

RESEARCHING THE ADOPTION OF SCHOOL AUTONOMY WITH ACCOUNTABILITY REFORMS: A METHODOLOGICAL NOTE ON COUNTRY CASE STUDIES

REFORMED Methodological Notes No. 1

Clara Fontdevila

Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona

✉ clara.fontdevila@gmail.com

This note presents the methodological approach that guided the five case studies conducted in the context of REFORMED RS1. The case studies aimed at reconstructing and analyzing the adoption of school autonomy with accountability (SAWA) arrangements in different countries, and were informed by shared data-gathering procedures and a common analytic strategy. This note gives a detailed description of the main data-collection and data-analysis tools on which the case studies relied, and makes explicit the rationale and the theoretical premises that oriented the design of such instruments. Particular attention is given to the development of the interview guide and to the coding strategy that informed the analysis of the interview data.

Recommended citation:

Fontdevila, C. (2019). *Researching the adoption of School Autonomy with Accountability reforms: A methodological note on country case studies*. REFORMED Methodological Papers No. 1. doi: 10.5281/zenodo.3557302

Table of contents

1. Research background	3
2. Overview of the research strategy	4
Data-collection procedures	4
Analytical approach	5
3. Theoretical foundations	6
4. Data-collection tools: the interview guide	7
5. Data-analysis tools: the interview codebook	9
6. Lessons learned, possible future directions	10
List of references	11
Annex 1: Interview guide	13
Annex 2: Codebook	19

ANNEX 1: INTERVIEW GUIDE

Module I: Starting questions

- 1.1. About yourself: could you tell me a little about your trajectory in education, including relevant past positions and the specifics of your current position?

If not mentioned: Ask about the academic background.

If the background is not on education, or is not clear from their previous answer: Ask how they got involved in education.

- 1.2. Can you describe to me major changes in basic education in the last decade in this country?

[Notice whether they talk about accountability, external evaluations, or use accountability language or rather “quality assurance” language, and adapt the interview to it]

Module II: Policy formation [one instrument per interviewee, exceptionally two]

Recent reforms in [*name of the county*] have intended to introduce some degree of accountability/quality assurance in education - for teachers, principals and schools. With the following questions, I’m interested in understanding the processes of policy formation that lead to the adoption and development of the accountability/quality assurance system through different policy instruments. We have attempted to summarize the accountability system in this country in the following chart. [*Show chart*]

- 2.1. Does this chart make sense? Do you think that it represents well the evolution and the current form accountability system in this country? Which of these elements and policies have a bigger impact in ongoing educational processes at the school level? Has any of them that generated more debate than the other? Why?

- 2.2. Could you kindly indicate if you have been involved in the design, adoption or implementation of any of them? If so, in what ways?

Alternatively: To what degree, and in what position?) (decision-maker, advisor/expert, consulted party).

Probe for: Do you feel you were deliberately excluded from any of them? Why?

- 2.3. Also, which are the elements of the chart you think you are more knowledgeable about? How and why did you get acquainted with each of them? If you were not directly involved, how did you learn about them? Which were your sources of information?

Probe for: key informants, secondary documents, hearsay.

Problem stream

- 2.4. Why do you think this reform/instrument was adopted? Which was the problem intended to be addressed by the adoption of this policy instrument (or educational reform - in case we go for the general reform approach)? Was the problem related with the attitude or quality of the work of teachers?

- 2.5. Can you remember in which sphere and when were these problems discussed for the first time?

- 2.6. What role did research play, if any, in the debate on these educational problems?

- 2.7. Who else contributed to identify these types of educational problems in the country? Was the role of any particular international organization significant?
- 2.8. Would you say there was a general agreement on the causes and relevance of these problems? Or did particular groups, actors or organizations rather hold and raised a different views on that?

Policy stream

- 2.9. Can you remember when the idea of [*name of the policy instrument or measure*] was discussed for the first time? Do you have any idea about who came up with the idea?

Alt: Was this idea spearheaded by any particular group or individual?

- 2.10. [*If the policy was “materialized” in a clear and well-known policy text*] Who worked in the subsequent drafts of the [*decree/reform /bill of education*]?

Probe for: locus of policy design – executive power, parliament, appointed committee of experts, international organization, donor organizations, consultants etc.

Only in government-led processes: To what extent was the Ministry of Education/Department of Education responsible for the policy design? Were other ministers in the government involved? How so? Are the drafts accessible?

