, knowledge, etc." (S6, 752-53) and "provide [students] with the opportunity to learn as much as they can" (E7, 556-58).

Two of these teachers (S2,E7) spoke of moral reasons for why they were obligated to do this for the community. This is exemplified in the following excerpts:

E7: I guess the community in general. too. I mean, you know, I don't live in the community, but I used to. I'm a part of this community, and I want to add something to it. I feel responsible to these children. The reason, I guess, most people go into teaching is because they do want to make a difference in people's lives. You want to make life better for these kids. So in that respect I would say I am responsible to the community, because the kids are part of that community.

S2: No. I very much feel that I am accountable to the public. The kids were kicked out of the public schools to be placed in this school. . . .

. . . They have been suspended often enough, expelled for whatever reasons -- many, many reasons that they wind up here. And their behavior dictates that they cannot control themselves in a regular school, in a regular classroom. . . .
... I take that to heart because this is a kid that at a very, very young age is doing it. What toll are we, as a society, going to have to pay later on because of this kid, whereas now, I have a chance to work with him. I have a means of influencing him in a positive way -- trying to just get him refocused.

***

It appeared that teacher understandings of community expectations developed from interactions with parents. Parents were the most direct link to the community. This is not to say that the teacher's obligations to the community were determined by or the same as parental expectations, but rather the teacher's view of community was reinforced through parental interaction. The teachers appeared to draw on their moral responsibility and professional obligations in determining what was "best" for the community. When the elementary teacher (E7) was asked if the community expected the same as what she stated she was accountable to them for (i.e., provide students with opportunities to learn), she responded,

E7: I'm not sure that the entire community really thinks about it that much. You wonder sometimes. Kids come to school and ... Seems like you hear a lot about grades. They expect their kids to get good grades. And sometimes I think they forget that learning is more important than grades. So we're always going to be fighting that.

***

The secondary teacher (S6) discussed his perceptions of the community as it related to parental expectations. He said,
S6: This community was very interesting in that it was not an academically oriented community.

I: Academically oriented means?

S6: In terms of the knowledge, etc. that the students got. So many of the parents, when they called me to find out why their students were failing, did not care the reasons why. All they wanted to know was what the student could do to raise the grades so the student would pass so they could go on to the next grade level.

I would always ask them, “Well, when you say you want your child to pass, what do you mean?” And they would say, “Well, what’s the lowest passing grade?” I said, “Well, a D-.” “Well, what does he/she have to do to raise it up over that level?” And I would always say, “Well, I really think that your child is capable of doing much more. I think that your child could be making B’s or C’s, maybe even A’s in my course.”

***

His (S6) obligations to the community developed from moral and professional obligations. He said he was accountable to teach students “basic skills, knowledge, etc. . . because that was going to be the extent of their formal education outside of being trained on a specific job on a specific task that had to do with their employment” (S6, 752-60). Not only did the parents have minimal expectations, but the principal seemed to also hold minimal expectations for student performance. This, he said, was not acceptable.

S6: . . . But every year I failed anywhere between twenty-five, and one year I actually failed forty-five percent of the students in my course. And I didn’t have a
problem with that because I knew that I could justify it.

I: Did it come back on you?

S6: No. It never did. It never did from the administration, from parents, from anything. The first time I think that happened, I was astounded, and I really looked at the big picture. I wanted to make sure that it wasn't something that I was doing. I actually did go to my principal and say, "I'm kind of concerned about this." And he basically said, "I don't think it's something that you should worry about because with this particular course that's been the pattern for years." It's not you. He said, "It's not you. It's the kids that you get in this course."

Well, I'm getting off track, but that bothered me because I felt just because it's happened for years doesn't mean it's right. I'm not satisfied with that. I mean I want to work and try to improve that. Just because it's always happened and that's the level of student that you get in that course, I don't think that we should just say, 'Well, that's just the way things are always going to be so . . .'

***

Finally, the exceptional education teacher's (S2) obligations to community were based on contractual and moral obligations. There was little, if any, evidence of community concern or involvement in the school. He spoke of community involvement in his school (up to the time of the interview) as being non-existent. During the week of the interview, the local newspaper had published an article about the school's program and goals. Prior to that time, there had been no indication of community interest in, much less a demand for,
accountability from this school by any community group. The only means
the teacher had for developing an understanding of community
expectations was through parental interaction, which in this case, was
also minimal. He said,

I: ... Do you feel pressure from a local group here, or other outside bodies? Do you feel the demand for accountability from others? Is it verbalized or communicated in anyway?

S2: No. I really don't feel that kind of influence is out there. At least I've not been aware of it. ...

... At least I feel there’s no watchdog group, or a group in support of or against what we have here. It's kind of a ... not much is said. Very little is known in the public eye about what I do here, or what this building is like. This in the paper [refers to recent newspaper article -- see copy] ... this is the first time something like that has come out.

Since I've been in this school, we had a student who was here last year who shot his mother recently, and killed her. We have another student who was buried three weeks ago -- a shooting -- a murder. We have had a young man commit suicide here this year. So there's that kind of publicity that this school has experienced. We have very minimal parental involvement, unless we actively seek it. Not to say that there aren't parents who care out there, but a lot of the public out there just is not aware of what's going on, or why these kids are here. It's refreshing to see something put in the paper about that. Not that everything that was put in print was the truth.

***
**Businesses/Advisory Committees.** Three teachers (S1, S7, S9), all of whom taught vocational-type courses, expressed accountability to the business community through Advisory Committee members as representatives of community interests. One (S1) taught Industrial Technology, an elective course offered to all non-vocational students in the traditional high school program. Two others (S7, S9) worked in a joint vocational district: one (S7) of whom taught academic courses and the other (S9) taught in a vocational program area (Cooperative Business Education).

The Cooperative Business Education teacher (S9) met regularly (at least twice a year) with the Advisory Committee in her program area to discuss curricular changes. She said,

S9: Yes. We are required to have an Advisory Committee. It is mandated by the State, and we do have an Advisory Committee. The Executive Secretary class and my class have shared an Advisory Committee for the period of time I’ve been there. We do have members of local industry who are members of our Advisory Committee. We are required to have two meetings a year. If I want to make a change or do something like that, I must have the approval, or I would usually need the approval of my advisory committee.

The other teacher (S7) who worked with the academic portion of the program at the vocational school did not meet directly with Advisory Committee members. Instead, she met with the vocational teachers from each of the five vocational programs in which her students attended. In this way, the other teachers conveyed the needs and expectations of the
business community. As this teacher said, however, it was difficult to find the time to meet with each teacher on an individual basis. She said,

I: And you have access to those Advisory Committees?

S7: I can talk to the teachers.

[review comment: The vocational teachers and I are supposed to meet to discuss what I should be presenting in Applied Communications].

I am supposed to spend time, and I did not last year. As I said, I was just learning the Communications classes and kind of struggling through it, plus I had eight classes. So I did not spend time with the various vocational teachers, but I should spend one evening or one day a week with each of the vocational teachers whose program I am teaching, which should mean that every night after school I meet with one of those people, because I have five programs. I'm not sure. This year, I'll see what I can do that's a little different, but you do what you can and you try your best.

***

She did, however, have opportunities to meet with individuals from local businesses. Most recently, this occurred during an inservice day wherein she scheduled interviews with two businesspersons to learn more about local industry needs. She said,

I: Do you have much contact with businessmen?

S7: No, not a whole lot. Last year on our COTA (Central Ohio Teachers' Association), we had a choice. We could go to Columbus or we could stay here and go out and interview a couple of businessmen. I wanted to stay in [local] county. I talked to a man -- a personnel manager at...
I talked to him. And then I talked to a man who owns his own business — construction business.

I was just talking to them about what they expect and what they need.

***

Finally, the third teacher (S1) who taught the elective course, Industrial Technology, was under no mandates to work with an Advisory Committee. Instead, after having witnessed the effectiveness of advisory committees in vocational programs, he took it upon himself to organize an Advisory Committee for the purpose of garnering support and assistance in securing the necessary resources to develop the program as outlined in the district’s course of study. In addition to bolstering his own program, he envisioned a strengthened school-community relationship with the added participation from local business groups.

He said,

S1: Yes. And I can't tell you exactly how much I'm going to have. Because if I get the people I want, and they are going to politically powerful people -- in that small town anyway -- then I run a risk of getting some things I may not want. But I guess at this point, it's a risk I'm willing to take. And if we get a little negative with a lot of positive, it will be worth it. But it's good for accountability -- you get the relationship between school and business and school and the community. Anytime you can do that I think it helps the whole school. . . .

. . . Because I see the resources that we need to teach this subject area correctly, and I need a power base to help me get it.
I: Are there instances of that occurring in other areas?

