



## (Re-)framing the teaching profession by reforming teacher education and careers in Chile

Annelise Voisin & M. Beatriz Fernández

**To cite this article:** Annelise Voisin & M. Beatriz Fernández (09 Jun 2025): (Re-)framing the teaching profession by reforming teacher education and careers in Chile, Journal of Education Policy, DOI: [10.1080/02680939.2025.2515569](https://doi.org/10.1080/02680939.2025.2515569)

**To link to this article:** <https://doi.org/10.1080/02680939.2025.2515569>



Published online: 09 Jun 2025.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)



# (Re-)framing the teaching profession by reforming teacher education and careers in Chile

Annelise Voisin <sup>a</sup> and M. Beatriz Fernández <sup>b</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Department of Education, Faculty of Psychology, Logopedics, and Education Sciences, RUCHE-Research Unit for a Life-Course Perspective on Health and Education, University of Liege, Liege, Belgium; <sup>b</sup>Institute of Education, CIAE-Center for Advanced Research in Education, University of Chile, Santiago, Chile

## ABSTRACT

This critical policy study uses frame analysis coupled with a sociology perspective on policy instrumentation and a policy document analysis to analyze the System for Professional Development Law (SPDL) (2016) in Chile, a multidimensional reform aiming at supporting teachers' professionalism and improving the profession's attractiveness and status. Framed as a moral duty and a human rights issue, and as a mean to deliver quality education, the SPDL calls for greater regulation of the teaching profession. It targets key pillars (teacher education, teachers' careers and teaching labor market) and draws on a wide range of policy instruments to reform the teaching profession. Despite noble objectives, our study shows that the stated aim of the policy is threatened by the emphasis on control, accountability and performance assessment. Delving into the ambivalent discourses about professionalism underlying the SPDL, the paper contributes to understanding the tensions between professionalization, regulation, and participation in countries that attempt to improve teacher professionalism using standards and accountability mechanisms while preserving pre-existing market logic.

## ARTICLE HISTORY

Received 9 April 2024  
Accepted 5 May 2025

## KEYWORDS

Education policies; teaching profession; frame analysis; policy instrumentation; Chile

## Introduction

'Developing, promoting and maintaining a good professional teaching workforce from primary to upper secondary education is a policy imperative for education systems around the world' (OECD 2021, 290). This statement illustrates a proposition that dominates transnational discourses and permeates national debates, and which asserts the link between the quality of the teaching force and the quality of education (OECD 2021; 2005). The formula linking teacher quality to education quality sounds simple. In fact, it is not. Quality is a contested concept, difficult to embody, especially in contexts where the teaching profession faces many challenges such as low status and poor working conditions (Towers et al. 2023; Unesco 2023). It has nonetheless underpinned reforms worldwide with areas considered crucial to ensuring teacher quality (e.g. recruitment and education, hiring and distribution, and supporting and rewarding the profession – Akiba

2013; Darling-Hammond et al. 2017). In this quest for education quality, teacher professionalism stands as critical (Mezza 2022). Yet rhetoric that calls on professionalism constructs a deficit discourse that conceives teacher professionalism as an unfulfilled aim. Framing educational quality as a teacher professionalism and teacher quality issue also contributes to an ambivalent discourse that conceives teachers as both the problem and the solution (Ávalos 2013; Barnes 2021; Goodwin 2020; Kumashiro 2012). This discourse has nevertheless driven policy initiatives in various parts of the globe, teacher reforms having reshaped teacher professionalism from an occupational view, based on autonomy, collegiality, and trust, to an organizational view, based on performance cultures, standards, and accountability (Anderson and Ian Cohen 2018; Ávalos 2024; Evetts 2011; Sachs 2015).

Chile is no exception to these debates, having witnessed intense policy activity for decades to address high levels of school inequalities in a market-oriented and highly segregated education system (Ávalos and Bellei 2019; Bellei and Muñoz 2023; Valenzuela, Bellei, and de Los Ríos 2013). In the late 2000s, waves of protests led by student movements carried massive calls for greater equity and quality in education (Ávalos and Bellei 2019; Cabalin 2012). These calls for profound changes came against the backdrop of reforms deemed inadequate, unable to challenge the prevalent market logic (Bellei, Cabalin, and Orellana 2014; Donoso 2013), and in a context where the difficult conditions of the teaching profession and a technical view of teachers' work have been widely documented (Ávalos 2013; Villalba-Pino, Valdés-Flores, and Fernández 2023). In the mid-2010s, under strong social pressure, the government of Michele Bachelet (2014–2018) launched a cycle of educational policies that includes the System for Teachers' Professional Development Law (SPDL) (2016) (Law 20.903 2016), an unprecedented multidimensional reform of the teaching profession (Ruffinelli Vargas 2016). The SPDL crystallizes years of heated debate about the role of teachers regarding the quality of education and that of the state in supporting the teaching profession, and aims at strengthening teachers' professionalism and improve the profession's attractiveness and status (Ruffinelli Vargas 2016). However, even though there was a national agreement on the need for this reform, the bill faced strong opposition by an emerging group of teacher organizations and led to massive teachers' protests and a 57-day national strike (Sisto et al. 2022).

Echoing international recommendations (see Darling-Hammond et al. 2017), the SDPL targets key institutional pillars for regulating the teaching profession – teacher initial education and training, teachers' careers and the teaching labor market. To regulate initial teacher education (ITE), the SPDL includes new mandatory accreditation for ITE programs, a renewal of standards for ITE, increased national ITE entry requirements, and two standards-based assessments of teacher candidates in both the first year of training and the one before graduation (Law 20.903 2016). In relation to teacher training, the SPDL provides free of charge both non-mandatory induction and mentoring programs and locally defined in-service training for professional development. Regarding teachers' careers and the teaching labor market, the reform introduces a multi-stage teaching career structure comprising three required stages (initial, early professional, advanced professional) and two voluntary stages (expert 1 and 2). Assessment for career advancement considers years of professional experience and the result in two instruments, a portfolio and a standardized evaluation of

specific and pedagogical knowledge. Career advancement (in the early stages) is compulsory, with several failures in the evaluation system leading to a career exit. The law also provides an improved remuneration system attached to career stages and slightly better teachers' employment conditions for all teachers in publicly funded institutions (salary increase, legal determination of working hours and recognition of elective and non-elective hours).

To date, literature has highlighted the politics surrounding the law (Mizala and Schneider 2020), and teacher organizations' opposition to the bill and their demands to incorporate a reflective, collective, community, and relationship-centered vision of teaching (Sisto et al. 2022). Teachers' conceptions of the bill as 'unrepresentative, based on distrust and validating a punitive evaluation system that makes them invisible as a relevant actor in the design of the aforementioned bill' have also been stressed (Arriagada and Castañeda 2018, 1). Studies also discuss the advances and tensions inherent to this reform that oscillate between an organic and a technological approach (Ruffinelli Vargas 2016), and how standardization, externally assessed performance and accountability mechanisms (Ávalos and Bellei 2019) have structured the law in control-oriented way (Cavieres-Fernández and Apple 2016; Sisto et al. 2022; Durán; Sanhueza 2017). The heterogeneous impact of this policy as perceived by teacher educators is also discussed, those located in regional universities and with a curriculum primarily connected to their local communities holding a more negative view of the policy (Fernández et al. 2022). Finally, recent international evaluation depicts advances in implementing the SPDL while raising criticism towards standardization in ITE, concerns related to implementation problems, the low coverage of mentoring schemes and the relevance of teacher professional development programs, and as regards the balance between formative and punitive goals of teacher evaluation (PNUD, 2023).

While light has been shed on key aspects of the SPDL, literature analyzing this policy initiative while unpacking its instrumental, cognitive, and normative dimensions (e.g. the instruments it promotes, and the belief and value systems it conveys) and stressing its implications for teacher professionalism is still scarce. This is the aim of this critical policy analysis that uncovers how the SPDL has framed teacher professionalism and professionalization through the discursive construction of problems it seeks to address and policy solutions it introduces. This is crucial as it reveals the social imaginary of the teaching profession (Taylor 2004) constructed through the law. Also, the case of SPDL is fascinating for at least four reasons. First, few countries have had the audacity to implement such an ambitious reform. Second, the SPDL takes place in the context of both an imperative to improve the teaching profession as prompted by global discourses and strong social pressure in the Chilean context, and, at the same time, high criticisms from teachers' collective groups during policy discussion. Third, and correlatively, this reform illustrates the complex intertwining between transnational discourses, national policy agendas, evidence, and local initiatives about professionalization that percolate through policy frames. Fourth we argue that this policy provides a striking example of the tensions between the stated aim of supporting the profession and the emphasis on control that ultimately prevails through policy choices and instruments. We thus outline how these ambivalences and tensions are reflected in the discourse underlying the promotion of the SPDL and related policy instruments, and how they crystallize in the choice and articulation of the latter.

## Conceptual background

Our critical policy analysis brings together a frame analysis (Entman 1993; Rein and Schön 1996) with a sociology perspective on policy instrumentation (Lascoumes and Le Galès 2004, 2007) as an analytical perspective. Both have in common a strong emphasis on ideas and beliefs, positioning the meaning-making process at the heart of the analysis, assuming that policy problems are socially constructed. They differ nonetheless in terms of focal considerations, encouraging either stronger emphasis on the discourses that shape a policy, or to the policy instrumentation that materialize and operationalize it. We do consider these elements to be interdependent and interrelated. Participating in the construction of a (certain form of) reality, elaborating problems and related (desirable) solutions, they serve a social and control function, shaping reality and social order, linking rhetoric and practice.