- 2.11. [*Only in government-led processes*] In the process of policy design, which groups or organizations were consulted? Which not? Why?

Probe for: inputs from civil society organizations, teachers’ or student unions, etc; ask also how were “relevant” actors selected.

Probe for: role of the political parties not in power.

Probe for: input from technical staff in the Ministry of Education or other government agencies.

Probe for: role of international organizations.

Probe for: role of the experts, think tanks, etc.

- 2.12. Can you think of any technical or research documents that played a key role in the process of policy design?

Probe for: ad-hoc products; dynamics of instrumentalization, etc.

- 2.13. Can you think of any comparable education experiences (in other regions or countries) that inspired in some way these policy and measures? If so, why do you think these particular areas or countries were considered as valid examples?

Probe for: dynamics of policy borrowing, dynamics of instrumentalization and selectivity, influence of particular reference societies.

- 2.14. Did the policy proposals experiment any significant changes during the design process? How do you explain this evolution?

- 2.15. Did any individual or group came up with “alternative” formulations, major amendments?

Probe for: inputs from specific actors; concerns or considerations on their feasibility (technical, political, financial).

- 2.16. [Only when the policy instruments have been in place for a significant period of time and the object of criticism] Were any potential problems anticipated at the time of the design of this policy?

Political stream

- 2.17. Which groups, individuals or organizations were supportive of this policy measure? Do you think that they are shared the same motivations, that is, did they all identify the same advantages? Did they organize in some form of coalition or alliance?

Probe for: Had they cooperated or teamed up in the past? Were you part of this coalition?

- 2.18. Which groups, individuals or organizations were opposed to its advancement? Do you think that they are shared the same motivations, that is, did they all identify the same dangers or limitations? Did they organize in some form of coalition or alliance?

Probe for: Had they cooperated or teamed up in the past? Were you part of this coalition?

- 2.19. In general terms, do you think that the adoption of this policy/measure was an easy process?

Alt: Would you say that was a rather smooth/straight forward, or a rather challenging process?
[If the process is described as complicated or the interviewee has mentioned actors actively opposed to the policy] What made possible the final adoption of this policy? Can you identify any turning point, which eased the advancement of the reform?

Probe for: compromises, political bargaining, communication issues, leadership, triggering event, changes in the government composition.

- 2.20. Which was the degree of consensus within the educational community at the time of adoption?

Module III. Enactment, autonomy and support

Awareness of autonomy policies/level of school autonomy

- 3.1. In many education systems, accountability systems is being preceded by higher levels of school autonomy. Do you recognize that this is the case of your country?
- 3.2. How would you define the level of the autonomy of schools in this country?
- 3.3. In which domains do schools have more autonomy? For example personnel, finance, facilities, curriculum, pedagogy, organization of the school, or combinations of these and other domains?
- 3.4. Who is taking the most relevant decisions at the school level? How are decisions on pedagogy and instruction taken, e.g. in full autonomy, after consultation with other bodies, within a restrictive framework set by educational authorities?

Perception of evolution of school autonomy over time and in recent years

- 3.5. What changes have occurred in the degree of autonomy of schools to take decisions in the last years?
- 3.6. If so, in which domains of authority have these changes occurred more intensively?
- 3.7. How have these changes been received by different actors? Why?

- 3.8. What prompted these changes? Is there a particular policy, reform or program advancing these changes on the autonomy of schools? Have you been involved in the formulation of the school autonomy program/policy [*If so, back to questions on policy formation - Module II*].

Autonomy to work with the results of the standardized test

- 3.9. What is your opinion on the way test results are communicated to schools, teachers? And to families? In case the school results are published, does this has an impact on parent's school choice decisions, schools status, self-perception, and so on?
- 3.10. And what do you think about the kind of feedback and the nature of the information that these agents receive on the basis of the test?
- 3.11. What are schools expected to do when they receive the results of the [*name of standardized test*]?
- 3.12. Are the expected learning standards sufficiently clear for the schools?
- 3.13. Do you have the feeling that schools react sufficiently to the results? What type of decisions are taken by schools based on [*name of standardized test*]? Who takes these decisions?
- 3.14. Is the data coming from the test useful for educational improvement purposes? What other sources of data would be more useful/are also useful for schools?
- 3.15. What can schools do to improve their results in the test?