S1: Well, I think the instance of Vo-Ag is a very good one where they got a lot of help from the school.

I: And you've seen that happen, and that's why you . . .

S1: Yes. That's one of the reasons.

... And I'm hoping to get more than just input and pressure and calling the superintendent and saying, "Hey, I think you ought to fund him." I'm hoping that we can have some people on the phone that can call up somebody and say, "Hey, you work in this. We need to get something set up in hydraulics. How about you guys doing that part — funding that part of it." And give the businesses some recognition for that, but I think we have enough different businesses around the area that I think that we might be able to set the program up with a lot of help from the community in that way.

***

Emphasizing the importance of being responsive to businesses and their changing needs for the program's survival, two teachers (S1, S9) said,

S1: Oh, probably the best process of change is gradual. You know I found — we have some new equipment for the communications and when it's new technology to me, it takes me about a year to implement it. We got a multi-track recorder for the radio part so we can do some splicing in and some different things, and it's going to be a year. I teach too many classes to be able to jump in and learn what I need to learn in all the different areas. That's what I'm kind of looking at now, to try to get a couple of things a year and work
into it. Now the field is changing dramatically. It's either change or we're going to die, one or the other.

***

S9: So again, you're going to have to be keeping track of your community -- what industries are there, what needs are there for jobs, because if you don't need those jobs, you don't need to run the program.

You're always looking for: Is there a new area we should be going into? Is there something we should be teaching that we're not teaching? Is there a need out there that we could be filling or finding students for?

We're an alternative education. We're not a mainstream education. People choose us. They don't have to come to us. They don't have to come to the JVS. They can stay at their home school. They have to go to school, but they don't have to come to us. So we have to be teaching something that has some meaning in the community or we don't have a function. And that's what I'd be looking at my Advisory Committee for -- that would be for help in these areas and trying to stay current with what's going on, with what the needs are in the community, with what they see.

***

Areas of Responsibility and Obligations

Within this view, teachers expressed accountability to four audiences: (1) students, (2) parents, (3) community/public, and (4) businesses/advisory committees. Areas of responsibility and accountability obligations to each are discussed separately.

It is important to note that the characteristics of this view of accountability (described in the previous section) were derived from the
analysis of obligations to specific audiences. Many of the illustrative excerpts were presented as a means of exemplifying these characteristics. So in an effort to avoid redundancy and yet still present supporting data for accountability obligations, illustrative excerpts for this section have been kept to a minimum. To restate them here would not serve to provide further clarification of obligations.

Students

As noted in Table 20, sixteen teachers expressed accountability to their students. Teachers stated they were accountable for five areas of responsibility: (A) Curriculum, (B) Student Achievement, (C) Classroom Environment, (D) Interactions with Students, and (E) Personal Accountability. Two teachers (E5, E6) stated they were accountable, but did not identify specific obligations.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas of Responsibility</th>
<th>Obligations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **A. Curriculum (n=12)** | 1. Delivering curriculum from the course of study (S3,E8)  
2. Allowing students to determine curricular content (E9,S2,S4,S6)  
3. Providing rich, broad learning experiences (E1,E2,E3,E8,S2,S4,S5,S6,S7,S8)  
4. Providing instruction that students find a. understandable (S3,S7,E1), b. interesting (S7,E1)  
5. Providing after-class opportunities for students to learn (S4,S8) |
| **B. Student Achievement (n=3)** | 1. Establishing fair, achievable evaluation standards (S3)  
2. Having taught students; improved them in positive ways (S9)  
3. Monitoring student progress; knowing where they are academically (E8) |
| **C. Classroom Environment (n=4)** | 1. Maintaining a classroom environment that is a. comfortable; students feel free to learn (S2,S3) b. safe (S4,S6) |
| **D. Interactions with Students (n=4)** | 1. Communicating expectations and standards (S3)  
2. Motivating students to learn (S4)  
3. Treating students with respect (S4,S7,S9)  
4. Serving as a role model (S7,S9) |
| **E. Personal Accountability (n=2)** | 1. Being organized and prepared (S4)  
2. Meeting personal accountabilities (E4)  
Accountable, but did not indicate for what (E5,E6). |
Area of Responsibility: Curriculum. Twelve teachers stated they were accountable to students for curricular obligations. Two (S3,E8) said they were obligated to deliver the curriculum outlined in the district's course of study. One (S3) said,

S3: To the students, I think I should be accountable, number one to cover the material that's been expected of me -- that they're getting what material they should be getting at the grade level. So they should be confident that they're getting the material that they need to go on to be successful in their science career.

***

Four teachers (E9,S2,S4,S6) stated they were accountable to allow students opportunities to determine the curricular content. As one of these teachers (S4) said,

S4: Yes, to a certain extent [accountable to students to deliver] the content . . . . There are certain things that are prescribed in the Course of Study that they expect you to deal with as a teacher. My notion, also, of content is that I try to let the students also decide some measure of democratic input into the content. But that's not something that deals with accountability specifically, except that I feel that I'm accountable to my students to try and touch on the things that interest them and impact them, as well as the others.

***

Ten teachers said they were accountable for providing rich, broad learning experiences. Though most did not elaborate on this, the obligation generally included (a) assisting students in their learning;
(b) creating opportunities for beneficial learning experiences; and (c) addressing both cognitive and affective development.

With regard to the first aspect (assisting in learning), three teachers (E3, E8, S5) said, "I'm accountable to helping them [learn]" (E3, 256-7); "I'm accountable to help them progress" (E8, 615-6); and "[I'm accountable] for helping [them] extinguish behavior that could be detrimental to their life in the long run" (S5, 527-9).

When six others (S4, S7, E2, S5, S8, E1) spoke of creating opportunities for learning, they said, "[I'm accountable] to try to give them the richest experience that I can" (S4, 236-7); "[W]hat I try to do is present them with as many different experiences" (S7, 584-6); "[I'm accountable] for giving them the best possible first grade experience I can" (E2, 394-5); "Accountable for providing a good learning experience for them" (S5, 525-5); "I'm accountable to give them every opportunity I can to get those things I want -- the ability to use the [math] tool; the confidence to use the tool" (S8, 1578-89); and "I'm accountable for providing them with what they need in order to learn" (E1, 1000-2).

Finally, one teacher (S6) stated he was accountable for creating learning experiences that addressed affective, as well as cognitive, development. He said,

S6: So in that sense I think I'm accountable for things beyond -- for affective kinds of behavior and feelings and emotions and things like that. I think that those things should be nurtured. Again, that is personal...
Three teachers (E1, S3, S7) said they were accountable for providing instruction in ways that students found understandable and interesting. One (E1) said,

E1: Oh, I'm accountable to my students. Definitely. Now that's more personal and right there. I'm accountable for providing them with what they need in order to learn. With making what they need interesting. With presenting it in a way that they can grasp it and understand it.

***

And finally within the area of responsibility for curriculum, two teachers (S4, S8) said they were accountable for providing after-class opportunities for additional instruction or remediation. One (S4) said,

S4: ... So I let them know, "This is what I expect. This is what I will offer them. This is when I'm available to help remediate. This is what I will do for them." And they know that. It's not a hidden agenda. It's always well announced.

***

**Area of Responsibility: Student Achievement.** Three teachers (S3, S9, E8) stated they were accountable for student achievement. Obligations included (1) setting fair, achievable evaluation standards (S3); (2) ensuring that students have learned and improved in positive ways (S9); and (3) monitoring student progress. These teachers said,

S3: I think I'm also accountable to set fair evaluation standards that people can achieve if they fulfill my requirements.

***

S9: You have an accountability to have improved them; to have actually taught them something; to actually
have had something happening in the classroom; to have a positive influence.

***

E8: Uhm, I think I'm accountable to monitor their progress and to help them along to where they need to be. You know, when you have thirty kids in the classroom there's no way everybody's going to be at the same level. You know, I think I'm accountable to know where they are (number one), and to help them progress.

***

Area of Responsibility: Classroom Environment. Four teachers (S2, S3, S4, S6), all of whom were secondary teachers, were accountable for creating and maintaining a classroom environment that was conducive to learning (S2, S3) and safe (S4, S6). This is illustrated in excerpts from conversations with two of these teachers (S3, S6):

S3: I think I should be accountable to have a learning atmosphere where the students are comfortable, and that would be accountable for discipline and things like that (which I haven't mentioned before), but that have some kind of learning atmosphere that they're comfortable in and they feel free to learn.