Goffman developed the concept of 'frame analysis' in the field of sociology in 1974; it has since been used for the analysis of social movements, public policy, and advertising. From this perspective, frames are conceptualized as structures which organize information promoting specific understandings and actions (Gamson 1992; Oliver and Johnston 2000). Frames can involve four functions: defining problems, attributing causes, making moral judgments or evaluations, and suggesting solutions for problems (Entman 1993; Gamson 1992; Rein and Schön 1996). Frames call attention to some aspects of information, making them more salient, meaningful, and memorable for others (Davies 2002; Entman 1993; Rein and Schön 1996).

The way a policy issue is framed is relevant because it determines who bears responsibility and justifies certain policy solutions while ruling out others. Using frames, policy makers and politicians provide a perspective to make sense of an unstructured situation to act upon it, and express their proposals (Davies 2002; Rein and Schön 1996). These frames usually refer to cultural perspectives, ideologies, and myths in order to resonate with people and become more persuasive (Davies 2002). The study of frames in policies allows identifying their rationale (Wu et al. 2012). Studying ideologies using frame analysis implies the analysis of ideas about how the world works, including norms and values that guide actions or promote or resist change (Oliver and Johnston 2000). Frame analysis of policy, from a critical perspective, seeks to identify the assumptions related to a policy problem expressed on understanding and actions, unveiling the relationships between premises and their implications for policy (Rein and Schön 1996).

Snow and Benford (1988) recognized three different framing tasks for achieving consensus and action in social movements, which have been used by several authors to examine policy documents in various countries (e.g. Butler and Milley 2020; Ro 2020). These tasks are related to diagnosis, proposing solutions, and a call for action. Based on this premise, frame analysis focuses on the identification of: 1) diagnostic frames or how the problems and their causes are constructed in discourses, involving the identification of what the problems are, what the causes are, and who is responsible for the problems, what the antagonists and protagonists are; 2) prognostic frames or the proposed solutions, strategies, and target to solve the problems; who would be benefited and who would be excluded from them; and what the values underlying the solutions are; 3) motivational frames or the elements used to call for or justify actions, which are usually

related to status, moral and material incentives and the elements used to create a sense of urgency (Benford and Snow 2000).

Frames work at different levels; they can be identified at the macro level (i.e. supranational or national level, or in the society in general), meso level (i.e. a group of actors or a policy domain), and the micro level (i.e. individual) (Dombos 2012). In this article, we focus on the frames at the meso level (education policy domain) constructed by the government in relation to the SPDL and its instrumentation, unveiling how 'ideas' and 'meanings' as regards the teaching profession are constructed through the law and its instrumentation, and how these shape how teacher professionalism is conceived (D. E. Snow et al. 1986).

Together with frame analysis, the sociology perspective on policy instrumentation (Lascoumes and Le Galès 2007; Lascoumes and Simard 2011) enables to shed light on the normative and cognitive implications of the policy instrumentation that is deployed through the SPDL to regulate the teaching profession. Indeed, as the sociology of public action stresses, policy instruments mix technical components (measuring, calculating, the rule of law, procedure) and social components (representation, symbol) (Lascoumes and Simard 2011). Policy instruments are not 'tools with perfect axiological neutrality, equally available: on the contrary, they are bearers of values, fueled by one interpretation of the social and by precise notions of the mode of regulation envisaged' (Lascoumes and Le Galès 2007, 4–8). In this sense, policy instruments are not reducible to a pure technical rationality. They carry a specific logic of regulation (Lascoumes and Le Galès 2004), which shares distinct conceptions of actors, of what might affect their behavior, and therefore of the key mechanisms that will bring about change (Author). Producing a specific representation of the issue to be tackled, they produce and share a cognitive and normative grid for interpreting reality, imposing 'conventional definition of social facts' (Lascoumes and Simard 2011, 19–20). Having a controlling function both cognitively and behaviorally, policy instrumentation shapes how the teaching profession is organized and regulated, and how teachers are conceived, and are expected to behave.

In this paper, combining frame analysis with a sociology perspective on policy instrumentation enables emphasizing the discursive construction of the problems and causes which the SPDL is intended to address (diagnostic framing), the solutions and strategies adopted (prognostic framing), and the elements used to call for or justify actions (motivational framing). We stress how this framing touches on international issues relating to the teaching profession, draws on frames promoted by social movements in Chile, and on national and local initiatives to justify policy choices. Also, if we place particular emphasis on the configuration of the policy instruments deployed for regulating the teaching profession, we do not enter into a detailed analysis of their contents or their uses but rather stress the discursive constructions underlying their dissemination, discussing their dissonance, and consonance with the stated aims of the policy (e.g. to promote teacher professionalism).

As the SPDL targets key institutional pillars for regulating the teaching profession (e.g. ITE, teachers' careers and the teaching labor market) whose organization is seen as a crucial element in supporting the work of professionals and enabling them to be defined and regarded as such (Freidson 2001), we question the forms of organization and control of work that are favored through the SPDL and its instrumentation, and whether they sustain the occupational control of work (Evetts 2013; Freidson 2001; Ro

2020). We thus unpack the extent to which teachers' discretionary power, professional control of work and professional autonomy, understood as the power of professions to define the content of their work, and to maintain the boundaries of their professional domains (Evetts 2013; Freidson 2001), are safeguarded, ensured or challenged. We thus ask: how has the SPDL been framed? Which conceptions of teachers and teacher professionalism are conveyed through this policy initiative and related policy instruments? Hence, we delve into the ambivalent discourse on teacher professionalism, and into the tensions between the favored policy tools for regulating the teaching profession and the aim to support the former, as reflected in a policy framework such as the SPDL.

## Methodology

As methodology, we conducted a policy document analysis using as main data sources official national policy documentation related to the SPDL ( $n = 26$ , volume  $\approx 300$  pages) published between 2014 and 2023, and retrieved from the Ministry of Education (MoE MINEDUC), MoE agencies websites (Center for Improvement, Experimentation and Pedagogical Research (CPEIP), Docente mas) and from the Chile National Library (Appendix 1). Our inclusion criteria refer to 1) the nature of the documentation and include political, legislative, normative and dissemination documents, 2) its scope (documentation related to the SPDL approval, promotion and instrumentation), 3) the source/author and relevance (documentation produced by the government and its agencies). Our corpus includes the presidential message introducing the bill that is key to grasping the frames (diagnostic, prognostic, and motivational frames) constructed by the government in relation to the SPDL, the law text (approved version), dissemination, and normative documents that include standards (ITE standards, professional standards (Framework for Good Teaching) and guidelines for actors (ITE actors, schools, teachers) to disseminate the policy and related instruments.

The material was analyzed using qualitative content analysis (Creswell 2007) via Atlas.ti software on the basis of theoretically developed code families (Appendix 2) and using a flexible coding strategy. Based on our conceptual foundations, key-related categories (e.g. Problems) and sub-categories (e.g. Problem definition) were created to analyze our material. During the analysis, emerging codes were added, relating to predefined categories and enabling them to be refined (e.g. Policy tools – Teacher Education) or relating to transversal elements central to the analysis (e.g. Conception of Teachers). The material was analyzed at two levels, vertical (within documents) and horizontal (between documents), using constant comparative analyses (Miles and Huberman 2003) in our multi-phase analysis. Vertical analysis, which involved coding each document and drafting memos, enabled us to extract key elements from each document (based on analysis of coded meaning units). Horizontal analysis involved identifying cross-cutting elements, convergences and divergences, and reconstructing dominant (diagnostic, prognostic, and motivational) frames that transcend the corpus.

## Findings: (re-) framing the teaching profession

This section is organized around three main framing tasks: diagnostic, prognostic, and motivational framing.



## ***Diagnostic frames: the need for recognition of teachers' professionalism***

'Rhetoric is persuasive. It seeks to influence our personal and collective behaviors by having us voluntarily agree with the communicator that a certain value, action, or policy is better than another' (Kuypers 2009, 288)

Diagnostic frames are critical to understanding how the problem of the teaching profession is constructed while revealing how professionalism is conceived around key institutional pillars in need of reform. Mainly outlined in the presidential message introducing the bill, diagnostic frames are constructed around the need for social and professional recognition of teachers' professionalism (Document 1, 5). It makes evident the need for the teaching profession to be revalued, supported and improved, and for teacher professionalism to be enhanced (Document 5). However, the problem of the teaching profession is not constructed in isolation, but tied to the problem of education quality, asserted as a fundamental 'right' for all children (Document 1). As stated, quality education and access to knowledge is a social 'right', and the quality of education children receive must be improved (document 1). The urge to support the teaching profession is thus tied to the imperative to deliver quality education (Document 1, 4), and teacher professionalism is conceived as intrinsically bound up with and oriented towards the sake of education quality.

The discursive construction of the problems also points to a systemic and structural issue. The prevailing market logic and deregulation policies are pointed out as the root cause of the problem, blamed for the deterioration of the conditions of the teaching profession, in particular during the dictatorship in Chile when teachers' salaries, work conditions were degraded and teachers' status was lost (Document 1). Also, recent teacher policies are deemed inadequate and insufficient, having failed to challenge inherited neoliberal ideological foundations and to adopt a comprehensive approach to improve the teaching profession (Document 1) and, in turn, to deliver quality education (Document 5). This makes clear that the segmented and market-oriented approach favored to regulate the teaching profession must be challenged. In this way, the (lack of) control and (de)professionalization are interwoven in policy problem construction. Relatedly, diagnostic frames identify key issues affecting the teaching profession, in particular fragmented teacher training provision and poor-quality control over ITE (institutions and programs), teacher candidates and teachers entering the labor market (Document 1). Henceforth (the regulation of) teacher education, teacher careers and the teaching labor market are singled out as critical to professionalize teachers and deliver quality education.