Capacity to work with the standardized test

- 3.16. Is teacher training in your country preparing teachers and principals properly to address the on-going educational and organizational changes/challenges we are talking about?
- Probe for:* Pre-service and in-service.
- 3.17. Do schools have the capacity and the necessary resources to do so? If not, what capacities and resources should be there?
- 3.18. Do schools receive sufficient support to manage the data, and to enact the necessary processes to improve their results? From whom is this support coming? (education department, inspection, private sector).

Private sector involvement

- 3.19. Are schools and teachers accessing to educational resources (services and materials) coming from the private sector for the purpose of instructional change and results improvement? Which types of resources are being acquired more often?
- Probe for: lesson plans, test preparation simulations, pedagogical advice, teacher training, digital services/technologies.
- 3.20. Do you think that the presence of services and materials for schools coming from the private sector has intensified in the last years? Is so, why do you think it is so?

- 3.21. What are the main private companies involved in the education sector (beyond private schools) in your country?
- 3.22. Is the relationship between the private sector and the schools sufficiently regulated by the government? How?
- 3.23. How would you define the relationship between the private sector and the MoE/DepEd?

Subjective perception of SAWA

- 3.24. How do you see the relationship between accountability and education quality?
- 3.25. In your opinion, are data coming from the test reliable to inform about the quality of and equity in education? If so, are these data useful to improve quality and equity in education?
- 3.26. Do you think that the national standardized test is a good instrument to hold schools and teachers accountable?
- 3.27. How do you see the relationship between school autonomy and quality of education? And between autonomy and equity in education?
- 3.28. How do you see the relationship between school autonomy and innovation in education, and relevant education?
- 3.29. Is there a tension between accountability measures and the autonomy of schools to promote innovation?
- 3.30. Have the programs/instruments of the accountability system been evaluated? Are the evaluations available? [*Idem for the school autonomy program, if applicable*].
- 3.31. Which elements of the accountability system do you think should be improved or adjusted?

Proxy question: If the Ministry of Education ask you to design a new accountability system, what would be its main characteristics? (Please, think about the whole theory of change: inputs-mechanisms-outputs).
- 3.32. Do you see this happening in the near future?

Module IV. Knowledge mobilization

Influential actors in the political arena [*Refer always to both national and international speakers*].

- 4.1. If you had to organize a seminar on accountability in education, school autonomy, or school reform, who would you invite to as speaker?
- 4.2. With which educational actors and stakeholders do you cooperate with often?
- 4.3. Regarding the educational debate in your country, could you name intellectuals and experts whose ideas are currently more influential? Which actors would you consider the most relevant in shaping education policy in your country?

4.4. Do you consider that the OECD and PISA in particular have an impact in ongoing education debates (SAWA and beyond) in [country name]?

4.5. Which aspects of your country's PISA results (across any survey round), have led to/inspired changes in policy or practice in your country?

[Need to pay attention to the use of PISA benchmarks, reference to league leaders and factors or characteristics that can explain their success, and mention to negative reference societies].

4.6. What is your opinion of how education policy formulation occurs in this country? Are the voices of principals and teachers sufficiently taken into account in policy formulation processes?

Strategies through which policy actors sought to influence the reform process [for non-governmental actors]

4.7. Do you (or your organization) produce or use any data related to quality in education? If so, do you use this data to inform educational debates in the country?

4.8. Do you use reports, data sources, evidence, etc. coming from other sources to support these strategies? Can you name some of these sources?

4.9. What else does your organization do to influence the education debate in this country (strategies of negotiation, resistance, knowledge mobilization and so on)?

Module V. Concluding questions

5.1. Is there anything else you think I might be interested in?

5.2. Are there any other people who would suggest I contact about my research?

5.3. If I have any follow-up questions as I review my findings, would you be willing to participate in a very brief follow-up phone call or email exchange?