***

S6: Although it was not a problem that I ever had to deal with, I do feel that teachers are accountable for the health and safety of the students. Whether in a science classroom or on an athletic field, we are accountable for injuries which could have been prevented. In addition, we should be accountable for first aid that necessitates administration, in the case of an injury. Besides the "simple" education of children, they are in our care for eight (or
possibly more) hours per day for 180 days of the year.

Area of Responsibility: Interactions with Students. Four secondary teachers (S3, S4, S7, S9) stated they were accountable for their interactions with students. Obligations involved (1) communicating expectations (S3); (2) motivating students to learn (S4); (3) treating students with respect (S4, S7, S9); and (4) serving as a role model (S7, S9). The following excerpts (S3, S4, S7, S9) illustrate each obligation:

S3: I think I'm accountable to the students. I need to communicate with them exactly what I expect, and I need to be fair in my own practices of evaluation since that's what I'm mostly focusing in on.

S4: I'm accountable to motivate. To cajole, where necessary. To try to give them the richest experience that I can. Now, I know that sounds sort of nebulous and vague, but... I don't know, I think that's the idealistic goal of most teachers -- to provide that.

S7: I need to treat them [students] as human beings. I need to value what is good in them. I need to set an example for them.

S9: I still owe them the fact that they should be treated a certain way; that I should present -- try to present a role model to them -- a professional model.

Area of Responsibility: Personal Accountability. Two teachers (S4, E4) stated they were accountable to students for fulfilling personal
accountability obligations. One (E4) stated explicitly that his personal accountability was interrelated with his accountability to students. He said,

\[
\text{E4: Well, the accountability to students is completely interrelated in the first in the personal level for me. Because my accountability for myself can't be really separated from them, because I view what I do in terms of their growth and their appreciation. Because if they don't like me and they don't like social studies and they're not enjoying what they do and they're not learning and excited by it, then I'm not accountable to myself. I have failed. So that's completely interrelated at that level.}
\]

The other teacher (S4) mentioned he was accountable to fulfill the same obligation for which he was personally accountable: "to have some kind of logical and cogent idea of how I'm going to deal with their education ... to be organized" (S4, 230-43).

Parents

As noted in Table 21, thirteen teachers were accountable to parents. They stated they were accountable for five areas of responsibility: (A) Curriculum, (B) Student Achievement, (C) Interactions with Students, (D) Personal Accountability, and (E) Contractual Accountability. Two teachers (E6, E7) stated they were accountable to parents, but did not specify for what.
### Table 21

**Accountability to Parents as Clients: Responsibilities & Obligations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas of Responsibility</th>
<th>Obligations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **A. Curriculum** (n=6) | 1. Following district Course of Study (S3,E8)  
2. Working together to support educational opportunities from within and outside school setting (E9)  
3. Responding to suggestions for modification in curricular program (E1, E9,S2,S4)  
4. Informing parents of student difficulties (E8) |
| **B. Student Achievement** (n=6) | 1. Educating their child (E1,E2,E5,S6,S7)  
2. Assessing their child's progress (E8) |
| **C. Interactions with Students** (n=1) | 1. Treating their child fairly (S7) |
| **D. Personal Accountability** (n=2) | 1. Ensuring their child is happy, learning, growing, and adjusting (E4)  
2. Being knowledgeable of subject matter (S3) |
| **E. Contractual Accountability** (n=1) | 1. Adhering to district rules and policies (S3)  
Accountable, but did not indicate for what (E6,E7) |

Area of Responsibility: Curriculum. Six teachers (E1,E8,E9, S2,S3,S4) stated they were accountable to parents for curricular responsibilities. Obligations included (1) following the course of study (S3,E8); (2) working with parents to support educational opportunities in and outside school (E9); (3) responding to suggestions for modifications in the curricular program (E1,E9,S2,S4); and (4)
informing parents of student difficulties (E8). As one teacher (E9) said,

E9: I would say -- piggybacking on that -- I feel that I am also accountable to the school where I am in addition to the parents. I work very closely with the school administration as well as the parents. I am not there to impress the parents with who I am or what I do, but I want to work very closely with the parents so that TOGETHER we can support the educational opportunities that open up that year for the child.

***

Area of Responsibility: Student Achievement. Six teachers (E1,E2,E5,E8,S6,S7) stated they were accountable for the student's achievement. Obligations included (1) educating the parents' child (E1,E2,E5,S6,S7); and (2) assessing the child's progress (E8). As one teacher (S7) said,

I: [You're accountable] to the parents. . . for what?

S7: Educating their children to go into the job market and be independent. That's why they send their children to school, for the most part. Now, some of them look at us as glorified baby sitters. But most parents when you talk to them truly want their children to learn.

***

Area of Responsibility: Interactions with Students. Only one teacher (S7) said she was accountable to parents for her interactions with students. For her, the obligation was to treat students fairly. She said,

S7: But, maybe, another thing. I think the parents want their
children to be treated fairly. By that I mean they realize their children are not perfect -- none of us are. But give the kid a chance. If they are having a bad day one day. Fine. Give them a break and let them the next day make it up, whether it be nice and friendly and smiling or having another chance at an assignment. I think they do not expect the child to be verbally picked on in the classroom, put down in any way. I guess they just expect us to treat their kids decently.

Area of Responsibility: Personal Accountability. Two teachers (E4,S3) stated they were accountable for fulfilling personal accountability obligations. One (E4) was personally accountable for ensuring students were happy, learning, growing, and adjusting. Of this, he said,

E4: Well, again, for me I'm going to keep addressing these questions from the two contexts. If I'm accountable in the personal level, and doing what I want to do in the classroom with the kids, then I feel the public part takes care of itself. In that context almost completely. Because see the public -- like parent conferences -- parents don't sit there and say, "Do you teach these three concepts in science -- phylum, class, and order in your zoology unit?" Parents don't care on that level. They want to know if their kid is happy and learning and growing and adjusting with kids and feeling. . . so in that professional context of accountability to curriculum and stuff like that, parents and the public beyond, I don't think give a rat's piddle about that. So if I'm doing my job personally, I find parents overwhelmingly excited by what I'm doing. They don't come in and ask me about grades. They come
in and say, "I can't believe Johnny loves social studies. He always hated social studies."

***

For the other teacher (S3), she stated she was accountable to parents for the same obligation for which she was personally accountable (i.e., being knowledgeable of subject matter). She said,

I: . . .To the parents, I think is next.

S3: I guess they're going to be interested in my being accountable for my knowledge of the subject matter. [pause] And curriculum -- knowledge of the curriculum.

***

Area of Responsibility: Contractual Accountability. Only one teacher (S3) stated she was accountable to parents for following district rules and policies. This teacher said,

S3: I guess they're [parents] going to be interested in my being accountable for . . .

. . . following school system discipline standards and any other school system policies.

I: Okay, these are things that you think you are accountable to them for.

S3: Right. I think that if they came into the classroom and if I wasn't following one of them, I wouldn't be doing my job.

***

Community

As noted in Table 22, three teachers (E7, S2, S6) were accountable to the community. The area of responsibility for which they were accountable was Curriculum.
### Table 22
Accountability to Community as Clients: Responsibilities & Obligations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas of Responsibility</th>
<th>Obligations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Curriculum (n=3)</td>
<td>1. Helping students develop social skills to become good citizens (S2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Teaching basic skills so students can become productive employees (S6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Providing students opportunities to learn as much as they can (E7)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Area of Responsibility: Curriculum.** Three teachers (S2, S6, E7) were accountable to the local community for curricular responsibilities. Obligations included (1) helping students develop social skills to become good citizens (S2); (2) teaching basic skills so students can become productive employees (S6); and (3) providing students with opportunities to learn as much as they can (E7). These teachers said,

S2: And we remediate. We work on why it is that they were placed here in the first place. That's the focus. So that we can get them back into a regular school setting. To have a kid here -- maybe you have a kid in a regular school who is truant constantly, or . . . who is truant (let's stay with that) and to come here and is placed here, and then he starts to demonstrate the same behaviors (he's not coming to school, tardy all the time), we are accountable for that. I take that to heart because this is a kid that at a very, very young age is doing it. What toll are we, as a society, going to have to pay later on because of this kid, whereas now, I have a chance to work with him. I have a means of influencing him in a
positive way -- trying to just get him refocused.  

I: What are you accountable to the community for?

S6: In this particular area so many of the students went through high school, graduate from high school, did not further their education, and stayed in that town to work. So I think that the community was expecting kind of a... knowing that these students were going to be their future employees, or co-workers that they expected a certain basic skill... certain basic skills, knowledge, etc. that they expected these students to come out of the school system with. Because a lot of them knew that was going to be the extent of their formal education outside of being trained on a specific job or a specific task that they had with their employment.

E7: ... I am responsible to the community, because the kids are part of that community.