The problem of teacher education is constructed as the lack of government regulation on ITE institutions and programs, having led to heterogeneity in ITE programs quality (Document 1). Problems related to teachers' careers and the teaching labor market concern the retention of novice teachers, in-service training that requires 'modernization' to move from the 'traditional model of in-service training to one of transformative professional development' (Document 1, p. 6), and professional development opportunities that have to be guaranteed, just as teacher performance, merit and continuous development must be rewarded (Document 1, p. 7). Also, it is stated that collaborative work must be revived, as 'the incipient culture of collaborative work has been hindered



by an authoritarian legacy and the market logic that prevails in the education system' (Document 1, p. 3). Hence, key concepts around which teacher professionalism is conceived (and teacher professionalization is oriented) are asserted: merit, performance, collaboration, and transformative continuous learning.

### ***Prognostic frames: a comprehensive commitment requiring a systemic approach***

#### ***Students' right to quality education and teachers' dignity***

Proclaiming solutions, prognostic frames present the law as a way to improve the prestige and social and economic status of the teaching profession (Document 1, 3, 7). Accordingly, the SPDL is erected as a key to develop 'the line that makes it possible to dignify the teaching profession, support its performance and value as an attractive profession for new generations' (document 1, p. 4). Ultimately, pupils' right to quality education needs to be ensured by teachers 'strengthened in their professional capacities, valued and recognized by society', as they fulfill a decisive mission, that of 'the integral education of pupils' (document 1, p. 3). As documents stated, 'education is key to 'children' social and personal development' (Document 1) and to ensure they develop 'the skills of the 20<sup>th</sup> Century' (Document 5) as well as for the construction of a democratic and educated society (Document 1). This justifies the need for an attractive profession 'motivated by the challenges of education and its influence on society, the quality of life and the personal and social development of Chileans' (document 1, p. 3). This way, children's right to quality education and the crucial role of the teaching profession in this endeavor are tied together in a narrative that gives strength to the argument and goes as follows: quality education is a right that aims at the integral development of children/individuals. The teaching profession is instrumental in this venture. Only by improving the teaching profession will it be possible to achieve quality education (Document 1, 5). As with diagnostic frames, prognostic framing therefore bears the imprint of an ambivalent discourse that constructs the profession both as a problem in need of improvement and as a key for the nation's future.

#### ***The need for transformation and profound change***

Based on the diagnosis, the law advocates for a systemic and comprehensive approach (Documents 1, 5). The need for transformation and profound change is depicted as critical, both in the foundations and conditions of the teaching profession, and the principles that underpin professional practice (Document 4). Relatedly, a multidimensional reform (and framing) of the teaching profession is needed. The solution is a professional development system in which 'initial training, induction of beginning professionals, professional practice, support for professional development, and training for the professional development of educators are the main components' (Document 1, p. 3). In this way, teacher professionalism is now asserted as a key principle supported by (and rooted in) institutional pillars at the heart of the government's approach to reforming the teaching profession, and strongly regulated by standards constituting the cornerstone of the change strategy deployed through the SPDL.

The policy discourse and strategy (orientation towards a systemic approach for professionalism) are materialized through policy instrumentation where standards and evaluation play a key role in regulating the profession. While ITE Standards and the

Framework for Good Teaching (professional standards) were in place before (since 2012 and 2004, respectively), the SPDPL mandated their renewal. One of the six premises of the new ITE Standards is their articulation with the Renewed Framework for Good Teaching, making it explicit that they were built with a common conceptual framework and have a common organizational architecture for teaching knowledge and expected performances (Document 6). Thus, both sets of standards share domains or thematic areas but differ in the description of the standards according to the stage of teachers (pre or in-service). It is also established that the ITE Standards and the Framework for Good Teaching together form the Standards for the Teaching Profession (Document 6). Also, the ITE Standards and the Framework for Good Teaching guide pre-service and in-service teachers' assessments, respectively. In this way, one shared vision about teaching guides education and teaching practices. This means tightening control over the profession to enhancing professionalization.

### ***Regulated teacher education for quality education***

Based on the problem of deregulation in ITE, the law raises the requirements and includes more regulation and greater consequences for ITE programs. Accreditation with high consequences becomes an articulating linchpin to mobilize ITE program changes and implement the policy strategies regulating ITE. The law establishes that ITE programs must be accredited to enroll pre-service teachers, so not having this accreditation results in the closure of the programs. In addition, to achieve accreditation, ITE programs must not only meet the objectives each program has set for itself but must also demonstrate that their curriculum is aligned with the National Standards for ITE programs (Document 4). It is also state that programs must report that their students took the two diagnostic tests for pre-service teachers defined in the SDPL (the first designated by each university and the second designed and applied centrally by the MoE) and report the improvement actions developed based on the test results. Pre-service teachers take the second of these tests in their penultimate year of ITE, which is compounded by three instruments: the first assess pedagogical standards, the second evaluates subject matter standards, and the third is a characterization questionnaire. In addition, the accreditation requirements state that ITE programs must meet the new admission criteria for pre-service teachers defined by the SDPL. In this sense, the accreditation mechanism is the hinge that allows the other requirements to be enforced, turning the SDPL into a tightened accountability policy with high consequences for ITE. However, accreditation is presented as an instrument not only of external control but also as a formative instrument that allows for improving programs and institutions that provide ITE. In this way, control and formative approaches are presented as being complementary to improving ITE without questioning their capacity to work in tandem. Yet, although teacher educators had a low level of participation in the policy process (Villalba-Pino, Valdés-Flores, and Fernández 2023), the changes or consequences must be implemented and faced mainly by the ITE program staff and faculty. ITE programs must implement the new admission requirements and are mandated to generate improvement plans based on the results of their teacher candidates in the national tests. The policy does not, however, include additional funding or support for ITE programs to make these changes. In this way, the policy increases control over teacher preparation programs without providing support to adapt to the new regulations. The

rationale of the policy documents is that teacher education quality will improve when programs are able to meet centralized external demands.

Also, the quality of teacher education is defined very centrally by its outcomes. A good teacher education program would be one with high results obtained by the student teachers in the national diagnostic test and with high or good accreditation. Both policy instruments are based on the national standards for ITE. The Standards for Teacher Education Programs are created to ensure a minimum standard in the education of the country's teachers, regardless of where they study teaching. To this end, it is established by law that the training processes of teacher education program must be coherent with the defined Standards for Teacher Education Program (Document 5).

Underlying rationale is that society needs to be assured of the quality and consistency of ITE, which should be based on common criteria that apply to all ITE institutions throughout the country. Hence, the relevance of compulsory assessment of teaching candidates and of standards for ITE on which assessments and ITE programs must be aligned. Also, a good pre-service teacher is to be one who performs well in the national diagnostic test, based on the pedagogical and subject matter teacher education standards. In this way, the policy instruments not only guide program actions but also produce a particular way of organizing teacher preparation and being a pre-service teacher, establishing what knowledge is valuable and what are the legitimate ways to demonstrate this knowledge.

Also, a good pre-service teacher would be a person able to meet the national admission requirements for ITE. These requirements establish a minimum entrance score on the national standardized university admission test (PSU or PAES) 'as an expression of the student's standard performance' and considers students 'high school grade point average, as an indicator of performance in the local context' (Document 1, p. 7). 'In a complementary manner, it advances to establish models of early recruitment of young people with pedagogical interests and talents' (Document 1, p. 7).

'This project seeks to establish a more demanding regulation for the initial training of education professionals, both with respect to the institutions that may offer teaching careers, as well as the programs and selectivity requirements for students who may enroll in such careers'. (Document 1, p. 7)

The formula as expressed in the policy discourse is straightforward: excellent teachers require excellent TE. There is a need to strengthen teacher training from the very beginning. Better ITE will ensure better preparation for teachers entering the labor market, and excellent ITE is the key to quality education. The policy establishes nonetheless a narrow definition of a good pre-service teacher. Prospective teaching students' quality is understood as the achievement of a cut-off (or minimum score) in the national university admission test or else performing strongly in a high-school academic ranking. The requirements to enter teacher education are defined very centrally by academic characteristics, disregarding social skills or motivation.

### ***Regulated teachers careers and labor market – a professional career perspective***

Erected as key to the profession valorization, the multi-stage teaching career structure associated with an improved remuneration system is undoubtedly the law's flagship measure. An integral part of the Professional Development System

(Document 1, 7, 8), it epitomizes the complementary logics of control and support at the heart of the government effort to reform the teaching profession and that shapes teacher professionalism. Introducing ‘a professional career perspective’ (Document 1, 10), it embodies and gives shape to a paradigm shift for ‘re-signifying and redefining initial education, induction and professional practice as part of the same development process’ (Document 12, p. 1). As a result, teacher learning becomes critical, conceived as a continuum from teacher education to continuous education, designed as a means to support and improve the profession, whereas teachers’ commitment (and success) to this continuous learning process, in turn, becomes a legal requirement (Document 1, 3, 12). This way, the professionalization of teachers is conceived as relying on (and depending on) continuous learning, and the professionalism of teachers, on their ability to demonstrate their success in this process.