ANNEX 2: CODEBOOK

Code	ATTR_POSITION
<i>Brief definition</i>	Current position
<i>Full definition</i>	Current position and associated responsibilities of interviewee.
<i>When not to use</i>	It should not be used when interviewee refers to past positions and/or responsibilities, when interviewee talks about anyone else than him/herself, or when the related events are of no interest for the purposes of the research.
<i>Example</i>	“I am currently working as a Senior Advisor within the Department of Primary and Lower Secondary Education, and my main responsibilities entail ...”.
<i>Group</i>	Attributes of the interviewee

Code	ATTR_BACKGROUND
<i>Brief definition</i>	Professional background
<i>Full definition</i>	Relevant past positions and associated responsibilities of interviewee. It should include any mention to previous job posts, in the current or prior workplaces (also when the interviewee casually drops the fact in the middle of the interview). References to the educational background of interviewee, including the highest level of education obtained (e.g. secondary; university degree; PhD), area of focus of education (e.g. topic of degree), professional development or training (for example during professional career), etc.
<i>When not to use</i>	It should not be used when interviewee refers to current position(s) and/or responsibilities, or when interviewee talks about anyone else than him/herself, or when the related events are of no interest for the purposes of the research.
<i>Example</i>	“Before I started working here, I worked within the Ministry of Education for three years. My main responsibility there was...” “I have a Master’s degree in English (...) and throughout my career I took part in additional training, for example leadership training”.
<i>Group</i>	Attributes of the interviewee

Code	ATTR_AFFILIATION
<i>Brief definition</i>	Political affiliation
<i>Full definition</i>	Political preferences of interviewee or membership to a political party or politically-connoted organizations.
<i>When not to use</i>	This code should only be used when the interviewee talks about his/her own political affiliation or preferences, not when the interviewee talks in more general terms, e.g. “with the recent election, a shift was made to the left”.
<i>Example</i>	“I am a member of the Green Party”; “I do not align myself to the Socio-Democratic political ideology”.
<i>Group</i>	Attributes of the interviewee

Code	SUBJ_SAWA TOC
Brief definition	“Theory of Change” behind SAWA reforms
Full definition	<p>Virtues and uses of SAWA policies and instruments: references to the main advantages about that the interviewee identifies with concern to the use of SAWA reform elements. It should include possible education dimensions that would benefit from SAWA tools (equity, quality, efficiency etc.) as well as intrinsic values of SAWA (transparency, meritocracy, fairness, etc.).</p> <p>Mechanisms: Causal beliefs of the interviewee about how particular (SAWA) policy instruments, under particular contextual conditions, will trigger particular dynamics that will lead to specific desired effects. In other words, references made by the interviewee to the promises of particular policy instruments (ultimate aims or objectives of the policy instrument), to the mechanisms triggered by SAWA reforms that are to enable the consecution of their ultimate aims, and the contextual conditions that will allow for this chain of events to occur.</p> <p>Risks of SAWA policies and instruments: Main disadvantages or risks that the interviewee identifies with concern to the use of SAWA reform elements, in relation to both its inherent logics as well as in relation to its implementation.</p>
When not to use	The code should not be used when the interviewee talks about the working of non-SAWA related policy instruments.
Example	<p>“If one cuts in central regulations around teaching methods, teachers are enabled to adapt their ways of teaching to the individual student, which will lead to greater creativity and dedication. However, this effect may only be expected when the state offers clear framework conditions and provides support and guidance”.</p> <p>“In order to enhance diversification of education, schools need to receive autonomy in pedagogical and organizational terms”.</p>
Group	Subjective perception of SAWA regimes

Code	PROB_CONTENT
Brief definition	Content of the problem
Full definition	<p>Situation requiring attention or questions that need to be solved via a public response and that gain a prominent place on the policy agenda.</p> <p>This includes not only the construction of “brand-new problems” but also the re-interpretation of already recognized issues.</p> <p>Possible categories include: Quality problems (related to overall achievement); equity problems (segregation; academic achievement of certain groups); teacher-related problems (poor levels of competence, etc.); administrative culture (excessively centralized or bureaucratized); centralization (need for a more centralized steering); and economic, financial or budgetary difficulties. This is something that could be signaled through a memo.</p> <p>NB: the narrative can be used to validate the adoption of pre-established solutions by policy-makers seeking the opportunity for implementation.</p>
When not to use	Use only if the recognition of the problem gain a relatively prominent place on the policy agenda - not when a given issue is perceived as problematic only by the interviewee or related to a “widespread feeling” that never receives public and governmental attention. (This could however be put down in the memo).
Example	“There was growing understanding of the dangers of an under-skilled teacher force. New recruits displayed higher qualifications but their ability when in classroom was poorer than ever as a consequence of a striking lack of practical training”.
Group	Policy process: diagnosis