I: Can you put your finger on what it is that you're responsible for?

E7: Well, I guess to provide them with the opportunity to learn as much as they can.

Businesses/Advisory Committees

As noted in Table 23, three teachers (S', S7, S9) stated they were accountable to businesses through interactions with business advisory committees as representatives of local business and industry groups. Areas of responsibility were (A) Curriculum and (B) Student Achievement.
Table 23

Accountability to Businesses/Advisory Committees as Clients: Responsibilities & Obligations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas of Responsibility</th>
<th>Obligations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Curriculum (n=2)</td>
<td>1. Working cooperatively to develop curricular program (S1,S9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Student Achievement</td>
<td>1. Ensuring student competence and confidence (S7)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Area of Responsibility: Curriculum. Two teachers (S1,S9) stated they were accountable for curricular responsibilities. The obligation was to work cooperatively with Advisory Committee members to develop curricular programs. They said,

S1: The people that have agreed to serve on that are all businessmen some far, or manufacturing, or some area of expertise inside of industry. And my goal isn't necessarily to produce workers for them. I certainly want to have kids going out there that are more adaptable and can do that. And so it might create some problems for me. I run that risk doing it. That their view of what ought to be done may be different than mine because I might see a broader picture. I'm not just looking for a group that just says, "yea, yea, yea". I'm looking for a group that are going to ask questions, "why are you doing this? or what can we do different to help?"

***

I: Okay, how about your Advisory Committee? What are you accountable to them for?
S9: Our Advisory Committee basically, I don't look at someone who is there, again, doing anything negative to me. I look at them as to people who... I always want to know what's happening in the business world. In other words, what's out there? Am I teaching the right things? Even though we have like a State-mandated curriculum which is going to tell us, for example, that we're going to have teach a word processing, I'm looking at my Advisory Committee, "What word processing system do I want to teach?"

We just made the change a year ago to Word Perfect 5.1, which I'm very happy with. I think we made an extremely good change, but we did it with their input.

In other words, "what do you need out there? What are businesses using?" So this is what we're using them for -- as a source of information. I'm looking to them to give me some guidance on, "Are we doing the right things? What do you need? What do you need in people coming into your situation? What should we be working at?"

I look at them positively as someone who's there to help me.

***

Area of Responsibility: Student Achievement. One teacher (S7) stated she was accountable for ensuring student competence and confidence. She said,

I: Okay, how about to the businessmen? 1060

S7: To the businessmen, I owe students who can think. 1062

... I guess I think in terms of education for the whole country. Maybe these kids won't stay here in [local] county. I need to 1081
train these kids to go out there and work. To be able to think. To be able to reason. To make a decision. To have the confidence to come in and learn a job and then make a decision. The desire to do this.

From what I have read (and it could be all wrong, but from what I have read), American business wants students (people) who can read; who can understand what they read; who can think for themselves and make decisions; and who can add and subtract; and who can write simple, direct statements that other people who will receive these will be able to read and understand.

***
Summary

All teachers stated they were (1) accountable; (2) accountable to multiple audiences; and (3) accountable for performance of various responsibilities and obligations to respective audiences. For these teachers, "accountability" was a multifaceted concept encompassing four interrelated views. Views, as major themes emerging from the data, were (1) Personal Accountability, (2) Collegial Accountability, (3) Contractual Accountability, and (4) Accountability to Clients. Views were distinguished by the (a) audiences to whom accountability was expressed, and (b) nature of the obligations for which they were accountable to each audience.

Audiences were (1) self, (2) colleagues, (3) professional organizations, (4) principal, (5) district administrators, (6) superintendent, (7) local school board, (8) State Department of Education, (9) students, (10) parents, (11) local community, and (12) businesses and Advisory Committees. Audiences mentioned most often were those with whom they worked in close proximity and had immediate access to direct interaction and communication. Audiences also tended to be local audiences.

Accountability obligations were specific acts or attitudes for which they were responsible and related to (1) performance, (2) non-performance, and (3) performance of future yet unknown responsibilities. Obligations developed from perceptions of moral, professional, and/or contractual responsibilities. Areas of responsibility were (1) curriculum, (2) personal professional development, (3) interactions with students, (4) staff development, (5) student achievement, (6) classroom
environment, (7) administrative documentation, (8) personal behavior, (9) district planning, (10) contractual obligations, and (11) personal obligations. Only one area of responsibility, curriculum, was common to all views. Specific obligations within each area of responsibility varied among the four views: (1) Personal, (2) Collegial, (3) Contractual, and (4) Accountability to Client.

The first view, Personal Accountability, was characterized as (1) a private, solitary accountability relationship; (2) a primary and critically demanding accountability relationship; and (3) related closely to the teacher's sense of accountability to students. Expanding on Fenstermacher's (1979) definition of accountability, this was an accountability relationship with oneself. One was responsible to oneself for one's performance. Personal expectations were held for one's performance, and performance was judged according to student academic growth and achievement. Possible reasons for the primacy of this view were that it (1) is a motivating factor in one's work, relating to feelings of self-worth, pride, and professional satisfaction; (2) subsumes other accountability obligations; (3) is a necessary condition in being accountable to others; and (4) contributes to one's teaching ability. Embedded in each of these aspects is the notion that self-evaluative activities play a significant role. Areas of responsibility were (a) curriculum, (b) personal professional development, and (c) interactions with students.

The second view, Collegial Accountability, was characterized as (1) an informal accountability relationship developed from professional interaction; (2) a relationship nurtured by direct communication and
shared decision-making with opportunities for negotiation; and (3) involving an assumption of responsibility for the group's collective actions. Audiences were (1) other teachers, (2) principal, and (3) professional organizations. This accountability relationship was not founded on formal agreements, but was selectively chosen based on areas of interest. Obligations were personal or professional obligations to support and strengthen curricular programs and abilities of/relationships among professional staff, all of which involved direct communication. This view extends beyond personal accountability, wherein there is recognition that one is part of a larger entity, and one's performance affects the performance of others and ultimately the group as a whole. One is accountable to others for one's actions as it impacts the group. Areas of responsibility were (a) curriculum, and (b) staff development.

The third view, Contractual Accountability, was characterized as a formal accountability relationship, whereby (1) responsibilities are defined through organizational rules, policies, documents, contracts, and student test data; (2) performance is routinely monitored by supervisory personnel, and judged according to explicit rules and uniform criteria; (3) accountability to audiences at higher levels is communicated through intermediary sources; and (4) there are hierarchical lines of authority and control over decisions affecting teachers' responsibilities. Audiences at three administrative levels were (1) principal, (2) district administrators, (3) superintendent, (4) local school board, and (5) State Department of Education.
The policy mentioned as most influencing determination of responsibilities currently was the State Competency-Based Education requirement. Concerns with this policy focussed on the appropriateness of (1) identified pupil performance objectives, (2) suggested methods of instruction, and (3) methods used for measuring/reporting student competency. Decisions to change (or not change) the content and/or methods of instruction in order to meet this requirement were defended with arguments related to student test scores.

Accountability to audiences at the district and state levels was communicated through intermediary sources. Communication moved through a chain of command. At the school level, the principal monitored teacher performance through classroom observations and/or review of lesson plans. At the district and state levels, performance was perceived as being monitored through student test data. Teachers expressed concerns about the lack of information regarding decisions made at the highest levels which affected their responsibilities; specifically, the rationales, purposes, and future uses of information derived from newly created accountability programs. Areas of responsibility were (a) curriculum, (b) student achievement, (c) classroom environment, (d) administrative documentation, (e) personal behavior, (f) district planning, and (g) contractual obligations.

Fourteen of the 17 teachers expressing this view addressed the issue of statewide testing for accountability purposes. Although two discussed the importance of testing to the community or in motivating students to learn, most were strongly opposed to statewide testing. Opposition focussed on the (1) validity of test data as representative
of student or teacher performance, and (2) use and implications of comparing student performance without regard for differences in social, economic or developmental differences among students.

Finally, the fourth view, Accountability to Client, was characterized as (1) a professional-layperson relationship: professional accountability to lay groups as financiers and beneficiaries of educational services; (2) the focus of accountability obligations is on the provision of educational opportunities to students; and (3) accountability obligations develop from personal and contractual obligations which are modified based on understandings of client expectations. Audiences were (1) students, (2) parents, (3) community, and (4) businesses/advisory committees. Students were viewed as direct recipients; other client groups were indirect beneficiaries of educational services. Accountability obligations were communicated to each group (with the exception of community) in the following ways: (1) I.E.P., (2) syllabi and handouts, (3) class bulletin boards, (4) conversations, and (5) direct interaction. Areas of responsibility were (a) curriculum, (b) interactions with students, (c) student achievement, (d) classroom environment, (e) contractual obligations, and (f) personal obligations.
CHAPTER V
CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

Summary of the Study

This research was an investigation of teachers' perspectives on accountability. Discussion of the importance and need for this study was presented in Chapter One. As a critical player in education, the teacher mediates external and internal influences in the context of classroom instruction, yet minimal attention has been directed toward developing an understanding of the teacher's meaning of accountability. This, along with the importance placed recently on local discretion and the teacher's role in policy formulation in educational reform (National Governors' Association & The White House, 1990), highlights the value of developing understandings of ways in which teachers view the demands of accountability.

