

Performance as a False Promise of Accountability



Melvin J. Dubnick
University of New Hampshire
February 28, 2006
Yonsei University, Seoul

A Skeptic's View

- Living in the “Age of Accountability”
- Extension of the “Enlightenment Project”
- Pervasive, obsessive, perversive
 - Pervasive: Being all things to all people.
 - Obsessive: The “holy grail” of governance.
 - Perversive: Distorting, misleading, perverting.

The Premises: Accountability in/is Governance

- Accountability exists and it plays a central (if not THE central) role in modern governance.
- Modern governance could not exist without the account-giving “posture” assumed in accountability. *Governance works because there are “governable” subjects.*
- Policies based on accountability are “radical by nature” – they are engaging the *root relationships* that underpin governance.

Promises of Accountability 1

Pervasiveness of accountability today:

- Synonymic: Equated with “good” governance
 - responsible, responsive, transparent, ethical, democratic, etc etc etc
- Iconic: Rhetorical tool, effective symbol with positive valence
- Indexical: Associated with desired ends of governance: THE PROMISES

Promises of Accountability 2

- Promise of JUSTICE: The seeking of justice through juridical means (from trials to “truth and reconciliation”) will produce justice.
- Promise of DEMOCRACY: Being able to hold agents accountable as definition of modern democracy.
- Promise of ETHICS: Account giving requirements and oversight will result in truly ethical behavior.
- Promise of PERFORMANCE: Holding people to account will improve desired performance-based outcomes.

False Promises?

- “Engineering logic” of accountability: manipulation of account giving can be used to elicit “right” behavior.
- Assumes a certain model of “human nature” – scientific management model
- Unframed and untested – lacks empirically sound theoretical support
- Subject to adverse and perverse consequences

Case of Performance 1

- The critical “black box”;



Case of Performance 2

- NPM:
 - Ambiguous: Lacks basic empirical theory
 - Paradoxical: Problems of “performatives”
 - Unsubstantiated: Untested and untestable?

Case of Performance 3

Schooling: The US case: focusing on test-based result

- No Child Left Behind is only “tip of iceberg”
- Technical issues (measurement – Lake Wobegon effect)
- Behavioral issues (perverse incentives)
- Policy issues: making things worse....
- “New Accountability”: works best where it is least effective – where it complements rather than changes the account-giving posture of teachers

Conclusions

- Not an effective policy instrument for change
 - May make matters worse
- Needs to be approached as object of change, rather than tool of change
 - Requires greater confidence in desired outcomes – certainty about the curriculum, pedagogy, etc