

DATAFILE CODEBOOK

The results of participatory processes: public policies and government-society relationships

Variable	Codes
MUNICIPALITY LEVEL	
POL_ID	Data File Policy Proposal ID
PP_ID.- MECPALO Participatory Process ID	Numeric
PP_Name.- Participatory Process name	String
M1.- Municipality	1 Alcaudete 2 Arbúcies 3 Archidona 4 Barberà Del Vallès 5 Begues 6 Bescano 7 Cambrils 8 Córdoba 9 Cúllar Vega 10 Cunit 11 Fuente Vaqueros 12 Jerez De La Frontera 13 Las Gábias 14 Lora Del Río 15 Madrid 16 Málaga 17 Moguer 18 Móstoles 19 Parla 20 Santa Cristina D'aro 21 Sevilla 22 Torrox 23 Mejorada del campo 24 Rivas Vaciamadrid 25 Villanueva de la Cañada
M2.- Region	1 Andalusia 2 Madrid 3 Catalonia
M3.- Province	1 Almería 2 Cádiz 3 Córdoba 4 Granada 5 Huelva 6 Jaén 7 Málaga 8 Sevilla 21 Madrid city 22 Madrid metropolitan area 23 Madrid rest 31 Barcelona 32 Girona 33 Lleida 34 Tarragona
M4.- Number of inhabitants (2012)	Numeric
M5.- Inhabitants (intervals)	1 Less than 5.000 2 5.000-10.000 3 10.001-20.000 4 20.001-50.000 5 More than 50.000
M6.- Mayor's party at the moment of the experience	1 Left (IU) 2 Social-democrats (PSOE) 3 Center and others (PA, independents) 4 Right (PP, CiU) 9 No info

Variable	Codes
M7.- Participation Department	0 no 1 yes 9 No info
M8.- Participation Plan	0 no 1 yes 9 No info
M9.- Density (Number of participatory experiences)	1 1 experience 2 2 experiences 3 3 experiences 4 4 experiences 5 5 experiences 6 6 or more 9 No info
M10.- Municipal revenue per capita (in 2012)	Numeric
M11.- Mayor's party in 2011-2015 period	1 Left (IU) 2 Social-democrats (PSOE) 3 Center and others (PA, independents) 4 Right (PP, CiU) 9 No info
M12.- Continuity at the political level (comparing before and after 2011 municipal elections)	1 Complete continuity (same mayor and same party/coalition) 2 Partial continuity (mayor or most important party in government remains) 3 Clear government change
M13.- Proximity to election (from the moment where proposals were made)	1 Less than one year 2 Between one and two years 3 More than two years
M14.- Government stability / strength (in 2011-2015)	1 Single-party majority government 2 Coalition government (with majority support at local council) 3 Minority government (one or several parties)
PARTICIPATORY PROCESS LEVEL	
PP1.- Start year	Numeric ____ Year 9999 No info
PP2.- Temporal character	1 One-off experience 2 Long but limited in time 3 Stable mechanism 9 No info
PP3.- Ongoing?	0 No 1 Yes 9 No info
PP4_Months.- Number of months working	Numeric 0 Less than one month 999 No info
PP4_Years.- Number of years working	0 Less than one year 1 One to two years 2 Two to five years 3 More than five years 9 No info
PP5_1 – PP5_77.- Subject Urban planning (PP5_1) Budget (PP5_2) Development (PP5_3) Mobility (PP5_4) Welfare (PP5_5) Participation (PP5_6) Environment (PP5_7) Immigration (PP5_8) Culture (PP5_9) ICTs (PP5_10) Others (PP5_77)	0 no 1 yes 9 No info