Major objectives of this research were to develop (a) a categorized set of topics or concepts of teachers' perspectives on accountability; (b) exemplars and discussion of each topic or concept in teachers' own words; and (c) discussion of the relationship to and implications of these perspectives for classroom practice. This was accomplished through an investigation of the following research questions:

1. What does educational accountability mean to elementary and secondary teachers?
2. To whom are teachers accountable?

3. For what are teachers accountable?

4. What are the obligations of accountability, i.e., record-keeping; explaining, justifying, critically examining practice?

5. What forces shape these obligations, i.e., inter-professional norms, social interaction, mandated policies, beliefs about teaching?

6. In what ways do teachers' thoughts regarding accountability shape or influence their decisions or judgments? What actions are taken to be accountable? What are the benefits and/or consequences of these actions? In what ways do these actions reinforce, change, or modify the way teachers view accountability?

In Chapter Two, a review of the literature was presented, which included (a) the history of accountability in England and the United States; (b) accountability legislation in the United States with specific attention to Ohio's legislation; (c) policy implementation studies on accountability and reform; and (d) research investigating teachers' perspectives on accountability.

Methodological design and strategies used in this research were presented in Chapter Three. Qualitative methodology with a phenomenological focus toward developing an understanding of a "shared view" or meaning (Erickson, 1988; Patton, 1990b) toward accountability was used. Data were collected through semi-structured interviews with eighteen experienced teachers from Ohio; teachers volunteered for participation. Analysis was conducted using the constant-comparison method of qualitative data analysis (Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Miles & Huberman, 1984; Strauss, 1987). Strategies used to enhance the credibility of findings were member checks and peer-debriefings (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Patton, 1990b).
In Chapter Four, the findings, as emerging themes or "views" toward accountability, were presented. Findings were presented and discussed as set forth in the major objectives outlined in Chapter One.

In this chapter, conclusions drawn from the findings are presented. This is followed by a discussion of implications and recommendations for further research.

Conclusions

Eight conclusions can be drawn from the results of this study which should serve to help other professional educators and educational policymakers develop a clearer understanding of teachers' meanings of accountability.

1. **All teachers in this study were accountable.**

   All stated they were (1) accountable; (2) accountable to multiple audiences; and (3) accountable for performance of specific obligations to each audience. Not one teacher was opposed to the notion of accountability. Each recognized that s/he was accountable to various audiences (as participants, recipients, and financiers of educational services) for performance of specific obligations while serving in the professional role of educator. Specific audiences were (1) self, (2) other teachers, (3) principal, (4) professional organizations, (5) district administrators, (6) superintendent, (7) local school board, (8) State Department of Education, (9) students, (10) parents, (11) community, (12) Advisory Committee/Businesses. Accountability obligations were specific acts or attitudes for which they were
responsible, and related to performance and non-performance of responsibilities.

2. The notion of accountability is a complex, multidimensional concept.

Conceptually, there were four distinct views that comprised teachers' overall meaning of accountability: (1) Personal, (2) Collegial, (3) Contractual, and (4) Accountability to Client. Each teacher discussed a minimum of two views in their overall conception. Specifically, half discussed all four; one-third discussed three; and three discussed two views.

Each view varied in significant and meaningful ways, making it amenable to characterization along numerous dimensions, such as (a) audiences to whom the teacher was accountable; (b) areas of responsibility and obligations for which each teacher was accountable to specific audiences; (c) development of expectations for performance of accountability obligations; (d) degree of formalization of the accountability relationship (formal, informal); (e) type (direct, indirect) and frequency (frequent, infrequent) of communication involved in the accountability relationship; (f) type of criteria (unique, situational, uniform) used to judge performance of accountability obligations; and (g) the underlying sense of responsibility (moral, personal, professional, legal) for accountability obligations. These differences highlight the complexity of teachers' meanings and represent the extent to which they perceive and mediate various, and sometimes conflicting accountability demands. Specific points regarding this complexity are discussed where applicable in the following conclusions.
3. **One's view of accountability is influenced by the nature of the relationship with those to whom the accountability is expressed.**

Teachers described multiple types of accountability relationships. The four views (personal, collegial, contractual, client) characterize four distinct types of accountability relationships, which were developed from a comparison of teachers' descriptions of their (1) relationships with audiences to whom accountability was expressed (i.e., description of audience; degree of formalization; type and frequency of communication), and (2) accountability obligations (i.e., development of expectations for performance; criteria used to judge performance; underlying sense of responsibility). Descriptions of accountability relationships became part of the defining characteristics of each view.

As stated earlier, teachers held multiple views. Each view represents a different type of accountability relationship, and all teachers discussed their involvement in multiple (two or more) types of accountability relationships, such as,

**The personal view**, an informal accountability, was a solitary relationship; one was accountable to oneself. Expectations for performance developed through self-understandings of educational processes and one's influence in them; understandings developed over time through reflection on professional experience, training, and education. Criteria for judging performance were (a) individually unique, (b) continually developing, and (c) applied only to oneself for one's performance. Obligations evolved from a moral, personal, and/or professional sense of responsibility.

**The collegial view**, also an informal accountability, was a relationship with other professional educators. Expectations for performance were jointly-determined through direct and frequent communication. Criteria for judging performance were situational in the sense they developed from group norms and expectations. Obligations developed from a professional sense of responsibility.
The contractual view, a formal accountability, was also a relationship with other educators. However, expectations for performance developed through understandings of organizational and governmental policies, contracts, documents, and guidelines. Communication with audiences was typically indirect and infrequent. Uniform criteria (principal observations, administrative review of lesson plans, student data) were used to judge performance. Obligations developed from a legal, contractual sense of responsibility.

Accountability to Client was a professional-layperson relationship. As professional educator, the teacher was accountable to various client groups as financiers, recipients, and beneficiaries of educational services. Expectations for performance developed from a combination of personal and contractual expectations which were modified based on understandings of client expectations. In this way, the accountability relationship was both formal and informal. Teachers were accountable for carrying out responsibilities as directed by the institution (formal), yet also accountable for exercising professional judgment in mediating needs and expectations of client groups (informal). Type and frequency of communication varied among client groups, as did criteria for judging performance. Communication occurred directly with students, parents, and businesses (as represented through Advisory Committees), and was most frequent with students. Communication with parents also occurred indirectly through the student. Criteria for judging performance might be uniform, situational, or unique depending on the way in which the expectations developed. Expectations, ranging from formal to informal, developed from sources such as (a) district course of study, (b) school philosophy or program orientation, (c) teacher's classroom discipline and grading policies, (d) unique student needs. Thus, within this view, accountability obligations develop from a combination of moral, professional and legal responsibilities.

Generally, audiences could be described as homogeneous within views, and heterogeneous across views (i.e., personal accountability to self; collegial accountability to other educators -- peers; contractual accountability to other educators -- administrators; and accountability to clients as lay groups). However, there was an exception with one audience, the principal, mentioned within the context of two views. Teachers varied in perceptions of their accountability relationship with
the principal. Though most discussed the relationship as a contractual one, four emphasized the collegial nature of the relationship as being more prominent. This shows how variable, and dependent on the nature of the working situation, the accountability relationship (collegial, contractual) can be.

4. **Audiences mentioned most often were those with whom the teacher worked in close proximity; audiences tended to be local audiences.**

Teachers mentioned audiences with whom they worked in close proximity and had immediate access through direct interaction as those to whom they were accountable. These audiences were self, other teachers, principal, students and parents. More remote, albeit influential audiences were mentioned by fewer teachers. These included the superintendent, local school board, district administrators, local community, and State Department of Education. Though few teachers mentioned having direct communication with these audiences, their influence was recognized as having a significant effect on the conditions of employment, and the availability and use of educational resources (i.e., teaching contracts were issued by local school boards, local communities voted on passage of school levies, and the State Department of Education was influential in statewide policies and educational laws). Audiences also tended to be local audiences. With the exception of the State Department of Education and professional organizations, there were no other non-local audiences (governmental, legislative, or otherwise) mentioned.
5. **Teachers were accountable for performance of curricular responsibilities.**

This was the one common area of responsibility in all four views. Though specific obligations varied across views, every teacher stated s/he was in some way responsible, thus accountable, to one or more audiences for the way in which classroom curricula were developed, interpreted, and implemented. Specific obligations in each view are

- **Personal obligations:** (a) setting realistic expectations for student performance; (b) determining appropriate methods, instructional resources, and content; and (c) defending decisions for promotion/retention of students.