Code	PROB_DEFINER
<i>Brief definition</i>	Problem-definer
<i>Full definition</i>	<p>References to individual or collective agents responsible for prompting attention to a subject and/or linking a proposal to a problem (thus enhancing their prospects of “moving up in the agenda”).</p> <p>The category is not restricted to those seeking transformative policy change (political coalitions or organizations with an agenda), but also any agent responsible for fixing policy-makers’ attention over a subject (even if they do not push for any particular solution).</p> <p>There might be some overlapping with the Focusing event category – depending on how the interviewee frames the episode (the degree of “agency” he/she identifies in it – e.g., a PISA scandal can be seen both as the result of OECD action but also as a process not animated by anybody in particular).</p>
<i>When not to use</i>	--
<i>Example</i>	“The TALIS results published last year threw light on the limited degree of preparation of our teachers”.
<i>Group</i>	Policy process: diagnosis

Code	PROB_CONSENSUS
<i>Brief definition</i>	Degree of general consensus around the relevance and causes of the problem
<i>Full definition</i>	<p>Comments on the degree of recognition of the problem by others than “original” problem-definers - for instance regarding its centrality within the corresponding policy communities, etc. It should give an idea of the extent to which the perception of the problem is shared by other relevant stakeholders.</p> <p>Can also be used in when the interviewee refers to the degree of acceptance among the general public (published opinion; public feelings).</p>
<i>When not to use</i>	--
<i>Example</i>	“The Conservatives seemed skeptical about the need to grant the federal government additional monitoring responsibilities”.
<i>Group</i>	Policy process: diagnosis

Code	PROB_EVENT
<i>Brief definition</i>	Focusing events
<i>Full definition</i>	<p>Comments on “catalysts” of policy attention: sudden, rare and (perceived as) harmful events that are considered to reveal a policy failure, episodes that open a “window of opportunity” for intensive policy discussion. They may bring less visible problems to the forefront, allow for a reinterpretation of an already recognized issue, or give additional prominence to an already existing problem. The group may include the publication of indicators, catastrophes, etc.</p>
<i>When not to use</i>	--
<i>Example</i>	“The publication of PISA results was a wake-up call for everybody”.
<i>Group</i>	Policy process: diagnosis

Code	POL_DESIGNERS
<i>Brief definition</i>	Locus of policy design
<i>Full definition</i>	References to the set of actors involved in the formulation of policy specifics during the design process. It should include references to the team in charge of developing the policy instrument in the more technical sense – i.e. those with a responsibility in “drafting” it.
<i>When not to use</i>	The code should be used only to identify agents with an influence on specific policy tools (on-the-ground measures rather than general goals pursued by that, or the problems to be solved). It should not be confused with references to key actors in a more general sense (relevant individuals or organizations who pushed for – or conditioned significantly- the policy change).
<i>Example</i>	“The ministry of education formed a consultative commission that came up with a first proposal of the new scholarships program”.
<i>Group</i>	Policy process: policy formation.

Code	POL_EVOLUTION
<i>Brief definition</i>	Evolution of policy proposals
<i>Full definition</i>	Comments on any change undergone by initial policy proposals; changes introduced in each one of the different rounds of policy formulation (substantial changes made to initial proposals and emergence of alternative proposals). This applies to policy proposals still in the process of being developed as well as to fully designed, adopted and implemented programs.
<i>When not to use</i>	The code should not be used to describe the negotiation process but rather to capture these excerpts in which changed made to the policy proposal are tracked. In some cases, this is likely to overlap with comments on negotiation dynamics (in this case, both the POL_EVOLUTION and the POL_NEGOTIATION code should be used). However, in other instances interviewees are likely to offer only “descriptive” insights on how specific aspects of the policy instruments were modified – without mentioning the who/how/why (in this case, only the POL_EVOLUTION code should be used).
<i>Example</i>	“After the parliamentary commission, a new requirement was introduced, so that only non-profit private schools were eligible for receiving public funds. This was very much the result of certain parental associations that pushed for the elimination of the subsidy to any kind of private providers”.
<i>Group</i>	Policy process: policy formation

Code	POL_NEGOTIATION
<i>Brief definition</i>	Negotiation dynamics
<i>Full definition</i>	Mentions to political dynamics contributing to consensus-building and to the advance of a particular proposal, including political bargaining, compromises, concessions, etc.).
<i>When not to use</i>	Does not refer to “persuasion” dynamics in which a given actor genuinely changes their preferences or priorities.
<i>Example</i>	“After two days of massive strike the government withdrew the provisions on early retirement”.
<i>Group</i>	Policy process: policy formation

