Possibilities and limits in assessing quality of CCE comparatively

Anu Toots
Triin Lauri

Institute of Politics and Governance, Tallinn University
Need for renewed agenda

- Shift in conceptualising the quality in education
  - From extraordinary excellence to the standard norm
  - From product to process (and policy design)

- Political and policy responses
  - IOs as influential actors
    - UNESCO EFA Quality Framework 2005
    - OECD PISA and PIAAC
    - EU Commission and IEA
  - “Quality” at domestic arena as
    - promise of government
    - tool of governance

- Theoretical responses
  - “comparative turn” (Martens); “governing by data” (Ozga)
The state of affairs in QA of CCE

- Quality as a good learning outcome
  - Country rankings in civic knowledge (CIVED 99, ICCS 2009)
  - Decrease in knowledge scores between ICCS and CIVED
    - Prominent in Eastern Europe
    - Was high performance in CIVED 99 a random effect?
- What is known about quality assurance process?
  - policy design and institutions
  - ICCS 2009 Encyclopedia
Looking for a new research method

- We have …
  - Diverse qualitative data (country descriptions)
  - Complex and multifaceted phenomena – QA in CCE
- We want …
  - To find institutional configurations, that are associated with good performance (high civic knowledge)
- Relevant method is…
  - fuzzy set Qualitative Comparative Analysis (fsQCA)
Method – fuzzy set QCA

- useful in summarizing data for typology-building
- Bridging qualitative and quantitative
- Enables - multiple conjunctural causation, i.e.
  - most often, it is a combination of conditions that produces a phenomenon
  - several different combinations of conditions may produce the same outcome
  - depending on the context, a given condition may have different impact on the outcome.
Guiding assumptions

- Quality is a property of institutional set-up
- There in no single, but several configurations of quality assurance systems that can produce high civic achievement
- Type of institutional configuration (proximate conditions) interacts with social context (remote conditions) and should be in correspondence.
Framework and conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social context (Remote conditions)</th>
<th>Accountability paths</th>
<th>Participatory paths</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Human capital approach</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rights based approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• HDI</td>
<td></td>
<td>• HDI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Educ. expenditures</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Economist Index of Democracy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional configuration of QA (Proximate conditions)</th>
<th>External evaluation</th>
<th>Internal self-evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strictness of the CCE as a teaching and learning area (STR)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existence of formal recommendations regarding civic and citizenship activities at school (CIV)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extensity and intensity of assessment/evaluation of schools and students in CCE (ACC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Keywords</th>
<th>Testing and ranking, standardization, cognitive achievements, evaluation agencies, benchmarks, indexes</th>
<th>Learner’s capabilities, democratic school, social and emotional development, equality of opportunities, feedback, school improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group of countries</td>
<td>Remote analysis</td>
<td>Proximate analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability paths</td>
<td>Outcome enabling context</td>
<td>Institutional set-up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HDI * EDU</td>
<td>CIV * ACC</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~STR * ~ACC</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.34 (0.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HDI * ~EDU</td>
<td>~STR * ~CIV</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participative paths</td>
<td>HDI * PPC</td>
<td>~STR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>redundant</td>
<td>STR * CIV * ACC</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>redundant</td>
<td>~STR * ~CIV * ~ACC</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Multiple paths to success

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>configuration</th>
<th>formula</th>
<th>consistency</th>
<th>coverage raw (unique)</th>
<th>cases with positive outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total participatory path</td>
<td>HDI*PPC *~ STR</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.60 (.40)</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participatory path within accountability oriented context</td>
<td>HDI<em>EDU</em>~ STR*~ ACC</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.34 (.20)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability path</td>
<td>HDI<em>EDU</em>CIVAC*ACC</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.28 (.17)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Puzzling cases

- Norway and Denmark - *equally strong membership* in accountability path (1) and participatory path (4) at the same time.
  - Extremely strong proximate conditions
- England and Finland – *double membership, but not equal*
  - England is more “in” in the path 5 (.95 *vers* .84)
  - Finland is more “in” in path 4 (.92 *vers* .84)
  - Effect of recent changes in educ. policy
- Poland, Estonia, Russia – *non-members of any path*
- An “empty” path (England, Taipei) – *none of the conditions counts*
Limitations of the method and data

- **Method**
  - Good in explaining established systems
  - Unique coverage of paths is low

- **Data**
  - Remote (social) conditions too general
  - Proximate (institutional, policy) conditions differently understood across countries
    - Name of the subject/area (*social studies*)
    - Testing/ exams/ assessment

**Insufficiently described**
- Monitoring of CCE teachers development
- QA explicitly in CCE
Key messages for further research

- Quality and QA should be more in focus of research
- Data collection should be streamlined to this purpose