- **Collegial obligations:** (a) participating in, and (b) implementing joint-decisions regarding (1) discipline and learning environment, and (2) curricular emphases.

- **Contractual obligations:** (a) following the district’s course of study, (b) responding to administrative requests for information, and (c) teaching basic facts identified in statewide testing programs.

- **Obligations to client groups:** (a) delivering the curriculum from the course of study; (b) involving students in curricular decisions; (c) providing rich, broad learning experiences in ways that students find understandable and interesting; (d) providing after-class opportunities for students to learn; (e) working with parents to support educational opportunities within and outside the school setting; (f) responding to parent suggestions for modification in curricular programs; (g) helping students develop social skills to become good citizens; (h) teaching students basic skills to become productive employees; and (i) working cooperatively with businesses (through Advisory Committees) to develop curricular programs.

All teachers were morally, professionally, or contractually obligated and accountable for their actions as it related to creating and implementing classroom curricula. Examples might include the (a) moral obligation to themselves to do the best they could in creating conditions of learning; (b) professional obligation to self, students, or parents to do what’s best for the student; (c) professional
obligation to other educators to work in ways that strengthened the curriculum or the abilities of others to deliver the curriculum; or (d) contractual obligation to administrators or parents to follow the content in the district's course of study. They were accountable to others (other teachers, students, parents, business) to work cooperatively in modifying the prescribed program in ways that were responsive to a variety of interests and needs, such as (a) student ability levels and areas of interest; (b) school philosophy or educational orientation; (c) teachers' beliefs about teaching; (d) parental interests, areas of expertise, or involvement; and (e) skills needed by business and industry.

Overall, teachers expressed general satisfaction with these responsibilities. There was opportunity to exercise professional judgment in determining the methods and instructional content of the prescribed program, with discretion to be responsive to the needs of others.

With the advent of competency-based education (CBE) policies, however, teachers (primarily elementary) expressed frustration with the ways in which these policies limited and constrained their use of professional discretion in determining curricular offerings. According to these policies, students were tested at regular intervals to determine mastery of knowledge identified in the district's course of study for a given grade and subject area. Students not mastering the required objectives were provided additional instruction until they were able to do so. Districts varied with regard to types of tests used and frequency of test administrations. In districts where testing occurred
more frequently, teachers were reluctantly changing instructional practices in ways that promised satisfactory student performance on tests.

Those who perceived the possibility that students would not perform well were making the most dramatic changes. Some were focusing on content that, in their opinion, was inappropriate for student ability levels (i.e., students did not have prerequisite skills and knowledge to conceptually grasp the given content). Methodologically, others were implementing curricula in ways that were antithetical to the school's educational philosophy (i.e., integrated curricula) or the teacher's beliefs about effective teaching and learning (i.e., holistic teaching philosophies).

6. **Teachers were accountable for student academic growth and achievement.**

As evidenced in discussions of accountability obligations, teachers were accountable to all audiences for student academic growth and achievement. They were accountable to (a) themselves for student academic growth, as this was the criterion against which they judged their own performance; (b) other teachers and principals for working together to create opportunities and conditions which fostered student academic growth; (c) administrative audiences for adhering to and implementing policies designed to facilitate student achievement; and (d) administrative and client groups for ensuring student achievement.

Their accountability for student achievement was also evidenced in discussions of the use of test data. Even though such data may be used to judge student and/or school performance, most expressed the opinion
that data were also used administratively to judge their performance. Because they were accountable for student achievement, and test scores were considered important and valued indicators of student performance by administrative groups (only one teacher acknowledged the importance of test data to client groups), teachers were accountable for ensuring that students performed well on these tests.

Many teachers (primarily elementary) were strongly opposed, for several reasons, to the use of statewide testing for accountability purposes. First, they did not view test data as valid indicators of student or teacher performance; scores (a) represented only a partial view of student or teacher performance, and (b) failed to adequately account for differences in populations and resources. Second, because test scores were made public, they were concerned that the public was receiving a partial and inaccurate view of education (i.e., "better scores mean better teaching"). And finally, if test data were linked directly to employability status, they feared that other teachers would (a) tend to "teach to the test," narrowing the curriculum to only those objectives measured, or (2) not want to be responsible for teaching low-ability students.

It is important to note that teachers did not assume sole responsibility for student achievement and academic growth. They viewed themselves as one of many players in the performance of this obligation; accountability for this was viewed as a cooperative effort among all audiences. Some expressed the desire to see more participation, thus more accountability, on the part of parents.
7. There were two primary audiences to whom teachers were accountable: students and oneself.

Twelve teachers stated that the two most important audiences were (a) students and (b) oneself. The remaining teachers did not prioritize audiences, but highlighted the centrality of students indirectly through discussions of accountability obligations. The focus of all obligations was on the provision of educational services for students. Thus, students were a primary audience in all teachers' views.

Of those who prioritized audiences, four placed equal importance on the two audiences; and eight were accountable to oneself first, and students second. The former group saw accountability to self and students as being interrelated and inseparable; successful performance of personal obligations was contingent upon successful performance of obligations to students, and vice versa.

The latter group provided four reasons for the importance of accountability to oneself relating to (a) personal responsibility, (b) professional growth, and (c) professional pride in one's work. First, personal obligations subsumed other obligations and were considered higher level obligations (i.e., moral and professional obligation to utilize professional judgment in the performance of all obligations). Second, personal accountability was a necessary condition in being accountable to others (i.e., one cannot be accountable to others until accountable to oneself). Third, the act of being personally accountable (through reflection and self-critique on practice) was seen as a way of improving one's teaching ability. And fourth, personal accountability (to do one's best) was important in how they viewed themselves as a
teacher, and related to feelings of self-worth, pride and professional satisfaction.

8. **The notion of professionalism was embedded in teachers' meanings of accountability.**

Within all views, teachers spoke of themselves as professionals or as professional role models. They viewed themselves, like other professionals, as having a specialized expertise acquired through education, training, and experience in the field of education. As role models, their professionalism was a demonstration of a particular attitude or demeanor reflecting an assured competence in one's field. As a professional there was a commitment to utilizing this knowledge and understandings in ways that supported, enhanced and strengthened one's ability to provide the best possible educational services to students.

There was also an assumption of professional responsibility (expressed through the collegial view) for the collective actions and behaviors of other educators. The teacher was responsible for her/his own behavior as it effected the ability of others to carry out their duties and responsibilities successfully. This responsibility involved working cooperatively with others in ways that strengthened the collective provision of services at various levels (department, school, or profession).

Some teachers recognized potential difficulties inherent in carrying out these responsibilities. Because differences in educational practices and beliefs toward teaching could become barriers in working together, they recognized the importance of maintaining an openness and willingness to work cooperatively in resolving difficulties resulting
from these differences. There was a professional responsibility to (a) acknowledge differences, (b) make the effort to resolve associated problems, and (c) support and implement (sometimes controversial) group decisions.

A few teachers highlighted the importance of "professionals monitoring professionals;" professionalism involved the assumption of responsibility for the internal monitoring and regulation of professional members. Teachers should mentor, evaluate, and assist in the improvement of other teachers' performance. Though in these teachers' reports there was little evidence of these practices occurring with any regularity, professionalism, and its various meanings, was an integral aspect of teachers' views toward accountability.

Implications

Determinations of the applicability of these findings in other settings and contexts are joint responsibilities of the researcher and reader. In this study, the substantive meaning of accountability was examined with a volunteer sample of eighteen experienced teachers from Central Ohio. The goals of this research were to (a) ensure that findings were representative of their thoughts and not the biases of the researcher; and (b) develop a rich, detailed and contextualized description of teachers' thoughts and meanings of accountability. This was done in such a way that would enable the reader to (a) understand the meanings of accountability from this group of teachers, and (b) use this information in consideration of accountability processes, policies and implications. Implications for educational policy or practice drawn
from this research should be considered by the reader in the context of local circumstances. With this in mind, there are four implications suggested by these findings.

First, teachers should be encouraged to examine their own notions of accountability, and apply them in the context of educational reform. These findings demonstrate the complexity of the concept; accountability is not simply the fulfillment of contractual obligations. There are other (possibly equally important) dimensions with obligations for which teachers are accountable: (a) the deep-seated personal dimension -- accountability to oneself for the fulfillment of personal, professional goals; (b) collegial dimension -- accountability to other educators and the educational profession as a whole, and (c) client dimension -- accountability to consumers of educational services.

