Appendix 2

Tables

*Table 1 – Contextual Elements Influencing Discretion at Different Levels of Analysis (Personal Re-elaboration Based on Findings from Gofen et al., 2019)*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Level of Analysis | Contextual Elements |
| **Individual-level factors**: personal beliefs, attitudes and values of people involved in the implementation process | **Teachers’ Individual Characteristics:** personal beliefs, attitudes towards policy, and professional values.  **Students’ individual characteristics**: income, race, ethnicity, attitudes, behaviour. This may involve stereotyping and prejudice that influences teacher-student interactions and the way teachers implement educational policy across different students. |
| **Meso-level factors**: **design, structure, and clarity of the policy itself**—how it is formulated, communicated, and implemented within organizations or sectors | **Organizational environment/characteristics:**   * **Type and extent of training and support offered by the school**.   + **Formal training** establishes rule compliance as a default behaviour, promoting adherence to policies.   + **Informal training and socialization**, such as learning from more experienced colleagues, may foster more adaptive or tolerant **approaches** to rule enforcement. * **Budgetary resources**   + **Budgetary constraints** affect teachers’ creativity and ability to respond to students’ unexpected questions through practical activities   + Extended budgetary resources enable teachers’ creativity and ability to respond to students’ questions and needs. * **Access to Human Resource**    + A shortage of qualified staff can impact how teachers exercise their discretion and deliver curriculum content. The pressure to cover for absent or unqualified colleagues can further reduce their ability to implement educational curricula and/or activities required by policies.   + Access to extended human resources favour teachers’ ability to implement educational curricula and/or activities required by policies.   **Characteristics of Policy Frameworks**   * Extent of a**mbiguity and vagueness of educational policies.**   + When policies fail to provide clear guidance on implementation practices, more space is left to teachers’ discretionary actions.   + When policies provide explicit guidance, implementation becomes more straightforward whilst the space for discretion tends to be reduced. |
| **Macro-level factors**: **broader, systemic or national-level characteristics** | **Political-administrative system (e.g., federal vs centralized states)**  **National governance traditions, administrative cultures, or policy paradigms**   * **State and National Educational Policies:** Educational policies at the state or national level shape how teachers are expected to deliver curriculum and manage classrooms. Variability in policy design and implementation across regions affects how teachers perceive their professional roles. * **Cultural and Social Context:** The societal values and expectations regarding education impact how teachers exercise discretion. In some contexts, professional norms align more closely with social values, guiding how teachers interpret policy mandates. |

*Table 2-Families and Ways of Coping Stategies (by Tummers et al., 2015)*
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*Table 3- Policy/Practice Gap Overview – Trento 3 & Trento 4**Institutes*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Institute** | **Practices carried out** | **Contextual factors at play** | **Extent of the policy/practice gap** |
| Trento 3 | Coping practices:  - Rules bending  - Using teachers’ personal resources, notably their own time and availability  - Rule-breaking  Practical Adaptations fostering Intercultural Goals: | * Access **to human resources**: limited availability * Client**/parental pressures**: lack of instruments to manage them adequately * Policy **characteristics**: high degree of **vagueness and unresponsiveness. Teachers report** need for training courses to support teachers | Rule-breaking strategies de facto not only diverge from, but also neglect and contradict, the goals of intercultural education, fostering a more assimilationist-oriented view of migrant integration (although teachers do not explicitly endorse such assimilationist goals). |
| Trento 4 | Coping practices:  Using teachers’ personal resources,  Intercultural-oriented practices. | * Access **to human resources**: enhanced through targeted recruitment of linguistic facilitators, including private staff * Client**/parental pressures**: better managed through training * Policy **vagueness and unresponsiveness**: mitigated by training courses offering empirical implementation guidance and mitigating policy ambiguity and vagueness | Existing coping strategies bend intercultural norms, based on teachers’ needs and pressures faced; yet do not contradict intercultural goals. |