Variable	Codes
PP6_1-PP6_5.- Policy stage Diagnosis (PP6_1) Programming (PP6_2) Decision (PP6_3) Implementation (PP6_4) Evaluation (PP6_5)	0 no 1 yes 9 No info
PP7.- Number of stages	Number of Policy Stages 0 No info 1 1 2 2 3 3 4 4 5 5
PP8.- Initiative of the process	0 Also civil society 1 Just public administration
PP9.- Any other administration involved?	0 No 1 Yes 9 No info
PP10.- Participation of associations	0 No 1 Yes 9 No info
PP11.- Participants	1 Just citizens no associations 2 Citizens + associations 3 Just associations 9 No info
PP12.- Criteria for including participants in experience	1 Open to everyone 2 At random 3 Invitation 4 Mixed 9 No info
PP13.- Number of participants	0 0 1 10 or less 2 10-24 3 25-49 4 50-99 5 100-299 6 300-499 7 500-1000 8 More than 1000 99 No info
PP14.- Cost of the participatory process	_____ exact cost 99999 No info
PP15.- External financial help	0 No 1 Yes 9 No info
PP16.- External Consultant	0 No 1 Yes 9 No info
PP17_1-PP17_77.- Methodologies used Focus groups (PP17_1) Specific convention (PP17_2) Workshops (PP17_3) Forum convention (PP17_4) Open meeting (PP17_5) Citizen Jury (PP17_6) Participatory Diagnose (PP17_7) Brainstorming (PP17_8) New ICTs (PP17_9) IAP (PP17_10) Questionnaires (PP17_11) Interviews (PP17_12) Others (PP17_77)	0 No 1 Yes

Variable	Codes
PP18.- Diffusion / Visibility	0 No 1 Yes 9 No info
PP19_1-PP19_77.- Diffusion media Radio (PP19_1) Local Press (PP19_2) Local TV (PP19_3) Letters (PP19_4) Posters (PP19_5) Info associations (PP19_6) Web local government (PP19_7) Mails, social networks (PP19_8) Louspeakers (PP19_9) Others (PP19_77)	0 No 1 Yes
PP20.- Presence of facilitator	0 No 1 Yes 9 No info
PP21.- Presence of experts	0 No 1 Yes 9 No info
PP22.- Level of information	1 Low 2 Medium 3 High 9 No info
PP23.- Process design	1 Participatory Budgeting 2 Strategic planning 3 Other permanent mechanism 4 Other temporary experiences
PP24.- Type of policy proposals	1 Yes, all implementable 2 Yes, a majority implementable 3 Yes, both 4 Yes, a majority generic 5 Yes, all generic 6 No information found about the process 7 Not enough information to permit proposal classification
PP25_1,- Policy proposals sources of information PP25_2 (Filtered when just one information source)	1 Official minutes / Municipal resolution/motion 2 Technical report (diagnose, conclusions, results, ...) 3 Excel spreadsheets 4 Final Executive Report 5 References on newspapers, blogs, etc. 6 Interviews 7 Others 9 No info
PP26.- Number of source documents for policy proposals	1-4 1-4 5 5 or more 9 Don't apply
PP27.- Time of release of policy proposals	Date (month/year)
PP28.- Number of policy proposals (total)	Numeric ___ exact number
PP29.- Introduction of technical criteria during the participatory process	0 Technical criteria are accountable 1 Technical criteria are not accountable 2 No technical criteria 9 No info
PP30.- Requirement of local authority to respond	1 Compulsory 2 Recommendation 3 No obligation at all 4 Not specified
PP31.- Immediate response of the authority (organizing authority compromise with the process results as a part of the process or some time later, i.e. press conference)	0 No 1 Yes 9 No info
PP32.- Global acceptance of proposals (i.e. an executive or legislative body)	0 No 1 Yes, all proposals accepted 2 Yes, some proposals accepted