With this ‘professional career perspective’ comes the recognition of the early stages of teaching careers as critical. As stated, ‘what educators and teachers learn in their first years of practice is key to their future professional performance’ (Document 18, p. 1). Thus, induction and mentoring programs coupled with financial incentives (allowance for young teachers and mentors) (Documents 3, 18) stand as a right for novice teachers, as key levers for ‘early construction of teaching professionalism’ and teachers’ professional performance, and as a remedy for retention problems. In fact, these programs should allow the novice teacher to ‘learn more’ and be a ‘better professional’ (Document 18, p. 1), and must be oriented towards ‘reflection on and about teaching and pedagogical practice and the associated challenges, analysis of learning results, planning of teaching activities, discussion about integration within the educational community’ (Document 17, p. 1). As stressed in this excerpt, teachers’ professionalism refers to teachers’ ability to develop desired skills and reflect on their practices. As such, from the outset, teachers must become reflective practitioners (Schön 2017). For this, peer support and collaboration are critical (Document 1, 3, 17, 18). Consequently, induction and mentoring schemes are rooted in (and enact) a professional (and collegial) logic, and a logic of support, oriented towards the development of desired skills.

This logic of support also underpins free of charges in-service training established by the SPDL as a right granted by law, as a moral duty for teachers, and as a shared responsibility (Document 3 and REF). As stated, professional development activities and local training addresses the need to ‘build a bridge between two worlds’ in need of dialogue – the training of future teachers and ‘the practice of the profession itself’ (Document 12, p. 13). In fact, they are critical in supporting teachers’ learning process, and encouraged teachers to engage in multiple modes of professional learning (e.g. action research, school improvement networks) (Documents 16, 17). As a focus, they are explicitly oriented toward collaborative work and feedback on pedagogical practices (Document 17). Here, peer-support remains crucial. Moreover, as a shared responsibility, the MoE (through the CPEIP) is responsible for designing professional development programs and activities in collaboration with universities and accredited institutions. Schools must provide quality local training relevant to teachers’ needs and related to the school’s project and context (Document 3, 16, 17). Emphasis is also placed on the role of the educational community in supporting teachers (through school

improvement networks). However, beyond ‘teachers’ need’, documents explicitly state that in-service training must focus on practices allowing teachers to:

‘Update and deepen their disciplinary and pedagogical knowledge, reflect on their professional practice, with special emphasis on the application of techniques of collaboration with other teachers and professionals’. (Document 5, p. 3)

In this way, in-service training is aligned with prescriptions as regards valued (and valuable) practices as advocated by the MoE (through guidelines and standards) (Document 5, 6, 16, 17). However, although professional development is portrayed as a shared responsibility (Document 3), the accountability chain falls short as teachers are primarily held accountable as they must engage in professional learning activities and succeed in advancing their careers at the risk of losing their jobs. The law increases the pressure over teachers and the control over teaching practices, while no consequences are foreseen for actors (MoE, schools) who fail to provide support to teachers.

In fact, support, pressure, and control are intertwined constitutive facets of the law, as the SPDL is inextricably linked to a high-stakes accountability system that provides for strong consequences for teachers, especially in the early stages of their careers (Document 3, 8, 9). As a matter of fact, teachers must progress through the -compulsory career stages to desired levels of professional proficiency, with successive failures leading to suspension and dismissal from the profession (Document 1, 3, 7). Levels of proficiency are defined according to career stages. Linked to financial incentives (salary bonuses), purposive incentives (professional responsibilities), and career advancement consequences (Document 3, 9, 10, 20), they are tightly aligned with the Framework for Good Teaching to control teacher quality. This way teachers are given limited room for maneuver and must comply with the requirements.

As a matter of fact, instruments used for career progression (portfolio first introduced in 2004 for the assessment of public-school teachers, and standardized assessment of disciplinary and pedagogical knowledge), tightly aligned with ITE, curricular and professional standards (Document 3, 23, 24), define what matters in teaching and as teaching knowledge base. Professional standards (Framework for Good teaching), which have evolved from criteria structuring the teaching profession to precise performance standards (Document 4, p. 9), provide ‘fundamental knowledge, skills and tools to improve teaching and learning’ (Document 11, p. 1).

Organized by domain (4), each professional standard (12) is associated with knowledge, attitudes and expected performance levels (Document 4). Advocating for ‘student-centered’ practices oriented towards ‘deep learning’, rooted in a ‘constructivist perspective on learning and pedagogy’ (Document 5, p. 16), they frame teachers as ‘lifelong learners’ (Document 5, p. 3) and teaching as ‘a transformative task that is learned’ (Document 5, p. 12). This way, they construct an ontology and epistemology of teachers, defining what teachers should be, what teaching is, and which practices are valid. As such, teacher professionalism is tightly framed, and professional autonomy strongly constrained.

## ***Motivational frames: a moral duty and a strategy based on participation and evidence***

Values can be constructed as modes of conduct or states of existence that are thought to be worthy of protection and promotion (D. E. Snow et al. 1986, 469)

Motivational frames illustrate both the discursive strategies and sources of legitimacy used to legitimate policy choices and gain support. As motivational frames, the law is presented as a moral duty, reflecting the need to honor the government's commitment to educational reforms (Document 1), and as a way for democratic governments to pay a 'national debt' to teachers (Document 1). As part of this moral duty, and as moral incentives, education quality is framed as a 'right' for children. Teacher professionalism, teacher quality and education quality are conceptualized as intertwined phenomena, building the urge to improve the teaching profession in relation to students' right to quality education (Document 1, 4). In fact, this frame, 'right to education' was promoted by student movement in 2006, and was used to promote the law and its reform strategies.

'Participation' as democratic value is also erected as both a fundamental principle at the heart of the SPDL and a key element in the process that led to the proposed law (Document 1, 3). As a source of legitimacy, frequent exchanges with the leader of the main teachers' union in Chile (the Colegio de Profesores) are highlighted (Document 1). It is also stated that civil society has 'organized itself' (Document 1). Here, the reference is to the Plan Maestro, an initiative launched in 2014 by a think tank that resulted in concrete proposals for reforming the teaching profession, and which was developed through a consultation process with civil society (Hochschild et al. 2014; Mizala and Schneider 2020).

However, some congress representatives stress that the law was elaborated with a lack of participation of teachers and teacher organizations, which resulted in Chile's second-longest teacher strike, and delayed the approval of the law (BCN 2016). In question in policy debates, a conception of education, teaching careers and teaching under the parameters of education 'as a consumer good', a summative, instrumental and controlling logic, and an excessive accountability that reflects a lack of trust, and of consideration for the collaborative dimension of teachers work (BCN 2016). Whether certain concerns have been acknowledged (e.g. importance of collaborative practices), one can argue that teacher participation was limited to the opportunity to present concerns or proposals, without taking a direct part in the development of policy strategies. Civil participation was used nonetheless to legitimize the law.

As motivational frames, foreign examples are also used as a source of legitimacy. The work of the Education Commission presented in the Chamber of Representatives referred to Mexico, Finland and Singapore (BCN 2016). As a matter of fact, Finland and Singapore have been erected by influential international studies as examples of high-performing systems producing highly qualified and committed teachers thanks to their systemic teacher policies (Darling-Hammond et al. 2017). With Finland's selective ITE held up as key to the high social status granted to teachers (Sahlberg 2010), and Singapore's system for regulating teachers' careers attracting increased global attention (Tan and Low 2023), these country examples are particularly worthy of interest for legitimizing policy choices to reforming ITE and teachers' careers.

In the same vein, the work of leading (international and national) figures in the field of education (Document 5, 6, 13) is used in documents to justify the standards-based approach favored to regulate the teaching profession and teachers' careers:

A good teacher standard is one that helps change the general public's perception of the teaching profession by providing compelling evidence about the complexity of what a good teacher knows and is able to do at different levels of teaching and across different subjects in the curriculum (Ingvarson 2009) (Document 13, p. 1)

In fact, based on Danielson's work (Danielson 2007), professional standards in Chile have been inspired by approaches favored in the United States, Scotland, and Australia. The updated 2021 version also refers to an inventory of teaching practices in Chile (Document 5) that has justified the need for promotion of student-centered practices and a constructivist approach to teaching and learning (Document 5, 6, 12, 13). On the other hand, it is mentioned that subject matter and pedagogical standards for teaching and ITE are connected and organized according to Lee Shulman's distinctions (Document 6).

Along with evidence, initiatives launched in the country are also used as sources of legitimacy. It is stated that induction and mentoring programs are already implemented in the country by leading universities, and coherent with evidence showing that the first years of teaching are crucial 'to improve the levels of satisfaction and efficiency in (teachers) work and to avoid their early desertion from the system' (Document 1, p. 6). As a matter of fact, they were also part of the Plan Maestro's recommendations (Hochschild et al. 2014; Plan Maestro 2014). As for local training oriented towards collaborative work and feedback on professional practices, their relevance is also supported by reference to evidence as stressed by this excerpt:

'evidence shows that these processes are fundamental, since teachers learn preferably in their schools and through reflection on their own practice'. (Document 17, p. 1)

All in all, while the various sources of legitimacy used in policy documents serve the discursive strategy for promoting the SPDL, they also highlight the complex process at work in the design of the SPDL.