These dimensions need to be examined as they pertain to changes in educational practices and structures. Lieberman and Miller (1990) have pointed out that educational reform will require teacher involvement in the review of such things as curricular and instructional practices, school structure, learning and working environments, and ways to increase community participation. Several of these were obligations for which teachers in this study considered themselves accountable. If teachers are to be involved in determining accountability, they should be encouraged to examine their own notions of it as related to these reforms.

Second, professionalism was a defining aspect of these teachers' accountability (i.e., how they perceived and conducted themselves). These two notions (professionalism and accountability) need to be
seriously examined in conjunction. What does collective responsibility, characteristic of collegial accountability) mean in relation to teacher autonomy? What is one's individual responsibility (to other educators or the profession as a whole) to share professional insights gained from personal accountability? If educators, desirous of developing and strengthening a professional base in education, are to move ahead in this arena, then teacher educators, school practitioners, and educational policymakers must think in ways that support these two notions.

A third implication pertains to the use of standardized tests and the potential effects on efforts to be responsive to local or situational needs. Policies (state or local) that emphasize the use of traditional standardized test measures should be re-examined in light of practices and other policies designed to encourage (a) shared decision-making at the local level, (b) responsiveness to local needs and circumstances, and (c) teacher professionalism. Particular attention should be given to the ways in which the use of these measures constrain practices intended to foster local discretion and responsibility.

And finally, teachers should be encouraged to investigate and develop ways to demonstrate and communicate performance of accountability obligations. The focus of this research was on the meanings of accountability, not the effects of traditional accountability mechanisms (i.e., state and local testing programs) on classroom practice. For many, these issues were extremely important as accountability mechanisms were having a powerful and significant influence on how they perceived their obligations and carried out
classroom practices. The standards and criteria used to judge accountability were defining accountability obligations. With this in mind, teachers should be encouraged to investigate and develop alternative ways to demonstrate and communicate performance that (a) are more representative of the nature of the obligations; (b) are understandable to multiple audiences, particularly non-educators; and (c) include consideration of the institution's accountability needs (i.e., comparison of performance among schools and districts).

Recommendations for Further Research

While the findings from this study support Murphy's (1989) claim that first wave reform efforts are working, they also highlight potential problems inherent in these efforts. Murphy suggests that the success of reform efforts are evidenced through the "tight-coupling" of school systems as educators become more uniformly focused on the provision of instructional services derived from a common curriculum with particular emphasis on development of basic skills. In this research, there was a clear expression of responsibility for maintaining a curricular focus within the guidelines of a uniform district curriculum. Teachers emphasized contractual accountability to administrators and client groups for implementing the curriculum as prescribed in the district course of study, and for some teachers, in accordance with competency-based education policies. Emphasis on basic skill development was evidenced in discussions of competency-based education testing as teachers were accountable for ensuring student mastery of pupil performance objectives derived from the district course
of study. They also talked about district alignment of texts, curricula and tests. Overall, it was clear that within districts there was a common focus on curricular objectives.

There were, however, problems associated with this, particularly with regard to the influence of testing on curricular programs. Teachers were changing the way they taught to ensure satisfactory student performance on tests, and these changes were at odds with what they believed to be effective learning and teaching.

The possibility that this tight-coupling may not lead to improved educational programs was suggested by Stake and Theobald (1991) in discussions of their study on the effects of testing on efforts to reform and improve education. They sought to understand, through surveys and interviews with teachers, the causal relationships between changes in standardized testing and efforts to improve education. They observed that the general feeling among teachers was that "standardized testing [was] not a major force in maintaining or achieving improved instruction" (p. 199). Testing was viewed as a complementary component in efforts to focus on a common district curriculum stressing basic skill development. But for methodological reasons, Stake and Theobald seriously question the accuracy of their findings.

In their opinion, their findings did not accurately portray (a) teachers' conceptions of education, and (b) the compatibility of these views with the epistemological basis of educational curricula (district objectives, texts, and tests). They suspect that teachers have a
different concept of education than that conveyed in district curricula
and standardized tests. They said,

... we believe much more is happening. We think there is a
mismatch between the concept of education most teachers have and
the representations of education they find in statements of
learning objectives, workbook exercises, and test items. We think
that they believe that mastering the facts and habits is important
but that young people are not educated until they assimilate those
facts and habits into personal experience and develop a repertoire
of reasoning, application, and situational interpretation. We
believe that centrally mandated curricula have been delaying this
assimilation and repertoire, pressing for mastery of the simple
before introducing the complex, and in effect, postponing much of
the serious business of education beyond the years of public
schooling (Stake & Theobald, 1991, p. 200).

The findings of this research on teachers' perspectives on
accountability tend to support Stake's and Theobald's suspicions. Some
teachers do have different conceptions of education and learning.
Teachers discussed pedagogical and epistemological differences (i.e.,
holistic philosophies and methods, integrated curricula and learning) as
it related to (a) policies on testing, and (b) cooperative relationships
among professionals. Teachers' "beliefs about teaching" permeated their
discussions about accountability. Thus, one avenue of further research
would be to investigate relationships between (a) accountability and
it's various dimensions, and (b) beliefs about teaching. Answers to
this might serve to (a) further understandings on teachers' views toward
accountability; (b) explicate the nature of teachers' theories of
learning and teaching; and (c) shed light on potential alternatives to
traditional accountability measures. The findings of this research
are viewed as a beginning in developing understandings about teachers' perspectives on accountability, and should serve to help other educators
and policymakers better understand the complexity of this concept.
During interviews, teachers easily articulated opinions regarding formal accountability systems, but when asked to discuss their own meaning of accountability they appeared to struggle with the concept. Many indicated they never had the opportunity to discuss this concept (without regard to accountability policies) with others, and until asked to articulate thoughts on the subject in this study, didn't realize how complex it really was.

Other research questions which should serve to further illuminate teachers' thoughts on the topic might include

1. What are the views of other teachers in other settings? In what ways do they confirm/extend/refute the findings in this study?

2. The findings from this study suggest that one's notion of accountability is closely related to one's thoughts on professionalism. In what ways are the two notions related?

3. This study was conducted with experienced teachers. What are the thoughts of preservice or beginning teachers on the subject? In what ways are they similar/different to experienced teachers?

4. In what ways can understandings of teachers perspectives on accountability be useful in efforts to rethink educational processes in the reform process?

5. The findings in this study suggest there are four distinct views on accountability (personal, collegial, contractual, client). What types of administrative structures tend to support and constrain teachers' accountability in each view?

6. What are others' views of teachers' accountability. What are the similarities/differences in a teacher's view and the views of those to whom the teacher is accountable?

7. The findings from this research suggest that the teacher's view of "community" is limited as there appeared to be a lack of conceptual definition in responses (i.e., population characteristics such as income levels, interests, ethnicity, geographical boundaries, sub-communities, etc.). If community is considered a legitimate client group, than further investigation of teachers' notions of community might aide the practitioner in future efforts to communicate
accountability to this audience. How do teachers develop understandings of community? What communication avenues exist? How does this fit within their notion of accountability?

8. Because this research was exploratory, the only criteria used in selecting teachers were level and geographical location of experience (three or more years' teaching experience from within Ohio). But other characteristics may play a prominent role in teachers' views of accountability, suggesting the need for further research with information-rich cases representing other areas of interest. What are the views of teachers working with student populations of various socio-economic levels? What are the views of teachers from various ethnic backgrounds? What are the views of teachers who are actively involved in professional teaching organizations? How do these views compare with the findings from this research? Do particular views of accountability (personal, collegial, contractual, client) predominate?
A. Educational and Professional Background

1. Where did you complete your undergraduate (and graduate, if applicable) educational training?

2. Where did you complete your student teaching experience?

3. How many years fulltime teaching experience do you have?

4. In what cities have you taught?

5. What grade levels and subject areas are you currently teaching?

6. How many students are in your current classroom assignment(s)?

7. Are you a member of any professional organizations? If so, what are the organizations? Please describe your level of involvement and participation?

B. Meaning of Educational Accountability

1. When you think of the term, educational accountability, what comes to mind? Please explain.

2. Have your thoughts about accountability changed over time? Think about when you first started teaching. If yes, how have they changed?

3. a. If answer to #2 is yes: What has(ve) caused you to think differently?
   b. If answer to #2 is no: What is it that reinforces your thoughts?