Code	POL_CONSENSUS
<i>Brief definition</i>	Comments reflective of the consensus around new instruments and policy changes about other actors' rationales and arguments regarding SAWA
<i>Full definition</i>	<p>Degree of consensus about specific policy proposals and divisiveness brought about by the reform within a given policy community, as well as comments on the general public's receptivity (references to national mood, public sentiments/opinion).</p> <p>Should include references about the preferences of other relevant actors regarding SAWA reform (support, opposition, partial support...), as well as the rationales, framing, arguments, and legitimizing narratives used by them during the policy debate.</p> <p>Should include criticisms made by antagonistic forces (unless they were considered as administrative/technical/ideological considerations during the policy design-process).</p>
<i>When not to use</i>	--
<i>Example</i>	<p>"So taxpayers were not keen on seeing their benefits reduced in exchange of nothing... This never gained any sort of public acceptance".</p> <p>"Teachers unions expressed different positions according to their ideological preferences. Unions A and B were definitely in a critical position meanwhile Union C hold a more balanced position".</p> <p>"Initially the conservative party was very reluctant to the reform but since the Ministry was open to their contributions they ended with a more supportive position".</p>
<i>Group</i>	Policy process: policy formation

Code	POL_INCL
<i>Brief definition</i>	Perceptions on in inclusiveness in the policy design process
<i>Full definition</i>	Comments on the openness of the processes to the concerned community, as perceived by the interviewee. Should also include comments on the (perceived) exclusion of certain groups or actors.
<i>When not to use</i>	Should be used only when such an insight is made by the very interviewee (not when the coder reaches a conclusion on that regard).
<i>Example</i>	"There are formal procedures that allow the labor unions to comment on drafts of a policy proposal".
<i>Group</i>	Policy process: policy formation

Code	POL_TIMING
<i>Brief definition</i>	Perceptions on the timing of reforms /back-and-forth dynamics
<i>Full definition</i>	Comments on the "pace" of the policy change (including the identification of drastic vs. incremental processes) and on its reversibility as perceived by the interviewee.
<i>When not to use</i>	The code should be used only when such an insight is made by the very interviewee (not when the coder identifies these dynamics).
<i>Example</i>	"In this country demands for reform are inevitably followed by the appetite for stability but that never lasts. So you are likely to pass a reform, devote some years correcting and refining the whole thing, and then a new reform period and so forth".
<i>Group</i>	Policy process: policy formation

Code	POL_RESEARCH INPUTS
<i>Brief definition</i>	Technical and research inputs considered during the policy design process
<i>Full definition</i>	References to policy briefs, working papers, journal articles, reviews of national policies for education, and another kind of reports and evidence (such data from ILSAs) that has been mobilized to affect the policy design.
<i>When not to use</i>	This code should not be used when the interviewee refers to the evidence that may have contributed to a scandalization process (diagnosis).
<i>Example</i>	“During the policy design process, the World Bank elaborated a very influential report about how to build a Quality Assurance System in Chile”.
<i>Group</i>	Policy process: policy formation; Knowledge mobilization

Code	POL_ECONOMIC CONSID
<i>Brief definition</i>	Economic considerations that make feasible and workable the enactment of SAWA reforms in relation to budgetary capacities and possible financial constraints
<i>Full definition</i>	References to the impact of “material” factors that influenced decision-making processes, especially if policy-makers can adopt SAWA policies because they perceive that such policies are more cost-effective or less expensive than other policy options. Also, it can be used when policy-makers refer to the influence played by the economic environment, the existence of an economic recession, or budget constraints, in the selection of certain policies.
<i>When not to use</i>	This code should not be used when the interviewee refers to financial crises as a triggering factor of an educational crisis (diagnosis).
<i>Example</i>	“The Financial Minister of Chile was in favor of adopting accountability policies because he perceived them as cost-effective measures that are aligned with economic austerity and budget cuts”.
<i>Group</i>	Policy process: policy formation