## Discussion and conclusion

In this paper, using frame analysis coupled with a sociology perspective on policy instrumentation and a policy document analysis, we have shown that the SPDL has been framed as a moral duty and a human rights issue, and as a means to enhance teacher professionalism and deliver quality education. This framing takes on its full force in a global and national context where teacher professionalism is conceived as key to improve the teaching profession and, in turn, to deliver education quality (see Mezza 2022). The discourse that considers teacher quality a key driver for educational quality has indeed gained momentum internationally since the 2000s, in particular since the publication of the OECD report *Teachers Matters* (OECD 2005). Rhetoric emphasizing the importance of quality teachers for quality education has also supported policy initiatives in Chile since the 1990s-2000s (Cox et al. 2010). However, this framing takes on its full force in the mid-2000s Chilean context where anger and expectations are particularly strong and have vehicle a pressing imperative for change. Framing the law as



a human right issue has thus both experiential commensurability and resonance (Benford and Snow 2000), in that this framing resonates with social demands for greater access to quality education voiced by student movements, the urge to support the teaching profession tied to the imperative to deliver quality education giving strength to the argument and creating a sense of urgency. Also, as the government was elected with a strong mandate for education reforms and with solid majorities in both houses of congress (Mizala and Schneider 2020), this framing intended to mobilize coalition members to support the proposed policy initiative, and to rally teacher representatives in a context of strong teacher opposition to the law, providing thus a 'springboard for mobilizing support' (D. E. Snow et al. 1986, 469).

The SPDL rests on the central idea and underlying rationale that better trained teachers will lead to better teaching, which, in turn, will improve education quality. Attractive teaching careers will help raise the status of the profession and attract suitable individuals into teaching. Advocating for a systemic approach to reforming the profession, the law constructs a conceptualization of teacher professionalization rooted in the organization (and regulation) of interrelated institutional pillars, and echoes policy solutions promoted internationally (see Darling-Hammond et al. 2017) and nationally (see Hochschild et al. 2014) to improve the teaching profession. As sources of legitimacy, moral incentives and taken-for-granted assumptions are used in policy documents, drawing on evidence, foreign examples, international, and national initiatives to legitimate policy choices. The process at work is complex, stressing how the policy agenda touches upon international and national issues, is fueled by national and local forces that permeates the policy framing. It involves policy borrowing phenomena (Phillips et al. 2005) and local impulses, enacting policy choices rooted in Chile specific context. This policy is thus an example of the complex process of hybridization in which international and national discourses, social movements' demands, and previous reforms are articulated to promote new policies. In the case of Chile, even though this process attempts to combine diverse rationales and logic, we argue that the previous managerial view of professionalism remains and prevails, pervading the SPDL and related policy instrumentation.

The SPDL is remarkable in that it draws on a wide range of policy instruments to reform the teaching profession. The layering process involves new policy instruments (new entry requirements for ITE, teaching career ladder) articulated to existing institutional arrangements whose function has been enlarged (portfolio extended to career advancement purposes) or reoriented (Streeck and Thelen 2005). In this instrumental landscape, coupled with material (financial bonuses) and purposive incentives (career advancement, professional responsibilities) (Clark and Wilson 1961), the law introduces and reinforces standards-based and high-stakes performance-based accountability schemes that strengthen and extend control over teachers' knowledge, skills, and practices. The law thus multiplies the objects (processes and outcomes), sites (external and internal), and forms of control (professional, hierarchical, external) enacting the favored standards-based approach to regulating the teaching profession. Through the law, teaching processes (assessed through portfolio, targeted by continuous learning) and outcomes (in a market-oriented education system where students' results are critical for schools) become critical objects of control. External control (assessment in ITE and for career advancement) and the targeting of teachers' internal dispositions, which whom are

expected to internalize standards-related expectations, multiply the sites of control, while professional (to peer experts/mentors), hierarchical and external accountability (to educational authorities) structure the chain of responsibility and authority.

As such, although it can be argued that the law relies on policy instruments that *a priori* carry conflicting logics, or logics in tension (Ruffinelli Vargas 2016), e.g. a logic of support and a logic of control, we argue that control and support are complementary and key for controlling the teaching profession and governing behaviors. Beside control instruments (external evaluation, accountability mechanisms), the law establishes support systems key to continuous improvement (in-service training) and introduces policy instruments based on a professional logic that values peer-to-peer support (induction and mentoring, collaborative work). In fact, the SPDL combines pressure and support, drawing on external coercive devices and institutional arrangements favoring reflexivity and situated learning (at an individual and collective level) to bring about change. Here, the (individual and collective) learning process should favor the construction of a 'value consensus about educational goals' (Broadfoot 1996), sustaining the process of (cultural) change that seeks to modify existing norms, structures, and processes (Elmore 2004). The alignment strategy of organizational change on which the SPDL relies is expected to bring coherence, and guide actors' behavior according to desired organizational objectives. This means that actors are expected to align their practices and behavior in accordance with standards, constrained by coercive devices and supported by institutional arrangements favoring the integration of new practices.

Whereas the law establishes teacher professionalism and professional autonomy as guiding principles, our study rather stresses a discourse of professional change and control 'to inculcate "appropriate" work identities, conducts and practices' (Fournier 1990 in Evetts 2013, 786), and to construct teacher professionalism from 'above' rather than from 'within' the profession (Evetts 2013). Organizational professionalism as a discourse of control incorporates rational-legal forms of authority and hierarchical structures of responsibility and control. It relies extensively on externalized forms of regulation and accountability measures (Evetts 2013, 786) as is the case in the SPDL. Although this discourse of organizational professionalism may be appealing, creating a sense of empowerment for the profession, it remains a powerful mechanism for promoting occupational change and social control (6). As such, rather than reinforcing teacher professionalism, the SPDL might lead to the deprofessionalization of teachers by focusing on control, accountability, and performance evaluation (Acuña 2024; Falabella 2020, 2021; Parcerisa et al. 2022).

We argue that the predominant conception of a professional in the policy documents related to the law entails a constrained autonomy, tightly framed, constrained and restricted to teachers' ability to comply with prescriptions, and which allows flexibility in the ways that the policies may be implanted in different contexts but offers few spaces for teacher educators and teachers to discuss the aims and purposes of education. Teachers are identified as key actors in the educational process, but their role is reduced to technical aspects (Goodson 2001). Professionalism is diminished through testing and control based on a specific definition of competence. In this way, teacher policy in Chile fosters an impoverished or post-professional definition of professionalism (Ball 2009; Bottery 2009; Hargreaves 2000). Also, teacher preparation policy in Chile uses the same rationale that other professions have been using to define themselves as a profession, and

to gain legitimation and public recognition: the delimitation of a knowledge base (through standards) and the regulation of whom has access to practice (Yinger 1999). However, the low level of participation of teacher educators and student teachers in the process of construction of tests and standards could undermine the policy aims. While the policy discourses use a rhetoric of restoration regarding dignity and the teaching status, this discourse is accompanied by a restricted participatory process, in which teachers and teacher educators are heard but do not intervene in the design of the policy. In this way, their participation is limited to that of implementers of policies that increase the regulation of their curricular practices and decisions, while at the same time, contradictorily, policies claim to promote teachers' professionalization.

This study thus shows the discursive tensions in educational policies implemented in neoliberal contexts, which aim at improving the teaching profession by increasing regulations while preserving preexisting market logic. Bottery (2009) defines this combination of ideas of market competition from the private sector and regulation from the legacy of bureaucracy as a managerial market professional model. He argues that this kind of reform redefines the professional selves of teachers as focused workers (Bottery 2009), implementers of expert knowledge (standards) under the pressure that they and their universities will be judged based on their students' performance in tests. In contrast, Goodson (2001), links the characteristics of the educational system with the conditions of teaching work, and identifies as 'old professionals' those who, in a welfare state and democratic social services, developed their work based on autonomy and professional freedom.

To conclude, this study contributes to understanding the tensions between professionalization, regulation, and participation in countries that attempt to improve the teaching profession using accountability mechanisms. The analysis shows how a traditional perspective on accountability, which emphasizes outcomes, standards, and external regulation of teacher educators and teachers' work, threatens the aim of professionalization stated in the policy. The purpose of professionalization could be better aligned with the enactment of a democratic accountability perspective (Cochran-Smith et al. 2018), based on democratic values and goals in the process of policy construction and implementation, and a complex definition of teaching quality and learning beyond standards and beyond the results of standardized tests. Putting the emphasis on 'the voices of stakeholders who work, learn, and teach in school' (Smith and Benavot 2019, 193), it invites considering teachers' agency and teachers' voices in the construction, discussion and enactment of education policies. Based on a principle of trust in the profession considered capable and trustworthy (Smith and Benavot 2019), it draws on three principles – inclusion, dialogue, and deliberation. It implies the inclusion of key stakeholders, including teachers, coupled with a dialogical approach that allows portraying interests, opinion, and values, while enabling to 'reasoning reflectively about relevant issues' (Ryan 2005, 537). This approach that includes all players considered mutually accountable (including policy-makers) is certainly an avenue worth exploring.

## Acknowledgement

The authors thank Christian Maroy and Javier Nunez-Moscoso for their comments on previous draft. We also thank the anonymous reviewers for their insightful feedbacks.

## Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

## Funding

Funding from ANID/PIA/Basal Funds for Centers of Excellence FB0003/ Support 2024 AFB240004 is gratefully acknowledged. The authors acknowledge financial support from ANID FONDECYT project 1221395. Support from RUCHE is also acknowledged.