C. Accountability Relationships

1. Do you consider yourself accountable?

2. If yes to #1, 
   a. to whom are you accountable?
   b. for what are you accountable?

3. If no to #1, 
   a. who is accountable? who should be?
   b. to whom are they accountable?
   c. for what are they accountable? for what should they be accountable?

4. Is anyone (or group) accountable to you? Who? For what?
D. **Accountability Obligations**

1. What are the expectations others have for you in this accountability relationship? What do others expect you to do to be accountable?

2. What are the expectations you have for others in this accountability relationship? What do you expect others to do?

3. In what ways are these expectations conveyed to each person (group)? How do you (and others) know what is expected?

4. Are the expectations as they now exist realistic? If no, how might they be different?

5. a. What expectations do you have for yourself in being accountable?
   b. In what ways are you able to realize your own expectations?
   c. In what ways are you hindered from realizing them?
   d. How do you plan to overcome/assuage these hinderences?

E. **Accountability Outcomes**

1. What are the outcomes/results of accountability?

2. What are some of the benefits of accountability as you see it?

3. What are some of the consequences of accountability?

4. Can you think of a recent occasion when you did something you might not have done several years ago, for the sake of being accountable? Please describe.
APPENDIX B

RESEARCH CONSENT AND RELEASE FORMS
Consent Form

I consent to participate in the research of **Teachers' Perspectives on Accountability**, conducted by James W. Altschuld, Principal Investigator, and Carol Cullen, Doctoral Candidate. Ms. Cullen has explained the purpose of the research, the procedures to be followed, and the expected duration of my participation.

I acknowledge that I have had the opportunity to obtain additional information regarding this research and that any questions I have raised have been answered to my full satisfaction. Further I understand that I am free to withdraw consent at any time and to discontinue participation in this research without prejudice to me by contacting Ms. Cullen at the address (or phone number) below.

Finally, I acknowledge that I have read and fully understand the consent form. I sign it freely and voluntarily. A copy has been given to me.

Participant's Signature __________________________ Date ____________

Principal Investigator: James W. Altschuld, Ph.D.
Educational Services and Research
The Ohio State University
282 Arps Hall 292-3239

Co-Investigator: Carol Cullen
Educational Services and Research
The Ohio State University
4921 Chapman Road
Delaware, Ohio 43015
548-5720
Research Release Form

I have read the transcript of the interview conducted by Carol Cullen on (insert date), and I agree that this transcript is an accurate reflection of our conversation.

I have have not (circle one) modified this transcript to reflect my considered thoughts on this subject since the time of the original interview, and I am enclosing the transcript for return to Ms. Cullen.

I grant Carol Cullen permission to use this information for the dissertation work she is conducting on Teachers' Perspectives on Accountability, and I understand confidentiality will be granted for me and for my school district in the use of this information. I also understand that I may withdraw from participation in this study at any time, without having to provide any justification, by contacting Carol Cullen at the address (or phone number) below.

Participant's Signature          Date

Principal Investigator: James W. Altschuld, Ph.D.
Educational Services and Research
The Ohio State University
282 Arps Hall                 292-3239

Co-Investigator: Carol Cullen
Educational Services and Research
The Ohio State University

4921 Chapman Road
Delaware, Ohio 43015
548-5720
Dear,

First, let me thank you for taking the time to share with me your thoughts and feelings on educational accountability.

Enclosed is the transcript of our conversation and two copies of the Research Release Form. As I mentioned during our conversation, I would appreciate your reviewing this transcript to make certain that this is what you intended to say and that it conveys accurately and thoroughly your thoughts on accountability. I encourage you to modify it accordingly.

When you have finished reviewing the transcript, please read and sign the release form, and return both the transcript and signed release form to me in the enclosed stamped, self-addressed envelope. I have enclosed an extra copy of the release form for you to keep. Please remember that if you choose to withdraw from participating in this research please let me know, and I will not use any of the information you provided. I would appreciate it if you would return this information to me by [insert date] as I would like to use the information you provided to develop questions for my next interviews.

Again, thank you for your participation in this research. I will send you a copy of the preliminary findings after I complete all of my interviews. If I can be of any assistance to you, please do not hesitate to contact me. I look forward to hearing back from you soon.

Sincerely,

Carol Cullen

enclosures
Final List of Codes Used in Data Analysis

Biographical Information on Respondents: B

Education:
B-E  Formal educational training in the field of education. The importance of this category is the geographic location of this training:
B-E-U  Institution and location of undergraduate training
B-E-G  Institution and location of graduate training, as well as extent of graduate training
B-E-I  Location of teacher’s internship/student teaching experience

Teaching History:
B-T  Biographical sketch of the teacher’s teaching experiences
B-T-Y  Total number of years employed as a fulltime teacher
B-T-P  Description of the teacher’s teaching assignments prior to the current school year:
B-T-P-G  Grade levels taught
B-T-P-S  Subject areas taught
B-T-P-L  Geographical location of employment
B-T-C  Description of the teacher’s current teaching assignments, and description of teaching circumstances:
B-T-C-G  Grade level(s)
B-T-C-SUB  Subject area(s)
B-T-C-L  Geographical location of employment
B-T-C-C  Total number of classes/groups of students for which the teacher is responsible in a given day
B-T-C-STD  Total number of students for which a teacher is responsible during the school year

Professional Memberships:
B-M  Identification of professional organizations and affiliations to which the teacher belongs
B-M-L  Reported level or extent of teacher’s participation in these organizations

Organizational Structure: OS
OS  Description of district or school organizational structure related to perceived areas of responsibility (i.e., grade level, subject area, ancillary service), functions, or sources of authority
Relationships within the School Setting: R

Among Faculty:

R-FF Descriptions of interrelationships among faculty members, both personal and professional

Between Faculty and Parents:

R-FP Descriptions of interrelationships between faculty members or teacher and parents

Between Teacher and Administrator:

R-TA Descriptions of interrelationship between teacher and administrator; description of role and practices of administrator

Expectations: E

Expectations Teacher Holds for Parents:

E-TP Description of actions or practices the teacher expects parents to perform or carry out

Expectations Teacher Hold for other Teachers:

E-TT Description of actions or practices the teacher expects other teachers in the school setting to perform or carry out

Expectations of the Teacher:

E-T Perceptions of expectations held for teacher by individuals or groups

Expectations of Education:

E-E Perception of expectations held for education/schools by individuals or groups

Conveying Expectations:

E-C Description of means or ways in which the expectations of intended actions are conveyed or communicated

Negotiating Expectations:

E-N Ways in which expectations are negotiated, or attempted to be negotiated (such as clarifying expectations, arriving at mutually acceptable expectations)

Beliefs About Teaching: BT

Role of Education and Function of Teacher:

BT-RE Description of the teacher's stated beliefs about the role or purpose of education in society and the function of the teacher's role; includes teacher's beliefs about professionalism
Teaching Practices:
BT-TP  Description of the teacher's stated beliefs about appropriate teaching strategies, practices, or techniques

Teacher Goals:
BT-TG  Reported goals teacher establishes for his/her curriculum

Student Needs:
BT-SN  Description of student needs and role of education in meeting those needs

Knowledge:
BT-K  Description of teacher's stated beliefs about what constitutes important, worthwhile, or necessary knowledge and attitudes

Perceptions Related to Accountability:  A

Characteristics:
A-C  Reported indices, characteristics or dimensions of accountability

Relationships:
A-R  Descriptions of teacher's role and function in accountability relationships
   A-R-T  Identification of individuals, positions, or groups to whom the teacher perceives her/himself to be accountable
   A-R-F  Activities, duties, performance for which the teacher perceives to be accountable

Sources of Accountability:
A-S  Identification of individuals, groups, organizations requesting accountability from the teacher, including identification of the specified vehicle or means for conveying accountability
   A-S-P  Teacher's perception of the purpose or function of accountability conveyances
   A-S-RI  Teacher's beliefs about the relative importance of the various sources, or relevance and usefulness of the conveyances

Actions Taken to be Accountable:
A-A  Reported actions taken by the teacher to be accountable or to demonstrate/communicate accountability
Accountability Obligations:

A-OBL Perceived obligations, duties or responsibilities involved in the act of being accountable; actions that in and of themselves do not make up the act of being accountable, but are viewed as necessary to being accountable.

Outcomes of Accountability:

A-OUT Benefits, consequences and/or problems associated with being accountable or meeting accountability requirements.

Quality Indicators:

A-QI Indices of educational quality, and ways in which these might be conveyed/communicated to interested groups or individuals.

Changing Views on Accountability:

A-CH Ways in which teacher's views regarding personal accountability have changed (or not changed) since being a beginning teacher.

Sources of Influence of View of Accountability:

A-SI Description of actions or events influencing teacher's view of accountability.
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