Variable	Codes
PP33.- Degree of accessibility of source documents for policy proposals	1 Public document, full availability (i.e. published in webpage, book or other documents available online) 2 Public document, restricted availability (i.e. book or other documents you have to look for) 3 Internal documentation (i.e. minutes of the meetings, technical reports, spreadsheets, etc.) obtained after request 9 No info
PP34.- Quality of the information about proposals	1 Clearly identifiable proposals WITH detailed information of their content 2 Clearly identifiable proposals WITHOUT detailed information of their content 3 Proposals not clearly identifiable (i.e. proposals distributed through the text) 9 No info NOTE: When more than one code applies, choose the one that fits best to the majority of proposals.
POLICY PROPOSAL LEVEL	
POL1.- Policy proposal ID	Numeric
POL2.- Policy proposal description	String
POL3.- Policy proposal nature	0 Generic 1 Implementable 9 No info
POL4_1.- Policy proposal subject (1)	1 Social Welfare
POL4_2.- Policy proposal subject (2)	2 Education 3 Health care 4 Foreign Affairs 5 Culture 6 Sports, Youth, Leisure 7 Economy / Tourism 8 Public Administration 9 Environment 10 Citizen participation 11 Transports 12 Security 13 ICTs 14 Urban Planning
POL5.- Number of departments concerned	1 1 2 2 3 3 4 More than 3 9 No info
POL6.- Boundaries of political competence	1 Complete municipal competence 2 Partial municipal competence 3 No municipal competence 9 No info
POL7.- Policy proposal continuity character	0 Does not challenge existing policy positions 1 Challenges existing policies and practices 9 No info
POL8_1.- Policy proposal outcome (when fieldwork were conducted)	0 Ignored 1 Rejected / Abandoned 2 Active / In progress 3 Partially implemented 4 Completely implemented 9 No info
POL8_2.- Degree of acceptance of the proposal (check highest degree)	1 Rejected / ignored 2 Formal acceptance 3 Appears in department's policy documentation 4 Appears in department's programme of work 5 Implementing (work in progress) 6 Implemented (<i>complete + partial</i>) 9 No information

Variable	Codes
POL8_1AND2.- Policy proposal implementation (combination of POL8_1 and POL8_2)	1 Full implementation 2 Partial implementation 3 Small development 4 Rejected 5 No info
RL_POL8_2.- Reliability question 8_2	
POL9.- The proposal, has been significantly modified? (Filtered for ignored or rejected proposals, codes 0 or 1 in POL8_1)	0 No 1 Yes 9 No info
RL_POL9.- Reliability question 9	
POL10.- The rejection or transformations, have been explained by the local authority? (Filtered for all cases except for ignored / rejected, code 1 in POL8_2, or significantly modified proposals, code 1 in POL9)	0 No 1 Yes 9 No info
RL_POL10.- Reliability question 10	
POL11.- Final or budgeted cost (exact when possible, ball park evaluation when not)	POL11_1.- Exact cost (numeric) _____ € POL11_2.- Ball park evaluation 0 No cost 1 Low (minor contract, <50.000 € for construction works and < 18.000 € for the rest) 2 Intermediate (50.000 to 200.000 for construction and from 18.000 to 60.000 for the rest) 3 High (more than 200.000 € for construction and more than 60.000 for the rest) 9 No information
POL12.- External funding for policy proposal implementation	0 No 1 Yes 9 No information
POL13.- Internal support (in the participatory process). Is the proposal prioritized over other proposals in the same process?	0 No prioritization (all proposals have the same priority) 1 Prioritized proposal (in case all proposals are ranked, priority will mean being on the first quartile) 2 No prioritized proposal (priorities assigned to other proposals) 9 No information
POL14.- Politicians agreement with POLP implementation	1 Totally agree 2 Tend to agree 3 Tend to disagree 4 Totally disagree 9 No information
RL_POL14.- Reliability question 14	
POL15.- Technicians agreement with POLP implementation	1 Totally agree 2 Tend to agree 3 Tend to disagree 4 Totally disagree 9 No information
RL_POL15.- Reliability question 15	
POL14_POL15.- Agreement/Disagreement with policy proposal implementation (combination of POL14 and POL15)	1 Both agree 2 Politicians agreement 3 Officers agreement 4 Both disagree 5 Politicians disagreement 6 Officers disagreement 7 No info
POL16.- Broader external support (support coming from outside the participatory process)	0 No 1 Yes 9 No information
RL_POL16.- Reliability question 16	
POL17.- External support source (most important) (Filtered for no or no information, codes 0 or 9 in POL16)	1 Political Parties 2 Expert committees 3 Business 4 Associations 5 Others_____ 6 Citizens / Neighbours 9 No information