## Notes on contributors

**Annelise Voisin** holds a Ph.D in education from the University of Montreal (Canada). She is Assistant Professor at the University of Liege (Belgium). Her research interests focus on education policies in a multi scalar, comparative perspective, and the teaching profession.

**M. Beatriz Fernández** holds a Ph.D from Boston College (United-States). She is Associate Professor at the Institute for Advanced Studies in Education of the University of Chile (Chile) and at the Center for Advanced Studies in Education (CIAE, University of Chile). Her research interests include teacher education, teacher policies, teacher professionalism and professional development.

## ORCID

Annelise Voisin  <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-6193-6414>  
M. Beatriz Fernández  <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-7639-2811>

## References

- Acuña, Felipe. 2024. "Governing Teachers' Subjectivity in Neoliberal Times: The Fabrication of the Bonsai Teacher." *Journal of Education Policy* 39 (2): 171–190. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02680939.2023.2196954>.
- Akiba, Motoko, ed. 2013. *Teacher Reforms Around the World: Implementations and Outcomes*. England: Emerald Group Publishing Limited.
- Anderson, Gary L., and Michael Ian Cohen. 2018. *The New Democratic Professional in Education: Confronting Markets, Metrics, and Managerialism*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Arriagada, Carmen, and María Castañeda. 2018. "Representaciones Sociales Frente al Proyecto de Carrera Profesional Docente en Chile: Análisis Estructural del Discurso." *Revista Brasileira de Educação* 23. <https://doi.org/10.1590/s1413-24782018230075>.
- Ávalos, Beatrice, ed. 2013. *¿Héroes o Villanos?: La Profesión Docente en Chile*. Santiago de Chile: Editorial Universitaria de Chile.
- Ávalos, Beatrice. 2024. "Evaluación del desempeño y profesionalismo docente: una discusión crítica." In *Evaluación docente en el mundo: Experiencias, dilemas y desafíos futuros*, edited by Jorge Manzi, Yulan Sun, and María Rosa García, 93–109. Cham Switzerland: Springer International Publishing.
- Ávalos, Beatrice, and Cristián Bellei. 2019. "Recent Education Reforms in Chile: How Much of a Departure from Market and New Public Management Systems?" In *Politics of Education in Latin America*, edited by C. Ornelas, 43–71. The Netherlands: Brill. [https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004413375\\_003](https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004413375_003).
- Ball, Stephen J. 2009. "Education Reform, Teacher Professionalism and the End of Authenticity." In *Re-Reading Education Policies: A Handbook Studying the Policy Agenda of the 21st Century*, edited by M. Simons, M. Olssen, and M. A. Peters, 667–682. The Netherlands: Brill.

- Barnes, Melissa. 2021. "Policy Actors or Objects of Policy? Teacher Candidates' Interpretations of 'Teacher Quality' Policy Initiatives in Australia." *Teaching & Teacher Education* 106:103440. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2021.103440>.
- BCN – Biblioteca del Congreso Nacional de Chile. 2016. *Historia de la Ley N° 20.903. Crea el Sistema de Desarrollo Profesional Docente y Modifica Otras Normas*. <https://www.bcn.cl/historiadelaley/nc/historia-de-la-ley/4890/>.
- Bellei, Cristián, Cristian Cabalin, and Victor Orellana. 2014. "The 2011 Chilean Student Movement Against Neoliberal Educational Policies." *Studies in Higher Education* 39 (3): 426–440. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2014.896179>.
- Bellei, Cristián, and Gonzalo Muñoz. 2023. "Models of regulation, Education Policies, and Changes in the Education System: A long-Term Analysis of the Chilean Case." *Journal of Educational Change* 24:49–76. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10833-021-09435-1>.
- Benford, Robert D., and David A. Snow. 2000. "Framing Processes and Social Movements: An Overview and Assessment." *Annual Review of Sociology* 26 (1): 611–639. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.soc.26.1.611>.
- Bottery, Mike. 2009. "Critical Professional or Branded Technician? Changing Conceptions of the Educational Worker." In *Re-Reading Educational Policies*, edited by M. Simons, M. Olssen, and M. Peters, 683–700. Rotterdam, The Netherlands: Sense Publishers.
- Broadfoot, Patricia. 1996. *Education, Assessment and Society: A Sociological Analysis*. London, United Kingdom: Open University Press.
- Butler, Jesse K., and Peter Milley. 2020. "Reframing Citizenship Education: The Shifting Portrayal of Citizenship in Curriculum Policy in the Province of Ontario, 1999-2018." *Education Policy Analysis Archives* 28 (83). <https://doi.org/10.14507/epaa.28.5162>.
- Cabalin, Cristian. 2012. "Neoliberal Education and Student Movements in Chile: Inequalities and Malaise." *Policy Futures in Education* 10 (2): 219–228. <https://doi.org/10.2304/pfie.2012.10.2.219>.
- Cavieres-Fernández, Eduardo, and Michael Apple. 2016. "La Ley Docente y la Clase Media: Controlando el Desarrollo de los Profesores Chilenos." *Cadernos Cedes* 36 (100): 265–280. <https://doi.org/10.1590/CC0101-32622016171391>.
- Clark, Peter B., and James F. Wilson. 1961. "Incentive Systems: A Theory of Organizations." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 6:129–166. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2390752>.
- Cochran-Smith, Marilyn, Carney Cummings, Molly Stringer Keefe, Elizabeth Burton, Stephani Chang, Wen Chia, María Beatriz Fernández, Andrew F. Miller, Juan Gabriel Sánchez, and Megina Baker. 2018. *Reclaiming Accountability in Teacher Education*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Cox, Claudia, Laura Meckes, and Martín Bascopé. 2010. "La Institucionalidad Formadora de Profesores en Chile en la Década del 2000: Velocidad del Mercado y Parsimonia de las Políticas." *Pensamiento Educativo, Revista de Investigación Latinoamericana (PEL)* 46 (1): 205–245.
- Creswell, John W. 2007. *Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design: Choosing Among Five Approaches*. London: Sage.
- Danielson, Charlotte. 2007. *Enhancing Professional Practice: A Framework for Teaching*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Darling-Hammond, Linda, Dion Burns, A. Lin Goodwin Carol Campbell, Karen Hammerness, Ee-Ling Low, Ann McIntyre, Mistilina Sato, and Ken Zeichner. 2017. *Empowered Educators: How high-Performing Systems Shape Teaching Quality Around the World*. Hoboken, New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons.
- Davies, Scott. 2002. "The Paradox of Progressive Education: A Frame Analysis." *Sociology of Education* 75 (4): 269–286. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3090279>.
- Dombos, Tamas. 2012. "Critical Frame Analysis: A Comparative Methodology for the 'Quality in Gender + Equality Policies' (QUING) Project." Accessed October 30, 2024. <https://cps.ceu.edu/sites/cps.ceu.edu/files/cps-working-paper-critical-frame-analysis-quiring-2012.pdf>.

- Donoso, Sofia. 2013. "Dynamics of Change in Chile: Explaining the Emergence of the 2006 Pinguino Movement." *Journal of Latin American Studies* 45 (1): 1–29. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022216X12001228>.
- Elmore, Richard F. 2004. *School Reform from the Inside Out: Policy, Practice, and Performance*. Cambridge: Harvard Education Press.
- Entman, Robert M. 1993. "Framing: Toward Clarification of a Fractured Paradigm." *Journal of Communication* 43 (4): 51–58. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.1993.tb01304.x>.
- Evetts, Julia. 2011. "A New Professionalism? Challenges and Opportunities." *Current Sociology* 59:406–422. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0011392111402585>.
- Evetts, Julia. 2013. "Professionalism: Value and Ideology." *Current Sociology* 61 (5–6): 778–796. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0011392113479316>.
- Falabella, Alejandra. 2020. "The Ethics of Competition: Accountability Policy Enactment in Chilean Schools' Everyday Life." *Journal of Education Policy* 35 (1): 23–45. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02680939.2019.1635272>.
- Falabella, Alejandra. 2021. "The Seduction of hyper-Surveillance: Standards, Testing, and Accountability." *Educational Administration Quarterly* 57 (1): 113–142. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X20912299>.
- Fernández, María Beatriz, Alvaro González, Ivan Salinas, Víctor Orellana, and Alejandra Crocco. 2022. "Entre la Autorregulación y el Cumplimiento: El Impacto de la Acreditación Obligatoria en el Cambio de Prácticas en Programas de Pedagogía." *Comisión Nacional de Acreditación* (Cuadernos de Investigación), Cuaderno 23, 2022. Retrieved from <https://www.cnachile.cl/SiteAssets/Paginas/Cuadernos%20de%20Investigaci%C3%B3n%20en%20Aseguramiento%20de%20la%20Calidad%202022/Cuaderno%2023.pdf>.
- Freidson, Eliot. 2001. *Professionalism, the Third Logic: On the Practice of Knowledge*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Gamson, William. 1992. "The Social Psychology of Collective Action." In *Frontiers in Social Movement Theory*, edited by A. D. Morris and C. McClurg Mueller, 53–76. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Goodson, Ivor F. 2001. *Life Histories of Teachers: Understanding Life and Work*. Tokyo: Koyo Shobo.
- Goodwin, A. Lin. 2020. "Teaching Standards, globalisation, and Conceptions of Teacher Professionalism." *European Journal of Teacher Education* 44 (1): 5–19. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02619768.2020.1833855>.
- Hargreaves, Andy. 2000. "Four Ages of Professionalism and Professional Learning." *Teachers and Teaching: History and Practice* 6 (2): 151–182. <https://doi.org/10.1080/713698714>.
- Hochschild, Hernán, Facundo Díaz, Joaquín Walker, Jorge Schiappacasse, and María Paz Medeiros. 2014. "El Plan Maestro, Diálogos para la Profesión Docente." *Calidad en la Educación* (41): 121–135. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4067/S0718-45652014000200005>.
- Kumashiro, Kevin. 2012. *Bad Teacher! How Blaming Teachers Distorts the Bigger Picture*. New York: Teacher College Press.
- Kuypers, Jim A. 2009. "Framing Analysis from a Rhetorical Perspective." In *Doing News Framing Analysis*, edited by P. D'Angelo and J. A. Kuypers, 286–311. New York: Taylor and Francis.
- Lascoumes, Pierre, and Patrick Le Galès. 2004. *Gouverner par les Instruments*. Paris: Sciences Po, Les Presses.
- Lascoumes, Pierre, and Patrick Le Galès. 2007. "Introduction: Understanding Public Policy Through Its Instruments - from the Nature of Instruments to the Sociology of Public Policy Instrumentation." *Governance: An International Journal of Policy, administration, and Institutions* 20 (1): 1–21. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0491.2007.00342.x>.
- Lascoumes, Pierre, and Louis Simard. 2011. "L'action Publique au Prisme de ses Instruments: Introduction." *Revue française de science politique* 61 (1): 5–22. <https://doi.org/10.3917/rfsp.611.0005>.
- Law 20.903. 2016. *Ley 20.903 Crea el Sistema de Desarrollo Profesional Docente y Modifica otras Normas*. Santiago de Chile: MINEDUC. Retrieved from Biblioteca del Congreso Nacional de Chile.