Code	POL_TECH_ADM CONSID
<i>Brief definition</i>	Technical and administrative considerations
<i>Full definition</i>	<p>This code refers to comments about the administrative and/or technical viability of certain policy ideas, and how these factors influence the policy debate as well as the policy-design process.</p> <p>It should include comments in relation to the design of the test, the production of indicators (validity, representativeness, etc.), the conduction of the test, and the implementation of SAWA arrangements (distribution of responsibilities between concerned authorities; human and material resources required by the policy change; need for new or improved standards and guidelines, etc.).</p> <p>It should also include comments about consideration and anticipation of possible side or perverse effects of SAWA reforms effectively taken into account in the process of policy design.</p>
<i>When not to use</i>	In relation to side effects: it should not be used when possible side-effects resulting from other policies (not SAWA) are mentioned; or when the interviewee expresses concerns of his/her own if they were not taken into account during the policy-design process.
<i>Example</i>	“Unfortunately, we are still a developing country, so such kinds of policy ideas are not technically workable due to the lack of administrative capacity to implement a national large-scale assessment to measure students’ performance”.
<i>Group</i>	Policy process: policy formation

Code	POL_POLITICAL_IDEO_CONSID
<i>Brief definition</i>	Political and ideological considerations
<i>Full definition</i>	<p>References to political and ideological factors and interest taken into account during the design of SAWA reforms, and references about how these factors have influenced the policy debate. It should include mentions to strategic action aimed at affecting how the promoters of (or opponents to) a reform are perceived by the public; or directed at preserving or altering the balance of forces and power.</p> <p>Add references to: ideological, value-related and cultural considerations.</p>
<i>When not to use</i>	--
<i>Example</i>	<p>“The adoption of SAWA reforms allowed us to legitimize ourselves (the Neoliberal Government) in front of the citizens. In their saw bureaucracy as one of the main problems of the education system. So, we promise them to fight against bureau- cracy through the enactment of a high-stakes accountability system with school autonomy. In the end, we won the elections”.</p> <p>“Accountability measures allow both coalitions (center-left and the right) to align their policy preferences, building a great consensus among them. However, they also have some latent differences: for example, the center-left coalition was in favor of introducing a Superintendency to take control over the management of school’s financial resources, while the right-wing coalition was against the introduc- tion of such measure within the Quality Assurance System”.</p>
<i>Group</i>	Policy process: policy formation

Code	ACT_CENTRALITY
<i>Brief definition</i>	Key and influential agents
<i>Full definition</i>	<p>References to stakeholders perceived and identified by the interviewee as the key or influential agents that participated in the policy process (government, oppo- sition, think tanks, policy entrepreneurs, political leaders, mass media, teachers’ union, students’ movement, social movements, and so on) or as having displayed some degree of leadership or inspirational role in the promotion and the advance of SAWA reforms (as well as over the balance of forces between different coalitions).</p> <p>It may include (a) core actors in the governmental sector (executive staff, central agencies and task forces); (b) public sector insiders (commissions, research council- is, international organizations); (c) private sector insiders (“formally” invited by po- licy-makers) (consultants, political party staff) and (d) non-governmental outsiders (business groups, trade unions, academics, think tanks, media, etc.).</p> <p>It might also include references to actors’ sources of influence - references to the sources of influence of the interviewee that would have enabled them to effecti- vely determine or change the course of policy change (including their prestige and reputation, financial resources, social capital and connections to other agents, as well as external circumstances that created an environment receptive to the action or ideas of these agents).</p> <p>(This might be difficult to code since it is frequently not made explicit by the very interviewee).</p>
<i>When not to use</i>	The code should not be confused with the locus of the policy (policy designers).
<i>Example</i>	<p>“The alliance between the right-wing Government and the Christian-Democratic party allowed the enactment of the SAWA reforms in Chile”.</p> <p>“They were the most influential actor in the design of the education reform act”.</p>
<i>Group</i>	Policy process: balance of forces, actors

Code	ACT_COOPERATION
<i>Brief definition</i>	Cooperation between actors
<i>Full definition</i>	References to sporadic or reiterative modes of collaboration between different actors in order to advance education reform according to some degree of shared or compatible policy (or/and political) preferences.
<i>When not to use</i>	--
<i>Example</i>	“Students and Teachers Unions shared a common strategy of opposition based on social mobilization”.
<i>Group</i>	Policy process: balance of forces, actors

