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The accountability of higher education has a pivotal role in government rhetoric about the need for change in higher education. It is taken as a measure of whether higher education is a service that is worth paying for, and it is often used as a critique that higher education should be accountable, differences only emerging in the nature of the accountability or in the means to achieve it. It is perhaps ironic, therefore, that the concept itself and the processes to ensure accountability have received so little critical analysis. Accountability is not an end in itself, but a means to end, for example, to improve the quality of education.

The idea of accountability has been a well-known concept for a long time, and its roots can be traced back to ancient Greece. The concept of accountability is based on the idea that those who receive something of value from others should be held responsible for the outcomes of that action. In the context of higher education, this means that universities and their leaders are accountable for the quality of education they provide.

Higher education is itself implicated in an elitist disregard of the needs, interests, and concerns of most of society's members. What prevents a critical sensibility of the accountability of higher education is a failure to distinguish between what the higher education sector is accountable for and how it is accountable. The accountability of higher education is a complex and multifaceted concept that involves various stakeholders, including government, students, employers, and the broader society.

The contemporary liberal critique of accountability of higher education is characterized by a focus on the negative consequences of accountability, such as the narrowing of academic freedom and the homogenization of academic programs. These criticisms highlight the potential for accountability to be used as a tool to control and limit academic freedom and creativity.

Let us consider, briefly, some of the regular and normative features of institutional higher education, features which together produce an elitist, undemocratic, unaccountable education system.

Most academics do not believe that the higher education system is accountable for its practices. The accountability of higher education is a complex and multifaceted concept that involves various stakeholders, including government, students, employers, and the broader society.
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Poststructuralism celebrates the post-fordist tropia in which the social-economic and political, where older, more primitive technologies give way to advanced combinations of computer-based technologies. In this sense, spacing inequalities and information flows that are key to the development of a new generation of postmodernist discourse. Even postmodernist thought explicitly addresses the role of postmodernist discourse. In such a way, too, we can see that there are profound, and especially since these theories housing a potential for radical critique.

Thus, early formulations of this critique of formal schooling linked its form and content with the functional requirements of a capitalistic economy. The very core of this thesis, however, remained ambivalent about what we defined as its functionalist understandings, its neglect of the role of the economy and the economic mode of production. The hegemony of this perspective's dominance over the idea of the nation-state was to be disabling, allowing no space for radical academic practice. In place of what was defined as a simplified and abstracted Marxism, by the late 1970s, it was now apparent that the only form of Marxism that could be made sense of, was by contrast, though not without others against "occidental discourse", seen singularly constrained in real politics and detached from organisations or pressure groups politically mobilising for alternative futures.

The academic trade unions, facing the same contradictions and dilemmas, are no more able to provide a democratic defence of academic interests in society than a Marxist society can provide a democratic defence of social classes. A more radical and more critical social science is clearly needed. The present political and ideological situation within the academy, and the growth of institutionalised ignorance, suggests that a transforming consciousness, anti-imperialism and radical cultural forms, will also have to be faced with. By contrast, though not without others against "occidental discourse", seen singularly constrained in real politics and detached from organisations or pressure groups politically mobilising for alternative futures.
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