- Mezza, Anita. 2022. "Reinforcing and Innovating Teacher Professionalism: Learning from Other Professions." *OECD Working Papers No. 276. OECD Edition*. <https://doi.org/10.1787/117a675c-en>.
- Miles, Matthew, and Michael Huberman. 2003. *Analyse des Données Qualitatives*. Louvain la Neuve, Belgium: De Boeck Supérieur.
- Mizala, Alejandra, and Ben Schneider. 2020. "Promoting Quality Education in Chile: The Politics of Reforming Teacher Careers." *Journal of Education Policy* 35 (4): 529–555. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02680939.2019.1585577>.
- OECD. 2005. *Teachers Matter: Attracting, Developing and Retaining Effective Teachers*. Paris: OECD Publishing.
- OECD. 2021. *Teachers Getting the Best Out of Their Students: From Primary to Upper Secondary Education*. Paris: TALIS. OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/5bc5cd4e-en>.
- Oliver, Pamela E., and Hank Johnston. 2000. What a Good Idea! Frames and Ideologies in Social Movement Research. <http://www.ssc.wisc.edu/~oliver/PROTESTS/ArticleCopies/Frames.2.29.00.pdf>.
- Parcerisa, Lluís, Antoni Verger, Marcel Pagès, and Natalie Browes. 2022. "Teacher Autonomy in the Age of performance-Based Accountability: A Review Based on Teaching Profession Regulatory Models (2017–2020)." *Education Policy Analysis Archives* 30:100. <https://doi.org/10.14507/epaa.30.6204>.
- Phillips, David. 2005. "Policy Borrowing in Education: Frameworks for Analysis." In *International Handbook on globalisation, Education and Policy Research*, edited by J. Zajda, et al. 23–34. New York: Springer.
- Plan Maestro. 2014. *Principios y Propuestas de El Plan Maestro*, Santiago. [https://educacion.uahurtado.cl/wpsite/wp-content/uploads/2015/01/planmaestro\\_pyp\\_bajaresol\\_ref.pdf](https://educacion.uahurtado.cl/wpsite/wp-content/uploads/2015/01/planmaestro_pyp_bajaresol_ref.pdf).
2023. "Programa de las Naciones Unidas para el Desarrollo (PNUD)." *Informe Final: Evaluación del Sistema de Apoyo Formativo y del Sistema de Reconocimiento y Promoción de la Ley 20.903*. <https://www.undp.org/es/chile/publicaciones/resumen-ejecutivo-evaluacion-del-sistema-de-apoyo-formativo-y-del-sistema-de-reconocimiento-y-promocion-de-la-ley-20903>.
- Rein, Martin, and Donald Schön. 1996. "frame-Critical Policy Analysis and frame-Reflective Policy Practice." *Knowledge and Policy: The International Journal of Knowledge Transfer and Utilization* 9 (1): 85–104. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02832235>.
- Ro, Jina. 2020. "Curriculum, Standards and Professionalisation: The Policy Discourse on Teacher Professionalism in Singapore." *Teaching & Teacher Education* 91:103056. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2020.103056>.
- Ruffinelli Vargas, Andrea. 2016. "Ley de Desarrollo Profesional Docente en Chile: De la Precarización Sistemática a los Logros, Avances y Desafíos Pendientes para la Profesionalización." *Estudios pedagógicos (Valdivia)* 42 (4): 261–279. <https://doi.org/10.4067/S0718-07052016000500015>.
- Ryan, Katherine E. 2005. "Making Educational Accountability More Democratic." *American Journal of Evaluation* 26 (4): 532–543. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1098214005281344>.
- Sachs, Judyth. 2015. "Teacher Professionalism: Why are We Still Talking About It?" *Teachers & Teaching* 22 (4): 413–425. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13540602.2015.1082732>.
- Sahlberg, Pasi. 2010. *The Secret to Finland's Success: Educating Teachers*. Stanford: Stanford Center For Opportunity Policy in Education. <https://edpolicy.stanford.edu/sites/default/files/publications/secret-finland%e2%80%99s-success-educating-teachers.pdf>.
- Sanhueza, Francisca Durán. 2017. "La Evaluación de la Calidad Educativa en Chile: Instrumentos de Control y Rendición de Cuentas." *Revista Educación, Política y Sociedad* 3 (1): 85–99. <https://doi.org/10.15366/repso2018.3.1.005>.
- Schön, Donald A. 2017. *The Reflective Practitioner: How Professionals Think in Action*. Milton Park, United Kingdom: Routledge.
- Sisto, Vicente, Lorena Núñez-Parra, Andrea López-Barraza, and Lorena Ramírez-Casas Del Valle. 2022. "The Rebellion of the Bases Against the Standardization of Pedagogical Work: The Case of the Mobilization Against the Teaching Career Law in Chile." *Education Policy Analysis Archives* 30 (September): 138. <https://doi.org/10.14507/epaa.30.6460>.



- Smith, William C., and Aaron Benavot. 2019. "Improving Accountability in Education: The Importance of Structured Democratic Voice." *Asia Pacific Education Review* 20:193–205. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12564-019-09599-9>.
- Snow, David A., and Robert D. Benford. 1988. "Ideology, Frame Resonance, and Participant Mobilization." *International Social Movement Research* 1 (1): 197–217.
- Snow, David E., E. Burke Jr., Steven K. Worden Rochford, and Robert D. Benford. 1986. "Frame Alignment Processes, micromobilization, and Movement Participation." *American Sociological Review* 51 (4): 464–481. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2095581>.
- Streeck, Wolfgang, and Kathleen Thelen, eds. 2005. *Beyond Continuity: Institutional Change in Advanced Political Economies*. United Kingdom: Oxford University Press.
- Tan, Oon-Seng, and Ee-Ling. Low. 2023. "Teacher Learning and Development in Singapore: A career-Long Perspective." In *Research, Policymaking, and Innovation: Teacher and Education Development in Belt and Road Countries*, edited by Oon-Seng Tan and Ee-Ling Low, 105–130. Berlin, Germany: Springer.
- Taylor, Charles. 2004. *Modern Social Imaginaries*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Towers, Emma, Elizabeth A. C. Rushton, Simon Gibbons, Sarah Steadman, Richard Brock, Ye Cao, Carla Finesilver, et al. 2023. "The 'Problem' Of Teacher Quality: Exploring Challenges and Opportunities in Developing Teacher Quality During the COVID-19 Global Pandemic in England." *Educational Review* 77 (1): 1–17. March. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00131911.2023.2184771>.
- UNESCO. 2023. *Informe Mundial sobre el Personal Docente: Afrontar la Escasez de Docentes; Puntos Clave*. UNESCO [8664], Paris: International Task Force on Teachers for Education.
- Valenzuela, Juan Pablo, Cristian Bellei, and Danae de Los Ríos. 2013. "Socioeconomic School Segregation in a market-Oriented Educational System: The Case of Chile." *Journal of Education Policy* 29 (2): 217–241. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02680939.2013.806995>.
- Villalba-Pino, D., F. Valdés-Flores, and M. B. Fernández. 2023. "Desafiando las nociones de trabajo docente: Críticas, propuestas y bilingüismos desde la organización docente." *Estudios Pedagógicos* 49 (2): 373–392. <https://doi.org/10.4067/S0718-07052023000200373>.
- Wu, Bihu, Lan Xue, Alastair M. Morrison, and Xi Y. Leung. 2012. "Frame Analysis on Golden Week Policy Reform in China." *Annals of Tourism Research* 39 (2): 842–862. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2011.10.002>.
- Yinger, Robert J. 1999. "The Role of Standards in Teaching and Teacher Education." *Teachers College Record* 100 (5): 85–113. <https://doi.org/10.1177/01614681991000050>.