Code	ACT_STRATEGIC ACTION
<i>Brief definition</i>	Strategic action
<i>Full definition</i>	References to the repertoires of action deployed by key agents in order to advance their policy goals and preferences. This includes a range of public and non-public activities, such as (but not limited to): knowledge mobilization strategies (commissioning, conducting, disseminating research; media releases, public awareness campaigns; etc.); lobbying; purposive inter or intra-organizational change (appointing a person explicitly focused on the issue, joining or creating an issue-specific coalition, etc.); formal and informal lobbying; street and industrial action (demonstrations, strikes, etc.). The codes include strategic actions oriented to condition and influence policy in any sense (ensuring its progress; modifying particular provisions, etc.) and also apply to the opposition and resistance to policies or policy tools.
<i>When not to use</i>	The code should not be used to describe strategies whose “materialization” is unclear.
<i>Example</i>	“We published a white paper which was very influential in defining the priorities of education reform”.
<i>Group</i>	Policy process: balance of forces, actors

Code	GEN_REFERENCE SOCIETIES
<i>Brief definition</i>	Reference and counter-reference societies and/or sectors
<i>Full definition</i>	Comments on so-called “reference societies” (and counter-references societies) at any point during the policy-shaping process (including diagnostic action as well as policy-design practices). Reference societies are those countries (e.g., ILSAs league leaders) likely to appear in scandalization processes or to be used to showcase desirable policy solutions that should be emulated and enacted. Counter-reference societies are usually mentioned with some heterostereotypes to avoid the adoption of certain reforms.
<i>When not to use</i>	It should not be used to code quotes about the influence of ILSAs.
<i>Example</i>	“The design of our accountability system was inspired by countries such as England, New Zealand and the US”. “The example of Sweden shows us that the combination of school choice and a voucher system can have damaging effects in terms of education quality and equity”.
<i>Group</i>	Policy process: policy formation; knowledge mobilization

Code	GEN_INSPIRATION
<i>Brief definition</i>	Nature of the “emulation process” (or of a process presented as an “emulation”); uses of reference societies or inspirational models
<i>Full definition</i>	References to the specific ways in which a policy model was adopted. With this code we aim at capturing if the “imitation” dynamics affect the practical implementation of the reform (policy-design) or are rather used to frame and guide the spirit of the policy idea (i.e., related to the adoption of a new paradigm). The code could also be used in relation to other policy sectors deliberately used as an “example” or inspiration for education reforms. NB: This code would in fact include references societies but we found it useful to codes references societies as a separate code.
<i>When not to use</i>	--
<i>Example</i>	“This reform is inspired by new public management paradigm”.
<i>Group</i>	Policy process: policy formation; knowledge mobilization

Code	GEN_FUTURE
<i>Brief definition</i>	Expectations regarding next or future developments of the policy
<i>Full definition</i>	References to conjectures, predictions and expectations regarding future developments of the policy instrument or arrangements; comments on the probable evolution of the policy discussed.
<i>When not to use</i>	The code should not be used when the interviewee comments on what he/she perceives as desirable future developments, but only when he/she discusses a <i>likely</i> turn of the events.
<i>Example</i>	“I guess the Minister will eventually bend to at least some of the union’s demands, so they probably will be giving greater weight to the peer evaluation component”.
<i>Group</i>	General; Other

Code	GEN_ENACTMENT
<i>Brief definition</i>	General comments on the enactment of the policy measure
<i>Full definition</i>	References to the actual enactment of the policy measures discussed in the interview – how they have been put in practice, interpreted or renegotiated by policy “enactors” and how this has impacted the eventual policy outcomes. Special emphasis should be put on comments regarding the possible “gap” or disjointedness between the original expectations and theory of change and the actual effects of the policy “in context”.
<i>When not to use</i>	--
<i>Example</i>	“So the inspectorates became responsible for the supervision of the new scheme... but as it turns out most of them do not have so much knowledge about what was going on with in-service training, so they basically rely on principals’ self-reporting, and that makes the whole thing pretty circular, in fact”.
<i>Group</i>	General; Other

Code	GEN_POL EFFECT
<i>Brief definition</i>	General comments on the effects of the policy measure
<i>Full definition</i>	References to any comment on the (perceived) consequences of a given policy or policy instrument - including changes in any education dimension (quality, equity, effectiveness, etc); as well as unintended or side effects.
<i>When not to use</i>	--
<i>Example</i>	“Student achievement improved hugely as a consequence of the new policy”.
<i>Group</i>	General; Other

Code	GEN_POLICY INSTRUMENT
<i>Brief definition</i>	Policy instrument, measure or program discussed by the interviewee
<i>Full definition</i>	References to the policy tool(s) that center the interview and constitute its main focus.
<i>When not to use</i>	--
<i>Example</i>	--
<i>Group</i>	General; Other