Variable	Codes
RL_POL17. - Reliability question 17	
POL18. - External opposition (opposition coming from outside the participatory process)	0 No 1 Yes 9 No information
RL_POL18. - Reliability question 18	
POL19. - External opposition source (most important) (Filtered for no or no information, codes 0 or 9 in POL18)	1 Political Parties 2 Expert committees 3 Business 4 Associations 5 Others_____ 6 Citizens / Neighbours 9 No information
RL_POL19. - Reliability question 19	
POL20. - Proposal impact on media	0 Not present in media 1 Slightly present in media (newspapers, local broadcast, blogs, etc.). Maximum of 2 appearances 2 Intensely present in media (newspapers, local broadcast, blogs, etc.). More than 2 appearances 9 No info
RL_POLX. - Variable specific reliability	1 No reason to have doubts 2 Small uncertainty 3 Medium uncertainty 4 Maximum uncertainty 9 No info
POL21. - General reliability (to be coded at the participatory process level, same code for all the policy proposals in the same PP)	1 No reason to have doubts 2 Small uncertainty 3 Medium uncertainty 4 Maximum uncertainty 9 No info
POL22. - PP Reliability Index (arithmetic mean computed from specific reliability variables for each participatory process)	1 No reason to have doubts 2 Small uncertainty 3 Medium uncertainty 4 Maximum uncertainty 9 No info
POL23. - PPOL Reliability Index (arithmetic mean computed from specific reliability variables for each policy proposal)	1 No reason to have doubts 2 Small uncertainty 3 Medium uncertainty 4 Maximum uncertainty 9 No info

Coding Reliability Guidelines

POL21.- General reliability (at participatory process level), this variable reflects the subjective perception of the fieldwork technician about the quality of the information retrieved. To be coded according to these general directions:

1) No reason to have doubts	Good quality of information retrieved from documentation and/or interviews; No contradictions (according to the assessment of the person that is coding the information)
2) Small uncertainty	Medium quality of information retrieved from documentation and/or interviews; No contradictions (according to the assessment of the person that is coding the information)
3) Medium uncertainty	Medium quality of information retrieved from documentation and / or interviews; There are contradictory evidence (according to the assessment of the person that is coding the information)
4) Maximum uncertainty	Poor quality of information retrieved from documentation and / or interviews; There are contradictory evidence (according to the assessment of the person that is coding the information)

RL_POLX.- Specific reliability, for each important variable (at policy proposal level). To be coded according to these directions:

Final coding	Examples of situations that represent this category
1) No reason to have doubts	Official written source
	Other written sources
	Two different interviews (one of them, no government nor administration) with no major disagreements
	Two interviews (any) and no explicit doubts, nor contradictory evidence
	One interview with the key person that provides the information without any kind of doubts
2) Small uncertainty	One interview with administration, no explicit doubts, nor contradictory evidence
	One interview with administration or the leading organization of the process, interviewee checks information in documents
	Two interviews with small differences; one of the versions is much more serious/credible according to interviewer
	Two interviews, no contradictory evidence, both express some doubts or lack of conviction or an estimation based on his/her relevant expertise on the issue.
3) Medium uncertainty	One interview, interviewee's answers express some doubts or lack of conviction or an estimation based on his/her relevant expertise on the issue
	Two interviews, with somehow different versions; one of the versions seems to be more serious/credible/informed according to interviewer
4) Maximum uncertainty	Two interviews with opposing views; both versions with the same degree of seriousness/credibility/information according to interviewer
	One interview, with explicit doubts (manifested by interviewee or captured by interviewer)