## Appendix

### Appendix 1: Corpus

| Type                    | Documents                                                                                                            | N  | Retrieved from                                                                                                                                                                                    | Access date |
|-------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|
| Political documents     | Presidential message (20/04/15) – 7 p.<br>Law 20.903 – Creates System for Teachers’ Professional development         | 1  | <a href="http://s.bcn.cl/1v0sg">http://s.bcn.cl/1v0sg</a> .                                                                                                                                       | 12/12/22    |
|                         | Presidential message (27/01/2023) – 10 p.<br>Law 21.625 – Establishes Single Teacher Evaluation System (2023)        | 2  | <a href="https://bcn.cl/3g4zg">https://bcn.cl/3g4zg</a> .                                                                                                                                         | 18/10/23    |
| Legislative documents   | Law 20.903 – Creates System for Teachers’ Professional development (2016) – 47 p.                                    | 3  | <a href="http://bcn.cl/24y8q">http://bcn.cl/24y8q</a> .                                                                                                                                           | 12/12/22    |
|                         | Law 20.129 Establishes a National System of Higher Education Quality Assurance (2006 – Updated in 2022)              | 4  | <a href="https://www.bcn.cl/leychile/navegar?idNorma=255323&amp;idParte=8721536">https://www.bcn.cl/leychile/navegar?idNorma=255323&amp;idParte=8721536</a> .                                     | 15/02/24    |
| Normative documents     | CPEIP – Framework for Good Teaching (2021) – 87 p.                                                                   | 5  | <a href="https://estandaresdocentes.mineduc.cl/wp-content/uploads/2021/08/MBE-2.pdf">https://estandaresdocentes.mineduc.cl/wp-content/uploads/2021/08/MBE-2.pdf</a> .                             | 15/01/23    |
|                         | CPEIP – Pedagogical and Disciplinary Standards for the General Basic Education Pedagogy Career Paths (2022) – 216 p. | 6  | <a href="https://estandaresdocentes.mineduc.cl/wp-content/uploads/2023/05/basica_2023_digital.pdf">https://estandaresdocentes.mineduc.cl/wp-content/uploads/2023/05/basica_2023_digital.pdf</a> . | 15/01/23    |
| Dissemination documents | CPEIP – Discover the teaching career – 1 p.                                                                          | 7  | <a href="https://www.cpeip.cl/descubre-carrera-docente/">https://www.cpeip.cl/descubre-carrera-docente/</a> .                                                                                     | 15/01/23    |
|                         | CPEIP – Entry to the Teaching Career – 1. p                                                                          | 8  | <a href="https://www.cpeip.cl/carrera-docente-ingreso/">https://www.cpeip.cl/carrera-docente-ingreso/</a> .                                                                                       | 15/01/23    |
|                         | CPEIP – Stages and progression in the Teaching Career – 2 p.                                                         | 9  | <a href="https://www.cpeip.cl/carrera-docente-progresion-tramos/">https://www.cpeip.cl/carrera-docente-progresion-tramos/</a> .                                                                   | 15/01/23    |
|                         | CPEIP – Teaching Career Allowances – 2 p.                                                                            | 10 | <a href="https://www.cpeip.cl/carrera-docente-asignaciones/">https://www.cpeip.cl/carrera-docente-asignaciones/</a> .                                                                             | 15/01/23    |
|                         | CPEIP – Standards of the Teaching profession – 1 p.                                                                  | 11 | <a href="https://estandaresdocentes.mineduc.cl/">https://estandaresdocentes.mineduc.cl/</a> .                                                                                                     | 15/01/23    |
|                         | CPEIP – Professional Standards – Meaning and implications – 3 p.                                                     | 12 | <a href="https://estandaresdocentes.mineduc.cl/estandares-docentes/">https://estandaresdocentes.mineduc.cl/estandares-docentes/</a> .                                                             | 15/01/23    |
|                         | CPEIP – Standards for Pedagogy Careers – 1 p.                                                                        | 13 | <a href="https://estandaresdocentes.mineduc.cl/estandares-carreras-pedagogia/">https://estandaresdocentes.mineduc.cl/estandares-carreras-pedagogia/</a> .                                         | 15/01/23    |
|                         | CPEIP – Professional Performance standards – 1 p.                                                                    | 14 | <a href="https://estandaresdocentes.mineduc.cl/marco-para-la-buena-ensenanza/">https://estandaresdocentes.mineduc.cl/marco-para-la-buena-ensenanza/</a> .                                         | 15/01/23    |
|                         | CPEIP – Documents to deepen in the Professional Standards – 1 p.                                                     | 15 | <a href="https://estandaresdocentes.mineduc.cl/documentos-para-profundizar/">https://estandaresdocentes.mineduc.cl/documentos-para-profundizar/</a> .                                             | 15/01/23    |
|                         | CPEIP – Continuing Education – 1 p.                                                                                  | 16 | <a href="https://www.cpeip.cl/formacion-continua-docente/">https://www.cpeip.cl/formacion-continua-docente/</a> .                                                                                 | 15/01/23    |
|                         | CPEIP – Local Training – 2 p.                                                                                        | 17 | <a href="https://www.cpeip.cl/formacion-local/">https://www.cpeip.cl/formacion-local/</a> .                                                                                                       | 15/01/23    |
|                         | CPEIP – Induction to the Teaching Profession – 1 p.                                                                  | 18 | <a href="https://www.cpeip.cl/inducccion-docente/">https://www.cpeip.cl/inducccion-docente/</a> .                                                                                                 | 15/01/23    |
|                         | CPEIP – Teacher Evaluation* – 4 p.                                                                                   | 19 | <a href="https://www.cpeip.cl/evaluacion-de-la-docencia/">https://www.cpeip.cl/evaluacion-de-la-docencia/</a> .                                                                                   | 15/01/23    |
|                         | CPEIP – Recognition system                                                                                           | 20 | <a href="https://www.cpeip.cl/sistema-reconocimiento/">https://www.cpeip.cl/sistema-reconocimiento/</a> .                                                                                         | 15/01/23    |
|                         | Docentemas – Teacher evaluation* – 4 p.                                                                              | 21 | <a href="https://www.docentemas.cl">https://www.docentemas.cl</a> .                                                                                                                               | 20/01/23    |

(Continued)

(Continued).

| Type | Documents                                                                                                           | N  | Retrieved from                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  | Access date |
|------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|
|      | Docentemas – Recognition system – 4 p.                                                                              | 22 | <a href="https://www.docentemas.cl/sistema-unico-evaluacion/sistema-de-reconocimiento/">https://www.docentemas.cl/sistema-unico-evaluacion/sistema-de-reconocimiento/</a>                                                                       | 20/01/23    |
|      | Docentemas – Portfolio – 1 p.                                                                                       | 23 | <a href="https://www.docentemas.cl/instrumentos-de-evaluacion/portafolio/">https://www.docentemas.cl/instrumentos-de-evaluacion/portafolio/</a>                                                                                                 | 20/01/23    |
|      | Docentemas – Evaluation of Specific and Pedagogical Knowledge – 1 p.                                                | 24 | <a href="https://www.docentemas.cl/instrumentos-de-evaluacion/evaluacion-de-conocimientos-especificos-y-pedagogicos-ecep/">https://www.docentemas.cl/instrumentos-de-evaluacion/evaluacion-de-conocimientos-especificos-y-pedagogicos-ecep/</a> | 20/01/23    |
|      | Docentemas – Self-evaluation Manual Basic Education 1st to 4th grades Language and Mathematics 2013–14 p.           | 25 | <a href="https://www.docentemas.cl/download/manual-autoevaluacion-educacion-basica-1-a-4-lenguaje-y-matematica/">https://www.docentemas.cl/download/manual-autoevaluacion-educacion-basica-1-a-4-lenguaje-y-matematica/</a>                     | 20/01/23    |
|      | Docentemas – Self-evaluation Manual Basic Education 1st to 4th grades Language and Mathematics (updated) 2023–14 p. | 26 | <a href="https://www.docentemas.cl/download/manual-autoevaluacion-educacion-basica-1-a-4-lenguaje-y-matematica/">https://www.docentemas.cl/download/manual-autoevaluacion-educacion-basica-1-a-4-lenguaje-y-matematica/</a>                     | 20/01/23    |

\*The teacher evaluation system has evolved towards a single evaluation system for all teachers in schools receiving public funding through the Law 21.625. Consulted information has been updated recently.

## Appendix 2: Coding Matrix

| Categories (codes)                             | Sub-categories (sub-codes)                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               |
|------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Problems (Diagnostic frames)                   | Problem definition<br>Causes<br>Antagonist<br>Protagonist                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                |
| Stakes/Challenges                              | Conception of education system<br>Conception of learning<br>Conception of teachers and teaching<br>Conception of students<br>Conception of teacher education<br>Conception of induction<br>Conception of professional development                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        |
| Justification for action (Motivational frames) | Moral incentives<br>Material incentives<br>Symbolic device<br>Consequences of non-action                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
| Proposed solutions (Prognostic frames)         | Goals<br>Strategies<br>Mechanisms<br>Policy tools – Teacher education<br>Policy tools – Teachers' employment and working conditions<br>Policy tools – Teacher professional development<br>Policy tools – Induction<br>Beneficiaries<br>Key actors – educational authorities<br>Key actors – teacher education institutions<br>Key actors – principal and school management team<br>Key actors – teachers<br>Key actors – mentors<br>Norms and values<br>Direct and indirect consequences |